

Town of Greenfield Comprehensive Plan

Saratoga County, Greenfield, New York

Adopted by the Town Board:

May 12, 2005

Prepared by:



Prepared for:

The Town of Greenfield
Greenfield, New York 12833

Comprehensive Plan Committee

Town of Greenfield Comprehensive Plan Acknowledgements

Comprehensive Plan Committee

Brian Aurwater

Keith A. Avellino

Taylor Conard (Zoning Board Member)

Gary Dake (Planning Board Chairman)

Deborah Howes, AICP Consultant

Al Janik (Town Board Liaison)

Joan Kelly

Thomas Kinsella, Chairman (Planning Board Member)

Nancy Kmen

James Major

Stu Mesinger, Consultant

Daniel Pemrick (Zoning Board Member)

Jason Penge

John Streit

Mark Young (Planning Board Member)

Pamela Young (Environmental Committee Chair)

Others who have been instrumental in the preparation of this report:

Mary DeMarco, Town Historian

Mary Ann Johnson, Town Clerk

Gerard McKenna, Building and Codes Officer

E. James Older, Superintendent of Highways

Robert Stokes, Town Supervisor

Table of Contents

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	What is a Comprehensive Plan?.....	1
1.2	About This Document.....	2
1.3	Planning Process.....	3
2.0	GREENFIELD TODAY	4
2.1	Regional Setting.....	4
2.2	Land Use.....	5
2.3	Topography & Slopes.....	8
2.4	Soils	9
2.5	Zoning.....	12
2.6	Water Resources	14
2.6.1	Watersheds	14
2.6.2	Wetlands & Floodplains	16
2.6.3	Groundwater	17
2.7	Development Constraints	19
2.8	Transportation.....	22
2.9	Water & Sewer Infrastructure	25
2.10	Solid Waste Disposal.....	26
2.11	Fire & Rescue	27
2.12	Parks & Recreation	27
2.13	Historic Resources.....	31
2.14	Demographic Data	33
2.14.1	Population.....	33
2.14.2	Population Projections	34
2.14.4	Income.....	35
2.14.4	Travel Time	36
2.15	Housing.....	37
2.16	Development Data.....	38
2.16.2	Subdivision	39
2.17	Empire Zones.....	39
2.18	School Districts	40
2.19	Town Budgets.....	42
3.0	OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES	46
3.1	What makes Greenfield Special?	46
3.3	What Are the Challenges for Greenfield?.....	48
3.4	Greenfield Today: A Synthesis	49
4.	A VISION FOR THE FUTURE	53
5.	GOALS	56

6.	FUTURE LAND USE PLAN.....	65
7.	THE GREENFIELD ACTION PLAN.....	68

List of Figures

Figure 1:	Location Map
Figure 2:	Aerial Overview
Figure 3:	Land Use
Figure 4:	Topographic Map
Figure 5:	Slope Map
Figure 6:	Soils Map
Figure 7:	Surficial Geology
Figure 8:	Greenfield Zoning Map
Figure 9:	Wetlands and Water Resources
Figure 10:	Aquifer Map
Figure 11:	Constraints to Development
Figure 12:	Development Constraints to Vacant and Residential Parcels Greater Than or Equal to 10 Acres
Figure 13:	Roads
Figure 14:	Sewer District
Figure 15:	Recreational Facilities
Figure 16:	Empire Zones.
Figure 17:	Future Land Use Map

List of Tables

Table 1:	Land Use in Greenfield	5
Table 2:	Existing Residential Parcels.....	6
Table 3:	Predominant Soils.....	10
Table 4:	Prime Agricultural Soils.....	12
Table 5:	Zoning Districts	13
Table 6:	Development Constraints.....	20
Table 7:	Acreage of Developable Vacant & Residential Land.....	21
Table 8:	Road Designations	24
Table 9:	Potential Recreational Activities	30
Table 10:	Total Persons Census Data.....	33
Table 11:	Total Households Census Data.....	34
Table 12:	Population Projections.....	34
Table 13:	Median Age Census Data	35
Table 14:	Age of Population Census Data	35
Table 15:	Median Household Income.....	36
Table 16:	Travel Time to Work for Greenfield Workers 16 Years of Age and Older	36
Table 17:	Housing Structures	37
Table 18:	Year Structure Built.....	37
Table 19:	Building Permits.....	38
Table 20:	Subdivisions & Lots Created 1990 - Present	39
Table 21:	Saratoga Springs City School District Enrollment & Projections	41
Table 22:	Greenfield Elementary Enrollment History	41
Table 23:	Corinth Central School District Enrollment & Projections.....	42
Table 24:	Land Tax Rates per \$1,000 of Assessed Value.....	43
Table 25:	Total Assessed Values for Greenfield.....	43

Table 26: School Tax Rates per \$1,000 of Assessed Value	44
Table 27: Budget Summary	45
Table 28. Strategy and Implementation Chart.....	69

Appendices

Appendix I:	Soils in Greenfield
Appendix II:	Zoning Districts
Appendix III:	Highway Conditions
Appendix IV:	Known Historic Resources
Appendix V:	Town Budget
Appendix VI:	Potential Funding Sources
Appendix VII:	Summary of Stakeholder Interviews

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Good plans shape good decisions. That's why good planning helps to make elusive dreams come true. **Lester R. Bittel**

1.1 What is a Comprehensive Plan?

A comprehensive plan is a policy guide that sets forth directions for the future of a community. It is not a law or regulation. Rather, it is a blueprint to help guide the future. Like any blueprint, it is subject to change and revision with the passage of time and events. A plan sets forth specific goals and implementation measures to be undertaken to guide the physical development of the Town. Local officials daily undertake actions, enact regulations and approve development, all of which are likely to have long-term implications. To ensure that these daily decisions ultimately benefit the whole community, the decision making process should be undertaken within the context of a considered evaluation of the Town's objectives for future growth and its desired character. This *Comprehensive Plan* identifies the community development policies and objectives of the Town of Greenfield.

Greenfield originally adopted a *Land Use Plan* in 1974. This Plan was used as the foundation for establishing zoning and subdivision regulations. In 1991, Greenfield updated its Plan. The new Plan included updated analyses and policies regarding environmental features, land use, housing, and economic development.

The 1974 *Land Use Plan* concentrated on the key issues then facing the community and presented suggestions for policy development to address these issues. The 1991 Plan established long-range goals to deal with the Town's potential future development.

With this Plan, the Town of Greenfield once again is taking a comprehensive look at its development policies as well as refining its vision to reflect the changes experienced by the community since the preparation of the last plan. This *Comprehensive Plan* makes use of many of the studies, data, analysis and policy objectives of the prior plans. In addition, it presents new data related to development, land use, and demographic trends, and utilizes digital data for analyzing land use and development patterns. Key stakeholders participated in this process to identify challenges and opportunities that the community currently faces.

A comprehensive plan typically includes a statement of goals, followed by a discussion of how to achieve those goals (i.e., implementation). Goals are the broadest expression of a community's desires. Goals give direction to the plan as a whole. Goals are long-term aspirations and are used to achieve a vision of the Town in the future.

The formulation of community goals is one of the most important products resulting from the development of a comprehensive plan. In addition to giving direction to the plan and articulating the community's vision for its future, goals help define priorities and provide common ground between diverse groups.

Besides providing a policy foundation, the *Comprehensive Plan* can be used as a tool to help obtain funding for a variety of projects. The *Comprehensive Plan* can be used as a marketing tool to promote the assets of the Town. The *Comprehensive Plan* also provides the foundation for any land use regulations the Town may adopt in the future.

1.2 About This Document

The Town of Greenfield Comprehensive Plan is written and organized to be as succinct as possible. The plan is organized as follows:

- Chapter 1 is this introduction.
- Chapter 2 provides an overview of existing conditions, organized by subject area.
- Chapter 3 is a synthesis of Chapter 2, summarizing the Town's strengths and weaknesses. Chapter 3 discusses the interrelationship between the various trends and conditions.
- Chapter 4 presents the vision statement for the Greenfield of the future.
- Chapter 5 is goals of the Town, necessary to implement and achieve the vision. Goals provide a policy framework for the Town over the next 10 to 15 years.
- Chapter 6 the Future Land Use Plan describes the specific areas of the town and the types of land use activities envisioned.
- Chapter 7 provides the specific recommendations necessary to implement the desired goals. For each recommendation, an implementing agency/organization and potential funding source is identified.

1.3 Planning Process

A Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Review Committee (The Committee) was appointed by the Town Board on September 18, 2003. The Committee began meeting in January 2004. The Committee represented a diverse range of community interests including representatives of the Planning Board, the Zoning Board, the Environmental Committee, the Concerned Citizens of Greenfield, former elected officials, long time residents and recent arrivals to the community.

Community input was sought through interviews with individuals and agencies involved in land use planning and development activities in Greenfield. In addition, there were public meetings in April 2004 and in January, 2005. These efforts aided in the issues identification phase and in the development of a future vision for the Town of Greenfield.

In addition to the issues identification phase, an inventory of existing land uses, population trends, building history, traffic, and historic and natural resources was conducted. The Committee formulated goals based on the issues identification and using the inventory as a contextual guide.

Potential alternatives to address the goals were developed by The Committee upon reflection of the information gathering phase. The preferred alternatives were selected and recommendations for implementation were developed.

Finally, a budget and timeline were developed for achieving the goals. These elements were published in a draft plan, and subject to public review and comment. Following a Public Hearing on the draft plan, the Committee revised the plan in response to public comments and forwarded the *Comprehensive Plan Committee Recommended Draft* to the Town Board in February 2005 for review and approval. The Town Board adopted the *Comprehensive Plan* on May 12, 2005.

2.0 GREENFIELD TODAY

In the United States there is more space where nobody is than where anybody is. This is what makes America what it is. **Gertrude Stein**

2.1 Regional Setting

Greenfield is a beautiful rural town located in northeastern New York State. As illustrated by Figure 1, *Location Map*, Greenfield is located in Saratoga County and borders the City of Saratoga Springs, and the Towns of Milton, Galway, Providence, Edinburg, Corinth, and Wilton. The northwestern corner of the Town lies within the Adirondack Park.

Figure 2, *Aerial Overview*, provides an aerial overview of Greenfield. This Figure generally illustrates that while residential development is densest in those areas of Greenfield most proximate to the City of Saratoga Springs, there are significant undeveloped lands in close proximity to the City. Because of the provision of small town amenities and a relaxed lifestyle, as well as its proximity to the City of Saratoga Springs and the greater Capital District area, the Town has recently seen an increase in residential development. As a result, Greenfield has become a bedroom community for persons working in places like Albany and Saratoga Springs, and land prices have increased as a result.

Greenfield is located near a variety of cultural, educational, historic, and recreational resources. The immediate region provides access to natural resources and recreational opportunities of the Adirondack Park and Lake George, cultural, economic and educational opportunities of the Capital District, and the cultural, entertainment and retail opportunities in Saratoga Springs.

Due to its proximity to Saratoga Springs 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.

2.2 Land Use

Land use patterns are a result of historic settlement characteristics and modern building codes, zoning ordinances, and subdivision regulations. Until recently Greenfield was relatively lightly developed, in large part due to natural resource constraints and lack of infrastructure.

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 a country lifestyle close to an abundance of recreational and cultural amenities.

There are 42,791 acres in the Town of Greenfield. Figure 3, *Land Use*, illustrates the location of the land uses. Table 1, *Land Use in Greenfield*, provides a break down of the total acreage of each of the existing land uses within the Town. Note that this table is based on assessment information provided by the Saratoga Office of Real Property Services for 2004, which is not always completely accurate. For example, some land classified as vacant may be used for agricultural purposes such as hayfields or grazing. Land use should not be confused with zoning. A property may be zoned commercially yet the land use can be residential.

The largest single land use is vacant land with 17,227 acres, or approximately 40% of the Town. The second largest land use is residential, with 16,891 acres or approximately 39% of the Town. The majority of the residential properties consists of parcels of one acre or larger. The effect of the vacant lands and the large residential lots contributes to the rural, undeveloped character of the Town.

Land Use Classification	Acres	Number of Parcels	Percent of Land Use Per Classification
Vacant Land	17,186	1,158	40%
Residential	16,891	2,397	39%
Wild, Forested, Conservation Lands & Public Parks	6,055	70	14%
Recreation and Entertainment	702	12	2%
Commercial	664	77	2%
Industrial	566	7	1%
Agricultural	356	6	1%
Community Services	176	46	1%
Public Services	195	5	0%
Total	42,791	3,778	100%

Vacant Land

Vacant land comprises more than 40% of the land in Greenfield. Vacant land is found in every zoning district, with the majority of it zoned residentially. There are currently 1,160 parcels of vacant land totaling 17,186 acres. These vacant lands can be found in several zoning districts, with the majority zoned residential. This is significant because it implies that a great deal of future development is possible. Of these vacant parcels, many are very large, with 336 parcels greater than 10 acres in size. These large vacant parcels appear to create opportunities for significant future subdivision and residential development.

Residential Land

As noted above, residential land is the second largest use in the Town of Greenfield, accounting for 16,891 acres or 39% of the Town. Single-family homes are the predominant residential use in the Town. Table 2, *Existing Residential Parcels*, breaks down residential parcels by size.

Parcel Size	Number of Existing Parcels
< 1 acre	742
1-2 acres	498
2-5 acres	519
5-10 acres	317
> 10 acres	321

Wild, Forested and Conservation Land

There are 5,740 acres in this category, encompassing seventy (70) parcels, or 14% of the Town. This includes some land located in the Adirondack Park and several parcels of State-owned forest land, located in the eastern part of the Town.

Recreation and Entertainment

There are fourteen (14) parcels actively used by the Town for recreation and entertainment, which account for 717 acres or approximately 2% of the Town's area. Ten of the parcels are privately owned. The private recreational properties include 126 acres associated with the Saratoga Springs Rod and Gun Club, and 130 mostly wooded acres owned by Skidmore College. The remaining four parcels are publicly owned and include a total of three parcels totaling twelve acres owned by the Town and a two and half acre parcel owned by the Regents of the University of New York. The fourteen parcels range in size from less than an

acre for the lands associated with the Greenfield Historical Society to more than 226 acres for lands associated with the Golf Course owned by Beyer.

The Town recently purchased approximately twenty five acres of vacant land which will likely be developed for recreational purposes, but which are not included in this discussion as the land is still technically considered vacant.

The Town has several commercial recreation facilities, including the Whispering Pines Campground, the American Campground and the Brookhaven Golf Course. Alpine Meadows is a small commercial ski hill that is no longer in operation. Other recreational opportunities in Greenfield include social organizations, outdoor sport facilities, parks, athletic fields, riding stables, and playgrounds.

Commercial

There are a total of seventy-seven (77) parcels within Greenfield used for commercial purposes, comprising 664 acres, or 1.6% of the Town's total land area. The Town contains several small hamlets, including Greenfield Center, Middle Grove, and Porter Corners. The Hamlets have existed essentially since the Town was first settled, and they are the centers of cultural history, historical architecture, and recreational facilities. The Town's commercial land uses are primarily located within these Hamlets.

The Town's only commercial strip is found along a short stretch of Route 9 (Maple Avenue) located between Saratoga Springs and Wilton. Commercial properties in Greenfield include, but are not limited to: automobile services, banks, convenience stores, inns, office and professional buildings, restaurants, storage facilities, and veterinary services. Apartment buildings and mobile home parks are considered commercial properties rather than residential properties since the property owner collects revenues for the properties in the form of rent.

Industrial

Industrial development is minimal in Greenfield. Industrial uses are found in two separate areas of Town. One is along the Town's southern boundary and is zoned General Business. The other is located in the western part of Town. This second area is covered by an overlay zone, called the Earth Material Extraction Zone. Both of these zones are discussed in greater detail in the Zoning section of this Comprehensive Plan.

There are currently seven (7) parcels located in the EME zone. These parcels comprise a total of 566 acres or 1% of the Town's total 42,791 acres. The

industrial parcels include mining operations in the EME zone and commercial warehousing and manufacturing in the General Business zone.

At one time, there were a large number of sawmills in the Town, but today there are only a few remaining. Timber harvesting, although not classified as an industrial use, still occurs on much of the Town's privately owned vacant land. The lands in timber production are mostly owned by local paper companies who harvest trees for use in their mills.

Agricultural Land

Despite the abundance of prime agricultural soils in Greenfield, there are limited agricultural uses, totaling only 356 acres. This includes only six (6) parcels accounting for 0.8% of all land uses in the Town. Agricultural uses in the Town include several horse farms, a dairy farm, a sheep and wool farm and a farm with donkeys and goats.

Community Services

There are forty-six (46) parcels in the Town, totaling 176 acres, comprising 0.5% of the Town's land area used for various community services. These include the animal welfare shelter, cemeteries, churches, the Greenfield Elementary School, the Greenfield Highway Garage, Fire buildings, and the Town office buildings. In addition, there are four State operated group homes in Greenfield, located at Alpine Meadows Road, Squashville Road, Wilton Road, and Middle Grove Road.

Public Services

The five (5) parcels included in this category comprise 195 acres, or 0.5% of the Town's area. These include railroad right-of-ways, cellular telephone towers, and telephone facilities.

2.3 Topography & Slopes

As shown in Figure 4, *Topographic Map*, relief is highly variable throughout the Town. Elevations in the Town range from 330 feet to 1986 feet above sea level (asl). The western portion of the Town consists of a mountain ridge, an outlier of the Adirondack Park. The elevation of the ridge ranges from approximately 1700 feet to approximately 1980 feet above sea level. A second geologically distinct bluff characterizes the eastern half of the Town. The central portion of the Town is generally characterized as gently rolling, with some minimal constraints resulting from the steep slopes in this area. See Figure 5, *Slope Map*, to identify those locations with particularly steep slopes.

The determination of an area's suitability for development is partially dependent on the slope of the land. Generally, steep slopes are prone to erosion, flooding, and drainage problems. Steep slopes are also a scenic resource and therefore worth preserving. Construction on steep slopes can be detrimental, particularly when vegetation is removed, which increases the potential for erosion. Steep slopes require special design and construction techniques to prevent significant adverse impacts to the surrounding environment, including potential adverse impacts to water quality and other natural resources. The New York State Department of Health does not generally allow septic system construction on slopes in excess of fifteen percent without regrading and stabilization. Construction of septic systems on steep slopes can result in lateral seeping and effluent surfacing prior to adequate filtering.

2.4 Soils

Knowledge of soils, including their properties and distribution, is essential to a comprehensive plan. Soils characteristics often determine the suitability of land for development and weigh heavily in the planning process. The suitability of particular soils for development should be a critical factor when determining zoning districts.

This section describes the soils in Greenfield and emphasizes properties which are most critical in land-use planning. For example, soils are of critical importance when considering the feasibility of on-site sewage effluent disposal. Construction of on-site wastewater disposal systems on poorly drained soil can lead to system failure and result in surface and groundwater contamination. See Figure 6, *Soils Map*, for the location of soil types within the Town.

The predominant soils in the Greenfield consist of Charlton Loam (CcB and CcC), Becket-Tunbridge Complex (BEE), Chatfield-Hollis Complex (CeC), and Sutton Loam (StB) series. The following Table 3, *Predominant Soils*, lists the ten (10) most prominent soils within the Town of Greenfield and some of the important characteristics associated with these soils. The full list of soils in Greenfield can be found in Appendix I.

Soils in the Town of Greenfield are derived from a variety of glacial and bedrock sources including till, bedrock, lake deposits, glacial outwash, deltaic deposits, alluvium, and organic matter. The following are general descriptions of each of the predominant soil types found in Greenfield. See Figure 7, *Surficial Geology*, for the approximate location of these soils.

Table 3: Predominant Soils			
Soil Symbol	Soil Name	Acres	Building Site Constraints
CcB	Charlton Loam, 3 To 8 Percent Slopes	7,010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Slight slope constraints for most development. ▪ Moderate slope constraints for small commercial buildings.
BEE	Becket-Tunbridge Complex, Steep, Very Bouldery	5,088	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Severe wetness for shallow excavations and dwellings with basements. ▪ Severe slopes for most development.
CeC	Chatfield-Hollis Complex, Rolling, Rocky	4,609	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Severe depth to rock for most development. ▪ Moderate to Severe slopes. ▪ Frost action for roads.
CcC	Charlton Loam, 8 To 15 Percent Slopes	3,287	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Moderate slope constraints for most development. ▪ Steep slope constraints for small commercial buildings.
StB	Sutton Loam, 3 To 8 Percent Slopes	2,853	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Severe to moderate wetness for most development. ▪ Severe frost action for road development.
Ms	Massena Silt Loam	2,269	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Severe wetness for most development. ▪ Severe frost action for road development.
BEC	Becket-Tunbridge Complex, Strongly Sloping, Very B	1,223	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Severe to moderate wetness for most development. ▪ Moderate slopes for dwelling without basements. ▪ Severe slopes for commercial buildings. ▪ Moderate frost action for road development.
HcC	Hinckley Gravelly Loamy Sand, Rolling	1,115	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Moderate to severe slopes for most development.
CcD	Charlton Loam, 15 To 25 Percent Slopes	1,112	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Severe slopes for most development.
WnC	Windsor Loamy Sand, Rolling	1,109	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Moderate to severe slopes for most development.

- Till is a deposit of clay, sand, and gravel, formed in a glacier valley by waters derived from the melting glaciers. Therefore, till tends to consist of compacted glacial deposits which contain an unsorted mixture of materials ranging from clay to boulders. Suitability of till soils for land use development can vary because of their heterogeneous character. Till soils, however, generally have moderate to severe development limitations because of wetness and low permeability.
- Bedrock and till soils are generally only a few inches thick and are usually severely limited in their suitability for development. Generally, this soil group tends to have rock outcrops. Overall, this soil group is not suitable for septic systems and/or construction of buildings with basements.
- Lacustrine or lake deposit soils contain silts and clays deposited in glacial lakes that formed during the last ice age. These soils are generally free of gravel and coarse sediments and also tend to have high water tables and low permeability rates. Due to these constraints, these soils usually have moderate to severe limitations with respect to development suitability. This soil type tends to experience drainage problems and it is often difficult to accommodate individual septic systems.
- Glacial outwash soils contain sand and gravel deposited horizontally from glacial melt water. Soils formed in these deposits are advantageous for development and often only experience slight limitations. Sand and gravel soils often provide a good support for buildings, exhibit good percolation characteristics for individual septic systems, and provide adequate treatment of septic tank effluents. Often, these outwash soils overlie productive aquifers.
- Deltaic deposit soils are similar to outwash soils, but rather than consisting of the sand and gravel deposits, these soils are underlain by silts and clays. The silts and clays may impede groundwater movement causing this soil type to have slight to moderate development limitations. Groundwater tends to accumulate because the flow is restricted and can result in a high water table, especially during wet seasons.
- Alluvium or stream sediment soils generally consist of sands, gravels, silts and/or clays. These soils are typically associated with floodplains due to the fine grain materials which have a low permeability. These soils tend to experience stream flooding and should be considered as severely limited when assessing land development suitability.

- Organic matter soils are composed of decaying plant material associated with wetlands, bogs, and swamps. These soils are generally unsuitable for development due to unstable soils, poor compaction for building foundations, and wet conditions.

Table 4, *Prime Agricultural Soils*¹, identifies the best agricultural soils in Greenfield for production. As noted in the previous table, the Charlton loam (CcB) is the principal soil type found in the Town, covering over 7,000 acres; and the Sutton Loam (StB), is the fifth most common soil type in Greenfield, covering over 2,850 acres. Given the quantity of good agricultural soils in Greenfield, it is somewhat surprising that there are so few farms. However, in addition to general characteristics indicating the presence of soils conducive to agriculture, the soils in Greenfield tend to be extremely rocky, making cultivation a very challenging task.

Map Symbol	Soil
CcB	Charlton Loam, 3 To 8 Percent Slopes
ChB	Chenango Silt Loam, Loamy Substratum, Undulating
EIB	Elmridge Very Fine Sandy Loam, 3 To 8 Percent Slopes
GaB	Galway Loam, 3 To 8 Percent Slopes
HuB	Hudson Silt Loam, 3 To 8 Percent Slopes
NuB	Nunda Silt Loam, 3 To 8 Percent Slopes
SeA	Scio Silt Loam, 0 To 3 Percent Slopes
SeB	Scio Silt Loam, 3 To 8 Percent Slopes
StA	Sutton Loam, 0 To 3 Percent Slopes
StB	Sutton Loam, 3 To 8 Percent Slopes
Te	Teel Silt Loam

2.5 Zoning

Greenfield has a Zoning Ordinance that was last comprehensively revised in 1988. Various small revisions have been implemented nearly every year since. The purpose of the Zoning Ordinance is to protect and promote the health, safety, and welfare of the community. The Zoning Ordinance is intended to implement the policies of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan of the Town.

The Town's current Zoning Map, Figure 8, *Greenfield Zoning Map*, is confusing and does not appear to follow readily definable natural resource limitations or land use patterns. There are several districts that are nearly identical, such as the Town Center and Town Hamlets. There appears little rationale for their differentiation. There are also lands zoned for dense residential development, at one acre per parcel, which are constrained by wet soils and/or steep slopes.

¹ United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, <http://efotg.nrcs.usda.gov>.

The Town has eleven different zoning districts and two overlay districts. Each district has a defined list of allowed and specially permitted uses. Uses not specifically listed for an individual district are not permitted. Further, each district has different area requirements. This allows the Town to regulate different intensities of uses and control land uses that may be incompatible with other uses in a district. Table 5, *Zoning Districts*, is a list of the existing districts in the Town. A discussion of each district can be found in Appendix II.

In addition to the eleven zoning districts identified in Table 5, *Zoning Districts*, there are two overlay zones. An overlay zone is a zoning district that encompasses one or more underlying zones and that imposes additional requirements beyond those required for the underlying zone. Overlay zones typically address special situations that are not appropriate to a specific zoning district, or may apply to several districts. For example, an historic overlay zone may cover parts of several zones and require additional site plan review requirements for any building or renovations.

Greenfield’s two overlay zones are the Earth Material Extraction Overlay District and the Floodplain Management, Wetland Resource Conservation Overlay District. Figure 8, *Greenfield Zoning Map*, identifies the location of the zoning districts and the overlay districts.

Zoning District Symbol	Zoning District Name
R-1	Residential 1
R-2	Residential 2
R-3	Residential 3
R-4	Agricultural/Residential 4
R-5	Residential 5
RD	Rural Density
OR	Office Residential
NC	Neighborhood Commercial
GB	General Business/Enterprise
TC	Town Center
TH	Town Hamlet
EME	Earth Material Extraction Overlay
FMWRC	Floodplain Management, Wetland Resource Conservation Overlay

The Earth Material Extraction Overlay Zoning District (EME) consists of 1,053 acres. This overlay zone is currently located in the western part of town and overlays some lands zoned Rural Density and other lands zoned Agricultural / Residential 4. The overlay requires that land use activities within this district comply with the requirements of the underlying zone (the RD or the R4) as well as with the requirements of the EME.

Within the EME Zoning District, allowable activities include mining of sand, gravel and bedrock; and blasting activities for hard rock. These activities are regulated by the NYS DEC under the Mined Reclamation Act.

The Floodplain Management, Wetland Resource Conservation District was established to regulate land development within flood hazard zones, wetlands and the Kayaderosseras Creek basin. Development within this overlay district is restricted. Each of the varying water resources, known to be prone to flooding, has a designated buffer area. Development and other land disturbing activities within the buffer areas are strictly regulated and frequently prohibited.

2.6 Water Resources

2.6.1 Watersheds

The Town of Greenfield has a number of water resources, including numerous lakes, streams, and wetlands. There are approximately 125 miles of streams, 128 acres of lakes and ponds and more than 4,993 acres of wetlands within the Town's boundaries.

All of the water bodies have been assigned classifications for best uses and standards of quality and purity by the NYSDEC. Classifications are based on water quality at the time of sampling, as well as recommended best usage, which is determined by natural conditions and past, current, and desired uses of the lands bordering the water. Class A and AA waters are suitable for drinking water; Class B waters are suitable for primary contact recreation, such as swimming; Class C waters are suitable for fish propagation; and Class D waters are suitable for secondary contact recreation, such as boating. A Class D designation does not necessarily imply that the water is polluted. These are waters that may not have been sampled or are small or intermittent and, therefore, unsuitable for fish propagation. The symbol (T) after any class designates that the waters are trout waters and the symbol (TS) after any class designates that the water are suitable for trout spawning.

The Town's water resources, consisting of lakes, streams, and wetlands, functionally create two main watersheds and a number of secondary or sub-watersheds. A watershed is an area of land that catches rain and snow and drains or seeps into a receiving body of water. Receiving bodies can be a marsh, stream, river, lake or groundwater. The two main watersheds are the Kayaderosseras Creek watershed, which flows to the southwest into the Kayaderosseras Creek, and the Geyser Brook watershed, which flows to the southeast and ultimately into the Hudson River. Figure 9, *Wetlands and Water Resources*, illustrates the location of the Town's water resources.

In addition to the two main watersheds located in Greenfield, there are portions of other watersheds as well as some sub-watersheds. A portion of the City of Saratoga Springs Loughberry Lake watershed is located within the Town. The City of Saratoga Springs is currently considering the use of Saratoga Lake as a drinking water source. Nearly all of Greenfield drains to this lake. The northwestern portion of the Town contains a number of small sub-watersheds which drain west to the Sacandaga Reservoir. These include: Black Creek, West Vly Creek, Hans Creek, Balsam Brook, Rose Brook, and Alder Creek.

The Stony Creek watershed is the only watershed in the Town that drains to the north. This watershed drains directly into the Hudson River shortly after entering the Town of Corinth. The Snook Kill and Little Snook Kill drain to the east and also flow directly into the Hudson River in the Town of Moreau.

Kayaderosseras Watershed

The Kayaderosseras Watershed is the largest watershed within the Town and drains south to form the Kayaderosseras Creek, which eventually drains into Saratoga Lake. The Kayaderosseras, which is part of the Upper Hudson River watershed, has a varying NYSDEC water classification, with portions of the stream ranging from class C to B (T). Eight sub-watersheds drain into tributary streams within this watershed, including: Star Brook, Blue Brook, Peacock Brook, South Branch, Sessions Brook, Mud Creek, Frink Brook and the Gasher Brook watersheds². Much of the area surrounding the Kayaderosseras Creek falls within the 100-year floodplain. Additionally, numerous wetlands exist within this watershed due to the topography of the watershed area. See Figure 9, *Wetlands and Water Resources*, and Figure 5, *Topographic Map*.

According to Figure 7, *Surficial Geology*, the Kayaderosseras Watershed primarily consists of accumulations of outwash sands and gravels. These deposits tend to produce good groundwater yields. Sand and gravel aquifers of this nature and their surface recharge areas provide some of the best water supply potential for the Town and should be protected and regulated accordingly.

Geyser Brook Watershed

The Geyser Brook is a part of the Upper Hudson River watershed. The NYSDEC water classification ranges from class C to B (TS). The Geyser Brook watershed forms from four sub-watersheds, the Sesselman Brook, Bell Brook, Slade Creek and Putnam Brook watersheds. These watersheds all drain to the southeast corner of the Town and flow together within the City of Saratoga Springs' limits.

² *Update of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement*, Town of Greenfield, Saratoga County, adopted 1991.

This brook eventually flows into the Kayaderosseras Creek which flows into Saratoga Lake.

The geology of this watershed is underlain with accumulations of outwash sands and gravels, till, and lacustrine sands. Accordingly, this watershed and the underlying aquifer areas should be protected and regulated to maintain water quality and groundwater recharge capacities for existing and future water supply purposes.

Lake Desolation

Lake Desolation is located in the northwestern part of the Town, and is also a part of the Upper Hudson River watershed. Lake Desolation is designated by NYSDEC as a class B water body. Lake Desolation consists of approximately 36 acres and is located at 1,561 feet above sea level. The land surrounding Lake Desolation has been densely developed with camps, many of which have been recently converted to year round homes.

Despite the lake's classification by NYSDEC as a class B water body, there have been numerous reports in the past several years of water contamination. In 2003, the Town conducted a survey of residents living around the lake. One striking result of the survey was the high degree of concern among area residents about changes in the lake's water quality.

The water quality of the lake is likely affected by substandard septic systems associated with the many undersized lots surrounding the lake. Accordingly, this lake and the underlying aquifer areas should be protected and regulated to maintain water quality and groundwater recharge capacities for existing and future water supply purposes. The area is not suitable for increased development.

2.6.2 Wetlands & Floodplains

Wetlands protect surface and groundwater quality and provide erosion control, pollution abatement, and floodwater storage. Regulations for development in and/or adjacent to wetland areas have increased over the years. Streams and their associated floodplains are credited with providing flood control systems, creating potable water, supplying water for industry and agriculture, and for adding to a community's open space and recreational needs.

The Town of Greenfield has approximately 3,107 acres of NYSDEC regulated wetlands and 3,928 acres of federally mapped wetlands National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) which are regulated by the US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). Most of the NYSDEC wetlands are also mapped as NWI wetlands, but

not all NWI wetlands are mapped by the NYSDEC. Therefore, all combined wetland areas total approximately 4,993 acres.

Wetland areas are shown in Figure 9, *Wetlands and Water Resources*. Note that all wetland boundaries on the official NYSDEC wetlands map are approximate boundaries. These boundaries are subject to change upon field delineation and subsequent verification by the NYSDEC and/or the ACOE. Wetland areas are found throughout the Town, but are especially prevalent along the stream corridors.

Floodplains are mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and in the Town of Greenfield are generally associated with Lake Desolation, Balsam Brook, Kayaderosseras Creek, Mud Creek, and the South Branch. FEMA has identified sections of these areas as special flood hazard areas inundated by 100-year flood. In some cases, base flood elevations have been determined. However, in most areas, the base flood elevation has not been determined. The floodplains are shown in Figure 9, *Wetlands and Water Resources*.

Uncontrolled filling and development of wetlands and floodplains can be a liability for the Town, and may result in uncontrolled flooding. Many flood problems exist because of improper management of floodplain and wetland development. These problems increase as forests and fields along streams are converted for land development.

2.6.3 Groundwater

Groundwater is the primary source of drinking water in the Town and is obtained from both unconsolidated (sand and gravel aquifers) and consolidated (bedrock) sources.

The central portion of the Town of Greenfield is underlain by an unconfined aquifer, the location of which is shown in Figure 10, *Aquifer Map*. However groundwater can be obtained from unconsolidated deposits, which exist almost everywhere in Town. These deposits range in thickness from less than one foot to over 300 feet.

Glacial tills and glacio-lacustrine deposits are generally not suitable for even residential water supplies because of low yields. These deposits generally yield between 0 and 10 G.P.M. Unconsolidated deposits, which have the greatest potential to yield moderate to high quantities of water, are the sands and gravels of outwash and deltaic deposits. Sandy deposits generally yield from 10-50

G.P.M., while deposits which consist primarily of gravel can yield quantities of water in excess of 50-100 G.P.M.³

Groundwater is transmitted through bedrock via faults, joints, bedding planes and fractures. Because consolidated bedrock can have different fracture configurations, each rock type will yield a different amount of water to wells. Groundwater obtained from bedrock sources generally consists of Pre Cambrian crystalline rocks and Early Paleozoic sedimentary rocks of Cambrian and Ordovician age. Bedrock formations can be divided into three major categories: sandstone, carbonates (limestone and dolostone), and crystalline rocks.

Unconsolidated aquifers will continue to be relied upon as the primary source for the Town's water supply. Unconsolidated aquifers can be easily drilled and are more economically tapped than bedrock. Additionally, unconsolidated aquifer wells are less susceptible to natural contaminants such as sulfur, iron and calcium than bedrock resources.

Protection of unconsolidated aquifers is important. Typically, lands underlain with sand and gravel materials have few development constraints. However, excessive paving and diversion of stormwater in areas of sand and gravel resources may limit the ability of the aquifer to recharge. It is equally important to protect the watershed recharge areas in order to protect the aquifer. These areas directly feed the primary aquifer resources of the Town and are crucial to the continued recharge of aquifer resources. Nitrates from fertilizers or other contaminants that get into the runoff may damage an aquifer if they contaminate the primary recharge zones.

Water quality in the Town varies. Most sand and gravel aquifers are relatively free of natural contaminants but are susceptible to surface water runoff contamination. Bedrock resources are more susceptible to natural contamination, but these natural contaminants are treatable. The following water quality conditions are most commonly encountered from bedrock resources.

Water hardness, caused by the presence of calcium and magnesium varies throughout the Town. Reported hardness values range from less than 50 parts per million (ppm), considered soft, to greater than 250 ppm, considered hard to very hard water. Water hardness is generally dependent on the chemical composition of the rock or deposit through which water flows. Most of the hard water within the Town can be softened satisfactorily and economically⁴.

³ *Update of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement*, Town of Greenfield, Saratoga County, adopted 1991.

⁴ *Update of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement*, Town of Greenfield, Saratoga County, adopted 1991.

Some wells within Saratoga County have reported the presence of Hydrogen Sulfide Gas (H₂S gas). H₂S is most commonly known for its rotten egg odor. This gas is likely caused by chemical and/or bacterial action which transforms iron sulfates found in black shale to sulfide. H₂S concentrations of less than one million per liter are generally not considered harmful to consume, however the odor can be unpleasant. These shale deposits are sporadically located in Greenfield, which should result in a minimal presence of H₂S. Overall, the presence of H₂S gas is treatable with available technology.

2.7 Development Constraints

Identifying development constraints is an important step in analyzing the natural characteristics of the Town. Each of the previously identified natural resources has been individually mapped. In order to understand the parameters of the development constraints in Greenfield, a composite development suitability map has been created. See Figure 11, *Constraints to Development*.

Constraints to development are classified into 3 categories:

1. Severe = Wetlands, &/or 100-Year Floodplain &/or Slope >15% &/or Depth to Bedrock 0-20" &/or Depth to Water Table 0-2'.
2. Moderate = Depth to Bedrock 20-40" &/or Depth to Water Table 2-3', &/or Slope 8-15%.
3. Slight = Depth to Bedrock >40", &/or Depth to Water Table >3', &/or Slope < 8%.

The *Constraints to Development* map indicates the physical ability of the land to support development by overlaying the wetland map, the floodplain map, the depth to bedrock map, the depth to water table map, and the slope map over one another in order to identify lands that have none, few or many constraints to development. Note that the mapping sources from which Figure 11 was created are relatively large in scale and may not accurately depict conditions on every parcel of land. Thus, site specific investigation is always necessary before land can be developed. Nevertheless, the map does provide an accurate picture of the overall development suitability of the Town and is therefore useful for land use planning purposes.

Greenfield has a large number of critical environmental features which severely limit development possibilities. An attempt should be made to maintain land with these features as undeveloped. Typically, land development suitability is expressed in terms of severe limitations, moderate limitations, and slight limitations. Development limitations are considered slight if there are few

constraints to construction. A moderate rating indicates that some modification or special design feature is usually necessary to allow development. A severe rating indicates that it will be difficult and costly to develop the land in order to prevent significant adverse impacts. The following Table 6, *Development Constraints* serves as a general reference for reviewing the feasibility of future development.

Suitability for Development	Slope	Depth to Bedrock	Depth to Water Table	Wetlands	Floodplain
Slight Limitations	< 8%	>40 inches	>3 feet	None	None
Moderate Limitations	8-15%	20-40 inches	2-3 feet	None	None
Severe Limitations	>15%	0-20 inches	<2 feet	Present	Present

Areas with severe limitations are suitable for low density development only if special construction techniques are employed and/or public infrastructure is installed. Environmental characteristics for this category include slopes greater than 15%, depth to bedrock of 0-20 inches, depth to water table of less than 2 feet, and/or wetland areas and floodplains. Suitable land uses include agriculture, public parks, nature preserves, wildlife sanctuaries, forestry activities and housing at very low densities. Ideally, development within environmentally sensitive zones should be restricted to uses that will not require major alteration of the terrain and which minimize human activity.

Moderate limitations include lands with a depth to bedrock of 20-40 inches, a depth to the water table of 2-3 feet, and a slope of 8-15%. These lands may be susceptible to erosion and may have unstable slopes or poor filtering soils which limit septic system development. Again, development densities for this category should be kept low. These lands typically have environmental conditions that may be compensated for through additional construction requirements and careful design review prior to construction. Suitable activities include forestry, agricultural uses, and residential development of three acres or more per lot depending on well water yields from on-site test wells and soil percolation test results for septic systems placement. Commercial uses should be kept to a small scale with strict site plan review requirements.

Slight limitations include land with a depth to bedrock of greater than 40 inches, a depth to the water table of greater than 3 feet, and a slope less than 8%. This category includes all remaining areas in the Town where areas are favorable for more intensive development. Increased residential densities can be accommodated on these lands. Industrial and commercial developments can be accommodated in most of these areas.

In addition to the above evaluation criteria, soils must be reviewed for suitability prior to development. Soils that will not drain can not be expected to accept septic system effluent, while those with loose sand and gravel or fractured rock may result in inadequate filtering of effluent prior to reaching potential ground water supplies.

Wet soils and soils with shallow bedrock are also restrictive, but not as severely restrictive as soils that will not drain at all. Wetness, which includes flooding, slow percolation, or a high water table, can result in surface or groundwater contamination. Shallow bedrock may prevent proper system installation and cause septic flows to surface without adequate filtering. Fill and or mounded systems will often allow for suitable placement of discharge systems in these instances.

As previously noted, vacant land and land in residential use comprise almost 80% of the land in Greenfield. There are 17,186 acres of vacant land, which creates substantial opportunities for future development. In addition, there are 321 parcels that are currently used for residential land uses which are greater than 10 acres. These lands are currently zoned to allow further subdivision despite the constraints to development. Property owners wishing to subdivide must provide evidence that the land can accommodate additional pervious structures and provide water and sanitary septic systems. Frequently, subdivisions must be substantially revised to conform to the constraints. The existing zoning map creates a false expectation that a particular parcel may be able to accommodate much more building than is actually feasible.

A second map was created using the constraint data to determine how much of these lands were actually developable. This second analysis specifically examined vacant and residential parcels greater than 10 acres. See Figure 12, *Development Constraints of Vacant & Residential Parcels Greater or Equal to 10 Acres*. Based on this analysis, the total acreage for each constraint level was calculated and is shown in Table 7, *Acreage of Developable Vacant & Residential Land*.

Constraint Level	Acreage	Percent of Vacant and Residential Parcels Greater Than or Equal to 10 Acres	Percent of the Town's Total Acreage
Slight	5,938	22%	14%
Moderate	3,035	12%	7%
Severe	17,698	66%	41%
Total Acreage of Vacant and Residential Parcels Greater or Equal to 10 Acres	26,671	100%	62%

According to this analysis, there are almost 27,000 acres of vacant residential lands in parcels zoned for residential development with a minimum of ten acres per parcel. The 26,672 acres represent almost two thirds of the Town's total land. Approximately half of these lands have moderate or severe constraints. The constraints limit the actual amount of subdivision and development that may ultimately be possible on these properties. The land that is readily available for development or redevelopment is more likely to be in the range of 9,000 acres, which is approximately 20% of the Town's total acreage.

2.8 Transportation

The primary transportation corridor in Greenfield is along Route 9N. Route 9N provides road service for automobiles, trucks, and motorcycles. It is also occasionally used by bicyclists. Route 9N serves not only as a major road within the Town, but also as a regional connector to other towns north and south of Greenfield.

Greenfield has access to other modes of transportation, besides those private vehicles driven on roads. Both rail and bus services are available in nearby Saratoga Springs via AMTRAK, Greyhound and other local providers. The Saratoga County Airport in the Town of Milton provides a limited airport facility, while the Albany International Airport provides a full service airport.

At one point rail service provided frequent service to Greenfield. Although currently not utilized there is limited freight access along the Delaware and Hudson Railroad.

As illustrated by Figure 13, *Roads*, there are a total 129.18 miles of Federal, State, County and Town roads in Greenfield. U.S. Route 9 transects the southeast corner of the Town for approximately half a mile. The State owns and maintains seven and nineteen hundredths (7.19) miles of road consisting of New York State Route 9N, which runs north and south in the approximate center of the Town.

The County owns and maintains twenty-four and a half (24.5) miles of road along County Routes 12, 19, 21, 25, and 36. The County Routes serve to collect automobiles from minor roads and deliver them into the arterial system. Each of the County roads, except for Saratoga County Route 12, intersects with New York State Route 9N. Saratoga County Route 21 services the south and southwestern area of Town; Saratoga County Routes 36 and 25 serve the eastern portion of Town and connect to New York State Route 9; Saratoga County Route 19 and Saratoga County Route 12 serve the western portion of the Town.

The Town of Greenfield owns the remainder and the vast majority of the Town's roads, totaling 97.45 miles. Table 8, *Road Designations*, identifies the road name and its road classification⁵. Maintaining these roads consumes a major portion of the Town's annual budget. In addition, the Town maintains a Highway Garage on Bockes Road and employs eleven full time employees, and in the wintertime, employs an additional three to four part-time employees to assist with snow removal.

The Zoning Code for Greenfield further defines the road network for the Town into three categories, "Primary", "Secondary", and "Local". Primary roads are considered regional roads that convey traffic between Towns, Villages, and other urban centers. These roads are designed for fast-moving, free-flowing traffic. Route 9 and Route 9N are the only primary roads in the Town. Secondary roads are designated to allow the movement of traffic between primary roads and local roads, as well as serving adjacent land uses. Local roads are designated to provide access to abutting property and are not intended for through traffic movement.

Given the amount of growth that is anticipated in Greenfield and the surrounding municipalities, the Town should continue to make improvements to its road network. An inventory of the condition of the local roadways was completed in 2004 by the Town Highway Department (see Appendix III). Based upon this inventory, over 52% of Greenfield's roadways are classified as being in poor or bad condition requiring timely maintenance. Local roadways will continue to require upgrading to accommodate new development as well as to ensure that safety is not compromised. Obviously future development will have a major impact on the condition of the Town's roads.

⁵ The road classification system refers to the local functional classification system. The Federal Highway Authority has its own unique classification system. Under the FHA functional classification system, all roads in the Town of Greenfield are classified as local roads.

Table 8: Road Designations

Acer Drive	Local	Hemlock Drive	Local	North Creek Road	Secondary
Allen Drive	Secondary	Hickok Road	Local	North Greenfield Road	Secondary
Alpine Meadows Road	Secondary	Hillside Avenue	Local	North Milton Road	Secondary
Angel Road	Secondary	Hovey Road	Local	Old Daketown Road	Local
Anna Crest Drive	Secondary	Howe Road	Secondary	Old Route 9N	Local
Ashlor Drive	Secondary	Hudson Avenue	Local	Old State Road	Local
Ballou Road	Secondary	Hughes Road	Local	Ormsbee Road	Secondary
Barney Road	Local	Humes Road	Local	Peacock Road	Local
Bloomfield Road	Secondary	Hyspot Road	Secondary	Pine Robin Road	Local
Bockes Road	Secondary	Ivy Lane	Local	Pine Ridge Court	Local
Boyhaven Road	Secondary	Kilmer Road	Secondary	Plank Road	Secondary
Braden Road	Local	King Road	Secondary	Porter Corners Road	Secondary
Braim Road	Secondary	Kircher Road	Secondary	Revere Lane	Local
Brandell Road	Secondary	Lake Desolation Road	Secondary	Ridge Road	Local
Brigham Road	Secondary	Lanie Lane	Local	Roberts Drive	Local
Brookstone Drive	Local	Lark Spur Court	Local	Route 9	Primary
Brower Avenue	Local	Lester Park Road	Secondary	Route 9N	Primary
Bump Hill Road	Secondary	Lesters Lane	Local	Russell Road	Secondary
Canty Road	Secondary	Liberty Lane	Local	Sand Hill Road	Secondary
Canyon Crossing	Local	Lincoln Mountain Road	Secondary	Sodeman Road	Secondary
Clinton Street	Secondary	Locust Drive	Local	South Creek Road	Secondary
Cohen Road	Local	Locust Grove Road	Secondary	South Greenfield Road	Secondary
County Squire Road	Local	Main Street	Local	Southwest Pass	Local
Coy Road	Secondary	Maddy Road	Local	Spier Falls Road	Secondary
Daketown Road	Secondary	Malloy Road	Local	Squashville Road	Secondary
Daniels Road	Secondary	Maple Avenue	Local	Stone Church Road	Secondary
Denton Road	Secondary	Maple Drive	Local	Stonewall Lane	Local
Dunham Pond Road	Secondary	Medbury Road	Secondary	Tannery Hill Road	Secondary
Ericson Drive	Local	Mia Way	Local	Walker Drive	Local
Frasier Road	Local	Middle Grove Road	Secondary	Westminster Drive	Local
Goose Hollow Road	Secondary	Mill Road	Secondary	White Oak Court	Local
Grange Road	Secondary	Mill Street	Secondary	Wilsey Road	Secondary
Granite Lake Drive	Local	Miner Road	Secondary	Wilton Road	Secondary
Greene Road	Secondary	Moore Road	Local	Wing Road	Secondary
Greenfield Manor Road	Local	Murray Road	Secondary	Woodland Road	Local
Griffen Road	Local	Nat Hill Road	Local		

2.9 Water & Sewer Infrastructure

Public water systems and sewer systems provide incentives to developers to locate new development proximate to the service systems. The Town of Greenfield does not currently provide any public water or sewer systems. Future development will also be dependent primarily on well water and septic disposal systems. Reliance on well water and septic systems is generally perceived as a constraint to development.

The Town of Greenfield does not have any municipal sewer infrastructure. Residents primarily rely on individual septic disposal systems for wastewater disposal (see Section 2.6.3 Groundwater). However, Saratoga County Sewer District #1 (SCSD #1) provides some sewer service along the southeastern border of the Town adjacent to Saratoga Springs. Two private entities, Prestwick Chase and the Stewart's Company, have installed private sewer systems and have connected their private sewer systems to the SCSD #1. There are opportunities for both the Town and other private entities to develop additional sewer lines and connect to the county sewer line. For the location of the existing sewer lines and districts, see Figure 14, *Sewer District*.

Greenfield does not provide any public water service; however, several property owners in Greenfield purchase water services from Saratoga Springs. The majority of residents in the Town of Greenfield rely on water from wells for drinking and other potable water needs.

As mentioned earlier, there are several trailer parks in Greenfield. Many of these trailer parks have community water systems that are classified by the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) as public water supplies. NYSDOH requires regular monitoring of all public water supply systems.

The absence of public infrastructure is a major factor in the land planning process. Installation of individual sewage disposal systems and wells require specific land characteristics and area dimensions, along with suitable soils for septic and water facilities. Slopes, wetlands, floodplains, depth to bedrock, and the depth to the water table impact the overall suitability of a location for development. Generally, lands unsuitable for septic systems should be left as open space or developed at very low densities.

The Town may want to explore the possibility of installing additional water supply and/or wastewater collection and treatment facilities. An evaluation should be made of those of areas both hampered by development constraints and susceptible to additional or denser development. One of the first areas that should be considered in such an evaluation would be the areas adjacent to the existing sewer district. The proximity to Saratoga Springs and U.S. Route 9 may

cause development pressures in this area which has many development constraints. Providing public sewer service will greatly relieve these constraints.

The development of public wastewater treatment facilities may also be appropriate in several areas in the Town in order to improve existing substandard conditions. For example, Lake Desolation has been identified as one area currently experiencing numerous environmental problems that have developed due to improper sewage and drainage facilities. Public wastewater treatment facilities may eventually be necessary to protect the health of existing residents.

The Hamlets of Porter Corners and Middle Grove are two other locations where public wastewater treatment facilities may eventually be appropriate should additional development be desired for these areas. These areas are zoned as Town Hamlet Districts. Within the Town Hamlet Districts, relatively small lot sizes are permissible if public water and/or sewer services are available. Currently, such services are not available. Both the Hamlets of Porter Corners and Middle Grove currently accommodate individual sewage disposal systems; however, future development reliant on individual sewage disposal systems may be limited. Replacing individual sewage disposal tanks with public systems would remove the threat that development poses to the water supply and ecosystem in these areas and enable new development to achieve the compact densities that may be desirable for the hamlet areas.

As this Comprehensive Plan is being written, Saratoga County is exploring the possibility of building a county wide water line from the Hudson River to Saratoga Springs. If this potential public works project is successful, Greenfield may have an opportunity to participate in a public water system. This could have ramifications for development in Greenfield, but until the details are finalized, it is unclear exactly what that impact will be.

2.10 Solid Waste Disposal

The Town of Greenfield participates with Saratoga County in managing its solid waste. The County follows a Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan that is a requirement of the New York State Solid Waste Management Act of 1988. The Saratoga Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan was adopted in 1990. This plan provides guidance for solid waste management in Saratoga County until 2010. Waste for the Town of Greenfield is currently managed by private haulers. The Saratoga County Landfill does not currently accept waste.

Saratoga County Recycling is in its fifteenth year of operation. The program has been expanded substantially to include numerous household-type waste products. Greenfield actively participates in the County's recycling program

which requires residents to individually recycle newspapers, clear and colored glass, plastic bottles, tin cans, and bulk metal. These materials are collected by private haulers and the recyclable materials are then delivered to one of five recycling centers located in Saratoga County. All residents are asked to participate and support this program.

2.11 Fire & Rescue

Greenfield receives fire protection and rescue services from the Greenfield Fire District. The Greenfield Fire District is comprised of four local Fire Companies. Three of the fire companies are physically located in Greenfield: the Greenfield Fire Company #1, Porter Corners Fire Company #2, and the Middle Grove Fire Company #3. The Maple Avenue Fire Company #4, located in Wilton, provides fire protection and rescue services to properties in the southeast part of town and provides back up services to the other three Greenfield Fire Companies.

The Fire District has a Fire Chief. Each of the four companies has an Assistant Chief. There are 140 volunteer fire fighters who provide fire, rescue and other emergency services. In 2003, the Greenfield Fire District responded to 647 fire and 641 emergency and/or rescue calls.

The Fire Companies oversee the record management of hazardous materials stored in the Town of Greenfield. Businesses are required to supply a list of any hazardous materials stored on the premises. However, often the information is not adequately supplied to the Fire Company or it is too vague to use. Currently, the only major known source is the Stewart's Corporation, which is known to store ammonia.

The Greenfield Fire District budget for 2004 was \$600,000.00. \$294,000.00 was apportioned to Wilton and \$306,000.00 was apportioned to Greenfield. Appropriations are funded entirely through Real Property Taxes collected by the Town Assessor.

The 2005 Budget Summary for the Greenfield Fire District identifies \$641,750.00 in appropriations. Wilton's share will be \$308,040.00 and Greenfield's share will be \$333,710.00

2.12 Parks & Recreation

The Town of Greenfield currently owns and maintains four park and recreational properties and has just recently purchased a fifth parcel planned for the development of a recreation center. New York State, through its Office of the Regents of the University of New York owns another small park. There are also approximately 100 acres of land managed by the State which are located within

the boundaries of the Adirondack Park. The total park acreage of the seven park properties in the Town is approximately 174 acres. Figure 15, *Recreation Facilities*, identifies the location of all parks and trails located in the Town.

Porter Corners/Bockes Road Park

This park consists of 30.8 acres and is located adjacent to the Town Garage. It consists of several ball fields, a building used for concessions and equipment storage, picnic tables and playground equipment. The Environmental Commission has established nature trails along the South Branch of the Kayaderosseras.

Veterans Park

This park is a small passive recreation area located in Greenfield Center. It is approximately 0.26 acres and consists of a gazebo, flagpole, and monument.

Middle Grove Park

This park is approximately 12.4 acres and is located in Middle Grove on Main Street at the intersection of North Creek Road. The park contains a picnic pavilion, tennis courts, walking trails, soccer fields, basketball court, playground facilities, and restrooms. During the winter months, a skating rink is set up at this park.

Lester Park

Lester Park is a very small, two and a half acre, State-owned park on Lester Park Road that functions as a preserve for fossil stromatolites.

Kings Station

The Town owns the former railroad station on a three acre parcel of land at the corner of Porter Corners Road and State Route 9N. The former railroad station is currently used by the Town Historian to exhibit historic artifacts and displays.

New Town Park

The proposed new park is located along Brigham Road and is approximately 25 acres in size. It is anticipated that a recreation building will be constructed at this site to offer year round activities. Additionally, this park is planned to be used for summer youth programs offered by the Town.

Adirondack Park

In the northwestern corner of the Town there are approximately 100 acres of land owned and managed by the State of New York. These lands are part of the Adirondack Park Agency (APA) lands. There are additional private lands adjacent to the publicly lands which must comply with land use regulations administered by the APA. These private lands appear to the casual observer to be park-like lands.

2.12.1 Recreational Needs Assessment

In 2003, the Town of Greenfield undertook a survey of the Town's recreational needs under the auspices of the Greenfield Recreation Center Planning Committee. The purpose of the survey was to determine the recreational needs of the Town, the kind of recreation center, if any, to meet these needs, and the best possible location for the recreation center.

Surveys were sent to all households. 941 surveys were returned which represents thirty four (34%) of all households. Of the respondents, only 23% agreed or strongly agreed that there are adequate recreational facilities in Greenfield, 32% of the respondents had no opinion, and 34% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that there are adequate recreational facilities in Greenfield.

One element of the survey was a question asking respondents to identify specific activities that would be desirable at a Town Recreation Center. Table 9, *Potential Recreational Activities*, identifies the frequency of response for 27 different activities. The responses are further broken down by the hamlet in which the respondent lives.

Outdoor activities accounted for 33% of the responses. Such responses included walking trails, a summer recreation program, soccer fields, softball fields, rollerblading, and dog walking. Most of the other desired activities identified in the survey are geared towards children and young adults. The Town is actively pursuing the development of a Recreation Center to house many of these activities in one central location accessible to all Greenfield residents.

Table 9: Potential Recreational Activities

	Greenfield Center	Middle Grove	Porter Corners	Unknown Hamlet	Total	Percent Response
Walking Trail	318	97	107	39	561	9.40
Summer Recreation Program	207	67	85	20	379	6.35
Basketball	204	67	73	17	361	6.05
Defensive Driving	194	64	73	20	351	5.88
Lending Library	165	47	69	26	307	5.15
Movies	170	48	60	17	295	4.94
Volleyball	165	52	57	14	288	4.83
Soccer Fields	166	50	41	11	268	4.49
Hunting Safety	144	48	59	14	265	4.44
Rollerblading	138	44	58	19	259	4.34
Baseball Fields	154	46	36	13	249	4.17
Dog Path	155	38	41	11	245	4.11
Pool Tables	131	38	46	7	222	3.72
Parenting Classes	106	26	41	9	182	3.05
Painting	109	25	32	9	175	2.93
Skateboarding	94	36	34	7	171	2.87
Bingo	92	23	40	9	164	2.75
Game Tables	93	25	35	8	161	2.70
Gymnastic Mats	100	27	30	3	160	2.68
Quilting	91	19	30	5	145	2.43
Foosball Table	89	24	24	7	144	2.41
Air Hockey Table	83	24	31	5	143	2.40
Balance Beam	43	11	19	43	116	1.94
Chess Boards	63	19	23	4	109	1.83
Card Tables	69	16	18	5	108	1.81
Pinball Machines	53	14	21	1	89	1.49
Bridge Tables	35	4	8	2	49	0.82
	3431	999	1191	345	5966	100.00

2.13 Historic Resources

Historic Background

Both the Algonquin and Mohawk Indians were known to pass through the area on major Indian trails⁶. These trails lead from Lake Champlain and Lake George to the Hudson River, across Greenfield near Lake Desolation, and into Galway. Although there is no evidence of large-scale permanent Native American settlements in the Town of Greenfield, there is local knowledge of several Indian burial mounds in the Town. In addition, an Indian corn mortar and pestle was found in Greenfield and the site of these artifacts is available from the Town Historian.

The Town of Greenfield was originally part of the Albany County land grant when New York was divided into counties. In 1791, New York State formed Saratoga County from Albany County and two years later the Town of Greenfield was formed from portions of the Towns of Saratoga and Milton. The original Greenfield was almost double its current size and was later split to form the Towns of Hadley and Corinth.

It is thought that the Town was permanently settled in approximately the 1770's, although it is unclear as to who was the first settler in Greenfield. According to historical Town files, the first name to appear is Preston Denton who came from Dutchess County to join the Army. He returned to his family following the War. The only reminder of Greenfield's first known citizen is Denton Road⁷. Other settlers, Anthony Haggerty and Thomas Root settled near Greenfield Four Corners. The date of their settlement is unclear; however, both are buried in the Haggerty Cemetery, with inscriptions on the rough sandstone, "T.R. Sept 5, 1778", and the other "A.H., 1789."

Other recognized settlers in the Town of Greenfield around 1786, were Gershom Morehouse, Charles Deake, Charles Deake, Jr., and Benjamin Deake, near Middle Grove, William Scott, at Scott's Corners, Isaac Reynold, near Greenfield Center, and the Fitch family at St. John's Corners. These settlers were known to have brought a variety of new businesses to the area including the first sawmill, the first gristmill, first inn, first store, and first practicing physician.

⁶ *Greenfield Heritage Resource Inventory*, prepared by Lever, Anthony, Holman and Associates.

⁷ *Greenfield Heritage Resource Inventory*, prepared by Lever, Anthony, Holman and Associates.

Historic Sites

The Town of Greenfield is rich in historic resources. Greenfield has been a settlement of numerous homes and businesses for more than 300 years. Although settled for centuries, the Town has experienced relatively light development, and as a result many of its historic structures remain intact. Many landowners have taken care to keep these structures in good condition.

Attached as Appendix IV, is a map of the known Historic Resources in the Town of Greenfield. Also included as part of this Appendix, is a map of all Greenfield cemeteries. Many of the early settlers' tombstones remain in these cemeteries. Appendix IV contains an annotated list of the known historic resources found on the State and National Register provided by the Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP).

The Town does not currently have any program to protect historic resources. Despite the wealth of information available on many of the historic structures and locations within the Town, none of the sites or structures are listed with either the State or National Registers.

The State and National Registers of Historic Places are the official lists of buildings, structures, districts, objects, and sites significant in the history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture of New York and the nation. The same eligibility criteria are used for both the State and National Registers.

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and the New York State Historic Preservation Act of 1980 established the National and State Registers programs. In New York, the Commissioner of the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation, who is also the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), administers these programs.

There are several benefits and essentially no negative impacts associated with the listing of a historic property. Registered properties and properties determined eligible for the Historic Registers receive a measure of protection from the effects of federal and/or state agency sponsored, licensed or assisted projects through a notice, review, and consultation process. Owners of depreciable, certified historic properties may take a 20 percent federal income tax credit for the costs of substantial rehabilitation as provided for under the Tax Reform Act of 1986. Municipal and not-for-profit owners of listed historic properties may apply for matching state historic preservation grants.

There are no restrictions placed on private owners of registered properties. Private property owners may sell, alter or dispose of their property as they wish,

although an owner who demolishes a certified registered property may not deduct the costs of demolition from his/her federal income tax.

2.14 Demographic Data

2.14.1 Population

According to the U.S. Census in 2000, the population for the Town of Greenfield was 7,362 people (see Table 10, *Total Persons Census Data*). The 1990 U.S. Census counted 6,338 persons, indicating a population growth of 16.2% from 1990 to 2000. This was a faster growth rate than the State population growth, which grew by 5.5% during this same decade. It was also a faster rate of growth than Saratoga County as a whole, which was one of the fastest growing counties in the State.

A review of population data from past census years illustrates that Greenfield has had steady population growth for many years. Growth trends for the region show that the County has been experiencing similar rates of growth. When compared to the State as a whole, the growth rate for both the Town and the County is significantly higher. Overall, the suburbanization of Saratoga County has been uninterrupted since the 1960's. The population increase can largely be attributed to the migration of new residents into the area rather than natural population increase attributable to local births.

	1980	1990		2000	
	Total	Total	Percent change	Total	Percent change
Town of Greenfield	5,104	6,338	Up 24.2%	7,362	Up 16.2%
Saratoga County Total	153,759	181,276	Up 17.9%	200,635	Up 10.7%
New York State Total	17,558,072	17,990,445	Up 2.5%	18,976,457	Up 5.5%

Another measure of population change can be determined by the total number of households, as illustrated in Table 11, *Total Households Census Data*. This Table provides Census data from 1980 to 2000, and clearly shows that the Town of Greenfield and Saratoga County have both experienced an increase in the number of households over the last several decades. Simultaneously, the average number of persons per household has been decreasing. This is a trend being noticed throughout the region.

	1980		1990		2000	
	Number of Households	Average Persons per Household	Number of Households	Average Persons per Household	Number of Households	Average Persons per Household
Town of Greenfield	NA	3.09	2,188	2.90	2,761	2.66
Saratoga County	NA	2.90	66,425	2.67	78,165	2.51

Source: U.S. Census

2.14.2 Population Projections

The Capital District Regional Planning Commission (CDRCP) has compiled population projections for the Towns in Saratoga County for next several decades. The projections for Greenfield and for Saratoga County are shown in Table 12, *Population Projections*. These numbers project a steady growth rate for Greenfield through 2040; note however, that these figures project a much slower growth rate than has been experienced by Greenfield over the past twenty years.

Another way to project population is to look at the average rate of growth over the last census decade and then project it forward. Using this method the Town's population in 2010 would be 8,551; in 2020 9,932; in 2030 11,536; and in 2040 13,399. Note that the use of historic trends results in population projections considerably higher than those prepared by the CDRPC.

	1990		2000		2010		2020		2030		2040	
	Total	Total	Percent Change	Total	Percent Change	Total	Percent Change	Total	Percent Change	Total	Percent Change	
Town of Greenfield	6,338	7,362	16.15%	7,724	4.92%	8,032	3.99%	8,382	4.36%	8,745	4.33%	
Saratoga County	181,276	200,635	10.68%	218,373	8.84%	231,855	6.17%	244,279	5.36%	254,934	4.36%	

2.14.3 Sex and Age

The median age in Greenfield has increased over the past several decades. See Table 13, *Median Age Census Data*. This is consistent with both State and County trends. According to the 2000 Census, the median age in the Town was 36.2 years, also consistent with the overall median age for the County and the State.

	1980	1990	2000
Median age for Town of Greenfield	27	30.5	36.2
Median age for Saratoga County	29	30	36.9
Median age for New York State	31.8	33.8	36

The 1994 *Comprehensive Plan* noted that between 1970 and 1980 there was a significant increase in the number of persons younger than 44 years of age, and a decrease in the number of persons 65 or older. This data indicates an influx of younger households with children during the 1970s. This trend did not appear to continue in the 1990s. The 1990 Census determined that 67% of the population was younger than 40 years of age. The 2000 Census determined that only 57% of the population were younger than 40 years of age. Table 14, *Age of Population Census Data*, illustrates the percentage of the population within these two age cohorts.

	1990		2,000	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Population	6338	100.00%	7362	100.00%
Under 40 years	4276	67.47%	4208	57.16%
40 years and older	2062	32.53%	3154	42.84%

2.14.4 Income

The Median Household Income levels in Greenfield, as reported in Table 15, *Median Household Income*, has increased at approximately the same rate as was experienced throughout the State, and only slightly less than the rest of Saratoga County. The median household income remains just slightly more than the rest of New York State and just slightly less than the balance of Saratoga County.

Table 15: Median Household Income

	New York	Saratoga County	Town of Greenfield
Median household income in 1999	\$43,460	\$49,460	\$44,784
Median household income in 1989	\$32,965	\$36,635	\$33,902
Percent Change	31.8%	35%	32.1%

2.14.4 Travel Time

The 1990 Census provided data at the census block level on how much time people 16 years and older spent traveling to work. Prior to 1990, the information was only available at the County level. Therefore, in order to compare data, only the 1990 and 2000 Census Data can be analyzed. See Table 16, *Travel Time to Work for Greenfield Workers 16 Years of Age and Older*.

The two biggest changes between the two census years is the number of people traveling 45 minutes or more to work, and the decrease in people working at home. Although these are not large changes, they indicate that Greenfield is increasingly becoming a bedroom community for the region. Currently, the average commuting time for residents of New York State is approximately 29 minutes. In addition, with more traffic on the roadways, it is taking longer on average to travel the same distance today than it did in the past.

Table 16: Travel Time to Work for Greenfield Workers 16 Years of Age and Older

	1990		2000	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than 30 minutes	2,042	67.1%	2,268	63.9%
30 to 44 minutes	431	14.2%	481	13.6%
45 minutes or more	455	14.9%	722	20.4%
Worked at home	117	3.8%	73	2.1%
Total Number	3,045	100 %	3,544	100 %

2.15 Housing

Housing in Greenfield primarily consists of detached single-family housing. The second most common housing type in the Town is mobile home units. Table 17, *Housing Structures*, illustrates the total number of housing units available in the Town and the percent of the total that each structure represents.

Type of Structure	Number of Units	Percent
1-unit detached	2,191	68.0%
Mobile home	624	19.4%
Multi-Family - 20 or more units	157	4.9%
1-unit attached	97	3.0%
Multi-Family - 3 to 4 units	68	2.1%
Multi-Family - 2 units	64	2.0%
Multi-Family - 5 to 9 units	21	0.7%
Total	3,222	

The 2000 Census data provides information pertaining to the year structures were built in the Town. A simple analysis provides an average number of housing structures built per year. This information is useful in showing that the Town has experienced a continued growth trend over the last several decades, with the principal growth beginning in the 1960's. The apparent anomaly for the period 1999 to March 2000 is likely due to the fact that there is traditionally very little building in the first three months of the year.

Year Structure Built	Number of Structures	Average Number of Structures Built Per Year
Built 1999 to March 2000	124	99.2
Built 1995 to 1998	424	106
Built 1990 to 1994	369	73.8
Built 1980 to 1989	588	58.8
Built 1970 to 1979	569	56.9
Built 1960 to 1969	344	34.4
Built 1950 to 1959	155	15.5
Built 1940 to 1949	125	12.5
Built 1939 or earlier	524	Unknown

2.16 Development Data

2.16.1 Building Permits

The number of building permits issued annually in the Town of Greenfield has remained relatively stable since 1990. According to Table 19, *Building Permits*, an average of 192 building permits are issued each year. Building permits are required and issued for any type of building including new home construction, commercial development, additions to homes, garage and shed construction, and for the building and installation of swimming pools.

Building permits for new single-family homes has also remained relatively stable with minor fluctuations from year to year. The Building Inspector issued 45 building permits on average between 1990 and 2003, according to the records kept by the Building Department. The total number of single-family starts from 1990 to 2003 indicates a moderate growth rate in the Town of Greenfield. Between 1990 and 2003 there were a total of 591 known new single-family homes constructed. Due to the fact that the records for 1994 are not available, the actual number of new single family homes constructed between 1990 and 2003 may be greater than 600.

Year	Number of Single Family Building Permits Issued	Total Number of Permits Issued
1990	52	178
1991	60	191
1992	40	158
1993	52	306
1994	No Information Available ⁸	
1995	68	239
1996	44	194
1997	23	185
1998	32	175
1999	44	190
2000	39	173
2001	38	154
2002	49	156
2003	50	192
Total	591	2491
Average	45	192

⁸ The Town did not keep records in 1994 and therefore a report was never completed.

2.16.2 Subdivision

In the past several decades, the number of land subdivisions has remained fairly constant. Table 20, *Subdivision Data & Lots Created 1990 – Present*, provides a summary of land subdivisions in the Town of Greenfield between 1990 and 2003, including the total number of lots that have resulted from the subdivision of land.

Year	Number of Subdivision Created	Number of Lots Created
1990	5	15
1991	9	97
1992	2	17
1993	3	22
1994	25	85
1995	24	98
1996	14	42
1997	14	27
1998	11	44
1999	11	26
2000	13	35
2001	7	25
2002	4	39
2003	10	24
Total	151 Subdivisions	596 Lots

The total number of new lots created between 1990 and 2003 is 596. Between that same period of time, 591 building permits were issued for new single-family homes according to the data provided in Table 19, *Building Permits*. This data indicates that new construction of residential properties has kept pace with the number of lots created. Therefore, if current trends continue, more land subdivision can be expected.

2.17 Empire Zones

Governor George E. Pataki and Senator Joseph L. Bruno announced the official designation of the Saratoga County Empire Zone on December 18, 2001. On December 30, 2003 it was announced that the Empire Zones were approved for the Town of Greenfield (see Figure 15, *Empire Zones*). Empire Zones are designated areas throughout the State that offer significant incentives to encourage economic development, business investment and job creation. Businesses operating inside a zone are eligible for a range of tax benefits that are applied against new capital investments. Benefits include tax reduction credits, real property tax credits, sales tax exemptions, wage tax credits, and

utility rate reductions, among others. The tax benefits can reduce a company's tax liability to as little as zero.

The Saratoga County Empire Zone can virtually be a "tax-free" zone in best-case scenarios through a combination of New York State Tax credits, reduced utility rates, authorization for special low-interest loans, and priority attention from State agencies for new and expanding businesses.

The Saratoga County Empire Zone consists of two square miles of designated land in locations throughout Saratoga County. Businesses that locate within the boundaries of the Empire Zone and meet the objectives of the Saratoga County Empire Zone Development Plan may qualify for advanced New York State Tax credits for creating new jobs and making new capital investment in their business.

To qualify for benefits, businesses are required to complete an Empire Zone Certification Application. The application is then reviewed and approved locally and then submitted to the Empire State Development Corporation and the New York State Department of Labor for joint review. Once certified, Empire Zone tax credits are self-administering in that they are claimed when the taxpayer files its tax return on an annual basis. Eligibility must be self-determined each year based on the program criteria.

2.18 School Districts

Greenfield is served by two different school districts, the Saratoga Springs City School District and the Corinth Central School District. The Greenfield Elementary School and the Saratoga Springs Middle School are both located in the Town of Greenfield and are part of the Saratoga Springs City School District. The Corinth Central School District facilities are physically located within the Town of Corinth.

Saratoga Springs City School District

The Saratoga Springs City School District currently has 6,920 students. See Table 21, *Saratoga Springs City School District Enrollment & Projections*. The number of students has fluctuated slightly from year to year as shown in Table 21. Saratoga City School District provided school enrollment projections through the school year of 2009-10, and have projected that there will be an overall loss of 0.5% of its students.

Overall, the School District is anticipated to have fewer students than were enrolled in the District's peak year in 2001, when the enrollment was 6,970.

Enrollment Year	Number of Students
1997 – 98	6,842
1998 – 99	6,930
1999 – 00	6,968
2000 – 01	6,978
2001 – 02	6,970
2002 – 03	6,905
2003 – 04	6,920
2004 – 05	6,875
2005 – 06	6,867
2006 – 07	6,923
2007 – 08	6,892
2008 – 09	6,878
2009 – 10	6,883

Table 22, *Greenfield Elementary School Enrollment History*, illustrates that the school has seen an overall decline in the total number of students between 1993 and 2003. This is interesting given the increase in the Town's population and confirms the census data illustrating an aging population and smaller household size. However, it should be noted that some of these changes may be due to redistricting, so caution must be used in drawing conclusions from these data.

Enrollment Year	Number of Students
1993 – 04	523
1994 – 05	550
1995 – 06	552
1996 – 07	550
1997 – 98	522
1998 – 99	510
1999 – 00	508
2000 – 01	492
2001 – 02	470
2002 – 03	466
2003 – 04	466

Corinth Central School District

According to the Table 23, *Corinth Central School District Enrollment & Projections*, the School District currently has 1,301 students enrolled. The Corinth Central School District has experienced a slight decline in the number of students since 1995. Projections provided by Corinth Central School District

through the school year of 2009-10 anticipate that enrollment will decline and then rise back to the current levels.

Overall, in the year 2009-10 it is anticipated that the School District will gain 0.3% new students for a total of 1,305. It should be noted that this is less than the number of students that were enrolled in 1997, when the total was 1,392 students. Therefore, this increase should not create any additional impacts on the School District.

Enrollment Year	Number of Students
1995 – 96	1,325
1996 – 97	1,353
1997 – 98	1,392
1998 – 99	1,374
1999 – 00	1,366
2000 – 01	1,325
2001 – 02	1,311
2002 – 03	1,309
2003 – 04	1,301
2004 – 05	1,288
2005 – 06	1,281
2006 – 07	1,290
2007 – 08	1,293
2008 – 09	1,300
2009 – 10	1,305

Note that these are projections and are subject to change should a significant amount of residential growth occur in Greenfield or the surrounding region.

2.19 Town Budgets

The Town of Greenfield's annual budget provides details on all anticipated revenues and expenses for the coming year. Table 24, *Land Tax Rates*, accounts for the total assessed values, the fluctuations in the tax rates, and the amount of money to be raised through taxes from 1990 to 2004. Revenues are derived primarily from taxes, with some additional revenues raised through services, grants, licenses, fines and gifts.

Each resident in the Town of Greenfield pays a County tax, a school tax, and Town tax rate on their assessed property value. The school tax is assessed and collected by either the Saratoga Springs City School District or the Corinth Central School District depending on the property's location. See Table 26: *School Tax Rates*. (Note that the data in this table has not been normalized).

Table 24: Land Tax Rates per \$1,000 of Assessed Value

	Total	County	Town General	Town Highway	Fire District
1990	\$11.22	\$3.59	\$2.32	\$3.40	\$1.91
1991	\$12.61	\$4.18	--	\$6.46	\$1.97
1992	\$12.98	\$4.89	\$1.93	\$4.04	\$2.12
1993	\$15.24	\$7.34	\$1.72	\$4.04	\$2.14
1994	\$15.17	\$7.98	\$1.40	\$3.64	\$2.15
1995	\$14.15	\$7.19	\$0.92	\$3.78	\$2.26
1996	\$13.46	\$6.52	\$1.57	\$3.09	\$2.28
1997	\$13.83	\$6.89	\$1.57	\$3.09	\$2.28
1998	\$14.24	\$6.79	\$1.55	\$3.54	\$2.36
1999	\$14.03	\$6.23	\$1.98	\$3.55	\$2.27
2000	\$6.15	\$2.73	\$0.88	\$1.57	\$0.97
2001	\$6.23	\$2.78	\$0.74	\$1.71	\$0.99
2002	\$5.98	\$2.68	\$0.62	\$1.71	\$0.97
2003	\$5.96	\$2.77	\$0.61	\$1.72	\$0.86
2004	\$5.51	\$2.76	\$0.51	\$1.46	\$0.78

The Town's annual tax rate has decreased from 1990 to 2004, and is presently less than half of the 1990 rate. However, this is partly a function of the revaluation of property values and the actual tax rate has not been significantly reduced. Table 25, *Total Assessed Values for Greenfield*, shows the yearly changes in the total assessed values for the Town. The Town underwent a reevaluation in 1999 to represent the true assessed value of the property. Therefore, the percent change from 1998 to 1999 is not an accurate measure of change. The values that are most significant to the Town are those from 1999 to present.

Table 25: Total Assessed Values for Greenfield

	Assessed Value	Percent Change
1990	\$113,606,753	
1991	\$117,233,747	3.2%
1992	\$118,054,974	0.7%
1993	\$121,191,293	2.7%
1994	\$125,058,875	3.2%
1995	\$125,262,775	0.2%
1996	\$131,394,306	4.9%
1997	\$131,317,216	-0.1%
1998	\$133,723,792	1.8%
1999 ⁹	\$325,531,918	143.4%
2000	\$325,270,318	-0.1%
2001	\$341,717,775	5.1%
2002	\$366,066,374	7.1%
2003	\$431,646,502	17.9%

⁹ The Town underwent a reevaluation of all properties in 1999.

The current school tax for both districts is also significantly lower than the 1990 rate. The Saratoga Springs City School District reached its peak tax rate of \$45.35/\$1,000 of property valuation in 1997. The current rate is 63.6% lower. The Corinth Central School District reached its peak rate of \$42.55/\$1,000 of property valuation in 1998. The current rate is 61.6% lower. Table 26, *School Tax Rates per \$1,000 of Assessed Value*, summarizes these data. Note that the data in this table has not been normalized.

Table 26: School Tax Rates per \$1,000 of Assessed Value

	Saratoga Springs City School District (Total)	Corinth Central School District (Total)
1990	\$25.02	\$20.66
1991	\$25.89	\$26.19
1992	\$27.23	\$31.19
1993	\$33.68	\$32.28
1994	\$35.25	\$33.03
1995	\$38.21	\$34.86
1996	\$40.95	\$37.36
1997	\$45.35	\$39.85
1998	\$44.81	\$42.55
1999	\$41.97	\$37.81
2000	\$17.95	\$17.07
2001	\$19.03	\$17.89
2002	\$18.31	\$16.49
2003	\$17.87	\$16.34
2004	\$16.50	\$17.13

The Town's Budget is broken up into two categories, General Town funds and Highway funds. General Town funds cover most services and programs within the Town. Highway funds include expenses for general repairs and maintenance of the Town's roads, bridges, improvements, weed and brush removal, snow removal, and machinery purchases. Table 27, *Budget Summary*, provides the total Town Budget from 1990 to 2004.

Year	General Fund	Town Highway
1990	\$331,175	\$546,393
1991	619,079	277,116
1992	378,300	489,681
1993	448,608	453,515
1994	524,103	468,510
1995	605,103	528,874
1996	575,687	504,925
1997	606,012	522,525
1998	654,992	535,200
1999	648,200	561,600
2000	634,905	581,700
2001	672,200	590,700
2002	689,100	658,200
2003	749,435	707,200
2004	716,235	843,500

An expanded Budget Summary that includes a full break down of all expenses under both the General Town fund and the Town's Highway fund from 1990 to 2004 is attached as Appendix V.

3.0 Opportunities and Challenges

In the modern world the intelligence of public opinion is the one indispensable condition for social progress. Charles W. Eliot

In order to provide a foundation for the discussion of the Town's future, it is useful to summarize the Town's major opportunities and challenges. This chapter summarizes the opportunities and challenges facing the Town as identified by the citizens of Greenfield.

The citizens of Greenfield provided opinions and insights about the Town, and its future direction, in several ways during the preparation of this *Comprehensive Plan*. Over forty individuals participated in stakeholder interviews.¹⁰ Approximately 100 individuals attended public meetings where input was solicited and recorded. The entire process was directed by a Land Use committee appointed by the Town Board to represent a broad spectrum of public opinion.

The following summaries synthesize the information gathered from the individuals on the Comprehensive Planning Committee, the stakeholder interviews, the public meetings and an analysis of the data presented in Section 2 of this Comprehensive Plan.

3.1 What makes Greenfield Special?

The Town of Greenfield is a unique upstate New York community that provides a delightful mix of the wild and the civilized. It is a rural community nestled at the base of the Adirondack Mountains in close proximity to dynamic cultural, historic, educational and commercial centers. It is unusual in both the Capital District and within Saratoga County to find a town so close to one of the State's great cities that remains so rural.

Less than half of the Town's lands are developed. Most of the development consists of primary and secondary residences discreetly located on large lots. Its distinctive topography and gorgeous terrain provides spectacular views and vistas of the mountains, streams, and woodlands. The climate, although colder than much of the rest of the State, is still temperate. The rich soil, ample rain balanced with plenty of sunshine creates an ideal location and climate for trees to grow and thrive.

¹⁰ The questions asked and a summary of the stakeholder answers is found in Appendix VII.

With plenty of open space and deeply wooded lots, it is possible to enjoy a pleasant rural lifestyle, in comparative peace and privacy. The majority of the residents cite the rural location and attractive, peaceful lifestyle as the Town's primary positive attributes.

In addition to being rich in natural resources, such as timber, minerals, water and wildlife, the Town is conveniently located close to thriving Saratoga Springs and easily accessible from employment centers such as Albany and Glens Falls. Greenfield is also in close proximity to numerous cultural, recreational and educational opportunities.

The elected and appointed officials who serve on the Town Board, Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals respect the individual rights of private property owners while simultaneously protecting the distinctive and unique natural resources that make Greenfield a special place to live. In this regard, the Town regularly updates its *Comprehensive Plan*, Zoning Laws and Subdivision Regulations.

The residents of Greenfield are satisfied with most of the municipal services provided by the Town. This includes recognition and appreciation of the Highway Department's snow clearing and road work; the addition of sports fields and parks to the Town's recreation facilities; and the centrally located fire houses. The newly built Town Hall addition is praised for its convenient location and attractive design.

Another public entity that received favorable reviews from many of the citizens, particularly parents of school aged children, is the elementary school, which is located within the Town. High school aged children are sent to one of two schools, neither of which is physically located within the Town, but most parents are generally supportive of the various school districts and the associated educational programs.

Aesthetically, the Town's visual appeal is more than just an appreciation of its vast natural resources. There are many historic buildings that have been either carefully maintained or restored. Although not universally appreciated, several of the residents noted the interesting architecture guiding new development.

Finally, many of the individuals who provided information about the Town's strengths noted the fact that the Town is populated with so many wonderful individuals. Family run businesses, families that have been in Town for decades and centuries, and an interesting mix of new residents create a Town with character and characters.

3.3 What Are the Challenges for Greenfield?

While some people value the type of development that is occurring in Greenfield today, others are less complimentary. Some feel that development occurs without any pattern or conformance to an articulated vision. There is a concern that new development is creating sprawl leading to increases in traffic and vehicle circulation. Others expressed concern that there is too much development occurring in areas with wet soils or steep slopes. There are also complaints about construction that ranges from shoddy to ostentatious and monolithic.

Others felt that the existing zoning ordinance is overly restrictive and cumbersome. Some stated a belief that the zoning laws are unfairly applied. There was also a scattering of complaints that the zoning laws are just old and out of date, administered by old-fashioned bureaucrats, and that the Planning Board is behind the times.

Those opposed to mining are vociferously opposed. Of particular concern, especially for people living proximate to the existing mining operations, is the possibility of an expansion of the overlay district which allows mining. If the mining zone expands, it is likely that mining operations will occur within ¼ mile of existing residential development. There are also concerns about the amount of truck traffic related to the mining operation and the fear that increases in mining will lead to increased truck traffic. Blasting, damage to hillsides and contamination of the water table and streams are other concerns noted by the opponents of the Town's mining operations.

What some view as strength of the community, expressed as a respect for the individual, becomes a weakness, as expressed in the following statement: "Individualism has triumphed over thoughtful growth and sensible land use policies."

There are several areas of conflict between people who have lived in Greenfield for a long time and those who have recently moved to Town. This is not an uncommon phenomenon. Some of the respondents believe there is little social integration between these two types of residents. There is a sense on the part of some of the "old-timers" that some of the "newcomers" are elitist and isolationist. Some "newcomers" expressed the sentiment that the "old-timers" are not welcoming. While this does not rise to the level of a critical problem, perhaps an acknowledgment that such a situation exists can begin to alleviate some of the tension that appears to exist around this issue.

There may also be some discernible differences in the educational and economic status of those that have lived in Greenfield for a long time and the people who are currently buying land and building homes in Town. While it appears that

“newcomers” are not as active in the life of the community, there may be more than one reason for this occurrence.

There are several complaints relative to water and sewer. The lack of water and sewer infrastructure is clearly viewed by many as a weakness. This is particularly a problem in areas commercially zoned. Many would like to see increased density of both residential and commercial properties along the Town’s major thoroughfares such as State Route 9N. Without water and sewer infrastructure, increasing density is not a possibility. There are also concerns that a lack of consistently applied water policy has led to practices which may affect water resources.

Although not the number one complaint, as is true almost everywhere, people are unhappy about taxes. Of concern particularly among people who do not have children in the school system, are the school district tax rates. The fact that the Town has very little commercial or industrial activity, other than mining, is often repeated as a serious problem. The perception is that the lack of commercial activity causes the residential property owners to shoulder the majority of the Town’s expenses.

The only school facilities located within the town are part of the Saratoga Springs School District. Some feel that the Saratoga Springs School District is not as responsive to the specific needs of the residents of Greenfield as they would like. Many residents indicated that they would like a more autonomous school district.

3.4 Greenfield Today: A Synthesis

Before articulating a vision for the future, it is important to understand existing trends and conditions. The lessons learned through a careful inventory of the many resources, land uses, activities and policies in effect today will shape how the Town grows in the future. This section discusses the implication of the information presented in Chapter 2, and synthesizes the comments of the public.

As mentioned earlier, Greenfield is a unique community both in the Capital District and within Saratoga County. It is unique in several aspects. Despite being close to the teeming metropolis city of Albany, it is still a rural community. It is adjacent to the commercially vibrant and densely developed Saratoga Springs, a place that is often filled with young people, music, commerce and traffic. Greenfield, on the other hand, with its large lots, lack of commercial enterprises and winding country roads seems at times to be a place from another era.

There are several factors that have created this distinctive community. The lack of infrastructure makes it necessary to have relatively large residential lots. The abundance of natural resources, particularly dense woods and an abundance of water, make it a community very close to nature. Sparse development on large wooded lots in close proximity to commerce, culture and recreational opportunities have created an attractive place to live for people who want at least a modicum of privacy while still having access to goods and services, employment and social activities. These factors combine to make Greenfield an increasingly desirable place to live for those who can afford to develop challenging pieces of property.

The relatively recent influx of people able to develop the more challenging properties in Greenfield leads to demographic changes within this community which has existed for centuries. People with more money are coming into the community and are able to afford to build in places previously thought undevelopable. This trend has driven up land prices and created associated impacts, including additional pressures on roads, schools and water resources.

Although in recent years there have been many high priced homes built in Greenfield, these expensive homes are balanced by the extraordinarily large percentage of mobile homes. Nearly 20% of the Town's residential housing units are mobile homes. While the large number of mobile homes makes it hard to argue that the Town does not provide for affordable housing, it is becoming increasingly hard for middle income homeowners to afford new housing in Greenfield.

The Town historically developed around several hamlets. One of these, Greenfield Center is now the Town Center. The other hamlets have lost much of their historically rooted focus. However, the hamlets of Porter Corners and Middle Grove have many of the elements necessary to provide for denser development in the future.

Mining, one of the Town's historically significant industries, continues to galvanize strong feelings. There continues to be a local and a regional need for the products of the local mines. This need creates a supportive climate from some residents. Other residents have concerns about the accompanying noise, vibration, dust and visual impacts that continued mining may bring. State law makes it difficult to regulate mining at the local level. The Town will want to participate in the State permitting process and to carefully review any proposal for an expansion of the mining overlay zone in order to be assured that all interests are properly addressed and balanced.

The lack of public infrastructure to accommodate community water and sewer services has been a limiting factor for development in the past. Persistent

growth will continue to fuel the pressure to provide additional services including water, sewer road maintenance, education, and recreation.

The lack of public water and sanitary septic services will continue to be a factor that will limit development in the future. If Saratoga County builds a county wide water line from the Hudson River to Saratoga Springs, there is potential for Greenfield to participate in a public water system. But until the details of that proposal are settled, it is unclear exactly how Greenfield will be impacted by this public investment.

The Town has recently responded to pressures for additional recreational services by purchasing a 25 acre parcel of land in the Town Center. Providing additional services is an inevitable outcome of the type of continued growth that Greenfield is likely to see over the coming decades.

The Town is responsible for an extraordinarily large amount of road mileage, given its size and population. The Highway Department is the largest single component of the Town's yearly budgets. Many of the Town's roads are narrow and/or hilly, with constricted shoulders and cracked surfaces. Alarming, over 65% of the Town's roads are in fair, poor or bad condition according to an inventory conducted by the Town Highway Department. The Town also has roads it has never paved and given that subdivisions and new development will likely continue in the future, more new roads will likely become the responsibility of the Town Highway Department. New people moving to Greenfield may also demand better and safer roads.

The Town has been conscientious about revisiting its land use policies and regulations. Sometimes a small technical revision is necessary. At other times it becomes necessary to take a more comprehensive look at existing rules and regulations. The inventory and identification of goals inherent in this process has identified several issues in both categories.

The Town's existing Zoning Map has proved to be complicated, cumbersome and not always reflective of a coherent vision for the Town. Development in Greenfield is complicated by the presence of numerous constraints such as wet soils; steep slopes; many streams, brooks and rivers; shallow depth to the water table; and a shallow depth to bedrock. The Town's existing Zoning Map (see Figure 8, *Greenfield Zoning Map*) does not reflect these numerous development constraints, nor does the map conform to the existing land use patterns.

The Town of Greenfield has made attempts to provide for the development of housing on smaller parcels, which is one way to address housing affordability. This strategy has proved to be complex. The New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) has specific guidelines for proper septic system construction.

As discussed earlier, it is difficult to find soils in Greenfield that can easily accommodate sanitary septic systems. In addition to the challenges in complying with the NYS DOH guidelines, the Town has regulations which require four feet of separation between the sanitary septic system and the seasonal high water table. In order to allow for continued orderly development, the Town will want to revise the Zoning Map to more closely conform to the Town's development constraints.

One of the most striking natural features of the Town is the Kayaderosseras Ridge. This mountain range and the streams that flow from it provide the Town with two highly valued resources. The Kayaderosseras Ridge is widely known for its unusual plant assemblages, including rare, uncommon, and protected species¹¹, and for its significant songbird populations. Development, possibly even very low impact development, may cause problems for some of the wildlife and fauna that live in this unique, moist forest, and mountainous habitat. However, there are currently few measures to protect this resource. The Town will want to explore tools and strategies to protect this resource and the creatures and plants that live in its environment from visual, drainage or erosion impacts.

Lake Desolation, located within the Kayaderosseras Range, is another valuable resource that needs protection. A survey of residents in the Lake Desolation area found that local residents believe that there are several forms of pollution impacting the water quality in the Lake. Failing septic systems were listed as the most frequently cited cause of likely lake water contamination. Respondents also noted runoff from lawn care products; droppings from waterfowl and other animals; gasoline or oil from boats; and pollutants from lakeside roadways as causing water degradation. The Town will want to examine the possibility of installing a sanitary sewer system in this area or other measures, such as a management system for decentralized on-site wastewater systems as modeled by the USEPA, to protect the lake from failing sanitary septic systems and runoff.

The number of people working at home may increase in the future as digital and satellite technologies grow and become more accessible. In other parts of the state there have been increases in the number of people working at home. It is possible that when Greenfield homes have access to digital internet technologies, more people may take advantage of the convenience that working at home affords. Another factor that may lead to increased numbers of people working at home is the number of companies instituting telecommuting policies. The Town may need to revise the way it zones home businesses and to distinguish between those that have no impact on the surrounding neighborhood and those that do.

¹¹ Skidmore College, North Woods Stewardship Proposal. Campus Environmental Committee. May 11, 2001. page 5.

4. A VISION FOR THE FUTURE

Vision - It reaches beyond the thing that is, into the conception of what can be. Imagination gives you the picture. Vision gives you the impulse to make the picture your own. Robert Collier

This chapter addresses the vision that the residents of Greenfield have for the future of their Town. A “vision” is a picture or imagination that we have in our mind’s eye. It is a vitally important component of actualizing a *Comprehensive Plan*. A Town can never be better than the vision that guides it.

The vision of Greenfield in the near future is of a primarily rural, residential community. The framers of this plan envision residents communicating effectively and openly and working together toward goals identified as being for the common good. The Town will continue to be comprised primarily of large tracts of land providing privacy and quiet to the Town’s residents. There will be good schools and access to adjacent communities where the majority of the commercial services and employment are likely to be located. Natural resources will continue to be treasured and respected. Clean running water, a verdant forest with an expansive canopy, and breathtaking views of mountains and sky will continue to be visible from almost any vantage point.

The vision that lead to the revised Zoning Map evolved in response to the many and oftentimes severe constraints limiting development. The plan to guide the creation of a revised Zoning Map is visually depicted in Figure 17, *Future Land Use Map* and described in further detail in Chapter 6, *Future Land Use Plan*.

The densest development is expected to occur in the southern part of Town, adjacent to the Saratoga Springs – Greenfield Town boundary. Denser development is possible there because the soils are better able to accommodate development, the slope less severe and either the possibility or reality of infrastructure exists. However, even in this area of moderate residential development, the Town’s density is not likely to be as dense as the development found in other nearby communities like Saratoga Springs or Glens Falls. One acre lots will typically be the smallest lots to be found. Two, three and four acre lots are much more likely and compatible with the development constraints found in Greenfield.

The primary land use will continue to be residential. Instead of having many residential districts with varying densities, the Town should consider rezoning the residential lands into just a few areas of moderate density residential and

low density residential. The hamlets are targeted to receive the densest development, especially within the Town Center. Moderate dense residential development is allowed almost everywhere else.

The lowest densities remain in the area of Town that is within the Adirondack Park, located in the northwestern corner of the Town. The area on the western side of Town, along and around the Kayaderosseras Ridge with steep slopes, shallow depth to bedrock and many water resources remains a low density residential area. The area along the eastern edge of town with many wetlands and steep slopes is another area of low density residential development. Average minimum densities in these areas range from 8.5 to 42.7 acre minimum lots.

Several hamlets, including the Town Center, provide the few commercial services available within the Town. These hamlets are located in historically rooted commercial areas. Typically, each of the hamlets has a Fire House, a few shops, is located along main transportation corridors, and has or hopefully will have, some public infrastructure. It is hoped that the hamlets will all have public water and sewer, making commercial enterprises, multiple family housing, and rental opportunities a possibility within these denser developed parts of Town.

In the southeastern corner of Town, along Route 9, there is a small pocket of Office Commercial that will remain. A small portion of this area is connected to the Saratoga County Sewer District #1. This area is also located along a primary thoroughfare between Saratoga Springs and Glens Falls. See Figure 15, *Sewer Districts*, for the exact location of the sewer district and sewer line.

The only area where new residential development will not be allowed is in the Industrial Zone, zoned primarily to accommodate light industrial uses. It is located in the south eastern part of town, slightly west of the Office Commercial Zone. The Industrial Zone allows offices, wholesale businesses, light industries, self storage facilities and municipal buildings. Heavy industry is not allowed anywhere in the Town.

The north western corner of Town, located within the Adirondack Park, has very low density housing. The Kayaderosseras Ridge is a major distinguishing characteristic of this area of town. The Kayaderosseras is partially within the Adirondack Park, but mostly outside of it. The landscape is park-like with little to distinguish the private from the publicly owned lands. Within this zone, retention of the forest cover and preservation of the many natural resources available within this part of Town, are the primary goals. In addition to residential development on large parcels, other allowed uses include farming, agriculture, nurseries, forest management activities, religious institutions,

recreational uses and municipal buildings. This area will remain essentially unchanged.

Although no new commercial zones are likely to be established during the creation of the new Zoning Map, there may be more commercial activity in Town. One possible change may be an increase in the number of people working at home and the effect that home occupations will have on the neighborhood.

As part of the rezoning process, it is anticipated that two home occupation classifications will be developed, Home Occupation I and Home Occupation II. By allowing more intense uses in some parts of Town, primarily the Office Commercial and the Moderate Density Residential Districts, and utilizing Site Plan Review, additional home based businesses are possible. If services, such as copy shops, coffee shops and mailing services find a base of clients eager for services in closer proximity than Saratoga Springs, these services will likely be found in Greenfield.

5. GOALS

The achievement of your goal is assured the moment you commit yourself to it. **Mack R. Douglas**

Goals, in the context of this plan, are formal statements of what the citizens of the Town of Greenfield hope to achieve over the life of the plan. Goals are broad policy statements that formalize the vision for the Town's future. These goals provide a policy framework for the next 10 to 15 years. In addition to land use goals, goals have also been developed to address many of the specific issues raised elsewhere in this plan. The goals are structured by general topic area.

Planning and visioning are the only first steps in a much longer process of creating an ideal community. The real power of a plan comes from its implementation. By involving the whole community in the creation of the plan and its goals, it is hoped that the whole community will work together toward achieving the vision by implementing the goals of this plan. To achieve the vision of a 21st century rural, residential community, the Town has established a set of goals to guide decision-making. The recommendations in the *Comprehensive Plan* attempt to direct actions towards achieving these goals. The goals for the *Greenfield Comprehensive Plan* are as follows:

A. Land Use

A.1 *Expand the definition of home occupations.* As more and more people work part or all of their job hours in their homes, it has become necessary to look at this land use more carefully. Separating low intensity home occupations from higher intensity occupations is warranted.

Low intensity home occupations include those professions or trades which are conducted entirely on a residential parcel and carried on by the inhabitants of that residence. This type of home occupation requires no exterior evidence of the business, such as signs, and does not create additional traffic nor require additional parking facilities.

Higher intensity home occupations are those professions or trades conducted entirely on a residential parcel, which may employ additional individuals who do not reside within the home. Although the business is still secondary to the residential use, there is a distinct character difference between a home that only provides residential use and one that which provides for a more intense home occupation. Examples of these latter types of businesses include doctor offices, law firms, accountants, hair dressers, artisan and craft shops, and computer consulting

businesses. There may be a sign advertising the presence of the home occupation. In addition, this type of home occupation is likely to involve the sale of stock in trade or the entertainment of clients.

- A.2** *Create a new Zoning Map reflective of the Town's vision.* Simplify the map and collapse some zones so as to have fewer zones altogether. There are currently eleven zoning districts and two overlay zones. The allowed densities and allowable uses should have better relationship to the actual characteristics or constraints of the land. The new Zoning Map should continue to have the two overlay zones; the Earth Material Extraction Zoning Overlay District and the Floodplain Management, Wetland Resource Conservation Overlay District.
- A.3** *Do not expand the existing commercial districts.* There is little commercial activity in Greenfield, and very few areas of Town zoned for commercial use. However, with most commercial services available in nearby Saratoga Springs, it is unlikely that simply zoning additional lands for commercial use would produce significant commercial development. In addition, commercial properties are more successful when there is water and sanitary sewer services available for the commercial tenants. As long as properties in Greenfield are dependent upon well water and septic systems, trying to encourage additional commercial development in Town is counter intuitive.
- A.4** *Do not create additional nor expand the existing industrial manufacturing zone.* In light of the fact that there is little unemployment in Greenfield and there are currently many vacant lots in local industrial parks, there is no need to create additional industrial manufacturing zones within the Town. The Town of Greenfield is primarily a residential community with many sensitive natural resources. Industrial manufacturing uses are not always compatible with residential and recreational uses. Therefore there is no need to create additional opportunities for industrial manufacturing use.
- A.5** *Establish an Adult Uses Zone.* In light of Supreme Court rulings forbidding the outright exclusion of all adult uses from a Town, it is recommended that the Town identify appropriate locations or location for adult uses. These uses should not be adjacent to or within close proximity to schools, dense residential districts, or churches. A potential location for this use is the Earth Material Extraction Overlay District.
- A.6** *Establish a procedure for Lot Line Revisions.* The Town's Planning Board reviews many applications for Lot Line Revisions, despite the fact that there are no provisions for addressing this land use process in the Town's

laws and regulations. The revised Subdivision Regulations should address this frequently requested land use action.

- A.7** *Revise the mobile home replacement regulations.* The Town's current regulations regarding replacement of existing mobile homes makes it difficult to replace an old, dilapidated mobile home with a manufactured home. This provision should be replaced. The new provision should allow mobile homes to be replaced with manufactured homes, even of a larger size, as long as water and septic concerns are addressed and setbacks are met. The authority to approve replacements should reside with the Zoning Enforcement Officer.
- A.8** *Develop standards in the revised Zoning Code to address self-storage units.* Currently, the Town's Zoning Law is silent relative to storage units. The revised Zoning Ordinance should provide standards for the development of storage units and should identify in which zones storage units are allowed. The Zoning Code should address landscaping, signage, lighting, parking, drainage, articulation, fencing and/or screening.

B. Roads and Traffic

- B.1** *Explore the possibility of collecting fees for road impacts from developers that create impacts.* Some development creates specific road impacts. Impacts such as increased traffic or increases in the frequency of left hand turns on a narrow road can create a need for left turning lanes or widened roads. Underground drainage systems for new subdivisions need to be adequately designed to interface with Town's roads. The Town also needs a mechanism to ensure that the drainage systems are maintained. The Town should explore the various impact fee tools available that tie a specific impact to new development. The fee structure should be incorporated into the Plan Review process.
- B.2** *Lower the speed limit on Route 9N.* As development increases and more and more properties along Route 9N are developed, traffic increases. The additional development along Route 9N is primarily residential. The traffic tends to travel at or above the posted speed limit of 55 miles per hour. This is too fast for residential neighborhoods. Although it is unlikely that the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT), which owns and manages Route 9N, will consider lowering the speed limit, the Town should request that the speed limit be lowered as much as possible.
- B.3** *Establish bike paths to connect the hamlets and parks with one another.* Many residents expressed a desire for bicycle paths throughout the Town. Both major roads like Route 9N as well as many of the smaller country

roads throughout the Town provide incredible views and interesting terrain for cyclists. The Town will need to approach this issue cautiously in order to ensure that bicycle paths are developed safely. Given the fact that many of the Town's roads are narrow, windy and hilly, providing sufficient room for cyclists can be challenging.

B.4 *The Town should develop a plan for ongoing maintenance of drainage culverts and bridges.* With the passage of New York State Department of Environmental Quality's MS4 regulations, there is an increased mandate to manage stormwater runoff. The Town has several culverts that must be maintained on a yearly basis in order for these facilities to function properly. The Town should develop an inventory of the existing bridges and culverts. There should be a requirement to add new bridges and culverts to the list. There must also be an ongoing maintenance plan in order to preserve the life of these facilities.

B.5 *Revise the Zoning Code requirements that tie the maximum length of a dead-end road to the size of the lot's frontage.* The maximum length of a dead-end road should be consistent across all districts. If it is to vary, the variation should be based on conditions of the road or the slope of the road, but not be tied to the size of the parcel.

B.6 *Discourage new driveways that pass through other lots.* The practice of approving subdivisions that do not provide direct access to a public road or right-of-way has led to numerous conflicts between neighbors. There needs to be a balance between limiting the number of curb cuts onto public roads with the need to provide appropriate access to newly created building lots.

C. Natural Resources

C.1 *Kayaderosseras Ridge should be protected from visual, drainage and erosion impacts.* The Town should consider the creation of an overlay district similar to those in some of the communities around Lake George. An overlay district can provide additional protection to special areas through performance standards that require that certain uses and or levels of intensity, otherwise allowed within the base zone, be either subject to additional restrictions or completely prohibited.

C.2 *The water in Lake Desolation should be protected from septic effluent and other sources of contamination.* Over the past several decades, many of the homes built around Lake Desolation have transitioned from camps, operating a few months a year, to year round residences. The sanitary septic systems developed to accommodate septic waste from the temporary

residences are frequently not adequate to handle the increased use. The Town should consider installing a public sanitary sewer system in this part of Town to protect this resource from continued septic contamination. As a precursor to public sewer, the town should review all septic and well conditions on properties applying for additions to seasonal camps or upgrades from seasonal camps to year-round homes to ensure satisfactory effluent disposal and potable water quality.

D. Mining

D.1 *The Town should carefully review any proposal to expand the Earth Material Extraction (EME) Overlay Zone.* This is an issue that has garnered a tremendous amount of passion on both sides of the requested expansion. The issue is further complicated by New York State's Mined Land Reclamation Law (MLRL) which governs virtually all extractive mining activity in the state, including hard rock quarries, sand and gravel pits, and topsoil stripping operations.

New York State law limits the extent to which municipalities may restrict or regulate mining operations within their borders. Before allowing an expansion of the EME zone as requested by a local mine operator, the Town should participate in an environmental review, utilizing the State Environmental Quality Review Act process, with the help of an outside consultant familiar with the impacts of mining. If in the course of the environmental review it is determined that potential impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated, then the Town should consider approval of the requested rezoning. If however, the Town does not believe such impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated, the requested rezoning should be denied.

The relevant issues that should be explored and reviewed within the SEQRA process include:

- Visual impacts
- Groundwater impacts
- Truck traffic
- Noise impacts
- Erosion
- Impacts to wetlands and streams
- Dust

E. Timber Harvesting

E.1 *Revise timber harvesting regulations to ensure consistency throughout the regulations.* The current regulations relative to Timber Harvesting are contradictory. The Planning Board recommended revisions several years ago, but they were not adopted by the Town Board. The Town Board should revisit this issue. The Town Board should consider adopting a policy statement and implementing legislation to address the following:

- Limiting the amount of clear cutting that can be conducted on a lot.
- Considering the implications of clear cutting on lands designated as wetlands or floodplains.
- Minimizing erosion.
- Addressing debris management
- Including a dimensional requirement for setbacks from public roads and rights-of-way.
- Including a replanting provision as a condition of permit approval for clear cutting.

F. Public Water and Sewer Services

F.1 *Extend the public water and sewer utilities on Route 9.* Many of the properties along Route 9 have individual septic systems. Due to shallow depth to bedrock and high water tables, many of these septic systems are failing. Failure of septic systems can lead to contamination of ground water. Since this area along Route 9 is intended to be the only commercial office zone within the Town, it is important to make this area a priority for the extension of public water and sewer services.

F.2 *Extend public sewer facilities along Locust Grove Road to Daniels Road.* This is a fairly dense residential area with failing septic systems. Failing septic systems can lead to groundwater contamination. It may be possible to connect this area with the small area of existing sewer service along Route 9 or in the vicinity of Prestwick Chase. The Town should make this a priority and address the problem before ground water contamination becomes a serious problem.

G. Community Services

G.1 *The Town should monitor the need for community services and provide as necessary.* Consider conducting a Needs Assessment in a few years to determine if there are any specific recommendations. Currently the greatest demand is for better roads.

G.2 *The Town Board should support the extension of cable TV and internet web services to the more rural parts of Town.* There are currently large areas of the town that are not served by cable TV or internet services. The Town should work with residents and local providers of these services to facilitate the extension of high-speed digital access and other technological improvements throughout the Town through the development of franchise agreements.

H. Recreation

H.1 *Study the feasibility of trail construction on State and private lands, including provisions for use by the disabled users.* Trails should be built to accommodate bicyclists, baby carriages, hikers, walkers, cross-country skiers and disabled users. Development of the proposed Palmertown Range Trail as mapped by the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation should be encouraged as part of new trail construction. Wherever possible, efforts should be made to connect the various trails so that hikers can traverse large sections of the Town. If private lands prevent logical connections, the Town should be supportive of efforts to acquire easements on private properties that connect public trails, when possible.

H.2 *The Town should develop additional parks, preferably large, town-wide parks, and discourage the development of pocket parks.* The Town should specifically explore the possibility of developing a park and recreation center on the recently acquired lands near the Town Center.

H.3 *The Town should not create nor sponsor any ATV trails.* Although the Town recognizes the popularity of this form of outdoor recreation, given the negative impacts that ATV riders cause to private and public properties, the incompatibility of this recreational use with more passive and contemplative pursuits and the conflicts between ATV users and wildlife, the Town should not be in the business of actively supporting this form of recreation.

H.4 *The Town should consider developing some type of indoor recreation facility.* The results of the recreation survey indicated that there is a strong desire, on the part of many residents, for the Town to provide a recreation center with game tables, classes, and indoor recreational opportunities.

I. Historic Resources

- I.1** *Create a Historic Preservation Commission.* The Commission should be advisory in nature and make recommendations to the Town Board regarding the potential listing on the State and/or National Register of Historic Places. Having a designation as a historic district or landmark can have financial impacts; therefore, the responsibility of recommending specific properties needs to reside with elected officials. A Historic Preservation Commission can take the lead on many of the various tasks relative to the Town's historic preservation programs. Some of the initial tasks include creating an inventory of sites and structures for nomination on the State and National Registers of Historic Places.
- I.2** *Create and provide for the use of a demolition notification form.* This form should be simple and user friendly. It would be used by an owner planning to demolish a structure appearing on the Town's historic inventory. Its only purpose would be to indicate a property owner's intention to demolish a structure to the Town. This form should not be considered a permit for demolition. The Town Board should also consider a requirement that property owners consult with an advisory committee prior to demolition. The recommendations of the advisory committee would not be binding, but would provide the applicant with options and advice in the event that property is of historic significance.
- I.3** *The Town should support the creation of specific historic projects.* The Town Historian identified several specific projects which should be addressed as soon as possible. These projects include the restoration of cemetery headstones in some of the historic cemeteries, the James Bank in Porter Corners and the Graphite Mine in Porter Corners.

J. Hamlets.

- J.1** *Support the development of hamlets as mini centers of commerce, housing and services.* The new urbanist concept of providing housing and commercial services in a compact walkable location is modeled, in part, after the historic villages and hamlets of places like Middle Grove and Porter Corners. There are many examples of second story housing on top of small businesses providing goods and services to the home based businesses that have proliferated in recent years. Each hamlet has an active Fire House that provides a focal point for the hamlet. The Fire Houses also offer meeting room space which allows the residents to get together on a regular basis.
- J.2** *Support cooperation between the hamlets while simultaneously allowing each of the three hamlets to maintain and/or develop their own identities.* The hamlets need equal opportunity to develop. They also need to be able to maintain and further develop their own unique identities. Efforts to support the individual characteristics of the hamlets should be balanced with measures that allow the hamlets to develop more densely than the surrounding residential districts.

6. FUTURE LAND USE PLAN

Make no little plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood...

Make big plans... aim high in hope and work. Daniel H. Burnham

The Future Land Use Plan is a major element of the Town's Comprehensive Plan. The Plan, illustrated by Figure 17, *Future Land Use Plan*, provides the physical recommendations for the future use of land within the town and provides the foundation for what the Town will look like if the implementation strategies are successfully executed.

The plan for Greenfield is to remain largely rural, with large residential parcels. The revised Zoning Map responds to the many severe development constraints that exist within Greenfield such as slopes in excess of 16%, floodplains, shallow depth to bedrock, regulated wetlands and shallow depth to the water table.

Overall, the concept is to acknowledge and accommodate the development that has occurred and is likely to occur in the community and the region. The intent is to provide for diverse opportunities while retaining the identity of the community.

The Future Land Use Plan is described in more detail as follows:

The Town Center and the Hamlets will be the centers of commercial and mixed use activities and land uses. The plan envisions that the Town Center and the hamlets at Porter Corners and Middle Grove will have similar zoning regulations allowing mixed use development to occur. Slightly denser residential development will be allowed in these areas. Retail development on the ground level and rental housing on the upper floors will be encouraged. These areas will receive priority attention should public water and sewer facilities become available in Greenfield. Single family housing, cluster development, multiple family housing, personal service outlets, religious institutions and mixed use buildings are allowed uses in the hamlets. Other likely uses, allowable perhaps with a Special Permit, include: hotels, inns, motels, rooming houses, and bed and breakfasts; restaurants and pubs; office buildings; veterinary facilities; food markets, and convenience stores; day-care centers, life-care facilities, nursing homes, community residences; academic and institutional uses; and funeral homes.

Commercial activities that will be welcome in the hamlets and Town Center include restaurants, tourist accommodations, medical offices, support services for home occupations such as cyber cafés and printing shops, and goods and services for local residents.

The Town should carefully review any proposal to expand the Earth Material Extraction (EME) Overlay Zone. Mining is recognized as an integral part of the community's fabric. The Town has struggled to balance the need for mined products with protection of the health and safety of the Town's residents. The Town's efforts have been further complicated by New York State's Mined Land Reclamation law (MLRL) which governs virtually all extractive mining activity in the state, including hard rock quarries, sand and gravel pits and topsoil stripping operations. The Town should participate in an environmental review of the requested proposal, utilizing the SEQRA process. The Town should also engage the services of an outside consultant familiar with the impacts of mining. At the completion of the review process, if it determined that the potential impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated, then the Town should consider approval of the requested rezoning. If however, the Town does not believe that the potential impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated, the requested rezoning should be denied.

Continue to work with the Adirondack Park Agency to preserve the natural open space character of lands within the Park. The two dozen or so parcels within the Zoning District, all of which are also within the boundaries of the Adirondack Park, will continue to have zoning compatible with the requirements of the APA. These parcels, which are mostly 40 or more acres per parcel, and which are located just west of the Kayaderosseras Ridge, will not likely change much over the next several years.

Maintain a small area for industrial development along the southern boundary of the Town between Route 9N and Locust Grove Road. The Town recognizes the importance of allowing some light industrial development, particularly the existing industries in Town. The current industries located within the industrial zone are low impact and compatible with surrounding residential development. Efforts will be made to facilitate public water and sewer to this area when possible.

Create one moderate density residential district in the southern center of the Town. This area, which borders Saratoga Springs, is already among the densest developed area in the Town. The Town Center is on the northeastern border and the Middle Grove hamlet is on the southwestern border. While public water and sewer are not available in this part of the Town, other infrastructure, including roads and street lights are available. Large lots that can sustain additional development will be allowed to subdivide, if appropriate water and sanitary septic systems can be provided.

Create a second moderate density residential district in the northern center of the Town. This area, which borders Corinth, also has moderately denser

development. The hamlet of Porter Corners is located in the center of the district. Route 9N is the eastern boundary.

Maintain the Office Residential District in the southeastern section of Town, along Route 9. This area, which allows both office commercial and multi-family residential, is currently one of the few areas in Town with public sewer service. There is a very small section of this area connected to the Saratoga County Sewer District. Permitted uses will continue to include offices, municipal buildings and facilities, private clubs, religious institutions, personal service outlets, mixed use structures and multiple family dwellings.

Create low density residential districts in the remainder of the Town. The rest of the Town will be zoned to accommodate fairly low density residential development. These larger parcels can accommodate high end residential housing with a variety of engineered sanitary septic systems.

Recreational expansion should be allowed whenever appropriate lands and funding sources can be identified. The Town recognizes that it has a lack of recreational opportunities for its growing population. Continued efforts to develop recreational activities should be allowed throughout the Town.

7. THE GREENFIELD ACTION PLAN

Set priorities for your goals. A major part of successful living lies in the ability to put first things first. Indeed, the reason most major goals are not achieved is that we spend our time doing second things first. **Robert J. McKain**

The following section discusses the specific actions or tactics needed to implement the *Greenfield Comprehensive Plan*. Table 28, *Strategy and Implementation Chart*, identifies each of the specific actions the Town has agreed are instrumental in achieving its vision.

In addition to identifying a recommended action for each stated goal of the plan, the *Strategy and Implementation Chart* also identifies the priority placed upon the specific action. It is not possible to do all things at once. Therefore, the prioritization provides guidance as to which actions should be undertaken first.

In order for the action to be undertaken, someone has to take responsibility. Many of the actions will require several entities working together in order to be successful. The *Strategy and Implementation Chart* identifies the recommended collaborators for each recommended action.

The final critical component to achieving the recommendations of the plan is to obtain funding. The *Strategy and Implementation Chart* identifies potential funding sources that may be useful in pursuing the recommended action.

In addition to the Town's existing tax base, additional funds are available from Federal, State and local agencies, as well as from private foundations. Most public sector organizations and many private foundations which provide funding require a local matching component. The local match can be in the form of goods, services or cash. New funding sources, in addition to the traditional tax base tools, will be essential to implementing the recommendations of this plan.

Table 28, *Strategy and Implementation Chart*, identifies each objective in the preceding chapter, assigns a responsible agency, and provides guidance for prioritizing the action. Where applicable, a potential source of funding is identified by the acronym of the potential funding agency. Appendix VI provides additional details on funding sources including the full name of the potential funding agencies.

Table 28. Strategy and Implementation Chart

Strategy Objective and Implementation Goal		Priority Urgent (U) High (H) Medium (M) Low (L)	Collaborators	Funding Source
A. LAND USE				
A.1	Expand the definition of home occupations.	H	Planning Board, Town Board	NN ¹²
A.2	Create a new Zoning Map reflective of the Town's vision. Reduce the number of zones and make the zones more reflective of the actual constraints to development.	U	Planning Board, Town Board	NN
A.3	Do not expand the existing commercial districts.	M	Planning Board, Town Board	NN
A.4	Do not create additional nor expand the existing industrial manufacturing zone.	M	Planning Board, Town Board	NN
A.5	Establish an Adult Uses Zone preferably within the Earth Material Extraction Overlay District.	L	Planning Board, Town Board	NN
A.6	Establish a procedure for Lot Line Revisions.	M	Planning Board, Town Board	NN
A.7	Revise the mobile home replacement regulations to encourage replacement of older mobile homes with newer manufactured housing.	M	Planning Board, Town Board	NN
A.8	Develop standards in the revised Zoning Code to address storage units.	L	Planning Board, Town Board	NN
B. ROADS				
B.1	Explore the possibility of collecting fees for road impacts from developers.	L	Highway Department, Town Board	NN
B.2	Lower the speed limit on Route 9N.	L	Highway Department, Town Board, NYS DOT	NN
B.3	Establish bike paths to connect the hamlets and parks with one another.	M	Highway Department, Town Board, NYS OPRHP	Town Board, NYS OPRHP
B.4	The Town should develop a plan for ongoing maintenance of drainage culverts and bridges.	H	Highway Department, Town Board, NYS DEC	Town Board, NYS DEC, NYS DOT
B.5	Revise the Zoning Code requirements that tie the maximum length of a dead-end road to the size of the lot's frontage.	H	Highway Department, Town Board, Planning Board	NN

¹² NN- None Needed and/or Available

Table 28. Strategy and Implementation Chart

Strategy Objective and Implementation Goal		Priority Urgent (U) High (H) Medium (M) Low (L)	Collaborators	Funding Source
B.6	Discourage new driveways that pass through other lots.	M	Highway Department, Town Board, Planning Board	NN
C. NATURAL RESOURCES				
C.1	Kayaderosseras Ridge should be protected from visual, drainage and erosion impacts.	H	Town Board, Planning Board, Greenfield Concerned Citizens	Private, NYS OPRHP
C.2	Lake Desolation should be protected from septic effluent and other sources of contamination.	H	Town Board, Planning Board, residents of the Lake Desolation area	Unknown
D. MINING				
D.1	The Town should carefully review any proposal to expand the Earth Material Extraction (EME) Overlay Zone.	H	Planning Board, Town Board	NN
E. TIMBER HARVESTING				
E.1	Revise timber harvesting regulations to ensure consistency throughout the regulations.	M	Planning Board, Town Board	NN
E.2	Consider the impacts of zoning requirements on tree farms.	M	Planning Board, Town Board	NN
F. PUBLIC WATER AND SEWER				
F.1	Extend the public water and sewer facilities on Route 9.	M	Planning Board, Town Board, Highway Department	NYS DOH, EFC
F.2	Extend public sewer facilities along Locust Grove Road to Daniels Road.	M	Planning Board, Town Board, Highway Department	NYS DEH, EFC
G. COMMUNITY SERVICES				
G.1	The Town should monitor the need for community services and provide as necessary.	H	Town Board	NYS DOS

Table 28. Strategy and Implementation Chart

Strategy Objective and Implementation Goal		Priority Urgent (U) High (H) Medium (M) Low (L)	Collaborators	Funding Source
G.2	The Town Board should support the extension of cable TV and internet web services to the more rural parts of Town.	M	Town Board, Time Warner, Adelphia	NN
H. RECREATION				
H.1	Study the feasibility of trail construction on State and private lands and include disabled accessible trails.	M	Town Board, NYS OPRHP, EPA, Private	NYSDEC NYS OPRHP
H.2	Town should develop additional parks, preferably large town-wide parks. Discourage the development of pocket parks.	M	Town Board, NYS OPRHP, EPA, Private	NYS DEC, NYS OPRHP
H.3	Town should not create nor sponsor any ATV trails.	L	Town Board	NN
H.4	Town should consider developing some type of indoor recreation facility.	M	Town Board, NYS OPRHP, EPA, Private	NYS DEC, NYS OPRHP
H.5	The Town should explore the possibility of developing a park on vacant lands near the Town Center.	M	Town Board, NYS OPRHP, EPA, Private	NYS DEC, NYS OPRHP
I. HISTORIC RESOURCES				
I.1	Create a Historic Preservation Commission	M	Town Board, NYS SHPO, Town Historian	Heritage account, NYS OPRHP
I.2	Create and provide for the use of a demolition notification form.	L	Town Board, NYS SHPO, Town Historian	Heritage account, NYS OPRHP
I.3	The Town should support the creation of specific historic projects.	L	Town Board, NYS SHPO, Town Historian	Heritage account, NYS OPRHP
J. HAMLETS				
J.1	Support the development of hamlets as mini centers of commerce, housing and services.	M	Town Board, Planning Board, Chamber of Commerce	NYS DOS, NYS DHCD, GOSC
J.2	Support cooperation between the hamlets while simultaneously allowing each of the three hamlets to maintain and/or develop their own identities.	M	Town Board, Planning Board, Chamber of Commerce	NYS DOS, NYS DHCD, GOSC

**Appendix I:
Soils in Greenfield**

**Appendix II:
Zoning Districts**

Appendix III: Highway Conditions

**Appendix IV:
Known Historic Resources**

**Appendix V:
Town Budget**

Appendix VI: Potential Funding Sources

Appendix VII: Summary of Stakeholder Interviews