Planning Board

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

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD SEPTEMBER 3, 2026

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

ABSENT was MICHAEL CZORNYJ.

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 July 16, 2026 regular meeting were reviewed. Upon motion of Member Henderson, seconded by Member Stancliffe, the draft minutes of the July 16, 2026 regular meeting were unanimously approved without amendment.

Chairman Oster stated that the fifth item of business on the agenda would be addressed first. The fifth item of business on the agenda was a special use permit application submitted by Bjorn Loftfield for property located at 276 Bulson Road. Bjorn Loftfield and John Debboli were present to review the application. Mr. Loftfield stated that he was proposing to install a solar array in his side yard, that the array would be 275 feet from Bulson Road, and that his property was heavily wooded, meaning that the array would not be very visible to neighboring properties. Chairman Oster stated that the Planning Board had received drawings of the site, including where

the solar array would be placed. Chairman Oster asked Mr. Bonesteel if he had any initial comments on or issues with the drawings submitted by the applicant, and Mr. Bonesteel stated that he did not. Member Henderson asked the applicant if his closest neighbor would be able to see the solar panels. Mr. Loftfield stated that his closest neighbor might be able to see the panels. Member Henderson noted that the solar panels may be more visible during the winter months when leaves were off trees. A public hearing on this application was scheduled for October 1, 2026 at 7:00pm.

The Planning Board then returned to its regularly scheduled agenda.

The first item of business on the agenda was a minor subdivision application submitted by Rebecca Fischer for property located at 842 Tamarac Road. Paul Engster, Esq., Mark Danskin and Rebecca Fischer were present to review the application. Mr. Engster stated that he had submitted his written responses to comments made at the public hearing earlier that day, while the applicant had submitted her own response letter earlier in the week. Mr. Engster then briefly reviewed his response letter, noting that most responses were to comments made by Charles Bulson and his attorney, Martin Miranda. Mr. Engster stated that the existence of two ponds on either side of the proposed driveway had been discussed, and stated that cars had driven over the strip of land where the driveway was proposed since the 1980s without causing any issues for those ponds, and that a private road maintenance agreement had been submitted to the Town, reviewed, and deemed acceptable. Mr. Engster stated that Mr. Bulson had claimed that there was an underground waterway between the two ponds and that the construction of the proposed gravel driveway would affect that, but that a wetlands delineation report and the project's stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) both stated that there was no water connection between the two ponds. Mr. Engster stated that the existence of an underground powerline had been discussed, that the applicant acknowledged the existence of the powerline, that the powerline was an easement issue that was

currently being addressed, and that the exact location of the powerline would be determined and that the powerline would be protected. Mr. Engster stated that Mr. Bulson had requested a 100-foot buffer for his property as his agricultural land would be adjacent to residential property if the application was approved. Mr. Engster stated that the requirement for such a buffer was to protect farmers from nuisance lawsuits, not from any houses built on adjacent parcels. Mr. Engster also addressed the request that the application be resubmitted as a major subdivision, specifically disagreeing with Mr. Miranda's assertion that a street was proposed to be built, stating that a private driveway was proposed, not a public street. Mr. Danskin then spoke on the differences between a roadway and a driveway, noting that emergency turnouts were proposed, and that emergency turnouts are required for a driveway, not a public roadway. Mr. Danskin stated that a dead-end road of the length the driveway was proposed to be would not be approved by the Town, and that a roadway is paved, whereas the proposed driveway would be made of gravel. Mr. Danskin stated that it was mentioned at the public hearing that grade lines were not included on the site maps, but that they had been. Mr. Danskin stated that a turning radius was required to be included on the plans for emergency vehicle access, that the application had been reviewed with the Fire Chief of Brunswick Fire Co. No. 1, and that the Fire Chief did not object to the plans. Mr. Danskin also noted that there was an existing power pole just off Bulson Road, which would require large trucks to install and provide regular maintenance to, meaning that large trucks were capable of driving over the land where the driveway was proposed to be without affecting the nearby ponds. Mr. Engster then spoke again, addressing the alleged conflict of interest discussed by Mr. Miranda at the public hearing and stating that he had represented the family that sold their land to Mr. Bulson in the early 2010s, that he had subsequently represented Mr. Bulson on a number of legal matters from 2013 to 2017, that his earlier statements that Mr. Bulson did not have

legitimate agricultural operations on his land were made due to not speaking of or seeing any agricultural operations on Mr. Bulson's land while he represented Mr. Bulson, and that he had no conflict of interest in this case. Mr. Engster concluded by stating that the application was straightforward and that it was only Mr. Bulson and Mr. Miranda that were holding up the Planning Board from making a determination on it. Mr. Danskin then spoke again, stating that Mr. Miranda had stated during the public hearing that the 70-acre remainder lot could be used for business purposes, and that the applicant currently had no plans to run any business on their land. Mr. Danskin also addressed a subsequent comment that the applicant was trespassing and noted that the applicant had already purchased the land she was looking to subdivide, so she was not trespassing on the land. Chairman Oster then noted that the applicant had submitted her own response letter and asked if she would like to review it or make any comments. Ms. Fischer stated that the review of the application had been very thorough and had lasted for almost a year, that she had no business interests in her property, and that she had done everything the Planning Board had asked, yet there was always something else extending the review. Ms. Fischer stated that her initial relationship with Mr. Bulson when she purchased her property was very friendly, but had since deteriorated, and brought up how at the first public hearing on the application, Mr. Bulson stated that he liked the proposal and would do exactly the same thing if he owned the land, making it especially strange that he was pushing for the Planning Board to deny the application. Ms. Fischer noted that she was proposing to subdivide the land to build two houses, which would be 0.75 miles away from anything, and that reiterated that she was not proposing businesses on her property, while also noting that whether a business was proposed for the land was not even part of the application, and that bringing up potential businesses on the site was just another delaying tactic. Ms. Fischer stated that she had complied with all of the Planning Board's requests, such as hiring

specialists to review wetlands and stormwater on the site and reopening the public hearing, yet there were always more delays, to the point that other neighbors had become concerned about nonexistent issues. Ms. Fischer also discussed Mr. Bulson's claim that she was trespassing on his land, stating that shortly after she had bought the land, she had asked Mr. Bulson if she could walk her dogs near and partially on his land, that he had consented to that, that he had subsequently photographed her walking her dogs near a creek on his land, and that he was now using those photographs as evidence that she was trespassing. Chairman Oster asked Mr. Bonesteel if he had any further comments on the application. Mr. Bonesteel stated that he had no further comments, and that all of his previous comments had been addressed. Attorney Langlois advised that the Planning Board take time to read both response letters, and that he could draft a Resolution that the Planning Board could review and vote on at a subsequent meeting. Member Stancliffe returned to the issue of the underground powerline, noting that the easement that had been signed concerning the land the powerline was beneath was not legal. Mr. Engster agreed, noting that Morgan Waters, who had signed the easement many years ago, did not own the land he had signed the easement for, and reiterated that the issue of the underground powerline was being addressed. Ms. Fischer stated that a new easement between her and National Grid had been written and just needed to be signed by both parties. Chairman Oster asked about the proposed shared driveway for the three parcels, specifically if there was room to construct three driveways if necessary. Mr. Danskin stated that there was not room for three driveways, and that more land would need to be obtained if three driveways were required. Ms. Fischer asked if a determination on the application could be made at the current meeting, reiterating that all questions had been answered, all comments had been addressed, and that the application had been before the Planning Board for almost a year. Attorney Langlois advised that the Planning Board review and vote on a Resolution

concerning the application due to the amount of information submitted concerning it and the length of time it had been before the Board. This matter was placed on the October 1, 2026 Planning Board agenda for further deliberation.

The second item of business on the agenda was a major subdivision application submitted by Brunswick Road Development, LLC for property located along NYS Route 2. Andrew Brick, Esq. and Anthony Casale were present to review the application. Mr. Brick stated that Mr. Brick stated that open was being maintained both in front of and behind the project site. Mr. Brick also stated that no changes were proposed to NYS Route 2 as part of the project and that while the applicant did not have the ability to change the speed limit along NYS Route 2, the applicant would not object if the Town worked toward doing so. The Planning Board then discussed speed limit and site distances along NYS Route 2. Attorney Langlois stated that he could draft a Resolution that the Planning Board could review and vote on at a subsequent meeting, and asked if all conditions from the project's previous approval should be included in that Resolution. Chairman Oster asked Russ Reeves, P.E., who was present and was reviewing the project on behalf of the Planning Board, if he had reviewed the conditions of the project's previous approval. Mr. Reeves stated that he had reviewed the previous conditions, that he had no comments on them, and that he found them acceptable. Attorney Langlois stated that he could have a draft Resolution ready for review for the next Planning Board meeting. Mr. Reeves stated that he and Kevin Mainello would review the applicant's written responses to comments made at the public hearing and submit any comments they had on those written comments to Attorney Langlois and the Planning Board. This matter was placed on the September 17, 2026 Planning Board agenda for further deliberation.

The third item of business on the agenda was a site plan application submitted by Richard Valverde for property located at 721 Hoosick Road. Kevin Hixson, of BL Companies, was present

to review the application. Mr. Hixson stated that written responses to comments made at the joint public hearing on the applications before both the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals had been reviewed at the last Planning Board meeting on August 20, and that the Zoning Board had granted the two area variances requested by the applicant at its August 17 meeting. Mr. Hixson briefly reviewed those written responses again, including construction hours and signage, and the procedure for repairing damage caused during construction. Member Henderson asked what would be behind the Mavis Tire building on the site. Mr. Hixson stated that fencing and trees would be installed behind the building along the rear property line, and that the trees would grow over several years to eventually completely screen the building. Mr. Hixson stated that the applicant had contacted NYS Department of Transportation (DOT) concerning the application earlier that week, and was told that DOT review of the project would begin very soon. Member Henderson asked what the project's timeline was if it was approved. Mr. Hixson stated that the applicant was hoping to open the store by May, giving the applicant eight months to complete construction. Member John Mainello asked about current maintenance of the site. Mr. Hixson stated that the applicant hoped to begin demolition of the existing building as soon as possible if the project was approved. Mr. Hixson also stated that the applicant was requesting a waiver for the number of parking spots required on the site. Kevin Mainello stated that the number of parking spots on a commercial site was within the jurisdiction of the Planning Board. Attorney Langlois clarified that 23 parking spots were required based on the size of the site, while the applicant was proposing 20 parking spots. Member Stancliffe asked if fencing was proposed to be along the top of the retaining wall. Mr. Hixson confirmed that it was, then reviewed the retaining wall and fencing to be along the top of it. The Planning Board discussed the existing damage to Mohawk Avenue and when that damage would be fixed. Member John Mainello asked if the waiver for the number of parking

spots was granted, if that waiver would stay with the property even if the property were eventually sold and another business was established in its place. Attorney Langlois stated that the waiver for the number of parking spots would stay with the land as long as the building proposed to be constructed by the applicant was there. Mr. Bonesteel had no comments on the application. The Planning Board had no further questions or comments on the application. Member Tarbox made a motion to adopt a negative declaration on the application under SEQRA, which was seconded by Member Kreiger. The Planning Board voted unanimously to declare a negative declaration on the application under SEQRA. Member John Mainello asked if the waiver for the number of parking spaces required for the site needed to be granted as a condition. Attorney Langlois stated that it was not necessary to make that waiver a condition of approving the application, and that the waiver could be granted alongside the potential approval of the application. The Planning Board determined to require the following six conditions: that all required NYS DOT approvals and permits be obtained, that an easement concerning the underground water regulator be signed by the Town and applicant, that only ornamental fencing be installed at the top of the retaining wall, that the application be reviewed the Fire Department and a knox box be installed, that the applicant coordinate with the Town Building Department on repairs to Mohawk Avenue before a Certificate of Occupancy could be granted, and that an engineering review and approval of the retaining wall be done. Member Tarbox made a motion to approve the site plan application, subject to the six listed conditions, and a waiver for the minimum number of parking spots on the site so as to allow 20 parking spaces instead of 23 spaces, which was seconded by Member John Mainello. The Planning Board voted unanimously to approve the site plan application, subject to the six listed conditions, and a waiver for the minimum number of parking spots on the site so as to allow 20 parking spaces instead of 23 spaces.

The fourth item of business on the agenda was a major subdivision application submitted by Jim Cillis for property located on Cole Lane. This matter was tabled prior to the meeting at the request of the applicant's representative, and the applicant's representative had also requested that the application be placed on the agenda for the second Planning Board meeting in October. This matter was placed on the October 15, 2026 agenda for further deliberation.

The sixth item of business on the agenda was a site plan application submitted by 810 Hoosick Road, LLC for property located at 810 Hoosick Road. Sam Burden, of Bohler Engineering, and Vartan Jerian, CEO of Vive Collision, were present to review the application. Mr. Burden stated that the project site was an approximately 20,000 square foot building, that there was an existing two-way curb cut from Hoosick Road, and that the applicant was proposing to change the use of the building from motor vehicle sales to motor vehicle repair. Mr. Burden described the proposed layout and internal design for the building. Mr. Burden also stated that the applicant had been before the Planning Board at its August 20 meeting to present a sketch plan of the project, and that the applicant was now presenting a full site plan application. Member Henderson asked where the cars being worked on would be kept. Mr. Burden stated that cars would be worked on inside the building, and that some cars could be kept outside the building if there was not enough space inside the building at a given time. Member Henderson stated that he did not want to see partially fixed cars along Hoosick Road, and Mr. Burden confirmed that that would not happen. Mr. Jerian then spoke, describing the operations of the proposed body shop. Mr. Jerian stated that the shop would not work on totaled vehicles and that the building would be almost double the size of other locations Vive Collision operated. Member Henderson asked where scrap metal would go, and Mr. Jerian stated that it would go into an onsite dumpster. Member Henderson asked if there was a safety plan concerning painting inside the building. Mr. Jerian stated that there

was a safety plan, that only water-based paints would be used, and then described painting operations inside the building. Chairman Oster asked if there was any safety issue with painting cars next to a restaurant. Mr. Jerian stated that there was not, as other Vive Collision locations were located next to houses and there had never been any health or safety issues. Member John Mainello asked if cars driving on Hoosick Road would be able to see into the building. Mr. Jerian stated that no one would be able to see into the building as the applicant was planning to frost the windows at the front of the building, and that frosted windows at other locations prevented work inside the building from being seen from the outside. Member Stancliffe asked if there would be a fence installed along the rear of the property for cars temporarily parked outside. Mr. Jerian confirmed that cars temporarily kept outside would be screened, and fencing would likely be used. Chairman Oster asked if adequate parking was proposed for the site, and Kevin Mainello confirmed that the proposed parking was sufficient. Mr. Jerian stated that the shop was only expecting 3-6 customers per day. Member Henderson asked where employees would park. Mr. Jerian stated that employees would park behind the building and that not every employee would work at the site every day. Mr. Jerian also stated that the shop would be open 8:00am to 5:00pm Monday through Friday, that the store would have limited operating hours on Saturdays to pick up vehicles only, and that the shop would be closed on Sundays. Member Henderson asked what the outside of the building would look like, and Mr. Burden reviewed a rendering of the outside of the building. Member Henderson asked about the site's lighting plan. Mr. Burden stated that two light poles were proposed to be installed in front of the building. Member Henderson asked when the lights would turn on and off. Mr. Burden stated that the applicant was willing to work with the Town to determine the hours that the lights would be on, and that the applicant was willing to turn the lights off one hour after the store closed. Member Henderson asked if a freestanding sign was

proposed for the site. Mr. Jerian stated that the applicant planned to use the existing freestanding sign already on the site. This matter was placed on the September 17, 2026 agenda for further deliberation.

The seventh item of business on the agenda was a waiver of subdivision application submitted by Craig Hansen and Pauline Hansen for property located at 1144 Tamarac Road. Jacob Keasbey, of Keasbey Land Surveying, was present to review the application. Mr. Keasbey stated that the applicants were proposing to subdivide 5.48 acres from a 60-acre parcel to create a new lot. Mr. Keasbey stated that the new lot would have frontage on Tamarac Road, that soil testing had been done on the site, and that the lot's septic plan was being developed. Chairman Oster asked if the existing parcel was entirely in the Town of Brunswick. Mr. Keasbey confirmed that it was, and stated that an easement would be partially in the Town of Pittstown. There were no further questions or comments from the Planning Board members. Member Kreiger made a motion to adopt a negative declaration on the project under SEQRA, which was seconded by Member Tarbox. The Planning Board voted unanimously to declare a negative declaration on the project under SEQRA. The Planning Board determined that two conditions on the application should be that the deed for the new parcel be filed with Rensselaer County, and that a driveway permit be obtained from Rensselaer County for the new lot if the driveway for the lot was to come off Tamarac Road. Member John Mainello made a motion to approve the waiver of subdivision application subject to the noted conditions, which was seconded by Member Henderson. The Planning Board voted unanimously to approve the waiver of subdivision application subject to the noted conditions.

There was no new business to discuss.

There was no old business to discuss.

The index for the August 6, 2026 regular meeting is as follows:

1. Loftfield – special use permit (October 1, 2026).

2. Fischer – minor subdivision (October 1, 2026).

3. Brunswick Acres – major subdivision (September 17, 2026).

4. Mavis Tire – site plan (approved with conditions).

5. Cillis – major subdivision (October 15, 2026).

6. 810 Hoosick Road – site plan (September 17, 2026).

7. Hansen – waiver of subdivision (approved with conditions).

The proposed agenda for the September 17, 2026 regular meeting is currently as follows:

1. Brunswick Acres – major subdivision.

2. 810 Hoosick Road – site plan.

The proposed agenda for the October 1, 2026 regular meeting is currently as follows:

1. Loftfield – special use permit (public hearing to commence at 7:00pm).

2. Fischer – minor subdivision.

The proposed agenda for the October 15, 2026 regular meeting is currently as follows:

1. Cillis – major subdivision.