

301 Brooklea Drive
Fayetteville, NY 13066
Phone 315-637-3414
Fax 315-637-0713



Chairperson:
David Shomar

Members:
Valerie Beecher
Richard Rossetti
Judy Salamone
Erin Reynolds
Don Western
Kristen Zarella

Alternate Members:
Eric Neubauer

**Minutes
Planning Board
June 8, 2026
6:30 PM**

The Town of Manlius Planning Board held a hybrid meeting with in-person attendees and virtual attendees. The meeting was live streamed on the Town Website, Town Facebook page and the Town YouTube Channel. Chairperson Shomar presided, and the following Board members were present:

Valerie Beecher

Richard Rossetti

Judy Salamone

Erin Reynolds

Don Western

Eric Neubauer

The following Town Officers were present: Duffy Hartnett, Planning Board Clerk. Joseph Frateschi, Town Attorney and Thomas Poitras, Director of Planning and Development

In-Person Attendees: Brandon Jacobsen, Matt Napierala, Troy Bullock, and Allen Olmsted

Virtual Attendees: Jared McCormick

Pledge Of Allegiance

Director of Planning and Development

Director Poitras was away during his allotted time to attend to a structure fire in the Town and returned later in the meeting.

Approval Of Minutes

1. May 11, 2026 - Minutes

Member Salamone made a motion, Seconded by Member Western, to Motion to Approve the 5/11/2026 Planning Board Meeting Minutes.

Ayes: Chair Shomar, Member Western, Member Neubauer, Member Rossetti, Member Beecher, Member Reynolds, Member Salamone

Nayes: None

Abstain: None

Results: Passed

Current Projects

1. Ironhorn Enterprises - 5912 North Burdick Street, E. Syracuse, NY 13057
-Second meeting for possible site approval - Site Plan Amendment - Same Address - Zoning Classification - Commercial B (CB) - Tax Map #'s 077.3-01-01.1 & 077.-03-24.4

Matt Napierela - Relayed all comments to our team, they are summarized in the response letter on 5/8/26. We are looking to advance this project as a facade enhancement. The responses are in our letter.

Member Western - number 5, the colors are bland in the board comments, you say the color has a modern appeal

Matt Napierela - we were trying to focus on the building itself it was restriped, it used to be broken up, it has a fresh asphalt with striping.

Chairman Shomar - Question - have you reviewed our comprehensive plan and has that helped you reflect?

Jared McCormick - yes and we wanted to bring a modern aesthetic. Jared McCormick details design elements and states that it was done to appeal to modern sensibilities and remain cost friendly and provide a modern feel.

Member Beecher - did you look at the commercial section of the plan, this looks like least desirable in the plan. I feel that our comments have not been addressed.

Jared McCormick - I do not believe that is the case.

Member Beecher - you chose a site that is commercially zoned but it is in a residential area. I feel this does not hold with the comprehensive plan.

Chairman Shomar - The biggest elements we are looking for is to "embrace residential design characteristics" there is commercial there but there are a lot of neighborhoods. If you could take a look at it and make it more residentially acceptable.

Jared McCormick- you are asking to change the building design materials?

Chairman Shomar - No more of a color issue.

Member Reynolds - We also asked for vegetation, so it is a choice to not do it, yes the cost is a factor but there is a lot that can be done with fenestration. There are small things that can make a difference. I think it would be a mistake to make an industrial building residential but it should compliment the residential neighborhood. A strip of vegetation would help.

Chairman Shomar - the building is a very modern design but it is bland and too industrial it needs to blend into the surroundings, please look at the color it would help, as would vegetation.

Member Beecher - Window trims would also help.

Jared McCormick - are we only talking about the front facade? The sides do not need to change?

Member Reynolds - that is a reasonable compromise.

Chairman Shomar - thank you.

Jared McCormick- we would like to make an applied cladding, maybe we should look at tone and color? Are you opposed to simulated wood?

Member Reynolds - the color is troubling. And the lack of vegetation.

Member Western expresses concern about the difference in the windows in the plan and what is currently existing.

Jared McCormick - explains the discrepancy.

Member Reynolds - asks about the painting of the building and the facade of the

Warehouse.

Jared McCormick responds the paint will match.

Member Rosetti states that he would be satisfied with added vegetation in the front of the building.

Chairman Shomar - thanks the Ironhorn representatives for their time.

Member Reynolds - states that they need to address parking now.

Matt Napierala - Addresses the parking issue, and states that they will have adequate parking and direct employees to park in the proper places.

Chairman Shomar thanks Ironhorn, and requests they check the sites and make adjustments.

Member Beecher - in your letter you state that overhead lines prohibit vegetation is that documented by the utility company.

Matt Napierala - Discusses limitations for high vegetation on the site.

Member Beecher mentions that a property adjacent has no vegetation screening.

Member Reynolds states she does not believe it is a good idea to recommend vegetation planting on the adjacent residential property.

Member Western asks why it would be an expectation.

Member Beecher expresses concern about the traffic without vegetation screening.

Member Western discusses parking of construction vehicles along the property easement. Under the power lines.

Matt Napierala - there is temporary interior work which is causing that.

Member Reynolds states that is an issue for the code enforcer to determine.

Member Western asks if it is possible to reach a formal arrangement for parking in that space

Matt Napierala - we are looking internally to regulate parking.

Member Rosetti states Ironhorn could get a parking easement in the future.

Matt Napierala states he would need to check with the surveyor about planting.

Member Reynolds discusses planting and the impediments to getting that done with the property.

Matt Napierala discusses the discharge of drainage into the wetland.

Member Reynolds discusses right of way issues and topographical drop off and the effect on the property and how that affects planting.

Matt Napierala- we would need to talk to the county about planting in the future.

Member Reynolds discusses proper planting using appropriate planting materials.

Troy Bullock - with the North access, it could impact site visibility because we sit below the road at grade.

Member Reynolds discusses specific plants and some of their limitations in the space. States that this is an improvement but that more can be done to make this match the character of the neighborhood, it will cost money.

Matt Napierala- we will discuss internally and ask DOT.

Member Beecher asks a question of Chairman if they should have a public hearing.

Chairman Shomar states there is no need and that was covered last meeting.

Member Beecher states she feels there should be a discussion on whether to have a public hearing.

Town Attorney Frateschi states it is at their discretion to have a public hearing.

Member Beecher states she would prefer a public hearing with the traffic issues and the history of the property and the area. Feels we should at least offer.

Chairman Shomar discusses that this is an improvement on the area. Is concerned that a public hearing would obfuscate the issues already being discussed by the board like facade color.

Member Western states it is the board's job to make sure it is consistent with the zoning, and that the discussion of a public hearing is not appropriate.

Member Rossetti states there is no need for a public hearing.

Member Beecher made a motion, Seconded by Member Salamone, to Motion to hold a public hearing on the Ironhorn Enterprises Site.

Ayes: Member Beecher

Nayes: Chair Shomar, Member Western, Member Neubauer, Member Rossetti,
Member Salamone

Abstain: Member Erin Reynolds

Results: Failed

Member Beecher reiterates her stance that the sensitivity of the area and the comments on the design of the building to make sure the public is heard.

Chairman Shomar state the public should be heard all the time, in this situation he does not see what the public is needing to look at because it is just a change in facade not use, the amount of traffic is not impacted. It has been empty and now it is an improvement. Lighting, drainage is not in question, the public is going to be asked if they like the look or not? does not believe that is appropriate, would vote no.

Matt Napierala- asks about a deadline for resubmission.

Member Reynolds - when you get us what we are looking for there is no deadline.

Director Poitras - within 10 days.

Member Western - Work it out with the Director.

2. Burdick St. Apartments - Medical Center Dr. Fayetteville, NY 13066 -
Discussion PUD District Request - Zoning Classification - Residential
Agricultural (RA) - Tax Map # 086.-01-11.0

Brandon Jacobsen - Brolex Companies states that he has submitted 2 projects, for Mixed use projects. Trying to incorporate a project already approved. Has discussed making changes to give the Town Board.

Member Reynolds states they submitted it but it is just a discussion.

Brandon Jacobsen - Understands the concerns based on speaking with the supervisor, understands this is a discussion piece, but there is a corridor study that is still being developed. I want to announce my intentions.

Chairman Shomar -

Brandon - took feedback on parking, keeping the same parking, and moving the ingress

and egress to make it a singular point. We are making changes to comply with the comprehensive plan. Discusses making property changes to comply with comp plan and a deed restriction. States he is hopeful that the board sees they are working to make changes.

Chairman Shomar - recognizes the parking change, still discussing what will happen with PUD and our recommendation.

Member Rossetti asks Mr. Jacobsen about the coverage.

Member Beecher asks about the scale of the parking.

Member Reynolds states we realize it is one of the empty pieces left for infill, thinks that multistory mixed use is not a bad thing with residential on upper floors, not opposed to multistory there. Discusses the area and how it would fit, states that the use is probably good but are struggling with the PUD situation and the law that requires some changes along with the Zoning update. Also sees red flags, like the retaining wall without setbacks.

Chairman Shomar asks if they would entertain not using a PUD and going for a zone change. We are not in a place to discuss PUD because it is being worked on currently.

Brandon - if you have a better path for me to take I am willing to listen. This is the highest and best use of this property. Happy to take guidance.

Member Reynolds states he should apply for a special use permit in the RA zone.

Chairman Shomar recommends he meet with Director Poitras and the Town Engineer.

Member Reynolds states that this process is in flux, there is a certain amount of site plan review that has to happen.

Chairman Shomar states he likes what he sees but he should get out of the PUD and meet with Director Poitras and the Town Engineer.

Director Poitras states that there is no path through RA to do what he wants to do and for the project to move forward.

Brandon Jacobsen - the reason I went PUD is that the residential zoning is very antiquated, thought this was the only way forward in this zoning. Do not know of any existing code that would allow this.

Member Reynolds questions how the Towne Centre Senior home fit in the zoning.

Director Poitras states that R3 allows for senior homes.

Member Beecher and Member Reynolds discusses any accommodation in zoning for such a project under current zoning. Discusses the possibility for underground parking.

Brandon stated it is not financially feasible.

Town Attorney Frateschi suggests he could apply for an area variance.

Member Reynolds discusses the project and the way the units are spaced. States it looks too "tight".

Brandon Jacobsen- anticipates the project could change, understands the give and take of the project. Feels he could work with everything.

Chairman Shomar discusses the possibility of losing a floor.

Brandon - states he could not.

Member Reynolds discusses the concerns about the project and the nature of where the town stands with the PUD law. Discusses the property and how there are site issues beyond the PUD.

Member Rossetti discusses the PUD law with Town Attorney Frateschi, asks if there is flexibility to say we are looking at a new PUD law and whether we can tell the applicant to come back when it is finished.

Town Attorney Frateschi says yes. Discusses the nature of the flux state the PUD law is in and the changes being looked at with the corridor study, says the board can tell applicants to wait until these are resolved.

Chairman Shomar expresses gratitude to the applicant for making changes.

Brandon Jacobsen- Want to have an informal meeting while we wait for the PUD.

Chairman Shomar asks Member Rossetti if it is okay to have this discussion.

Member Beecher asks if we can put Brolex on the next meeting.

Applicant states that he wants to keep the discussion high level so he can make more equitable changes.

Member Beecher offers advice on the nature of the changes that could be made to the site, like providing amenities to benefit the area.

Mr. Jacobsen expresses thanks but states that tenants are looking now.

Chairman Shomar asks if the applicant is looking at combining his two projects.

Member Rossetti feels there should not be an informal discussion.

Mr. Jacobsen asks when the PUD Law will be done.

Member Beecher expresses that one of the current projects look good.

Member Neubauer asks if it makes sense from a visual perspective in the area.

Chairman Shomar Thanks

Other Business

Member Beecher asks for a revision date on the project agenda, discussion on how to improve the project sheet Director Poitras puts out.

Chairman Shomar thanks Director Poitras and explains the utility of the document.

Member Rossetti moves to adjourn Member Beecher Seconds.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board, upon motion duly made by Member Rossetti and seconded by Member Beecher the Board voted unanimously to adjourn regular session at 07:37 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Duffy Hartnett
Planning Board Clerk