

Planning Board

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

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD NOVEMBER 6, 2025

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

ABSENT was MICHAEL CZORNYJ.

ALSO PRESENT were KEVIN MAINELLO, Brunswick Building Department, ANDREW GILCHRIST, ESQ., Attorney to the Planning Board, and WAYNE BONESTEEL, P.E., Review Engineer to the Planning Board.

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

The first item of business on the agenda was a public hearing concerning the application for a special use permit submitted by Edwin O'Neill for property located at 229 White Church Road. Edwin O'Neill was present to review the application. Chairman Oster read the procedure for a public hearing held by the Planning Board. Attorney Gilchrist read the Notice of Public Hearing into the record, with the Notice having been published in the Troy Record, placed on the Town sign board, posted on the Town website, and mailed to the owners of all properties within 300 feet of the project site. Chairman Oster stated that the application had been submitted to the Rensselaer County Bureau of Economic Development for review, and that the Town had received a response letter stating that the project will not have a major impact on County plans and that local consideration shall prevail. Chairman Oster asked Mr. O'Neill to briefly review the project

for the public. Mr. O'Neill stated that the project was a home solar energy project, that he was proposing two solar racks of four solar panels each to be built in his backyard, and that the racks would be 4 feet by 6 feet. Mr. O'Neill stated that the project would store energy in a battery for later use, such as a power outage, that it would also power a backup energy system in his home, and that the power would be hooked up through a standard generator connection system. Mr. O'Neill stated that the solar collector system was like a generator, but produced no emissions, sound or glare. Mr. O'Neill stated that there would be no need for any fuel storage on his property due to the project, that it would be a small energy system in his backyard, that it would have no impact on neighboring properties, and that it would make his home more energy efficient. Chairman Oster opened the public hearing on the application. There were no public comments on the application. Chairman Oster asked Mr. Mainello if there had been any written comments on the application and Mr. Mainello stated that there had been none, wither by written letter or email. Chairman Oster stated that since there had been no public comments, there was no need for an extended written comment period. There were no questions or comments from the Planning Board members. Chairman Oster made a motion to close the public hearing, which was seconded by Member Henderson. The motion was unanimously approved and the public hearing was closed.

The draft minutes of the October 2, 2025 regular meeting were reviewed. Upon motion of Chairman Oster, seconded by Member Stancliffe, the draft minutes of the October 2, 2025 regular meeting were unanimously approved without amendment.

The draft minutes of the October 16, 2025 regular meeting were reviewed. Upon motion of Chairman Oster, seconded by Member Kreiger, the draft minutes of the October 16, 2025 regular meeting were unanimously approved without amendment.

The first item of business on the agenda was the application for a special use permit submitted by Edwin O'Neill for property located at 229 White Church Road. Edwin O'Neill was present to review the application. Chairman Oster stated that there had been no public comments made at the public hearing, so there was no need for the submission of written responses. Chairman Oster asked Mr. Bonesteel if he had any questions or comments on the application. Mr. Bonesteel stated that all of his comments on the application had been addressed. There were no questions or comments from the Planning Board members. Member Stancliffe made a motion for a negative declaration under SEQRA, which was seconded by Member Petersen. The Planning Board voted unanimously to declare a negative declaration on the special use permit application under SEQRA. Chairman Oster asked if there should be any conditions on the application, and the Planning Board determined that there should not be. Member Henderson made a motion to approve the special use permit application, which was seconded by Member Petersen. The Planning Board voted unanimously to approve the special use permit application.

The second item of business on the agenda was a waiver of subdivision application submitted by Kenneth Herrington for property located on Herrington Lane. Jacob Keasbey, LLS, of Keasbey Land Surveying, was present to review the application. Chairman Oster noted that an updated survey of the site had been submitted since the last meeting, which showed setbacks of the buildings on the Herrington lot, the adjacent parcel, and the remaining lands of Herrington Farms. There were no questions or comments from the Planning Board members. Member Tarbox made a motion for a negative declaration under SEQRA, which was seconded by Member Kreiger. The Planning Board voted unanimously to declare a negative declaration on the waiver of subdivision application under SEQRA. Chairman Oster asked if there should be any conditions on the application. Attorney Gilchrist advised that the area divided from the farm parcel be legally

merged into the receiving residential parcel and that a copy of the merger deed be filed with the Brunswick Building Department. Member Tarbox made a motion to approve the waiver of subdivision application subject to the stated conditions, which was seconded by Member Petersen. The Planning Board voted unanimously to approve to approve the waiver of subdivision application subject to the stated conditions.

The third item of business on the agenda was the Colton Ridge major subdivision application submitted by Paramount Building Group of NY for property located at the northeast corner of Spring Avenue and Creek Road. Matt Bond, P.E., of Hart Engineering, and T.J. Ruane, Esq. were present to review the application. Chairman Oster stated that acoustic analysis of the site had been submitted immediately before the current Planning Board meeting, that the Planning Board members had not had the opportunity to review that analysis, and asked Mr. Bond to review that analysis for the Planning Board. Mr. Bond stated that there had been no significant changes to the plans since the last Planning Board meeting and reviewed the acoustic analysis, stating that ambient noise levels had been studied at four points along the project site's property line in proximity to off-site residual receptors. Mr. Bond also stated that the analysis had modeled the sound impacts from excavation equipment at the receptors. Mr. Bonesteel stated that he found the methodology used in the acoustic analysis acceptable, and asked Mr. Bond to review the data collected as part of the analysis. Mr. Bond provided more in-depth review of the data collected, noting that the analysis had measured noise generated by construction vehicles from multiple points on the project site. Member Henderson asked what the hours of operation would be for construction on the site. Mr. Bond stated that 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM would be the hours of operation, and noted that most construction would be later in the project timeline. Chairman Oster stated that the Planning Board members and Mr. Bonesteel would further review the sound study and discuss

it at the Board's next meeting. Chairman Oster stated that Mr. Bonesteel had drafted Part 2 of an Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) for the project, and asked him to review it for the Planning Board. Mr. Bonesteel confirmed that he had drafted Part 2 of the EAF, dated November 5, 2025, and reviewed it. Mr. Bonesteel stated that for Section 1, Impact on Land, there would be physical alteration of the land on the project site, noting that there would be a moderate to large impact due to the proposed excavation of 400,000 cubic yards of mineral material from the site, but that the remaining factors should all be listed as a small impact. Member Stancliffe noted that excavation was proposed to take 1-2 years, before construction of the houses began, and asked if that meant that there would be a moderate to large impact for that factor as well. Mr. Bonesteel stated that there were other development projects in Upstate New York that were proposed to take five or more years to complete excavation of the site, which was why he believed this factor would be a small impact. Mr. Bonesteel stated that for Section 2, Impact on Geological Features, that there would be little to no impact to unique features on the site. Mr. Bonesteel stated that for Section 3, Impacts on Surface Water, that there would be an impact due to there being wetlands on the site, but that it would be a small impact overall. Mr. Bonesteel stated that for Section 4, Impact on Groundwater, that there would be little to no impact on groundwater on the site. Mr. Bonesteel stated that for Section 5, Impact on Flooding, that there would be little to no impact on lands subject to flooding. Mr. Bonesteel stated that for Section 6, Impacts on Air, that there would be little to no impacts resulting in air emissions. Mr. Bonesteel stated that for Section 7, Impact on Plants and Animals, that there would be impacts due to vegetation being removed from the site, but that it would be a small impact. Mr. Bonesteel stated that for Section 8, Impact on Agricultural Resources, that there would be an impact, but that it would be a small impact. Mr. Bonesteel stated that for Section 9, Impact on Aesthetic Resources, that there would be little to no impact. Mr.

Bonesteel stated that for Section 10, Impact on Historic and Archeological Resources, that there would be little to no impact. Mr. Bonesteel stated that for Section 11, Impact on Open Space and Recreation, that there would be little to no impact. Mr. Bonesteel stated that for Section 12, Impact on Critical Environmental Areas, that there would be little to no impact. Mr. Bonesteel stated that for Section 13, Impact on Transportation, that there would be an impact due to truck traffic and construction vehicles coming to and from the site for 1-2 years. Mr. Bonesteel also stated that the amount of traffic expected would not trigger any Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) numeric thresholds, meaning that overall, there would be a small impact. Mr. Bonesteel stated that for Section 14, Impact on Energy, there would be little to no impact. Mr. Bonesteel stated that for Section 15, Impact on Noise, Odor, and Light, that there would be impacts, all due to construction and excavation, and that they would be short-term and would result in a small impact. Mr. Bonesteel stated that for Section 16, Impact on Human Health, that there would be little to no impact. Mr. Bonesteel stated that for Section 17, Consistency with Community Plans, that the project would not be inconsistent with community plans. Mr. Bonesteel stated that for Section 18, Consistency with Community Character, that the project would not be inconsistent with community character. Mr. Bonesteel stated that Part 2 of the EAF was in draft form only, that it should be reviewed by the Planning Board members, and that a SEQRA determination was the Planning Board's to make. Mr. Ruane stated that two factors had been listed as moderate to large impacts and noted for the Planning Board that the applicant's discussions with NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) made it clear that excavation must be completed within two years, and that the subdivision must be built after excavation was complete. Member Tarbox asked to review Section 8, Part D of the EAF, noting that it stated that the project would not result in an irreversible conversion of agricultural land, and that he disagreed, stating that if the project

were approved and built, that that land would never be used for agricultural purposes again, and that Section 8 should also be a moderate to large impact. The Planning Board members agreed with Member Tarbox. Member Stancliffe noted that Part 1 of the EAF needed to be consistent with NYS DEC requirements for excavation. Chairman Oster stated that the Planning Board members would review that draft Part 2 of the EAF and comments made at the current meeting, and that once Part 2 was finalized, the Planning Board could move forward to Part 3. Chairman Oster reviewed the potential schedule for the project, stating that if Parts 2 and 3 were finalized for the next meeting, that a SEQRA determination could be made, and that a public hearing on the project could then be held at the Planning Board's second December meeting, but reiterated that this was only a tentative schedule for the project. Mr. Mainello stated that the Rensselaer County Highway Department and County Engineer were requesting information from the applicant concerning truck routes and the duration of excavation and construction, noting concerns about Creek Road. Mr. Bond stated that he would submit that information, noting that the likely truck route would be along Spring Avenue Extension. This matter was placed on the November 20, 2025 agenda for further deliberation.

The fourth item of business on the agenda was site plan and special use permit applications submitted by National Grid for property located at 1278 Spring Avenue. Allyson Phillips, Esq. was present to review the application. Ms. Phillips stated that the applicant was present at the Planning Board's last meeting on October 16, that the applicant had answered questions and responded to comments from the Planning Board at that meeting, that the applicant had submitted written responses to all questions and comments from that meeting in a letter dated November 5, and that a full Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and updated Full EAF had been submitted on November 5. Chairman Oster asked of the 27,000 National Grid customers who

would be served by this project, how many would be located in the Town of Brunswick. Ms. Phillips stated that there were 3,363 National Grid meters in Brunswick, with 3,165 being residential and the remaining being hospitals and schools, and that all of them would be served by this project. Ms. Phillips then reviewed the written responses submitted by the applicant. Ms. Phillips stated that the project had 6.81 acres of impervious surface, that 5.6 acres of that surface would be covered by a concrete pad, that 1.02 acres would be used for truck access, and that the remaining approximately 0.11 acres would be used for secondary access to the site. Ms. Phillips also requested that the Planning Board declare the intent to serve as lead agency under SEQRA for the project and circulate a notice for a coordinated review of the project to all involved and interested agencies. Chairman Oster stated that the project was intended to help mitigate the effects of extreme cold weather events, that the technology for the proposed project was new, and asked what technology and equipment was previously used to handle extreme cold weather events. Jason Dusick, director of gas operations at National Grid, was also present and stated that National Grid previously would increase the size of gas pipelines and/or the pressure within a pipeline to handle extreme cold weather events, and that the current proposal sought a non-pipeline solution to meet increased demand for heat and power during extreme cold weather. Chairman Oster asked if tanks/trailers brought to the project site would be automatically hooked in to National Grid's existing gas lines. Mr. Dusick stated that they would not, that the tanks would be parked onsite and only available for operation from December 15 to March 5, and that they would not be connected and hooked up to the existing gas lines unless needed. Chairman Oster noted an incident in a nearby town a number of years earlier where a propane tank had exploded and caused several deaths, and asked for details on the current project's safety plan. Mr. Dusick described the safety features of the site and gas tanks, specifically that each gas tank had individual valves and their

own safety features. Member Henderson asked if there would be a full safety plan for the project. Ms. Phillips stated that National Grid was still communicating with Rensselaer County and local fire departments on safety features, and confirmed that a safety plan would be submitted to the Planning Board. Mr. Henderson asked where the National Grid gas pipeline that the tanks would connect to started and ended, and if the applicant could give the Planning Board a precise route of that pipeline. Mr. Dusick reviewed the National Grid section of the pipeline, stating that the transfer station was located in Bloomingrove, and that the pipeline went through Troy, under the Hudson River, and into Albany County. Member Henderson asked if the Brunswick transfer station would supply power into Albany County. Mr. Dusick stated that it would not, and that National Grid customers in close proximity to the transfer station would use the gas and energy. Member Henderson asked to confirm that -5 degrees Fahrenheit was the temperature at which the excess fuel from the project would be needed. Mr. Dusick stated that a temperature of -5 degrees or colder being maintained for 24 consecutive hours would be the point at which the excess fuel would be needed, and that -5 degrees had been determined to be the critical temperature where excess fuel would be needed. Member Henderson noted that average temperatures had been increasing over the last few years and that New York State was moving toward electric power over gas power, and stated that this project may not even be necessary. Chairman Oster noted that National Grid had several projects on Long Island like the one proposed for Brunswick and asked what zoning districts those five projects were in. Mr. Dusick stated that National Grid had five such projects in Long Island and stated that four of them were located in industrial or commercial areas, with one being located in a residential district. Chairman Oster stated that the current proposal for Brunswick would be located in a residential suburban area, which none of the Long Island projects are, and that those Long Island projects did not involve transporting fuel tanks

through residential neighborhoods. Chairman Oster asked if the current project was the first project proposed to feature a transfer station in a residential area. Mr. Dusick stated that it was, but did note that the projects in Long Island had trucks coming from New York City. Chairman Oster asked whether National Grid trucks would be used for transportation. Mr. Dusick stated that they would not, and that trucks from a contracted carrier would be used. Member Henderson asked if that contracted carrier had a safety plan the Planning Board could have. Mr. Dusick stated that National Grid had not yet contracted a carrier for the project. Chairman Oster stated that the Planning Board's biggest concern was safety, that he was concerned about the project being proposed for a residential area, that the Planning Board needed to make sure all safety features were in place, and asked if there was an alternate location considered for the site, even in the Town of Brunswick, that was more rural. Mr. Dusick discussed the safety issues concerning the transfer station and stated that there was a safety process group within National Grid that analyzed every project site. Chairman Oster asked if the gas line was located in an electric corridor near power lines. Mr. Dusick confirmed that it was. Member Tarbox asked if a distribution main along NYS Route 7 was part of this system, and reiterated Mr. Henderson's request that National Grid supply the Planning Board with a map of the pipeline through Brunswick. Mr. Dusick stated that he would review that request with National Grid, as National Grid limited what information it gave out due to safety and security concerns. Member Henderson repeated Chairman Oster's earlier question, asking if alternate sites had been considered for this project and if they had been, what site or sites were specifically considered. Mr. Dusick stated that he would review that information with National Grid as well. Member Stancliffe stated that the amount of impervious surface on the site proposed to be impacted, specifically for trucks, seemed excessive, and asked if the project would be completed in phases. Ms. Philips stated that the project would not be phased, and that the area

of impervious surface was needed under engineering analysis for efficient truck circulation on the site. Mr. Bonesteel stated that analysis of impervious area on the project site would be part of the overall stormwater analysis of the project. Chairman Oster asked if there had been community outreach done before the project had been submitted to the Planning Board. Ms. Phillips confirmed that there had been and that it had been well attended. Chairman Oster asked where the community outreach had been held. Ms. Phillips stated that it had been held at the Brunswick Community Center and that it had been a National Grid sponsored event. Chairman Oster asked how community members were informed of the event. Ms. Phillips stated that flyers had been mailed out by National Grid. Several members of the Planning Board noted that they were unaware of the community outreach. Chairman Oster stated that it was not a public hearing, but asked the members of the public in attendance if they had attended or were aware of the community outreach, and most members of the public present stated that they were not aware of it. Ms. Phillips stated that National Grid would be willing to give a full presentation of the project at a future Planning Board meeting before a public hearing was held. Chairman Oster stated that he would discuss the matter with the new Planning Board attorney and follow up with the applicant. Mr. Bonesteel stated that he had received the SWPPP the previous day, at the same time as the Planning Board, and that he had started his review of the project. Chairman Oster stated that the project would be adjourned for now as the Planning Board and Mr. Bonesteel needed time to review the submitted materials. This matter was placed on the December 4, 2025 agenda for further deliberation.

The Planning Board discussed one item of new business.

The one item of new business was a site plan application submitted by Kyle Smith for property located at 1691 NYS Route 7, specifically at the corner of NYS Route 7 and Deepkill Road. Kyle Smith was present to review the application. Mr. Smith stated that the previous owner

of the property had gotten Planning Board approval for a two-story building on the site, which was a revision to a one-story building previously on the site, but that the previous owner had only built the foundation for the two-story building. Mr. Smith stated that he had purchased the property and was seeking to finish construction on the site. Mr. Smith stated that he was specifically seeking to build a small office building for a construction contractor, and had a tenant already lined up for it. Mr. Smith also stated that there would be no exterior storage, except possibly one small trailer, and that no heavy equipment or materials would be brought to the site. Member Tarbox asked about parking on the site. Mr. Smith stated that only the tenant would be parking on the site. Mr. Mainello stated that the project site was located in a Business Light Overlay zoning district, which required a 40,000 square foot lot, 75 feet of frontage on a public road, 25-foot side setbacks, and a 50-foot rear setback, none of which the current proposal would meet, meaning that the applicant would be require variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals before the Planning Board could take any action. Member Tarbox asked how the Planning Board approved the project for the previous owner if multiple variances were required from the Zoning Board. Mr. Mainello stated that the previous structure on the lot was an existing nonconforming structure and that the previous owner was allowed under the Town Zoning Code to demolish it and build a new structure in its place, but that he had one year to complete the project, which had passed, and that current Town zoning requirements applied to the current proposal. Member Tarbox noted that if the applicant merged the parcel containing the project site with the adjacent parcel, which the applicant also owned, that some variances currently required from the Zoning Board would no longer be necessary. Mr. Smith stated that he was not planning to merge to the two parcels. Chairman Oster stated that the Planning Board could not act at this time, and advised that the applicant meet with the Building Department to confirm specifically what variances were needed. Attorney Gilchrist

confirmed that the Planning Board could not act at this time as the Board was not legally allowed to act on an application that was not in compliance with the Town Zoning Code.

There was no old business to discuss.

The index for the November 6, 2025 regular meeting is as follows:

1. O'Neill – special use permit (approved).
2. Herrington – waiver of subdivision (approved subject to conditions).
3. Paramount Building Group – major subdivision (November 20, 2025).
4. National Grid – site plan and special use permit (December 4, 2025).
5. Smith – site plan (adjourned without date).

The proposed agenda for the November 20, 2025 regular meeting is as follows:

1. Paramount Building Group – major subdivision.