

TOWN OF GREENFIELD
PLANNING BOARD MEETING

June 9, 2026

Regular Meeting

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by T. Yasenchak, Chair, at 7:02 p.m. On Roll call the following Board members are present: T. Yasenchak, S. Licciardi, C. Dake, R. Roeckle, J. Sabanos, B. Podhajecki, B. Duffney and C. Ronk (Alternate). J. Reckner, Building Inspector, is present. E. Faas, Executive Secretary to the Planning Board, is present.

Minutes

April 28, 2026

MOTION: C. Dake

SECOND: S. Licciardi

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of April 28, 2026, minutes and accepts them as presented.

VOTE: Ayes: T. Yasenchak, S. Licciardi, C. Dake, R. Roeckle, J. Sabanos, B. Podhajecki, B. Duffney

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

May 12, 2026 – Postponed

May 26, 2026 – Postponed

New Business

Saratoga Escape, Case# PB 26-018

SUP

TM# 126.-1-81.1

265 Brigham Rd

C. Dake recuses himself. C. Ronk has full voting privileges and discussion on this project. Owners Eli Hackle and Andy Lewis are present. Attorney Charles Gottlieb is present on behalf of Winner Circle RV LLC. The Applicants are under contract to purchase the property and are in front of the Board to request the transfer of an existing Special Use Permit associated with the campground operation.

C. Gottlieb explains the property contains approximately 81.84 acres and includes 113 RV sites, 9 cabin sites, 2 glamping tents, and 2 tent sites, for a total of 126 campsites. He states the Applicants intend to operate seasonally from April through November without any immediate operational changes. The Applicants emphasize the request is not for a new expansion or a new use. While doing their due diligence, the issue of whether a formal Special Use Permit exists in Town records. The campground has existed for decades and may have continued as a pre-existing non-conforming use. However, on the other hand records contained multiple latter applications and approvals that seemed to suggest a Special Use Permit must have existed at some point even though no original resolution granting such permit was found. C. Gottlieb states the Applicants obtained information from a Freedom of Information Law request including past applications, amendments and approvals related to the campground. Although a resolution was not located, the history of amendments strongly suggests the Town treated the campground as having a Special Use Permit. The Applicants also submitted a recent survey dated May 4, 2026, identifying existing conditions on the property to try to help establish what currently exists on the campground parcel.

Before Board discussion, B. Duffney disclosed he had performed work at the campground in the past (ie: tree removal) but stated no money had changed hands and there was no current contract or ongoing business relationship.

During discussion, T. Yasenchak raises concern about determining which version of the Special Use Permit, or which set of conditions from past approvals would be transferred. Because several amendments were approved over the years and some improvements were not completed, the Board questioned whether unfinished or expired approvals should be transferred, whether they remain valid, and whether the Applicants would be obligated to complete the items the prior owners did not finish. The Applicants acknowledge that certain prior approvals, particularly those relating to septic improvements, were never completed and may now be void or expired due to the amount of time that has passed. The Applicants representative states the prospective owners have reviewed those materials and may wish to revisit or reapply for septic related permits after acquiring the property and recognize that a new application process may be required.

R. Roeckle asks if the septic engineer plans are still current and notes that any changes would need to be approved by the DOH.

T. Yasenchak states the importance of the perspective owners reviewing and understanding the operating standards, conditions, and limitations that apply to the Special Use Permit and what level the new owners are to be held accountable to. She goes on to explain the specific criteria and considerations regarding how the property is operated. T. Yasenchak states the Board will need a clear written basis for determining whether the campground is operating within its permitted use. The Applicants representative suggests the applicants could provide a narrative of operations to help establish how the campground is currently operated and what conditions should be part of the transfer.

T. Yasenchak states that Code Enforcement must be able to have something to look at to determine they are operating with compliance, such as an enforceable list of standards or conditions against which future operations can be measured. The Board wants to be able to determine which conditions remain

applicable, which approvals have expired, and what obligations should attach to the transfer of the Special Use Permit.

Board members agree that they will need to see a detailed narrative describing the existing campground use. B. Duffney stated he would like to see that there will be someone on-site making sure campers follow rules (i.e.: trespassing, proper RV waste disposal, speeding, etc.).

J. Sabanos agrees with a detailed narrative and suggests a conditional timeline and the possibility of a conditional (temporary) SUP, then coming back for a final permanent SUP. C. Ronk and B. Podhajecki agree. S. Licciardi would also like to see an updated narrative. He states we need proof that operations are staying the same. T. Yasenchak notes that the SUP is only for the campground, not for the residence.

Before the next meeting, the Applicants are asked to provide a written operations narrative describing:

- Existing campground use
 - Seasonal schedule
 - Site layout
 - Number and type of campsites
 - Structures
 - Infrastructures
 - Any intended maintenance or improvements
-

Old Business

Romano, Jon – Case # PB 25-026

Minor Subdivision

TM# 138.-1-97.3

24 Bump Hill Rd

Pat Jarosz of Van Guilder Land Surveyors is present representing the Applicant. P. Jarosz explains that the Applicant was previously in front of the Board with this application as a proposed 5-lot major subdivision, then revised to a 2-lot minor subdivision with remaining lands and are now here presenting revisions as a 3-lot subdivision. The revised plan includes proposed house locations, septic locations and test-pit information, driveway locations, fire-code notes and emergency access considerations including turnouts and staging areas for emergency vehicles

The Board clarifies that the Applicant had amended their existing application, rather than submitting a new one.

Board members appreciated the new revisions and acknowledged them to be a great improvement.

During Board discussion questions were raised whether the 90-degree turn near lot-3 provides an adequate turning radius for emergency vehicles. Driveway grading was also discussed, especially

regarding lots 2 and 3, and the need to ensure runoff does not sheet-flow into the road. It is mentioned that the Town Engineer will also require grading information after reviewing the revisions. As well as disturbing/clearing calculations, sight-distance, and driveway turn around details.

A public hearing is scheduled for July 14, 2026. Next steps for the Applicant include:

- Providing/clarifying grading details for driveway entrances
- Confirm the turning radius at the Lot 3 driveway turn and verify that it meets emergency access requirements.
- Add/confirm site- distance information on site plan
- Provide overall clearing and disturbance calculations if requested by the Town Engineer

Old Business and Public Hearing

55 & 65 Wilton Rd LLC

PUD

TM# 138.-2-109

59 Wilton Rd

John Cannie is present representing the Applicants. At the last meeting, the Board discussed the application had enough information to move forward reviewed short form SEQRA last meeting and gave a negative declaration, however, did not act on anything. As part of a review for a recommendation to the Town board as a PUD or an Amendment to a PUD, the PB is required to write a report. The Code is very specific on the items within that report that must be included. T. Yasenchak states that she has a draft recommendation and report based on our conversations and the plans and materials that were submitted to the Board.

The Board re-opens the Public Hearing at 8: 23 p.m. A motion is made to close the Public Hearing at 8:24 p.m.

MOTION: C. Dake

SECOND: B. Duffney

VOTE: Ayes: T. Yasenchak, R. Roeckle, S. Licciardi, C. Dake, J. Sabanos, B. Bohajecki, B. Duffney

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

T. Yasenchak reads through the draft advisory report aloud.

After reading through draft report and brief discussion, a motion is made to accept the report on the application and recommendation on the proposed CAREM Planned Unit Development as discussed with modifications noting that prior to Site Plan Review, zoning verification will be required; and refer the recommendation to the Town Board.

MOTION: C. Dake

SECOND: J. Sabanos

VOTE: Ayes: T. Yasenchak, R. Roeckle, C. Dake, S. Licciardi, J. Sabanos, B. Podhajecki, B. Duffney

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

Meeting Adjourned at 9:48 p.m.
