

Planning Board

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

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD JANUARY 15, 2026

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

ALSO PRESENT were KEVIN MAINELLO, Brunswick Building Department, CHRIS LANGLOIS, 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.

Chairman Oster stated that at the Town Board's organizational meeting held on January 5, he had been appointed chairman of the Planning Board for another one-year term. Chairman Oster stated that Andrew Petersen would no longer be serving on the Planning Board and that John Mainello III had been appointed to the open seat on the Planning Board at the organizational meeting. Chairman Oster also stated that Chris Langlois, Esq. was the new Attorney to the Planning Board as of January 1, 2026.

The first item of business on the agenda was a public hearing concerning the applications for site plan and a special use permit submitted by Tranquility Bookshop, LLC for property located at 902 Hoosick Road. Andrew Gilchrist, Jeanne Gilchrist, and Jacob Keasbey, LLS, of Keasbey Land Surveying, were present to review the applications. Chairman Oster read the procedure for a

public hearing held by the Planning Board. Attorney Langlois 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 asked the applicants to briefly review the project for the public. Mr. Keasbey stated that the applicants were proposing to renovate the house on the property and convert it into a bookshop. Mr. Keasbey stated that the applicants were proposing changes to the parking on the site, as well as minor changes to the exterior to the house. Mr. Keasbey also stated that the only change to the applications since the last Planning Board meeting was that the one proposed handicap parking spot had been moved to the front of the building to allow for easier access to that handicap parking spot. Mr. Gilchrist confirmed that the proposal was to convert the existing house on the site into a retail bookstore, that the project site was in a Business Light zoning district, where retail is an allowable use, that the existing driveway in front of the house would be used and extended for the parking lot, and that the proposed parking was closer to and facing a commercial real estate office next door, so that headlights from cars would shine at the commercial building if customers were to stop by as the sun was setting, rather than at the residential house on the other side of the site. Mr. Gilchrist stated that the applicants planned to maintain the existing trees on the site and add some additional vegetation at the front of the site. Mr. Gilchrist reviewed the proposed handicapped parking and entrance to the building. Mr. Gilchrist stated that the bookshop would have limited hours, likely closed Sundays and Mondays, and likely be open 10:00-4:00 Tuesday through Saturday, with the possibility of staying open until 7:00 on Fridays. Mr. Gilchrist stated that a light was proposed to be installed on the corner of the existing house to shine on the parking lot during the winter months when it gets darker earlier. Mr. Gilchrist stated that the front walkway to the house would be re-done and that the existing garage would be

renovated to become part of the bookstore. Mr. Gilchrist stated that a special use permit was being sought due to the house on the site being greater than 2,000 square feet, and that there would be sign in front of the store which would be in compliance with the Town sign law. Chairman Oster opened the public hearing on the application. Susan Finn, of 900 Hoosick Road, stated that she lived next to the project site, and that she had reviewed the project plans with Mr. Gilchrist, including lighting, traffic, and the proposed renovations. Ms. Finn stated that the proposed bookstore was a good plan for the site if it was no longer going to be residential and that the bookstore would be good for the neighborhood. Jim Tkacik, of 387 Brunswick Road, agreed that a bookstore would be good for the neighborhood and that a small, locally-owned business in an existing structure was the type of business that should be promoted along Hoosick Road. Leanne Keough, of 911 Hoosick Road, stated that she lived across the street and a few houses down from the site, and asked how many parking spaces there would be. Mr. Keasbey stated that there would be eight regular parking spots and one handicap spot. Ms. Keough asked how long the renovations were planned to last. Mr. Gilchrist stated that the renovations would likely be 6-9 months depending on material availability, and that the hope was to open the bookstore in late summer or early fall. Ms. Keough asked if the applicant had already purchased the house. Mr. Gilchrist confirmed that that house had been purchased. Ms. Keough stated that traffic had been increasing steadily over the last few years along Hoosick Road, to the point that she had to wait several minutes to enter and exit her driveway, and that a bookstore would further increase traffic. Ms. Keough noted that the previous owner of the property had garage sales throughout the previous summer and that cars had illegally parked along Hoosick Road and on Wyman Lane to attend the garage sales. Ms. Keough stated that she was not concerned with a bookstore in the neighborhood, but that she was concerned with commercialization and more businesses along Hoosick Road in

general, specifically the number of gas stations. William Joyce, of 901 Hoosick Road and 13 Wyman Lane, stated that a bookstore was an interesting proposal for the site and examined the site map. Mr. Joyce stated that he had previously worked in construction, that the proposed parking area needed to be safe, and asked if a traffic study or lighting plan had been submitted. There were no further public comments on the application. There were no further questions or comments from the Planning Board members. The Planning Board discussed whether there was a need for an extended written comment period, and determined that there was not. Member Czornyj made a motion to close the public hearing, which was seconded by Member Tarbox. The motion was unanimously approved and the public hearing was closed.

The draft minutes of the December 18, 2025 regular meeting were reviewed. Upon motion of Member Tarbox, seconded by Member Stancliffe, the draft minutes of the December 18, 2025 regular meeting were unanimously approved without amendment.

The first item of business on the agenda was applications for site plan and a special use permit submitted by Tranquility Bookshop, LLC for property located at 902 Hoosick Road. Andrew Gilchrist, Jeanne Gilchrist, and Jacob Keasbey, LLS, of Keasbey Land Surveying, were present to review the application. Chairman Oster stated that the applications had been submitted to the Rensselaer County Bureau of Economic Development for review, and that the Town had received one response letter for each application. Chairman Oster stated that concerning the special use permit application, the Town had received a letter stating that the project will not have a major impact on County plans and that local consideration shall prevail. Chairman Oster also stated that concerning the site plan application, the Town had received a letter stating that the project will not have a major impact on County plans, but commented that the Planning Board should consider a walkway from the bookstore entrance to the sidewalk along Hoosick Road. Member Czornyj stated

that he lived near the project site on the other side of Hoosick Road, that cars parking along Hoosick Road and Wyman Lane to attend the garage sales at the house the previous summer was due to the previous owner having the garage open and not allowing any parking in front of the house, and that any issue with parking for those garage sales will not be occurring with the bookstore. Chairman Oster asked Mr. Bonesteel if all of his comments on the application at the last meeting on December 18 had been addressed. Mr. Bonesteel stated that zoning information, such as a table listing the zoning district and bulk requirements, had not been included on the site map. Mr. Gilchrist agreed that zoning information should be added to the site map, and noted that the house on the site, which was approximately 100 years old, complied with current Town zoning requirements. Mr. Gilchrist stated that the edge of the parking area was within 7 feet of the side lot line, which was not allowed under the Town site plan regulations, but that the site plan regulations also stated that if having the edge of the parking area be 7 feet or more from the side lot line would inhibit development, then the Planning Board had the discretion to allow it if the proposed use for the site remained consistent with the intent of that particular zoning district. Mr. Gilchrist stated that a few of the proposed parking spaces were within 7 feet of the side lot line due to the lot line being at an angle to Hoosick Road, and asked the Planning Board to consider allowing it. Chairman Oster asked if the applicants needed to apply for a waiver from the Zoning Board to address the issue of the edge of the parking lot being within 7 feet of the side lot line. Attorney Langlois confirmed that the Town site plan regulations allowed for the Planning Board to allow the edge of the parking to be within 7 feet of the side lot line, and that review by the Zoning Board on this issue was not necessary. Chairman Oster asked how close the closest part of the parking lot was to the side lot line. Mr. Keasbey stated that the closest point was approximately 3 feet from the side lot line. Chairman Oster asked how wide the driveway to the parking lot was,

and if it was possible for one car to enter the site as another car exited. Mr. Keasbey stated that the driveway would be 30 feet wide, with two 15-foot lanes for traffic. Chairman Oster asked if the applicant would consider the Rensselaer County Bureau of Economic Development's comment about installing a walkway from the bookstore entrance to the sidewalk along Hoosick Road. Mr. Gilchrist stated that a new walkway from the parking lot to the front entrance was already proposed, and that a second walkway at the front of the site would be excessive and difficult due to an existing septic tank and the location of a proposed sign at the front of the site. Mr. Gilchrist also noted that after parking in the parking lot, customers would be walking through the parking lot to the walkway to the front entrance, and anyone wishing to go from the public sidewalk to the walkway to the bookstore entrance could also use the parking lot area to do so, and that adding a second walkway in the same spot did not make sense conceptually. Chairman Oster asked if a walking area could be striped in the parking lot entrance area. Mr. Bonesteel stated that he did not believe there was enough room for two-way traffic and a walkway in the parking lot entrance area. Mr. Bonesteel also noted that a site plan should not be designed to direct pedestrians toward traffic, and therefore did not recommend striping or directing pedestrians at the entrance to the driveway. Member Czornyj asked if the County was requiring or suggesting a walkway from the house to the sidewalk along Hoosick Road. Chairman Oster stated that it was included in the response letter as something for the Planning Board to consider, not a requirement. Mr. Bonesteel noted that if the second walkway was not installed, it would result in more greenspace at the front of the site. Mr. Gilchrist noted that in all the times he had already been at the site, he saw very few people walking or running on the sidewalk along Hoosick Road. The Planning Board determined that it would not require a walkway from the existing house to the sidewalk along Hoosick Road. Member Tarbox stated that there had been a question at the public hearing about lighting on the site.

Chairman Oster asked if there had been any changes to the proposed lighting on the site. Mr. Gilchrist stated that there had been no changes, and that a wall-mounted light on the outside corner of the garage to light the parking lot was proposed. Mr. Gilchrist also stated that the proposed sign at the front of the site would not be illuminated, and that there would be lights on both sides of the sign pointing up at it, not shining outward. Mr. Gilchrist also stated that the lights for the sign would be turned off when the store closed. Member Mainello asked Mr. Gilchrist to repeat the operating hours for the bookstore. Mr. Gilchrist stated that the hours were not set, but that the store would likely be open 10:00-4:00, staying open until 6:00 or 7:00 on Fridays. Mr. Bonesteel noted that the proposed lighting was merely a safety issue for people going to the store from the parking lot and vice versa, and asked what types of lights were proposed. Mr. Gilchrist stated that he could provide information on the lighting before the next meeting. Chairman Oster noted that traffic had been brought up at the public hearing, and asked if a traffic study had been done and if one was required. Mr. Gilchrist stated that a traffic study of the site had not been done, that he did not believe one was required based on the zoning district and proposed use, and noted that there was a turn lane on Hoosick Road almost directly in front of the site, meaning that it was unlikely that there would be any traffic backups due to people trying to turn into the parking lot. Member Stancliffe noted that other than Fridays, the bookstore's operating hours would not be during rush hour traffic. Chairman Oster noted that even though the applicant had responded to comments made during the public hearing, the Planning Board would still require written responses. Mr. Gilchrist stated that he would provide written responses to those comments. Chairman Oster stated that he would like to see all changes made to the parking area added to the site map. Member Mainello asked if the bookstore would sell food or beverages. Mr. Gilchrist stated that no food or beverages would be sold, but that complementary tea and coffee would be offered. Kevin Mainello

discussed the setback requirement for the proposed sign, and Mr. Gilchrist stated that he would work with the Building Department on the location of and setbacks for the sign. This matter was placed on the February 5, 2026 agenda for further deliberation.

The second 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 at the last meeting on December 18, 2025, the Planning Board has discussed the applicant's written response to the draft Part 2 of the project's Environmental Assessment Form (EAF), which the Planning Board had discussed at its November 6 and November 20 meetings, and that based on that written response, the Planning Board had asked Mr. Bonesteel to redraft Part 2 of the EAF. Chairman Oster asked Mr. Bonesteel to review his redrafted Part 2 of the EAF. Mr. Bonesteel reviewed the redrafted Part 2 of the EAF, noting that he had made changes to two items identified as potentially having moderate-to-large environmental impacts. Mr. Bonesteel also stated that he had included an "Exhibit A" as an attachment to Part 3 of the EAF. Mr. Bonesteel stated that Section 1, Parts D and E, which concerned excavation on the site, specifically the amount of material being removed and the duration of time that the excavation would last, had been changed from moderate-to-large impact to no-to-small impact based on the excavation plan submitted by the applicant and additional correspondence with Mr. Ruane. Mr. Bonesteel stated that Section 8, Part D, which concerned the irreversible conversion of agricultural land to a non-agricultural use, had been changed from moderate-to-large impact to no-to-small impact based on correspondence with Mr. Ruane. Mr. Bonesteel stated that he had also drafted a Part 3 of the EAF, which is an evaluation of the magnitude of environmental impacts of the project, and a determination of significance. Mr.

Bonesteel stated that the Part 3 has a section on reasons supporting the determination, and that the “Exhibit A” included with Part 3 listed those reasons, and he reviewed that “Exhibit A.” Mr. Bonesteel reviewed the draft Part 3 of the EAF. Chairman Oster asked when the last time the site was used for agricultural purposes. Member Tarbox stated that he contacted a farming insurance agency and was told the site had not been used for agricultural purposes within the last 9 years. The Planning Board briefly discussed the agricultural history of the site. Mr. Bonesteel then finished reviewing Part 3 of the EAF, concluding with a recommendation that a negative declaration under SEQRA be made for the project. Member Henderson asked the applicant to confirm that the project was proposing to remove 400,000 cubic yards from the site. Mr. Bond confirmed that 400,000 cubic yards were proposed to be removed. Member Henderson asked how many truckloads it would take remove 400,000 yards of material. Mr. Bond stated that the traffic study submitted by the applicant proposed one year, one-and-a-half year, and two-year timelines for the project. Mr. Bond stated that 34 truckloads per day were proposed under the two-year timeline for the project. Member Henderson asked what the hours of operation for the site would be. Mr. Ruane stated that the operating hours would be 7:00-5:00 Monday through Friday and 8:00-5:00 on Saturdays. Member Czornyj asked what the truck route would be. Mr. Bond stated that the truck route had not yet been finalized, but that trucks would likely travel to and from the site via Spring Avenue. Member Czornyj asked if trucks would stay off Creek Road. Mr. Bond stated that trucks would likely stay off Creek Road. Mr. Ruane clarified that the plan was for trucks to leave the site via Spring Avenue, turn onto NYS Route 355, and merge on NYS Route 66. Member Henderson asked if there would be site clean-up every day. Mr. Ruane confirmed that there would be daily clean-up, and that the excavation plan submitted by the applicant detailed trucks routes in more detail. Chairman Oster asked if there were any more questions or comments

from the Planning Board. Attorney Langlois stated that the excavation plan should be added to “Exhibit A,” specifically to the list of documents reviewed in preparing Part 3 of the EAF. Mr. Bonesteel stated that the excavation plan would be added to that list in “Exhibit A.” Chairman Oster noted that the applicant had also drafted and submitted its own Parts 2-3 of the EAF. Mr. Ruane stated that the applicant had prepared its own Parts 2-3 in case Mr. Bonesteel did not prepare his, and that since it was almost exactly the same as the Parts 2-3 prepared by Mr. Bonesteel, the Parts 2-3 prepared by the applicant were not necessary and that the Parts 2-3 prepared by Mr. Bonesteel should be considered by the Planning Board. Attorney Langlois stated that since the project was a Type I action under SEQRA, the Planning Board was required to make one of two determinations: issue a negative declaration, meaning that the project would not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts, or issue a positive declaration, meaning that the project may result in one or more significant adverse environmental impacts, which would continue the SEQRA review process and require the submission of an Environmental Impact Statement by the applicant. Member Stancliffe noted two corrections on Exhibit A: on page 1, the Description of Action section, “water lien extension” should be “waterline extension”; and on page 3, the Impact on Land section, “will accomplished” should be “will be accomplished.” Mr. Bonesteel stated that he would make those two corrections, in addition to adding the excavation plan to the list of documents reviewed in preparing Part 3 of the EAF. There were no further comments or questions from the Planning Board. Chairman Oster made a motion to adopt a negative declaration on the project under SEQRA, which was seconded by Member Czornyj. Chairman Oster then asked if a motion for a negative declaration with conditions could be made. Mr. Bonesteel stated that conditional negative declarations were for unlisted actions under SEQRA only, which this project was not. Attorney Langlois agreed with Mr. Bonesteel, and stated that Chairman Oster’s motion

for a negative declaration was still before the Planning Board. Chairman Oster again asked if there were any further questions or comments from the Planning Board. Member Mainello stated that there was a large holding area on the site map for stormwater runoff, and asked if that area needed to be in place prior to the beginning of excavation. Mr. Bonesteel stated that the excavation plan stated that that holding area would be in place during the early phases of the project, and that that area would serve as a temporary sediment basin during excavation, then be converted into a permanent pond after construction was complete. Chairman Oster's motion for a negative declaration on the project under SEQRA was unanimously approved, and a negative declaration was adopted. Chairman Oster asked Mr. Bonesteel if the application was complete for the purpose of holding a public hearing, and Mr. Bonesteel confirmed that it was. A public hearing on this application was scheduled for February 5, 2026 at 7:00pm.

The third item of business on the agenda 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 turn-outs and a turnaround had been added to the site map, as requested by Mr. Bonesteel at the last meeting on December 18. Mr. Danskin stated that a private road maintenance agreement had been completed and submitted to the Town, that Attorney Langlois had reviewed and approved it, and that a note had been added to the site map concerning that private road maintenance agreement. Attorney Langlois confirmed that he had reviewed the private road maintenance agreement and that it was acceptable. Mr. Bonesteel stated that he wanted to review the NYS stormwater regulations for guidance on this type of stormwater disturbance. This matter was placed on the February 5, 2026 agenda for further deliberation.

The fourth item of business on the agenda was a waiver of subdivision application submitted by Karen DuJack for property located at 70 Town Office Road. Jacob Keasbey, LLS of

Keasbey Land Surveying was present to review the application. Mr. Keasbey stated that the applicant was seeking to subdivide a 9.68-acre lot into two new lots, that the applicant would keep the smaller of two new lots, which would be 3.68 acres, and sell the bigger of the two new lots, which would be 6.00 acres and would have the existing house on it. Mr. Keasbey also stated that it had been more than 7 years since the last subdivision on the site. Chairman Oster noted that a shed was proposed to be on the 3.68-acre lot and asked if that was still the case. Mr. Keasbey confirmed that the shed was proposed for the smaller of two new lots, but that it was a roll-off shed, not a permanent structure, that the applicant had previously used it as a run-in shed for horses, and that they would take down the shed if they decided to build on the parcel. Attorney Langlois noted that the issue was that if the subdivision were approved, the shed would be a secondary structure on a parcel without a primary structure, which was not allowed under the Town Zoning Code. Chairman Oster stated that if the subdivision were approved, the shed would need to be taken down or moved. Mr. Keasbey asked if the shed would need to be moved or taken down even though it was not a permanent structure without a foundation. Chairman Oster confirmed that it would still need to be moved or taken down. Kevin Mainello asked if the shed was 80 square feet or more, as it would qualify as an accessory structure if it was. Mr. Keasbey stated that he was unsure and would need to research the size of the shed. Chairman Oster stated that in the past, the Planning Board had approved waivers of subdivision with a condition that a secondary structure without a primary structure on the parcel be moved or taken down by a certain date after the approval. Attorney Langlois stated that determining the square footage of the shed was the most important item at this point. Mr. Keasbey stated that he had no problem with requiring any accessory structure over 80 square feet be moved within a certain period of time, since if the shed was less than 80 square feet, it would not qualify as an accessory structure. Member Stancliffe

made a motion for a negative declaration on the project under SEQRA, which was seconded by Member Henderson. The Planning Board voted unanimously to declare a negative declaration on the waiver of subdivision under SEQRA. Chairman Oster asked if there was a motion on the waiver of subdivision, and Member Czornyj asked what specific condition should be placed on a potential approval. Attorney Langlois stated that a condition on the approval could be that any accessory structure that was 80 square feet or greater on the 3.68-acre lot must be removed within one year or the applicant must apply for a building permit for the structure. Member Czornyj then made a motion to approve the waiver of subdivision subject to the stated condition. The Planning Board voted unanimously to approve the waiver of subdivision application subject to the stated condition.

The fifth item of business on the agenda was applications for site plan and a special use permit submitted by Kyle Smith for property located at 1691 NYS Route 7. Kyle Smith and Mark Danskin were present to review the application. Mr. Smith stated that he was last before the Planning Board at its November 6, 2025 meeting, where he had introduced the project. Mr. Smith stated that the previous owner of the site had gotten approval from the Planning Board to rebuild a two-story house on the site that had needed to be taken down after being hit and severely damaged by a car. Mr. Smith stated that the previous owner of the site had poured a foundation for the new house, but had done no more work on the site, that he had bought the property, and was looking to complete construction of that two-story house, which he would use for office space. Mr. Danskin reviewed the most recent site plat, clarifying that a one-story frame with a carport was proposed. Chairman Oster had a question about the right-of-way for the site. Mr. Danskin again reviewed the plat, specifically the property line and right-of-way for the site. Mr. Smith stated that he had gone before the Zoning Board of Appeals at its December 15, 2025 meeting and had been granted four area variances – two front setback variances, since the parcel is a corner lot, as well as one

variance for lot size, and one variance for house size – in connection with the project. Mr. Bonesteel asked where a NYS Department of Transportation (DOT) right-of-way was on the site. Mr. Danskin again reviewed the site plat and pointed out the DOT right-of-way. Kevin Mainello stated that Bill Bradley, from the Brunswick Water Department, raised an issue with wetlands on the site, noting that there was no issue with the house, as it would be grandfathered, but that the proposed carport could be an issue as it was a new structure that would be too close to the wetlands on the site. Mr. Danskin noted that the applicant was proposing to rebuild the house previously on the site exactly as it had been, that the foundation had been poured by the previous owner, and that the applicant was proposing to add the carport only to provide extra parking for the business using the office space. Mr. Bonesteel stated that he would like more time to review all the documents submitted by the applicant. This matter was placed on the February 5, 2026 agenda for further deliberation.

The Planning Board discussed one item of new business.

The one item of new business was a waiver of subdivision application submitted by Robert Monticup for property located at 19 Miller Lane. Robert Monticup was present to review the application. Kevin Mainello reviewed the application, stating that the applicant was proposing to subdivide 1.18 acres from his 19.5-acre parcel, which he intended to sell, and that the purchaser of the 1.18-acre parcel planned to build a house on it. Mr. Mainello stated that some additional information was required on the site map, which would be added before the next meeting. This matter was placed on the February 5, 2026 agenda for further deliberation.

Chairman Oster asked if there were any items of old business to discuss. Member Kreiger stated that an approved storage facility on Carroll's Grove Road had two trailers at the front of the site, each with a billboard on it, even though a condition on approving that site plan was that there

could be no outdoor storage. Chairman Oster noted that that was likely a Building Department issue, and Kevin Mainello stated that he would look into it.

The index for the January 15, 2026 regular meeting is as follows:

1. Tranquility Bookshop – site plan and special use permit (February 5, 2026).
2. Paramount Building Group – major subdivision (February 5, 2026).
3. Fischer – minor subdivision (February 5, 2026).
4. DuJack – waiver of subdivision (approved with condition).
5. K. Smith – site plan and special use permit (February 5, 2026).
6. Monticup – waiver of subdivision (February 5, 2026).

The proposed agenda for the February 5, 2026 regular meeting is as follows:

1. Paramount Building Group – major subdivision (public hearing to commence at 7:00pm)
2. Transquility Bookshop – site plan and special use permit.
3. Monticup – waiver of subdivision.
4. Fischer – minor subdivision.
5. K. Smith – site plan and special use permit.
6. National Grid – site plan and special use permit.