

Planning Board

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

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD FEBRUARY 19, 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, CHRISTOPHER 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.

The draft minutes of the February 5, 2026 regular meeting were reviewed. Upon motion of Chairman Oster, seconded by Member Czornyj, the draft minutes of the February 5, 2026 regular meeting were unanimously approved without amendment.

The first 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 a public hearing on the project had been held at the last meeting on February 5, that the public hearing had been closed at that meeting, that a seven-day written comment period had been established at the February 5 meeting, and that that seven-day written comment period had ended on February 12. Chairman

Oster stated that the Planning Board had received a letter from the applicant responding to comments from both the public hearing and comments received during the written comment period, and asked Mr. Ruane to review that letter. Mr. Ruane stated that several comments were made at the public hearing concerning traffic and stated that Creighton Manning Engineering had done a traffic study of the site, studying existing roads and potential excavation periods of one, one and a half, and two years. Mr. Ruane stated that Creighton Manning concluded in that traffic study that there would be no impacts to either of two potential traffic routes used by trucks: leaving the site by going north on Creek Road, and leaving the site by going south on Creek Road and turning onto Spring Avenue. Mr. Ruane stated that several comments were also received concerning the project's excavation timeline, and stated that an excavation plan had been submitted and that "best management practices" would be followed for excavation. Mr. Ruane stated that comments had also been received concerning noise issues and blasting, and stated that no blasting was proposed and that acoustic analysis of the project had been done by Hart Engineering and incorporated into the excavation plan. Mr. Ruane stated that comments had also been received concerning dust kicked up into the air by excavation, and stated that water trucks would be driven on on-site roads and surrounding roads for the duration of excavation. Mr. Ruane stated that comments had also been received concerning groundwater, specifically hazards to wells on surrounding properties, and stated that 56 test pits were dug across the site during the planning process and that those test pits showed that there would be no impacts to groundwater at all. Chairman Oster asked if there were natural springs on the site, and Mr. Ruane stated that there were not. Mr. Ruane stated that comments had also been received concerning wetlands on the site, and stated that the delineation of wetlands on the site had been sent to NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) and that the project was purposefully staying away from both

the wetlands and the wetlands buffer. Mr. Ruane stated that comments had also been received concerning sediment and erosion control, and stated that sediment and erosion control was discussed at length in both the stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) and excavation plan. Mr. Ruane stated that comments had also been received concerning community character, and stated that there was another subdivision close nearby. Mr. Ruane stated that comments had also been received concerning property values, and stated that there was no evidence that property values would be affected by surrounding properties being near a subdivision. Mr. Ruane stated that perhaps the most comments received concerned mining, and stated that mining had been heavily discussed from the start of the project's development, that NYS DEC has mining exemptions for certain construction projects, but that DEC does not make determinations on mining exemptions until local approvals are granted. Chairman Oster asked to confirm that the applicant had an on-site meeting with a representative from DEC. Mr. Bonesteel confirmed that the applicant had met with DEC, that he was also present at that meeting, and confirmed that the DEC representative stated that mining exemptions are not given until local approvals are granted. Mr. Ruane stated that the on-site meeting took place earlier in 2025. Attorney Langlois asked what the DEC review of the project for the mining exemption would entail if the Planning Board approved the project. Mr. Ruane reviewed what DEC's review of the project would look like, and stated that DEC review would continue throughout the construction process, as DEC wanted to ensure that the project was completed and did not end partly or completely after excavation and before construction of the subdivision. Chairman Oster asked when the two-year time period would begin, whether at the potential approval of the project or the start of construction. Mr. Bonesteel stated that the two-year period would start at the start of construction. Chairman Oster asked what would happen if there were delays in the start of construction, such as until August,

after the project was approved. Mr. Bonesteel stated that in that case, the two-year time period would also be delayed. Member Henderson asked when a trucking company would be hired to move the material from the site. Mr. Bond stated that preliminary discussions with contractors were ongoing, but that a contractor would not be selected until the project was approved. Mr. Ruane stated that the potential one, one-and-a-half, and two-year timelines for moving the material had been determined after talking with contractors about how long it would take to move the material. Mr. Ruane asked why Chairman Oster was concerned about construction in August specifically. Chairman Oster stated that trucks traveling north on Creek Road in August would absolutely be an issue. Member Czornyj noted that at a previous meeting, the applicant stated that trucks traveling north along Creek Road was not being proposed. Mr. Bond clarified that trucks traveling north along Creek Road was not a preferred option. Member Czornyj asked for clarification, asking if the applicant was now denying that trucks traveling north along Creek Road was not an option. Mr. Bond reiterated that trucks traveling north along Creek Road was not a preferred option, but was not going to be prohibited as an option. Chairman Oster asked if prohibiting traveling north along Creek Road could be included in bids to potential trucking contractors. Mr. Ruane stated that the applicant was not against that condition, but that he was not sure what the language for the type of condition would look like. Member Czornyj stated that the applicant should reach out to Rensselaer County about the trucking routes as Creek Road is a County road. Mr. Bonesteel agreed and stated that the applicant should reach out to Rensselaer County sooner rather than later. Member Henderson asked how the project who mitigate excessive noise, and Mr. Bond reviewed the acoustic and noise plan. Member Henderson asked how much material was proposed to be removed from the site. Mr. Ruane stated that between 420,000 and 425,000 cubic yards of material was proposed to be removed, as stated in the project's excavation

plan. Member Henderson asked how much material would be removed per truck. Mr. Bond stated that about 20 cubic yards would be removed in each truck. Member Henderson stated that based on approximately 20 cubic yards being removed per truck, if approximately 20,000 truckloads were proposed to remove all the material from the site, and Mr. Bond confirmed that was correct. Member Henderson expressed disbelief that the applicant was proposing 20,000 truck trips over a one, one-and-a-half, or two-year period. Mr. Ruane noted that the Planning Board and Mr. Bonesteel agreed that it would not cause serious impacts due to declaring a Negative Declaration on the project under SEQRA. Attorney Langlois stated that the applicant had mentioned multiple times that project timelines of one, one-and-a-half, and two years had been proposed, and asked the applicant to confirm which timeline was being aimed for. Mr. Ruane stated that the applicant would like to complete excavation in as close to one year as possible. Attorney Langlois asked if a one-year excavation timeline was being sought, and Mr. Ruane confirmed that it was. Member Henderson asked if it was correct that 18 trucks leaving the site per hour would be proposed for the one-year excavation period, and Mr. Ruane confirmed that was correct. Chairman Oster asked if that many trucks entering and exiting the site could cause a stacking issue, and if there was a proposed staging area for trucks. Mr. Ruane discussed truck traffic flow through the site during a one-year excavation window. Attorney Langlois stated that the specifics of traffic flow through the site could be a condition on the application, but asked how that would be monitored and enforced. Member Mainello asked if the road proposed to be constructed through the site would be built at once at the end of excavation, or if it would be built out in phases. Mr. Bond stated that the road would be built in phases. Member Mainello asked if construction on houses on the site would begin before excavation ended. Mr. Bond stated that utilities and fire hydrants would be installed through the site before excavation was complete. Member Mainello stated that it was then

possible that construction could begin on houses before excavation was complete. Mr. Bond stated that it was unfeasible to begin construction on houses during excavation, but did not confirm it would not happen. Member Czornyj asked if the applicant had been asked about extending the watermain for surrounding properties. Mr. Bond stated that the subject had been briefly explored with the applicant, and that the applicant did not feel that there would be a great demand for it. Member Czornyj suggested that the watermain could still be extended for potential neighbors that wanted to connect to public water in the future. Chairman Oster stated that at the public hearing, there were multiple comments made about potential contamination of wells due to the project. Mr. Bond noted that all 18 residential lots proposed for the project would have public water, not drawing water from the ground, and that there would be effects to wells on neighboring properties. Member Stancliffe asked if two houses to the south of the project site received public water. Mr. Bond noted that the watermain extended to those two properties, but that he was not certain if those properties connected to the watermain. Member Stancliffe asked if a well survey would help alleviate fears about effects to wells on neighboring properties. Mr. Bonesteel stated that knowing where the water table was would be more important and that the applicant was not proposing to go deep enough to disturb the water table. Mr. Bonesteel also stated that well surveys are typically done when blasting is done, and that blasting was not proposed here. Member Tarbox asked how big the houses on the site would be. Mr. Bond stated that he was not certain, but that the houses would all be within Town zoning regulations. Member Tarbox asked if Paramount Building Group would be constructing the houses. Mr. Bond confirmed that Paramount would be building the houses. Member Tarbox asked how deep the test pits dug on the site were and what equipment was used. Mr. Bond discussed the test pits, stating that a large excavator was used. Member Tarbox noted that the applicant providing bonding for the project if it were not completed for any reason

was brought up at the public hearing, and asked if the applicant had considered that. Attorney Langlois clarified that such a bond would be a reclamation bond, that the establishment of such a bond would likely be a condition on the application, and that he, the Planning Board, and the applicant needed to discuss the amount for such a bond. Member Stancliffe discussed the grading plan for Lots 13-15 and asked if those lots would be the location of the infiltration basin. Mr. Bond confirmed that it would be. Member Stancliffe noted that there were steep slopes on some lots and asked if the plans could be at all modified to address those slopes. Mr. Bond stated that if the plans for Lots 13-15 were changed to mitigate the slopes, then the slopes elsewhere on the site would become steeper. Member Stancliffe asked if additional vegetation could be planted on those lots. Mr. Bond stated that additional vegetation on those lots would be difficult to maintain. Member Stancliffe asked about utility lines on the site. Mr. Bond reviewed the proposed utility lines. Member Mainello asked if the utility lines would be above or below ground. Mr. Bond stated that below-ground utility lines were being proposed. Chairman Oster stated that the Town received a letter from NYS DEC dated February 17, 2026, and a follow-up email earlier that day, stating that there were jurisdictional issues with the project and requesting a meeting with the Town, which was being set up. Mr. Ruane stated that he was aware of the letter and potential jurisdictional issues, and that the applicant had sent to project's excavation plan to DEC. Attorney Langlois stated that the Planning Board was required to act on the application within 45 days of the closing of the public hearing, that 45 days after the public hearing was both opened and closed at the February 5 meeting was March 22, and that the Planning Board could approve the project, approve the project with conditions, or deny the project. Attorney Langlois stated that the DEC letter may affect the timeline of the project, but he was not sure. Attorney Langlois stated that the timeframe for the Planning Board to make a decision could be extended by mutual agreement of the Planning

Board and applicant, and noted that conditions on the project would take time to draft and finalize. Mr. Ruane stated that he was not opposed to extending the timeline, and would discuss that issue with the applicant. Chairman Oster asked if the 45-day period to make a decision started when the public hearing was closed, or when the written comment period ended. Attorney Langlois stated that NYS regulations stated that the 45-day period began at the close of the public hearing. This matter was placed on the March 5, 2026 agenda for further deliberation.

The second item of business on the agenda was a minor subdivision application submitted by Rebecca Fischer for property located at 842 Tamarac Road. Paul Engster was present to review the application. Mr. Engster stated that the project's SWPPP had been submitted since the last meeting, that the project's erosion and sediment control plan had been submitted earlier that day, and that a private road maintenance agreement had been previously submitted, reviewed, and approved by Attorney Langlois. Attorney Langlois confirmed that he had reviewed and approved of the private road maintenance agreement. Chairman Oster asked Mr. Bonesteel about the project's SWPPP. Mr. Bonesteel stated that he was still reviewing the SWPPP, but confirmed that it and the other application documents were complete for the purpose of holding a public hearing. A public hearing on this application was scheduled for March 19, 2026 at 7:00pm.

The third item of business on the agenda was applications for amendments to two previously-approved site plan and special use permits submitted by AT&T for property located at 227 Bald Mountain Road and 88-90 Palitsch Road. Martha Grady was present to review the applications on behalf of AT&T. Ms. Grady stated that the applicant was seeking revisions to two cell towers. Ms. Grady stated that the applicant was proposing to replace some equipment on both towers. Chairman Oster asked if the applicant was proposing a height extension to either tower. Ms. Grady stated that no height extension was proposed for either tower. Chairman Oster asked if

any additional equipment was proposed to be added to the concrete pad at the base of either tower, and Ms. Grady stated that there was not. Chairman Oster asked why the equipment needed to be replaced. Ms. Grady stated that the existing equipment was outdated and needed to be replaced. Ms. Grady also stated that structural analysis reports for each tower had been submitted. Mr. Bonesteel asked if the applicant was proposing to replace the sectorized panels on the tower with another type of panel. Ms. Grady stated that no new panels were proposed, and that the tower would look the same as it does now. Ms. Grady stated that the tower on Palitsch Road would soon have three new tenants, so three new antennas were proposed to be added to the tower, one on each sector of the tower, and clarified that the new antennas would not add any height to the tower. Mr. Bonesteel had no further questions on the application. A public hearing on these applications was scheduled for March 19, 2026 at 7:15pm.

The fourth item of business on the agenda was a major subdivision application submitted by Jim Cillis for property located on Cole Lane. Aaron Vera, P.E., of Verity Engineering, D.P.C., was present to review the application. Mr. Vera stated that the project site was an approximately 16.2-acre parcel in an R-25 residential zoning district, and 15 lots were proposed, with 14 lots being single-family homes and the remainder lot would be a stormwater management lot. Mr. Vera stated that an approximately 1,600-foot-long, “teardrop shaped” road through the site was proposed, with a cul-de-sac, which would be dedicated to the Town upon completion. Mr. Vera stated that public water was proposed for the lots, that municipal water was available along Cole Lane, that the applicant was proposing to extend a dead-end waterline with hydrants to do so, but that each lot would have a private septic system. Mr. Vera stated that the applicant was proposing a Homeowners Association (HOA) for the subdivision in order to maintain the stormwater practices on the subdivision. Mr. Vera stated that the project would disturb approximately 11.3

acres of the approximately 16.2-acre parcel. Mr. Vera stated that a New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) review had been done and submitted to the Town. Mr. Vera stated that revisions were required on the project's SWPPP due to new NYS DEC stormwater regulations, and that the applicant was currently in the process of making those revisions. Mr. Vera stated that there were stormwater issues on only one proposed lot, and that a small individual stormwater practice for that one lot, such as a retention area or rain garden, was proposed. Mr. Vera stated that wetlands on the site had been flagged and DEC had been informed about them, and DEC could take jurisdiction of the project site due to the wetlands, but this was not anticipated. Chairman Oster stated that during a previous site visit, concerns about erosion on the other side of Cole Lane had been raised. Mr. Bonesteel stated that Bill Bradley, of the Town Water Department, was already reviewing that issue, and that he would as well. Member Mainello asked who was responsible for stormwater maintenance. Mr. Vera stated that all stormwater maintenance and management would be the responsibility of the HOA. Mr. Bonesteel confirmed the HOA was responsible, unless a Drainage District was established, in which case stormwater management of the site would be the responsibility of the Town, though that still needed to be discussed. Mr. Vera stated that the project's SEQRA process was not completed, but that the applicant was hoping to have the project's Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) submitted before the next meeting. Attorney Langlois clarified that the EAF should be submitted well before the meeting, rather than shortly before, to ensure the Planning Board had proper time to review it. Member Stancliffe asked if the project's water engineering report had been updated. Mr. Vera stated that he did not believe so and would review that report. Member Mainello asked what size the houses on the subdivision would be. Mr. Vera stated that he was not certain, but likely around 2,500 square feet. Member Mainello asked if material would be removed from the site. Mr. Vera confirmed that some material

would be removed, that he was not sure how much material was proposed to be removed, and that the amount of material moved would be significantly less than the previous Paramount Group project. Attorney Langlois noted that the amount of material proposed to be removed would be included in the EAF. This matter was placed on the March 5, 2026 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 Richard Valverde for property located at 721 Hoosick Road. Robert Roles, P.E., of BL Companies, was present to review the application. Mr. Roles stated that the project site was zoned commercial, with residential parcels abutting the site, that the site was 0.65 acres, and that the site had 200 feet of frontage on Hoosick Road. Mr. Roles stated that the applicant was proposing to demolish the approximately 1,700-square-foot existing building on the site and construct a new building of approximately 6,000 square feet, which would be a Mavis Tire Supply store. Mr. Roles stated that approximately 12,000 square feet of pavement with a concrete walkup and a three-foot retaining wall at the front of the site were proposed. Mr. Roles stated that the entrance to the site would be from Mohawk Avenue. Mr. Roles stated that the applicant was also proposing to widen Mohawk Avenue by four feet to accommodate school bus turning. Chairman Oster asked if the entrance to the site was directly across from the entrance to the QuickChek convenience store on the other side of Mohawk Avenue. Mr. Roles stated that it was almost adjacent to the entrance to the QuickChek site. Chairman Oster asked about greenspace proposed for the site. Mr. Roles stated that there would likely be greenspace to the side of the building along Mohawk Avenue and directly behind the building. Chairman Oster asked how much noise would be generated by the Mavis Tire store. Mr. Roles stated that the applicant was preparing a noise study for the site. Member Henderson asked what the hours of operation would be. Mr. Roles stated that the likely

hours of operation would be Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday from 8:00am to 6:00pm; Thursday from 8:00am to 8:30pm; Saturday from 8:00am to 5:00pm; and Sunday from 9:00am to 5:00pm. Chairman Oster asked to confirm that the Mavis Tire store was proposed to be open seven days a week. Mr. Roles confirmed that, but stated that he would check with the applicant to see if that could be modified. Member Stancliffe asked about building elevations. Mr. Roles stated that the applicant was not to that part of the process, but that the applicant was proposing a single-story building that would meet all zoning requirements. Mr. Bonesteel asked if the applicant needed any variances from the Zoning Board. Mr. Roles stated that no variances were required. Member Tarbox asked if the applicant was proposing to build a sidewalk along Mohawk Avenue. Mr. Roles stated that a sidewalk was not being proposed, but that he would discuss potentially doing so with the applicant. Member Henderson asked about lighting on the site. Mr. Roles stated that a full lighting plan would be submitted. Member Mainello asked why the applicant was proposing the entrance to site from Mohawk Avenue as opposed to a curb cut off Hoosick Road. Mr. Roles stated that grading and safety were concerns, as well as Hoosick Road being a NYS highway, which would require extensive permitting for a curb cut. Chairman Oster asked if there was an existing curb cut from the project site to Hoosick Road, and Mr. Roles stated that there was not. Member Czornyj asked if the applicant had considered having car bays facing out toward Mohawk Avenue instead of toward Hoosick Road. Mr. Roles stated that the building was proposed to have seven car bays, and that it would be difficult to orient the building to have those car bays facing Mohawk Avenue unless the size of the building and number of bays were decreased to the point that the project was no longer attractive to the applicant. Member Tarbox asked what other services the Mavis Tire store would offer in addition to selling tires. Mr. Roles confirmed tires would be sold, and listed other services offered at the business, as well as clarifying that vehicles would not be

held overnight. Member Tarbox asked if all work on vehicles would be done inside the building, and Mr. Roles confirmed it would be. Mr. Bonesteel asked how tires would be delivered to the site. Mr. Roles stated that the tires would be delivered by truck. Member Mainello stated that a sign variance may be required from the Zoning Board in the future. Member Czornyj asked if there would be any outdoor storage on the site. Mr. Roles stated that there would be no outdoor storage. Member Henderson stated that the applicant would need to send the application to, and coordinate with, the local Fire Department. Mr. Roles confirmed that the applicant would coordinate with the Fire Department. Member Stancliffe asked if a full EAF would be required for this project. Mr. Bonesteel stated that he was not sure, and would review the application documents to determine if a full EAF was required. Member Schmidt asked if the applicant was proposing to widen Mohawk Avenue just along the project site, as opposed to the entirety of the road. Mr. Roles stated that the road widening was proposed to go from Hoosick Road to the entrance to the site, and reiterated that the road widening was to accommodate school bus turning. Member Mainello asked if there would be any signage advising drivers exiting the site to drive toward Hoosick Road, as opposed to driving further up Mohawk Avenue. Mr. Roles confirmed that there would some sort of signage advising drivers exiting the site to turn toward Hoosick Road. Member Tarbox stated that drainage on the site would be an issue. Mr. Bonesteel agreed, stating that drainage was already proving to be an issue on the project site across Mohawk Avenue. Mr. Roles stated that he would review the drainage plan for the site. This matter was tentatively placed on the March 5, 2026 agenda for further deliberation.

The Planning Board discussed one item of old business.

The one item of old business was an amendment to a previously-approved site plan submitted by Zafer Ak for property located at 585 Hoosick Road. No one was present to review

the application. Kevin Mainello stated that the applicant was proposing changes to the site plan, and had already gone before the Zoning Board for an area variance for the same changes to the site plan. Mr. Mainello stated that the Zoning Board had scheduled a public hearing on that area variance for March 16 at 6:00pm, and asked if the Planning Board was interested in holding a joint public hearing with the Zoning Board. The Planning Board agreed to hold a joint public hearing with the Zoning Board. Chairman Oster stated that he would like the applicant to come before the Planning Board at its next meeting to discuss the application before the public hearing, and other Planning Board members agreed. This matter was placed on the March 5, 2026 agenda for further deliberation, and a public hearing on this application was scheduled for March 16, 2026 at 6:00pm.

The index for the February 19, 2026 regular meeting is as follows:

1. Paramount Building Group – major subdivision (March 5, 2026).
2. Fischer – minor subdivision (March 19, 2026).
3. AT&T – amendments to site plans and special use permits (March 19, 2026).
4. Cillis – major subdivision (March 5, 2026).
5. Mavis Tire – site plan (March 5, 2026).
6. Golden Grain Pizza – amendment to site plan (March 5, 2026).

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

1. Paramount Building Group – major subdivision.
2. Cillis – major subdivision.
3. Mavis Tire – site plan (tentative).
4. Golden Grain Pizza – amendment to site plan.
5. K. Smith – site plan and special use permit.

The proposed agenda for the March 19, 2026 regular meeting is as follows:

1. Fischer – minor subdivision (public hearing to commence at 7:00pm).
2. AT&T – amendments to site plans and special use permits
(public hearing to commence at 7:15pm).