

TOWN OF GREENFIELD

PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

February 24, 2026

Regular Meeting

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by T. Yasenach, Chair, at 7:03pm. On roll call the following members are present: C. Dake, B. Duffney, S. Lucciardi, R. Roeckle, B. Podhajecki, and C. Ronk (Alternate). J. Sabanos is absent. J. Reckner, Building Inspector, is absent. E. Faas, Executive Secretary, is present.

Minutes

January 27, 2026

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: C. Ronk

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of the January 27, 2026 minutes and accept the corrected minutes

VOTE: Ayes: C. Ronk, B. Duffney, R. Roeckle, Podhajecki, C. Dake

Noes: None

Absent: J. Sabanos

Abstain: S. Lucciardi, T. Yasenach

February 10, 2026

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: S. Lucciardi

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of the February 10, 2026 minutes and accept the corrected minutes

VOTE: Ayes: B. Duffney, S. Lucciardi, R. Roeckle

Noes: None

Absent: J. Sabanos

Abstain: T. Yasenчек, B. Podhajecki, C. Dake, _____

New Business

Casavant, M. Case # PB 26-005

Site Plan Review

TM# 125.-2-25.3

822 Locust Grove Rd

Applicant is present. M. Casavant is in front of the Planning Board for a Sketch Plan/Site Plan Review. He is looking to put in electric and septic next to the lot that his home is built on, so that he can build tiny cabins for short term rentals as an Air B&B. The review letter from Building Inspector J. Reckner states that the project will fall under the designation of a campground, and will require a Special Use Permit to be approved as required by the town's Use Regulations Table and will also be subject to the provisions of section 105-125 of the Town Code.

The Applicant wished to start with Sketch Plan Review for feasibility purposes, prior to making any substantial investments. Campgrounds require a minimum of 10 acres and a minimum of 400 feet of frontage. The Applicant is aware of these conditions and has indicated he will combine both vacant parcels, 822 Locust Grove Rd (125.-2-25.3) and 826 Locust Grove Rd (125.-2-25.4), to meet this requirement. If this parcel merger is completed, the resulting lot would exceed the minimum lot and frontage requirements.

T. Yasenчak states that since this project falls under the designation of a campground, it would need to be seasonal. M. Casavant implies that he understands. T. Yasenчak reads the town's campground code to the Applicant and reiterates that it would have to be seasonal. She asks M. Casavant if this is what he is looking to do. The Applicant states that his intention was to have winterized running water so that people could snowshoe and enjoy winter activities on the trails. T. Yasenчak states that we can only operate within what our definitions are, so it would have to be seasonal. Applicant states that he understands. Project is opened up to the rest of the Board for their comments.

R. Roeckle inquires about the new water system that the Applicant will be putting in and asks if he has been in contact with the Department of Health, due to the fact that it will be considered a public water supply. And that they will be involved in the septic design. M. Casavant states that he understands and he also wants to make sure that it is done correctly.

R. Roeckle states that other than contacting the DOH, we will have to verify setbacks with regards to the site locations because of the two lots needing to be combined. Other than that R. Roeckle has no further questions or comments at this time.

C. Ronk advises the Applicant to be sure to have the wetlands delineated. The Applicant implicates that he understands.

B. Podhajecki inquiries about the site distance and the Applicant states that site distance was approved previously when the land was sub divided and he has the plans that confirm site distance.

C. Dake asks Applicant if more campsites could be put on the lot than Applicant is proposing. Applicant states that it was a possibility based on the septic capacity, but that he did not plan to. That his intention is to be a quiet couple retreat with hiking trails.

S. Lucciardi states that at this level of sketch review, he doesn't have any concerns. S. Lucciardi would like to see the trail plans and lighting plans as the project moves forward.

T. Yasenчек states to Applicant that there is a lot of engineering to do, however a campground is an approved use for the land. Moving forward the Board will need to see: plans showing site distance, location of cabins, trails and their locations (whether they will be public or private), lighting, septic and driveway/s. T. Yasenчек mentions that since it will be a public water supply it will need to be a certain distance from the road, driveway/s, or any other pavement or parking spots. R. Roeckle advises the Applicant that the Health Department will be able to give him information on the exact distance. T. Yasenчек states that after the roads and driveways have been designed a stormwater plan will need to be created and the wetlands will need to be delineated.

Old Business and Public Hearing

Brookview MHP/Sterling Engineering Case #690

PUD

TM# 150.-2-6

3499 Route 9N

The Applicant's and representative Sterling Engineering are here. They are in front of the Planning Board for an advisory opinion to the Town Board for a Planned Unit Development at 3499 Route 9N. The Applicants were last before the Planning Board in July 2025 and were told that more information would need to be provided to the Planning Board. The Applicants are here tonight presenting revisions. T. Yasenчек makes it known to the Applicants that no determinations would be made tonight. Our Town Engineer was not able to review the e-copy yet, but the Board will give some first thoughts on the revisions presented. The floor is given to the Applicant to explain the changes and what has transpired since they were last in front of the Board.

Applicant begins by saying that the biggest change since last year in July was that they submitted their jurisdictional determination with the DEC and the wetlands on the west side of the site that were previously non-jurisdictional under the new regulations, are now considered NYS jurisdictional wetlands and are subject to the 100 ft buffer. Do to the fact that buffer did encroach into a couple of their lots, Applicant states that they were forced to change the shape of the road slightly and the resulting layout has brought them down to 38 lots, instead of the 40 lots that were initially proposed.

The Applicant states that a couple of other changes were made due to the layout: They eliminated the athletic field and are now planning a playground area adjacent to the existing park. The playground area would be able to connect to the picnic/gazebo area and all be in one central location. Also, we left the language of the PUD the same for the 3 lots at the north end (there is a 50 ft clearing buffer, and a 100 ft setback). However, they have pulled those three lots the full 100 ft back. So right now, as this lays out, they would not need to clear within 100 ft of the northern property line, and we are showing a privacy fence that would extend along the northern boundary there behind those lots to provide a buffer from backyard lighting and headlights.

The Applicant is also presenting a slightly more detailed stormwater plan. The Applicant states that it is still very conceptual due to the fact that many things can change in regards to grading and layout, but they did want to demonstrate that the current stormwater plan maintains the existing hydrology where they are on top of the hill. The Applicant states that half of the water goes to the east and half to the west, and under the new drainage plan they are proposing with this system, they are sending roughly the same amount of water in either direction as they were before, and infiltrating as they are supposed to for the stormwater regulations from the DEC. The Applicant states that in the submittal package there is a full stormwater management summary plan with rough hydrology calculations and drainage areas mapped out well enough that an engineer can see that it is easily feasible to meet regulations with a few tweaks here and there to the design.

T. Yasenchak asks the Applicant if they have updated SEQR, to which the Applicant replies that he does not believe so. T. Yasenchak states that we will need to see that moving forward because when we start reviewing SEQR we want to be able to make sure we have everything updated because this has been a long process up to this point. And when we look at the SEQR form, we want to be sure the Applicant is not trying to make provisions as we are reviewing it.

Before opening up for comments from the Board, T. Yasenchak reiterates the process for anyone applying for a PUD. For anyone who wants to propose a PUD in the town, they start by going to the Town Board and making their submittal. The submittal is then referred to our Town Planning Board for review and recommendation. As far as what needs to be submitted for the start of the review is a narrative description, survey of the property showing existing site features, contours, buildings, etc. Preliminary site plan information on the intended construction sequence, parking areas, landscaping, and public utilities. Plan documenting proposed location, size and quantity of water effluent and storm drainage facilities. Additional studies, reports and documentation may be requested by the Planning Board to determine appropriate intensity of land use and development density and State environmental quality review documents as required by the Planning Board and Town Engineer. T. Yasenchak states that later on, the Town Planning Board will be tasked with proving a recommendation based on a minimum criterion of eight items. And that is just a minimum that we look at when giving our recommendation along with SEQR review. We are doing this review because the Town Board asked us whether or not we think the PUD is the right tool. T. Yasenchak states that the Planning Board is answering the request of the Town Board to review the PUD. The Planning Board will not be making a determination on the completeness of the application until we finish SEQR. Once we have determined SEQR (which will not be done until we have our Attorney available to be here) we will have 35 days to render our advice, our opinion and our recommendation to the Town Board.

T. Yasenchak informs the audience that this is an adjourned public hearing. That on this project we are under no obligation to send out additional notifications or advertisements, however the Planning Board decided to notify the public and neighbors so that they were aware because it has been several months since this application has been in front of us. T. Yasenchak starts with comments from the Board.

R. Roeckle starts by asking the Applicant if they removed the other driveway going up to Route 9N. The Applicant states the driveway is removed and was removed as of their last meeting in front of the Board. R. Roeckle states that he wanted to confirm what the current traffic flow was with the removal of the driveway. The Applicant clarifies that the traffic going in and out of the existing infrastructure of Brookview uses Manor Court as the primary entry and exit.

R. Roeckle goes on to discuss the sewage system asking where exactly the sewage plant is located. The Applicant states that it is all the way at the southeast corner of the existing park. The Applicant says that what is going to end up happening, is there is an existing lift station down at the bottom of Manor Court because of the hill. So, all of our flow will be directed out into here, and we will be upgrading that lift station at Manor Court to then pump the sewage up. The Applicant states that if there are subsequent lift stations along the way that need to be upgraded, that will be done and it will be part of a comprehensive sewer plan. Part of that plan will also most likely include the upgrade and replacement of the existing plant. The Applicant notes that plant is near its lifespan, so it could use an upgrading and refreshing. This is a part of the whole project, including improvement of the overall sewage of the entire park.

R. Roeckle states that he just wanted to clarify where that sewage system is and that it discharges down there. The Applicant states that does not. It discharges to the stream that this wetland (points to wetland on map) is part of. There is a stream that is in the middle there, and all the way at the end of that, is where it discharges out to. The Applicant states that they have an existing SPDES (State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) permit with the DEC for that plant and that they will be requesting a modification to that permit for increased discharge, and that anything will be subject to the DEC approving that discharge rate to the stream and whatever other effluent requirements for that plant.

R. Roeckle asks the Applicant if they will be increasing the flow from the existing public water system. The Applicant states that they have put in a new well. He states that the existing (2) wells there have the adequate capacity to serve this expansion, however due to the regulations required (redundancy in your wells if one of your wells goes down) we installed this new well and flow tested it. So most likely we will be operating the wells in an alternating fashion to not overload any one well. The Applicant states that they will have to go through the Department of Health because it is an update to the public water supply, so they will be required to put in applications with them. The Applicant states they may require additional storage and they have provided extra space on their plans for a treatment building. The Applicant states that the water coming out of this well and previously existing wells requires no treatment other than disinfection. He states that it meets all of the drinking water standards and the only thing they need to do is chlorinate it to disinfect it. So, the Applicant states, they are proposing putting chlorination in that area. At which point they would need additional tanks for storage and pumping. R. Roeckle confirms with the Applicant that the wells are not fed by groundwater in any way, shape, or form. The Applicant confirms that to be correct stating that it is also all in the geological report.

R. Roeckle verifies with Applicant that the PUD would be applicable only to allow for expansion of the property that was not owned at the time of the original zoning, properties that were owned at the time zoning went into effect will continue to operate as a pre-existing and non-conforming under our current zoning laws. The Applicant confirms this to be true. R. Roeckle has no further comments or questions at the moment.

B. Duffney inquiries about the privacy fence that would be going across the north end. The Applicant states that it is open to discussion. That typically an 8 ft fence would be recommended. That Applicant acknowledges that white PVC Fences can be very noticeable and referenced past projects where they recommended putting in chain-link fencing with green slats to blend into the woods more. It is discussed that solid fencing would be a better noise/light buffer, but that wood fencing can prove to be very high maintenance, so a PVC fence would be preferable.

B. Duffney brings the questioning back to the sewage plant and what would happen if there was a failure. The Applicant states that the redesign of the pump station would have reserve capacity based on the standards of NYS for if the pumps fail. It would be required to have hook ups for backup power so that the station could still operate and continue pumping sewage. It would have a reserve capacity or typically 1-2 days' worth as well as pump redundancy, and an alarm condition that lets the operator know if there is a pump failure in the lift station.

B. Podhajecki comments that the revisions are an improvement to the proposed plan. She comments that she was not happy previously with where the new road was proposed in the athletic field and bringing that kind of activity to the north of them. She agrees that a darker fence as opposed to a white fence would be better. B. Podhajecki also comments that she thinks it's a good thing to have more affordable housing for the community. And that we need to be sensitive to the thoughts and opinions of other community members as well. Other than that B. Podhajecki doesn't have any technical questions at this time.

T. Ysenchak takes a moment to mention that something we will be weighing will also be that in both of these zones, multi-family dwelling units are allowed. So, we need to take a look at what is allowed, as well as what is being proposed. There is a balance of what would feel more consistent in general with the character of the neighborhood. However, that is something that we can look at as we move forward later in the process.

C. Dake begins by recognizing the reduction in the number of lots and removal of the athletic field for traffic flow as good revisions. C. Dake requests that when we receive more maps, that one of the maps show where the neighbors houses are so that it is easier for the Board to make well informed decisions when trying to consider the proximity of the neighbors. The Applicant says that is defiantly something they could provide.

C. Dake brings up the fact that the Applicant has previously mentioned the possibility of combining everything into one PUD, and that he had felt very positive about that. C. Dake expresses disappoint in the fact that this no longer seems to be the case. The Applicant states that if they were to want to entertain the possibility of expanding the PUD to incorporate all of the existing park, they would most likely change the language of the PUD to basically state that any homes be grandfathered in to the zone. C. Dake states that in his opinion that would be a good change, and has nothing further at this time.

T. Yasenchak comments that if it was all in one it could just incorporate a paragraph about the existing. The Applicant states that they could look at that language and the possibility of merging then together. T. Yasenchak also references the fact that it could be helpful in the long run as the existing mobile home park ages. If you have something in the PUD language so that at some point the older section gets upgraded, but it doesn't require it to all be done at one time. So that is something that can be covered.

R. Roeckle mentions that manufactured homes are much longer now than they were, presumably, when the existing park was first built. So, the original lots in the original section, the homes would not be able to be replaced with the same sized unit, because they are not made that small anymore. R. Roeckle also states that the original park manufactured housing park would have been designed for smaller units originally.

S. Lucciardi refers to the PUD language as relates to section 4C and 4D, Parking and Accessory Structures. He sees that they are still allowing attached garages and accessory structures less than 150 sq ft, which are subject to setbacks. He states that should be reflected on the plans, as a building envelope or struck from the PUD language. Noting that if these were to be added later, it would obviously change the density of what we are looking at now.

The Applicant states that they will review with the vendors who typically put these manufactured homes together, to see how they do that and we can show how that envelope changes in regards to the building layouts. The Applicant states that with the setbacks they do have, there is quite a bit of extra space on the lots, so there is some maneuverability. He states that a lot of these units do come with small sheds. And that they would be subject to the setbacks. For the other units the Applicant states that he will go back and review the language to make sure it is very clear that if they want to adjust the size of the home and put an attached garage, they are still subject to all of the unit's setbacks that are in the lots.

B. Duffney asks if the proposed lots are going to be double. The Applicant confirms that yes, they will be double wide and references one of the drawings that shows a typical unit layout and the dimensions of the building. He states that they are the same units that were put in during the most recent expansion.

B. Duffney asks what the spacing would be between each of the units back-to-back and side-to-side. The Applicant states that the units are set back 20 ft minimum from the road, and they have to be 15 ft from any of the unit lot lines. There will be a minimum of 30 ft separation between buildings. The Applicant continues to say that the lots are a little bigger than that and there is significantly more space between them. That theoretically you could push a unit 15 ft and have another unit mirrored 15 ft, so there would be 30 ft of separation there.

B. Duffney asks if the Fire Department has any specifications of how close together the homes can be. T. Yasenchak clarifies that is all building code related and she believes that it is 10ft. That once you start getting closer than 5, 10 feet, you start needing to have structures that are fire rated. T. Yasenchak mentions that we did also ask the Applicant to provide a letter from the Fire Department, and although the Applicant has yet to receive a response from the Fire Department, they will need to keep reaching out to them because we will need to have that. T. Yasenchak also mentions that we will need a new SEQR due to the fact that the last one we looked at was from 2023.

T. Yasenchak mentions there is a notice of no clearing within 100 ft of the north property line. She questions if it is in the PUD language and if there was a definition of what that would be. The Applicant says that they will double check to make sure they have this clearly marked out that 50 ft from the property line, all the way around, they are not allowed to touch any vegetation. There is a 50-foot vegetative clearing buffer restriction, so we can't touch anything other than that. It's 100-foot setback to any buildings. To put fences in you will have to clear and grade, but there is going to be no substantial grading or clearing within that area. Because we would need to do a little bit of grading/clearing in that area, the Applicant states that they will be leaving that language alone in the PUD. So, the 100 ft is just the building setback. The 50 ft is the complete clearing and grading restriction. But this site plan, we are keeping it as far south as we can while still maintaining these lots. T. Yasenchak states that moving forward she would like to see something in the PUD with more clarification with regards to anything that has to do with clearing. We would like everything to stay there unless it is harmful to health and life. It should be made very clear in the PUD language what that means in several locations and about that area.

The Applicant states that is really the only place even close to a property line, so they can adjust that so that way its not just the North property line, they can change that all the way around because they can't do anything in the other areas anyway.

T. Yasenchak also states that she would like to make sure the fence/screening gets extended for the entire driveway, not just behind the proposed lots. She states that its important to have screening from the road, as well as the lights that would be coming from the back of the proposed home. The Applicant states that right now they are proposing to have the fence extend from basically the lot line, to all the way over here (points to map). He states that is basically limited grading here and that they can't extend it any further because at that point they would run into the wetland buffer, so they wouldn't be able to disturbance there. T. Yasenchak tells the Applicant that they could plant trees as screening. That the Board has asked past applicants to plant trees within the buffer and that has been allowed. The Applicant suggests that they would need to get a permit to do so. T. Yasenchak says that she is unclear as to whether a permit would be needed, and suggests the Applicant should look into it for extra screening purposes.

T. Yasenchak states that she would also like to see more of a detailed landscaping plan as well as a detailed lighting plan, an updated traffic plan including reposes from the Fire Department as to any past accidents there. She mentions that a letter from the school is also still needed with regards to capacity and buses. Along with the new SEQR, aerial maps showing the entire project including adjacent properties.

B. Duffney asks the Applicant is he recalls the number of elementary aged kids had moved into the newer section of the park stating his concerns about overcrowding the school. The Applicant states they had the information three years ago when the new section wasn't fully built out and filled yet and that they can update that information and provide to for the Board.

T. Yasenchak ask the Applicant if they know what percentage of the Brookview installs are rented vs. owned. M. Mancini states that the company typically puts you in your own and then the person can purchase the home, or sometimes rent it. T. Yasenchak asks if taxes are paid based on the assessment of every individual unit. M. Mancini states that is correct.

B. Podhajecki has a question on the 50-foot non-clearing and if there is language in the PUD regarding upkeep to the fence. The Applicant states that he will double check.

T. Yasenchak begins to move on to the public hearing stating that we have an adjourned public hearing tonight. We did notice the Hearing so that the public would be aware of us discussing this again. We can re-open the Public Hearing to hear what the public would like to say. T. Yasenchak reiterates that we have not had our Town Engineer review this yet. So, we are not saying that everything we said tonight is finite. Nothing we said tonight is binding, we haven't made any decisions. We will be continuing a complete review. We will open the Public Hearing at 8:20pm.

C. Dake states he would like to make one comment first, as a point of information, discussing deed restriction being outside of our purview and borderline practicing law without a license and that is not anything we are interested in.

T. Yasenchak directs this comment toward R. Roeckle, stating that he deals with this in town law and although he is not an attorney, he deals as a consultant within the State. R. Roeckle explains that a deed restriction is typically considered a private matter between two property owners or former property owners. A town does not enforce deed restrictions. Technically, according to state finance law, towns cannot do things on private properties and enforcing the deed restriction could be considered performing an action on private property. So that is something the towns stay away from. We don't enforce HOA requirements. We don't enforce deed restrictions. We don't enforce anything. We have zoning laws and that is what we enforce. The Town Board has referred the PUD legislation to us and that is why we are here.

T. Yasenchak states that our Town Attorney has also confirmed if a seller had an issue with a deed restriction not being allowed/for whatever reason, then it would be the seller's responsibility to track down the buyer and take them to court for breach of contract.

T. Yasenchak re-opens the Public Hearing at 8:29 pm. She explains there is a three-minute limit on public comments, to speak loudly, and to state their name and address for the record.

Chris Hillerich, 29 Robin Road : C. Hillerich has provided the Board with a detailed correspondence prior to this Public Hearing. He gives a summary and main points. He states that the absence of a defined timeline for submitting a complete application has created a prolonged uncertainty for the Town, its staff, and neighboring residents. Without clear deadlines, homeowners are unable to make informed decisions about long term investments in their properties. Over three years, UMH has submitted multiple iterations of the materials, which have been deemed incomplete by both the Planning Board and the Town Engineer. Each revised submission has triggered additional rounds of professional review, consuming municipal time and resources. Additionally, UMH representatives have falsely characterized the application as complete during past Planning Board meetings, which is misleading to residents referencing the last month. To prevent this cycle from continuing or reoccurring in the future the Town should amend the Town Code to establish clear timelines and procedural safeguards. Any such amendments should include provisions allowing the Town to formally disapprove and close the application within a reasonable timeline. Next point, your proposal to utilize a planned unit development appears legally questionable. The PUD mechanism is being used to bypass existing Town Code requirements, then mandated a Use Variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals for the expansion of the existing mobile home park. Furthermore, the PUD is not being applied as a comprehensive

master plan for the entire development intended in the Town Code. UMH has not provided the information which was requested by the Town Engineer Charlie Baker back on April 11, 2023. Charlie subsequently issued a letter to the Planning Board in July 24, 2025 to follow up on this issue, which states that a project of this scale and magnitude with documented public opposition, it does not appear that taking a piece meal approach to the project review is a proper way to move forward. Our reserve detailed comments related to the engineering aspects of the project to tell a complete projects middle, including the item by item, response to the comments. Provided in the April 11, 2023 letter, I would ask that you ask UMH for that. This statement underscores the importance of receiving a complete and comprehensive submission as before further advancing the project. As discussed at the last Public Hearing, UHM purchased this land subject to a restrictive covenant in the deed that clearly prohibits its use as a commercial home park. The deed restriction says running with the land that the premises interfaces shall not be used for trailer park or other mobile home type dwellings. (T. Yasenachak indicted that speaking time has ran out) C. Hillerich continues to say that they have not performed a recent wetland delineation and asks the Board to request one stating the map being used in from 1999.

Peter Pedrotty , 4 Maddy Groves Road : I think most of the people here are affected by this are to the north of the project and Pine Robins Canyon Crossing. I think they rightly deserve most of the time speaking about this. But I just want to point out that we are directly east of the project and we would also potentially be affected by this. I just want you guys to take that into consideration as well. We are really not that far away through the woods and noise does travel pretty well despite the woods being there. In fact, we already hear sounds from the existing park as well as the Canyon Crossing neighborhood.

Phil Engborg, 5 Pine Robin Road: with regards to wetlands and the delineation needs to be reviewed and probably updated. Also questions whether the DEC is being consulted about the possible impact clearing will have on water flow into the wetlands. He mentions that last year at one point there had been an inspection of a neighboring well across the street to use as a metric to determine the impact however the well testing was done outside of the recommended window for it. It was done during a high period of snow melt runoff, which greatly increases the aquifer when it should have been done in later summer or fall to look at a worst-case scenario. Recommends there be an additional water testing on that.

Vince Walsh, Greene Road: Talking about wetland delineations, there's been other projects in front of the Planning Board that waited until the very last second, which severely altered what they could and couldn't do. Having that formal wetland delineation requirement before any further activity occurs on this property, updated delineation and material alter any of the developmental areas. Besides DEC's jurisdiction here, there are vernal pools that are up to 800 ft setback. This project is located between two wetlands, which is hugely important for amphibians and reptiles. There is no bioassessment here, such as an ecological impact. This is pretty expansive. It's got to be done at the right time, which is coming up. It needs to be done in the growing season. DEC has the positive jurisdiction. For the wetlands to the West, the Planning Board previously questioned the placement of the units and stormwater infrastructure within 100 feet of the Western wetland. And residents raise concerns about prior clearing activities associated with the new well installation. All that was already done. Beyond the jurisdictional boundary, substantial environmental impacts remain insufficiently addressed. Lots of force to be cleared. Parcel lies along the Ridge between the two adjacent wetlands. Grading vegetation. Renewable installation of stormwater infrastructure. It's going to change, like somebody else just noted. There's no

detailed analysis provided the regarding cumulative impacts. SPDES reports from 2022 to 24 show 15 regulatory limit violations, 12 of which contain no documented explanation. Three instances of biochemical oxygen demand above regulatory limit, suspended solids, six instances of ammonia above the limit, two of phosphorus above the limit, three instances of wastewater flow exceeding the regulatory limit. These violations raise a lot of concerns. I don't live next to this place. We're downstream, but that's pretty darn concerning. There should be some enforcement going on with that. There's a DEC foil request that's in a particular concern. The wastewater flow readings and the timing of the flow meter recalibration. So, there's some flow anomalies in their own reports. 2022 reported wastewater flow range from 27. Of 42,000 gallons per day, averaging roughly 35,000 gallons per day, approaching the 50,000 gallons per SPDES limit shortly after they submitted their expansion proposal in November of 2022. A lot of erratic reporting months. The system was recalibrated throughout 2023 and 2024 reported wastewater flow range from 20,000 to 23,000 gallons per day, with an average of 22,000. Gallons per day, roughly. This represents a 60% reduction from the 2022 annual average. This is a substantial shift. In in this information that they're pointing out. The Town Engineer requested all correspondence regarding notice of violations and that letter to you is still not provided. There's a lot of problems here, seven months, years coming back in front of the board. That's frustrating to the public, to the residents here. And without deed restriction. That's a big ticket. I know you guys don't. Address it. But that's pretty big. Proximity of wetlands, proximity of neighbors. I see these guys are going 1000 feet deep closest to the closest neighbors. There's no reason for that. Keep your infrastructure close to where it already exists at the road. Tonya, you kind of hinted that some maybe some multifamily units, but I was thinking about today. I'm like, what's the solution to all this? Concerns they could take their same resources instead of building 38 new units very close to the wetlands, and the neighbor bring everything closer that is still affordable housing.

Tom Curran , 3 Canyon Crossing : First of all, thank you so much for all the hard work. And the dedication of all you on the Planning Board, it's incredible. All the hard work that you put for all these concerns and issues. I'm not going to rehash and reissue a lot of the concerns that were stated already. I'm just going to reiterate that this has been a concern going on and on. Every single one of these meetings, you seem to be now appeasing more and more of what they're bringing because they're making changes, which is good. We're not against affordable housing, we absolutely need more affordable housing. We're asking for it to be built within the zoning and within the regulations that exist. They exist for a reason. We have an awesome town. This is a gem. Butch mentioned concern about the school. And overcrowding. If you continue to let these projects go through, Greenfield will no longer be the gem that it is. I would have moved to Wilton if I wanted this type of density. I chose Greenfield thirty-one years ago because it's such a great community with acreage, privacy, wildlife, clean air, clean water. Let's not jeopardize that by being greedy, looking for more tax dollars. Let's put in the development within the means that it should be allowed.

Rebecca Sewell, Rebecca Dr : I think it is important to ask what defines affordable housing. I think a question for this Board would be what are the prices of affordable houses vs the cost of living.

Lauren Branzi : I actually do not live in Greenfield Center. I'm here to address concerns. About speech, including the affordability of manufacture. Manufactured housing is affordable. You're paying between

\$2000 to \$2800, if not more, in my experience. We pay about \$2100 a month, it has become unaffordable as well as lacking infrastructure. I am here tonight because there are questions regarding infrastructure questions about expansion. Whether or not the current infrastructure can maintain and uphold what is being absorbed. There are huge problems in other parts across New York State, including the quality of the water, standards of testing, regulatory standards. Some problems are bigger than others. One of the biggest is if the soil is adequate to hold the slab system for the average home. Double wide are usually 26 by 56 feet. The weight of one of these is extensive. Some pier systems don't go down far enough. Things need to be changed, how they're certified and inspected prior to moving. My home was never inspected prior. I did not have. There's a systematic compromise and failure. I feel like issues should be addressed prior to the building of these. I wanted to share to try to bring awareness to the problem. We do not want people to feel trapped in these homes because unfortunately I feel trapped in my home. I cannot afford to move out of my home and I feel like we are stuck in an abusive system with manufactured housing.

Nicholas Frirsz, 24 Pine Robin Rd: I'm just on the edge of all that proposed stuff. We all figured out tonight that this UMH proposal is not compliant with Greenfield's Comprehensive Plan, or any of the other zoning laws or EPA standards that the people of Greenfield have voted on and have lived by daily in this town. I've been here 25 years now. Greenfield, obviously doesn't have a municipal sewer or water infrastructure system. With increased density at this kind of rate, New York State could eventually mandate Greenfield to have to supply water and sewer for the town. This would dramatically increase our taxes beyond all imagination. This worst-case scenario would become more of a reality day by day if this project is not withdrawn. The safeguard of Greenfield's Comprehensive Plan outlines low density and low impact. The current footprint of the Brookview Home Park already encroaches on the maximum density for our surrounding area. The proposed expansion would only create even more of a threat to our wildlife and the quality of living in Greenfield. And I love Greenfield. My property borders the proposed expansion and would be mere feet from my back door. The aquifer that feeds precious water to my home and the homes of my neighbors would be under threat from the added demand of new dwellings. In our backyard, the Brookview septic treatment facility is currently running over its limits and is on notice for environmental violations. They are currently discharging grade water into our water recovery system and streams. Imagine what would happen with water supply and the surrounding environment should their system fail catastrophically. That could be us. The clearing of land in and around protecting wetlands would affect endangered species, including the long-eared bat and spotted owl (which live in my backyard), and protected wetlands. Reptilians would also be destroyed. Nitrates from fertilizers and pesticides, plus the additional foot and car traffic would destroy what's left of the wetlands after they clear cut that lot. The Comprehensive Plan of Greenfield was meant to prevent such disasters from occurring, and the residents of this town deserve better. Expansion has been a three-year ordeal for this town and it's long overdue to put an end to this proposal. We respectfully request UMH to withdraw their expansion project.

Amber Hickey, President of the Manufacturing Housing Alliance of New York, Resident of a manufactured home in Hoffman Homes Hypspot Park: My concern is this Board needs to enforce, if you're going to have a manufactured home and they are they're dealing with wetlands that the DEC has

permits. I live in a manufactured house. My house does not have permit. And I am inside the buffer zone. I have a drainage tube underneath my house that literally is sinking. I have a sink hole in my backyard. The wildlife around us has been affected. We have deer that get caught in our yards, partly due to the fact that we have a lot of sinking. Thank you. We have homes that are flooded. I'm not the only home that didn't get a DEC permit that was built inside the buffer zones, and it has created a lot of issues for a lot of homes. Not only that, but it affects the drainage. We have flooding issues on a continuous basis and this board needs to make sure that the DEC is involved. The other aspect to that too is manufactured housing is told that it's affordable and affordability also has to do with. How much is being charged to the tenant, not just the lot rent, but the selling point to that because it becomes unaffordable if manufactured houses are not made sure that they are built to code. I am talking about the HUD code. That impacts them greatly. We have a lot of houses within our community in Greenfield that all have major issues. We had houses that didn't have a C.O. and they were living in the home for six months. The septic wasn't hooked up. We have roof issues. We have siding issues, floor issues. Almost every home was not properly done in that park. And we need to make sure that they're done properly and definitely we need to know what the impact is to homes in general and that we have proper drainage for them and how it is affecting wildlife.

Justin Thomas , 2040 Route 9N : I had a couple of comments about the plan itself, but then after hearing some people speak, I'd like to reiterate like what Tom was saying about Greenfield. I grew up in Wilton, went to school at Dorothy Nolan. Had friends in Greenfield and always wanted to live here because they lived in a place where it wasn't growing so quickly. Every place that I used to go in Wilton is overrun with housing now, big housing, small housing. Affordable apartment buildings. Every tract of land is being developed down there along 9 and into Wilton. My wife grew up in Saratoga and we decided twenty-five or so years ago, to move here, buy a house with acreage for just that reason. So, we would have some space and we would have clean water and, have some forest land. That's what we moved here for. I'm just going to pull a little excerpt from the Greenfield Comprehensive Plan adapted May 12th, 2025. There's quite a bit of information here, but I'm just going to read a couple paragraphs. Due to its proximity to Saratoga and its desirable rural lifestyle, the town of Greenfield is faced with many challenges in managing land use development. Development pressures within the town of Greenfield are rising and could negatively impact the town's resources in the near future. Almost half of the town's land is currently vacant, which causes some to think that the town is ripe for development. One objective of this chapter is to understand the conditions that have created such a rural, undeveloped town in close proximity to so much recent development. And then there's a section on land use. Land use patterns are result of historic settlement characteristics and modern building codes, zoning ordinances, and subdivision regulations. Until recently, Greenfield was relatively lightly developed in the large part due to natural resource constraints and lack of infrastructure, which these have all been touched on. Greenfield has recently experienced an increase in residential growth. This can be attributed to the encroachment of Urban Development from Saratoga Springs, along with the promise of country lifestyle close to an abundance of recreational and cultural amenities. And then it goes into some more technical information about the land. But that that was from 2005 comprehensive plan. So back then they had some insight on this and I feel like we go, it's going to come up every 10 - 20 years, this institutional amnesia. People forget what the root of this whole area is and why we love it. And why we choose to live here, and raise our children here. It's all about land use and the density that we're creating. As far as the one thing that I wanted to comment on, there was a lot of questioning about the fence here. I would like to see something, some screening along the road, also because you're

going to see this is a high spot, you're going to see all the backyard lighting of this from the road. Like you said, you can see a lot through the trees in the winter time.

Mark English , 16 Pine Robin Rd : I've got 20 or so pages of analysis of facts and law that I'll be giving you when I'm done, so I don't have time to talk about all that. I just want to talk about one thing, the Comprehensive Plan. Since 2022, every annual narrative that's come out for the plot has had this provision about the comprehensive plan. It says the demand for housing remains high, as evidenced by rapid occupancy, new units being stalled within the existing Brookview Village in Greenfield. Comprehensive plan identifies the provision of housing as a crucial need for the town. And portions of the North parcel not in wetlands are identified as ideal areas for housing development. None of that is in the comprehensive plan. And there's not a shred of anything that indicates any kind of intention to make any kind of satisfying kind of crucial need and be expanding into the north parcel. Additionally, what the comprehensive plan actually says, is that the vision of the town is that it would be rural and built on one acre or greater properties. And if there was going to be denser housing, it would be in the Hamlets and Town Center. Now that property is not in a hamlet and it's not in the Town Center, so there's absolutely no support for rezoning this property in the comprehensive plan and all the regulations that they're relying on for the PUD. And if you do the rezone based on the PUD, then you have to do the special use permit. You have to be consistent with the comprehensive plan, and there's nothing in the comprehensive plan that would support expanding a mobile Home Park into these MDR and LDR parcels. This seems to be a fundamental legal problem. It could prevent this from going forward. The alternative is that the applicant would have to go to the zoning Board of Appeals for variants or in the future, maybe the town of people of the town of Greenfield will vote for an amendment to the comprehensive plan that would allow and take into consideration and provide board expansion of more dense housing into the LDR and MDR zoned areas. That that's a fundamental legal flaw that I think prevents. And then I would point out the narrative has always said this and, continues to. I think the applicant realizes the importance of following the comprehensive plan, but it doesn't. And there's also in regard to being consistent with the surrounding community care. Really this thing will not fly. It's against the law. It's outside the comprehensive plan, clearly applicable. It shouldn't happen. Thank you.

William Mayor, 21 Pine Robin Rd: My main concern is with the water. I know for a fact the well in my home has run dry. I have 170-gallon reserve tank in the basement for that reason. Secondly, I've lived in the home for less than two years. I have a three-year old and a six-month-old. Me and my wife purchased this house in a small wooded neighborhood in Greenfield. I'd never in a million years would have purchased this home if I had known they were planning on building a neighborhood straight into the back. In the neighborhood, they're proposing an 8-foot fence, which will not cut down on the light. It will essentially, I don't want to say ruin, but diminish what I thought I was purchasing.

Anne Womack, 24 Pine Robin Rd: I see a lot of talk about fencing and borders and all cosmetic. This to me, is not cosmetic. For what they want. Because it doesn't help, it's going to hurt. They talked about the lack of water that's going to happen, the sewage running off into the stream. None of it sounds good. I started reaching out in the community and asking more questions. And I implore you to -I don't know how you would do it. We got to find out, it seems like the big thing is it affordable? The people that I've talked to who live in there, the rents go up, the upkeep is not taken care of. Why would I want

to sacrifice the beauty that I live in to somebody who doesn't even manage their park? And they're going to ruin my wetlands? Please have a heart, being good for the community. This isn't. I feel this is not good for the Community overall.

Public hearing is adjourned at 9:08pm.

T. Yasenchak asks members of the Board if they have follow-up questions. B. Podhajecki would like to know just how affordable the homes are. What is the cost to buy the home and to rent the lot making it known that she understands prices may vary. The Applicant states that it depends on the market and that they could put something together in their follow-up to include what the current prices are. T. Yasenchak asks Applicant to include what is affordable by all of our standards. She states that there is information out there from the Saratoga Economic Development Council about what exactly affordable housing is and how the State and the County look at the definition. She asks the Applicant to please include the numbers we are seeing from the County and the State and what is the line that they are comparing.

B. Duffney asks Applicant if they know of any Brookview septic violations that have occurred within the last 10 years. Applicant states they are not aware of any violations that involved enforcement actions. Dave Bangle, Attorney for UMH, states they will take a look at what is on record. States they got the system upgraded and answered compliance back in the 90s, through the best of his knowledge. His experience working with UMH has been not just here but elsewhere and not just in New York. When there is an issue of compliance with environmental matters, they get it resolved. Applicant states that regarding septic system they are aware that this system is near its capacity and is an older system. Part of this project would involve upgrading and replacing the system so any historical deficiencies would be dissolved. They would be putting in new, upgraded, treatment processes and the DEC is going to look at any application for modification of the SPDES permit in regards to stream quality. And they're going to set effluent standards. And part of that may actually end up being increased, you know, or decreased limits. So, we may be required to treat the water beyond what is being treated now and beyond what the existing permit is.

B. Duffney asks if the homes are inspected by the Town Code Enforcement when they are put in place. R. Roeckle states that yes, they should be and T. Yasenchak states that yes, they need a certificate of installation that shows that they have correct anchoring for the residential building code. Applicant states they also are required to notify the DOH for any new unit installation.

T. Yasenchak asks the Applicant when the last time a wetlands study was done and if there is documentation of that. The Applicant states that the initial wetlands study was completed in the late 90's, and that in the spring of 2023 a local wetland scientist went back out and delineated and remapped the wetlands. He states there should be a note at the bottom of the drawings which indicate who performed that. T. Yasenchak says that they will need more documentation regarding that delineation. She asks about the jurisdictional letter from the DEC and whether it says anything about the date the wetlands were done and if they are in agreement with it. The Applicant states that they will follow up with the DEC to confirm that they accept those wetland boundaries and get documentation with them.

C. Ronk ask about the well draw and the timing of it. T. Yasenchak tells E. Faas to make a note to ask C. Baker about the timing on the well drawdown. The Applicant states that he will need to confer with

their hydrogeologist on the dates and timing. He states that he will confer with his staff and provide a response to that. R. Roeckle asks if the Health Department reviews the well draw and if so he asks whether they have accepted/approved it. The Applicant states the DEC has accepted and reviewed the report as it refers to the capacity of the well and the treatment requirements. They have reviewed our hydrogeologic report and accepted it. DEC has also confirmed the capacity that we have stated in the report, as the capacity of that well and they have confirmed that treatment requirements of the well are only disinfection and no other treatment is required. He states the DEC have not issued any other approvals in regards to system design, integration, or anything like that. DEC just accepted that this is a well installed to their standards and can be used as a public water supply well within this park. R. Roeckle tells Applicant to include documentation.

T. Yasenchak begins to close meeting and reiterates that this application is not complete, the Applicant has homework to do before the Board and our Town Engineer can continue to review the case and move on to SEQRA.

Meeting adjourned at 9:30pm

Respectfully Submitted By,
Erika Faas
Executive Secretary to the Planning Board