

**CITY OF PLATTSBURGH
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
July 25, 2016**

Call to Order: Meeting was called to order 7:05pm by Chairman Rotella

Board Members Present: Joseph Rotella, John Kanoza, Craig Worley, James Abdallah, Gerald Hofmaister, Maurica Gilbert

Board Members Absent: William Ferris, Curt Gervich

PB2016-17: 61 Beekman Street

Ryan Smith, Ryan's Masonry

PB2016-16: 17 Bridge Street

Ryan Smith, Ryan's Masonry

PB2016-06: 176 US Ave/40 New York Ave

Scott Allen, AES

Tom Murnane

Scott Raznake

Jack Milbank

Neil Fesette, Property Owner

PB2016-18: 64-70 US Oval

Rick Perry

On a motion by Hofmaister, seconded by Kanoza, to accept the minutes of the regular meeting for June 27, 2016, as presented to the Board this evening with the correction to the references of "soldier horses" to be "soldier course", was carried and passed.

PB2016-17: 61 Beekman Street

Smith presented the project as tearing off the cedar shakes and replacing the plywood behind it, put up a paper barrier and replace the cedar shakes, same pattern, same style on the small section of the Vilas Home as shown.

Gilbert and Hofmaister stated that the project seemed pretty straight forward.

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Kanoza, that the Board finds no adverse environmental impact on the SEQR was unanimously carried and passed.

On a motion by Worley, seconded by Gilbert, to approve the application for 61 Beekman Street to replace the cedar shakes on the Vilas Home as shown in the photo, same shakes and color, was unanimously carried and passed.

PB2016-16: 17 Bridge Street

Smith presented a sample of the brick to be used for the project which would be replacing a couple hundred bricks stating that the brick was from the homeowner to the south who owns the building and had extra brick at his house.

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Kanoza, that the Board finds no adverse environmental impact on the SEQR was unanimously carried and passed.

On a motion by Hofmaister, seconded by Gilbert, approve the application to remove existing decayed brick and install new aged brick using type N mortar as described in the application was unanimously carried and passed.

PB #2016-06: 176 US Ave/40 New York Ave

Allen stated that they had met with Kevin since the last meeting and went over the check list and reviewed Kevin's comments with him. Allen continued to say that he felt the focus of last month's meeting was around the review comments and they worked through all those comments at the meeting with Kevin and doesn't think there are any outstanding issues.

Allen stated that there were additional questions about the textures, siding and so forth, to which Allen presented samples of the siding, brick and sills of the windows and referred to the 3D color drawing on the last page for finishes on the building showing a good amount of detail in respect to the site, how the brick and windows will look and where the sign will be placed. The aerial view shows the sidewalk coming in from US Ave, the new sidewalk that would connect the bike path to get pedestrian and bicycle traffic into the store, the white stripes lead the pedestrian traffic over to the building and between the two street lights on the left side of the drawing there's a bike rack to park the bike then walk across the designated stripe area to get to the store improving pedestrian access to the site. Allen also mentioned at the bottom of the right corner the striping that allows the bike path to continue there will be a drop curb, no curb, no barrier and it will be striped for continuous use of the bike path. Allen referred to the 3rd page from the back showing details of the lighting, downward pointing, full cut-offs after there was a concern to compare to existing Oval area lighting. Allen referred to another drawing showing striping the driveway and blending the sidewalk into the grade crossing.

Allen referred to a view of the driveway coming in off US Ave with the sign with the brick column and brick base for the sign which is relatively low.

Allen stated that the subdivision went before the Clinton County Health Dept and the sheet presented had the amended lot lines.

Allen continued to present and review elevation views with details such as the rear elevations with the view from the Oval Brewing Company in the back, left side elevation, front elevation primarily from US Ave and the right side elevation showing the style of windows, architectural shingles and brick siding that faces NY Road.

Allen stated that they reviewed turning movements using Auto Turn software after comment from Kevin to see if there was any way to narrow the entrances, which they have narrowed as far as the can to allow trucks to move in and out without crossing into other lanes.

Rotella inquired where the gas tanks were that would be refueled, to which Allen and Rasnake pointed out the locations on screen.

Parking calculations and predicted calculations were discussed with specific regards to the medical building and square footage of use assessment, lot 13 requirements and handicap ramp.

Allen explained the lighting plan.

Discussion was had on landscaping, removal of compromised old trees having no shape or form because of trimming from power lines and additional plantings at the nose of US Ave and NY with suggested tree species being pink flare cherry, evergreens, spruce and maples.

Farrington note the additional drainage added to filtration basins improving the water quality of the storm water being discharged from the site by putting the remainder of that through the filtration units.

Discussion was had on rebuilding handicapped accessible ramp at the existing office building along New York Road to connect to the parking spaces designated for the building.

Rasnake stated that the blue band and Mobile were removed from the canopy as requested by the Board. Gilbert stated just plain, no signage, no prices, no NASCAR logos... Allen ran the 3D fly-over view on the screen and commented throughout. Overlapping discussion was had on dumpster, curbing all along the back, bollards for the bike path and columns.

Farrington commented that the New York Road entrance requires a concrete sidewalk across the proposed asphalt driveway instead of the stripes. Abdallah inquired about handicap transition warning coming to either side of the drives, to which discussion followed about bollards to the bike path but transition warnings not necessarily required for driveway crossings like they are at intersection crossings but could air on the side of safety and put in a tactical surface.

Hoffmaister asked about utility plan c1.3 and an easement across lot 16 from the sanitary man hole 2 to the lot 13 property line for the private sanitary lateral serving lot 13, to which Allen responded that they would add it.

Farrington mentioned that the sidewalk is thinner than City's and sidewalk in the highway crossing on NY Road should be used with City's detail due to having a 4" sidewalk, 6" at crossings. After Farrington re-reviewed the sidewalk detail, he determined the proposal was ok with the proposed 5" thick sidewalk.

Gilbert asked about drawings and specifications for signage, to which Resnake responded that it will be included. Gilbert also asked if the two pillars that go up the sides of the signs can mirror what is being done with the canopy, to which Resnake responded they do but it isn't showing well in some of the details. Discussion followed regarding RC2 zoning district restrictions for no digital signs.

Gilbert stated that all three free standing signs must be permanently landscaped is stated in the City Code which usually means that there is a free standing landscaped area underneath the free standing signs, like a raised flower bed incorporated into the sign or lower than the sign, usually perennials of some sort or could be little evergreens, day lilies, just something so it's not a naked sign base and softens the base of the sign but still sign accessible.

Overlapping discussion was had regarding materials samples presented, shingles detailed as Owen Corning Berkshire Architectural shingles in Colonial color, bricks being Stiles & Hart light charcoal waterstruck with SGS brand, 44H (red/pink) mortar and the use of black aluminum window base for the glazing of the windows.

Gilbert inquired about echoing area buildings, grey bottom & brick, to which Worley and Abdallah were in disagreement and Allen responded that in the past working with NYSOPRHP, one of the things they've mentioned was when building new, do not recreate what was already there, do not copy exactly, preserve but do not copy exactly.

Gilbert added into the record the letter from NYSOPRHP dated 6/27/2016 stating to provide a protection plan for all historic structures within 90ft of any new construction and maintain height for new construction to 1 story. Discussion followed as to the actual height of the store and canopy at their peaks and interpretation of what 1 story is.

Abdallah requested to revisit parking calculations, parking district and what would be given up and discussion followed regarding the table presented which included assumed future parking details and the fact that the assessor's record and the parking district record calculations are quite a bit different from applicant's therefore needing a closer review.

Farrington noted items to be addressed and extensive discussion included 16 parking spaces stated as be provided on main property but not shown anywhere, to claim a space need to have a space, show exactly in the tables what is being proposed as part of this site plan and not predictions, don't show adjustments if not part of this project,

parking calculations, lot 16 existing parking, lot 13 not in district (only properties fronting the Oval), assessment of 129 requires 129 provided, City code requires highest permitted use calculation for empty buildings in that district,

Abdallah summarized to clarify that by the Board's site plan approval, the Board can approve a site plan into the parking district regardless of the parking spots going in there and it's automatically assumed the Common Council's covered it, to which Farrington commented that there is adequate supply with significant surplus of parking spaces.

Farrington stated that on one hand there are some negatives to it but the nice thing is that if it wasn't for that special assessment parking district (nobody else in the City can do offsite parking on their site plan), the only reason applicant is there with this plan is because they can. Farrington continued that while it may feel like a burden, nobody would be at the meeting discussing it if that offsite parking wasn't available and provided by virtue of the special assessment parking district and should be kept into perspective.

On a motion by Kanoza, seconded by Hoffmaister to approve final subdivision to increase the size of existing PARC Subdivision Lot 13 and decrease the size of existing log PARC Subdivision Lot 16 was unanimously carried and passed.

On a motion by Kanoza, seconded by Abdallah to accept the Site Plan for New York Ave to construct 6,000 square foot Maplefields Convenience Store with gasoline islands and parking was unanimously carried and passed with the following conditions:

- The New York Road entrance needs the sidewalk to be concrete instead of stripes.
- The US Avenue entrance bike path needs the textile warning strips.
- The easement showing for the main sewer line from the new lot line to lot 16 easement.
- Signage in front to have band on bricks to match canopy.
- Permanent landscaping on the base of the sign in front.
- Parking calculations related to US Oval Parking District to be confirmed by City.
- Use of Owens Corning Colonial architect shingle along with the brick as shown, real brick with the red mortar, reddish grout.
- Black aluminum window base for the glazing of the windows.
- Brick columns added to the entrance on US Ave entrance side.

- Rebuild ramp and connect to the parking designated as the seven stalls.
- Add SHPO letter of Creative Protection Plan for the buildings within 90 feet.
- Maintain the height for one story construction.
- Additional planting at nose of US Ave and New York Rd.

PB2016-18: 64-70 US Oval

Perry introduced himself to the Board with a little bit of his background and that he represents the Larkin family. Perry went on to explain that John Larkin purchased this property through extensive renovation and Planning Board and Zoning approvals the Larkin family went through every extent possible to comply with SHPO, the regulations, the Planning Board, the Planning Board regulations and they achieved that and to their own expense they did preserve the windows, which was being discussed. Perry continued that after time and abuse of property by tenants there has been deterioration, mold growth on windows and are seeking to alleviate that problem that does become an environmental health issue, by making all efforts to change the education of the tenants to live in a less humid free environment and come up energy safer windows that would achieve the purpose of quality interior space. Perry explained the different quotes obtained for 490 windows not all of the same dimensions. Perry stated that the goal is to try to achieve consistency with all the buildings on the Oval and be consistent with the windows that were approved in each of the buildings. Perry presented samples of the windows and colors, commenting that they are consistent with the original color on the Oval, which the color is identified as Oval white. Perry summarized that they were looking to have the ability to change out the windows as necessary under the guidance of the Zoning Building officials and they were not looking to change out the storm windows on the exterior. Perry added that in a lot of the pictures shows, the windows had already been replaced, the lower level windows are stationary storms on the exterior and don't provide ventilation and were manually changed out with screen windows when weather conditions call for it.

Abdallah inquired if they planned to change out the dormer windows as well, to which Perry responded absolutely that the original dormer windows are the worst and referred to phase I having storms on the outside, phases II, III & IV do not. Abdallah verified that those were a major part of the proposal, immediate, to which Perry stated that they are major.

Hoffmaister stated that Perry commented that some of them had been replaced and inquired replaced with what, to which Perry responded they replaced them with vinyl windows. Perry added that at the original renovation project, they replaced them because they couldn't be repaired. Perry continued that they had been asked to repair what windows they could and reuse them, that effort was made with about 95%

accomplishing that but they are now at a point in time where the condition of the windows that existed are rapidly becoming the standard they have today.

Farrington asked if Perry said that Phase I wood windows were changed out with vinyl, to which Perry responded, no that some of the windows were changed out. Gilbert stated that the Board was not clear and asked if in the last 13 years if that has happened. Perry stated no, original and that SHPO asked them to preserve the windows that were there, to which Gilbert questioned if those windows were already there when asked SHPO and Perry replied that that was right.

Farrington asked was it probably the Air Force or PARC that replaced them, to which Perry stated no, that it would have been the Larkin family and to remember that they were tasked to try to preserve the original windows, the windows that they couldn't preserve, they were allowed to change out but the whole character of the building has been preserved as shown in the pictures, the roofs over the entry ways are copper and the architecture is the same as it was.

Abdallah asked if the Larkin family has consulted SHPO anymore in this regard, to which Perry replied that John Larkin passed away two years ago and was the point man for the Larkin family but they now have a management team that works from the office in Vermont and they've tasked him with trying to preserve the character of the building. Abdallah commented that the biggest thing is that there is a matter of record given the past history of this building, a letter from SHPO specifically in regards to windows, that's the reason for questioning any further correspondence to see if they have a different opinion now that there are windows in that condition. Perry responded that in consistent with the previous application, SHPO's task originally in '95 when the City took over the property was to replicate the historic character of the properties. Perry went on to state that then that opinion started to change over the years and they looked to compliment rather than replicate, that's why they don't want you to construct the same architectural and feature character that the historic properties still have. Perry added that this is probably one of the newer buildings amongst the building that have been approved to have windows changed.

Farrington stated that the application was received by Perry and has been forwarded to SHPO for the concurrences of involved agencies for SEQR review and they have not responded yet but have 30 days.

On a motion by Hoffmaister, seconded by Gilbert, to table the application until a response is received by SHPO, was unanimously carried and passed.

Kanoza asked what improvements are being sought to solve deterioration issues, to which Perry responded educating tenants with timers on natural gas fireplaces, automated exhaust fans to be use when showering and cooking, provide reference materials and go through it with tenants on how to utilize apartment features and insulate for quality of interior.

Farrington suggested more photos of existing windows of different styles.

On a motion by Worley, seconded by Abdallah, unanimously carried and passed, the Board adjourned at 9:08pm