

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

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD April 16, 2015,**

PRESENT were RUSSELL OSTER, CHAIRMAN, FRANK ESSER, KEVIN MAINELLO, TIMOTHY CASEY, MICHAEL CZORNYJ and DAVID TARBOX.

ABSENT was VINCE WETMILLER.

ALSO PRESENT were DAN BRUNS and MONICA NANN-SMITH, Brunswick Building Department, and WAYNE BONESTEEL, P.E., Review Engineer to the Planning Board.

Chairman Oster reviewed the agenda for the April 16, 2015 meeting as posted on the Town website.

The draft minutes of the April 2, 2015 were reviewed. Upon motion of Member Czornyj, seconded by Member Tarbox, the draft minutes of the April 2, 2015 meeting were unanimously approved without amendment.

The first item of business on the agenda was the site plan application submitted by Skyworks, LLC for property located at 795 Hoosick Road. Joe Raziano and Susan Cerone appeared on behalf of the applicant. The applicant reviewed with the Planning Board members the revised and updated site plan to respond to the prior Planning Board comments. The applicant noted that the site plan map now includes location of fencing, a delineated parking and equipment storage/display area, added handicapped parking, and also provided information on lighting. Member Czornyj asked whether the entire site would be fenced. The applicant stated that the entire site would now be fenced, with the use of rolling gates for traffic flow. Chairman Oster asked whether only existing lighting would be utilized. The applicant stated that it would be utilizing

only the existing lighting on the site, and no changes were planned. Chairman Oster noted that the site plan had been revised to address previous comments of the Planning Board. Chairman Oster also reviewed with the applicant the requirement to send the site plan, as revised, to the Rensselaer County Department of Economic Development and Planning for review and recommendation. Chairman Oster also reviewed with the applicant the fact that a public hearing would be held by the Planning Board on the site plan application. The applicant understood these requirements. Member Tarbox asked whether any of the larger lifts planned for this location would remain extended in the air. The applicant stated that some of the larger lifts would remain extended in the air, but it is primarily done for safety purposes so that children cannot get into the bucket of the lift. Member Esser asked whether the paving on the site would extend all the way to the lot line. The applicant stated that the pavement on the site was not proposed to be changed, and that these were existing conditions. The Planning Board members generally discussed the general requirement that pavement not be located directly adjacent to the property line, but that this was an existing site and an existing condition. The Planning Board generally concurred that this application was now complete, and set a public hearing on the site plan application for the May 7 meeting to commence at 7 p.m. Chairman Oster also directed the Brunswick Building Department to forward the updated site plan to the Rensselaer County Department of Economic Development and Planning for review and recommendation. Attorney Gilchrist noted for the record that the Planning Board could not act on the site plan application until such time as the County recommendation had been received, and that the County has thirty days in which to forward that recommendation. This matter is placed on the May 7 agenda for public hearing to commence at 7 p.m.

The second item of business on the agenda was the site plan submittal by Matopato, LLC for property located at 289-299 Oakwood Avenue. Thomas Murley, P.E., was present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Murley provided the Planning Board with the applicant's response to the initial comments raised by the Spiegletown Fire Department, and also noting that he was informed at this evening's meeting that the Spiegletown Fire Department will have additional comments to which the applicant will respond. Mr. Murley also reviewed a map which was provided by the applicant in response to a question of the Planning Board members as to how close this project is located to the Miami Beach Estates homes. Mr. Murley reviewed the aerial map provided, showing the layout of this proposed site plan as well as its proximity to the Miami Beach Estates homes. Chairman Oster had a question in regards to stormwater management in relation to the Miami Beach Estates homes. Mr. Murley generally reviewed the stormwater plan, noting that the full stormwater pollution prevention plan is still in preparation. Mr. Murley also provided an aerial photograph depicting the relationship of the area of this specific commercial site plan to the overall 56 acre parcel. Chairman Oster noted that the specific commercial site plan area noted green space of 27% of the project site, and inquired whether it could be increased through a larger commercial site plan area so that the green space reached the 35% requirement under the site plan regulations. Mr. Murley stated that he could increase the size of the commercial site plan area on the entire 56 acre parcel, but that the applicant had initially limited the commercial site plan area to those areas which had been tested and reviewed by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation as having been "clean" and removed from the listing maintained by NYSDEC concerning the old Troy incinerator and landfill area. Mr. Murley also provided the Planning Board members with correspondence which had been submitted to NYSDEC regarding the elimination of this area from the NYSDEC listing. Attorney Gilchrist stated that the Planning Board did have the authority under

the site plan regulations to reduce the required green space percentage, and that in the event the Planning Board wished to exercise that discretion, it could note that this commercial site plan area is not a separate lot but rather part of a much larger 56 acre parcel, the remainder of which is currently undeveloped and green and which the applicant states he has no plans for development. Chairman Oster noted that a special permit application has also been made by the applicant to the Brunswick Zoning Board of Appeals in connection with the “filling station” aspect of the proposed site plan, and inquired whether the Planning Board could complete its recommendation on that special permit. Attorney Gilchrist stated that while the Planning Board could start their deliberations on that recommendation, the Planning Board should wait to provide a formal written recommendation until a referral and request for the recommendation had been made by the Brunswick Zoning Board of Appeals. Thereupon, the Planning Board members generally discussed the “filling station” aspect of the project, concluding that the Planning Board had no objection to the construction of a gas station with underground petroleum storage tanks at this location, that such facilities are generally sited at the areas of major intersections and that the Oakwood Avenue/Route 142 intersection provided that opportunity, that this was not out of character with the general area given the commercial development generally north of this location on Oakwood Avenue, that this would serve a need for northbound vehicles for gas station and convenience store purposes on Oakwood Avenue, and that the location of a convenience store at this site was appropriate and may be particularly convenient for residents within the High Pointe project. The Planning Board also noted that it was unlikely that this property would ever be used for residential purposes. Chairman Oster then raised the possibility of providing a cross-walk from the High Pointe project across Oakwood Avenue to this commercial site plan entrance, and provide a sidewalk along the entranceway for pedestrian use. Mr. Bonesteel, as Planning Board Review

Engineer, stated that he is generally not in favor of cross-walks across public highways unless installed at an intersection controlled by a signal, and that in this case, the cross-walk would need to go across four lanes of traffic, and concluded that he would not recommend the installation of a cross-walk at this location. Mr. Murley confirmed that there was not much pedestrian traffic along Oakwood Avenue in this area at the present time. Member Tarbox asked whether the installation of a sidewalk on the side of Oakwood Avenue adjacent to the commercial site plan entrance would be advisable. Mr. Bonesteel stated that the construction of the sidewalk would be acceptable, but that he would not recommend the cross-walk without a signalized intersection. Mr. Murley stated that he could review the option of including a sidewalk adjacent to the applicant's project on Oakwood Avenue. This matter will be placed on the May 7 agenda for a project update.

One item of new business was discussed.

A sketch plan presentation was made by William Bradley on behalf of Brunswick Design Group for property located at 74 Farrell Road. The proposal is to construct self-storage units on a 20 acre parcel. Mr. Bradley reviewed a sketch plan of the total build-out area, which will include both storage buildings as well as outside storage areas. Only 20% of the project site would be subject to buildings and storage area. Mr. Bradley generally reviewed a written submittal concerning the project, reviewing the zoning for the site, projected traffic volumes based on the use of the property for storage, site lighting, utilities, stormwater, and emergency services. The written submittal also included photographs of the type of storage units proposed for this site, taken from a facility located in Lee, Massachusetts. Mr. Bradley stated that the project had been designed to preserve as much buffer around the storage units as possible for the benefit of the surrounding property owners. Mr. Bradley did note that the roofs of the self-storage units would be used for installation of solar panels for power generation at the site. The project will continue to use the

existing entrance off Farrell Road. The Planning Board members generally discussed the types of storage units being proposed, as well as site lighting. Mr. Bradley stated that the business plan is to market the facility for commercial use, not necessarily residential self-storage units. Member Tarbox asked whether the site would include fencing. Mr. Bradley stated that fencing was proposed for the front of the site adjacent to Farrell Road, but that fencing the entire site was not being proposed; rather, Mr. Bradley stated that for security, the use of cameras and site lighting is being proposed. This matter is placed on the May 7 agenda for further discussion.

The index for the April 16, 2015 meeting is as follows:

1. Skyworks LLC – Site Plan – May 7, 2015 (Public Hearing to commence at 7 p.m.).
2. Diamond Rock Plaza – Site Plan – May 7, 2015.
3. Brunswick Design Group – Site Plan – May 7, 2015.

The proposed agenda for the May 7, 2015 meeting currently is as follows:

1. Skyworks LLC – Site Plan (Public Hearing to commence at 7 p.m.); and
2. Sean Gallivan – Minor Subdivision; and
3. Diamond Rock Plaza - Site Plan; and
4. Brunswick Design Group – Site Plan.