

# **Planning Board**

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

## **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD OCTOBER 6, 2016**

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

ALSO PRESENT was WAYNE BONESTEEL, P.E., Review Engineer to the Planning Board, and KAREN GUASTELLA, Brunswick Building Department.

Chairman Oster reviewed the agenda for the October 6, 2016 meeting.

The first item of business on the agenda was the public hearing for the site plan application submitted by Brunswick Design Group for property located at 74 Farrell Road. Chairman Oster reviewed the procedures regarding Planning Board public hearings. Attorney Tingley read the notice of public hearing into the record and noted that it had been published in the Troy Record on September 23, 2016, that it had been posted on the Town signboard and Town website, and that it had been sent to neighboring properties on September 22, 2016. Bill Bradley appeared on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Bradley reviewed the project and the surrounding uses. Mr. Bradley noted that the project proposes 77,000 square feet of storage including 1.3 acres of outside storage. The storage units will be comprised of shipping containers that are approximately 80 feet by 40 feet, and that there is a caretaker's home proposed on the east side of the property. Mr. Bradley noted that there is a weight limit restriction on the Town road of 6 tons. Mr. Bradley indicated that the industry standard number of trips for such a site was 0.26 trips per 1,000 square feet, which equates to approximately 21 trips during the peak hours. Mr. Bradley noted that there would be LED down-lighting that would be activated by motion sensors. The only utilities to service the site currently planned are electrical and

telephone. Mr. Bradley reviewed the stormwater facilities and indicated also that the project proposes to preserve the vegetative buffer along neighboring properties. He further indicated that Speigletown Fire Company had been consulted. Chairman Oster then opened the public hearing for public comments. Dan Walczyk, of 49 Farrell Road, commented that the currently proposed project is of less concern than a prior proposal for a foundry at the site many years ago. However, Mr. Walczyk continues to have concerns regarding the impact of such development on neighboring property values and he stated that increased development gives rise to increased visibility, which attracts criminals. Mr. Walczyk indicated that his property had suffered incidents of vandalism as development has increased in the area. Jeanette Chambers of 60 Farrell Road commented that her house is located one house away from the project site and she inquired what the containers will look like. Mr. Bradley showed an example of the containers and stated that there will be mitigation through berming, along with a 100-foot front setback and screening. Ms. Chambers further stated that she noted in prior minutes that the applicant had stated that if the project is economically successful that it would be expanded and she inquired as to the proposed expansion. Mr. Bradley stated that the proposal is to develop the site beginning in the rear and, as the project becomes economically successful, work towards the front. However, the currently proposed plan is the full extent of the proposal including expansions. Ms. Chambers further inquired as to the schedule to start the project and Mr. Bradley responded that it is proposed to begin next year. William Shover of 322 Grange Road commented that he was concerned about traffic. He stated that Farrell Road is now used as a bypass from Route 142 to Oakwood Avenue. He stated that the paintball facility can only exit one way, and he inquired whether this project would have the same restriction. Mr. Bradley indicated that he is not currently proposing to restrict exiting traffic to one way out. Lou Bonelli of 98 Liberty Road commented that there is substantial residential development in the area consisting of single-family homes, condominiums, and apartments, and that those developments have caused increased traffic growth.

He is concerned about the additional traffic generated by the project. He further stated that the paintball facility has not been developed as had been expected, given that there is now generated lighting on the site, he hears activity at the paintball facility, there are heavily attended Halloween events on weekends in October, and there are tents on the site. Mr. Shover acknowledged that the area is zoned industrial, but does not believe that this project is conducive to the neighborhood. He further stated that the water supply in the area is private wells, and he has concerns regarding the environmental impacts of the project, particularly with respect to the outside storage of boats, trailers and automobiles. He stated that outside storage of such equipment could result in leaking fluids, including oil and gasoline. He further asked how wastewater would be handled and whether there would be any sanitary impacts associated with the project. Larry Leblanc of 57 Farrell Road believes that the applicant should submit more detail concerning the project. Mr. Leblanc commented that the applicant has stated that it would maintain greenspace and buffers and vegetative areas to the extent practicable, but he would like to know what percentage of the area will be maintained as greenspace. Mr. Bradley responded that, of the 20-acre site, approximately 6 acres will be developed, leaving the remainder as greenspace. Mr. Leblanc further asked whether there would be signage and Mr. Bradley responded that there is a proposed wood sign that will be painted green with gold lettering and ground-lit from both sides located at the front entrance. Mr. Leblanc asked whether there would be security measures, and asked how big the gate would be. Mr. Bradley indicated that the individual storage units would obviously be locked, and that there would be a motor-operated gate and limited 8-foot tall fencing. Mr. Bradley indicated that the entire site would not be fenced in. Mr. Leblanc asked whether there would be security cameras and whether they would be monitored. Mr. Bradley indicated that there will be a security system but that he is continuing to investigate what that will consist of and so he is not able to provide those details at this time. Mr. Leblanc indicated that the project may encourage trespassing, and Mr. Bradley indicated that trespassing occurs now, but once

the project is developed there will be more reason and opportunity for trespassers to be detected. Mr. Bradley, in response to Mr. Leblanc's question, indicated that the caretaker's home is not proposed to be constructed for a couple of years. Mr. Leblanc asked whether there would be any rules associated with the outside storage including whether property would have to be removed within a certain time after delinquency by the customer. Mr. Bradley indicated that the goal is to store campers, travel trailers and boats and that any abandoned property will be disposed of in accordance with law. Mr. Leblanc further commented that developments in Brunswick have not had a clean history from an enforcement perspective and asked what the plan was to ensure that the approved project would be developed as proposed. Chairman Oster indicated that when a project is approved, the Building Department conducts periodic inspections during development to ensure consistency with the approved plan. Following development, if there are complaints or if the Building Department notices additional expansion, then there are enforcement mechanisms that can be used to bring the site into compliance with the approval. Mr. Bradley stated that he has been looking for a project for this site to yield some value from the property given that he has been paying taxes on it but has not been able to develop it yet. He further stated that it is to his advantage to maintain the property in a way that will attract customers. Jeanette Chambers of 60 Farrell Road submitted an additional comment asking whether Mr. Bradley had additional plans for development of the remaining 14 acres. Mr. Bradley indicated that he has no current plans for development of the additional 14 acres and that such development would be limited by the Town Code and the physical restraints of the site. Ms. Chambers indicated that she wants the Planning Board to ensure that the visual impact of the project is mitigated. Dan Casale of 2 Patriot Place commented that he would like to see the project have landscaping and vegetation to mitigate the visual impact of the site and to hide the storage sheds from view. He stated that the storage containers are not visually pleasing, and that the Board should consider that in making its determination. He further commented that he would like to see the

applicant ensure that personal property is removed from the storage facility property if a tenant becomes delinquent. The applicant responded that it is anticipated, based on industry standards, there will be some delinquency and that he is prepared to effectively address such delinquency. Chairman Oster then indicated that no other members of the public sought to submit comments and indicated that the applicant would be required to address the comments submitted. The public hearing was then closed.

Chairman Oster then opened the regular meeting.

The draft minutes of the September 15, 2016 meeting were reviewed. Upon motion of Member Czornyj, seconded by Member Wetmiller, the draft minutes of the September 15, 2016 meeting were unanimously approved without amendment.

The first item of business on the agenda was the site plan application submitted by Brunswick Design Group for property located at 74 Farrell Road. Bill Bradley of Brunswick Design Group was present for the application. Chairman Oster noted that the public hearing had been opened and closed earlier this evening. Member Casey asked the applicant whether they would be willing to consider a right-turn-only limitation on the exit of vehicles from the site as it is his belief that such a limitation would be recommended for this project. Mr. Bradley responded that the applicant is willing to put signage at the exit to provide for a right-turn-only, but that he cannot guarantee that customers leaving the site will necessarily abide by the sign. Member Wetmiller asked whether the parking area for the outside storage space would be paved. Mr. Bradley indicated that it would not be paved and that it would consist of a gravel surface. Member Wetmiller expressed concern about possible leaking fluids, along with the fact that there may not be an easy way to detect leaking fluids if the surface is simply gravel or the ground surface. He believes that prior projects that had outside storage such as that proposed here have been required to address the possibility of leaking fluids. Mr. Bradley indicated that the applicant is willing to write into the lease with vehicle owners an obligation to

periodically inspect the ground surface to confirm that no fluids are leaking. He further stated that the same issue can arise on any site, even for a residence, but that he will attempt to address the Planning Board's concern. Member Czornyj asked whether the applicant would be planting pine trees in front of the proposed berm. The applicant responded that he is continuing to look at the particular location of the berm in an effort to mitigate the visual impacts of the proposal, but that he does propose to plant pine trees in front of the berm, which will provide better screening than planting trees on top of the berm. Member Czornyj asked whether there will be phases to the development. The applicant responded that there is not a specific phasing plan, but that the proposal is to start with 30–50 units near the rear of the site and to work forward as the project becomes more economically successful. The applicant indicated that while his plan is to start with storage units in the rear, he is willing to reconsider and potentially begin development of the storage units in other areas of the site as may be recommended by the Planning Board. Member Wetmiller asked whether there is a way to segregate the vehicles that would contain oil or other fluids from the other items that would be stored in the outdoor storage area. He asked whether that particular area could be surfaced with crushed stone so that any leaking fluids can be detected more easily. The applicant indicated that he would be willing to segregate those vehicles from the other outdoor storage and to surface the area with crushed stone. Chairman Oster asked whether there would be restrooms or washing facilities for the customers. The applicant indicated that there were none planned. Chairman Oster asked whether there would be a proposed dumpster or garbage area. The applicant responded that there may be some dumpster or garbage area for owner use but that it would not be open to use by the tenants. Chairman Oster then stated that while the public hearing included comments concerning the paintball facility, it was his belief that this project has no ability to control what occurs at the paintball facility and that the paintball facility is an entirely different project that is being addressed by the Town in accordance with standard procedures. Member Mainello asked whether the stormwater pond near the

front of the site would be screened because stormwater ponds tend to become unattractive over time. The applicant stated that the goal is to have a detention pond and that the intention will be to blend the detention pond into the existing landscape to address the concern. Mr. Bonesteel indicated that the applicant would need to allow room for access to the stormwater detention facility for maintenance. Chairman Oster asked the applicant whether there was a formal stormwater pollution prevention plan prepared yet, and the applicant responded that it is still being prepared. Chairman Oster then asked if the Board had any further questions. Hearing none, Chairman Oster requested that the applicant address all comments received at the public hearing, which would be recited in the minutes of the meeting, and the matter was placed on the agenda for the October 20, 2016 meeting.

The next item of business on the agenda was the referral of the Brunswick Square Planned Development District amendment application from the Town of Brunswick Town Board for recommendation. Paul Mutch of Stonefield Engineering was present for the applicant, which is Bank of America. Mr. Mutch indicated that there had been concern expressed about how the ATM kiosk would look and he indicated that he had submitted a photograph showing what the kiosk would look like. Chairman Oster noted that he had originally been concerned that the ATM kiosk would be located in the path of the delivery truck route for the Walmart store, but that upon investigation, it appeared that the truck route had been previously amended by the Town Board and there was no conflict between the truck route and the proposed ATM kiosk location. Chairman Oster noted that he had concern about lighting and the location of the ATM kiosk proximate to Hoosick Road. He stated that his concern relates to distraction to the travelling public, and that while he acknowledged that banking regulations imposed certain requirements on lighting the ATM kiosk, he believed that the lighting and appearance of the kiosk should be addressed. The applicant stated that they have faced similar issues in other areas, and they have the ability to modify lighting in a way so as to comply with banking regulations while also addressing local concerns regarding the lighting.

Member Czornyj indicated that he had concern about the ATM kiosk being located just 12 feet from the front property line whereas it should be 30 feet. He further stated that the ATM kiosk has a 4-foot overhang which may actually reduce the setback from 12 to 8 feet. The applicant responded that the canopy edge is 12 feet from the property line and that the actual ATM kiosk is 3–4 feet farther away from the property line. The applicant further stated that the proposal is to locate the ATM kiosk close to the road so that it serves as a wayfinding mechanism given that there is no sign proposed to alert the public to the existence of the Bank of America ATM in the plaza. Member Wetmiller indicated that he had concerns regarding the visual impact on the neighborhood, particularly with respect to the lighting, and noted that it would be distracting to the traveling public on Hoosick Road. Chairman Oster asked the applicant whether he foresees other banks proposing similar kiosks in the future. The applicant responded that, generally speaking, there is a shift in the banking industry towards more ATM kiosks in lieu of opening additional branches because many of the transactions that can be completed at a branch can now be completed at an ATM. Member Czornyj asked whether there was a particular reason that the applicant was not opening a bank branch at the plaza or affixing the ATM to the existing structure. The applicant responded that being able to open a bank branch at the plaza or installing an ATM into the existing building depends on negotiations with the landlord. Following negotiations with the landlord, the ATM kiosk was the direction in which the bank wanted to proceed. The Board then discussed the possibility of locating the ATM to a different portion of the plaza, and stated that there is an existing area of the plaza that was formerly used by the SEFCU branch that had closed. The Board discussed recommending to the Town Board that the location of the ATM kiosk be moved to the portion of the site formerly used by SEFCU. Chairman Oster then asked Attorney Tingley to prepare a draft recommendation on the PDD amendment referral for consideration at the next meeting. The applicant then stated that the current application before the Town Board seeks to authorize the use from a zoning perspective, and that site design will be



determined when the applicant receives approval from the Town Board and then reappears in front of the Planning Board for site design. Chairman Oster also stated that he would like the recommendation to include a statement that the Town should take into consideration how it wants to proceed with respect to proposals such as this where a portion of a parking lot is used for a business use, whether permanent (such as the currently proposed ATM kiosk), or temporary (such as the previously proposed BBQ/food truck proposal). Chairman Oster expressed concern about the precedent that would be set by approving the PDD amendment to allow this type of use. The matter was placed on the agenda for the October 20, 2016 meeting.

The next item of business on the agenda was the Brunswick Zoning Law and Zoning Map. Chairman Oster noted that he would like to discuss the Brunswick Zoning Law and Zoning Map in more detail with the Board at the next meeting, but that he would offer a few comments. First, Chairman Oster indicated that the Town Board had scheduled a public hearing for October 25, 2016, and that Chairman Oster intended to attend. Chairman Oster encouraged other Board members to attend the public hearing as well. Chairman Oster further noted that he would like the Planning Board to take into consideration Articles 6, 7, and 8 of the proposed Zoning Law, which relate to, among other things, the site plan review standards and procedures and the special use permits standards and procedures. The matter was placed on the agenda for the October 20, 2016 meeting.

There were four items of new business discussed.

The first item of new business discussed was the site plan application for 767 Hoosick Street submitted by Fagan Associates. The application seeks approval to construct a 1,170 square foot addition to the existing building and to add five additional parking spaces. Nick Costa of Advanced Engineering and Surveying appeared on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Costa reviewed the existing building and its current use as a professional office building and explained that the application seeks to add a 1,170 square foot addition along with five parking spaces, and that the proposal meets the

currently applicable setbacks in the B-15 Zoning District. Mr. Costa indicated that there would be a substantial amount of greenspace on this site and that the overall site would be 1.1 acres. Mr. Costa indicated that water and sewer have already been connected for the existing building and there will be no additional services necessary. He further stated that a new sign is proposed and that the addition to the building is proposed to match the architectural style of the existing building. Member Czornyj asked the applicant whether the parcel to the east would be merged into the existing parcel. The applicant replied that currently the site consists of two parcels but that the parcel to the east would be merged so that there would be one parcel consisting of approximately 1.1 acres. Chairman Oster asked whether the additional parking would be for additional employees, and the applicant responded that the parking and the addition would be to service additional customers, not necessarily additional employees. Chairman Oster asked whether the proposal included a handicapped spot, and the applicant responded that the addition to the building would remove a currently existing handicapped spot, but that the additional parking spaces to be added would include one handicapped spot to replace it. Mr. Bonesteel asked the applicant to describe the topography and the drainage plan. The applicant indicated that the topography runs from the rear of the site towards Hoosick Street and that no additional drainage was currently proposed. Member Tarbox asked whether the addition would include a basement or would be constructed on a slab, and Mr. Costa was unsure but he agreed to check. Chairman Oster asked whether the increase in the size of the parking lot would require a stormwater pollution prevention plan. Mr. Bonesteel responded that the need for a stormwater pollution prevention plan is based on the area of disturbance and that in this particular case there is not enough disturbance to require a formal stormwater pollution prevention plan. However, Mr. Bonesteel indicated that the applicant can be required to provide details concerning the drainage plan. The applicant stated that he had discussed the drainage plan with Bill Bradley, and further stated that the disturbance area was approximately 15,000 square feet. Member Casey asked about the gravel

drive that is located on the lot that is to be merged into the existing property. The applicant responded that the adjoining property owner had previously used the gravel drive to access his property. Member Czornyj asked whether the applicant would be eliminating the gravel drive, and Mr. Costa agreed to find out. Attorney Tingley advised the Board to consider what should be done with the gravel drive in the event that the gravel drive constitutes the only access to the adjoining property. The Planning Board then discussed that the application must be sent to the County for recommendation, and that also DOT may require a submission concerning the drainage. Member Czornyj asked whether the existing sign is proposed to be removed, and the applicant indicated that the newly proposed sign would replace the existing sign. The matter was placed on the agenda for the October 20, 2016 meeting.

The next item of new business on the agenda was the site plan application submitted by Rosenblum Development Corporation for property located at 850 Hoosick Road. Daniel Hershberg and Jeff Mirel appeared on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Hershberg stated that the proposal is to construct a 3-floor, indoor, climate-controlled, personal storage business. Mr. Hershberg indicated that they propose to use the existing curb cut, but given the change in use, they will be required to submit information to the Department of Transportation. Mr. Hershberg further stated that the proposed project will involve less impervious area than the existing site and that the project would be required to comply with the stormwater redevelopment standards. Mr. Hershberg indicated that the stormwater facilities would include a downstream defender and hydrodynamic separator. With respect to the proposed building, Mr. Hershberg explained that there would be overhead doors that would be muted in color, along with signage on the building and a small monument sign at the entrance. He further stated that there would be a small retail operation which would be staffed for portions of the day. The building will include elevators and the site will be landscaped. He indicated that detailed plans are not yet complete but are in progress. Member Czornyj asked if the building

would be three stories. Mr. Hershberg stated that the building is proposed to be built into the side of the hill and is going to be two stories in the rear and three stories in the front. He stated that the building height at the front of the building would be approximately 45 feet and that it would be approximately 30 feet in the rear. The Planning Board discussed with Mr. Hershberg the possibility that the building, as designed, may not comply with the height restrictions in the applicable Zoning District. Member Mainello asked whether the building would have corrugated panels, and the applicant responded that that is to be determined. Chairman Oster asked how many employees would be on the site and the applicant responded that there would be one employee on the site during the operating hours which are proposed to be from 6:00am until 10:00pm. Chairman Oster asked whether there would be on-site security, and the applicant responded that there would be no security personnel, but that there would be security cameras and secured access. Chairman Oster asked what type of clientele the project would serve. The applicant responded that nationally, approximately 75% of self-storage users are women who are seeking secure facilities and facilities that do not make them uncomfortable. This project is geared toward satisfying that demographic, along with mostly residential users and empty-nesters. Chairman Oster asked the size of the units, and the applicant responded that the unit mix is to be determined, but there will be 5x5-foot units, 5x10-foot units, 10x10 foot units, and most would be accessible only from the inside. There will be units accessible from the outside and those would be larger units and would be intended to service entrepreneurs and sales persons. Mr. Hershberg indicated that the project is ideal in light of the developments in the Town of apartments, condominiums and townhouses. Member Casey asked how many units would be proposed, and the applicant indicated that he still did not know the precise number but that it would be several hundred. The applicant then stated that the entire project would be fenced in, with the building walls serving as a portion of the fence. Chairman Oster suggested that the applicant take a look at the overall height of the building and its compliance with the Zoning Code. Chairman Oster

then asked when the applicant would be ready to be on the agenda next, and the applicant indicated that it expected to be ready sometime in December. Chairman Oster indicated that the Board would place the matter on the tentative agenda for the first meeting in December, December 1, 2016. Member Tarbox asked whether there would be enough room for a tractor trailer to make turning movements. The applicant stated that he did not anticipate tractor trailers accessing the site, and that he anticipated that the largest vehicles accessing the site would be small box trucks. The applicant then indicated that there were comparable facilities on Route 9 in Latham and also some facilities in Southern Saratoga County.

The next item of new business discussed was the waiver of subdivision application for property located at 321 Farm to Market Road submitted by Capital District Farms, Inc. John Schmidt appeared on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Schmidt explained that currently there are two properties on which there are wetlands. The applicant is seeking a lot line adjustment to merge 0.74 acres from one lot to the adjoining lot to be added into the existing conservation easement on that lot. The entire area is currently fenced in, and there are no buildings or other structures on the site or proposed for the site. Member Czornyj made a motion to adopt a negative declaration on the application, which was seconded by Member Mainello, and was unanimously approved. Member Czornyj then made a motion to approve the waiver of subdivision application as presented conditioned on proof of merger being filed with the Building Department, which was seconded by Member Casey and was unanimously approved.

The next item of new business discussed was the site plan application submitted by Cumberland Farms for property located at 630 Hoosick Street. Stefanie Dilallo Bitter, Esq. appeared on behalf of the applicant. Also present on behalf of the applicant was Rob Osterhoudt from Bohler Engineering. Ms. Bitter explained that the project site is located at the corner of Hoosick Road and Hillcrest Avenue and is currently the site of a single family residence with two accessory structures

which have been used as garages. The proposal is to construct a 4,786 square foot Cumberland Farms convenience store together with a 6-pump fuel island. The site is 1.3 acres, which would be accessed through a shared entrance to 626 Hoosick Street, which is currently an auto parts store. Ms. Bitter also indicated that there would be access to the site from Hillcrest Avenue. Ms. Bitter indicated that Creighton Manning had been retained to provide a traffic assessment and report. She indicated that the zoning of the site was primarily B-15, with a small portion in the rear of the site being zoned R-9. She stated that the applicant would be applying for a special use permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals for a filling station, and she reviewed the specifics of the proposed project including its architectural features and pedestrian features. Ms. Bitter indicated that the site would be connected to public water and sewer, would include 22 parking spaces, along with 12 fueling positions, would be open 24 hours per day, and that it appears that the proposal complies with the Zoning Code's height restrictions. Ms. Guastella indicated that, based on the presentation, it appears that there may be a sign variance needed. Member Czornyj asked whether this was similar to the Cohoes location of the Cumberland Farms, which he found to be very busy and lacking enough parking. Ms. Bitter indicated that she believes that the Cohoes location has fewer parking spaces but she will confirm. Chairman Oster stated that traffic at this area of Hoosick Street is always an issue for any development, and he stated that the shared access between 626 Hoosick Street and this property was discussed previously in connection with the subdivision application. He further stated that given the need to obtain a special use permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals, the Planning Board would have to issue a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals. The applicant indicated that it intended to apply to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a special use permit so as to be on the October 17 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting agenda. The Board advised the applicant that there would be a mandatory public hearing at the Zoning Board of Appeals, which might be held in November if the presentation was made at the October 17 meeting. Member Tarbox asked whether this project would be similar to the

Cumberland Farms in Glenmont. The applicant responded that the Glenmont location is not a new project, but was instead a retrofit. Mr. Osterhoudt displayed photo simulations showing the proposed project site, both before and after development. Member Czornyj asked the applicant to look at possibly including additional parking and the applicant agreed to do so. Mr. Osterhoudt stated that there may also be an opportunity for shared parking between the adjoining auto parts store and the Cumberland Farms. Member Casey asked whether there was any status update on the traffic signal that was expected nearby. The Board was uncertain as to the status of that improvement. Member Wetmiller stated that traffic getting in and out of the site will be an issue and Mr. Osterhoudt indicated that Creighton Manning was retained to do a traffic assessment. The matter was placed on the agenda for the October 20, 2016 meeting for discussion of the project to work on preparation of a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals. A draft recommendation could therefore be prepared and considered at the following Planning Board meeting to be held in November, 2016. Mr. Osterhoudt stated that he would provide full size plans to Mr. Bonesteel for review.

The next item discussed by the Planning Board was a potential application submitted by David Leon for a minor subdivision, and the Board generally discussed matters relating to whether the proposed parcel would be landlocked and whether the proposal would render any of the other properties non-compliant with the greenspace requirements. The Board generally discussed the layout of the Planet Fitness site, the Taco Bell and Aldi site, and the nearby Cumberland Farms proposal, and traffic in the vicinity of these sites.

The index for the October 6, 2016 meeting is as follows:

1. Brunswick Design Group - Site plan - 10/20/2016 (public hearing completed);
2. Brunswick Square Planned Development District - Recommendation on PDD Amendment - 10/20/2016;

3. Brunswick Zoning Law and Zoning Map - deliberation to prepare comments - 10/20/2016;
4. Fagan Associates - Site plan - 10/20/2016;
5. Rosenblum Development Corporation - Site plan - 12/1/2016;
6. Capital District Farms, Inc. - Waiver of subdivision - Approved with condition;
7. Cumberland Farms - Site plan/recommendation on special use permit - 10/20/2016.

The proposed agenda for the October 20, 2016 meeting currently is as follows:

1. Brunswick Design Group - Site plan.
2. Brunswick Square Planned Development District - Recommendation to Town Board.
3. Brunswick Zoning Law and Zoning Map - deliberation to prepare comments.
4. Fagan Associates - Site plan.
5. Cumberland Farms - Recommendation on special use permit.