

TOWN OF GREENFIELD

PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

March 10, 2026

Regular Meeting

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by T. Yasenachak, Chair, at 7:04 p.m. On roll call the following members are present: R. Roeckle, C. Dake, S. Lucciardi, B. Podhajecki, J. Sabanos, C. Ronk (Alternate). B. Duffney is absent. J. Reckner, Building Inspector, is absent. E. Faas, Executive Secretary, is present.

Minutes

February 24, 2026 – Postponed

Old Business

Washco, N. Case # 727

SPR/SUP

#152.-2-10.11

356 Clinton St

N. Washco is in front of the Board for a site plan review and Special Use Permit. Applicant previously had a septic system within 100 feet of a stream or wetlands, which required DEC approval. The DEC would not approve, so the Applicant removed the system and re-located it beyond the 100-ft boundary. The DOH has now approved the revised septic location and a Special Use Permit is still required by the Planning Board, however the Planning Board has not been provided updated maps or plans showing the revised septic system or any other changes since the last meeting. The Applicant believed the building department had been given everything they needed, and did not bring the documentation with them. T. Yasenachak instructed N. Washco that the Board could not review the application without updated site plan, maps, or any revised material associated with the special use permit. T. Yasenachak also notes that the Board review covers more than just septic. Including exterior lighting, garbage location, compliance with site plan standards and overall project details. N. Washco is instructed to provide document copies for each Board member, as well as an e-copy. So that the Applicant does not lose any time during the Applicant process, the Board agrees to set a Public Hearing for March 31, 2026 at 7 pm.

New Business

55 Wilton Road LLC & 65 Wilton Road LLC

PUD

TM#

59 Wilton Rd

T. Yasenchak begins by saying this is a Planning Board case; however, it is in front of us for an advisory opinion to the Town Board as an amendment to the existing PUD. T. Yasenchak states that she lives up the street in proximity, however she does not live adjacent to this property. She states that she can help review this project reasonably. That anything being developed on this property is not near her property. T. Yasenchak also states that we have several PUD's in front of us and she feels that it is fairer that everything gets reviewed the same. T. Yasenchak asks the Applicant to introduce them self.

Applicant states that his name is John Cannie of Cannie Law, PLLC. He is here on behalf of the Applicants, 55 Wilton Road & 65 Wilton Road LLC's. Principals are Bob and Lisa Moser. It is their home, their residence, along with their agricultural facility. J. Cannie is joined by Frank Colombo of CT Male, Dennis McGowan of Balzer and Tuck Architects, and Vince Latera of Prime Construction.

J. Cannie starts by saying it is technically three parcels, although there are only two named LLC's the parcels are 55,59, and 65 Wilton Rd. It is currently in two separate zoning districts. One id a PUD that was set up in 1981. The other is in the LDR (low density residential zone). J. Cannie states that the goal here is to expand the PUD into the LDR and then update and modify the 1981 drafting to conform to todays preferred method and code. J. Cannie states that there are some portions of the PUD that do not conform to what the requirements of the PUD would be in the Town right now. Cannie states that to start with, they are going to rename it to KARUM PUD. Cannie states that when the PUD was set up in 1981, it permitted multiple residences, agricultural structures and installations. When they created the PUD in 1981, they submitted a map. He states that predominantly, nearly all of the structures and installations put on the map were never actually built, and that it has been through a couple of reiterations. J. Cannie states that many of the Board members have sat through site plan amendments for this property. He says the Moser's brought it back in 2011, and then they acquired the additional parcel in 2019. He stated that it appears the original Applicant provided for a mix of a commercial use and residential use, where they were planning to do a horse training facility. J. Cannie states that now it is much more akin to a personal use. Although they do have horses on site and continue to maintain that, they are their personal horses. They're horses that they own themselves. They don't bring any horses on site to train. One of the predominant features of that original PUD was a horse training track, and that was never completed at all. Cannie states that additionally, there are portions of the language that are kind of out of date and subject to interpretation, so we want to just cut bait with 1981 and start again in 2026. Here is that original map (J. Cannie refers to his power point presentation). You can

see that big training track was never built at all. Some of the features are still the same. The entry point is still the same, as well as general access to the property. Cannie states that now there is a much different configuration, especially in the rear, which is now where the principal residence is located. Here is our proposed PUD map (references PowerPoint). He states that additionally, the PUD has already been expanded to include this area. There was a lot line adjustment done between this owner and the Moser's some years ago to add in this property. This is the additional property of 65 Wilton that's going to be added into the PUD. And then this is the other parcel that's already part of the PUD. It's just cut up in a different lot line. So those are the three lots that are going to be contained in there. Additions to the PUD that will be imminent once it is approved are a couple of new structures. Predominantly the one you'll see most from the road is going to be a gatehouse at the property. J. Cannie states that it will be along the frontage and the main driveway. He also states that there will be an addition to the primary residence of a barn/maintenance garage also installed in the rear of their residence. As well as a garage for vehicles that will also be installed and constructed. All of those are being designed by Balzer Tuck. The garage is unique in that it's going to be grass covered, so it's predominantly going to be underground. Additionally, a couple of extra run-in sheds and such for the horses and other animals on site

J. Cannie continues to say that touching on the failings of that PUD, it indicated that there were residential and agricultural uses, but there was nothing specific as to density or number of units. What it did was it referred any other person back to the code that existed in 1981 to determine what any setbacks were, what lot coverage was, what parking requirements were, which really is not a great way to operate, because obviously that has changed over time as well. So, you really want to go back to what's already been modified again. And it required any deviation from that original 1981 layout to come back to this Board for a Site Plan approval, no matter how small. A lot of the changes were for run-in sheds and barns and that sort of thing, so we want to update those things in line with the requirements for a PUD in Greenfield J. Cannie states we are going to have specific density requirements and a specific one for residential use. The PUD also will be comprehensive in that it will have all the requirements within it for setbacks, lot coverage, and parking. That way you don't have to go and refer to another code. It's going to provide clear and concise language of how it can be utilized and can be relied on by both the Town and the Applicant for any future development. He states that it also allows for advanced planning. In the event the Applicant was ever going to sell the property, it provides that another user, who may not necessarily want to use it in that same layout, can come in and still utilize that same PUD and not necessarily have to modify the zoning. It would be more akin to probably subdivision and site plan approval at that point. Cannie states that highlights are limiting the residential use to single-family homes only, with a maximum density of 15 homes on the 58 acres. Lot coverage is going to the overarching density control of 12.5% for the entire development. J. Cannie continues to say that is lot coverage for any and all buildings on site, agricultural and residential, which is less than the surrounding zoning of an LDR, and is significantly less than the zoning in the town center, which is the other nearby zone. The building heights, setbacks, and parking requirements are also all going to match the LDR zoning. Cannie states that additionally, and this was kind of a sticking point in between Code Enforcement and the Applicant, there will be a list in the PUD of potential

accessory structures, but it will not be specifically limited to those. Cannie states that as he pointed out before, we are going to have a gatehouse, so that will be listed in there as a potential accessory structure. However, he states, who knows what could happen in 50 years with regard to whatever other type of structure could possibly be put in. We don't want to limit it to just those specific mentions. T. Yasechak interrupts J. Cannie to be sure that he will be giving some specifics. Because, she states, we don't know if it is a store...or a gatehouse. For any PUD we will need specifics, just to clarify. J. Cannie states that yes, they will be giving specifics.

J. Cannie refers back to his PowerPoint presentation. J. Cannie states that there are eight criteria that the Board will review when making their determination and referral back to and recommendation to the Town Board, who will ultimately be the ones voting on this PUD. Cannie starts with conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. He states that in the Comprehensive Plan, this property is identified as Town Center and that Town Center designation should consider a mixed-use. Cannie states that the proposed PUD is mixed-use. It is not commercial and residential as often that is conferred, however it is a mix of agricultural and residential. Additionally, he states, it is very close to the border with the LDR designation, which is the same designation both in the zoning code, and in the Comprehensive Plan. The uses in the density restrictions that we are submitting in the PUD track that LDR zone. J. Cannie goes on to say that because it's really on a border between those two, a mix of those uses is appropriate. He states that a residential and an agricultural use fit this parcel. Conformance with the objectives of that section are the objectives of the PUD. So more usable open space, preserved lands, and or recreational land shall be created. Here, J. Cannie states, we are adding in the additional parcel at 65 Wilton Road. He says that will increase open space because that will predominantly be paddock space. Cannie states that additionally, the track area will also be paddocks increasing open space in the area. He says that increasing the density number from what's locally an LDR 15% to 12.5% increases that density as well. Cannie talks next about preservation of natural features. He states that we are going to do that to the greatest extent possible, but that this site has already been kind of developed and it is a horse farm and a residence. As far as the extent that the current trees are there, we are going to preserve nearly all of them, except for in the areas where we need to build. J. Cannie states that the land will be used efficiently and that over 95% of the site will remain open. He confirms that is the current count on green space as it is right now, and under the new proposal. J. Cannie addresses whether this PUD will be detrimental to the natural characteristics of this, or any adjacent site. He states that it is already developed and natural characteristics will be preserved and no adjacent natural characteristics will be affected. He states that there will be sufficient buffering between this development and any of the land surrounding. Cannie states that the rest is, parking, landscaping, utilities, roadways, pedestrian access, open space, drainage, and traffic, and that there is plenty of parking on site. And again, J. Cannie reiterates, to the extent that the Applicant ever wants to come in and modify any of it, they come to the Board for a site plan. He states that if somebody does want to come in and construct those 15 single-family homes, they will do it with the Board's knowledge and site plan approval where you can put in the required parking. J. Cannie states that landscaping will already exist and will be continued and likely modified along the roadway and the frontage when the new gatehouse comes in. Cannie points out that 96% green space is already incorporated into the

plan, well above the minimum requirement. J. Cannie states that it is already connected to utilities, there is on-site sewer and water. J. Cannie states that there will be a SWIP in place which will be part of the site plan review when this ultimately comes back to the Board, and no significant increase in traffic. Cannie states that they are hoping that the Board this evening would make a declaration with respect to lead agency, provide us with any comments, and ultimately send a positive recommendation to the Town Board.

T. Yasenchak states that with regard to Lead Agency, the property is on a County Road, so E. Faas will need to send a letter out to the County before we can address Lead Agency requests. T. Yasenchak opens comments from the Board.

R. Roeckle begins saying that this is an expansion of an existing PUD. The PUD has been in a horse farm for since 1981 or before. R. Roeckle did a quick review of the PUD language. and under utilities the PUD says that all buildings shall be served by municipal water service and municipal service lines. R. Roeckle points out that there is no municipal water, but it most likely is a public water supply if you have more than five service connections on an existing well. R. Roeckle states that even though it is an internal system, it might be considered a public water supply, and that they might want to clarify and instead of municipal, say public water supply. Other than that, R. Roeckle states, I don't really have any other comments at this time.

J. Sabanos questions referenced administrative decisions for future expansions and minor items. He states that he would like more clarity as to what that is going to mean. J. Sabanos asks does that mean administrative just goes to you...or administrative internally? J. Sabanos reiterates that he would like more clarification on what is meant by administrative.

J. Cannie states the he believes the way he wrote it in the PUD, and states that it is subject to change, but says that the way he wrote it is that as long as effectively, it fits into the box of the PUD, that it is compliant with the setbacks, it doesn't violate the density restrictions, and that it can be approved administratively by the Code Enforcement Officer. Different towns do it different ways. Some of them do it with the code enforcement. J. Cannie states that they are trying to cut down on the need to always come back to the Board for every minor site plan change.

T. Yasenchak says that in the past the Board has done similar things, but only if there is a master site plan that has been done that shows the full build out of the maximum impact of the development. T. Yasenchak uses Stewart's as an example. She states that Stewart's is an industrial, they don't have a PUD, however they came in with a master site plan. She states that when we were able to do our SEQRA review, the Board looked at it as the maximum build out. And then when they wanted to build such and such a building, it was already accounted for in our review. She states that the storm water was already accounted for in our review. Then, if they wanted to come back and make a minor revision to their site plan, they didn't really need to come to us. It was only if the Building Department looked at it and thought that it was significant amount of change that it needed to come back before the Planning Board. However, the site plan that was approved showed the maximum. For us to review SEQRA, and you want to put 15 total homes, we need to know what that looks like, what the maximum

impact could be. T. Yasenchak also references another PUD applicant that the Board is looking at for the Mobile Home Park. She states that the only way Board can do SEQRA to look at the maximum impact for that PUD is if they show us the maximum of what they want to do. So that would be the same for you. We wouldn't be asking for anything different.

J. Cannie states that maybe the revision there is something along the lines of agricultural, accessory structures so we don't have to come in every time we want to build a new run-in shed or modify the location of a run-in shed, as an example. Cannie states if we were coming in with 15 homes, one, we're going to have to put a road in, there's going to be a whole lot of stuff we're absolutely coming in for site plan review.

T. Yasenchak interrupts to say that at that point, we get into something different about subdivision development, because that's something else that we will have to discuss. T. Yasenchak wants to be clear that the Board cannot just give a cart blanche to do whatever the Applicant want to do. She states that she does understand the value of not wanting to come in before The Board when they want to build a little shed, as an example.

J. Sabanos adds that he is thinking more towards the future if the family decides to move out and we don't want the new owners to be completely free to do whatever they want.

R. Roeckle comments, reading the section that says "shall be developed in accords with the revisions of the zoning code", which is, and you're referring to the PUD legislation, "but with the exception that any single-family residential building or accessory structure or agricultural use building or structure proposed within the PUD may be administratively approved by the Town Zoning Administrator without the need for cycling approval". R. Roeckle states that he would not want single-family residential approved by the Zoning Administrator, as well as open development because the Town Board would have to grant that. R. Roeckle states that it is one thing for a running shed or something else that meets all the setback requirements that you've proposed, versus an additional single-family dwelling.

J. Sabanos inquiries about the overall energy demand and consumption. For instance, with another structure how it will be heated, are there cars, or multiple charging stations within the structure. J. Sabanos states that we want to see what the impact is going to be on the front of the community. We want to be reassured that the community is not going to be negatively impacted. Sabanos continues that one might not think that a single-family residence has that impact, however this is not your average single-family residence. The Applicant agrees to provide more information on that.

B. Podhajecki states that she does not have any comments on the language of the PUD at the moment however she does agree that we'd need to see the final potential of anything that could happen there stating, otherwise, how can you make a judgment call?

C. Ronk states he has no comments at the moment and that we will go through the language more to get a better script on it.

C. Dake states that he would like to hear more about the potential for subdivision in the language. For instance, would the PUD have its own language for minimum lot size, or would that go back to the

underlying district? The Applicant states that he would like to preface all of this that there is no plan in any way, shape, or form anywhere talked about of trying to subdivide this property. C. Dake interrupts by saying if we were going to say it's allowable, we want to make sure it looks good.

The Applicant states that he understands. That his goal when he was drafting the PUD language was to allow for that eventuality, but again, to have that all be done during the site plan approval process. Because if you are going to subdivide it, has to, it also has to go through site plan. J. Cannie states that those will come together and you would have to abide by the the way the Greenfield Town Codes read is you have your planning section and then you also have the subdivision and need to conform both with the site plan approval and the subdivision process. Cannie states we would be here for streets, be here for access, be here for lot size. He states that he didn't incorporate lot size into the PUD, because it's really not something that's we're generally looking to do. He states that he was trying to leave it a little bit open because it was in some the PUD was both in some ways very much closed, but also was very open because it did not have any density limitation on it. He states that he wanted to put a cap on it with the idea that somebody would eventually probably change this layout.

T. Yasenchak states that we are going to put that back into your court of which way do the Applicant wants to go, to make revisions. T. Yasenchak points out that the way the proposed language currently reads basically says that you could just put 13 more or 12 more single-family homes on there, wherever you want, as long as it meets a setback. That's how it reads right now. How it would look played out is that it would look like a subdivision, even if it's all in one piece of property. You know, so we're saying pick, you know, if you're going to put that in. T. Yasenchak states that in order to move forward, the Board will need to review the maximum build out to figure out the maximum impact for SEQRA. J. Cannie states that he understands.

S. Lucciardi comments that aside from density clarification, this seems like the best mechanism to bring everything up to current standards. No other comments at the moment.

T. Yasenchak adds that although some members of The Board don't have any questions today, more questions will most likely arise during the Public Hearing after listening to concerns from the neighbors. She addresses some of the setbacks and brings up language in the PUD regarding farm stands. T. Yasenchak states that if there is a farm stand, it needs to be produced and grown onsite and there would need to be proper pull offs and parking as well as site distance. Another note T. Yasenchak makes refers back to talking about the property being able to be made-up into multiple lots, having different titles and different owners and so-forth. She states that gets more into subdivision, and questions how that works. She mentions she also saw the language mentioned open development. She reiterated that The Board needs to see what the maximum buildout looks like. Even if ultimately that is not the Applicants intent, if it is going to be in the PUD language, the Board needs to be able to review what the largest possible impact could be. She states that there is something about an open development clause in the PUD language, and comments that if something needs to go through the proper process for subdivision review, then that takes the choice away. She states that typically we cannot subdivide a piece of property that doesn't have frontage on a public way. She states that language needs to be looked at. T. Yasenchak brings up the language regarding building height stating

50 ft. she states that all of our zones say 35 ft to the highest point, and yours is 50 ft from halfway in between the eaves and the highest peak. She notes that the reason we have 35 ft is because of our fire apparatus. The Applicant states that 50 ft was listed in the language for agricultural buildings and that he took it from the Towns Code. T. Yasenchak states that could be referring to a Silo, and that 50 ft seems very high for an agricultural structure and states that they would need more details on what that structure could be. She states that Town Code also states 50 ft to the ridge and not halfway up the structure.

T. Yasenchak moves on to talk about setbacks. She states the Applicant lists in their setbacks excludes porches, decks, patios, chimneys and similar. She states that right now porches and decks are part of the building, but patios and chimneys are not. She states the Applicant might want to look at that language.

R. Roeckle mentions that J. Cannie references the setbacks to the district boundaries, but never mention the internal property lines where there are separate parcels within the PUD. R. Roeckle states that there is reference to the PUD line, but not the property line. That the building code itself has setbacks along property lines, so that would be a problem and language they might want to look into.

T. Yasenchak next goes over the language that says that the agricultural accessory buildings and structures being no closer than 10 feet to any building and 20 feet to any zoning district. She suggests to maybe look at that a little differently because in our regular code, some of that needs to be further away. T. Yasenchak brings up have the pre-existing non-conformities. She states that she does not feel comfortable with that just being a blanket of, if you did something without a permit that wasn't code compliant, now you just get to have it. She asks the Applicant to double check with the Building Department to ensure previous existing structures have CO's and CC's that were issued. T. Yasenchak also states that going forward we will need a full landscape during PUD planning, not during site plan review. Unless they address that language in the PUD.

With regard to open development, T. Yasenchak states there will need to be more discussion on that. She states that she is unclear as to whether the Town could even put subdivision language in a PUD.

R. Roeckle states that regarding open development in this case would be used if they were to have multiple residences on a property accessing a private drive rather than a public drive. However, he states, even if they were subdivided, they would be accessing a private drive and therefore would have no road frontage. R. Roeckle states that he is not even sure why we would want to approve that until such time that the property owners wish to subdivide. R. Roeckle states that he understands where the Applicant is coming from to try to simplify things for a future property owner if they choose to subdivide, but that it is essential is like tying the Town's hands for now for something that might happen 20 or 30 years from now. T. Yasenchak states that we also don't allow subdivisions on private roads, the only time we do is when open development is granted. The Town would also know the design of the road when they approve the open development plan. T. Yasenchak also states that inevitably what happens with private roads the next owner doesn't take care of them. T. Yasenchak states that a Public Hearing will be set for March 31, 2026 and that E. Faas will send out notices.

John Cannie is present on behalf of the Applicant E.C. Braim Road. He is here also with Vince Latera on behalf of GC Prime Construction. J. Cannie states that they came in front of the Board in late November and discussed the project and that they have made some revisions since then, and submitted a full long-form SEQRA in an effort to request the board to declare Lead Agency on this subdivision. J. Cannie states that they did get final confirmation from DEC that the delineation was accepted and approved for five years. In addition to the long form submitted, J. Cannie states that they did revise the subdivision to provide at least a sketch as of now of some turnouts in the driveways on turnarounds as well, to conform with both this Board's previous comments, as well as comments from Code Enforcement and the Town Engineer. Additionally, in response to some of those other comments from Code Enforcement, we will engage an engineer to evaluate 15% grades. J. Cannie states they are looking for Lead Agency to be declared so that they can begin the process of getting DEC's take on the driveways, wetland impacts, and see where they stand on issuing A Title 24.

T. Yasenchak begins by saying that we received a new letter from our engineer and asks J. Cannie if they have the sight distance, stating that she believes The Board had told the Applicant that site distance was needed the last time they were in front of the Board. J. Cannie states that they do not have it now, but they will engage an engineer to do that. T. Yasenchak tell J. Cannie that without site distance, it brings the application process to a full stop with The Board for any subdivision. She states that we need to have the site distance at every driveway and intersection provided to the Board before they can move forward with any kind of review. She continues to say that we don't do preliminary review unless we know those driveways need it, and we will not know until site distance is determined. J. Cannie asks if the SEQRA process could be started. T. Yasenchak informs J. Cannie that the Board will have to reach out to DEC, because of the significant wetlands, requesting Lead Agency. R. Roeckle mentions that it is possible that DEC could choose to take Lead Agency. T. Yasenchak tells J. Cannie the Board will send a letter and the necessary materials for DEC to review to request Lead Agency. She asks other members of the Board if they have any questions or comments.

R. Roeckle begins saying his biggest concern would be the wetlands, and that DEC will need to make determinations as to whether or not they can even access the property the way they've shown, once that is determined, then it's septic, sight distance, pull-offs. B. Podhajecki, J. Sabanos, and C. Ronk agree and have no further comments at the moment.

C. Dake states that aside from DEC input, conceptually everything looks okay at the moment, and that the revisions look much better than what was first submitted.

T. Yasenchak tells j. Cannie eventually the Board will need to see limits of clearing and making sure the road turnouts are wide enough for fire apparatus. She also mentions for the Applicant to keep in mind that the Board does not typically approve shared driveways in new subdivisions.

The Applicant is informed that once the Board hears back from DEC regarding Lead Agent we will contact him.

Foothills/Walsh, V. Case # PB 26-007

Site Plan Review

TM # 139.-1-88

160 Wilton Rd

V. Walsh is present and is in front of the Board for Site Plan Review at 160 Wilton Road. T. Yasenchak asks the Applicant to give the Board a quick summary of why he is here.

V. Walsh starts by saying the packet is a letter from Jerry McKenna, dated 2016. At that time, Paul Van Arm owned the property and he was interested in purchasing it. The Applicant states that Paul ended up passing away, but he agreed that he would sell the property to him and Paul's wife would stay on as long as possible. The Applicant purchased the property in 2018, a little over 2 years when he first came to the Board. Since then, talking with Jerry when he was still Code Enforcement, he gave v. Walsh a letter and said this is what you want to do. V. Walsh states that he runs his tree service out of there, has no more than four trucks. He states that it is still under a small contractor storage yard. The Applicant's biggest truck is 23,500 lbs., and then he has his equipment: a couple trailers, a couple loaders, chipper, and they're all stored on site. In the site plan, Paul had multiple greenhouses in the back that were 100-foot-long by 30, 40 feet. The existing pole shed in the upper right, the northeast corner, is where the Applicant keeps most of the equipment. Below that is the existing farmhouse. He states that is not livable, not heated and is a storage building. He states that he talked to Lorraine, the Assessor, and that it is considered AG storage. He states the copper is pulled out of that and recycled, so there is no heat in that building. Just power for him and the pressure tank, so he has water on site. The Applicant states there is a 200 ft well in the middle of the lot. He says when the lot was purchased, there was a lot line adjustment via Paul's son-in-law, because the property immediately to the north was owned by Paul. V. Walsh states that Paul gave the lot one of his employees years ago. Applicant points out the parcel to the Board on the map stating that was originally Paul's daughter's house and that currently would be the shop up front. V. Walsh goes on to say Paul has a son-in-law that lives to the north and his daughter, and then to the east is his other daughter and son-in-law. The property of the north power goes in on the west side, they wanted to own that where the power was as well as getting it out of the right of way. V. Walsh points out on the map the deeded easement right of way. V. Walsh goes on to say that when Paul bought the property in 1961, he had a nursery, greenhouse, farm and his residence there and that it was mixed-use. He states that everything pre-dated Code. He states that currently one of the greenhouses came down four years ago during a storm, to the west

closest to the driveway there are two smaller greenhouses that are just dry storage. V. Walsh is proposing to continue to use the property to sell lumber. He stated that he has a portable sawmill that he currently keeps 50 ft off the driveway away from the area that I would have the most impact. He states that his intention is to get the sawmill under cover and that he spoke to J. Reckner about a building the sawmill would go into. He states the J. Reckner explained that would be classified as AG processing and that the Applicant would need to meet Code because there would be employees inside that building. V. Walsh stated that the rest of the buildings are AG storage. V. Walsh states that the farmhouse right now has power and water and is cold storage. He states there is a driveway on the right side that goes between the buildings as well as a horseshoe that goes right through the property. He states that when he sells lumber people typically come in either driveway. He states they are wide enough and that there are signs saying do not block the driveway.

T. Yasenchak reads the letter from J. Reckner, Zoning Code Enforcement Official. It says use of a small contractor storage is permitted as an accessory use within the LDR requires no site plan review. However, the question of what the small contractor storage is accessory to should be clarified. For the purpose of this review, I will assume that the small contractor storage will be accessory to the proposed ag processing indicated on the application. provided that the small contractor storage is indeed accessory to the ag processing, it would require no additional approvals outside of the primary use, providing that the primary use ag processing has obtained site plan approval as required by the town of Greenfield's use table under agricultural uses and structural agricultural processing. After reading the letter aloud, T. Yasenchak ask the Applicant to confirm that the primary use is agriculture processing. V. Walsh states that he also grows mushrooms there. He states he has apx 200 logs there inoculated with shiitake, and a couple chip beds of Lion's Mane and Garden Giants and he would also like to keep expanding on that. T. Yasenchak asks the Board if they have questions or comments.

R. Roeckle mentions that there are setbacks for agricultural processing, and we will need clarification from the Code Enforcement Officer, if the storage of the logs and/or other agricultural products need to meet the setbacks. R. Roeckle states that his main concern is the setback from the road.

J. Sabanos asks if the farmhouse is staying going to remain unoccupied or if the Applicant has any intention of renovating and renting it out. The Applicant states he plans to have it remain unoccupied. J. Sabanos mentions there is a lot of material stored close to the road and asks the Applicant to pull it back away from the road to help with curb appeal. J. Sabanos also suggests more signage for the property indicating that it is a business.

B. Podhajecki agrees that more signage would be advantageous for the Applicant. And suggests signs indicating where to enter and exit the property as well.

C. Ronk asks the Applicant what is stored in the house. The Applicant states that it is mostly overflow of his fathers from when his elderly father sold his home, as well as some of the Applicants tools. C. Ronk, S. Lucciardi and C. Dake also echo curb appeal and signage.

T. Yasenchak explains to V. Walsh some things that the Board looks for with Site Plan such as parking, how many parking spots are needed, can customers get in and turn around easily. She states that in this instance they will not ask for site distance since it was already existing and was commercial. She asks where storage will be. She indicates that this all needs to be shown on an updated Site Plan Map. T. Yasenchak also states that she wants to be sure the Applicant plans to keep a buffer between the neighbors and processing and to include that on the map.

T. Yasenchak asks if there are onsite restrooms. The Applicant states that there are currently no toilets on site in any of the buildings. R. Roeckle states that we will need clarification from the Town Code Officer determining if the building being used as an office/other occupancy requires a bathroom per building code. T. Yasenchak tells the Applicant that we will also need County Referral due to the fact that the property is on a County road and that a Public Hearing will also be scheduled for March 31, 2026.

Meeting Adjourned at 8:51 pm

DRAFT

Respectfully Submitted By,
Erika Faas
Executive Secretary
Planning Board