The Zoning Board Meeting of the Town of Dickinson was called to order at 5:30 PM on Tuesday July 22, 2025, at the Town Hall, 531 Old Front Street, Binghamton, New York.

The members of the Zoning Board present were:

Jean Compton, Board Member Jason Delanoy, Board Member Lubomyr Zobniw, Board Member Michael Curley, Board Member

Also in attendance:

Keegan Coughlin, Esq. Coughlin & Gerhart Wendi Evans, Town Clerk Code Enforcement Officer Kyle Doyle 3 Guests

CALL TO ORDER/ WELCOME

Attorney Coughlin called the meeting to order at 5:30 PM

The meeting was started with a moment of silence for the passing of our Zoning Board Chairman, Nazar Logvis who passed away suddenly.

Attorney Coughlin explained that the residents at 90 Phelp St. are proposing to have a glamp ground. They would like to use 33.76 acres as a glamp ground having up to 4 tents, staying 1-3 nights.

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

The property owner commented that the 4 sites would include a fire pit for each one, and an outhouse. They would like people to come and enjoy the scenery around the area. The glampers will not need to bring any camping equipment with them, only their personal supplies as they will be providing everything for them to sleep with. It has become very popular across the U.S. travelers travel across the country mapping out each spot, the stay is usually only 1 or 2 nights. He feels it would be great to bring the community together as well as increasing local business. He feels they are compliant with the health dept. and DEC regulations. It is not a campground that anyone will come to spend any duration of time. The ability to rent them as an Air BNB would be an option as well.

Board Member Zobniw questioned as to why each site could not be parceled out as separate properties. Attorney Coughlin explained that they are applying for a use variance to allow for tent sites, so you do not have to worry about going down that pathway of having it broken up into parcels. It would be classified as a commercial property if this got approved.

Attorney Coughlin questioned that the plans currently say that the driveway is 12 ft. and asked for dimensions. The existing is 450 ft and they will be adding 1300 ft of driveway and will use shale to build it. The turnaround is 50 ft. radius. The current plans that were submitted did not have all the dimensions that are needed.

Attorney Coughlin proceeded to read the comments from Broome County as well as the comments from the Village of Port Dick. They are as follows:



State of New York County of Broome Government Offices

Department of Planning and Economic Development Jason T. Garnar, County Executive · Anthony F. Fiala, Jr., Commissioner

June 5, 2025

ZBA Chair Nazar Logvis PB Chair Hans Van Houten Town of Dickinson 531 Old Front Street Binghamton, NY 13905

RE: Review Pursuant to Section 239-I and -m of the General Municipal Law

Dear Chair Logvis and Chair Van Houten:

The Broome County Department of Planning and Economic Development has received your request for review of the below captioned matter:

Applicant: Roger Beagell

Project: Site Plan Review and Use Variance: applicant wants to use 33.76 acres of land for

a campground, would like to have up to 4 tents only, public would stay for only 1

to 3 nights at 90 Phelps Street

Municipality: Town of Dickinson Tax Map No: 129.13-1-14.11

BC Case: 239-2025-065 (239-2024-012)

The Planning Department has reviewed the above-cited case and has determined that the project lacks a complete site plan that fully addresses the **BCHD and DPW comments** and other outstanding items noted below for a full assessment of impacts. While the current application states up to 4 tents only, the submittal and emails note the project still lacks a full set of plans for the Town, this current review is mainly for the use variance, and more answers will come June 23 for the variance.

Camping and glamping have become popular and attractive forms of vacation and recreation. However, as noted in our previous comments, the above uncertainties about the scope of the project and completeness of the site plan make it difficult to assess if the project as submitted could have significant county-wide and inter-community impacts within the intent of GMU Section 239-I and -m.

We provide the following comments on the use variance and site plan and will provide final comment upon submission of the complete site plan, most significantly confirmation on the number of campsites planned, sanitation and water needs, area of disturbance, emergency access, fire safety, and potential for expansion/impacts over the life of the project.

As stated in our previous comments from February 13, 2024, if more details about the project can be confirmed, some of the comments may no longer apply.

- We make no determination about whether the applicant meets the four tests of a use variance.
 However, we also consider the use variance preliminary without a complete site plan. We feel the use
 variance is tied to the feasibility of the site plan as a whole and impacts of the use variance and site
 plan should be considered concurrently in the reviews.
- The SEQR EAF should consider the whole project, including the site plan review, use variance, permits, complete site plan, and potential for future expansion; and address and show compliance with the BCHD, DPW, and with all other applicable agency requirements for the full environmental review under SEQR.

- The site plan should show and document compliance with the BCHD and DPW comments and with all other applicable agency requirements. The site plan and use variance should also address the following for the proposed 4 campsites and for any future expansion:
 - Plans for remaining acreage and potential for future expansion any potential for and known future expansion, full buildout, types of campsites, potential impacts, mitigation, and capacity to meet all applicable agency requirements. The 239 form notes the applicant "would like to use the 33.76 acres of land of a campground" and the applicant "would like to have up to 4 tents only". These discrepancies should be addressed. See BCHD and DPW comments.
 - plans and requirements for the solar array, retention pond, sign, solar lights, and security camera
 - tax map and municipal boundaries, area of disturbance, tree removal, grading, drainage, proposed ground cover and maintenance of the driveway, erosion and sediment control. See DPW email.
 - o Maximum number of campsites, project limits within the 33.76 acres, and adjacent land uses
 - o seasonal use or year-round use and renderings of the campsites
 - emergency access with consideration of the steep slopes and unimproved roads; fire safety, suppression, and response; equipment storage; water access for fire suppression and sanitation
 - potential for RV use; campfires; dirt bikes and ATV use; events; boon docking; and associated waste; trash; habitat and wildlife impacts; campfires, bonfires, and forest fires; tree removal, soil erosion, light, noise, and air pollution; and traffic
 - o compliance with noise, lighting, and signage regulations and associated plans
 - consideration of DEC correspondence which seemed to indicate a SWPPP was prepared for this
 project site and the project site is located within an area sensitive for archaeological resources
 - consideration of applicable permits, approvals, mitigation, and best practices for this land use such
 as restrictions on length of stay; distance between campsites; permitted activities on site; parking
 and durable surfaces; smoking restrictions; campfire and bonfire restrictions; leftover firewood, ash,
 and lighter fluid; and generator use
 - setback requirements, O & M, site maintenance, trash, dumpster, and disposal

The case file was routed to the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT), Broome County Department of Public Works (DPW), and Broome County Health Department (BCHD) for review. Enclosed are comments from the DPW and BCHD. NYSDOT had no comments.

Please submit a copy of your decision in this case within seven (7) days of taking action so it can be included in the case record. Thank you for your cooperation.

Commissioner

AFF/mz

inc

Kyle Doyle, Code Enforcement Officer, Town of Dickinson Keegan J. Coughlin | Partner, COUGHLIN & GERHART, LLP BC File Copy

All,
I have the following 3 comments.
 The site plan submitted is insufficient to determine the full extent of impacts on the Village of Port Dickinson regarding environmental or engineered controls.
The information submitted related to the variance is insufficient to make any determination or provide comments.
3. There are discrepancies between the information provided on the applicant's EAF and the NYSDEC's EAF Mapper. Specifically for responses to questions 13a, 15, and 20. I have attached the EAF from NYSDEC as well as the applicants for reference.
a. 13a: Does any portion of the site of the proposed action, or lands adjoining the proposed action, contain wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by a federal, state or local agency?
Yes – Additional information is required to evaluate the significance to the subject parcel.
b. 15: Does the site of the proposed action contain any species of animal, or associated habitats, listed by the State or Federal government as threatened or endangered?
Yes – Brook Floater and Bald Eagle
c. 20: 20. Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the subject of remediation (ongoing or completed) for hazardous waste?
Yes – Additional information is required to determine extent of remediation on subject parcel.

Gene Hulbert Jr., PE, NYSCEO

President | Hulbert Engineering and Land Surveying, DPC

Attorney Coughlin commented that there are a lot of questions that need to be answered to approve a project like this. The application will need to be correctly filled out. Attorney Coughlin explained to them what they are missing and explained how to correctly fill it out regarding the DEC. A clear requirement of a site plan is that it must have dimensions. They have dimensions of the turn around but with zero dimensions of the length of the road, zero measurements of the distance between the campsites, zero measurements between the property lines, and showing where the neighboring property line is. It shows the slope and that is all we have. The solar lights they are putting in do not show us where they are being put in. There is a retention pond, but we are not showing how big the retention pond is. We are missing a lot of information. The property owner claims he never received the current 239 reviews. Attorney Coughlin explained that he was copied on all the emails that were sent and that it was indeed sent to him. Code Enforcer Doyle explained that once that application is submitted that means they should have completely sent what they have and are ready to propose the project and it is not his job to send them all the missing documents. He suggested that their engineers should appear at the meeting as well as they are the ones helping them with the project. The town's job is to make sure the development is compliant with both their site plan process, and they cannot evaluate a use variance without seeing what the project is going to look like.

The zoning board voted to hold over the application and to have an additional meeting to give them a chance to submit everything that is needed. The board only has 62 days from when the public hearing is closed to make a decision. If more time is needed, then they will need to withdrawal the application again and resubmit it. Once all the information is back in the office with the questions answered we can proceed with setting up another meeting. All in favor: Vote Ayes-4, Nays-0

Jean Compton, Board Member - Aye Jason Delanoy, Board Member - Aye Lubomyr Zobniw, Board Member - Aye Michael Curley, Board Member - Aye

All in favor.

NEXT PLANNING BOARD MEETING

The next Zoning Board Meeting is to be determined

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by J. Delanoy and seconded by M. Curley at 6:18 PM. All in favor.

Vote-4 Ayes, Nays-0

Respectfully Submitted,

Wendi Evans