

**TOWN OF COEYMANS MEETING MINUTES  
JANUARY 29, 2026 6:30PM**

*A joint PBZBA & Town Board Meeting was held Thursday, January 29<sup>th</sup>, 2026 at 6:30p.m. at 18 Russell Avenue, Ravena N.Y.*

**PRESENT:** Stephen Donnelly, Supervisor  
Michael J. Stott, Deputy Supervisor  
Stephen J. Schmitt, Council Member  
Patricia Grogan, Council Member  
Nathan Boomer, PBZBA Chair  
Albert Collins, PBZBA Member  
Bernie teRiele, PBZBA Member  
Michael McGuire, PBZBA Member  
Patrick Cronin, PBZBA Member  
Stephen Deitz, PBZBA Member  
Joe Cinque, PBZBA Alternate

**ALSO PRESENT:** Candace McHugh, Town Clerk  
Richard Reilly, Town Attorney  
William Keniry, Town PBZBA Attorney

---

Supervisor Donnelly opened the meeting and led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance. He asked that the record reflect all board members were present.

-It was stated by Town Attorney, Richard Reilly, that the purpose of this meeting is to solicit feedback from each board. The Town Board is not trying to influence the PBZBA in any way.

**Site Plan Review:** Supervisor Donnelly suggested the boards walk through the history and see if either board has noticed any issues. PBZBA Chair, Nathan Boomer started by saying he did not see anything that threw up a red flag. He said the law was in place but never enforced and he has a concern with going back to review prior decisions. Mr. Boomer stated that was not the fault of the applicant. It was asked of Mr. Chmielewski if site plan review has been brought forth to the PBZBA for the Industrial Park in his time. He said there was an amendment when he first started. It was clarified that site plan review has been done for Industrial Park projects but not within the time frame Mr. Chmielewski's employment as the Building Inspector. Council member Grogan asked if it was failure on the applicant or the town as to why this was not occurring. Council member Schmitt explained the schedule in place states site plan review is exempt in the I1 and I2 zones for principal uses. Mr. Reilly feels the repealer clause language in the 2011 law should have changed the that but it was never cleaned up which led to confusion. Supervisor Donnelly asked if the solution moving forward would include the PBZBA, Building Dept., and Supervisor should work together on this. Mr. Reilly suggested getting an inventory on businesses within the Industrial Park. Council member Schmitt was confused by Mr. Reilly's interpretation and asked him to clarify his opinion. Mr. Reilly stated the schedule has long been in place but the 2011 law described the type of project subject to site plan review. Section 136-5 was referenced. Council member Schmitt clarified that section 136-5 does not mention the I1 or I2 schedules. Mr. Nick Laraway of Carver Companies asked to participate in the conversation.

**TOWN OF COEYMANS MEETING MINUTES  
JANUARY 29, 2026 6:30PM**

He asked for the record, which versions say that site plan is required for principal uses because he has not found one. Mr. Reilly stated the repealer clause repealed anything inconsistent. The definitions given the 2011 law was broad which encompasses all types of projects except for what is specifically excluded. The next section delineates what is specifically excluded which is residential and agricultural. Mr. Laraway asked if this applied to industrial uses, Mr. Reilly stated it does. Mr. Reilly has spoken with the individuals involved in the creation of the law for history. Mr. Laraway asked for the opinion of the PBZBA attorney on this. PBZBA Attorney, Mr. Keniry stated he has not given an opinion on these issues. The planning board has been given the role of producing an advisory opinion and has begun the process. Mr. Laraway indicated he feels as though the town board is leading on this when it should be the PBZBA. Mr. Keniry stated the PBZBA is informally aware of this and preparing to give an advisory opinion. The PBZBA boards intent was to gather information tonight. Mr. Laraway stated his company will participate in collecting an inventory of the Industrial Park. He asked if the same was being asked of other companies such as Amrize will be asked to do the same. Mr. Reilly stated that was the intent. Supervisor Donnelly said his office is waiting till after this meeting to reach out to other businesses. Mr. Cronin agreed with Mr. Boomer's comments. Mr. Cronin brought up the phrasing regarding "a clean version of Schedule F be prepared". He suggested it just be revised to what the town board is proposing. Mr. McGuire does not feel a retroactive look would benefit anyone. He stated they have not been asked for a formal opinion at this time. A specific time clock will be started once a formal opinion is asked for. Mr. Collins asked if this would include the school projects. Mr. Keniry stated those particular uses come in on a voluntary basis as they consider themselves exempt. Mr. Laraway asked if either board has an opinion on a more comprehensive zoning overhaul. Supervisor Donnelly said it will be a future discussion. Supervisor Donnelly reiterated the general consensus was to not do any retroactive review. Council member Schmitt asked if anyone had reached out regarding a tenant list. Mr. Reilly stated he was surprised at the minimal amount of information the town had on the Industrial Park Tenants. Mr. Cronin asked if a change in tenant required a site plan review. Mr. Reilly stated it would depend on the type of business moving in. Mr. Chmielewski spoke of how he is aware of types of buildings and their use, not necessarily who each tenant is and/or what they do. Supervisor Donnelly stated his office will be reaching out to the companies in town to establish an inventory of Tenants.

**Definition Discussion:**

**Background to Potential New Zoning Definition:**

**"Owner Occupied Contractor Yard"**

- The Town Board has been exploring a potential new definition for the Town of Coeymans Zoning Code that may be added to the Residential-Agricultural (R-A) Zone, in conjunction with the revised definition for "Transportation Terminal," if Local Law No. 1 were to be passed.
- This new definition would address the concern that, by revising the current definition of "Transportation Terminal," it may cause existing uses in the R-A Zone to be nonconforming.

**TOWN OF COEYMANS MEETING MINUTES  
JANUARY 29, 2026 6:30PM**

- In drafting the potential new definition, the Town Board has asked the Town Attorneys to research the Zoning Codes of neighboring municipalities to determine whether those municipalities had similar defined uses.
- Based on that review, the Town Attorneys have drafted the following potential definition that the Town may choose to add to the Zoning Code, as an Accessory Use, to the R-A Zone:

**“Owner Operated Contractor Yard”** A portion of a lot used to store and maintain construction equipment and other materials and facilities customarily required in the contractor’s trade, but excluding the storage of materials or equipment for offsite sale. The owner of such business activity must reside on the premises. Exterior evidence of an Owner Operated Contractor Yard may include one or more of the following: a sign; exterior dumpsters or waste receptacles; stored vehicles or equipment; or vehicles or equipment directly related to the business activity conducted on-site. The minimum lot size for an Owner Operated Contractor Yard shall be \_\_\_\_ acres.

- This definition may alleviate concerns that certain existing businesses in the R-A Zone might be considered pre-existing non-conforming uses if Local Law No. 1 of 2025 is passed.
  - In any event, the existing businesses currently located in the R-A Zone would not be required to alter their operations to comply with the Zoning Code.
  - The addition of this new potential zoning definition – or a definition similar to it – would also allow new businesses of that type to operate.
- The Town is mindful that in the Coeymans 2006 Comprehensive Plan, and in the 2021 update to the Comprehensive Plan, the Town did express some level of concern about allowing additional industry into the residential zones.

2

- For example, in the 2006 Comprehensive Plan, a goal of the Town was to “continue to promote a separate, but solid balance between the residential, commercial and industrial areas.”
- Additionally, in the 2021 Comprehensive Plan update, one of the “Recommended Actions” was to “[e]nsure a balance of industrial and residential areas of the Town to protect and enhance community character. Industrial development should be focused in existing industrial areas and buffered from existing neighborhoods.”
- A review of past Town Board minutes, particularly during 2012 when an update to the Zoning Code was discussed, also shows that the sentiments in the Comprehensive Plans are consistent with concerns of past Town Boards about potentially expanding commercial uses in the R-A Zone – and/or desire to avoid that outcome.
- **The goal of an “Owner Operated Contractor Yard” would be to address concerns That have been raised by residents and business owners, while remaining consistent with the Town’s Comprehensive Plan.**

Supervisor Donnelly raised the question of how to determine the allowable acreage. Mr. Reilly stated that is language that could be massaged. Council member Grogan does not agree with the

**TOWN OF COEYMANS MEETING MINUTES  
JANUARY 29, 2026 6:30PM**

phrasing that the owner must live on the premises. She had asked who initially raised the question of the rest of these terms. Mr. Reilly stated Council member Stott initially raised the concern of the truck terminal definition.

The conversation veered towards the truck terminal definition.

**Transportation Terminal, Agriculture-Related**: a yard or transfer site used for the storage and/or transfer of Agriculture-related produce, goods or materials that are grown, cultivated, harvested or produced as a result of a permitted Principal Use within Residential-Agricultural (R-A) District.

Council member Stott feels that when the 2020 board amended the law they may not have realized the same terminology was in the agricultural zone as well. He feels there should be a separate definition for the agricultural zone to avoid any loop holes. Council member Schmitt brought up that some of the purposes listed in the definition could apply to the agricultural zone. Council member Grogan asked why the definition couldn't be left the same with the exclusion of railway terminal. She is very wary of limiting peoples potential land uses. Council member Schmitt asked if any PBZBA members had an opinion on these potential definitions. Mr. Cronin asked if all of these things are currently allowed, doesn't that suggest the language is working as intended? Council member Schmitt is concerned that all the businesses had not been considered but he doesn't know that anything necessarily has to change. Council member Stott asked how many people have applied for a transportation terminal within Mr. Chmielewski's tenure. None have been brought forth. Mr. Laraway stated he felt there are many businesses in town that use their RA land as a "transportation terminal".

Council member Grogan asked that the definition of an Agricultural Event Center not be discussed as the PBZBA is in the middle of dealing with an application and appeal pertaining to this. It was asked of the PBZBA to submit emails regarding potential changes to the definition to the town attorney.

Separation of PB/ZBA: PBZBA Chair Nathan Boomer asked why. He thought the original intention of joining the boards was to streamline the process for the public. Council member Schmitt feels it is difficult for the members of the PBABA to separate the duties of the 2 boards. He still feels the need for efficiency by doing 2 PB and 2 ZBA meeting per month if they were to separate the boards. Mr. McGuire agrees with the need for multiple meetings for efficiency. Council member Grogan asked what the other towns Mr. Keniry deals with typically do. He stated many are separate but there are some combined.

**Public Comment:**

**TOWN OF COEYMANS MEETING MINUTES  
JANUARY 29, 2026 6:30PM**

Barbara Tanner asked if the boards were combined to streamline the process? Mr. Schmitt answered yes but separate board will ensure the correct checks and balances are in place.

Mr. Laraway asked if there will be a follow up meeting considering this was a fact-finding mission in which the Supervisor replied yes.

---

**Motion to Adjourn** was made by Council member Donnelly and Seconded by Council member Stott- APPROVED – VOTE – AYES 4 – NAYS 0 – ABSENT – SO MOVED

*Respectfully Submitted,*

  
*Candace McHugh, Town Clerk*

