

Planning Board

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

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD DECEMBER 4, 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 draft minutes of the November 20, 2025 regular meeting were reviewed. Upon motion of Chairman Oster, seconded by Member Henderson, the draft minutes of the November 20, 2025 regular meeting were unanimously approved without amendment.

Chairman Oster noted that the third item of business on the agenda, the Colton Ridge major subdivision application submitted by Paramount Building Group of NY, had been tabled prior to the meeting at the request of the applicant.

Chairman Oster also noted that the sixth item of business on the agenda, an update on a previously-approved major subdivision application submitted by Jim Cillis, had also been tabled prior to the meeting at the request of the applicant.

The first item of business on the agenda was a waiver of subdivision application submitted by Dominick Maselli for property located at 689-691 and 693 Hoosick Road. Paul Engster, Esq. was present to review the application. Mr. Engster stated that the application was for a lot line adjustment, that the applicant previously owned both adjacent parcels, that the applicant had operated a deli on the 689-691 Hoosick Road parcel for many years, that the applicant had recently sold the parcel at 689-691 Hoosick Road, and that the applicant still owned the parcel at 693 Hoosick Road. Mr. Engster stated that as the parcel at 689-691 Hoosick Road was being surveyed in preparation to be sold, a discrepancy had been discovered showing that the description for the parcel at 689-691 Hoosick Road encroached seven feet onto the adjacent parcel at 693 Hoosick Road. Mr. Engster stated that the proposed lot line adjustment was to correct the lot line so that the seven-foot encroachment of the 689-691 parcel was transferred to the 693 Hoosick Road parcel, and that the lot line adjustment would confirm that the garage parking lot and pylon sign was located on the 693 Hoosick Road parcel. Chairman Oster agreed that the application was for a lot line adjustment and asked Mr. Bonesteel if he had any questions or comments on the application. Mr. Bonesteel stated that he did not. Member Stancliffe asked if there was any storage proposed for the gap between the two existing buildings on the adjacent parcels. Mr. Engster stated that no storage was proposed between the buildings. There were no further questions 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 stated that a condition to consider was requiring that a copy of the merger deed for 693 Hoosick Road be filed with the Brunswick Building Department. Chairman Oster made a motion to approve the waiver

of subdivision application subject to the stated condition, which was seconded by Member Henderson. The Planning Board voted unanimously to approve the waiver of subdivision application subject to the stated condition.

The second item of business on the agenda was a waiver of subdivision application submitted by David Mulinio for property located at 30 Stone Arabia Drive. Nick Costa, of Advance Engineering & Surveying, was present to review the application. Chairman Oster asked Mr. Mainello if he had researched the North Forty Planned Development District (PDD) in which the project site was located. Mr. Mainello stated that while he was not able to find the original PDD documents, he did discuss the project with Bill Bradley of the Brunswick Water Department, who was familiar with the project site and the map of the site, and that Mr. Bradley stated that the North Forty PDD conditions would not impact the current waiver of subdivision application. Mr. Costa reviewed the application for the Planning Board, stating that five lots had been approved as part of the PDD, that those five lots had been previously merged into one 2.30-acre parcel, and that the applicant was now proposing to subdivide that one parcel into two parcels of 0.82 acres and 1.48 acres. Mr. Costa also stated that the two proposed lots would meet all area and bulk requirements for the PDD. Chairman Oster asked if the two proposed lots would have public water and sewer, and Mr. Costa confirmed that they would. Chairman Oster asked if the five lots originally approved for the PDD had been in compliance with lots in a R-25 residential zoning district. Mr. Mainello confirmed that they had been. Chairman Oster asked Attorney Gilchrist if there were any legal issues concerning the site being part of a PDD, and he stated that he was not aware of any. Chairman Oster asked Mr. Bonesteel if he had any questions or comments, and he did not. There were no further questions from the Planning Board members. Member Tarbox made a motion for a negative declaration under SEQRA, which was seconded by Member Stancliffe. 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 stated that there were no conditions required here, which Mr. Bonesteel agreed with. Chairman Oster made a motion to approve the waiver of subdivision application, which was seconded by Member Henderson. The Planning Board voted unanimously to approve the waiver of subdivision application.

The third item of business on the agenda was the Colton Ridge major subdivision application submitted by Paramount Building Group of NY. Chairman Oster reiterated that this application had been tabled prior to the meeting at the request of the applicant. This matter is placed on the December 18, 2025 agenda.

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 since the applicant was last before the Planning Board on November 6, the applicant had received comments from Mr. Bonesteel concerning the application documents, the project's stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP), and supplemental materials, which the applicant was reviewing, and that the applicant would respond to Mr. Bonesteel's comments in writing. Ms. Phillips stated that there was a discrepancy in the application documents that she wanted to correct: the Full Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) stated that the area of disturbance was 14.3 acres while the SWPPP stated that it was 10.9 acres, that the accurate area of disturbance was 10.9 acres, and that the Full EAF would be resubmitted to correct that. Ms. Phillips stated that National Grid had scheduled additional public information sessions since the November 6 meeting, noting that one virtual session had been held online on December 3, which was well attended by the public, and that an

in-person session was scheduled for December 9 at 6:00pm at the Brunswick Community Center. Chairman Oster stated for the record that the public information sessions were being held by National Grid, not the Planning Board, that they were not public hearings, and that a public hearing would be held in the future on this project, which would be noticed. Chairman Oster asked how well attended the December 3 virtual public information session was. Ms. Phillips stated that about two dozen attendees were recorded. Chairman Oster asked if any new comments or questions had been raised at the December 3 virtual session. Ms. Phillips stated that the need for the project, project safety, the types of trucks to be used, truck traffic, and fire detection were discussed at the virtual session. Ms. Phillips stated that good questions were asked at the virtual session, that the public was looking for more information brought up at previous Planning Board meetings, and that National Grid had created a depository for project records. Ms. Phillips also stated that National Grid had prepared and submitted a public safety plan for the project earlier that day. Chairman Oster stated that the Planning Board had issues previously with applicants proposing cell towers where studies were done and applicants had agreed to a certain height of a cell tower, only to have that applicant return later stating that federal regulations allowed them to request additional height for that cell tower and that the Planning Board was prohibited from denying that request. Chairman Oster asked if the applicant had any plans to expand the project site in the future, and if the applicant would even be able to. Ms. Phillips stated that the project proposed a concrete pad to be built that was designed to store exactly 26 trucks and could not be expanded. Chairman Oster asked if the project site could be expanded in the future if the applicant purchased land from an adjacent parcel, and stated that a condition on the project could be that the applicant would need to come back before the Planning Board for any modifications to the site. Ms. Phillips stated that any potential future modification to the site requiring Planning Board review was a reasonable

condition. Peter Metzdorff, Director of Gas System Strategic Planning for National Grid, then reviewed the project's site design, reiterating that the site was specifically designed for 26 trucks and the amount of gas that could be held by 26 trucks. Mr. Metzdorff stated that the amount of fuel proposed to be held on the site was the standard amount held at similar sites elsewhere in New York State and that the applicant could not safely expand the site or increase the amount of proposed fuel. Member Henderson asked what trucking company would transport fuel to the site. Mr. Metzdorff stated that a trucking company had not yet been hired, that a number of vendors were expected to respond to the Request for Proposal (RFP), but that the applicant did know what type of truck would be used. Member Henderson stated that he wanted to see the safety record of the trucking company that was ultimately selected and a safety plan from the company. Ms. Phillips stated that the public safety plan submitted earlier that day included information on trucking safety requirements, which the applicant would adhere to, and that the Planning Board could include as a condition that the applicant must submit a specific trucking vendor safety plan. Mr. Bonesteel stated that the applicant would not put out an RFP until the site plan and special use permit had been completed. Member Henderson asked the applicant what other sites for the project had been considered. Mr. Metzdorff stated that more than 30 sites were reviewed before the current project site was selected, including sites that National Grid did not own and that the owners of those properties may not have known that their properties were being analyzed as some of those 30+ properties were removed from consideration early in the selection process for various reasons. Mr. Metzdorff also stated that the project site follows an existing gas transmission line and that sites were analyzed that were within 1,000 feet of existing gas transmission lines due to cost and effectiveness. Member Henderson asked if that existing gas transmission line followed an electric transmission corridor. Mr. Metzdorff stated that the gas line was partly in the electric transmission

corridor, but that many areas of the line were outside the electric corridor as well. Member Stancliffe asked the applicant to describe the process of how trucks would be connected to the system and activated. Mr. Metzdorff stated that all 26 trucks would be hooked up to the system and that fuel would be drawn from all 26 trucks simultaneously, and that it would take 4 hours to fill all 26 trucks and 4 hours to draw from and empty all 26 trucks. Member Stancliffe asked if trucks would be replaced only when all 26 trucks were empty, and Mr. Metzdorff confirmed that was correct. Mr. Metzdorff stated that the site would only be in use from December 15 to March 15 and only for either extreme weather events or “upstream issues” at other National Grid fuel sites. Chairman Oster asked if there would be people on-site when the site was operational. Mr. Metzdorff stated that there would be employees on-site all 90 days that the site was operational. Mr. Bonesteel asked how many people would be on-site during those 90 days. Mr. Metzdorff stated that at least three National Grid employees would be there, plus vendors when trucks were brought to and from the site. Member Henderson stated that since it took 4 hours to fill all 26 trucks and 4 hours to empty all 26 trucks, it was possible that the 26 trucks could be brought to the site in the morning and replaced that same day, meaning that 52 trucks could be brought to the site in one day. Mr. Metzdorff stated that that was highly unlikely, but confirmed it was possible. Chairman Oster asked if personnel would be on-site 24 hours a day when the site was operational, and Mr. Metzdorff confirmed that there would be. Member Henderson asked if the valves to all 26 trucks would be open at all times when the site was in operation due to fuel being drawn from all 26 trucks simultaneously, and Mr. Metzdorff confirmed that they would be. Member Henderson asked if there could be a cascade effect where a problem with one valve caused a problem with the valves to the 25 other trucks on the site. Mr. Metzdorff stated that the system was designed to isolate any trucks with technical problems and that if that were to happen, the system could run with 25 trucks

in operation and one truck isolated. Member Henderson asked if the valves for the trucks were automated. Mr. Metzdorff stated that the valves were automated and could be simultaneously shut down from a control area, but could also be operated manually. Member Tarbox asked how often the system would have been used last year. Mr. Metzdorff stated that the system would have been used zero times as it never got to the threshold temperature of -5 degrees Fahrenheit and stayed there for 24 hours, meaning that had the project existed last winter, the trucks would have been filled on December 15 and emptied on March 15. Member Henderson asked how many times other facilities like this one had been operated in New York. Mr. Metzdorff stated that there was one other facility like the one being proposed in Upstate New York and five such facilities on Long Island, and that none of them have ever been used for extreme weather events, only for testing and maintenance. Member Tarbox asked if the site could be used in emergencies outside the 90-day period of December 15 to March 15. Mr. Metzdorff stated that outside of the winter months, it would not be cold enough to justify activating this site and that in case of an emergency outside of the winter months, other sites would be used. Chairman Oster asked if the other project site in Upstate New York was currently operational. Mr. Metzdorff stated that the other site had the same period of operation as the currently proposed site, so it would not be in operation until December 15. Chairman Oster asked if the other Upstate New York site was in operation last winter, and Mr. Metzdorff confirmed that it was. Chairman Oster asked Mr. Bonesteel if he had any questions or comments. Mr. Bonesteel stated that all of his comments were in his comment letter to the applicant. Chairman Oster asked about the project's SEQRA lead agency coordination. Attorney Gilchrist stated that that process had not started and asked if the Planning Board wanted to be lead agency for this action. Ms. Phillips stated that the applicant requested that the Planning Board commence the lead agency coordination process. The Planning Board members determined that

they wanted to be lead agency under SEQRA for this application. Chairman Oster made a motion to declare the Planning Board lead agency under SEQRA for this application, which was seconded by Member Tarbox. The Planning Board voted unanimously to declare itself lead agency under SEQRA for this process. Attorney Gilchrist stated that he would draft and circulate a lead agency coordination notice to all involved and interested agencies for this project. This matter is placed on the December 18, 2025 agenda for further deliberation.

The fifth item of business on the agenda was a waiver of subdivision application submitted by Sean Gallivan for property located on Deepkill Road. Jacob Keasbey, LLS, of Keasbey Land Surveying, was present to review the application. Member Stancliffe recused herself. Mr. Keasbey stated that the application was for a lot line adjustment on a previously-approved subdivision, that the project site was on the west side of Deepkill Road, and that the applicant was seeking the lot line adjustment to allow for enough area for the installation of driveways on two of the lots on the site. Mr. Mainello asked what the length of the proposed driveways was. Mr. Keasbey stated that he was not certain, but that the driveways had been approved as part of the prior subdivision application and that the lengths and widths of the driveways would be addressed during the permitting process for the driveways. Mr. Bonesteel asked if permits had already been obtained for the driveways on the site. Mr. Keasbey stated that permits had been obtained for one lot on the site, but not the two lots that were part of this application. 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 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 Attorney Gilchrist and Mr. Bonesteel advised that there should not be. Member Henderson made a motion to approve the

special use permit application, which was seconded by Member Kreiger. The Planning Board voted unanimously to approve the waiver of subdivision application.

Member Stancliffe returned to the meeting.

The sixth item of business on the agenda was an update on a previously-approved major subdivision application submitted by Jim Cillis. Chairman Oster reiterated that this application had been tabled prior to the meeting at the request of the applicant.

The Planning Board discussed two items of new business.

The first item of new business was a minor subdivision application submitted by Rebecca Fischer for property located at 842 Tamarac Road. Mark Danskin was present to review the application. Mr. Danskin stated that the project site was approximately 82 acres of heavily wooded land on Tamarac Road north of Indian Creek Road, and that the applicant was proposing three new lots, two building lots and one agricultural lot. Mr. Danskin stated that the site had 60 feet of frontage on Tamarac Road, that each of the three proposed lots would have 20 feet of frontage on Tamarac Road, and that the three lots would share a common driveway. Member Henderson asked how long the shared driveway would be. Mr. Danskin stated that it would be approximately 3,600 feet long. Chairman Oster asked if the driveway would be dedicated to the Town, and Mr. Danskin stated that it would not be. Chairman Oster asked if the driveway would be paved. Mr. Danskin stated that the driveway would be a gravel driveway. Mr. Danskin stated that the three lots would have a private shared driveway maintenance agreement, which was currently being drafted, with a permanent access easement with 20 feet of fee-owned frontage on Tamarac Road. Mr. Bonesteel discussed the private road maintenance agreement and plat requirements to show the road and turn-outs. This matter is placed on the December 18, 2025 agenda for further deliberation.

The second item of new business was amendments to previously-approved site plan and special use permit applications submitted by AT&T for property located at 227 Bald Mountain Road and 88-90 Palitisch Road. No one was present to review the application. Mr. Mainello stated that the application was for upgrades to two existing cell towers, that new equipment was proposed to be installed on the towers, and that no changes to the heights of the towers was proposed. Mr. Mainello also stated that there was a 60 period in which to act, 30 days to determine completeness of the application and 30 days to act on the application. Mr. Mainello noted that the Town Building Department had requested additional information, but had not yet received a response from the applicant. This matter is tentatively placed on the December 18, 2025 agenda for further deliberation.

The index for the December 4, 2025 regular meeting is as follows:

1. Maselli – waiver of subdivision (approved with condition).
2. Mulinio – waiver of subdivision (approved).
3. National Grid – site plan and special use permit (December 18, 2025).
4. Gallivan – waiver of subdivision (approved).
5. Fischer – minor subdivision (December 18, 2025).
6. AT&T – amendment to site plan and special use permit (December 18, 2025).

The proposed agenda for the December 18, 2025 regular meeting is as follows:

1. Paramount Building Group – major subdivision.
2. National Grid – site plan and special use permit.
3. Fischer – minor subdivision.
4. AT&T – amendment to site plan and special use permit.
5. Tranquility Bookshop – site plan and special use permit.