

**WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES**  
**TOWN OF LLOYD PLANNING BOARD**

**Thursday, February 19, 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, Bill Meltzer (Via Zoom); Board Staff: Dave Barton, David Gordon, Christian Moore, and Sarah Van Nostrand.

**Absent:** Board Members: Laura Kelly

**Minutes to Approve at the February 26, 2026, meeting**  
October 23, 2025 & November 20, 2025 & December 4, 2025

**New Business:**

**Collins/Rechen: Lot Line Revision: 37 & 31 Hawley's Corners Rd: SBL #79.4-1-6 & 79.4-1-5**

Applicants are seeking a lot line revision.

Review Status: Application and plans circulated to board.

Collins (Applicant) said that his neighbor has moved into a senior home who offered to sell him that back lot. They have talked about it in the past and he wants it so no one builds on it.

Cuciti asked if the property is land locked.

Collins said he believes that it is land locked, but a new driveway went in to the south of it and there are a couple of new house in there.

Cuciti asked what zone is it in.

Barton said it is R-1 zoning.

Cuciti said they are going to end up with 2 compliant lots, so no problem there. Have the septic systems been located.

Collins said that the neighbor's is pretty far away.

Board set public hearing for March 26, 2026.

**Truncali Realty LLC: Amended Site Plan: 125 Tillson Ave Ext.: SBL #88.17-8-23**

Applicant is seeking an amended site plan to convert the existing building into a dental clinic and office space.

Review Status: Application and plans circulated to the board.

Demskie (Applicant's Agent) said that Truncali (Applicant) is going to rehab the building.

Sign details were passed around.

Truncali said that she wants to restore the building to move the dental office in and maybe other medical offices. There will be 1 rental space and her office upstairs and there will be 2 rental spaces downstairs.

Cuciti asked what she was changing on the elevations.

Truncali said the brick is staying, they are going to replace the siding that is there now as it is falling apart and adding all new windows.

Cuciti asked if they would be paving.

Truncali said keeping the layout of where the asphalt already is, it is going to be repaved.

Demskie asked if she wanted to talk about landscaping.

Truncali said that she likes the park like feel of the area and plans on keeping as much of it as possible. She is cleaning it up and would like to add some evergreen shrubs to have some green all year round.

Moore said this plan shows minimal site improvements; it is a reuse of an existing site. They notice that the entrance onto Tillson Ave is about 40-feet wide, the highway department may want that narrowed down a little bit and will have to weigh in on that. There are various lighting fixtures shown, he doesn't know if the lighting levels need to be looked or not or if they are proposing night time operations or not.

Truncali said that it will be standard business hours.

Moore asked if they were going to get rid of the excess pavement where the long building used to be.

Truncali said she doesn't think that they have a plan to remove that pavement.

Moore said that the grades for the parking area in the back, he knows that this is an existing site, but they try to keep parking areas to a grade of 5% or less for ease of opening car doors. The grades on the map appear to be 10%. ADA accessibility needs to be verified for the building entrances where the customers are going to be entering the building. They will need sign details for the ADA signage. They need to know what kind of pad they are going to be putting for the dumpster enclosure. They will also need an erosion control plan. It might also be good to take a look at the lighting levels that are provided. He knows that no night hours are planned, but in the winter time it can get dark because there are safety issues for people walking in the parking lot.

McCarthy said there will be more lights needed in the back parking area. He doesn't know if more handicap parking is needed based on the number of parking spaces required. He asked if there was a sidewalk from the handicap parking to the entrance.

Truncali said there is not currently. The sidewalk is just in front of the building. That is why there are two handicap spots up top, so people can access whichever floor they need. Inside the building there is not going to be access between the floors.

Zani said that your office is going to be on the top floor, what is going to be on the lower floor.

Truncali said right now just rental space. She hopes to get some other medical practitioners in.

Zani said if I have an appointment downstairs and then have one upstairs, someone would need to leave the building and go around because there is no way to get from upstairs to downstairs on the inside.

Truncali said there is a staircase.

Zani said it is not ADA compliant.

Truncali said that is correct.

Cuciti said that the board will need to see a landscaping plan. He would also like to see if they can connect the sidewalks around the building for safety. He thinks that there is a minimum lighting level for parking lots which will need to be met.

McCarthy said maybe a photometric plan sheet would help.

Cuciti asked if the existing meets the sign code currently.

Barton said it is pre-existing.

Cuciti said so they are grandfathering the sign in. If that is what the law then fine, though he doesn't particularly care for that sign. The board is definitely going to need to see landscaping and lighting. He rode out to the site and the entrance is wide and it doesn't look good.

Zani said it is on a dead-end street.

Cuciti said the way he sees it is that this building can be seen from Tillson Ave, but if the board is talking about landscaping maybe narrow that up and add some landscaping.

McCarthy asked if that entrance was also accessing Pheonix Cable.

Cuciti said no.

Zani said that you go past the hotel and go up the hill there is another vacant lot back there.

Cuciti said that the big trees on the site should be identified on the plan, he kind of hoped that some of them would be taken out because it makes it look like a gloomy forest back there. The board will need a landscaping plan, lighting plan and the elevations of the building.

Zani asked if this project would fit under adaptive reuse.

Barton said no.

McCarthy said that is more for a property that has been abandoned for a long period of time.

Cuciti said this is a change of use and it goes to the board when it is a change of use.

Barton said that the dumpster is sort of right in the front of some parking spaces, the board in the past have asked for those to be pushed away from where folks are. He assumes that there is going to be a fence around the dumpster maybe a cut sheet could be provided for that. The hedge row in front of the building offers an opportunity for some decorative plantings. Since the building is right there, putting decorative landscaping in that area and making it the vantage point will help take down the mass of the building some. He did have some concern about the width of the opening, but it is existing.

Zani asked if they were going to gut the inside of the building.

Truncali said yes.

Zani asked if it would be possible to put an elevator in.

Truncali said that she would have to talk to the architect about that.

Barton said that the lights along the front he doesn't remember them being shielded, so when they come back with that detail the lights should be facing into the property not just down into

other properties. Having some way to keep that light from the other properties maybe even replacing the light fixture so that the light is facing into their property and down would help.

Truncali said that her only concern would be adding the sidewalk or something because that is pretty sloped and in that area she planned on planting more plants and having a sidewalk go through there might not be the best idea.

Cuciti said it looks like you have a six-foot drop there.

Barton said it doesn't have to be ADA compliant the intent of the law is to demand reasonable accommodations, so if slope is the issue it is something that can be dealt with.

McCarthy said he is sure her architect could come up with something.

Truncali said that she thought it would have to be ADA compliant.

McCarthy said another concern would be the parking in the back area and the slopes there and he is concerned about people walking down that.

Moore said the grade back there is about 10% and to meet ADA it is 8 1/3.

### **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: Updated plans circulated to the board.

Cuciti said last meeting they discussed the wetland regulations and the conversation with the health department.

Kohler (Applicant's Agent) said that they emailed DEC and provided them with all the information from the health department. He received an email back from DEC which said that this project meets the transitional phase of the regulations based on local government approval and that the wetlands associated with lot 2 would be considered a minor project so it would be January 1, 2027, that the regulations would come into effect. If they were to continue with this process and finish this process up in 2026, it would give them time to at least construct the first 200-feet of the driveway, so that is out of the way before 2027 rolls around or they can add a note to the map that if constructs starts after 2027 that a permit will need to be obtained from the DEC for the wetland crossings. He can change the layout of lot 2 so that there is no disturbance of the wetland buffer area, there will be no disturbance to the wetlands themselves just the buffer area.

Cuciti said that the issue before the board is the delineation of the wetlands and whether there is a permit needed or not, a question of a jurisdictional determination and the board is probably going to be doing a coordinated review for SEQRA.

Barton said that if the house gets moved out of the buffer area of the already mapped wetlands he doesn't think that there will be a negative adverse impact on the wetlands.

Cuciti said what was discussed was doing a coordinated review, with DEC being an involved agency and if DEC continues to say the same thing the board can work off of the mark out that the engineer has and if he can stay 100-feet away then the process is the same.

Gordon said DEC is not going to do a jurisdictional determination.

Cuciti said that is what it sounds like.

Kohler read the DEC email.

Cuciti said can't they fill up to a tenth of an acre without a permit.

Kohler said yes they can.

Cuciti said for what is shown is it going to be over that.

Kohler said that it would allow him to go 25 feet wide for a length of 175 feet, so if he has a 12-foot driveway and he is able to maintain the grading and keep it within 25 feet of disturbance then he can fall under the tenth of an acre.

Gordon asked if that tenth of an acre was federal or state.

Cuciti said it is state as it is on the DEC website. In the wetland adjacent area he thinks you can fill in a tenth of an acre.

Kohler said anything over a tenth of an acre triggers the article 24 permit.

Barton said that the primary concern that he thinks they all have is will the board be defensible moving forward, accepting what the DEC has said that they are not official wetlands until 2027. Can the board say they have taken a hard look at this if Kohler moves the house and keeps the driveway under the one tenth, is it defensible that they have taken a hard look at protecting the wetlands so it can be satisfied.

Gordon said his understanding of the claim of the exemption that was presented at the last meeting was that the DEC had an exemption for the project. The way DEC works now is that there could be potential wetlands that need to be delineated as there used to be a map to go off of, but now everything has to be re-delineated, that is the basic rule. In the transition period the applicant is presenting a claim that they are exempt from that process because they received a neg. dec. from the health department. That claimed exemption does not exist as there has been no

neg. dec. from the DOH. Which leads to that a jurisdictional determination would be required. The letter that the applicant just read switched out the verbiage of neg. dec. from an agency to an approval from that agency. The original stated the exemption was for a neg. dec. or a SEQRA determination to a site plan approval.

Cuciti said that is something the applicant doesn't have.

Kohler said they have one from the county. The DEC states that they have approval from a local agency.

Cuciti said the second question that they came to is how to move this forward, he assumes if they do a coordinated review they are sending it to DEC and the applicant is going to apply for a JD and if DEC comes back and says that it is not in their jurisdiction without giving anything can the board move forward. He said that the board could circulate for lead agency.

Discussion about DEC email took place.

Gordon said that if this was pre-regulations the board would have to look at any possible negative impacts to the wetlands and if the project has any other significant impacts that is the task under SEQRA. If there is an exemption, then the board will respect the exemption, if there is not an exemption the task remains the same.

Discussion about exemption and JD took place.

Gordon said let's assume that a JD is needed you would delineate the wetlands and get DEC's approval as a JD, if that happens it would be the standard procedure. This is to show the Planning Board where the wetlands and the 100-foot buffer is so they can gauge what the impacts might be.

Discussion about prior board decision and SEQRA review process took place.

Barton suggested that they put this on hold for a week until the regular meeting, so counsel can take a look at the correspondence.

Discussion about exemptions to the wetland regulations and SEQRA review took place.

### **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: Updated plans circulated to the board.

Cuciti said that the board received the letter from the town regarding the need for more information.

Ostrovsky (Applicant) said that she received the letters. She sent some information but she doesn't know if it is enough.

Cuciti said that there needs to be a scaled drawing of the house layout and the parking area. Some of the other things that are needed is that the number of bedrooms needs to be verified and indicate on the plans which ones are for guests and which ones are not.

Ostrovsky said that she submitted the bedrooms that she is going to rent and which ones she will not be renting but she did not respond to the letter because she is travelling.

Drawings were shown.

Cuciti said that the board needs the plans to be scaled with the scale shown on them, the board needs to know where the property lines are. He suggested that she talk with a design professional as they will know what the board needs.

Ostrovsky said that she will look into it when she gets back.

McCarthy asked when was it last a bed & breakfast.

Ostrovsky said that it was at least 4 years ago before they bought the property.

McCarthy asked has it been a bed & breakfast continually until now.

Ostrovsky said no.

McCarthy asked how long was it not a bed & breakfast.

Ostrovsky said at least 3 years.

McCarthy said the number of bedrooms allowed to be had in a bed & breakfast is no more than six he believes. How many do you have now.

Ostrovsky said they have six bedrooms, but they are not going to rent them all.

McCarthy asked how many are you going to rent.

Ostrovsky said five.

McCarthy asked are you going to add two more bedrooms to that.

Ostrovsky said that they are not going to add any new bedrooms.

Cuciti asked if she currently has six or seven bedrooms.

Ostrovsky said that they have seven bedrooms but they are not renting all seven they are only renting five.

Barton mentioned that he doesn't know if this issue was taken care of in January when he wasn't here, but he is wondering about food service.

Ostrovsky said that they are not going to be serving food.

Barton said therefore you are not a bed & breakfast, so the application is not valid and the board cannot review it.

Ostrovsky said when she was applying she was told that she could serve breakfast or not and that it was up to her.

Barton said that the definition in the code requires a meal to be served.

Ostrovsky said that she wasn't going to do a bed & breakfast she was just going to rent on Airbnb and was told that she could not rent more than one item.

Barton said you could rent the whole house, but you cannot rent individual rooms in the house as part of an Airbnb to separate parties, if you want to rent multiple rooms it has to be to one party.

Ostrovsky said can she have two listings one for two rooms and one for the whole house.

Barton said one party can rent at the property at a time.

Ostrovsky said if she is not renting the whole house, she would not be renting part of the house.

Cuciti said you will have to decide what application you want to put in for, do you want a short-term rental or do you want a bed & breakfast.

Ostrovsky said that she already has permission for Airbnb, this all started when she wanted to rent the whole house or half the house and she is not renting to two parties.

Cuciti said you put an application in for a bed & breakfast.

Ostrovsky said yes because she was told that she couldn't rent the house on Airbnb.

Cuciti asked if she wanted to go forward with the application or not.

Ostrovsky said she is not sure.

Cuciti suggested that she come into the building department and discuss the application and once she gets an application she is happy with, she can come back to the board.

**Motion to Adjourn.**