

Town of LeRay

Planning Board Work Session Minutes

October 1, 2026

CALL TO ORDER

On October 1, 2026, the Town of LeRay Planning Board held their regular monthly Work Session meeting in the Conference Room of the Town of LeRay Municipal Building. The meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM by Chairperson Biondolillo.

ROLL CALL

Member Collette: ☒ Present ☐ Absent
Member Meeks: ☒ Present ☐ Absent
Member Moran: ☒ Present ☐ Absent
Member Jefferds: ☒ Present ☐ Absent
Member Russell: ☒ Present ☐ Absent
Chairperson Biondolillo: ☒ Present ☐ Absent

Additionally, Lee Shimel (Zoning Enforcement Officer), Leland Carpenter (Town Supervisor), David Mushtare (ZBA Member), and Morgan Melançon (Secretary to Planning & Zoning) were in attendance.

ACCEPTANCE OF WORK SESSION MINUTES

The minutes from the September 3, 2026 work session meeting were reviewed by the Board. A motion was made by Member Collette and seconded by Member Moran to accept the minutes as drafted. The vote went as follows:

Member Collette: ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Abstain ☐ Recuse ☐ Absent
Member Meeks: ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Abstain ☐ Recuse ☐ Absent
Member Moran: ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Abstain ☐ Recuse ☐ Absent
Member Jefferds: ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Abstain ☐ Recuse ☐ Absent
Member Russell: ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Abstain ☐ Recuse ☐ Absent
Chairperson Biondolillo: ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Abstain ☐ Recuse ☐ Absent

The motion passed.

WORK SESSION

1. **Preliminary Review for a Minor 2 Lot Subdivision Application for Samuel Glick, located on the corner of Hall Road and Elm Ridge Road, tax parcel #54.00-3-31.323.**

Chairperson Biondolillo explained that the applicant had initially considered a three-lot subdivision; however, the current application proposed two lots. It was noted that the remaining lands appeared to retain sufficient area and frontage to potentially accommodate an additional subdivision in the future, subject to applicable review and approval requirements.

The Board reviewed the preliminary subdivision proposal and a separate drawing depicting potential locations for the well and septic systems for the two lots to demonstrate that adequate separation could be achieved. The proposed driveway locations were also shown.

Mr. Shimel stated that he and Highway Superintendent Bruce Shawcross visited the site and had concerns regarding traffic safety due to the hill and limited visibility in the area, particularly for vehicles making left turns from the proposed driveways.

The Board discussed possible layout changes that could help address the traffic safety concerns. It was noted that the property had greater frontage along Hall Road than Elm Ridge Road and that relocating the proposed driveways to Hall Road may provide a safer access option. Mr. Shimel stated that there appeared to be sufficient room to adjust the proposed house locations, if necessary, to accommodate access from Hall Road.

The Board agreed that the proposed driveway locations and related safety concerns should be discussed further with Mr. Glick before the application proceeds.

2. Review of a 2 Lot Minor Subdivision Application AND a Lot Line Adjustment Application for Fults Farm, located at 30161 NYS Route 37, tax parcel #54.00-3-47.1.

Chairperson Biondolillo explained that the proposed lot line adjustment and the proposed subdivision were separate applications but were part of the same overall property reconfiguration between Fults Farm, LLC and Travis O'Guin. The lot line adjustment would transfer 0.26 acres from O'Guin to Fults Farm, LLC, while the minor subdivision would transfer 13.50 acres from Fults Farm, LLC to O'Guin. It was noted that the 0.26-acre area would ultimately be incorporated into the adjoining parcel by deed and that the subdivision was required due to the size of the additional land transfer.

3. Site Plan Application for the Calcium Fire Department, located at 24882 Stalder Road, tax parcel #74.12-1-19.

Chairperson Biondolillo stated that she had not heard anything from the Calcium Fire Department.

4. Discussion for Planned Development District Moratorium.

Chairperson Biondolillo stated that the Board would continue its review of the Planned Development (PD) District regulations and noted that Board members had previously been asked to review the existing provisions in greater detail. The review should consider not only the regulations as they currently applied to existing PD Districts and development near the Town's water sources, but also how the regulations should apply to any future PD Districts established within the Town.

Chairperson Biondolillo suggested that the Town Board consider whether periodic inspections may be appropriate for development within existing or future PD Districts located near a Town water source, as an additional measure to provide ongoing oversight and help protect the Town's wellhead areas.

➤ Permitted Uses and Dimensional Requirements

In review of the Schedule of District Uses, it was suggested that golf courses be considered for Special Use Permit review rather than Site Plan Review only.

The Board then discussed building height, noting that PD Districts currently permitted a maximum building height of 45 feet. The Board discussed whether this standard should remain or be revised in relation to dimensional standards used elsewhere in the Town.

The Board then raised the question of how modifications or amendments to an approved PD District should be handled. The existing regulations provided separate review procedures depending upon the type of deviation, including Town Board review for changes in land use, density, phasing or implementation; Planning Board review for amended site plans; and Zoning Board of Appeals review for dimensional variances. The Board discussed whether these provisions should be clarified as part of the code update.

➤ Buffering and Landscaping

The Board reviewed the buffer and landscaping requirements of § 158-34 (B). The current regulations required a twenty-foot buffer where a nonresidential use was next to residential property outside the PD District, along with an opaque vegetative screen six to eight feet in height that was fully functioning when installed.

Member Moran noted that the existing language requiring a screen to be fully functioning at the time of installation could be interpreted as requiring mature vegetation at the outset. Chairperson Biondolillo stated that the language should be reviewed further to determine whether clarification was appropriate. Chairperson Biondolillo suggested adding language requiring screening and landscaping to be maintained for the life of the development.

The Board discussed reviewing the existing planting-unit requirements to determine whether revisions or additional clarification may be necessary.

➤ Lighting

The Board discussed the lighting standards contained in § 158-34 (C) and suggested that photometric plans be required as part of the review, incorporating standards addressing dark-sky principles and light spillover onto adjoining properties. The current PD District regulations establish fixture-height requirements but did not contain detailed photometric-plan or dark-sky provisions within that section.

➤ Parking and Shared Access

The Board reviewed the parking and parking lot standards contained in § 158-34 (D). Chairperson Biondolillo noted that § 158-34(D)(1)(e) would need to be corrected from “Fire Marshal” to “Fire Chief” to reflect the proper local official.

The Board discussed adding minimum parking-space dimensions for clarity. A parking-space dimension of approximately 10 feet by 20 feet was discussed in recognition of the larger vehicles commonly used in the area and similar concerns that had been raised during prior project reviews.

The Board reviewed § 158-34(D)(6), which limited the amount of required parking that may be located between the front building façade and the primary abutting street. The Board noted the importance of this standard in mixed-use or residential areas of a PD District to avoid developments dominated visually by large parking areas.

Shared parking and shared access arrangements were discussed. The existing code allowed the Planning Board to waive certain parking requirements where an approved shared-parking arrangement existed. The Board discussed examples of existing commercial developments where shared driveways or interconnected parking areas are used and expressed concern about ensuring that such arrangements remain enforceable if properties change ownership in the future.

The Board discussed that any required shared-access, shared-parking or maintenance agreements should be formally executed and recorded with the Jefferson County Clerk so that the obligations continue with the property.

➤ Open Space and Recreation

The Board reviewed the open-space requirements of § 158-34E. The current regulations require at least 15% of the area of a contiguous development to be devoted to publicly accessible open space for the use and enjoyment of customers, tenants and residents. The Board discussed the importance of meaningful green and recreational space, particularly where residential development was included within a Planned Development District.

The Board noted that the term “plaza” is used within the examples of qualifying public open space but is not separately defined in the zoning definitions. The Board discussed whether a definition should be added for clarity.

Member Moran questioned how the 15% open-space requirement would apply where a single PD District contained multiple individual development projects. Chairperson Biondolillo said she interpreted the requirement as applying to each contiguous development or project rather than to the PD District as a whole. The Board agreed that the language should be reviewed and clarified so that the method of calculating the required open space is clear.

The Board also reviewed the requirement that public open spaces contain at least 20% of the planting units otherwise required under § 158-34B(5). The Board similarly discussed whether the code should clarify whether that requirement would be calculated on a project-by-project basis within a larger PD District.

REPORT FROM ZONING ENFORCEMENT OFFICER

Wewer Holdings, LLC: Mr. Shimel reported that the Town had completed brush-hogging and hydroseeding at the Waddingham Road property. He stated that the violations were considered resolved at this time and that the property owners were responsible for reimbursing the Town for the work performed.

Mrs. Wewer had submitted a new Zoning Permit application for a property recently purchased along US Route 11, where she proposed to operate her business. Because the proposal involved a change of use, Planning Board Site Plan Review would be required.

Tractor Supply: Mr. Shimel reported that he was continuing to work with Mr. Lundy regarding outstanding compliance issues at the Tractor Supply property. Mr. Lundy had previously indicated that the property would be brought into compliance within approximately one month; however, that timeframe had passed and the outstanding items had not yet been fully addressed. Mr. Shimel stated that he would need to discuss the matter with the Town Board regarding further action.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn the work session was made by Member Jefferds and seconded by Member Meeks. The vote went as follows:

Member Collette:	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ Abstain	☐ Recuse	☐ Absent
Member Meeks:	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ Abstain	☐ Recuse	☐ Absent
Member Moran:	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ Abstain	☐ Recuse	☐ Absent
Member Jefferds:	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ Abstain	☐ Recuse	☐ Absent
Member Russell:	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ Abstain	☐ Recuse	☐ Absent
Chairperson Biondolillo:	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ Abstain	☐ Recuse	☐ Absent

The motion passed and the meeting adjourned at 6:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Morgan R. Melançon
Morgan R. Melançon
Secretary to Planning and Zoning