

WORKSHOP MEETING AGENDA
TOWN OF LLOYD PLANNING BOARD

Thursday, January 15, 2026

CALL TO ORDER TIME: 5:30pm

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ANNOUNCEMENTS: GENERAL, NO SMOKING, LOCATION OF FIRE EXITS, ROOM CAPACITY IS 49, PURSUANT TO NYS FIRE SAFETY REGULATIONS. PLEASE TURN OFF ALL CELL PHONES.

OFFICIALLY OPEN THE MEETING

Attendance: Board Members: Sal Cuciti, Gerry Marion, Charly Long, Franco Zani, Lambros Violaris, Scott McCarthy (came in at 5:37pm), Lacy Maffei (Town Board); Board staff: David Gordon, Christian Moore and Sarah Van Nostrand

Absent: Board Members: Bill Meltzer and Laura Kelly.

Minutes to Approve at the January 22, 2026, meeting
October 23, 2025 & November 20, 2025

New Business:

YW Highland Realty LLC: Special Use Permit: 1 Lockhart Ln: SBL #88.13-8-24

Applicant is seeking a special use permit and site plan approval to convert a single-family dwelling into 4 apartments.

Review Status: ZBA variance received for under acreage parcel. Application and plans circulated to the board.

Cuciti said it is a special use permit for a one-family house being converted to a 4-family house.

Gordon said that this project is an unlisted action for SEQRA.

Cuciti said that it appears that he has the right number of parking spaces.

Moore said that the highway department would need to weigh in on the two entrances off of Lockhart Ln. There is one ADA parking space they need to make sure the entire pathway from that space is ADA accessible. The board needs an existing condition survey showing what is currently on the site. There is also a possible drainage swale on the site. They may need to

provide a lighting plan as they are proposing a light and the board needs to make sure that it is code compliant.

Violaris said that they would also need turning radius for emergency vehicles.

Moore said that the fire department would need to weigh in on the project as well. The building may be close enough to the roadway that physical access with a truck may not be needed.

Cuciti said they are not even paving anything it appears that they are going to use gravel. He is not sure how they are going to delineate the spaces.

Moore said that the plans show little bumper blocks. Gravel surfaces are not appropriate to use any kind of stripe or paint.

Cuciti said that they are not showing much in the way of landscaping.

Moore said that is why they need to see an existing condition map. On the first page it appears that all the trees shown are existing.

Cuciti said that the plans refer to a survey, so maybe the board can ask the applicant to update it.

Moore said all they need to do is provide a copy of the survey.

Zani asked if a sprinkler system would be required.

Cuciti said that is more of a building permit issue.

Moore said that the size of the water service would need to be verified.

Cuciti said that he doesn't see anything about upgrading the electric and if they are going to put heat pumps in that might be a cause for concern.

Zani said he thinks he would have to upgrade the electric as he would need 4 meters. Is there going to be separate water lines.

Ostrovsky, Dina: Special Use Permit: 430 N. Riverside Rd: SBL # 87.2-4-15.110

Applicant is seeking a special use permit to convert a single-family dwelling into a bed & breakfast.

Review Status: Application and plans circulated to the board.

Cuciti said that back in 2019 there was an approval for a bed & breakfast that expired. When looking at this he didn't see plans, or anything about parking or a sign. He said that it is type II SEQRA. No site plan approval is required by the zoning code.

McCarthy said that when the project was before the board the last time he remembers that they asked about parking, traffic going down that road and access to the site for the fire department. The board was also concerned with lighting along the driveway.

Cuciti said the board needs a better drawing of the site plan that includes the parking, lighting and sign. The board also needs a better sketch plan showing what rooms are to be rented, so they can make sure they have the right amount of parking for it.

Ostrovsky (Applicant) said that they have about 10 parking spaces.

Cuciti said they have no information on the parking.

Ostrovsky said that the board is looking for the parking.

Zani said that the board needs a drawing showing the parking on the property and how many spaces for both the residents and the guests who are going to be rented. The board also needs a lighting plan.

McCarthy asked if they need ADA compliance in case someone is going there with a wheelchair.

Cuciti said that they will need one handicap parking spaces. He said that he feels that they don't need to hire an architect for the plans.

McCarthy said he would say they need a print something that has been stamped showing that the building is as stated.

Marion asked is that well and septic up there.

Cuciti said yes.

Marion asked how many bedrooms are they going to have.

Ostrovsky said that there are 5 bedrooms. They have more bedrooms, but they belong to owner. There are 5 bedrooms they can rent, so probably 10 guests.

Zani said that they are going to have show the size of the septic tank.

Cuciti asked how many bedrooms are approved for the house.

Ostrovsky said they have 7 bedrooms.

Cuciti said that they are going to need a scale drawing of the layout of the house and show which ones are being renting and which ones are not being renting to scale.

Addition plans were shown.

Ostrovsky explained the layout.

Cuciti said part of this house remains a private residence and what side it is.

Ostrovsky said that the second floor remains the owners.

Zani said looking at the plans everything to the left side of the family side is the private residence.

Ostrovsky said if you look at the house everything on the right side is the owners.

Cuciti said that if you can take the plans and show the board which bedrooms are rented and which ones are not then you don't need to hire anyone. Are you serving them food, or do they use a kitchen.

Ostrovsky said she is not serving food, but the guests can have a kitchen.

Cuciti said so they are going to have kitchens.

Ostrovsky said yes.

Cuciti said so you can draw that as part of your guest area.

Ostrovsky said she will do that and include parking.

Cuciti said also add in any lighting you might add for exterior only.

Ostrovsky said that they have outside lighting.

Cuciti said you are going to use the existing lighting or add lighting.

Ostrovsky said that they have the lights already.

Cuciti asked if they are going to put up a sign.

Ostrovsky said if it is required she will.

Cuciti said he doesn't think its required but it is in the zoning code if you wish to put up a sign.

Ostrovsky said that she was not going to put up a sign.

Old Business:

Community Land 2002: Subdivision: S. Ohioville & Hurds Rd: SBL #94.2-1-4.152, 94.2-1-7, 94.2-1-8, 94.2-1-9, & 94.2-1-4.400

Applicant is seeking a subdivision/lot line adjustment.

Review Status: ZBA variance received for building offsets. Updated plans circulated to the board.

Cuciti said that this project came before the Planning Board and then was sent to the ZBA, so none of the board is very familiar with this project.

Koehler (Applicant's Agent) said that they may have been before the board a few times the first time they were sent to the health department and then the owners and applicants changed what they wanted to do they wanted to add in another lot behind the S. Ohioville address. That changed kicked in the need for an area variance. They obtained the area variance needed and is now coming back before the board.

Cuciti asked for a brief overview of the project.

Koehler said that they have a bunch of smaller lots along S. Ohioville and all of them are co-owners of the large lot that is in the back. They started out with one flag lot off of S. Ohioville and a large lot off of Hurds Rd, but they added another flag lot in off of S. Ohioville at some point. They have well and septic approval for all three lots. They worked with the Zoning Board to minimize the building offset variance that was needed. They delineated the wetlands a long time ago, they are staying away from the wetlands they are not within a 100 feet of them. They have provided an email from the DEC regarding the possible taking of the wetlands, so they want to get this approval sooner rather than later. Some of the owners just wanted to take a stripe basically the width that they have now and take it all the way to the back. Lot 1 and lot 3 will have new house and the land will go to the back of the property.

Moore asked how does the email from the DEC confirm that they are not taking jurisdiction for the wetlands.

Koehler said that the health department had to make a SEQRA determination in order to issue a permit. They have SEQRA determination on each of the new lots.

Moore asked how does the SEQRA determination from the health department effect the SEQRA determination that this board has to make.

Koehler said it is uncoordinated review and the Planning Board sent them to get individual health department approvals for the lots. It is an uncoordinated review and an unlisted action.

Gordon asked how is a negative declaration from the health department indicating that there is no significant impacts how does that equate to a jurisdictional determination for the wetlands.

Koehler said the way the wetland law is written is that it phases in over time so that there were not projects adversely effected right away. If you had a neg. dec. in place before January 1, 2025, it means that the wetlands will not be considered to be jurisdictional until January 1, 2027. If you

look at their email it states that January 1, 2027, for projects that are considered minor according their environmental conversation law.

Gordon asked is there any confirmation that the health department looked at the wetland delineations.

Koehler said he doesn't think they really had to do any review like that; they had a professional go out and delineate the wetlands and the surveyor went out and picked up all the flags. Whether or not that they took a look at it when they went out and witnessed the test pits.

Gordon said you had uncoordinated review; each agency is looking at SEQRA in a very narrow way for a determination. You are trying to piggyback here on the rule that says if you have a neg. dec. prior to a certain date it would cover the wetland delineation, but there is no proof that this neg. dec. looked at the wetland delineation.

Koehler said he doesn't think it has to the neg. dec. is related to what they looked at and determined. The way the rule was written is if there is a neg. dec. in place before January 1, 2025, then it sets a different time frame for when the wetlands become jurisdictional.

Gordon said he is going to have to look into this.

Cuciti said when it says if the action has received a negative declaration. It hasn't though because this is a different action. The action the board is taking now is the subdivision, so it hasn't received a negative declaration because it is not the same action.

Koehler said the way it was presented they were told it was a part of the subdivision. They saw the lot lines, they saw the proposed lot lines, you cannot have your septic on someone else's lot you need separation to the property line you need to have separation to other wells. They looked at all that during their review.

Cuciti said the board understands all that, but you want the board to take an action now an approval would be an action and it is not the same action as the health department.

Koehler said the board directed them to go to the health department. It could have been different the board could have done coordinated review and then the project could have went to the health department.

Cuciti said what he thinks is going to happen is that the board is going to do their review and it will get whatever declaration it gets in 2026. He feels this letter does not apply to the process.

Koehler said he is not a lawyer but he believes that there are SEQRA approvals on this project.

Gordon said in his opinion the board should be aware that it is generally suboptimal to do an uncoordinated review if there are multiple agencies involved, you should generally do a coordinated review and send them all an intent to be lead agency to all involved. It would be a way to avoid some screw ups. He feels that the applicant is trying to take advantage of a rule that

probably wasn't written for this situation. The board may have advised the applicant to go to the health department and set up an uncoordinated review; the health department gave them their own neg. dec., which is their right, but the health department was looking at it very narrowly. They are applying the rule in a way that the DEC didn't intend. He understands where the applicant is coming from. He suggests that someone reach out to DEC to find out if this is the way they meant the rule to work.

Cuciti asked if they could draft that letter.

Koehler said that he doesn't like it classified as a misuse as he did exactly what he was told to do. He agrees that it should have been a coordinated review and was surprised in the first place when it wasn't.

Gordon said that due to the fact that it was an uncoordinated review the board should be looking at the fact of whether a jurisdictional determination is required or not. He is just suggesting that the rule may or may not apply to this situation.

McCarthy asked what the applicant needed to do in order to come back before the board.

Van Nostrand said that the board referred the project to the ZBA. Also, the project the first time it appeared before the board already had the health department approval. Barton did reach out to the DEC for clarification and they returned the same email that the applicant had submitted. Barton is out this week and she doesn't know if there has been updates since.

Gordon said he would like to see that. He said that if you want to play word games it would come down to what the word project means. Does project mean to the department of health for which was essentially a preliminary health department approval of septic or does project mean the subdivision. He will take a look at the letter and if the DEC is copasetic with it then so should the board.

Cuciti said he has submitted to the health department and they never had knowledge of the subdivisions or the driveway profiles.

Gordon said that the health department may also be looking at the separation of septic and close they are to the wetlands they may look at that.

Koehler said they have to as there is a 100-foot separation required.

Moore said when you got the health department for these systems, did you get one neg. dec. or did you get individual neg. dec. for each application.

Koehler said that he is not sure, all he knows is that a regular agency cannot take an action or grant approvals without a SEQRA determination. In their letters they don't necessarily come out and say that they took a hard look at impacts to air, fish, etc. that is normally done in an EAF process, but it is inherent if they make a decision that they have to make a SEQRA determination.

Gordon said if they make an approval there should be some form of a neg. dec. that is written down, otherwise the approval is actually illegal, which reflects what they looked at. The question is are these septic systems within a 100-foot area of the wetlands or close to the buffer.

Koehler said they are over 100 feet away otherwise they wouldn't have gotten approvals. The bigger issue for them would be the driveway from Hurds Rd as there are wetland pockets on both sides of the driveway. That would create issue if it was a DEC wetland, that they never would have anticipated back when they started the project in July of 2023 and were directed to the health department.

McCarthy asked when was the last time it came before the board.

Van Nostrand said it was either summer or early fall.

Cuciti said then they were sent to the health department for the septic systems.

Koehler said they were sent to the health department for the septic systems in 2023 and they were sent to the ZBA the last time they were before the board.

Cuciti said that they need to communicate with the Department of Environmental Conservation on this.

Gordon said that they should sit down and very carefully go over this to see what they see the septic systems as, where they see potential wetlands as and then call DEC and see if they are interested in having it delineated and if they feel that the rules are being applied correctly.

Cuciti asked if the applicant could send the board all the approvals that they have for review.

Koehler said what they do is they give a plan that shows their approval block.

Cuciti asked where is the neg. dec., could he print it out and send it to the board as well.

Koehler said they don't give the applicants that.

Gordon said that from what the applicant said earlier they are presuming that they received a neg. dec. on the theory that is correct that it would not be legal for them to give approval without a neg. dec. without seeing it the presumption may or may not be correct. If it is not correct not is the health department action not appropriate but also the assumption that the wetland is grandfathered. If neither the applicant nor the town has the neg. dec. then someone should contact the health department to see if they have a copy of it. If they do receive it the board should look at it and see what extent they looked at the wetlands, in theory any organization that is giving a neg. dec. should be looking at all the impacts.

Cuciti said that based on his meeting with Gordon earlier this week that the project is an unlisted action and will need coordinated review. It is all down to the health department neg. dec. if it can be produced and reviewed.

Koehler said that he doesn't think the health department for every single approval goes into writing up anything significant. Which makes sense to him as there is a limited a review to a certain extent.

Short-term Rentals:

The North Polaris Revocable Living Trust: 110 Bellevue Rd

Review Status: Public hearing opened November 20, 2025.

Potential Action: close public hearing, approval resolution.

No public comment

Cuciti asked for a motion to close the public hearing.
Motion made by Zani, 2nd by McCarthy.
All ayes, motion passed to close the public hearing.

Cuciti read the resolution.

Cuciti asked for a motion to approve the resolution.
Motion made by McCarthy, 2nd by Marion.
All ayes, motion passed to approve the resolution.

New Business:

YW Highland Realty LLC: Special Use Permit: 1 Lockhart Ln: SBL #88.13-8-24

Applicant is seeking a special use permit and site plan approval to convert a single-family dwelling into 4 apartments.

Review Status: ZBA variance received for under acreage parcel. Application and plans circulated to the board.

Weiss (Applicant) said that he took over this project about 6 months ago. In the past there was some construction done without a permit which was a conversion into a three-family.

Cuciti asked if he owns the property.

Weiss said yes he has owned it for about 6 months and before he owned it there was work done without a permit. They took the upper floor and turned it into three apartments and the previous

owner wanted to do the same on the 1st floor, but then they got a stop work order. They never appeared before either the Planning or Zoning Board to remedy the situation, so he took it over and is trying to do the right thing. He went through ZBA and received an area variance.

Cuciti said because your lot was undersized. The plans mention that they are based off of a survey and the board would like a copy of the survey. He would like the designer to copy the meets and bounds of the survey onto the plans.

McCarthy asked if they were going to change the electrical service.

Weiss said they were not planning on it.

McCarthy asked if they were going to have one meter or have separate meters for each apartment.

Weiss said he will stick to one meter but have sub panels.

Cuciti said you are going to have one meter for four units.

Weiss said he has not thought too much about the electrical plans.

McCarthy said his question is the service large enough to provide for four apartments.

Weiss said he can add three more meters for the other apartments.

Cuciti said that is one thing, but you also need to check the size of the feeder cable, size of the breaker.

Weiss said he's going to assume that it is old and needs to be replaced anyways.

Marion asked if each apartment is going to have its own heating and separate utilities.

Weiss said yes.

Zani said each apartment will not have its own service.

Weiss said that is correct.

Cuciti asked how you delineating the parking spaces so each person knows where to park.

Weiss said he can put signs up.

Cuciti said that the board at the minimum require the individual curbs.

Weiss said that they can do that too.

McCarthy said that there is no on-street parking allowed, all parking must fit into the site. He suggests limiting the apartments to a certain number of parking spaces.

Cuciti said that they have a parking calculation on the bottom.

McCarthy said will it fit for the amount of cars.

Cuciti asked if there was going to be any landscaping.

Weiss said no.

Cuciti asked if he was making a new parking area.

Weiss said yes, but there are trees around the property currently. Most of the property has a tree line or bushes or something.

McCarthy asked about site lighting is there anything for the parking spaces.

Weiss said there is one it will have to be moved for the parking and will be placed over by the garage.

Gordon went over the SEQRA determination process. He said for this project it will be an unlisted action and it will be up to the board to decide whether it is a coordinated or uncoordinated review.

Cuciti said he is not sure if a coordinated review will be needed for this project as it is an existing building.

McCarthy said he feels that it would be an uncoordinated review.

Zani asked if he was aware of the swale that was behind the property.

Cuciti said when you get your survey the professional can show it on the plans. He asked if there was any exterior lighting being proposed.

Weiss said there is some existing, it is just to keep the property lit, nothing decorative.

Cuciti said can you at least locate them on the plan.

McCarthy said that the board wants to make sure the water feed is large enough to service four units.

Moore said that they need to determine if the building needs to be sprinklered or not. Whether or not the existing water service is large enough for what is proposed.

Zani asked if he was going to separate the water out its only going to be one meter in.

Weiss said yes. Would this be for the units or for the sprinkler system.

Moore said that they need to determine if a sprinkler system is required or not.

Zani said if a sprinkler system is required it would need to be a separate service.

Weiss asked if he could do a dry system like a tank in the basement.

Cuciti said let's just wait for Barton to come back and let us know if one is needed.

Moore said the size of the line may be sufficient for what is existing, but it may need to be increased due to the proposed project as it might not be enough.

Cuciti said have your architect do a water calculation and submit that to the board.

Weiss said he would.

Zani said that they will also have to verify the size of the sewer line coming out of the house.

Weiss said ok.

McCarthy said electrically he would like to know the size of the service coming into the property.

Weiss said that he will discuss it with his architect.

Motion to Adjourn.