

## **Town of New Baltimore Planning Board**

### **Monthly Meeting Minutes**

3809 County Route 51 Hannacroix, NY 12087

**November 13, 2025**

**7 PM**

**Present:** Rob VanEtten, Josh Boehlke, Ann Marie Vadney, Bob Court, Frank Orlando, Charles Irving, Bill MacDonald

#### **Pledge of Allegiance**

#### **Hannacroix Solar – Site Plan Extension Request:**

Jacqui Murray appeared on behalf of the Hannacroix Solar project to request an additional site plan extension. She reported that the project received a Notice of Complete Application from the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation on October 21, 2025, which initiated a 15-day public comment period. No comments were received by the November 13th deadline, and therefore no Public Hearing will be required. The close of the comment period triggered a 90-day period for DEC to issue a final decision on the Incidental Take Permit (ITP), with a deadline of February 11, 2026. Murray noted that the mitigation agreement with Magnolia Trust is fully executed and that the Engineering and Procurement Contract with C.T. Male and Avoca is in effect, with work underway on the construction drawings needed for the building permit. Representatives from the NY Power Authority, who will be financing the project, were also present. Murray stated that, for the first time, the project now has a definite DEC timeline for the ITP decision. Board member Vadney expressed concern regarding repeated extension requests, stating that prior extensions had been granted based on projected timelines and financing, but that the project had not been ready to move forward even aside from the DEC approval. She reminded the applicant that the Board had previously indicated that the last extension granted would be final and questioned whether the project would be ready even if an additional 6-month extension were approved. Board member Court acknowledged that the DEC's 90-day review provides clarity and asked how soon after an ITP decision the building permit application could be submitted. Murray stated that the Building Department will require full building and electrical design plans and that she could not guarantee a specific completion date. Vincent Hansen of Teichos Energy estimated that preparation of the plans would take 3–4 months. When asked why the design work had not begun earlier given the project's long duration, Hansen replied that engineering could not be engaged without greater certainty from DEC regarding the ITP. Board members expressed concern that the project, approved since 2021, lacked ready construction and electrical plans and that some preparatory work could have been completed prior to the DEC determination. Murray reiterated that the team was reluctant to proceed with full engineering until there was confirmation that the DEC application was complete, and she referenced

correspondence from C.T. Male and Avoca dated November 1 and November 5 indicating that they have now begun work on the final drawings. She added that, even once the drawings are complete, the Code Enforcement Officer will also require time for review. Board member Vadney noted that this review could be substantial. Chairman VanEtten asked whether a 6-month extension would be sufficient. Hansen stated that the project team has remained active and has continued work on interconnection matters with Central Hudson, including on-site meetings. Board member Vadney acknowledged this but noted that the project has now spanned four years. Chairman VanEtten asked whether the applicants had intentionally delayed final design work until receiving DEC's decision; Hansen confirmed this, explaining that completing engineering prematurely would risk having to redo the work if the Incidental Take Permit (ITP) were denied. Chairman VanEtten then asked the financial representatives about their commitment to funding. Nick Harris explained that the company will finance the project through a construction loan, which will be forgiven upon project completion when ownership transfers to them. He stated that they have worked with the developers for approximately a year and are now comfortable with the environmental, technical, contractual, and financial aspects. Representatives from the New York Power Authority indicated they are prepared to move forward contingent upon the extension being granted and DEC issuing the ITP. Board member Court asked what would happen if DEC does not issue the permit. Murray responded that, once an application is deemed complete, DEC has exhausted its questions and, absent public comments necessitating a hearing, the matter becomes procedural. She expressed confidence that the permit will be issued within the 90-day period. Board member Orlando noted that if the Board grants a 6-month extension and DEC denies the permit after several months, the project would terminate, as no further extensions will be granted. Murray agreed, stating that without the ITP, the project cannot mitigate impacts to the Northern Harrier as required under SEQR. Chairman VanEtten noted that the Town's prior Public Hearing on the project drew no significant comments, and Board member Court added that the site is largely out of view and follows the Thruway corridor. Board member Irving observed that DEC may issue its decision well before the 90-day deadline and asked whether Murray had encountered agencies waiting the full period; she responded that she had not. Board member Vadney reiterated that the applicants will need to secure a building permit within the 6-month extension period if granted, as no additional extensions will be considered. Hansen stated that they expect to have all required materials within that timeframe. Board member Vadney reiterated that a 6-month extension may not be sufficient because the Building Department will require time to review the final plans. Murray stated that if the Board wished to grant a longer extension, the applicants would accept it; however, they requested a conservative 6-month period given their prior appearances before the Board. Board member Court noted that equipment and standards have evolved over the four years since the project was first reviewed and asked how different the new plans would be from those presented in 2019. Murray confirmed that the site plan itself has not changed. Hansen added that, while technical details have been updated, the layout, panel size, and tracking systems remain substantially the same. Chairman VanEtten asked whether the Town still had a designated engineer assigned to the project. The Clerk confirmed that Crawford and Associates continues in that role and

recently reviewed the updated decommissioning plan. The Board discussed the expected timeline for plan preparation, and Murray estimated 3–4 months. Board member Orlando asked whether that timeframe started immediately or after issuance of the ITP; Murray clarified that the work is already underway. Board member Vadney expressed continued concern about the lack of a firm timeline for completing the plans. Murray responded that the schedule depends on the availability of the engineering firms and the Code Enforcement Officer, and thus can only be estimated. Vadney remarked that, given the applicants are paying for the work, they should be able to obtain clearer guidance. Hansen noted that the building permit fee alone exceeds \$100,000, underscoring their financial commitment. Vadney replied that the Board cannot consider project costs and must instead determine whether the extension timeline is realistically achievable. Board member Orlando asked whether Vadney would prefer a longer extension to ensure sufficient time. Board member Court added that the Board would like all materials submitted to the Code Enforcement Officer by March. Orlando suggested making that a condition. Murray proposed maintaining the 6-month extension but returning to the Board in 90 days to provide an update and a more concrete schedule. She stated that while the drawings are expected to be finished in 3–4 months, they cannot predict how long the Code Enforcement Officer’s review will take. Chairman VanEtten stated that, regardless, if materials are not submitted within 6 months, the project will be considered terminated. Board member Boehlke asked what factors contributed to the four-year delay. Murray explained that delays stemmed primarily from the DEC’s review process, combined with staff changes during COVID-19 and difficulty locating an acceptable mitigation site for the Northern Harrier. The first proposed site ultimately proved unacceptable, requiring a restart, and although DEC requested a Greene County location, none could be secured. The applicants have now finalized a mitigation agreement with Magnolia Trust, which was submitted to DEC earlier that day. Board member MacDonald asked whether this reflected that Greene County may be approaching saturation for such projects based on environmental constraints. Murray stated she could not conclude that, noting that mitigation sites within Greene County may also support projects in other counties. Board member Orlando asked whether state funding had been secured given the end of certain solar incentives. Hansen confirmed that funding is in place. With no further questions, the Board briefly discussed financing before Chairman VanEtten read the draft resolution and invited any proposed changes.

***Hannacroix Solar Resolution Granting Additional Site Plan Approval Extension***

**WHEREAS**, Teichos Energy and/or Hannacroix Solar Facility, LLC (the “Applicant”), submitted a Site Plan Application (the “Application”) to the Town of New Baltimore Planning Board (the “Planning Board”) at the November 19, 2019, Planning Board Meeting; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Board approved the Application by Resolution at the Planning Board’s Meeting on December 9, 2021 (the “Approval”); and

**WHEREAS**, the Applicant requested a one-year extension of the Approval, and the Planning Board granted the Applicant's extension request by Resolution at the Planning Board's Meeting on December 8, 2022 (the "First Extension"); and

**WHEREAS**, the Applicant requested an additional one-year extension of the Approval, and the Planning Board granted the Applicant's extension request by Resolution at the Planning Board's Meeting on August 8, 2023 (the "Second Extension") such that the Second Extension expires on December 9, 2024; and

**WHEREAS**, due to the NYSDEC's changes to its siting requirements, the Applicant was required to locate a mitigation parcel within Greene County, the county in which the solar project, the subject of the Application, will be located, which has, in turn, required "an entirely new review process by the NYSDEC of the ITP"; and

**WHEREAS**, the Applicant requested an additional one-year extension of the Approval, by letter from the Applicant's counsel dated April 23, 2024, and the Planning Board granted the Applicant's extension request by Resolution at the Planning Boards meeting on November 14, 2024 (the "Third Extension"), such that the Third Extension expires on December 9, 2025: and

**WHEREAS**, the applicant submitted the NYSDEC's Notice of Complete Application on October 21, 2025, notice was published in the Albany Times Union the week of October 27, 2025, starting a 15-day public comment period as well as a 90-day time frame to allow for the NYSDEC's decision; and

**WHEREAS**, the Applicant has requested the Planning Board to grant an additional six-month extension of the Approval, by email from the Applicant's counsel dated October 29, 2025 (the "Fourth Extension"), stating that the New York Department of Environmental Conservation ("NYSDEC") review of the Incidental Take Permit ("ITP") Application must conclude by February 11, 2026, and

**WHEREAS**, notwithstanding that the Applicant has not yet obtained a Building Permit nor commenced construction of the project, the Site Plan has not otherwise been changed since the Planning Board issued the Approval; and

**WHEREAS**, the Town Board of the Town of New Baltimore has delegated its authority to grant extensions for site plan approval to the Planning Board (see New Baltimore Town Code § 112-36), and the Planning Board may issue the Fourth Extension, in its discretion. now, therefore, be it

**RESOLVED**, that the Planning Board's Resolution dated November 13, 2025, is hereby modified to allow for an additional extension of the Applicant's Approval; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Site Plan be extended for an additional 6-month period on December 9, 2025, such that it shall expire on June 9, 2026, based on the Applicant's representation that NYSDEC issued a Notice of Completion of the Applicant's ITP Application and NYSDEC's review of the ITP Application must conclude by February 11, 2026; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Site Plan shall not be further extended beyond June 9, 2026

The Board pointed out a few mistakes with the dates that needed to be changed in the resolution and discussion was had concerning the last paragraph and the language that needed to be used to ensure the Site Plan Extension will continue through the Code Enforcement Officers review and issuance of the Building Permit.

After further discussion the last paragraph of the resolution was read again...

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Site Plan shall not be further extended beyond June 9, 2026, without submittal of the Building Permit application in which case Site Plan approval will be extended pending the issuance of the Building Permit.

### **Motion to Approve the Hannacroix Solar Resolution Granting Additional Site Plan Extension**

Made by Ann Marie Vadney, Seconded by Josh Boehlke

**Aye: 5      Nay: 2      Abstain:      Absent:**

Motion Carried

### **Jessica Camerati & Justin Otis – Lot Line Adjustment Application:**

The applicants presented maps for a proposed lot line adjustment. The Clerk explained that two maps were provided: the original survey prepared prior to construction of the house, and the current survey, noting a discrepancy between the Greene County tax map acreage and the surveyed acreage. Board member Court requested to review the submitted deeds; the Clerk provided them. Camerati explained that the discrepancy likely stems from a typographical error in the original deed, listing a 600-foot line that should have been 700 feet. Court noted that the applicants effectively received more land than reflected in the deed and that the corrected deed will resolve the acreage inconsistency. Camerati confirmed that a new house has been built on the property and that the lot line adjustment is intended to ensure the driveway lies entirely on their parcel and the structure meets setback requirements. Court asked about the required setback, and the Clerk stated it is 25 feet. The house currently sits 19 feet from the property line. The Clerk explained that the building permit was issued based on a cover letter acknowledging the setback issue, but the plans were never updated, necessitating the current adjustment. It was noted that the applicants own both parcels involved and have maintained each at over two acres to allow for potential future development.

The Board reviewed the maps, and Chairman VanEtten stated that the adjustment appeared straightforward and that a resolution could be prepared once required

documentation is submitted. Applicants must provide the conveyance deeds and drafts of final deeds before a resolution can be adopted, although if not submitted by the next meeting, the matter may simply be carried forward. The Clerk advised that an attorney will be needed to prepare these documents. Otis stated that involving the surveyor may require additional time. The Clerk confirmed that applicants may return when ready and will need to provide three paper copies and one mylar copy of the stamped, signed survey at that time. The Board asked about the Certificate of Occupancy for the new residence; the Clerk stated that a temporary CO is in place and that, with the lot line adjustment application accepted and minor outstanding inspection items addressed, the Code Enforcement Officer should be able to issue a full Certificate of Occupancy. The Board then reviewed the application, and Chairman VanEtten completed and read aloud Part 2 of the Short Environmental Assessment Form.

**Motion to Accept the Short Environmental Assessment Form Part 2 with a Negative Declaration for the Purposes of SEQRA**

Made by Ann Marie Vadney, Seconded by Josh Boehlke

**Aye: 7      Nay:      Abstain:      Absent:**

Motion Carried

**Motion to Accept the Application for the Justin Otis and Jessica Cammerati Lot Line Adjustment**

Made by Bob Court, Seconded by Frank Orlando

**Aye: 7      Nay:      Abstain:      Absent:**

Motion Carried

**Messina – Minor Subdivision:**

The Clerk presented draft maps of the proposed minor subdivision for Board review. Chairman VanEtten asked for clarification on the acreage involved. Property owner Jade Messina stated that the subdivision will create a new 2-acre lot, leaving approximately 14 acres remaining with the original parcel. She explained that one daughter resides on one side of the property and the new lot is intended for their other daughter. The proposed location was chosen to provide appropriate road frontage and to avoid interference with existing horse pastures. The Board reviewed the maps and application. Board member Court asked whether the lot is intended for new construction and whether an engineer had evaluated the placement of a house, well, and septic system, noting the unusual shape of the parcel. Kate Messina responded that nearby homes are oriented at an angle and the future house will likely align with her parents' and sister's homes. She added that they

intend to place the house farther back from the road for safety and privacy, especially with young children. Board member Orlando recommended that an engineer review the site to ensure that all components—particularly the required well and septic separation—can be properly accommodated. The Board expressed concern about creating a lot that might ultimately be unbuildable. Kate Messina stated that the property extends back significantly and she does not anticipate issues siting a home. Chairman VanEtten then read aloud Part 2 of the Short Environmental Assessment Form.

**Motion to Accept the Short Environmental Assessment Form Part 2 with a Negative Declaration for the Purposes of SEQR**

Made by Ann Marie Vadney, Seconded by Josh Boehlke

**Aye: 7      Nay:      Abstain:      Absent:**

Motion Carried

**Motion to Accept the Application for the Messina Minor Subdivision**

Made by Ann Marie Vadney, Seconded by Bill MacDonald

**Aye: 7      Nay:      Abstain:      Absent:**

Motion Carried

Chairman VanEtten stated that now the application has been accepted they will need to schedule a Public Hearing. He informed them they will have to notify the adjoining neighbors by certified letter. The Clerk said she will provide all the details that they will need to move forward. The Board agreed to schedule the Public Hearing for December 11, 2025, at 7pm.

**Motion to Approve the September 11, 2025, Lynn Brockett/Kasselmann Solar Public Hearing minutes**

Motioned by Ann Marie Vadney, Seconded by Josh Boehlke

**Aye: 6      Nay:      Abstain: 1      Absent:**

Motion Carried

**Motion to Approve the September 11, 2025, Planning Board Regular Monthly Meeting Minutes**

Motioned by Bob Court, Seconded by Josh Boehlke

**Aye: 6      Nay:      Abstain: 1      Absent:**

Motion Carried

Board member Vadney asked the Clerk whether she had received any updates from Mr. Ahrens. The Clerk reported that she last spoke with Mr. Rounds, the surveyor, who attempted to reach her but they were unable to connect. She left him a message advising that the subdivision application and payment had been received and that the maps are the only remaining item needed before the application can return to the Planning Board. The Clerk also confirmed that the consolidation of the smaller lot has been completed with the County.

Vadney then informed the Board that she wished to review expectations for JB Car Services going forward. She noted that the business submitted its 2024 annual DEC report and that the Code Enforcement Officer conducted an inspection of the property. Vadney reminded the Board that JB Car Services is the only business required to renew its Special Use Permit annually, and that the Planning Board has the authority to modify the renewal interval. Board member Orlando asked whether changing the renewal period would make a difference. Board member Court responded that although he once thought it might, the continued need for DEC reporting and annual Code Enforcement inspections indicates that the yearly renewal should remain in place.

**Motion to Adjourn the November 13, 2025, Planning Board meeting**

Made by Ann Marie Vadney, Seconded by

**Aye: 7      Nay:      Abstain:      Absent:**

Motion Carried

**Meeting Adjourned 8:37pm**