

**MINUTES**  
**LEWIS COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**  
**March 19, 2026**

- (1) **Call to Order:** Chairman Petersen called the regular meeting of the Lewis County Planning Board to order at 2:32 PM in the conference room on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor at the Lewis County Courthouse, Lowville, New York. Mr. Petersen requested a roll call.
- (2) **Roll Call:**  
**Board Members Present:** Tim Petersen, Sarah Metott, Jessica Moser, John Reed, Eric Virkler, Larry Dolhof.  
**Staff Present:** Casandra Buell, Planning & Community Development Director; Lauryn Tabolt, Community Development Specialist; Megan Krokowski, Community Development Specialist; Ben Manning, Code Enforcement Officer.  
**Public Present:** Willy Bieler
- (3) **Reading and Approval of Minutes:** The draft February 19, 2026 meeting minutes were received and reviewed before the meeting. Mr. Virkler motioned to approve the minutes; Mr. Reed seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.
- (4) **Correspondence and Communication:** None
- (5) **Report of Special Committees:**

**239-M Review**

Ms. Krokowski read the following review:

**TOWN OF GREIG TOWN BOARD**

Proposed Comprehensive Plan to be adopted by the Town of Greig.

*Town of Greig – Applicant*

The proposed Comprehensive Plan, Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF), and General Municipal Referral Form were submitted by the Town of Greig Supervisor, Bob Johnson. Upon review of the document, it appears that there are various formatting and reference inconsistencies that should be corrected before adoption. The inconsistencies include:

1. The page numbering is incorrect after Page 3.
2. The incorrect labeling of the Appendix, which is referred to as Appendix X on Page 12 (Page 14 of the document), but elsewhere as just Appendix. Furthermore, there appears to be nothing included in the Appendix.
3. An apparent editing error is present on Page 30 where bracketed text reading “[RJ20.1]” appears in the document. As written, it appears to be an internal editing marker or comment code that was inadvertently left in place. If the text is intended to serve as a citation, it should be relocated to

the appropriate location and formatted; accordingly, if it is a drafting artifact, it should be removed.

4. The first paragraph on Page 32 appears to be missing the number for the initial “Balance” Plan strategy and title, unlike the format used for the subsequent topic, which is labeled “2.”
5. For clarity and to avoid misinterpretation during implementation or future zoning updates, the Plan should consistently specify which entity is responsible — for example, ‘Town Board,’ ‘Planning Board,’ ‘Town of Greig,’ or ‘Lewis County’ — rather than using the general term ‘Greig.’
6. The Lakefront (Waterfront District 2) description and uses on Page 44 appear to be duplicated from the Settlement Area (Hamlet District) land use designation on Page 43. A description and the appropriate uses relative to the Lakefront District appear to be populated under the subsequent Woodland (Public Land District) description and uses. After this correction is made, the appropriate description and uses should be defined for the Woodland (Public Land District) section.
  - a. The Lakefront (Waterfront District 2) should clearly note the Town’s preferred development intensity and compliance with APA regulations.
7. The Implementation Strategies should be numbered for ease of reference and organized according to the Plan’s themes of Balance, Enhance, and Sustain to improve clarity and usability. Structuring the strategies in this manner would facilitate more effective tracking, coordination, and progress reporting.

Given the community’s demographics, distinctions between year-round and seasonal residents may be appropriate in certain contexts. However, repeated references to these groups separately throughout the Comprehensive Plan may unintentionally emphasize this division. The Town may wish to consider revising these sections so that references apply broadly to residents unless a distinction between year-round and seasonal populations is necessary for clarity, infrastructure needs, or policy relevance.

The Town Board may wish to consider adding clarification to the statement on Page 15, indicating that “most tax parcels in the Town of Greig are classified as residential, according to tax assessment records, although they comprise roughly 15% of the total acreage (Fig. 6).” As written, this statement may be unclear to readers. A brief explanation noting that a large number of residential parcels can represent a relatively small share of the Town’s total acreage — due to the presence of extensive public, forest, and conservation lands — would help ensure the information is clearly understood.

As part of this review, consultation with the Director of Lewis County Recreation, Forestry & Parks was conducted, and while there is a solid consensus on the recently adopted Lewis County Winter Recreation Master Plan, several sections of the Comprehensive Plan may inaccurately describe

recreation-related services and/or organizations. The following items should be reviewed and corrected prior to adoption:

1. The County's Singing Waters facilities should be described as limited to day-use access, tent campsites, and a pavilion. References to cabins, RV sites, or kayaking should be removed, as the water body at that location is not navigable. Campground amenities referenced in this section should instead be attributed to Raven Acres.
2. The Plan should clarify that the Black River — not Singing Waters — is the kayak-accessible waterbody within the Town.
3. The Plan should include the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) in sections addressing non-motorized recreation, reflecting the extensive State lands and DEC-managed trail networks within the Town of Greig.
4. Revise the Priority "Quick Win" relative to ATV/OHV etiquette & signage for clarity, something similar to "Coordinate with Lewis County and adjacent municipalities to promote a consistent framework for trail etiquette and signage, to include defining who is responsible for sign maintenance and posting, consistent with County permitting and management practices."

Regarding the Lewis County Agricultural and Farmland Enhancement Plan referenced on Page 24, the first bullet should be revised from "promoting renewable energy use" to "supporting the proper siting of renewable energy to protect farmland and rural character." This revision would improve consistency between the County Plan summary and the Town's stated position on commercial-scale renewable energy and energy storage development.

Under Housing Needs & Market Analysis – Town of Greig Considerations on Page 26, the Plan states: "*Zoning should be updated to encourage accessory dwelling units and universal design standards. This includes developing a model accessory dwelling unit ordinance for municipalities to consider and adopt.*" The Town may wish to consider adding a clarifying sentence — for example, noting that ADUs are appropriate in Rural Residential areas when designed and sited to preserve rural character and the established large-lot development pattern—or otherwise providing guideposts to inform future regulation. Alternatively, the Town could choose to retain broader language and present ADUs primarily as a tool to help address countywide housing needs.

The Town of Greig may wish to consider revising the language in Topic 2 on Page 32. The current wording — "Prohibit heavy industrial uses, including but not limited to commercial-scale renewable energy and energy storage projects..." — reads as a regulatory directive. Because Comprehensive Plans are intended to establish policy guidance rather than enforce regulations, the Town may wish to revise the language to clearly express its intent to restrict and strongly discourage such uses due to concerns related to public health, safety, and preservation of rural character.

Framing the policy in terms of restricting or discouraging these uses, and emphasizing the Town's intent to regulate their siting through future zoning and land use controls, would better align with the role of a Comprehensive Plan while still supporting the Town's objective of preventing incompatible heavy industrial, renewable energy, and energy storage development. This approach may also help strengthen the legal foundation for future zoning provisions adopted to implement the Plan's policy direction.

To support long-term economic development, the Town Board may wish to consider establishing a goal to reevaluate long-standing restrictions in the Brantingham area that prohibit most commercial uses. Given the Town's limited commercial corridors, lack of municipal infrastructure, high taxes, and absence of State Highway access, these restrictions may limit future economic opportunities.

The Town Board may wish to review the sequencing and scope of the goals included in the Implementation Matrix to ensure they are realistic and manageable for a small local jurisdiction. If certain actions are overly ambitious or resource-intensive, there is a possibility they may prove difficult to implement, which could affect the Plan's overall effectiveness.

Additionally, some actions appear to depend on the completion of earlier foundational steps and may benefit from being identified as such. For example, Naturally Lewis may be unlikely to promote the hamlet areas as "business friendly" until recommended zoning updates—such as provisions allowing small-scale commercial and mixed-use development—are adopted. At present, the marketing action appears earlier in the matrix than the zoning changes it relies upon. Clarifying these relationships could help ensure implementation proceeds in a logical and achievable sequence while supporting efficient use of local resources.

***Recommendation: APPROVE with Conditions***

*The acting municipal body must have a super-majority (majority plus one) vote to disregard the following conditions:*

1. It appears that there are various formatting and reference inconsistencies that should be corrected before adoption. The inconsistencies include:
  - a. The page numbering is incorrect after Page 3.
  - b. The incorrect labeling of the Appendix, which is referred to as Appendix X on Page 12 (Page 14 of the document), but elsewhere as just Appendix. Furthermore, there appears to be nothing included in the Appendix.
  - c. An apparent editing error is present on Page 30, where bracketed text reading "[RJ20.1]" appears in the document. As written, it appears to be an internal editing marker or comment code that was inadvertently left in place. If the text is intended to serve as a citation, it should be relocated to the appropriate location and formatted; accordingly, if it is a drafting artifact, it should be removed.

- d. The first paragraph on Page 32 appears to be missing the number for the initial “Balance” Plan strategy and title, unlike the format used for the subsequent topic, which is labeled “2.”
  - e. For clarity and to avoid misinterpretation during implementation or future zoning updates, the Plan should consistently specify which entity is responsible— for example, ‘Town Board,’ ‘Planning Board,’ ‘Town of Greig,’ or ‘Lewis County’— rather than using the general term ‘Greig.’
  - f. The Lakefront (Waterfront District 2) description and uses on Page 44 appear to be duplicated from the Settlement Area (Hamlet District) land use designation on Page 43. A description and the appropriate uses relative to the Lakefront District appear to be populated under the subsequent Woodland (Public Land District) description and uses. After this correction is made, the appropriate description and uses should be defined for the Woodland (Public Land District) section.
    - i. The Lakefront (Waterfront District 2) should clearly note the Town’s preferred development intensity and compliance with APA regulations (e.g., lodging and commercial uses).
  - g. The Implementation Strategies should be numbered for ease of reference and organized according to the Plan’s themes of Balance, Enhance, and Sustain to improve clarity and usability. Structuring the strategies in this manner would facilitate more effective tracking, coordination, and progress reporting.
2. As part of this review, consultation with the Director of Lewis County Recreation, Forestry & Parks was made, and while there is a solid consensus on the recently adopted Lewis County Winter Recreation Master Plan, there appear to be several sections of the Plan that may inaccurately describe recreation-related services and/or organizations. The following items should be reviewed and corrected prior to adoption:
- a. The County’s Singing Waters facilities should be described as limited to day-use access, tent campsites, and a pavilion. References to cabins, RV sites, or kayaking should be removed, as the water body at that location is not navigable. Campground amenities referenced in this section should instead be attributed to Raven Acres.
  - b. The Plan should clarify that the Black River— not Singing Waters— is the kayak-accessible waterbody within the Town.
  - c. The Plan should include the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) in sections addressing non-motorized recreation, reflecting the extensive state lands and DEC-managed trail networks within the Town of Greig.
  - d. Revise the Priority “Quick Win” relative to ATV/OHV etiquette & signage for clarity, something similar to “Coordinate with Lewis County and adjacent municipalities to promote a consistent framework for trail etiquette and signage, to include defining who is responsible for sign maintenance and posting, consistent with County permitting and management practices.”

3. The Town Board shall revise the Lewis County Agricultural and Farmland Enhancement Plan summary on Page 24 by replacing “*promoting renewable energy use*” with “*supporting the proper siting of renewable energy to protect farmland and rural character.*”

**Non-Binding Notes:**

*These are used as suggestions and/or advice from the County Planning Board; the municipality is not required to take action, nor is a supermajority vote required.*

1. If the Town Board adopts the proposed Comprehensive Plan, and the documents are filed with the Department of State, the Clerk should email a copy of all submitted materials to the Lewis County Planning & Community Development Department as a standard practice. This helps address recent inconsistencies in the records and supports the Planning Department’s increasingly active role in tracking local law filings.
2. The Town of Greig may wish to consider adding clarification to the statement on Page 15, indicating that “most tax parcels in the Town of Greig are classified as residential, according to tax assessment records, although they comprise roughly 15% of the total acreage (Fig. 6).” As written, this statement may be unclear to readers. A brief explanation noting that a large number of residential parcels can represent a relatively small share of the Town’s total acreage — due to the presence of extensive public, forest, and conservation lands — would help ensure the information is clearly understood.
3. The Town of Greig may wish to revise the language in Topic 2 on Page 32, as the phrase “prohibit heavy industrial uses, including commercial-scale renewable energy and energy storage projects” reads as a regulatory directive. Because Comprehensive Plans provide policy guidance rather than enforce regulations, the Town may instead wish to express its intent to restrict and discourage such uses and to address their siting through future zoning and land use controls.
4. Distinctions between year-round and seasonal residents may be appropriate in certain contexts; however, repeated references may unintentionally emphasize this division. The Town may wish to revise these sections so that references apply broadly to residents unless the distinction is necessary for clarity or policy relevance.
5. To support long-term economic development, the Town Board may wish to consider establishing a goal to reevaluate long-standing restrictions in the Brantingham area that prohibit most commercial uses. Given the Town’s limited commercial corridors, lack of municipal infrastructure, high taxes, and absence of State Highway access, these restrictions may limit future economic opportunities.
6. Under Housing Needs & Market Analysis – Town of Greig Considerations on Page 26, the Plan states: “*Zoning should be updated to encourage accessory dwelling units and universal design standards. This includes developing a model accessory dwelling unit ordinance for municipalities to consider and adopt.*” The Town may wish to consider adding a clarifying

sentence—for example, noting that ADUs are appropriate in Rural Residential areas when designed and sited to preserve rural character and the established large-lot development pattern—or otherwise providing guideposts to inform future regulation. Alternatively, the Town could choose to retain broader language and present ADUs primarily as a tool to help address countywide housing needs.

7. Review sequencing within the Implementation Matrix to ensure goals are achievable and not burdensome. Identify dependencies—e.g., Naturally Lewis is unlikely to promote the hamlets as business-friendly until zoning updates enabling small-scale commercial and mixed-use development are completed.

There was a brief discussion on whether the CPB should provide additional advisory input to the Town of Greig concerning enhanced health and safety language related to BESS. The Board also discussed the status of the lake as a perceived private resource, noting that the boat launch is municipally owned. It was recommended that Non-Binding Note 3 be expanded to incorporate stronger connections to public health and safety considerations.

Comprehensively, lake access is a problem throughout the County, as there are very few public access points and a perception that many lakes are privately owned, which hinders recreation and tourism.

With no further comments, Mr. Petersen motions to approve with conditions as amended, seconded by Ms. Metott, carried unanimously.

Ms. Tabolt read the following review:

**TOWN OF HARRISBURG PLANNING BOARD**

Special Use Permit to convert an existing shop/garage into a motor vehicle repair shop for use as a New York State Department of Transportation (NYS DOT) Commercial Truck Inspection Facility located at 8717 New York State Route 12 in the Town of Harrisburg.

Tax Map Parcel #158.00-02-06.000

*Walter J. Kennell, Kennell Farms – Applicant*

The applicant provided the following project documentation: 1) General Municipal Referral Form; 2) Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF); 3) January Town of Harrisburg Planning Board Meeting Minutes; 4) February Town of Harrisburg Planning Board Public Hearing Meeting Minutes; 5) Special Use Permit Application; 6) Aerial Image; and 7) Agricultural Data Statement.

- *Compatibility with Adjacent Uses*

The proposed project is located within the Highway (H-1) Zoning District portion of the parcel in the Town of Harrisburg. According to §305 of the Town of Harrisburg Zoning Law, the purpose of the H-1 District is to encourage mixed commercial and moderate-density residential development. The applicant proposes converting an existing shop/garage into a motor vehicle repair shop to be utilized as a NYS DOT Commercial Truck Inspection Facility. The subject parcel is also an active farm, and surrounding land uses consist primarily of agricultural and rural residential properties. Given the agricultural context of the site and the mixed-use intent of the zoning district, the proposed action appears to be compatible with the character of the surrounding area.

According to Article IV §405, the following dimensional requirements apply to Nonresidential Uses in the H-1 Zone:

<b>H-1</b>		
<b>Setback</b>	<b>Nonresidential Use</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Area (acres)	3 acres	221 acres
Building Height	35'	~26'
Frontage	300'	~2,000'*
Road Line (State Road)	50'	~120'*
Side Property Line	50'	~600'*
Rear Property Line	50'	~2,000'*

\* Proposed setbacks were estimated with the Lewis County GIS Cloud

As shown above, the proposed project appears to meet all the dimensional standards outlined in Article IV §405.

- *Traffic Generation and Effect:*

Based on the submitted SEAF, the applicant has indicated that the proposed action will not result in a substantial increase in traffic beyond current levels. The project site already accommodates a significant amount of truck traffic, and the existing driveway and parking area provide adequate space, including two separate points of entry and exit. As such, the proposal is expected to have minimal impact on traffic flow along State Route 12.

- *Protection of Community Character:*

According to the submitted SEAF, the project site is not located within a Critical Environmental Area, a property listed on the State or National Register of Historic Places, an archaeologically sensitive area, or a 100-year floodplain. As part of this review, this information was cross-referenced using the NYS EAF Mapper and the Lewis County GIS Cloud. A discrepancy between the EAF Mapper and the submitted SEQR indicates that the project site does contain, or is substantially contiguous to, a property listed on the State or National Register of Historic Places. Further research on the New York State Cultural Resource Information System (CRIS) illustrated that the proposed project is

located on a parcel that is adjacent to Gallup Cemetery, which appears to be listed as 'undetermined' on the website after a five-mile Visual APE Architectural Resource Survey for the Proposed Deer River Wind Farm was completed. Since there is no ground disturbance, this is not anticipated to be a concern.

Although the proposed project does not involve ground disturbance, applicants are advised to review and comply with Article 24 of the NYS DEC Freshwater Wetlands Law. Should land disturbance be proposed in the future, any required NYS DEC permits or approvals should be obtained prior to commencement of work to avoid potential legal and environmental risks.

The EAF Mapper also indicates that the project site or adjoining lands may contain wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by a federal, state, or local agency. Upon further investigation on the NYS Environmental Resource Mapper (ERM), it appears that the proposed project will be located approximately 100 feet from a National Wetland, classified as a Freshwater Emergent Wetland. It also appears that a Class C Stream, at one point, was located under the existing building. While no ground disturbance is proposed, given the nature of motor vehicle repair activities and potential drainage concerns, the Town of Harrisburg Planning Board should verify whether the nearby National Wetland is regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and further any conditions on the special use permit, if granted, that would ensure no disturbance to the wetland or alteration of drainage patterns that could affect the wetland resource as part of this project.

- *Signage:*

The Town Planning Board has waived the requirement for a signage plan for this application. During a phone conversation with the applicant on March 4<sup>th</sup>, it was indicated that no signage is proposed for this use. Should signage be proposed in the future, it must comply with Article V, §545 of the Town of Harrisburg Zoning Law.

- *Drainage & Erosion:*

The submitted SEAF indicates that the proposed project will not result in additional stormwater discharge. Motor vehicle repair facilities can be sources of pollutants (oil, anti-freeze, solvents, fuels). Given the nature of this use, it is imperative that the Planning Board ensure that the applicant follows proper spill-prevention and containment measures and confirms compliance with DEC regulations for petroleum and hazardous materials handling.

- *Parking:*

The Town Planning Board has waived the requirement for a parking plan for this application. Pursuant to Article V, §525 of the Town of Harrisburg Zoning Law, one parking space is required per 400 square feet of Gross Leasable Area (GLA) for retail and large product uses. Based on information provided by the

applicant on March 4<sup>th</sup>, the building measures approximately 50 feet by 120 feet (6,000 square feet), which would require approximately 15 parking spaces.

Although a parking plan was not included in the submission, the existing parking area appears sufficient to accommodate this requirement, and after speaking with the applicant, it was explained that the truck traffic is not expected to increase beyond current levels and the existing parking area should continue to provide ample parking even with a change in use.

- *Community Facilities:*

The submitted SEAF indicates that the project will not connect to existing public water supply or wastewater utilities. During a conversation with the applicant on March 4<sup>th</sup>, it was conveyed that additional restroom facilities are located elsewhere on the property and that the proposed use does not require potable water.

- *Lighting:*

The Town Planning Board has waived the requirement for a lighting plan for this application, and no lighting plan was submitted. The applicant indicated on March 4<sup>th</sup> that the building currently contains lantern-style fixtures and an overhead floodlight. If additional lighting should be added in the future, it should be downcast to avoid spilling onto neighboring properties or into the roadway.

- *Landscaping and Screening:*

The Town Planning Board has waived the requirement for a landscaping and screening plan for this application. No such plans were submitted, and the applicant indicated on March 4<sup>th</sup> that they had no further landscaping plans beyond maintaining the existing lawn. Should landscaping or screening be installed, it should comply with Article VIII, §815.

***Recommendation: Approve with Conditions***

*The acting municipal body must have a super-majority (majority plus one) vote to disregard the following conditions:*

1. Although the proposed project does not involve ground disturbance, if a Special Use Permit is granted to the applicant, the approval should be conditioned on compliance with all applicable state and federal regulations due to the site's proximity to a National Wetland (Freshwater Emergent Wetland) and the use of an existing building that appears, as shown on the NYS Environmental Review Mapper, to be located over a Class C Stream. Furthermore, should land disturbance be proposed in the future, any required permits or approvals from the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) or the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers should be obtained prior to the commencement of work to avoid potential legal or environmental impacts.

2. Prior to taking action, due to the nature of motor vehicle repair operations, the Town of Harrisburg Planning Board shall ensure that appropriate spill prevention, waste handling, and drainage controls are in place to prevent petroleum products or other contaminants from entering nearby water resources. Verification shall ensure confirmation of the proposed project's compliance with NYS DEC regulations for petroleum and hazardous materials handling. It should also include verification that all floor drains, oil separators, and drainage systems are and will be properly managed.
3. Should signage be proposed in the future, it must comply with Article V, §545 of the Town of Harrisburg Zoning Law.
4. If additional lighting should be added in the future, it should be downcast to avoid spilling onto neighboring properties or into the roadway.
5. Should landscaping or screening be installed in the future, it should comply with Article VIII, §815.

The CPB had a brief discussion about the commercial status and how it affects building code standards. Drainage was emphasized due to the NWI results and the type of business; however, that will also be addressed in the building codes.

With no further comments, a motion was made by Mr. Reed to approve with conditions, seconded by Ms. Metott, and carried unanimously.

Ms. Krokowski read the following review:

**TOWN OF HARRISBURG PLANNING BOARD**

Special Use Permit for a 50' by 32' expansion to the existing produce auction facility/small product retail business located at 8236 Cobb Road (CR 25) in the Town of Harrisburg.

Tax Map Parcel #158.00-01-13.211

*Emmanuel Widrick, Applicant*

The Town provided the following project documentation: 1) General Municipal Referral Form; 2) Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF); 3) Town Application for Special Use Permit; 4) Site Plan; and 5) Agricultural Data Statement.

▪ *Compatibility with Adjacent Uses*

The proposed project is located within the Agricultural/Rural Residential (AR-1) Zone in the Town of Harrisburg, where surrounding land uses primarily consist of agricultural operations and rural residences. The applicant seeks to expand an existing small produce auction facility by adding a 50-foot by 32-foot addition to the current 44-foot by 60-foot building on the property.

On March 4, 2026, the applicant verbally indicated that the building height is approximately 22 feet, which is below the maximum allowable height of 35 feet and therefore complies with §410.

Since the proposed action involves an agricultural-related use that will operate within and expand upon an existing structure, it appears consistent with the character of the surrounding land uses and the rural environment.

The proposed project appears to meet all required dimensional standards outlined in Article IV §405, with the exception of the County Road centerline setback requirement of 75 feet. The proposed addition is located approximately 63 feet from the road centerline, which is approximately 12 feet less than the required setback. Pursuant to Article IX §935.C.2.b, "Structures nonconforming as to road setback may be expanded only within the setback area which is greater than one half the setback distance from the road."

Based on this provision, the proposed expansion may proceed without the need for an area variance. This interpretation is consistent with the Letter of Zoning Referral completed by Enforcement Official Manning on 12/17/2025. Please refer to the attached Dimensional Standards Table for a detailed breakdown of how the project meets §405.

▪ *Traffic Generation and Effect:*

Based on the submitted Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF), the applicant anticipates that the proposed action will not result in a substantial increase in traffic beyond current levels. The existing loop-style stone driveway connecting to Cobb Road (CR-25) will continue to serve as both ingress and egress and is expected to have minimal impact on traffic flow along the roadway.

Given the topography of CR-25 and the site's location, adequate on-site parking accommodations should be provided to ensure safe traffic circulation and minimize potential hazards.

▪ *Protection of Community Character:*

The proposed expansion of the produce auction hall on Cobb Road appears consistent with multiple goals of the Town of Harrisburg Comprehensive Plan (2023). The Plan emphasizes supporting agriculture, retaining farmlands in productive use, and encouraging land uses that strengthen the agricultural economy (Goals 4.0, 4.4, and 4.7). The project represents an agricultural-supporting commercial activity that aligns with the Town's rural character and stated land-use priorities. The Town Planning Board should include a formal finding of Comprehensive Plan consistency in its decision.

According to the submitted SEAF, the proposed project site is not located within a critical environmental area, a National or State Register of Historic Places, an archaeologically-sensitive area, or a 100-year floodplain. This was confirmed using the NYS EAF Mapper and the Lewis County GIS Cloud.

The SEAF also notes that the project site or adjoining lands contain wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by a Federal, State, or Local Agency. These areas should be avoided when selecting the location of the building expansion and should comply with Article 24 of the NYS DEC Freshwater Wetlands Law. Should additional land disturbance be proposed in the future, the applicant should obtain the necessary NYS DEC permit or approval before proceeding, as failure to do so may result in significant legal and environmental risks.

- *Signage:*

The Town Planning Board has waived the requirement for a signage plan for this application, as it was deemed not applicable to this project. If signage is proposed in the future, it should comply with the sign regulations outlined in Article V §545 of the Town of Harrisburg Zoning Law.

- *Drainage & Erosion:*

The submitted SEAF indicates that the proposed project will not result in additional stormwater discharge; however, this may be a concern given the planned ground disturbance for the building expansion.

Based on the scope of the proposed project, it does not appear that provisions stipulated within § 810 Erosion Control apply, as the project appears to be below the established thresholds of 5 disturbed acres or on an average slope of 15%.

- *Parking:*

The Town Planning Board has waived the requirement for a detailed parking plan for this application. However, per Article 5 (§525), one parking space is required for every 200 square feet of Gross Leasable Area (GLA) for retail and small product uses. Based on this standard, the existing facility required 13 parking spaces, and the proposed 50' x 32' expansion would require an additional 8 spaces, bringing the total to 21 spaces.

With the updated site plan provided on March 4, 2026, the parking layout now shows more than 21 spaces. Due to inadequate roadway shoulders and existing sight-distance concerns, parking should not be permitted along either side of Cobb Road. No parking signs will be required on Cobb Road in this area. The applicant should coordinate with the Lewis County Highway Department to ensure proper maintenance of roadway infrastructure and to address any safety considerations associated with the proposed use.

- **Community Facilities:**

The submitted SEAF indicates that this project will not connect to existing water supply or wastewater utilities. The submitted materials state that a portable restroom will be provided on-site for these needs.

- **Lighting:**

The Town Planning Board has waived the requirement for a lighting plan for this application, and no lighting plans were included in the submission. If lighting should be added in the future, it should be downcast to avoid spilling onto neighboring properties.

- **Landscaping and Screening:**

The Town Planning Board waived the requirement for a landscaping and screening plan for this application, and no such plans were included in the submission. While the Town of Harrisburg Zoning Law does not appear to mandate landscaping and screening for this type of use, Article VIII (§815) provides guidance on landscaping standards that can enhance site safety and aesthetics. Landscaping to complement County Highway rights-of-way, define entrances and exits, and provide screening around parking areas may offer beneficial impacts for traffic flow, visibility, and overall community character. If landscaping is incorporated in the future, it should comply with the provisions of Article VIII (§815).

***Recommendation: Approve with Conditions***

*The acting municipal body must have a super-majority (majority plus one) vote to disregard the following conditions:*

1. The applicant should obtain all necessary NYS DEC permits under Article 24 (Freshwater Wetlands Law) before construction.
2. The applicant should verify that the expansion will not increase stormwater runoff (parking area may be particularly susceptible depending on material) and shall comply with §820 of the Zoning Law. If necessary, a basic drainage plan or erosion control measures should be submitted to the Planning Board to prevent impacts on adjacent properties.
3. Due to documented safety concerns along CR-25, as identified by the County Highway Superintendent, the applicant must, as a condition of any land use permit granted by the Planning Board, coordinate with the Lewis County Highway Superintendent to, at the very least, install no parking signs on Cobb Road, and to continuously monitor and address traffic patterns to ensure public safety.
4. The Planning Board should verify that §§815(C), (D), and (H) were intentionally waived, as landscaping/ screening to complement County Highway rights-of-way, define entrances and exits, and provide screening in and around parking areas may have a beneficial impact on health and safety. If feasible, the Board should consider requiring minimal landscaping measures to improve site aesthetics, traffic flow, and pedestrian safety.

5. The project shall comply with all applicable Federal, State, and Local laws, regulations, and ordinances, including but not limited to building codes, zoning requirements, environmental regulations, and permitting standards.

**Non-Binding Notes:**

*These are used as suggestions and/or advice from the County Planning Board, and the acting municipal body is not required to take action, nor is a supermajority vote required.*

1. If lighting or signage is proposed in the future, it should comply with Article V (§545) and ensure that lighting is downcast to avoid glare on neighboring properties.
2. As part of its review, the Town Planning Board may wish to include a finding addressing consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, as required under Zoning Law §710(A) regarding harmony with the General Plan. The following could be utilized "The proposed expansion of the produce auction hall on Cobb Road appears generally consistent with the Town of Harrisburg Comprehensive Plan (2023), particularly its goals to support agriculture and encourage land uses that strengthen the agricultural economy (Goals 4.0, 4.4, 4.7)."

Mr. Reed provided additional clarification regarding Condition 3 and asked the applicant's representative whether the proposed parking spaces would be located within the County right-of-way. The representative was unsure but advised that the area in question had not historically been used for parking.

Mr. Reed explained that the presence of a vehicle within the right-of-way materially changes the circumstances; regardless of past informal use, vehicles are not permitted to encroach into the right-of-way. He emphasized that the County must be able to properly maintain its roads without obstruction, and that parking within the right-of-way presents a significant safety hazard. Mr. Reed reiterated that parking along the roadway or within the right-of-way will not be tolerated under any circumstances. Condition 3 was amended to include that parking could not encroach into the road right-of-way.

With no further comments, a motion was made by Mr. Virkler to approve as amended, seconded by Ms. Metott, and carried unanimously.

**JOINT TOWN AND VILLAGE OF LOWVILLE PLANNING BOARD**

Site Plan Review of a 3,100 sq. ft. expansion and renovation of an existing financial institution (retail business) located at 5801 Number Four Road (CR 26) in the Town of Lowville.

Tax Map Parcel #213.00-01-39.140

*Northern Credit Union, Applicant*

The applicant provided the following project documentation: 1) General Municipal Referral Form; 2) Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF); 3) Town Application for Site Plan Review; 4) Site Plans; and 5) Negative Agricultural Data Statement.

▪ *Compatibility with Adjacent Uses*

The proposed project is located within the Town of Lowville’s Industrial/Commercial (I-3) zoning district, where surrounding land uses are predominantly government and commercial facilities. The applicant seeks to expand and renovate the existing retail business by 3,100 sq feet. Article II §250-8 of the Town of Lowville Zoning Law defines Retail Business as “A commercial activity characterized by the direct on-premises sale of goods and services to the ultimate consumer, including on-premises manufacturing, processing and servicing and preparation customarily associated therewith and generally involving stock-in-trade such as are normally associated with department stores, food markets and similar establishments, but also including financial institutions, business and professional offices and services, restaurants and bars.”

Schedule A of the Town of Lowville Zoning Law, Permitted Uses, indicates that the proposed use is allowed with a site plan review prior to the issuance of a zoning permit. The use appears compatible with the proposed location. Furthermore, according to Section 250 Attachment 3, the following dimensional requirements apply to the proposed project in the I-3 Zone:

<b>I-3</b>		
<b>Setback</b>	<b>Non-Residential Use</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Area	54,000 sq ft	136,000 sq ft
Building Height Max.	35’	31’ 11”
Frontage	250’	356’
Lot Depth	215’	309’
Front Yard Minimum (County Road)	50’	52.6’
Side Property Line	10’	14.8’
Rear Property Line	10’	113’
Lot Coverage Max %	50%	31%

According to the Zoning Information table on Sheet C-2 of the submitted engineered drawings, the proposed building height is listed as ±35 feet. However, the same table indicates that the maximum permitted height is 45', which does not align with Section 250, Attachment 3, where the maximum allowable height in the I-3 District is 35 feet. Additionally, the submitted Layout Plan identifies the Zoning District as Industrial-1 (I-1), which may be the source of this discrepancy. The applicant and consultant must correct all zoning district labels shown on the plans and revise the zoning table on Sheet C-2 to reflect the correct maximum building height. According to communication from the Joint Town and Village of Lowville Planning Board

Secretary, the Project Engineer confirmed that the building is proposed to be 31 feet, 11 inches in height and indicated that the zoning information, including the incorrect I-1 labels, will be corrected prior to the Planning Board's final action meeting.

- *Traffic Generation and Effect:*

Based on the submitted Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF), the applicant anticipates that the proposed action will not result in a substantial increase in traffic beyond current levels.

The Town Board noted potential concerns about perceived traffic increases on CR 26 resulting from the DMV and Lowville Farmer's Co-Op relocations. The Town Board would like the County to consider an updated traffic study to determine whether remediation is necessary from East State Street/Ross Road down Number Four Road.

Given that CR 26 is a county-owned road, any determination regarding roadway capacity, intersection performance, or required mitigation measures ultimately rests with Lewis County. If the County determines that improvements may be warranted due to cumulative traffic increases along the corridor, rather than impacts attributable to a single project, the Town and County may wish to discuss potential approaches for addressing future corridor improvements and coordinating with future development. At this time, available information does not indicate that the proposed 3,100 sq. ft. expansion alone will generate traffic levels exceeding existing roadway capacity; however, coordination with the Lewis County Highway Superintendent is encouraged to ensure long-term planning consistency.

- *Protection of Community Character:*

According to the submitted SEAF, the proposed project site is not located within a critical environmental area, a National or State Register of Historic Places, an archaeologically sensitive area, or a 100-year floodplain. This information was confirmed using New York State's Cultural Resource Information System (CRIS) and EAF Mapper.

A portion of the IPaC resource list associated with this project has been included as an attachment to this review, which indicates that the Monarch Butterfly may be present within the area of potential impact. During construction, care should be taken to avoid disturbance to any habitat that may support this protected species.

The submitted SEAF indicates that the project site or adjoining lands contain wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by Federal, State, or Local agencies. The plan set does not delineate any wetlands; however, a National Wetland Inventory (NWI) mapper printout was provided. Since the NYS DEC no longer recognizes mappers as accurate tools for wetland delineation, the Planning

Board should ensure that a formal jurisdictional wetland determination has been completed in accordance with Article 24 of the NYS DEC Freshwater Wetlands Act. If additional land disturbance is proposed in the future, the applicant should obtain any required NYS DEC permits or approvals before proceeding, as failure to do so may result in significant legal and environmental risks.

Article IV Section 250-19(F) states that “the exteriors of all buildings and structures shall be earth-tone colors or may be unpainted masonry or natural materials.” Article II further provides that, unless otherwise defined, words are to be interpreted according to their customary meanings and that the term “shall” is mandatory. The proposed exterior materials and colors—green siding, stone elements, wood arches, and black roofing shingles—generally fall within the customary understanding of earth-tone colors or natural materials. Therefore, the proposed color scheme appears to comply with this requirement.

- *Signage:*

The applicant indicated that the current signage would remain unchanged. Should the applicant propose changes to the signage, Article VII shall be followed, including permitting.

- *Drainage:*

The submitted SEAF indicates that the proposed project will not result in additional stormwater discharge; this may be a concern with the ground disturbance planned for the building expansion. The Site Plan Review provided by the Planning Board indicated that a stormwater management plan was not necessary.

§ 198-7.C.5 Stormwater Management and Erosion Control- Applicability provides the following as an exemption that may be applicable in this project “*Any maintenance, alteration, use or improvement to an existing structure which will not change the quality, rate, volume or location of surface water discharge or contribute to erosion and sedimentation.*”

- *Parking:*

The site currently contains 44 parking spaces; however, based on the size of the site and the applicable parking requirements, only 31 spaces are required. Because these spaces already exist in association with the current building, it is assumed that they comply with the provisions of Article VIII – Parking and Loading. Should any modifications to the parking layout be proposed as part of the project, they should be reviewed to ensure continued compliance with the requirements of Article VIII.

- **Community Facilities:**

The submitted SEAF indicates that this project will connect to existing water supply or wastewater utilities. The applicant indicates that existing utility services will be utilized.

- **Lighting:**

The applicant does not propose any changes to the existing on-site lighting, which appears to comply with § 250-83, Lighting. Should additional or modified lighting be proposed as part of the project, it should be reviewed to ensure compliance with the requirements of § 250-83.

- **Landscaping and Screening:**

The Planning Board reviewed the proposed landscaping as shown in the engineered site plan drawings.

Pursuant to § 250-85, side and rear yard buffer areas are required. The Planning Board may wish to note how the proposed landscaping plan specifically addresses and complies with these buffer requirements.

Additionally, the applicant should provide a final landscaping replacement schedule demonstrating compliance with § 250-86(B), which states: *“When planted, large trees shall be a minimum of two inches caliper, conifers shall be a minimum of five feet in height, and shrubs shall be a minimum of 36 inches in height.”* The schedule should also clarify planting specifications in locations where the plans reference *“replace in-kind.”*

***Recommendation: Approve with Conditions***

*The acting municipal body must have a super-majority (majority plus one) vote to disregard the following conditions:*

1. The IPaC resource review identified potential Monarch Butterfly habitat within the project’s area of potential impact. The applicant and contractors should avoid disturbance to milkweed or other host/native nectar plants during the Monarch’s active season (generally May–September) unless a qualified environmental professional confirms that no breeding or roosting habitat is present. If suitable habitat is identified, work should be adjusted or scheduled outside the active season to avoid impacts.
2. The applicant shall obtain all necessary NYS DEC permits under Article 24 (Freshwater Wetlands Law) before construction, including but not limited to a jurisdictional wetland determination, if applicable.
3. Prior to taking action, a final landscaping and tree replacement schedule must be provided to the Planning Board demonstrating compliance with Town Code §250-86(B), including required minimum tree/shrub sizes. Landscaping labeled “replace in-kind” must meet these standards.
4. Prior to taking action, the applicant shall provide the Planning Board with updated documentation identifying the trees removed “since survey” and

- demonstrate that any required replacements comply with applicable code provisions, including Town Code § 250-86(B).
5. Prior to taking action, the applicant must provide the Planning Board with proof of consultation with the Lewis County Highway Superintendent to ensure that there are minimal impacts to CR 26.
  6. The project shall comply with all applicable Federal, State, and Local laws, regulations, and ordinances, including but not limited to building codes, zoning requirements, environmental regulations, and permitting standards.

**Non-Binding Notes:**

*These are used as suggestions and/or advice from the County Planning Board; the municipality is not required to take action, nor is a supermajority vote required.*

1. The Town may wish to consider updating zoning use standards for retail/business uses to clarify landscaping, architectural, and dimensional expectations for future projects, as well as to define “earth-tone colors” and “natural materials” so that the intent of these requirements can be clearly interpreted.
2. If traffic conditions change on CR-26 due to DMV and Co-Op relocation, the Town and County may jointly evaluate whether an updated corridor traffic study is warranted.
3. If future site work involves additional land disturbance or changes to drainage characteristics, a stormwater review may be required even though the current project qualifies for exemption.
4. Any future modifications to lighting, signage, or parking layout not shown on the current plans may require additional Planning Board review.
5. The Town may wish to consider amending portions of §250-86 that are frequently disregarded or no longer applicable.

It was noted that the Article 24 permit was granted by the DEC.

With no further comments, a motion was made by Mr. Virkler to approve with the conditions, seconded by Mr. Reed, and carried unanimously.

**TOWN OF NEW BREMEN TOWN BOARD**

Proposed adoption of the updated and revised Comprehensive Plan for the Town of New Bremen.

*Town of New Bremen – Applicant*

The proposed local law, the General Municipal Referral Form, the Ag Data Statement, and FEA Form Part 1 were submitted by the Town Clerk.

The Final Draft 2026 Comprehensive Plan establishes a 10–20-year vision for New Bremen and includes goals, policies, and implementation steps addressing housing, community and culture, public infrastructure, economic development, environmental stewardship, and land use/zoning updates. The

Plan is supported by a Quick Reference Implementation Matrix, maps, and survey results, which provide a strong foundation for future decision-making.

Key directives include:

- Updating zoning to add a Future Land Use framework, allow Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), enable cluster development, and create a dedicated Short-Term Rental (STR) permitting system.
- Strengthening siting guidance for renewable energy, including a solar overlay district, Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) standards, and consideration of wind energy and emerging technologies.
- Prioritizing Crystal Pond Dam repairs, exploring broadband expansion, and implementing an asset management plan.
- Protecting farmland, forests, riparian buffers, and scenic viewsheds, while promoting recreation such as rail-trail development.

The Plan's emphasis on rural character preservation, housing balance, economic diversification, and environmental resilience is consistent with County planning principles and State guidance for comprehensive planning.

The Town currently administers a single zoning district (Rural Residential) that accommodates diverse uses. This lack of differentiation can lead to unpredictable development patterns and enforcement challenges. The Plan's recommendation to adopt a Future Land Use Map and district-specific use tables will:

1. Improve clarity for applicants and enforcement officials.
2. Direct growth to appropriate areas while preserving agricultural and natural resources.
3. Align with best practices for rural communities seeking a balance between growth and conservation.

The Plan recognizes the importance of agriculture to New Bremen's identity and economy. By proposing solar overlay districts and conservation strategies, the Town can prevent fragmentation of prime soils and maintain agricultural viability. This approach supports county-wide farmland protection goals and mitigates intermunicipal conflicts over large-scale energy siting.

Introducing ADUs and cluster wastewater systems will expand housing options for young families and aging residents without promoting sprawl. Transitioning STRs from "special use permits" to a dedicated STR permit system is critical because special use permits typically do not expire, creating enforcement gaps. A biannual STR permit cycle ensures accountability and protects housing availability for full-time residents.

The Plan appropriately addresses solar and battery storage but should explicitly reference NFPA 855 (2026 edition), NFPA 1 Chapter 52, and UL 9540/9540A standards in future local laws. These standards govern hazard mitigation, spacing, ventilation, and emergency planning for BESS installations. Incorporating these references will:

1. Enhance public safety.
2. Ensure consistency with state and national best practices.
3. Facilitate coordination with fire services and neighboring jurisdictions.

The Plan suggests ~100-foot multi-zone buffers “where feasible.” While this is a strong starting point, implementation should be tiered and site-specific, focusing on priority reaches such as the Black River and Beaver River corridors. This approach will:

1. Reduce downstream flooding and water quality impacts.
2. Provide flexibility for agricultural operations.
3. Align with regional watershed protection strategies.

The proposed rail-trail and OHV/snowmobile networks have intermunicipal connectivity and tourism implications. Coordinating with County and regional partners will maximize grant opportunities and ensure consistent design standards across jurisdictions.

The proposed Comprehensive Plan is well-organized, data-driven, and responsive to community input. It provides a clear roadmap for growth while safeguarding the Town’s rural character and environmental assets.

***Recommendation: APPROVE with Non-Binding Notes***

**Non-Binding Notes:**

*These are used as suggestions and/or advice from the County Planning Board; the municipality is not required to take action, nor is a supermajority vote required.*

1. If and when the Comprehensive Plan is adopted, the Municipality should email the Lewis County Planning & Community Development Department to update its Local Law webpage. Once adopted, the law becomes ‘operative’, meaning Enforcement Officials shall use that version of the code moving forward.
2. If and when the Town Board adopts the proposed Comprehensive Plan, the Board and Town Clerk should consider filing the Plan with the New York State Department of State (DOS). While filing is not a statutory requirement under Town Law §272-a, it is widely regarded as a best practice for transparency, public accessibility, and long-term recordkeeping.
3. Submitting the Plan to DOS ensures that the document is archived at the state level, which can be beneficial for grant applications, intermunicipal coordination, and compliance verification. Should the Town of New Bremen

- choose to file the Comprehensive Plan with DOS, the Clerk should also email a copy of all submitted materials to the Lewis County Planning & Community Development Department. This step supports consistency in local law tracking and addresses recent gaps in municipal filings, enabling the Planning Department to maintain accurate records and assist with future updates or amendments.
4. The Town shall consider incorporating explicit references to nationally recognized safety standards for Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) and similar technologies in any future local laws or zoning amendments. These standards should include NFPA 855 (2026 edition) for siting and hazard mitigation, NFPA 1 Chapter 52 for fire protection requirements, and listing to UL 9540 and UL 9540A for system safety testing. This condition ensures that renewable energy development aligns with best practices for public safety, emergency preparedness, and regional consistency.
  5. Within twelve to eighteen months of adopting the Comprehensive Plan, the Town Board and/or Planning and Zoning Board shall consider preparing and adopting an updated Land Use Map with corresponding zoning districts and clear use tables. This action will provide predictability for applicants, improve enforcement, and ensure that growth is directed to appropriate areas while preserving agricultural and natural resources. Alternatively, if creating multiple zoning districts proves politically or administratively challenging, the Town may consider a hybrid approach that maintains its single Rural Residential zone but introduces overlay districts. These overlays can apply additional regulations and protections to sensitive areas and features — such as agricultural lands, scenic viewsheds, riparian corridors, and renewable energy siting zones—without requiring a full rezoning. This approach offers flexibility while still achieving the Plan’s objectives for resource protection and targeted development.
  6. The Town / Planning/ Zoning Board shall consider transitioning proposed Short-Term Rental language from being regulated as “special use permits” to a dedicated STR permitting system with defined renewal cycles, performance standards, and enforcement protocols when implementing regulations into the zoning code. This change is necessary because special use permits typically do not expire, creating enforcement challenges and reducing housing availability for full-time residents.
  7. The Town / Planning/ Zoning Board shall consider clarifying that the recommended ~100-foot multi-zone riparian buffer is a targeted best practice applied to mapped priority corridors such as the Black River and Beaver River. The implementation should allow flexibility for agricultural operations and site constraints while maintaining water quality and flood mitigation objectives. Future local laws should specify methods, thresholds, and mitigation credits to ensure practical application.

With no comments, a motion to approve with non-binding notes was made by Mr. Petersen, seconded by Ms. Moser, and carried unanimously.

Ms. Krokowski read the following review:

**TOWN OF WATSON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

Area Variance for a porch addition and fence extension related to the structure’s conversion to a restaurant located at 6525 Number Four Road (CR 26).

Tax Map Parcel #214.03-01-10.112

*Darrell Miller, Miller’s Meat Market – Applicant*

The applicant provided the following project documentation: 1) General Municipal Referral Form; 2) Site Plan; 3) Negative Agricultural Data Statement; 4) Letter of Zoning Referral that includes a Project Narrative; 5) Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF); and 6) Images with setback distances.

This review is limited to the area variance. A separate County Planning Board review will be required for a Special Use Permit application once the Planning Board receives it.

▪ *Compatibility with Adjacent Uses*

The structure is nonconforming because it was constructed within the required 65-foot front-yard setback prior to current zoning regulations. Portions of the proposed porch/roof extension and the continuation of the fence would also be located within this setback. As a result, the project requires relief from Section 335.D.1.a, which governs front-yard setbacks for nonconforming structures, and Section 565.1, which regulates fences within the public right-of-way.

The proposed action is located on a parcel within the Hamlet District and is surrounded by a mix of commercial and residential uses. The existing building is already located closer to the roadway than permitted under current zoning regulations. The proposed improvements would extend this existing encroachment, increasing the nonconformity. The Zoning Board of Appeals must determine whether granting the requested variance would have any adverse impact on neighboring properties or alter the character of the surrounding area.

<b>Town of Watson – Hamlet (H) Zone</b>		
<b>Set Back</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
<b>Lot Frontage</b>	100’	340’
<b>Left Side</b>	25’	45’
<b>Right Side</b>	25’	165’
<b>Rear</b>	25’	300’
<b>Front</b>	65’*	25’

Because the project involves the expansion of a nonconforming structure, Section 335.D.1.a requires that a 65-foot front-yard setback be maintained. The proposed porch extension, roof overhang, and continuation of the fence would extend into this setback and therefore cannot proceed without the granting of an Area Variance. In addition, Section 565.1 states that “no fence, wall, or shrubbery shall be located within any public right-of-way,” which may also require variance relief for the proposed continuation of the fence.

The proposed porch will be used for outdoor seating and the consumption of food served from the interior buffet. A portion of the porch is also intended to accommodate grilling activities. These uses are associated with the encroaching structure and should be considered by the Zoning Board of Appeals when evaluating potential impacts on neighboring properties.

The Zoning Board of Appeals must follow and document the review procedures outlined in Sections 320.B.3 and 320.C as part of its evaluation of the requested variances.

- *Traffic Generation and Effect:*

Number Four Road (CR 26) provides access to the site. Seasonal vegetation and winter snowbanks can affect sight distance at the driveway entrance. Any structural encroachment, such as the proposed porch or fencing within the setback area, may further affect visibility along the roadway. If the Zoning Board of Appeals grants the requested variance, conditions may be appropriate to ensure adequate sight distance and maintain safety along CR 26.

- *Protection of Community Character:*

According to page 2 of the submitted State Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF), the proposed project site is not situated within a critical environmental area, a National or State Register of Historic Places, adjacent to an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeological site inventory, or a 100-year floodplain.

As part of this review, the above information was investigated. According to the EAF Mapper, the proposed action site may also contain the Tomah Mayfly, which is listed by the State or Federal government as threatened or endangered. Because the proposed variance-related improvements involve only limited ground disturbance, no adverse impacts to the species or its habitat are anticipated.

- *Drainage:*

The variance-related improvements involve minimal ground disturbance and are not expected to alter existing drainage patterns. No drainage impacts are anticipated from the setback encroachment. A full drainage review was not

conducted, as such analysis falls outside the scope of this Area Variance review.

▪ *Erosion:*

The proposed porch and fence improvements involve limited disturbance, and no erosion impacts are anticipated as a result of the requested variance. A comprehensive erosion control review was not performed, as it is not required for an Area Variance-only referral.

▪ *Signage:*

No new signage information was submitted, and signage is not part of the current area variance request. If the applicant proposes new or modified signage in the future, any required approvals or relief—whether through a zoning permit or a separate variance request—must be obtained from the appropriate municipal authority in accordance with Section 530.

▪ *Lighting, Landscaping, and Screening:*

Only elements impacting the requested setback relief were considered. Because the proposed porch is located within the required front-yard setback and near the highway right-of-way, any lighting installed on or under the porch may affect visibility along County Route 26. The ZBA may consider imposing conditions to ensure that any lighting associated with the encroaching structure is downcast and does not create glare or visibility concerns for motorists.

The continuation of the fence may provide useful screening between commercial and residential areas. However, the Zoning Board of Appeals may wish to consider conditions to ensure that the fence does not obstruct sight distance near the roadway.

***Recommendation: Approve with Conditions***

*The acting municipal body must have a super-majority (majority plus one) vote to disregard the following conditions:*

1. The ZBA shall determine whether to grant an Area Variance for the porch and roof extension located within the required 65-foot front-yard setback under Section 335.D.1.a.
2. The ZBA shall determine whether to grant an Area Variance for continuation of the fence along the structure and driveway, as Section 565.1 prohibits fences within the public right-of-way. The Town Attorney may provide guidance regarding right-of-way boundaries and appropriate relief.
3. Any variances granted by the ZBA shall consider the inclusion of conditions ensuring that improvements do not obstruct sight distance along County Route 26.

4. The ZBA may consider imposing conditions to ensure that any lighting associated with the encroaching porch structure is downcast and does not create glare or visibility concerns for motorists.
5. Vegetation, flowers, and winter snowbanks within the setback area shall be managed to maintain safe sight-distance visibility year-round.
6. The Zoning Board of Appeals shall notify the Planning Board of any conditions set forth that should be granted approvals.

**Non-Binding Note:**

This review is limited to the requested Area Variance. A separate, non-binding review by the County Planning Board will be required for the Special Use Permit application once the Town of Watson Planning Board receives a complete submission.

Mr. Reed discussed adding a condition to ensure that the second driveway is not used, thereby reducing the access points on CR 26.

Mr. Manning discussed a hypothetical situation regarding overflow seating across the road, which raised a number of health and safety concerns, but these concerns should be addressed when the applicable Special Use Permit comes before the County Planning Board for review.

With no further comments, a motion was made by Mr. Virkler to approve as amended, seconded by Ms. Metott, and carried unanimously.

Ms. Tabolt read the following review:

**VILLAGE OF LYONS FALLS BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

Site Plan Review for change of use from storage to light manufacturing for a building located at 3936 Franklin Street in the Village of Lyons Falls.

Tax Map Parcel #322.19-07-05.000

*Lawrence Williams – Applicant*

The applicant provided the following project documentation: 1) General Municipal Referral Form; 2) Resolution to Approve Zoning Application; 3) Site Plan Review Intake Form; 4). February Village Board Meeting Minutes; 5) Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF); 6) Aerial Map; 7) Paid Property Tax Bill; and 8) Application for Zoning Approval.

▪ *Compatibility with Adjacent Uses*

The proposed project is located within the Single Unnamed District in the Village of Lyons Falls and is surrounded by a mix of residential, commercial, and industrial uses. The applicant proposes to convert an existing 5,400-square-foot storage facility to a light manufacturing use, including but not limited to metal fabrication, powder coating, and various spray-on

hydrographic coating processes. Based on the mix of surrounding land uses and the scale of the existing building, the proposed action appears to be generally compatible with the character of the surrounding area.

<b>Village of Lyons Falls – Single Unnamed District</b>		
<b>Set Back</b>	<b>Required</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
<b>Front</b>	30'	70'

As shown above, the proposed project appears to meet the dimensional standards outlined in Article 4 Section 425 of the Village of Lyons Falls Zoning Law.

- *Traffic Generation and Effect:*

The applicant proposes converting a building previously used for storage to a light manufacturing facility on Franklin Street. According to the submitted SEAF, the applicant indicates that the proposed action will not result in a substantial increase in traffic beyond current levels. The property contains an existing driveway that is estimated to be approximately 8,300 square feet in area, based on measurements obtained using the Lewis County GIS Cloud. The driveway appears to provide adequate space for vehicle ingress and egress.

During a conversation with the applicant on March 10<sup>th</sup>, it was indicated that the majority of sales will occur online, which is expected to result in minimal additional traffic to the site.

The existing driveway generally appears to comply with Article 4 Section 430 of the Village of Lyons Falls Zoning Law. However, Part 2 of that section states that private streets and driveways must be finished with a surface that can be kept free of dust and debris, using acceptable materials such as oil and stone, compacted gravel, or blacktop. The existing driveway appears to consist primarily of sand and stone. Given that the driveway is approximately 70 feet in length and vehicle speeds are likely to remain low, dust generation is not anticipated to be a significant concern. However, the Village Board may wish to confirm that the driveway surface will not create dust or debris impacts on neighboring properties.

- *Protection of Community Character:*

According to the submitted SEAF, the proposed project is not located within a Critical Environmental Area, a property listed on the State or National Register of Historic Places, an archaeologically sensitive area identified by the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), or a 100-year floodplain. As part of this review, this information was cross-referenced using the NYS EAF Mapper, the NYS Environmental Resource Mapper (ERM), and the Lewis County GIS Cloud.

This review identified a discrepancy between the submitted SEAF and available mapping resources, indicating that the project site may contain, or be substantially contiguous to, a property listed on the State or National Register of Historic Places. Further review of the New York State Cultural Resource Information System (CRIS) indicates that the project has previously received a letter of no impact from SHPO. As such, impacts to historic resources are not anticipated.

Although the proposed project does not involve ground disturbance, applicants are advised to review and comply with Article 24 of the NYS DEC Freshwater Wetlands Law. Should land disturbance be proposed in the future, any necessary permits or approvals from the NYS DEC should be obtained prior to commencement of work to avoid potential legal or environmental issues.

The EAF Mapper also indicates that the project site or adjoining lands may contain wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by a federal, state, or local agency. Further review using the NYS Environmental Resource Mapper indicates that the project site is located approximately 170 feet from a Class C stream. Because no ground disturbance is proposed as part of this project, and the facility will connect to public water/sewer infrastructure, impacts to this resource are not anticipated.

- *Signage:*

The submitted project documentation did not include a signage plan. During a conversation with the applicant on March 10<sup>th</sup>, the applicant indicated that signage may be considered in the future, potentially as a building-mounted sign, but that no freestanding signage or roadside signage is currently proposed.

- *Drainage & Erosion:*

The submitted SEAF indicates that the proposed project will not result in additional stormwater discharge. As the proposed action does not include ground disturbance and is limited to interior renovations, impacts related to drainage or erosion are not anticipated.

- *Parking:*

The submitted project documentation did not include a parking plan. Based on a review of aerial imagery, the existing driveway area appears to be sufficiently large to accommodate parking consistent with the requirements outlined in Article 4 Section 435 of the Village of Lyons Falls Zoning Law.

During a conversation with the applicant on March 10<sup>th</sup>, it was explained that although the building has four garage bays, they will not necessarily be used for moving vehicles once the building is converted to light manufacturing. As such, parking will be available directly in front of the bays. Additionally,

because the majority of sales will occur online, the amount of customer traffic visiting the site is expected to be minimal. Based on this information, the proposed use appears consistent with the general parking provisions outlined in Article 3 of the Village of Lyons Falls Zoning Law.

▪ *Community Facilities:*

According to the submitted SEAF, the project site is currently served by existing public water supply and wastewater utility connections.

▪ *Lighting:*

The submitted project documentation did not include a lighting plan. During a conversation with the applicant on March 10<sup>th</sup>, the applicant indicated that the building currently has two exterior lights located at the front and rear of the structure that operate from dusk until dawn. No additional lighting is proposed at this time.

Should additional lighting be installed in the future, it should be downward-facing to prevent light spillover onto neighboring properties and comply with Article 4 Section 445 of the Village of Lyons Falls Zoning Law.

▪ *Landscaping and Screening:*

The submitted project documentation did not include a landscaping plan. However, aerial imagery indicates that a dense tree line exists between the project site and the neighboring residential property, which appears to meet the screening requirements outlined in Article 4 Section 440 of the Village of Lyons Falls Zoning Law.

During a conversation with the applicant on March 10<sup>th</sup>, the applicant indicated that he plans to perform general yard maintenance and site upkeep, but does not intend to install additional landscaping at this time. Based on the existing vegetative buffer, the project appears to comply with the applicable landscaping and screening provisions of Article 4 Section 440.

***Recommendation: Approve with Conditions***

*The acting municipal body must have a super-majority (majority plus one) vote to disregard the following conditions:*

1. The Village Board should confirm that the existing driveway surface will not create dust or debris that could impact neighboring properties to comply with Article 4 Section 430 of the Village of Lyons Falls Zoning Law.
2. Although the proposed project does not involve ground disturbance, applicants are advised to review and comply with Article 24 of the NYS DEC Freshwater Wetlands Law. Should land disturbance be proposed in the future, any required NYS DEC permits or approvals should be obtained prior to commencement of work to avoid potential legal and environmental risks.

3. Should additional lighting be installed in the future, it should be downward-facing to prevent light spillover onto neighboring properties and should comply with Article 4 Section 445 of the Village of Lyons Falls Zoning Law.

With no further comments, Ms. Metott motioned to approve with conditions, seconded by Mr. Virkler, and the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Buell read the final review:

**VILLAGE OF PORT LEYDEN BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

Proposed local law to adopt a Comprehensive Plan for the Village of Port Leyden.

*Village of Port Leyden – Applicant*

The General Municipal Referral Form and Part 1 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) were submitted by the Village Mayor, Heather Collins, along with the proposed Comprehensive Plan document.

The Village of Port Leyden’s proposed Comprehensive Plan was reviewed in its entirety. The Plan’s purpose is to “...*guide future planning decisions that make sense and align with smart growth principles and the community’s vision for the future.*”

The document provides a thoughtful framework for guiding the Village’s future growth and revitalization. The document clearly lays out a vision for a clean, walkable, family-friendly community that preserves its historic character while encouraging reinvestment and economic opportunity. Overall, the Plan does a good job balancing preservation with realistic opportunities for growth.

One of the strongest aspects of the Plan is its focus on tourism and recreation as economic drivers. By positioning Port Leyden as a gateway to the Adirondacks and highlighting opportunities related to ATV, snowmobile, and outdoor recreation, the Plan builds on existing regional strengths. The emphasis on improving trail connections, expanding lodging opportunities, and supporting Main Street businesses provides a practical strategy for increasing visitation and supporting local entrepreneurship.

The Plan is also notable for including clear implementation actions, identifying responsible parties, timelines, and potential funding sources. This level of detail will help the Village pursue grants and coordinate projects with partners such as Lewis County and Naturally Lewis. The focus on adaptive reuse of historic buildings, housing rehabilitation, and business support initiatives also demonstrates a strong commitment to community revitalization.

While the Plan is well structured and detailed, there are some areas that need to be corrected prior to adoption. Within the Transportation section, references to transportation modes provided by Lewis County Public Transportation should be corrected to accurately reflect available services. In sections discussing economic development partnerships and redevelopment funding strategies, references to collaboration with Lewis County and Naturally Lewis should clarify that these organizations typically participate as project sponsors or grant partners rather than property owners. Furthermore, across the document, acronyms should be defined upon first use to ensure readers can easily understand the terminology and associated organizations. Lastly, within the Renewable Energy section, language referencing the County's Solar Energy Overlay Districts should be revised to clarify that these overlays are planning tools suggested for municipal consideration, as Lewis County does not have the authority to establish local land use regulations within villages or towns.

Overall, the proposed Comprehensive Plan appears to proactively guide future development, protect resources, and provide a basis for regulating land use and development for decades to come.

***Recommendation: APPROVE with Conditions***

*The acting municipal body must have a super-majority (majority plus one) vote to disregard the following conditions:*

- 1) Prior to adoption, the Village Board should address several contextual revisions identified below and provided through a supplemental document accompanying this review to ensure accurate references and clarity throughout the Plan:
  - a. Correcting the referenced transportation modes provided by Lewis County Public Transportation.
  - b. Ensuring that the proposed partnership roles with Lewis County and Naturally Lewis for funding opportunities are limited to project sponsorships versus property ownership.
  - c. Acronyms are properly defined before use so that the reader can connect the references to the correct context.
  - d. Properly referencing that the County-developed Solar Energy Overlay District(s) are suggested tools for municipal adoption, as the County cannot establish land use regulations.

**Non-Binding Notes:**

*These are used as suggestions and/or advice from the County Planning Board; the municipality is not required to take action, nor is a supermajority vote required.*

1. Prior to adoption, the Village Board should review the suggested non-contextual revisions as supplied as a supplemental document to this review.

With no comments, a motion to approve with condition was made by Mr. Virkler, seconded by Mr. Petersen, and carried unanimously.

**(6) Report of County Planner:**

Responses from municipalities regarding previously submitted/reviewed projects: None

Ms. Krokowski reported that she is aware of the following referrals for next month:

- The Town of Watson has proposed a moratorium on energy storage (BESS) as the previous moratorium expired before its regulations were adopted. Ms. Metott made a motion to allow County Planning Staff to deem this a Matter of Local Concern, which was seconded by Ms. Moser and carried unanimously.
- Joint Town/Village of Lowville - 4 referrals (with another potential one that hasn't been deemed complete yet).
- Village of Constableville – ZTA

**(7) Unfinished Business:**

- a. Training | NYS THC Local Government Conference – April 21, 2026
- b. Renewable Energy Training for Municipal Officials – March 30, 2026 | 5-7 PM at Croghan Fire Hall.
- c. Ms. Buell revisited the request for County-issued email accounts and/or laptops for CPB members. She clarified that the confidential designation applied to draft CPB reviews circulated prior to meetings does not imply a need for encryption, but rather that such materials are not to be shared outside of the CPB until they have been discussed at a public meeting, as they remain in preliminary draft form. This requirement was established by the County Attorney in 2017, following a request from CPB members to review draft materials in advance of meetings, and reflects that the Board has not yet taken formal action on the proposed conditions or recommendations.

Ms. Buell also read a statement from the County's Director of IT addressing the feasibility of providing County-issued email accounts and devices to Board members, noting that such an approach is not practical due to licensing constraints, cybersecurity considerations, and other previously evaluated factors.

**(8) New Business:**

Ms. Buell also reminded CPB members that, under the Board's Bylaws, members may not exceed three absences within a 12-month period and noted that several members are currently approaching or exceeding this threshold. It was discussed that the Bylaws could be amended to account for excused absences or to incorporate more flexible language. County Planning staff will further evaluate and refine the proposed revisions.

- (9) **Adjournment:** There being no other business, a motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Reed and seconded by Ms. Metott, which carried unanimously. Mr. Petersen adjourned the meeting at 4:03 PM.

Respectfully submitted,



Megan Krokowski  
Community Development Specialist

*Note: These minutes have been transcribed from a recording but are not a verbatim or quoted version; they are rather a documentation of the meeting events.*