

MINUTES
LEWIS COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
June 18, 2026

- (1) **Call to Order:** Chairman Petersen called the regular meeting of the Lewis County Planning Board to order at 2:31 PM in the basement conference room #030 at the Lewis County Courthouse, Lowville, New York. Roll call was requested by Mr. Petersen.

- (2) **Roll Call:**
Board Members Present: Timothy Petersen, John Lehman, Sarah Metott, Jessica Moser, and John Reed.

Staff Present: Lauryn Tabolt, Community Development Specialist; Megan Krokowski, Community Development Specialist; Ben Manning, Code Enforcement Officer; **Public Present:** None

- (3) **Reading and Approval of Minutes:** The draft May 21, 2026 meeting minutes were received and reviewed before the meeting. Mr. Lehman moved to approve the minutes; Ms. Metott seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

- (4) **Correspondence and Communication:**

🚩 **Bob Bowman:** *Soft Maple Flow – Protective Covenants & Adirondack Park Agency (APA) Restrictions*

The documents provided include extensive restrictions on the properties involved, including but not limited to the following:

1. Land Use Restrictions

- Lots may be used only for seasonal, single-family dwellings and recreational purposes. No more than one principal building is allowed per lot; boathouses are prohibited.
- Commercial uses are not permitted on any lot.
- Further subdivision is prohibited; existing lots must remain as originally plotted.

2. APA Permit Requirements

- All owners must comply with **APA Permit 98-313** (and amendments), which governs siting, environmental protection, and development standards.
- Wetlands cannot be disturbed without APA approval.

3. Environmental and Shoreline Protections

- No vegetation cutting is permitted within 35 feet of mean high water or on slopes >25%, except for a 4-foot-wide footpath.
- Structures larger than 100 sq ft are not allowed within 100 feet of mean high water, except APA-compliant docks.

4. Building Limits

- Maximum total footprint: 1,500 sq ft, including camp, decks, porches, sheds, garages, lean-tos, etc.
- Maximum building height: 28 feet (from natural grade to highest point).
- No new basements may be constructed; structures must use piers, slabs, or frost walls.

5. Water & Wastewater Systems

- Systems must be installed exactly per the approved subdivision map. Any deviation requires written approval from NYSDOH and the APA.
- New or replacement systems must be certified by a professional engineer within 60 days.

6. Utilities

- Public electric service is not permitted to be brought to any lot.

7. Reservoir & Dock Regulations (Brookfield / EBH LP)

- The reservoir owner regulates water levels and shoreline structures.
- Docks and similar structures require Erie Boulevard Hydropower, L.P. permits.
- Must comply with their rules and potential fees.

8. Boat Launch Parcel (HOA Lot)

- Reserved exclusively for HOA members; cannot be subdivided and cannot contain sanitary or potable water facilities.
- Any improvements require approvals from agencies such as APA, DEC, Army Corps, and the Town of Croghan or Watson.

This list highlights the restrictions most applicable to property owners, local jurisdictions, and similar entities, as the County Planning Board does not review subdivisions directly unless it receives a communication through the APA; even then, only the communication is reviewed.

The information provided is not an exhaustive list of all covenants, conditions, or APA permit requirements. Board members, the public, local officials, and code officers should refer to the full recorded covenants and APA Permit No. 98-313 for complete details.

While appreciative of the information and importance of its adherence, the County Planning Board noted that enforcement of the covenants is the responsibility of the homeowners' association or community association, and that there is a two-year period during which a covenant violation may be cited.

Ms. Krokowski noted that Ms. Buell had indicated that the County Planning Department, Real Property Department, and the County Clerk's Office recently met with Ms. Jessica Moser to discuss subdivision filing procedures. The County is considering adding a verification step to ensure jurisdictional requirements are met, rather than relying solely on self-attestation. This change is also intended to address recurring issues, including instances where subdivisions are labeled as lot line adjustments to avoid the standard review process.

(5) Report of Special Committees:

239-M Review

Ms. Krokowski read the first review:

TOWN OF LEYDEN PLANNING BOARD

Site Plan Review for the construction of an alternative driveway providing site access from New York State Route 12, and the construction of a 50-foot by

100-foot unheated pole barn for equipment storage, located at 3304 State Route 12 in the Town of Leyden.

Tax Map Parcels #338.00-02-51.114 and #338.00-02-45.100

Ronald Shue – Applicant

The Town of Leyden Planning Board provided the following Project Documentation: 1) Site Plans/Designs; 2) General Municipal Referral Form with Agricultural Data Statement; 3) Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF); and 4) Site Plan Review Application and Information.

The Town is encouraged to update its General Municipal Referral Forms and use the revised SEQR Short EAF (May 2026) to remain compliant with State regulations.

The proposed 50-foot by 100-foot unheated pole barn is intended for equipment storage in support of the applicant's headquarters business located on the adjoining rear parcels, with primary access provided via Kelpytown Road.

▪ *Compatibility With Adjacent Uses:*

The Town of Leyden contains a single zoning district (Section 150). Because the proposed driveway and pole barn are located on parcels acquired separately from the applicant's existing headquarters property (2020 and 2025 acquisitions), the project may be interpreted as establishing a new commercial use on those parcels pursuant to Section 230, thereby requiring Site Plan Review.

Alternatively, if the Zoning Enforcement Officer determines that the proposed improvements—consisting of an alternative access driveway serving the existing operation and an additional equipment storage building—constitute an expansion or enlargement of an existing commercial use, the project may fall under Section 210.3 and require only the issuance of a zoning permit. Under this interpretation, the procedures set forth in Section 1020 (Application Procedure for Zoning Permits) would apply.

A further interpretation could arise under Section 240.2, which exempts certain alterations or additions to commercial or industrial structures from Site Plan Approval when such improvements do not increase the gross floor area of an existing structure by more than 25 percent within any five-year period. However, because the proposal involves the construction of a new accessory storage building on separately acquired parcels rather than an addition to an existing structure, the applicability of this exemption is subject to interpretation.

Notwithstanding these alternative readings of the Town's zoning regulations, the referral materials indicate that the Town, through its Zoning Enforcement Officer, has determined that the proposal constitutes a new commercial use and is therefore subject to Site Plan Review.

The proposed structure meets all minimum dimensional standards in Sections 310–330. Fire separation distances must be confirmed, as existing structures were not included on the site map.

Dimension Type	Minimum Required Dimensions	Proposed Dimensions
Lot Area	1 Acre	7.13 Acres
Frontage	175 Feet	1,137 Feet
Side Yard	10 Feet	100 Feet
Rear Yard	10 Feet	80 Feet
Front Yard Depth	60 Feet	408 Feet

The Town should consider evaluating whether certain aspects of Shue Brothers’ operations could be construed as prohibited uses under Section 360, particularly those involving the handling, processing, or storage of waste materials. This review has identified potential ambiguities within the definitions contained in Article 12 that may affect the interpretation and application of the Town’s zoning regulations. Clarifying these provisions would enhance the predictability, consistency, and defensibility of future land use determinations.

It should be noted that many of the prohibited uses identified in Section 360 are not defined in Article 12. As a result, the Town may face challenges in consistently interpreting and administering these provisions, as it is difficult to determine with certainty whether a particular proposed use falls within a prohibited category. The absence of definitions may also create ambiguity for property owners, applicants, and decision makers.

To improve the clarity and enforceability of the zoning regulations, the Town Board, in coordination with its Planning Board, should consider amending Article 12 to include definitions for all prohibited uses listed in Section 360. Clearly defined terms would promote consistent application of the law, reduce uncertainty during project review, and strengthen the Town's position in the event of an administrative or legal challenge.

Additionally, the Town should consider incorporating legislative findings or purpose statements within Section 360 that articulate the public health, safety, and welfare objectives supporting the prohibition of specific uses. Establishing a clear nexus between the prohibited uses and the community impacts that the regulations are intended to address would enhance the

defensibility of the ordinance and provide greater guidance for future interpretation.

Finally, the Town may wish to include a general rule of construction within Article 12 stating that terms not specifically defined in the zoning law shall be interpreted according to their customary or commonly accepted meanings. Such language is commonly found in zoning ordinances and can provide additional guidance when interpreting terms that are not expressly defined. “Storage Vehicle” is one of the few prohibited uses expressly defined in the Town’s zoning regulations. However, observations throughout the Town suggest that vehicles may be stored on certain properties in a manner that could warrant further evaluation for consistency with Section 360. The Town may wish to review these situations to determine whether they are legally nonconforming, are operating pursuant to a previously issued approval or temporary authorization, or otherwise require enforcement action.

As Lewis County continues to advance initiatives aimed at reducing blight and improving community appearance, consistent administration of the Town’s zoning regulations could serve as a complementary local strategy. Ensuring that prohibited uses are clearly defined and uniformly enforced may help preserve neighborhood character, enhance visual quality, and support broader community development objectives.

▪ *Traffic Generation and Effect:*

While the SEAF indicates no substantial increase in traffic, the introduction of a new driveway constitutes a change requiring NYSDOT review, including:

- a) Highway Work Permit
- b) Driveway design approval
- c) Guardrail removal authorization, if applicable

NYSDOT may also determine that “Trucks Entering” signage or additional safety measures are warranted.

Based on GIS measurements, the proposed driveway appears to satisfy the access spacing, driveway width, and intersection separation requirements of Section 515. Additionally, relocating a portion of truck traffic from local roads to New York State Route 12 has the potential to reduce noise and traffic impacts experienced by residents along Walker Road and Kelpytown Road.

Section 515.9 provides that when traffic generated by a proposed development is likely to adversely affect traffic safety conditions, the Planning Board may require appropriate traffic improvements as a condition of approval or may limit the size or intensity of the proposed development.

According to the application materials, the proposed access drive from New York State Route 12 will primarily serve Shue Brothers' fleet vehicles, while customer deliveries and pickups will continue to utilize the existing Kelpytown Road entrance. The applicant has indicated that a principal objective of the new access is to reduce the use of engine braking and associated noise impacts on nearby residences by directing company vehicles to the state highway.

While the proposed change in traffic patterns may provide localized benefits to neighboring properties, the introduction of a commercial access point onto New York State Route 12 warrants consideration of potential traffic and safety impacts. Given the volume and type of vehicles anticipated to use the driveway, the Planning Board may wish to consult with the New York State Department of Transportation regarding the need for a traffic impact assessment, access permit requirements, or other measures necessary to ensure safe ingress and egress from the site.

▪ *Protection of Community Character:*

As identified in the EAF Mapper Summary Report, the proposed action is located in proximity to resources of potential environmental significance, including properties listed on or eligible for listing on the National and State Registers of Historic Places, an archeologically-sensitive area, habitat associated with a threatened or endangered species (Monarch Butterfly), and wetlands or other regulated water resources.

As part of its SEQR review, the Planning Board should evaluate the potential for impacts to these identified resources and consult with the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), as appropriate, regarding the project's proximity to archeologically sensitive areas and historic resources. Such consultation will assist the Board in determining whether the proposed action may result in adverse impacts to cultural or historic resources.

The applicant is encouraged to incorporate voluntary best management practices that support Monarch Butterfly habitat, including minimizing mowing during the primary breeding season and retaining native milkweed and other pollinator-supporting vegetation where practicable. While these measures are not required, they may help minimize potential impacts to identified habitat resources.

According to the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) Environmental Resource Mapper, National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) wetlands, a Class C stream, and other potential wetland features are located in the vicinity of the project site, primarily toward the rear of the parcel. The Planning Board should ensure that all necessary state and federal wetland and stream permitting requirements are addressed prior to project

implementation, and that site disturbance avoids these resources to the maximum extent practicable.

The USDA Web Soil Survey identifies the project area as consisting of soils classified as Prime Farmland. However, available information indicates that the subject area has historically been forested and has not been actively utilized for agricultural production. As a result, while the development would convert land containing soils with agricultural capability, the proposal is not anticipated to result in the loss of actively farmed cropland or a significant impact on existing agricultural operations.

- *Signage:*

No signage plans were submitted. Any new or modified signage must comply with Section 535.

- *Drainage:*

The driveway requires a culvert to cross a stream and/or wetland.

The applicant is working with the Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) on the necessary Article 15 and Article 24 DEC permits. Nichelle Swisher of SWCD confirmed this collaboration on 6/8/2026. Final approvals must not be issued until DEC confirms compliance.

Drainage modifications must not negatively affect adjacent properties per Sections 410.9 and 540 of the Town of Leyden Zoning Law.

- *Erosion:*

With approximately 4 acres of ground disturbance, a SPDES General Permit (GP-0-20-001) is required. The Planning Board should determine whether the project also requires an Erosion Control Plan under Section 545 of the Town of Leyden Zoning Law.

- *Parking:*

Based on the requirements of Section 755, a minimum of five (5) off-street parking spaces is required for the proposed 5,000-square-foot structure. According to the application materials, the required parking will be located to the side and/or rear of the building, consistent with the parking location and site design standards established by the zoning regulations.

- *Community Facilities:*

According to the submitted SEAF, the proposed project will not be connected to an existing public or private water supply system.

Section 410.10 requires that proposed water supply and sewage disposal facilities be adequate for the intended use, while Section 510 requires

compliance with the applicable provisions of Chapter 1, Part 5 of the New York State Sanitary Code. Based on the application materials, no water supply or sewage disposal facilities are proposed for this project.

The Planning Board and/or Zoning Enforcement Officer should determine whether the intended use of the proposed 50-foot by 100-foot unheated pole barn necessitates the provision of water, sanitary facilities, or utility services under applicable local, state, or building code requirements. The applicant has represented that the structure is intended solely for the storage of equipment and will function as an unheated accessory building. If no occupancy, employee work area, or utility-dependent activities are proposed, the need for water and sewer infrastructure may be limited; however, this determination should be made by the appropriate reviewing and code enforcement authorities.

- *Lighting:*

No exterior lighting plan was submitted with the application, and the applicant indicated that the need for exterior lighting remains undetermined. If exterior lighting is proposed, the Planning Board may wish to condition approval upon the submission of a lighting plan demonstrating compliance with Section 530. Such a plan should illustrate fixture locations, mounting heights, and shielding measures to ensure that illumination is directed downward and does not adversely affect adjacent residences, neighboring properties, or the traveling public.

- *Landscaping and Screening:*

No landscaping plan was provided with the application. During site plan review, the Planning Board should determine whether landscaping, buffering, or screening measures are necessary to satisfy the objectives of Section 525. In particular, the Board should assess the applicability of Section 525.3 regarding screening and landscaping along road frontages to ensure that the proposed development is appropriately integrated into the surrounding environment.

- *Miscellaneous:*

The Town Planning Board shall determine whether Article 8, Bond for Installation of Improvements, applies to this project. According to Section 820, before a zoning permit is approved, the applicant shall have executed a contract with the Town Board and, if required, the Town Attorney, and a performance bond, certified check, or bank letter of credit covering the estimated cost of the required improvements designated by the Town Board.

Additionally, the Town Board and Applicant shall enter into a written agreement itemizing the schedule of improvements in sequence with the costs opposite each phase of construction, with 10% of the guarantee retained for a

year following the completion and inspection by the Town of all construction and installation covered by the guarantee according to Section 840.

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 taking action, the applicant should consult with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) prior to approval due to the identified archaeological sensitivity and proximity to State and National Register-eligible sites.
2. Prior to acting, the Planning Board should evaluate whether landscaping improvements are necessary to ensure consistency with the intent of Section 525, including the provision of appropriate screening along road frontages (Section 525.3).
3. Prior to taking action, the Town of Leyden Planning Board and Enforcement Officer shall ensure that the required setback for fire separation is achieved between the existing structures and the proposed pole barn, as no existing structures were drawn on the accepted site map.
4. Prior to final permit issuance, the applicant must obtain a NYSDOT Highway Work Permit (HWP), obtain approval of the driveway design, and request removal of the existing guardrail.
5. Prior to final permit issuance, all required wetland and stream permits must be received from DEC via the Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD), which is assisting the applicant, to ensure compliance with Articles 15 and 24.
6. Ground disturbance is estimated at 4 acres, well above the 1-acre threshold for the NYSDEC SPDES General Permit (GP-0-20-001); therefore, a SPDES permit shall be required prior to project approval.
7. The Planning Board and Enforcement Officer should determine whether water and sewer services are required for the proposed unheated pole barn, since the addition of power, heat, or plumbing could change the structure's classification and associated permitting requirements.
8. Compliance with all Local, State, and Federal regulatory requirements for this type of facility and the products stored.

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 Planning Board is encouraged to update its forms, including the General Municipal Referral Forms and the Environmental Assessment Forms, to ensure compliance. The Town of Leyden should update the Short EAF using the newly revised SEQR form (May 2026 version) to ensure compliance with current laws and maintain the integrity of the Town's environmental review process.
2. The Planning Board and Town Board should consider how this use could unintentionally be considered as one of the prohibited uses outlined in

Section 360. Given that Shue Brothers handles site waste removal services, as well as hazardous waste (liquid manure), through their trucking business, attention may be needed to possible revisions to Section 360 (possible revision language provided in the full 239-m review- to be provided)

3. The Town Board and Planning Board should work together to revise Article 12, including but not limited to the following:
 - a. The Town may wish to include language in Article 12 clarifying that terms carry their customary meaning unless otherwise defined.
 - b. The definition of “commercial use” within Article 12 should be refined, as it currently encompasses uses that may be more accurately categorized as industrial or light industrial, creating overlaps and potential loopholes.
 - c. Many prohibited uses listed in Section 360 lack corresponding definitions in Article 12, making interpretation and enforcement difficult.
 - d. The Town Board and Planning Board should work together to add clear, objective definitions for all prohibited uses to support consistent application and reduce the potential for appeals or challenges.
 - e. Create definitions of expansion, enlargement, and new use to prevent challenging decisions in the future.
4. The Town Board and Planning Board should work together to add justifications within Section 360 for prohibiting the use(s) within the Town that connect back to the health and safety of the residents for legal defensibility.
5. “Storage Vehicle” is one of the few prohibited uses that is defined; however, this use appears in multiple locations throughout the Town. The Town may wish to confirm whether temporary approvals were granted or whether enforcement procedures need clarification. Strengthening this provision would also support countywide anti-blight initiatives.

A motion was made by Mr. Lehman to accept the proposed changes, seconded by Mr. Petersen. During the discussion, the Board noted its concern about having enough information and was left with a variety of questions. Ms. Krokowski suggested revising the recommendation to “Matter of Local Concern with Comments,” and she explained that this was her initial recommendation, which included a suggestion that the Town review the use classification, noting that DOT and DEC requirements would apply regardless of whether the project proceeded under a zoning permit or site plan review. The Board agreed to revise the recommendation to a Matter of Local Concern with Comments, ensuring that one of the comments advises the Town to reevaluate the use classification. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Tabolt read the last review:

TOWN OF NEW BREMEN PLANNING BOARD

Site Plan Review to construct a 60 ft. x 80 ft. accessory structure for the storage of customer vehicles associated with an existing motor vehicle repair business at 7456 Kirschnerville Road (CR 60) in the Town of New Bremen.

Tax Map Parcel #130.00-02-09.000

Jason Roggie – Applicant

The Town of New Bremen Planning Board provided the following application materials for review: 1) General Municipal Referral Form; 2) Agricultural Data Statement; 3) Town Application for Site Plan Review; 4) Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF); 5) Letter of No Jurisdiction – Freshwater Wetlands; 6) Aerial Maps; 7) Correspondence from the Town Highway Superintendent; and 8) Site Plans.

▪ *Compatibility with Adjacent Uses:*

The proposed project is located within the Town of New Bremen's single Rural Residential Zone. The applicant proposes to construct a 60-foot-by-80-foot accessory structure for storing customer vehicles associated with the operation of an existing motor vehicle repair business. The proposed structure is intended to provide enclosed storage for vehicles undergoing repair or awaiting service. Given its association with the existing business, the proposed structure appears consistent with the adjacent uses.

▪ *Traffic Generation and Effect:*

The proposed project is located on Kirschnerville Road (CR 60), which has an Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volume of approximately 864 vehicles. According to the submitted SEAF, the proposed action is not anticipated to result in significant traffic impacts. To supplement the application materials, the Planning Board requested comments from the Town Highway Superintendent, who indicated that the project is not expected to adversely affect traffic conditions and that the proposed improvements may enhance existing parking and site circulation.

The applicant has proposed a building setback of 33 feet from the centerline of County Route 60. Upon review, staff recommends increasing the setback to 51 feet from the roadway centerline, consistent with the established setback of the adjacent structure located immediately to the east.

The requested increase in setback would serve several planning and public safety objectives. First, additional separation from the roadway would reduce the potential for damage to the structure from snow storage and snow removal operations associated with winter maintenance of County Route 60. Second, a greater setback would help preserve adequate sight distance and minimize

the potential for future line-of-sight conflicts for motorists entering and exiting the site. Finally, aligning the proposed structure with the setback pattern of neighboring development would promote visual consistency along the corridor and help maintain the established character of the surrounding community.

Based on these considerations, staff finds that a 51-foot setback from the centerline of County Route 60 is appropriate and would better support public safety, roadway maintenance operations, and compatibility with the existing development pattern.

- *Protection of Community Character:*

According to the submitted SEAF, the project site is not located within or adjacent to a Critical Environmental Area, an area designated as sensitive for archaeological resources, habitat for threatened or endangered species, or a 100-year floodplain. As part of this review, the information provided in the SEAF was verified using the NYS EAF Mapper and Lewis County GIS Cloud. This review indicated 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 (ERM) identified an R4SBC Riverine feature and an informational freshwater wetland located more than 800 feet from the proposed project site. In addition, the application materials included a Jurisdictional Determination Letter from the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (NYS DEC) stating that no DEC-regulated wetlands are located within the Area of Interest. Given the distance between the proposed project and these environmental resources, as well as the findings of the NYS DEC, impacts to wetlands and other regulated water resources are not anticipated.

- *Signage:*

The submitted Town of New Bremen Site Plan Review Application indicates that signage is not applicable to the proposed project, and no signs are proposed as part of this application. Should signage be installed in the future, it should comply with the requirements of Section 610(F) of the Town of New Bremen Zoning Law.

- *Drainage & Erosion:*

The submitted SEAF indicates that the proposed project will not result in additional stormwater discharge. A review of the USDA Web Soil Survey indicates that soils at the project site are not classified as having a high likelihood of flooding or ponding. Based on this information, drainage conditions are not expected to present a significant constraint for the construction of the proposed 4,800-square-foot structure.

The submitted SEAF further indicates that approximately 0.75 acres will be disturbed as part of the project. A review of the USDA Web Soil Survey found the maximum slope within the project area to be approximately 6 percent. Because the proposed land disturbance is less than five acres and the slope average is less than 15 percent, the preparation of an Erosion Control Plan does not appear to be required under Section 610(H) of the Town of New Bremen Zoning Law.

The Town of New Bremen Planning Board should confirm that the drainage requirements of Section 610(G) of the Town of New Bremen Zoning Law are satisfied as part of its site plan review.

- *Parking:*

According to the submitted site plans, as part of this project, the applicant will construct a new driveway with a 30-foot-by-60-foot parking area at the rear of the building. While the exact number of parking spaces was not defined, 1,800 square feet of parking area appears capable of accommodating approximately 6 to 8 vehicles, depending on the final parking layout and circulation patterns, which would align with the total square footage of both the existing shop and the new structure. The parking appears to be consistent with Section 610(C) of the Town of New Bremen Zoning Law.

- *Community Facilities:*

According to the submitted SEAF, the project will connect to the existing on-site water supply but not to the existing wastewater facilities. After speaking with the applicant on June 5th, it was explained that water use will be limited to hosing off vehicles and that there is no restroom warranting a wastewater system.

- *Lighting:*

According to the submitted site plans, the applicant proposes installing four (4) downward-directed exterior light fixtures, including one (1) on the west side of the building and three (3) on the rear elevation. Based on the information provided, the proposed lighting appears to be designed to minimize light spillover onto adjacent properties and is consistent with the requirements of Section 610(E) of the Town of New Bremen Zoning Law.

- *Landscaping and Screening:*

According to the submitted Town of New Bremen Site Plan Review Application, the site is adequately landscaped and screened from adjacent properties in a manner intended to protect the visual character of the area. Given that this project is associated with an existing business and does not involve significant changes to the overall site layout, landscaping and screening are not anticipated to be a concern.

The Town of New Bremen Planning Board should, however, confirm that the landscaping and screening requirements of Section 610(D) of the Town of New Bremen Zoning Law are satisfied as part of its site plan review.

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

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

1. The proposed building shall be set back a minimum of 51 feet, consistent with the existing building, from the centerline of County Route 60 to ensure compatibility with adjacent development, maintain roadway safety, and avoid conflicts with snow removal and maintenance operations.
2. Should signage be installed in the future, it should comply with the requirements of Section 610(F) of the Town of New Bremen Zoning Law.
3. The Town of New Bremen Planning Board should confirm that the drainage requirements of Section 610(G) of the Town of New Bremen Zoning Law are satisfied as part of its site plan review.
4. The Town of New Bremen Planning Board should confirm that the landscaping and screening requirements of Section 610(D) of the Town of New Bremen Zoning Law are satisfied as part of its site plan review.

Mr. Reed moved to approve with the conditions, seconded by Ms. Moser. No board discussion ensued, and the motion carried unanimously.

(6) Report of County Planner:

Responses from municipalities regarding previously submitted/reviewed projects:

- **Joint Town/Village of Lowville Planning Board | Bhatti Apartments-SUP/SPR – Approved with Conditions**

(7) Unfinished Business:

- Fully Executed Bylaws (2026 Revised) were distributed via hard copy.
- Cell tower by the fairgrounds is up and reportedly looks nice.

(8) New Business: None

- (9) Adjournment:** There being no other business, a motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Reed and seconded by Mr. Lehman, which carried unanimously. Mr. Petersen adjourned the meeting at 3:04 PM.

Respectfully submitted,



Megan Krokowski
Community Development Specialist

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