

TOWN OF LYSANDER
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
8220 Loop Road
Thursday, February 12, 2026 @ 7:00 p.m.

The regular meeting of the Town of Lysander Planning Board was held Thursday, February 12, 2026 at 7:00 p.m. at the Lysander Town Building, 8220 Loop Road, Baldwinsville, New York.

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Corey, Chairman; Hugh Kimball; Steve Darcangelo; Doug Beachel and Matt Hunt

OTHERS PRESENT: Al Yager, Town Engineer; Amelia McLean Robertson, Esq.; Norm Carroll, Belgium Cold Springs Fire Department; Peter Hansen; Julian Clark, Plumley Engineering; Robert Shanahan and Karen Rice, Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

I. PUBLIC HEARING -- None Scheduled

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Review and approval of the minutes of the January 8, 2026 regular Planning Board meeting.

RESOLUTION #1 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Kimball

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board accept the minutes of the January 12, 2026 Planning Board meeting as submitted.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes

III. OLD BUSINESS

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Site Plan Review
Case No. 2023-008 | Longview @ Radisson
Longview Terrace/River Road |
|--|--|

John Corey, Chairman, stated that Amelia McLean Robertson, our legal advisor, has drafted up SEQR Resolution for the Board's consideration.

Ms. McLean Robertson stated that suggested that the Board review Part 2 of the SEQR by going through each section before proceeding since it has been quite some time. I'll just say what the Board determined last time and we'll just discuss if there are any changes. I think that's the best way to do it so our record shows any changes that may have happened since we discussed it almost two years ago. I

IMPACT ON LAND: Yes, with sub-questions being no, or small impact may occur.

IMPACT ON GEOLOGICAL FEATURES: No

IMPACT ON SURFACE WATER: Yes, with sub-questions being no, or small impact may occur. It was indicated that new stormwater ponds are anticipated as part of the proposed action, but they would have no or small impact.

IMPACT ON GROUND WATER: No

IMPACT ON FLOODING: No There was some discussion as to whether or not a Flood Study was done. It was determined that at this point in time it is not necessary. Until they're at a point where they are finalizing grading, because right now we don't even have a grading plan to know exactly how this all lays out, so until we get to that point, I don't know if you really would want to do with flood study. What we can say is that the Seneca River is a very wide, big body of water. This is a very small site. So, any fill that is placed would require a permit and a flood study, but it would have to be a mountain of fill to impact the Seneca River.

IMPACT ON AIR: No, or small impact may occur.

IMPACT ON PLANTS AND ANIMALS: Yes, with sub-questions being no, or small impact may occur.

IMPACT ON AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES: No, or small impact may occur.

IMPACT ON AESTHETIC RESOURCES: Yes, with sub-questions being no, or small impact may occur.

IMPACT ON HISTORIC AND ARCHEOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Yes, a Phase I A & B Archaeological Study has been completed; with sub-questions being no, or small impact may occur.

IMPACT ON OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION: No, or small impact may occur.

IMPACT ON CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL AREAS: No, or small impact may occur.

IMPACTS ON TRANSPORTATION Yes, with sub-questions being no, or small impact may occur. Comment: A Traffic Study was performed that was deemed acceptable by the Board and Onondaga County Planning.

Discussion: One of the questions that came up in that area was the connection to Glacier Ridge Road and the rest of Radisson making it pedestrian friendly. The Radisson Community Association would love to have some kind of walkway to cross River Road to ultimately get residents over to the boat launch.

Julian Clark, Plumley Engineering, stated that they have no problem with a crosswalk.

There was some discussion regarding an all-way STOP with Al Yager, Town Engineer, stating that we'd like to look at a STOP sign analysis for pedestrian crossings. That has not been done yet. But it is something that he thinks the Board should request of the applicant.

Mr. Corey stated that it's definitely something that needs to be considered, but this project certainly isn't going to inhibit that in any way.

Doug Beachel added that the RCA has had some issues with crosswalks, we used to stripe our crosswalks across Town roads from the walking paths, but we can't do that anymore because they're technically private paths, so they've basically been 'blacked' out.

River Road being a County road, the Onondaga County Department of Transportation has jurisdiction of that road and what's allowed.

Mr. Clark reiterated that that's not a problem with the Developer, it's a matter of getting the County DOT to agree.

Ms. McLean Robertson stated that there being some concerns and for SEQR purposes the sub-questions will be reviewed:

- a) Projected traffic increase may exceed capacity of existing road network.
- b) The proposed action may result in the construction of a paved parking area for 500 or more vehicles.
- c) The proposed action will degrade existing transit access.
- d) The proposed action will degrade existing pedestrian or bicycle accommodations.
- e) The proposed action may alter the present pattern of movement of people or goods.

No, or small impact may occur.

IMPACT ON ENERGY: No

IMPACT ON NOISE, ODOR, AND LIGHT: No

IMPACT ON HUMAN HEALTH: No

CONSISTENCY WITH COMMUNITY CHARACTER: No, pursuant to correspondence received and considered by the Radisson Community Association confirming that the Proposed Action is permitted under the Radisson Development. The Board reviewed the sub-questions and determined No, or small impact may occur.

Ms. McLean Robertson stated that a Draft Determination of Environmental Significance has been prepared for the Board that will be read into record if the Board is ready to proceed with Board members concurring:

Hugh Kimball stated that he does feel there are some items he would like to discuss further with Mr. Corey asking if they were SEQR related. Mr. Kimball stated not entirely:

- SWPPP: Wetlands
- A visualization of separating the areas with apartments from the areas of single-family homes. Mr. Clark stated that renderings have been provided; is the Board looking for visual simulations of how those buildings will look from the existing homes in? We put the Townhomes in there to break it up.

Ms. McLean Robertson read the following Resolution In the Matter of State Environmental Quality Review Act Determination for the Longview Apartments Site Plan Application into the record for the Board to consider:

RESOLUTION #2 -- Motion by Darcangelo, Second by Beachel

The **PLANNING BOARD OF THE TOWN OF LYSANDER**, in the County of Onondaga, State of New York, met in regular session at the Town Hall in the Town of Lysander, located at 8220 Loop Road, Baldwinsville, New York 13027, County of Onondaga, State of New York, on the 8th day of February 12, 2026, at 7:00 p.m. The meeting was called to order by John B. Corey, as Chairman, and the following were present, namely:

John B. Corey	Chairman
Hubert D. Kimball	Member
Steve Darcangelo	Member
Doug Beachel	Member
Matthew Hunt	Member

WHEREAS, Greentree Realty Capital, LLC., (the “Applicant”) has proposed to construct twelve (12) three-story apartment buildings with associated parking lots and drive lanes, and twenty-one (21) townhouse units (the “Proposed Action”) on approximately 19.2 acres of land located at 8850 River Road, Baldwinsville, New York in the Radisson Community at the southeast corner of River Road and Longview Terrace within the Town of Lysander, County of Onondaga (the “Site”); and

WHEREAS, the parcel is within the Radisson PUD which allows the use proposed by the Applicant;

WHEREAS, the Town Planning Board of the Town of Lysander (the “Planning Board”) has reviewed the Proposed Action in light of the requirements set forth in the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act, Article 8 of the New York Environmental Conservation Law and the applicable regulations promulgated thereto at 6 NYCRR Part 617 (collectively referred to as “SEQRA”); and

WHEREAS, on or about October 1, 2023, the Applicant has completed Part 1 of a Long Environmental Assessment Form (“EAF”) along with certain accompanying attachments for the project for the purpose of conducting a review pursuant to SEQRA, of the originally proposed project comprised of seventeen (17) three-story apartment buildings containing ten (10) two-bedroom units; and

WHEREAS, on October 12, 2023, pursuant to NYCRR Part 617.6(b), the Planning Board issued to all involved agencies a Notice of Intent that classified the Proposed Action as a Type I action and further stated that it intended to be the Lead Agency for the Action, to which no involved agency objected; and

WHEREAS, on or about October 13, 2023, Lead Agency Notices were sent to all involved agencies; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board received correspondence dated November 13, 2023, from the New York State Department of Transportation stating that the Proposed Action would not have an impact on state transportation facilities, and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board received correspondence dated November 20, 2023, from the Onondaga County Department of Transportation, stating that the Traffic Study dated June 29, 2023, was acceptable and the Traffic Study did not recommend any mitigation for the traffic increase associated with the Proposed Action; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board received correspondence dated December 6, 2023, from the Radisson Community Association stating that the Site Plan complied with the multi-family residential development controls; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board received correspondence from the Town Engineer and read it into the record on December 14, 2023, stating that Applicant's site plan did not provide an adequate buffer between the existing single-family homes and the previously proposed multi-family apartment buildings. The Town Engineer's letter suggested a cul-de-sac be constructed where buildings 1-5 were shown on the previous site plan received by the Town on or about March 3, 2023, and that either duplex town homes or single-family homes would provide an appropriate buffer between the existing single-family homes and the multi-family apartment buildings; and

WHEREAS, on March 13, 2024, Applicant submitted an updated site plan for twelve (12) three-story apartment buildings with associated parking lots and drive lanes, and twenty-one (21) townhouse units, comprising the Proposed Action currently being reviewed by the Planning Board under SEQRA; and

WHEREAS, on March 26, 2024, the Planning Board received correspondence from the Radisson Community Association, that the revised site plan was in compliance with the multi-family development controls; and

WHEREAS, on April 11, 2024, at its regular meeting, the Planning Board commenced its review of the revised Long Environmental Assessment Form ("EAF"), which was received by the Town of Lysander on or about March 11, 2024, and the Planning Board discussed each question presented in Part 2 of the EAF; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to and in accordance with SEQRA, the Planning Board is required to undertake a review of and requisite "hard look" at any action which may cause a significant impact to the environment; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has considered the potential impacts on the environment of the Proposed Action as set forth in more detail below by undertaking a thorough review of the conditions associated with construction of the Proposed Action, including the completion of Parts 2 and 3 of the EAF; and

WHEREAS, on April 11, 2024, the Planning Board continued its review pursuant to SEQRA and discussed Part II of the Full Environmental Assessment Form; and

WHEREAS, on April 11, 2024, the Planning Board did not identify any moderate to large impacts to: Land; Geological Features; Surface Water; Groundwater; Flooding; Air; Plants and Animals; Agricultural Resources; Aesthetic Resources; Historical and Archeological Resources; Open Space and Recreation; Critical Environmental Areas; Transportation; Energy; Noise, Odor, and Light; Human Health; Consistency with Community Plans; and Consistency with Community Character; and

WHEREAS, during the meeting of April 11, 2024, the Planning Board delayed its SEQRA determination as the Board had not yet received a determination on the wetland delineation from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), as the previous wetlands delineation obtained was more than seven (7) years old; and

WHEREAS, on or about May 31, 2024, Applicant completed and submitted an updated wetland study on the subject parcel and submitted it to the Army Corp of Engineers (ACOE); and

WHEREAS, on or about August 27, 2024, Applicant submitted a joint application for a wetland permit (Joint Application) to the NYSDEC; and

WHEREAS, NYSDEC did not respond to the Joint Application, the ACOE issued a Nationwide Permit (NWP), renewing the original wetland permit, for the Proposed Action; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to 40 C.F.R. §121.9, NYSDEC waived its jurisdiction over a water quality certification and ACOE issued the NWP; and

WHEREAS, by correspondence dated January 12, 2026, Town Engineer, informed NYSDEC that the ACOE renewed the original wetland permit on November 17, 2025, and that as the wetland permit had been renewed, the Planning Board planned to make a SEQR determination; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has received no correspondence from NYSDEC contesting the Planning Board's ability to complete its SEQRA review of the Proposed Action; and

WHEREAS, during the meeting of February 12, 2026, the Planning Board reviewed its previous SEQRA analysis initiated on April 11, 2024; and

WHEREAS, as a result of its careful review and examination of the Proposed Action, as well as correspondence from other involved agencies, the Planning Board finds, on balance, and after careful consideration of all relevant documentation, it has more than adequate information to evaluate all of the potential impacts of the Proposed Action.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:

1. The Planning Board ratifies and confirms that it is the Lead Agency with respect to the coordinated review of this Proposed Action pursuant to SEQRA. The Proposed Action is classified as a Type 1 Action under SEQRA, and each of the Whereas Clauses in this Resolution is incorporated by reference as specific findings of this Resolution and shall have the same effect as other findings herein. Based upon a thorough and comprehensive review by the Planning Board of the Full Environmental Assessment Form, and pertinent documents from various records assessing impacts and potential impacts from the Proposed Action, including the Traffic Study dated June 29, 2023, and correspondence received from Involved Agencies, the Planning Board hereby finds that the Proposed Action will result in no potential significant environmental impacts requiring the preparation of an environmental impact statement for the action at issue. The Planning Board, having conducted a coordinated review of the Proposed Action pursuant to SEQRA, thus issues a Negative Declaration for the Proposed Action.

2. The Planning Board has considered the Proposed Action pursuant to the parameters and criteria set forth in applicable law and regulations, including but not limited to those set forth in the SEQRA regulations.

3. The Planning Board has considered the significance of the potential adverse environmental impacts of the Proposed Action by: (i) carefully reviewing and examining the responses to the EAF, including the information in the completed Parts 1, 2 and 3, which the Board hereby adopts and incorporates by reference with the enactment of this Resolution, together with examining other available supporting information and documents including the Project plans, and assessing the potential impacts from the Proposed Action to land, stormwater and groundwater, wetlands, other water resources, agriculture, historic, archaeological and other recognized and/or protected resources, threatened or endangered plant and animal species, transportation, traffic, community character and cumulative impacts, if any, and other potential impacts as required, and considered each of the other potential impacts as required by applicable regulation; (ii) considered the criteria set forth in 6 NYCRR § 617.7(c) of the SEQRA regulations in light of such potential impacts; and (iii) thoroughly analyzed the identified areas of relevant environmental concern and finds that the Proposed Action will not result in a potential significant adverse impact on the environment for the following reasons:

Impacts to Land:

The Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse impact on land. The location of the Proposed Action is within the Radisson PUD and will contain twelve (12) three story apartment buildings with associated parking lots and drive lanes and twenty-one (21) townhouse units. The Proposed Action will also include lawn areas, two stormwater management areas, and will also include a public road with right-of-way to serve the apartment complex and townhouses. All work will be conducted within the Site's boundaries and will not encroach on adjacent or neighboring properties.

The Proposed Action would result in the physical alteration of approximately 16 acres of the approximately 19.2-acre parcel. Approximately 6.2 acres of new impervious services will be created and forested areas will be reduced from 14.2 acres to 3.1 acres with no herbicides being used. Further, while the Proposed Action may involve the excavation and removal of more than one-thousand tons of natural material, the material will not be removed from the site. Instead, any excavated materials will be placed at alternate locations on the project site. The build-out of the Proposed Action is expected to occur in phases over an eight-year period. For these reasons it is not anticipated that the Proposed Action will have an adverse impact on land.

Impact on Geological Features:

Based on the review of site conditions, available mapping, and the absence of any designated or unique geological features on or near the project site, the Proposed Action will not result in a significant adverse impact on geological features.

Impacts on Surface Water:

The Proposed Action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impact on surface water, including the Seneca River, and there will be no significant adverse impact to wetlands. Approximately four acres of federally regulated wetlands are identified as being on the project site. Applicant has obtained an NWP from the ACOE, which was renewed on November 17, 2025. Per the NWP, reclamation of the site will not be required based upon the limited disturbance area. Stormwater will be managed by an on-site stormwater management area. Further, any wastewater will be discharged to Baldwinsville Seneca Knolls Wastewater Treatment Plant. As a result, no potentially significant adverse impacts from the Proposed Action being constructed in such areas is anticipated.

Impact on Groundwater:

Based on the environmental assessment, including review of site conditions, project design, and proposed erosion and stormwater controls, no impacts to groundwater were identified. Therefore, the Proposed Action will not result in a significant adverse impact on groundwater.

Impact on Flooding:

Based on the review of site conditions, project, design, and applicable stormwater regulations no impacts to flooding were identified. Therefore, the Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse impact on flooding.

Impacts on Air:

The Proposed Action will not result in any significant adverse impact to air quality. No new air registrations or permits are associated with the Project. The Planning Board therefore finds there will be no substantive adverse impacts to air quality from the Proposed Action including from construction activities.

Impacts to Plants and Animals:

Based on the review of existing habitat conditions, the nature of the construction activities, and the expected operational characteristics of the Proposed Action, no significant adverse impacts on plants or animals is expected. Part 1 of the Full Environmental Assessment form identifies that Lake Sturgeons and Bald Eagles are present

within the project site, however it is not anticipated that the Proposed Action would have a significant adverse impact on these species.

Impacts on Agricultural Resources:

The Proposed Action will not result in a significant adverse impact on agricultural resources since the Site is not located on, or adjacent to, agricultural lands.

Impacts of Aesthetic Resources:

Based on the review of existing visual character, surrounding land uses, and the scale and design of the Proposed Action, no significant adverse impacts on aesthetic resources are anticipated.

Impacts to Historic and Archeological Resources:

Based on the review of available cultural resource mapping, and evaluation of site conditions, no historic or archaeological resources were identified on or adjacent to the site of the Proposed Action. Therefore, the Planning Board finds that the Proposed Action will not result in a significant adverse impact on any recognized historic or archaeological resources.

Impacts on Open Space and Recreation:

Based on the review of existing open space and recreational resources in the surrounding area, and considering that the Proposed Action will not reduce public access or diminish the quality or availability of such resources, no significant adverse impacts to open space or recreation are anticipated.

Impacts on Critical Environmental Areas:

No Critical Environmental Areas, pursuant to 6 N.Y.C.R.R. § 617.14(g) of the SEQRA regulations, are identified as being located on or adjacent to the site of the Proposed Action. Therefore, the Proposed Action will not result in any significant adverse impact on a Critical Environmental Area.

Impacts on Transportation (Traffic):

The Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse impact on transportation or existing traffic patterns and flow. The Traffic Impact Analysis Report did not recommend any mitigation for the traffic increase associated with the Proposed Action. Planning Board received correspondence from the New York State Department of Transportation stating that the Proposed Action would not have an impact on state transportation facilities, and from Onondaga County Department of Transportation, stating that the Traffic Study dated June 29, 2023, was acceptable as the updated traffic study had less units, and therefore less impact. As a result, no further review was required. The Planning Board determines that construction associated with the Proposed Action may create temporary traffic impacts between the hours of 7am to 5pm during the weekdays during the construction period, however, there will be no significant adverse impact to transportation resulting from construction activities associated with the Proposed Action.

Impacts on Energy:

The Proposed Action will not have a potential significant adverse impact on energy and/or energy use. It is anticipated that there will be a net increase in annual electricity demand resulting from the construction of the additional residences. However, no significant adverse impact is expected on local utilities from the Proposed Action, including to such utilities after the Proposed Action becomes operational, as no issue has been identified as to the capacity of such local utilities to provide services to the Proposed Action.

Impacts Related to Noise, Odor, and Light:

The Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse impact resulting from objectionable noise or on odor or light. New lighting associated with the Proposed Action will be dark sky compliant per the Town Code. While the Proposed Action will result in an increase in noise from construction, including from equipment and construction operations above ambient noise levels, the impact will be relatively short in duration and discrete, because the noise will be limited to typical construction times and some buffering to adjacent properties will be provided by retained vegetation in the area including perimeter vegetation. In addition, any such noise from construction will be undertaken during work hours and as such is not anticipated to be significant. No undue odors are anticipated from construction of the Proposed Action or operation of it after it is built. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to noise levels, odor and light in the surrounding areas have been identified as a result of the Project.

Impact on Human Health:

The Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse impact on public health or safety. Further, the Proposed Action will connect to an existing sanitary sewer system which has the capacity to serve the project once all necessary approvals from Onondaga County and NYSDEC have been obtained. Therefore, no significant adverse human health impacts have been identified as a result of the Project.

Consistency with Community Plans:

Based on a review of applicable adopted land use plans and zoning regulations, the Proposed Action is consistent with the planned use of the site and surrounding area. Therefore, the Proposed Action is not inconsistent with adopted land use plans.

Consistency with Community Character:

Pursuant to correspondence received and considered by the Planning Board, from the Radisson Community Association confirming that the Proposed Action is permitted under the Radisson Development Controls, the Planning Board finds that the Project is consistent with Community Character.

4. Based on the foregoing, and after a thorough and comprehensive review of the Parts 1, 2, and 3 of the EAF, and the other documents and information concerning the Project, Planning Board finds that the Project will not have a potential significant adverse impact on the environment in accordance with the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act, Article 8 of the New York Environmental Conservation Law and, in particular, pursuant to the criteria set forth at 6 N.Y.C.R.R. § 617.7(b) of the SEQRA regulations. Therefore, after conducting the requisite coordinated review pursuant to SEQRA, Planning Board issues a Negative Declaration for the Project pursuant to 6 N.Y.C.R.R. § 617.7.

5. The Negative Declaration, which this Resolution constitutes, shall be filed and/or published to the extent required by the SEQRA regulations and/or as Planning Board may deem advisable.

6. This Resolution has been prepared in accordance with Article 8 of the New York Environmental Conservation Law and the regulations promulgated thereto at 6 N.Y.C.R.R. Part 617 by the Planning Board.

7. The Planning Board Clerk is authorized to file this Negative Declaration, as necessary, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the law.

8. This Resolution shall take effect immediately.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Mr. Corey stated that we've completed SEQR review, but we're not prepared at this time to move forward. So, we'll just put them on the agenda for next month and see if we start getting materials we need to proceed.

Julian Clark, Plumley Engineering, represented the applicant for a Controlled Site Use to allow his business to construct their office/storage facility at 9071-9073 Oswego Road. Plans for this facility were presented to the Board over a year ago.

A Minor Subdivision was previously approved to purchase 5+/- acres from Upstate Motors at a previous meeting; once the Final Plat has been signed and filed a separate address will be generated.

Al Yager, Town Engineer, stated that the property is zoned General Business and questioned whether or not a Special Use Permit was also required from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Karen Rice, Clerk, stated that the applicant filled out the necessary paperwork and paid the appropriate fees for a Special Use Permit as well, but it was determined that the use didn't fit in any of those criteria and that this action falls under the definition of office/warehouse.

Mr. Yager considered that and stated it could be considered warehouse as he's storing his landscaping equipment on the site.

Mr. Clark continued stating that the applicant would like to construct an 8,000 square foot facility with an asphalt driveway and parking in the front and a gravel area in the back. The facility will be on a septic system that has been designed and forwarded to the Onondaga County Health Department for their review and approval. It'll also be on a water well, and he's hoping to have that drilled in March, the Spring. And once we get the sample results back from that, we can design a water treatment system and send that to the Health Department for review. There is an existing driveway, however plans have been forwarded to the NYS Department of Transportation for their review and recommendation on the existing location. A full site plan will be submitted to the Town Engineer. There are wetlands associated with the site. The NYS Department of Environmental Conservation has said that because the stream connects to bigger wetlands they need to be shown. A Delineation was done with the wetlands and 100-foot buffer shown. We are avoiding the wetland except for a small crossing of drainage, which has also been submitted for review. We had to adjust the site layout slightly from what we originally showed. The previous approved lot will have an additional 10' of lot width at the road.

John Corey, Chairman, questioned if the Town Engineer has had the opportunity to review what has been submitted.

Mr. Yager stated that he has not. Once he receives the complete site plan package that review can begin. As long as the Code Enforcement Officer determined this is a warehouse facility, which it appears to be, I wouldn't argue with that.

The applicant has completed Part I, Project Information; John Corey, Chairman, reviewed Part Two—Environmental Assessment, with the board.

1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations? No
2. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land? No
3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community? No
4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)? N/A
5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking, or walkway? No

6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities? No
7. Will the proposed action impact existing:
 - a. public / private water supplies? No
 - b. public / private wastewater treatment utilities? No
8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources? No
9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, water bodies, groundwater, air quality, flora, and fauna)? No
10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding, or drainage problems? No
11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health? No

RESOLUTION #3 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Hunt

RESOLVED, That the Planning Board having followed the prescribed SEQR procedures and having received no comments to the contrary, hereby designates itself as **Lead Agency** for the Stumpbusters, Inc., 9071-9073 Oswego Road, Baldwinsville, New York Controlled Site Use application.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes:

RESOLUTION #4 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Hunt

RESOLVED, that having reviewed the SEQR regulations, determined this is an **UNLISTED ACTION**, and having reviewed the Short Environmental Assessment form, and finding no significant or adverse impacts resulting from the Stumpbusters, Inc, 9071-9073 Oswego Road, Baldwinsville, New York Controlled Site Use for their Office/Storage Facility, the Board issues a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**.

DISCUSSION:

Hugh Kimball questioned if they would be storing cut trees or other things of that nature like the 'guy' down the road does?

Mr. Clark stated that what you see on the Site Plan is all they're going to do.

There was some additional discussion regarding the large gravel area and its use with Mr. Clark stating it is for storage of their outdoor vehicles.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes

This item will be tabled to allow for such time that a complete application can be reviewed by the Town Engineer.

Mr. Clark stated that what you see on the Site Plan is all they're going to do.

Mr. Clark thanked the Board for their time.

III. NEW BUSINESS

1. Major Subdivision Case No. 2026-001

Landmark Challenger
Melvin Farms—Hayes Road

Julian Clark, Plumley Engineer, represented the applicant stating the Town and Developer have agreed to a Letter of Intent (LOI) for property known as Melvin Farms. This application is for a residential subdivision on the east side of Hayes Rd. That was part of that on the concept plan and we're here today to get the ball rolling. We're calling this Stage 1 of Melvin Farms Subdivision. This back parcel (indicating on the plan) has already been created as part of the three-lot subdivision that was done for the solar farm, so the property itself exists and the solar farm under construction. The LOI allowed 53 lots; the current layout has 45 lots, so a little bit under the allowed number of originally. Everything else is pretty much the same. We adhere to the lot requirements that were set up in the LOI as far as lot size setbacks, etc... The area will be served by public sewers and public water.

There was some discussion as to whether or not an additional SEQR review was required for 'site specific' uses or if the SEQR approved by the Town Board includes this parcel/action.

Amelia McLean Robertson stated that because it was handled by the Town Board and the different attorneys I need to see the copy of everything that was considered as part of that to make sure so it won't get SEQR twice...however, to the extent anything either was missed as a part of that or has changed that we were addressing.

Karen Rice, Clerk, added...that was the question we had like Radisson and Timber Banks an overall SEQR was done, but we don't know what was included in that review. With the PUD's as phases came in, we historically reviewed a short form for specific uses within the PUD.

Ms. McLean Robertson concurred, stating that she'd like to review the complete record before the next meeting.

Mr. Clark stated that he thinks we've agreed on the review fees; with Karen stating that the fee schedule that you and I have is accurate to get the project started. You can forward that on to your client.

Al Yager, Town Engineer, questioned size and configuration of Lot No. 45 with Mr. Clark stating that he's trying to get the developer to consider a couple of flag lots or maybe community property.

Mr. Yager continued stating that if not this is something that will have to be addressed. Community property would require a maintenance agreement through an HOA. We'd need a defined ownership there. Maybe some amenities would be nice in that area.

There was some discussion regarding the maintenance of these stormwater detention areas with Mr. Yager stating that there will be a drainage district established that the drainage district will take responsibility for long-term maintenance.

There was some discussion regarding trails around those ponds with Mr. Yager stating that the ponds should be separated out on to their own parcels. So, they don't get sold for development. They would be retained by the Homeowner's Association.

Sewer and Water Districts will have to be set up and/or extended. The sewer district is set up now. There's an existing water district on Hayes Rd. Coverage will need to be addressed. A Drainage and Lighting District will need to be established. Traffic improvements will be required and discussions with both the NYS and County Departments of Transportation.

Single-family homes are proposed. The other thing that's worth noting is they really need to move forward on the multi-family piece at the same time as we're doing this from a pump station flow standpoint that will include existing residents and the Plamer Elementary School.

Mr. Yager stated that this is just the literally the first step in the process. Show it to the Board, show that 'hey, they reduced the number of lots.' They've shown green space areas. This is a step in the right direction. The Planning Board has the right to review it as they would any other. This is a Major Subdivision; the Board can ask for amenities, you can ask for amenities, you can ask for whatever you want.

Mr. Yager continued stating that they want to make this an interconnected community. That was the whole vision of the project when it was presented. Get people interested in the area; rent an apartment, maybe by townhouse after that and after that maybe you would end up in a single-family house.

Steve Darcangelo questioned if we would ever consider sidewalks for development?

Mr. Yager stated that you could. Maintenance responsibilities would have to be put on the HOA. The development across the street is proposing gravel walkways. The HOA can choose to pay for those in the future. At least walking paths and making sure that the maintenance responsibilities of those paths are included in the HOA offering plan when it's developed by the applicant.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned what type of curbing would they have?

Mr. Yager stated that the Town would probably not want to see curbs would be my guess, due to the plow's wings, but we can certainly ask the Highway Supervisor about that.

Mr. Darcangelo concurred and said he understands the limitations that our drivers have.

Mr. Yager stated that he personally is not opposed to sidewalks. I do think that if you're going to have sidewalks, you should have HOA and the HOA should take responsibility for them. Again, gravel paths are going in across the street would say that maybe concrete sidewalks is not the way you want to go here because we're doing gravel paths across the street. It's an opinion and it's something that the Planning Board, through the subdivision and Site Plan review process needs to consider.

Mr. Corey concurred, stating that we shall when we get to that point.

Mr. Clark questioned if they are good to go with the proposed layout, with Board members concurring.

Mr. Clark thanked the Board for their time and asked to be placed on next month's agenda.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Waive Hearing/Sign Plat | Stumpbusters, Inc. |
| Minor Subdivision Case No. 2024—006 | 9071-9073 Oswego Road |

Julian Clark, Plumley Engineering, reiterated that the Board approved this 5-acre subdivision back in 2024. A Wetland Delineation was done with the wetlands and 100-foot buffer shown. We are avoiding the wetland except for a small crossing of drainage, which has also been submitted for review. We had to adjust the site layout slightly from what we originally showed. The previous approved lot will have an additional 10' of lot width at the road.

After reviewing the modification, the Board determined this is an insignificant change and offered the following Resolution:

RESOLUTION #5 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Darcangelo

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board having reviewed the Minor Subdivision application of Stumpbusters, Inc., as defined on a map dated July 14, 2024, revised February 2, 2026, prepared by CNY Land Surveying, for property located at 9071-9073 Oswego Road, Tax Map No. 025.-02-28.1, Baldwinsville, New York, and finding that all modifications and conditions have been met and that the Final Plat is consistent with the approved Preliminary Plat and that any differences found are not significant; the Board authorizes the Chairperson to waive the Final Plat Public Hearing and sign the Final Plat.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Mr. Clark thanked the Board for their time.

III. ADJOURN

RESOLUTION #6 -- Motion by Kimball, Second by Darcangelo

RESOLVED, that the February 12, 2026 regular Planning Board adjourn at 8:11 p.m.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Rice, Clerk
Planning Board