

**TOWN OF ANCRAM  
Planning Board Meeting  
February 26, 2026**

**Join Zoom Meeting:**

**<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6017878873?pwd=YVA1K0xGejdNdWkzVHRPUmE2cCtUUT09&omn=82810250487>**

**Meeting ID: 601 787 8873  
Passcode: 247210**

The February 26, 2026 meeting of the Town of Ancram Planning Board was called to order at 6:05PM by Joe Crocco, The chairman determined a quorum was established.

**Board Members Present:** Joe Crocco, Chairman, Tom Brondolo, Palmer Irvng, Phil Hack, Jessica Lovelace

**Board Members Present on Zoom:**

**Board Members Absent:** Erin Robertson, Don Tasch, Sara Porter, and Christine Brown

**Correspondence:**

**Conflicts Check:** The chairman checked for conflicts, none were reported.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**Homeland Towers 2024-SUP-007  
Special Use Permit and Site Plan Review  
6534 State Route 22  
215-1-41.110**

Kim Garrison of Grant & Lyons presented to the board regarding segmentation and co-location. There was a question raised at the February 10, 2026, meeting regarding whether the board should be reviewing the tower at 100 feet as the application states or if it should be reviewing based on a future eligible facilities request. Ms. Garrison reported that it the continued opinion of the Board's attorneys that they should be considering the 100-foot tower.

Nan Stolzenberg the town's planner presented and gave a summary of the work done at the February 10, 2026, meeting. At the 2/10 meeting the following items were marked as moderate to large impact on FEAF Part II.

9a. – Yes (moderate to large)  
9ci. – Yes (moderate to large)  
9cii. – Yes (moderate to large)  
9di. – Yes (moderate to large)  
9dii. – Yes (moderate to large)

9e. – Yes (moderate to large)  
18e. – Yes (moderate to large)  
18f. – Yes (moderate to large)

Ms. Stolzenberg continued to explain the FEAF Part III process, and how the question of significance and impact should be answered. Ms. Stolzenberg asked the board members present to offer their opinion on the significance (magnitude, duration and likelihood).

Tom Brondolo offered his opinion first, his feeling is that the magnitude is moderate, not large and not nothing. Palmer Irving offered her opinion next; she concurred with Mr. Brondolo that it is a low to moderate impact. Jessica Lovelace offered her opinion next; she feels that the project has significant impact. Phil Hack offered

his opinion next; he concurs with Ms. Lovelace's opinion that the impact is significant. Chairman Crocco offered his opinion last; he feels that the impact is low to moderate. Nan Stolzenberg asked the board if there is a consensus that the impact is long term, and likely. All agreed that the project's impact is long term and likely.

Ms. Stolzenberg asked the board if they would like to take a straw vote based on their opinions as currently the board has 2 members who feel the impact is significant or large, and 3 members feel the impact is low to moderate.

Mr. Kenny asked to address the board. Permission was granted. Mr. Kenny advised the board that tonight's decision is about the SEQR process, not about whether the project is visible.

Ms. Stolzenberg read the DEC definitions to the board of the degrees of impact of magnitude. The workbook and those definitions can be found here (<https://dec.ny.gov/regulatory/permits-licenses/seqr/eaf-workbooks/part-3-evaluation-of-magnitude-importance-of-project-impacts-and-determination-of-significance>).

Tom Brondolo advised that he feels that the reading of the definitions affirm his opinion that the impact is moderate. Jessica Lovelace advised that she still feels the impact is large. Chairman Crocco affirmed his opinion that the impact is small or at best moderate.

Phil Hack clarified that concluding that the impact is significant which results in a positive declaration which opens the door for further environmental review, and that a negative declaration closes the environmental review. Mr. Lyons advised that giving the application a positive declaration very rarely results in an application being unable to move forward. Mr. Kenny addressed the board again, describing how the applicants have already addressed the issues that would be brought up in further environmental review. Nan Stolzenberg and George Janes helped to explain significance, and the definitions in SEQR.

Discussion was had regarding the height of the tower, and how lowering the height would affect the coverage provided. CityScape consultants helped explain to the board that there would be a loss of coverage in lowering the tower. Additional clarification discussion was had about declaring a negative or positive declaration, and how that would impact the application and what additional materials would be provided if a positive declaration was declared, and what those materials would be. At this time the Chair polled the board for a straw vote. John Lyons clarified that this is not an official decision by the board as this is a workshop meeting, but it gives the consultants information they need to continue the process. The official vote will happen during the March meeting.

Chairman Crocco polled the board as to whether each member feels the FEAF Part II should be given and negative or positive declaration.

Tom – negative

Phil – negative

Palmer – negative

Joe – negative

Jessica – positive

Chairman Crocco confirmed that the town's planner and attorneys will be preparing what is needed for an official negative declaration. Discussion was had around how much time will be needed as the March meeting is next week. John Lyons reported that they would not have the information ready for then. Board members were in agreement with the applicant to schedule another special meeting once the town's planner and attorneys have had time to draft the negative declaration.

**A motion was made to adjourn by Tom Brondolo, seconded by Phil Hack and carried.**