

# **Planning Board**

TOWN OF BRUNSWICK  
336 Town Office Road  
Troy, New York 12180

## **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JUNE 24, 2025**

PRESENT were RUSSELL OSTER, CHAIRMAN, DONALD HENDERSON, LINDA STANCLIFFE, DAVID TARBOX, MICHAEL CZORNYJ, and J. EMIL KREIGER.

ABSENT was ANDREW PETERSEN.

ALSO PRESENT were WENDY KNEER and KEVIN MAINELLO, Brunswick Building Department, and WAYNE BONESTEEL, P.E., Review Engineer to the Planning Board.

Chairman Oster reviewed the agenda as posted on the Town sign board and Town website.

The Planning Board opened a public hearing on the special use permit application submitted by Hal Smith in connection with the construction of an accessory apartment on property located at 13 Heather Ridge Road. Chairman Oster reviewed the Planning Board procedures for the conduct of a public hearing. The Notice of Public Hearing was read into the record, noting that the Public Hearing Notice was published in the Troy Record, posted on the Town sign board, posted on the Town website, and mailed to owners of all properties located within 300 feet of the project site. Hal Smith was present. Chairman Oster requested that the Mr. Smith provide a brief overview of the project. Mr. Smith stated that he is seeking a special use permit for the construction of an accessory apartment which will be constructed off his daughter's house at 13 Heather Ridge Road, with the accessory apartment to be used by Mr. Smith and his wife; that the accessory apartment is approximately 800 square feet; and that the Zoning Board of Appeals did approve an area variance for side yard setback. Chairman Oster did confirm that the Brunswick Zoning Board of Appeals granted the area variance for side yard setback in connection with this

project. Chairman Oster then opened the floor for the receipt of public comment. No members of the public wished to provide any comment on this application. Chairman Oster asked the Planning Board Members if they felt the need to extend the public hearing or provide a written comment period. No Members of the Planning Board felt that the public hearing needed to be extended, or that a written comment period provided. Thereupon, Chairman Oster made a motion to close the public hearing on the Smith special use permit application, which motion was seconded by Member Henderson. The motion was unanimously approved, and the public hearing closed.

The Planning Board then opened the public hearing on the application seeking an amendment to a previously-approved site plan and special use permit submitted by Crown Castle USA, Inc. concerning a wireless communication facility located at 88-90 Palitish Road (Callanan Cropseyville Quarry location). This application has been submitted pursuant to Section 6409 of the Federal Spectrum Act. The Notice of Public Hearing was read into the record, noting that the public hearing notice was published in the Troy Record, posted on the Town sign board, posted on the Town website, mailed to owners of all properties located within 300 feet of the project site, and also mailed to the Town of Grafton Town Clerk. Don Carpenter of Crown Castle was present. Chairman Oster requested Mr. Carpenter to present a brief overview of the proposal. Mr. Carpenter explained that the existing tower included equipment for T-Mobile, and that this application would allow T-Mobile to replace existing antenna and also equipment at the base of the tower which result in a base compound expansion area; that the application did qualify as a minor modification under the federal law, as it proposes a modification of less than 10% in area; and that the application is straight forward. Chairman Oster then opened the floor for the receipt of public comment. No members of the public wished to provide any comment on this application. Chairman Oster asked the Planning Board Members whether there was any need to extend the

public hearing or provide a written comment period. No Members of the Planning Board felt the extension of the public hearing or providing a written comment period was required. Thereupon, Chairman Oster made a motion to close the public hearing on the Crown Castle USA, Inc. application, which motion was seconded by Member Czornyj. The motion was unanimously approved, and the public hearing closed.

The Planning Board then opened its regular business meeting.

The draft minutes of the June 5, 2025 meeting of the Planning Board were reviewed. Upon motion of Chairman Oster, seconded by Member Czornyj, the draft minutes of the June 5, 2025 Planning Board meeting were unanimously approved without amendment.

The first item of business on the agenda was a special use permit application submitted by Hal Smith for property located at 13 Heather Ridge Road. The applicant seeks a special use permit in connection with the construction of an accessory apartment on property located at 13 Heather Ridge Road. Chairman Oster confirmed that the Brunswick Zoning Board of Appeals had granted the necessary area variance for side yard setback for this project, and that the public hearing had been held on the special use permit application and that there were no public comments received. Chairman Oster inquired whether there were any further questions or comments from the Planning Board Members or Mr. Bonesteel. Hearing none, Member Czornyj made a motion to adopt a negative declaration under SEQRA for this project, which motion was seconded by Member Kreiger. The motion was unanimously approved, and a SEQRA negative declaration adopted. Thereupon, Member Czornyj made a motion to approve this special use permit in connection with the construction of an accessory apartment on property located at 13 Heather Ridge Road, which motion was seconded by Member Stancliffe. The motion was unanimously approved, and the

special use permit granted. The applicant will continue to work with the Brunswick Building Department on this project.

The second item of business on the agenda was the application submitted by Crown Castle USA, Inc. to modify a previously-approved site plan and special use permit concerning a wireless communication facility located at 88-90 Palitsh Road (Callanan Cropseyville Quarry location). Chairman Oster noted that the public hearing had been held on this application, and that no public comments were received. Member Stancliffe asked whether the modification was with regard only to the T-Mobil equipment. Don Carpenter of Crown Castle USA, Inc. confirmed this application addressed only the T-Mobil equipment, and that there has been a new application submitted for this tower for a minor modification to the special use permit and site plan with respect to the Verizon equipment located on the tower, but that is a separate application to be reviewed by the Planning Board. Mr. Bonesteel stated that he had reviewed the plans submitted on this application, deems them complete, and has no issues concerning the application. It is noted that the review and recommendation has been received from the Rensselaer County Department of Economic Development and Planning, determining that this application does not conflict with County plans in that local consideration shall prevail. It is noted for the record that under Federal law, the current application is deemed to be minor modification to an existing facility, and that Federal law does mandate an approval in such circumstances. Accordingly, the application is not subject to SEQRA review as Federal law mandates a non-discretionary approval. Member Czornyj then made a motion to approve the amendment to the existing special use permit and site plan with respect to this minor modification in connection with T-Mobil equipment on the existing wireless communication facility, which motion was seconded by Member Henderson. The motion was

unanimously approved, and the Planning Board approves the amendment to the previously-approved site plan and special use permit as mandated under 6409 of the Federal Spectrum Act.

The third item of business on the agenda was the waiver of subdivision application submitted by Thomas Brizzell for property located at 1 Angelo Drive. The applicant seeks a waiver of subdivision to divide approximately one acre of land from his neighbor's adjacent parcel, which he will acquire and merge into his existing parcel located at 1 Angelo Drive. Thomas Brizzell was present. Chairman Oster inquired whether any of the Members of the Planning Board had any questions or comments. No Planning Board Member had any question or comment. Mr. Bonesteel confirmed that he had reviewed the plan and has no comments. Mr. Mainello likewise he had reviewed the plans and has no comments. Member Tarbox made a motion to adopt a negative declaration under SEQRA, which motion was seconded by Member Czornyj. The motion was unanimously approved, and a SEQRA negative declaration adopted. Thereupon, Member Tarbox made a motion to approve the waiver of subdivision subject to the condition that the one acre divided from the adjacent lot be merged into the deed for 1 Angelo Drive, and that a copy of the merger deed be filed with the Brunswick Building Department. Member Czornyj seconded the motion subject to the stated condition. The motion was unanimously approved, and the waiver of subdivision application approved subject to the stated condition.

The fourth item of business on the agenda was the site plan application submitted by Thomas Murley and Calito Development Group for property located at 291 Oakwood Avenue. The applicant was not present, and the matter tabled to be further addressed later in the meeting in the event the applicant arrived at the meeting.

The fifth item of business on the agenda was the major subdivision application submitted by Paramount Building Group for property located at the northeast corner of Spring Avenue

Extension and Creek Road. Matt Bond, PE and TJ Ruane, Esq. were present for the applicant. Chairman Oster noted that a site meeting had occurred since the June 5, 2025 Planning Board meeting at which the applicant, representatives of the Town, and representatives of NYS DEC were present, and requested that Mr. Bonesteel review that site visit. Mr. Bonesteel stated that the site visit occurred on June 13, 2025, and that he had prepared a memorandum dated June 19, 2025 reviewing that site visit, and that the memorandum had also been reviewed by NYS DEC and that NYS DEC comments had been included within that memorandum. The June 19, 2025 memorandum prepared by Mr. Bonesteel is made part of the project file. Mr. Bonesteel generally reviewed his memorandum, noting that the attendants at the site visit included representatives from NYS DEC, representatives from the Town of Brunswick including Bill Bradley, Kevin Mainello, and Wayne Bonesteel, and also representatives of the owner/applicant, including Matt Bond, PE, TJ Ruane, Esq., and Tom Willetts; Mr. Bonesteel stated that an overview of the proposed project was discussed at the site meeting; Mr. Bonesteel also stated that the SEQRA review for this action was also discussed, and that NYS DEC had been non-committal regarding SEQRA lead agency, but that the 30 days to respond to the Lead Agency Coordination Notice had expired and NYS DEC had not objected to the Planning Board serving as SEQRA lead agency for this action; Mr. Bonesteel noted that the representatives of NYS DEC seemed to indicate that if this action is a viable, real residential subdivision project that included substantial grading, then NYS DEC generally does not object to the Planning Board serving as lead agency, but also noted that NYS DEC generally seeks to assume lead agency status with respect to mining projects; Mr. Bonesteel also stated that NYS DEC inserted in his review memorandum the statement that until a project has all necessary approvals, including Town subdivision approval, NYS DEC is unable to determine that the site is a construction project that is not subject to the permitting requirements

of the Mined Land Reclamation Law. Mr. Bonesteel also stated that the representatives of NYS DEC appeared to indicate at the site meeting that the Department does not issue construction exemptions at this time under the State mining program. Attorney Ruane stated that he had interpreted the statements made by NYS DEC differently, stating that NYS DEC has certain standards regarding construction exemptions within which a project must comply in order to be exempt from the State mining program requirements, and that his client is confident that it can stay within those NYS DEC standards for construction exemptions. Attorney Ruane stated that the standards for the construction exemption include time limitations, requiring that the excavation in conjunction with a construction project must be started within six months of approval and completed within two years of approval. Member Stancliffe asked if the NYS DEC requirements include that the location of the proposed subdivided lots be the same as the location for the proposed excavation. Attorney Ruane responded by saying that the excavation must be to aid the construction of the subdivision. Chairman Oster then inquired whether the applicant had considered different grading plans so that the site could be balanced without the removal of material. Matt Bond stated that the grading plan had taken this into account, and is balanced as much as possible but that material still needed to be removed from this site. Chairman Oster inquired that in light of 400,000 cubic yards of material being removed, will steep slopes be created. Matt Bond responded by saying that the grading and resulting slopes are included in the proposed site grading plan, and that will be reviewed by Mr. Bonesteel and the Planning Board. Chairman Oster inquired as to the next step for SEQRA review. Attorney Gilchrist stated that the Planning Board had received input from NYS DEC at the site meeting, that NYS DEC had not objected to the Brunswick Planning Board serving as SEQRA lead agency in response to the Lead Agency Coordination Notice, and that declaration of SEQRA lead agency for this action was

properly before the Board for consideration at this time, but did note that in the event the Planning Board declares itself SEQRA lead agency, it will need to review all environmental impact issues on this action, including not just subdivision of lots but also all grading and material removal from the project site which is considered part of this action. Thereupon, Member Bonesteel requested to complete the review of his memorandum regarding the site visit, which included his discussion concerning stormwater, noting that the Town of Brunswick is an MS4 community, and will need to review and act upon the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan; and also wetlands, including both federal wetlands and NYS DEC wetlands which at this time will require a jurisdictional determination from NYS DEC. The applicant indicated they will submit the application to NYS DEC for a wetlands jurisdictional determination. Following further discussion, Member Stancliffe made a motion to designate the Planning Board to serve as SEQRA lead agency for this action, which motion was seconded by Member Tarbox. The motion was unanimously approved, and the Town of Brunswick Planning Board declares that it shall serve as lead agency under SEQRA for the environmental impact review of this action. Chairman Oster then inquired what additional information was needed for purposes of the SEQRA review for this action. Mr. Bonesteel stated that the subdivision application is substantially complete, and that his office had prepared a review memorandum that the applicant is now addressing; however, Mr. Bonesteel noted that he will need further calculations submitted by the applicant regarding the amount of material proposed to be removed from the project site, as well as proposed truck routes. Attorney Gilchrist suggested that Mr. Bonesteel's office prepare a memorandum regarding all additional information needed in connection with the proposed excavation and removal of the mineral material from the project site, and any other needed information in connection with the subdivision application, so that the record can be determined to be complete with respect to both SEQRA determination as well as continued



subdivision application review. Member Stancliffe also stated that the applicant should submit a complete cut and fill analysis for review by the Planning Board. Mr. Bonesteel also noted that his office has requested information concerning site borings undertaken in connection with the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. Mr. Bonesteel also noted for the record that the applicant's submittal to the Rensselaer County Department of Health regarding onsite septic system is continuing in review. This matter is placed on the July 17, 2025 agenda for further discussion.

The Planning Board did note that it will not be holding its first meeting in July, which is scheduled for July 3, 2025, in light of the July 4 holiday, and that the next regular business meeting of the Planning Board will be held July 17, 2025.

The sixth item of business on the agenda was the application for waiver of subdivision, site plan, and special use permit submitted by CVE North America concerning property located at 511 McChesney Avenue Extension. Carrie Cosentino, Project Developer with CVE North America, and John Ahearn, Esq., project attorney, were present. Chairman Oster stated that following the last Planning Board meeting held June 5, the Planning Board had requested Mr. Bonesteel to prepare a draft Part 2 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form for review and deliberation by the Planning Board. Chairman Oster asked Mr. Bonesteel to review the draft Part 2 prepared for the meeting. A copy of the draft Part 2 as prepared by Mr. Bonesteel for discussion and deliberation by the Planning Board was provided to the applicant. Thereupon, Mr. Bonesteel reviewed the draft Part 2 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form with the Planning Board Members. As to whether the project would result in an impact on land, the proposed response is YES, but that the overall impact on land would be small; Mr. Bonesteel commented that the proposed solar panel array involves the installation of solar panels that will cover a large area of ground within the project parcel; that the panels are supported by posts driven into the ground,

resulting in preservation of the vast majority of the ground cover and minimal disturbance of the soil and that the real impact to the ground will come from the installation of the access drive and electrical equipment pads. Member Stancliffe noted that the applicant avoided most areas of the project site of 15% slope or greater, and Mr. Bonesteel concurred. As to whether the project would impact geological features, the proposed response is NO impact to geological features. As to whether the project would result in an impact on surface water, the proposed response is YES, but that the overall impact is small. Mr. Bonesteel commented that there are wetlands on the project site, but the project would result in minor impact associated with the crossing of a wetland for the installation of the access road; that the project plans had been provided and reviewed, and that the project will need coverage under an Army Corps of Engineers permit; that the proposed project is avoiding all other wetlands on the project site, which would render the overall to surface water as small. Mr. Bonesteel noted that there are DEC wetlands on the north end of the site, but that no panels or disturbance in that part of the project site is proposed; Mr. Bonesteel further commented that DEC has adopted new wetlands regulations that would apply to this project, and that the applicant will need to obtain a Jurisdictional Determination from DEC concerning the project. Ms. Cosentino stated that the request for the Jurisdictional Determination had been submitted to DEC, and it is pending. Member Henderson stated that the project, in his opinion, would result in increased erosion, and how could the Planning Board ignore that impact, as water would be cascading off panels and create erosion. Mr. Bonesteel stated that the surface area is proposed to remain in a vegetative state; that a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan has been prepared and will require compliance during the project operation; that erosion and sediment control measures have been identified which require implementation during construction; and that based on the erosion and sediment control plan and the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, the impact to

surface water has been mitigated rendering the overall impact to be small. Member Henderson stated that there are 16,000 solar panels being proposed, and what is required to distinguish between a small and large impact, as there is a stream on the project site that dumps into the Poestenkill Creek. Mr. Bonesteel stated that the project plan review, including review of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, indicates that with implementation of the stormwater control measures, there is no turbidity anticipated to the Poestenkill Creek. Member Henderson questioned how there could be no turbidity when 16,000 panels were being installed, and wouldn't erosion channels be created on the project site. Mr. Bonesteel stated that the project plans do include installation of filter strips under the panels, maintenance of a vegetative cover on the project site under the panels, and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan mitigation measures to address runoff from the panels and overland sheet flow. Attorney Ahearn also stated that the owner/operator of the solar facility cannot put turbidity into the Poestenkill Creek, as that would result in a violation of New York State law. Member Henderson asked that if a problem regarding turbidity or surface water impact arose after the project was built, would the project be shutdown. Attorney Ahearn stated that the project would not be shutdown, but that any violation would need to be corrected in compliance with New York State law, and that turbidity was not anticipated as the project area would remain in a vegetative state after construction of the solar panels, which is required under the project Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. Mr. Bonesteel also stated that in his opinion, the Poestenkill Creek is too far away from the project site to have any direct impact, and discharge to the Poestenkill Creek is not anticipated; Mr. Bonesteel also stated that surface water impact is why the erosion and sediment control plan and the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan are prepared and require compliance so that New York State stormwater and surface water regulations are met; that Brunswick is an MS4 municipality and will require

compliance with the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan; that stormwater inspections are required; and that stormwater impacts have been mitigated by the applicant. As to whether the project will have an impact on groundwater, the proposed response is NO, as there is no activity impacting groundwater resources. As to whether the project would have an impact on flooding, the proposed response is NO, noting that the FEMA map has been reviewed and the project site is not located in any floodplain; that a small section of the project area in the northwest portion is adjacent to a floodplain but that no construction is proposed in that northwest portion of the project site. As to whether the project would have an impact on air resources, the proposed response is NO. As to whether the project would have an impact on plants and animals, the proposed response is YES, but that the anticipated impact is small. Mr. Bonesteel commented that the solar panels will be supported by posts driven into the ground, and that plants will continue to grow over the majority of the ground surface, and that any animals that traverse or live in the area will continue that use; Mr. Bonesteel further commented that based on the reporting provided by the design engineer for the project, there are no documented occurrences of federal or state regulated rare, threatened, or endangered species nor their habitat within the project parcel; Mr. Bonesteel also commented that while a number of trees are expected to be removed for installation of the solar panels and access drive, plantings are proposed around the east and south property boundaries to act as vegetative screening. Chairman Oster noted that an 8 foot fence is proposed around the panel areas, and inquired whether it would be constructed to allow animals to go beneath the fence. Ms. Cosentino stated that there will be space underneath the fence, and that the fence specifications can be a condition required for the project; Mr. Bonesteel noted that the fence specification is currently part of the project plans. Chairman Oster also noted that there will be a prohibition on the use of pesticides or herbicides for this project, which has been agreed to by the applicant. As

to whether the project will have an impact on agricultural resources, the proposed response is YES, but the impact is anticipated to be small. Mr. Bonesteel noted that the project is in an Agricultural District, and that more than 2.5 acres will be utilized for non-agricultural purposes, rendering this a Type I action under SEQRA. Mr. Bonesteel commented that the non-agricultural use of the property is not irreversible, and the property can revert to agricultural use in the future. Member Henderson stated that the impact will be irreversible for the current surrounding residential owners for the next 30 years or more. As to whether the project would have an impact on aesthetic resources, the proposed response is YES. Mr. Bonesteel commented that according to the visual impact assessment report prepared by the applicant's consultant, the facility is visible from the Garfield School (on the National Registry) located near the intersection of Route 2 and Moonlawn Road; that approximately 50% of the Route 2 corridor, a high use road, that passes through the two mile radius of the viewshed study area, has views of the facility; and that portions of residential zones in the viewshed study area have visibility of the project site. Mr. Bonesteel also commented that views of the project from segments of McChesney Avenue Extension and Moonlawn Road produce the greatest visual impact with views of the site; and that the project will be more visible during the winter when leaves are off the trees, especially for residences located along these road segments. Mr. Bonesteel also commented that vegetative screening proposed for the project only partially screens views of the facility, and that the portion of the project site at higher elevations is largely visible to those traveling along McChesney Avenue Extension as well as other state, county, and local roadways and adjacent residences. Mr. Bonesteel then also reviewed all sub-questions concerning aesthetic resources on Part 2 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form with the Planning Board Members, noting that possible responses may include that a moderate to large impact may occur regarding visibility from publicly accessible vantage points seasonally

(screened by summer foliage, but visible during other seasons), and that the impact could be moderate to large regarding routine travel by residents, including travel to and from work, when viewing the proposed project. Member Stancliffe noted that if the proposed visual mitigation measures are not completed, the project would be visible year around, not just seasonally. Member Henderson noted that the public enjoyed looking at farm fields rather than solar panels, and questioned the response on item 9(e) of the Part 2 form. Mr. Bonesteel stated that this sub-question addresses impact on designated aesthetic resources. Chairman Oster noted that while Route 7 is the commercial corridor in the Town of Brunswick, Route 2 is maintained as a scenic highway, and wanted to further review the Town Comprehensive Plan to determine how the Route 2 corridor is described. Member Czornyj noted that he could see the project site from Creek Road in the summer time, including the entire project site, so that the impact may not be limited to just seasonally but could be year around. Mr. Bonesteel stated that the Planning Board does need to determine whether that impact is small, or whether that impact is deemed moderate to large, in terms of cars travelling along Creek Road. Member Czornyj thought this impact should be deemed moderate to large on a year around basis, and not limited to seasonally. As to whether the project has an impact on historic or archaeological resources, the proposed response is NO. Mr. Bonesteel commented that the State Historic Preservation Office issued a letter dated December 13, 2024 stating that it is the opinion of the Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation that no properties, including archaeological and/or historic resources, listed in or eligible for the New York State or National Registers of Historic Places, will be impacted by the project. As to whether the project would result in an impact on open space and recreation, the proposed response is NO, as there is no adopted municipal Open Space Plan identifying this project site. As to whether the project will impact a Critical Environmental Area, the proposed response is NO, as there are no

areas in the Town of Brunswick designated as a Critical Environmental Area. As to whether the project will have an impact on transportation, the proposed response is NO, as the project is intended to operate as an unoccupied passive solar array. As to whether the project will have an impact on energy, the proposed response is NO, as this project will generate energy rather than consume it. As to whether the project will have impacts based on noise, order, or light, the proposed response is NO. Chairman Oster noted that there were no lights proposed for the facility. Chairman Oster further stated that the only noise generated was limited to certain equipment. Ms. Cosentino stated that the sound generated is from the inverters at the center of the site, and that there are no impacts above ambient sound conditions at 50 feet from the inverters, which will be within the boundaries of the project site. As to whether the project may have an impact on human health, the proposed response is NO. Chairman Oster asked whether there were any hazardous materials in the solar panels proposed for use on this project. Ms. Cosentino stated that the project will use Tier 1 solar panels and do not contain toxic materials, and that all panels are self-contained. Chairman Oster asked about any potential impact to the panels due to hail or other weather damage. Ms. Cosentino stated that there are reported damage to solar panels from hail storms, but that any impact resulted from solar panels which are no longer used in the industry and will not be used at this project site, and that the solar panels used for this project are self-contained and will not include toxic materials. Member Stancliffe asked about the regulatory basis for describing the panels as Tier 1. Attorney Ahearn stated that the standard was ASTM, and that the applicant will submit cut sheets regarding the solar panels. Member Henderson asked how the solar panels would be disposed, as this could be a potential health threat. Attorney Ahearn stated that any panels would be disposed in compliance with all statutory and regulatory requirements at the time of disposal. Member Henderson asked how much the disposal of the panels would cost. Attorney

Ahearn stated that at this point, there can only be estimates as to future cost, as the panels would not be subject to disposal until the future. Member Henderson asked if the project were to be sold, how does the Town know if the new owner will have the economic resources to properly dispose of panels or decommission the facility. Attorney Ahearn stated that there would be a bond requirement for decommissioning. As to whether the proposed project is consistent with community plans, the proposed response is that the project is not inconsistent with the adopted community plans, noting that the Brunswick Zoning Law has zoned the project site for commercial solar facilities subject to special use permit and site plan review. As to whether the project is consistent with existing community character, the proposed response is that the project is not consistent with existing character of the surrounding area. Mr. Bonesteel commented that significant portions of the natural landscape would be changed by the installation of several thousand solar panels that are visible from nearby rural residential properties and other public view points, and that the change to the natural landscape could be deemed significant in terms of size and in sharp contrast to the surrounding area. The sub-questions under this item concerning community character were reviewed and discussed by the Planning Board. During discussion, it was noted that there is the potential for moderate to large impact concerning the proposed project being inconsistent with the character of the existing natural landscape. Member Stancliffe had a question concerning how SEQRA defines the predominate architectural scale and character, and whether this project could rise to the level of moderate to large impact on those resources. Mr. Bonesteel and the Planning Board Members will further review that issue. Member Czornyj had a question regarding impact to community services in terms of fire departments. Attorney Gilchrist stated that this item generally addresses the need for purchasing additional vehicles or equipment or an impact to available manpower, and that the Planning Board has required fire department



review on all prior solar projects that have come before the Planning Board. Chairman Oster confirmed that the fire department will need to review this site plan. Attorney Gilchrist then reviewed SEQRA procedure with the Planning Board Members, including review and consideration of Part 1 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form and the project documents, including any additional technical reports, as well as consideration of the information in Part 2 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form discussed at this meeting, leading to a determination of environmental significance which would be set forth in Part 3 of the FEAF. Attorney Ahearn stated that the applicant had only been provided a copy of the draft Part 2 at this meeting, and requested time for the applicant to further review the draft Part 2 and provide comments for further discussion with the Planning Board. Chairman Oster stated that this would be appropriate and asked that any comments be provided in writing prior to the next meeting for further discussion. This matter is placed on the July 17 meeting for further deliberation.

The Planning Board then revisited the site plan application submitted by Thomas Murley/Calito Development for property located at 291 Oakwood Avenue. Frances Bossolini, PE was present for the applicant. Mr. Bossolini stated that the applicant had provided written responses to the comments received at the public hearing on this site plan application, and also comments of the Speigletown Fire Department and the Rensselaer County Department of Economic Development and Planning, and that the written responses are now part of the project record. Mr. Bossolini then reviewed all written responses to such public comments and other written comments. Chairman Oster inquired whether the Planning Board had any questions or comments on the responses provided by the applicant. Member Stancliffe inquired whether there could be any further modification to the loading area to address comments from the Speigletown Fire Department and Rensselaer County. Mr. Bossolini stated that he would review those

comments again, with attention to the fire department vehicle requirements in terms of the loading dock and dumpster area, and could provide further detail on that. Member Tarbox asked about the distance between the proposed new retail building and the existing retail plaza building. It was determined that there is approximately 75 feet distance between these buildings, which adds additional area for truck delivery routes which would be consistent with other retail locations. Member Stancliffe stated she would like to see the easement behind the existing plaza building which had been discussed in prior Planning Board meetings concerning delivery truck usage shown on the site plan, so that there was no question regarding available truck lanes and turning areas. Mr. Bossolini stated that he would check on the issue of the easement, and will look at adding that information to the site plan. Chairman Oster inquired whether Mr. Bonesteel had any further comments on the site plan. Mr. Bonesteel stated that he had no major comments on the site plan, and was working through final detail comments with Mr. Bossolini. The Planning Board discussed procedure, and Chairman Oster determined that he would like to see the final site plan submittal addressing the comments discussed at this meeting, including final review by Mr. Bonesteel. This matter is placed on the July 17 agenda for further discussion.

There were two items of new business discussed.

Both items of new business were applications submitted by Crown Castle USA Inc. for minor modifications to existing telecommunications transmission towers, one located at 88-90 Palitsch Road (Callanan Cropseyvill Quarry location) with respect to equipment change out by Verizon, and the second concerning an existing facility located at 227 Bald Mountain Rd., also for equipment changeout in connection with Verizon. Mr. Maniello confirmed that each location required an amendment to an existing special use permit and site plan approval, and that based on his review the applications were complete. Mr. Bonesteel concurred that the applications were

complete. Accordingly, the Planning Board has set a public hearing on the application to amend special use permit and site plan for facilities located at 88-90 Palitsch Road and 227 Bald Mountain Road. The public hearings will be held July 17, with the Palitsch Road public hearing to commence at 7 p.m., and the Bald Mountain Road hearing to commence at 7:05 p.m or as soon thereafter as can be heard.

The index for the June 24, 2025 regular meeting is as follows:

1. Smith – special use permit – approved.
2. Crown Castle – amendment to special use permit and site plan – approved.
3. Brizell – waiver of subdivision – approved.
4. Calito Development Group – site plan (July 17, 2025).
5. Paramount Building Group – major subdivision (July 17, 2025).
6. CVE North America – waiver of subdivision, site plan, and special use permit (July 17, 2025).

The proposed agenda for the July 17, 2025 regular meeting currently is as follows:

1. Crown Castle USA, Inc. – amendment to special use permit and site plan (88-90 Palitsch Road) (public hearing to commence at 7 p.m.).
2. Crown Castle USA, Inc. – amendment to special use permit and site plan (227 Bald Mountain Road) (public hearing to commence at 7:05 p.m. or as soon thereafter as can be heard).
3. Calito Development Group – site plan.
4. Paramount Building Group – major subdivision.
5. CVE North America – waiver of subdivision, site plan, and special use permit.

The Planning Board has cancelled the regular meeting to be held July 3, 2025 in light of the July 4 holiday.