

TOWN OF GREENFIELD
PLANNING BOARD MEETING

May 12, 2026

Regular Meeting

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by T. Yasenchak, Chair, at 7:00 pm. On roll call the following Board members are present: T. Yasenchak, R. Roeckle, C. Dake, J. Sabanos, B. Podhajacki, B. Duffney and C. Ronk (alternate). C. Ronk has full voting privileges. S. Licciardi is absent. J. Reckner, Zoning Administrator, is present. E. Faas, Executive Secretary to the Planning Board, is present.

Minutes

April 28, 2026 – Postponed

New Business

Diggins, Christine Case # PB 26-016

Minor Subdivision

TM# 111.-2-18.111

165 Allen Road

The Applicant is present, as well as representative Pat Jarosz of Van Guilder Land Surveyors. The Applicant is in front of the Board for a minor subdivision at 165 Allen Road. P. Jarosz described the project as a two-lot line adjustment in a three-lot subdivision. The property is in the LDR zone and is served by well and septic systems. The Applicant states that all proposed lots comply with LDR zone requirements. P. Jarosz states the proposal would create three lots of approximately 16.45 acres, 8.06 acres and 20.16 acres while also adjusting boundaries with two neighboring properties.

The Board discussed the configuration of the proposed lots, focusing especially on the lot shapes, frontage and use of a keyhole lot.

Overall, the Board appears to accept the general proposed layout and indicated the proposal represented a practical and appropriate use of a keyhole lot. After further discussion it is determined that more follow up material will be needed to continue application review. This includes refinement of the survey and mapping details, with the addition of site distance, septic and well location, and possibly SWPP if more than an acre is going to be disturbed. No final action is taken on the proposed application at today's meeting. A Public Hearing will be

scheduled for May 26, 2026, contingent upon the receipt of revisions at least 10 business days before then.

Old Business and Public Hearing

Saratoga, Corinth & Hudson Railway Case # PB 26-010
SUP

TM# 151.-2-107.1

101 Canty Road

The Applicant, Hal Raven, is present. Mr. Raven appeared before the Board for a Special Use Permit for property located at 101 Canty Road, to continue operating his business with no change in operations: dinner trains and special events.

T. Yasenchak opened the Public Hearing at 7:13 p.m. Louise Bubleck of 103 Locust Grove Rd is present in favor. No opposition was voiced. T. Yasenchak closed the Public Hearing at 7:14 p.m.

The Board conducted SEQRA Review using the Short Environmental Assessment Form. In reviewing Part 1, the Board found the Applicant to be consistent with zoning, consistent with the Town's Comprehensive Plan, and reflective of an existing, previously operating use with no change in operations. The Board noted the site does adjoin a Critical Environmental Area, would not increase traffic above present levels, and would not affect pedestrian/bicycle facilities. The Board discussed utilities and site conditions including that potable water is provided by well and bottled water, wastewater is handled through existing facilities including septic and portable toilets and there is no stormwater discharge, is not located in the 100- year flood plain, does not involve wetlands, water bodies, hazardous site remediation or site alteration. The Board made a minor correction to Part 1 concerning the acreage associated with the application and referencing the Northern Long-Eared Bat. The Applicant initial ed the changes.

In completing Part 2, Impact Assessment, the Board found:

- The proposed action will not create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations
- The Proposed action will not result in a change in the use, or intensity of use of the land
- The proposed action will not impair the quality of the existing community
- The proposed action will not have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)

- The proposed action will not result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway
- The proposed action will not cause an increase in the use of energy
- The proposed action will not impact public/private water supplies or public/private wastewater treatment utilities
- The proposed action will not impair the quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources
- The proposed action will not result in an adverse change to natural resources
- The proposed action will not result in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems
- The proposed actions will not create a hazard to environmental resources or human health

A motion is made to check the second box, indicating a Negative Declaration:

Motion: B. Duffney

Second: C. Dake

RESOLVED, the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts based on the Negative Declaration determined during SEQRA, and any supporting documentation.

Vote: Ayes: T. Yasenchak, R. Roeckle, C. Dake, C. Ronk, J. Sabanos, B. Podhajecki, B. Duffney

Noes: None

Absent: S. Licciardi

Abstain: None

The Board goes through the Special Use Permit Criteria Checklist (A-Q). T. Yasenchak states the Board has looked at all items within the Special Use Permit and the granting of a Special Use Permit. She states the Applicant has provided us with materials about their Special Use Permit narrative and have also received the necessary zoning variance. T. Yasenchak asks the Board if they would like to make a motion to grant a Permanent Special Use Permit to Saratoga, Corinth & Hudson Railway.

MOTION: C. Dake

SECOND: B. Duffney

RESLOVED, the Planning Board hereby grants approval for a permanent Special Use Permit for Hal T. Raven of Saratoga, Corinth & Hudson Railway located at 101 Canty Road (MDR-1); TM# 151.-2-107.1. This approval will allow the Applicant to continue using the property with no changes in operation (dinner trains, weddings, and events). Special Use Permit will be permanent until such time as the property is sold or use discontinued.

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

Noes: None

Absent: S. Licciardi

Abstain: None

55 & 65 Wilton Rd LLC

PUD

TM# 138.-2-109
Rd

59 Wilton

J. Cannie of Cannie Law PLLC is present representing the Applicant. J. Cannie advises the Board that revised materials have been submitted to address the Boards previous comments. Notable revisions include:

- Setback language for agricultural buildings had been corrected and revised to 40-ft front, 25-ft side, and 40-ft rear.
- Clarification that certain agricultural buildings up to 400 -sq ft could be added administratively without amended site plan approval, subject to building permit requirements and subject to returning for full site plan review if the threshold for multiple structures was met.
- Lot line and setback language has been clarified, including how setbacks would be measured
- Language had been added addressing expansion of pre-existing non-conforming structures so long as the degree of non-conformity was not increased.
- Prior language concerning farmhouse or residential uses has been cleaned up and removed where appropriate

T. Yasenchak states that the Public Hearing remained adjourned and will be re-opened after Board discussion of the revised materials. Members generally responded favorably to the revisions. R. Roeckle suggests adding references in the utility section to comply with Town Code in addition to State Building Code, DOH, and DEC standards. The Applicant agrees. T. Yasenchak suggests putting language in concerning pool/gatehouses, making it clear that such additional accessory structures are not to become additional dwelling units.

T. Yasenchak re-opens the Public Hearing at 8:00 p.m. No members of the public come forward to speak. The Public Hearing is adjourned at 8:02 p.m. T. Yasenchak explains that the Board wishes to complete SEQRA review and prepare a written advisory opinion before formally closing the hearing and taking final advisory action. She states that is procedure is intended to preserve the Board's ability to complete its advisory role, without delaying the Applicant's timetable before the Town Board.

The Board begins review of the Short Environmental Assessment for the PUD amendment. The Board is lead agent, as previously granted by the DEC. Board members confirm they have sufficient information to make an informed SEQRA determination. During Part 1, the Board discusses acreage, energy code language, mapped wetlands on adjacent lands, and the fact that the Applicant has used an EAF mapper.

In completing Part 2, Impact Assessment, the Board found:

- The proposed action will not create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations
- The Proposed action will not result in a change in the use, or intensity of use of the land
- The proposed action will not impair the quality of the existing community
- The proposed action will not have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)
- The proposed action will not result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway
- The proposed action will not cause an increase in the use of energy
- The proposed action will not impact public/private water supplies or public/private wastewater treatment utilities
- The proposed action will not impair the quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources
- The proposed action will not result in an adverse change to natural resources
- The proposed action will not result in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems

- The proposed actions will not create a hazard to environmental resources or human health

A motion is made to check the second box, indicating a Negative Declaration:

MOTION: C. Dake

SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts based on the Negative Declaration determined during SEQRA, and any supporting documentation.

Vote: Ayes: T. Yasenchak, R. Roeckle, C. Dake, C. Ronk, J. Sabanos, B. Podhajecki, B. Duffney

Noes: None

Absent: S. Licciardi

Abstain: None

T. Yasenchak clarifies the Board has not acted on anything at this moment. She notes the Board is leaning toward a favorable opinion, and next steps include the drafting of an advisory opinion to be reviewed by the Town Attorney. It is noted the Town Board will still need to obtain County referral before taking final action

Meeting Adjourned at 8:23 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Erika Faas

Executive Secretary to the Planning Board

