

Town of Campbell, NY

Planning Board Meeting

Minutes

Wednesday, September 17, 2025 at 6:00 pm

Guests

Victoria Ramirez, Sandi Murray, Mollie Messenger, Joseph Giardina.

1. Pledge/ Call to Order/ Roll Call

Minutes:

Chairman Peterson opened the meeting at 6:00 PM with the Pledge of Allegiance. The Clerk took Roll Call Laura Bowen absent Alternate Tony Harris sat in.

2. Prior Minutes

Minutes:

The Prior minutes were not attached to the packet, they will be voted on at the October Meeting.

3. New Business

a. SP 25-2025 FP 26-2025

Minutes:

Chairman Peterson opened the Public Hearing for Applications SP 25-2025 and FP 26-2025. This application is for installation of a 20 x 20 addition to existing structure. The current structure was built in 1957 and with data from an elevation certificate it is 1 foot higher than base flood. The existing building is constructed of concrete block exterior walls. The current market value of the property is \$34900 and the cost of addition is \$10,000. Being this is less than 30% of home value it is not considered a substantial improvement and only the addition needs to be flood proofed per sections 6.7 and 6.8 of our local law. This is an acceptable request with the following conditions. The new addition needs to be elevated (2) feet above current floor level The stairwell into addition needs an 8" block wall surround attached to current structure walls Any electrical installation must be installed per NEC code and be inspected by a 3rd party electrical inspector A motion to approve SP 25-2025 and FP 26-2025 per the recommendations of Tom Hargrave was made by Anthony Harris and Seconded by Linda Baird. Adopted by vote

Vote results:

Ayes: 5 / Nays: 0 / Abstains: 0

b. SD 29

Minutes:

Chairman Peterson opened the public hearing on SD 29-2025 at 6:12 PM This proposal is to combine 5 parcels into 1 parcel and then divide 1 parcel into 3

parcels for future sale of these properties. This request meets the zoning requirements for The Town of Campbell zoning law as to bulk density and location of this type of action since the property is zoned AG/IND per zoning change filed 7/3/2000 with NYS. Lot # 1 is already zoned AG. Lot #2 will become a separate lot in IND zone but it is basically preexisting structures so no zoning change is required. If so the Town Board will have to rule on this action.

A motion to approve application SD 29-2025 was made by Denice Thompson and seconded by Anthony Harris with a recommendation to rezone lot 2 was adopted.

Vote results:

Ayes: 5 / Nays: 0 / Abstains: 0

c. SD 30

Minutes:

Chairman Peterson opened the public hearing for SD 30-2025 at 6:29 PM The Planning Board was informed that the Zoning Board had met on a variance application on 09/16/25 to discuss set back issues with the property and that the issue had been tabled until the Planning Board had addressed the issues. After a site visit to this property on 9/16/2025 I reviewed the proposal for a subdivision of this property. This request is to subdivide existing 101.15 acre lot into (1) lot 34.01 acres and (1) lot into 67.14 acres. This property is zoned Ag and R1. A subdivision plat dated July 15, 2025 was reviewed. An Area Variance application letter from Charles Malcomb which represents Delaware River Solar Real Estate dated August 1, 2025 was reviewed.

Several items are missing from this subdivision plat, which would help in the review of this application.

1. Existing / proposed site features that could impact setbacks such as proposed plantings, access roads, fencing, gates, wetlands and overhead electric lines & poles.
2. Current zoning setbacks and proposed setbacks.
3. Zoning district boundaries on the subject property, including the labeling of each district.
4. Driveways for Lot #2. (Section 11.7).
5. Development details for the new access driveways including stream crossing and wetlands crossings.
6. Site screening between districts. (Section 11.8) The Hodgson letter dated August 1, 2025 has been reviewed.

I. Argument a. states: "The requested variances will not produce undesirable changes in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties." By setting the Lot 1 property line so close to the barn would create the inability to completely access the perimeter of the barn for maintenance. This could be a detriment to the proposed subdivided Lot 2 property.

b. states: "Without demolishing residential structures, the benefit sought by the Applicant could not be achieved by another feasible method, other than an area variance." The paragraph states the the Applicant has no way of realizing the benefit it currently seeks (to construct the proposed solar facility) unless the requested area variances are granted. The site plan was approved, and the solar facility is under construction. The setback issue for subdivision will not affect the construction of the solar facility as approved. The setback issue

could affect the approval of the subdivision.

c. states: "The requested variances are not substantial." By reducing the setbacks near the existing buildings there no longer is the ability to access this area with firefighting apparatus and emergency vehicles. This does appear to be substantial. Also, development of access to the "rear" of the property will include a bridge over the stream on the north end of the property and a roadway through the wetlands on the south end of the property. With this information missing for the proposed subdivision plat, I cannot determine if this missing information could be considered substantial.

d. states "The requested variances will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district."

The response says "As discussed above, the requested variances, which are necessary for the construction of the proposed project, will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district." This area variance request has nothing to do with the solar project and its construction.

The response talks about the negative declaration for the solar project, which has nothing to do with the subdivision plat, or the variance request.

The response says "To avoid such an outcome, the Applicant is simply proposing modest setback variances from the proposed lot line, which would resolve this issue without needing to destroy existing buildings that contribute to the community's character." The subdivision plat does not address the environmental impacts of developing access to the rear of Proposed Lot 2. The subdivision application dated July 30, 2025 was reviewed. Attached was the short environmental form. Item 13b was not checked and left blank. This line says: Would the proposed action physically alter, or encroach into, any existing wetland or waterbody? The subdivision plat does not detail the developed access points for Lot #2. Without developing access points, the rear of Lot 2 WILL NOT be accessible at all. The area for access points will have to encounter a stream and a wetlands in order to be developed. A motion by Anthony Harris seconded by Albert Johnson to table the discussion until the issues were resolved was adopted by vote

Vote results:

Ayes: 5 / Nays: 0 / Abstains: 0

d. SP 27-2025 FP 28-2025

Minutes:

This request is a modification of an approved SP/FP on 5/21/2025 A site visit was conducted at this property with the owner on 09/03/2025 to discuss the placement of metal carport designed building in side yard of this property. The storage building will be 24x40 and be utilized for storage. It is my opinion this will fall under the category of wet flood proofing since the cost is less than 10% of the assessed property value per section 6.11 of our current zoning law. The following conditions should be part of approval for this application. Adequately anchored to ground Install access opening for a total of 320 square inches to minimize hydronic pressure (160 inches on north and south sides) A motion to approve applications SP 27-2025 and FP 28-2025 was made by

Denice Thompson and seconded by Anthony Harris. Adopted by vote

Vote results:

Ayes: 5 / Nays: 0 / Abstains: 0

4. Old Business

5. Other Business before the Board

6. Announcements

7. Adjournment

Minutes:

A motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:35 was made by Denice Thompson and seconded by Anthony Harris was adopted by vote

Vote results:

Ayes: 5 / Nays: 0 / Abstains: 0