

**CITY OF PLATTSBURGH
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
September 26 , 2016**

Call to Order: Meeting was called to order 7:00pm by Chairman Rotella

Board Members Present: Joseph Rotella, William Ferris, Craig Worley, James Abdallah, Gerald Hofmaister, Curt Gervich, Maurica Gilbert

Board Members Absent:

PB2016-22: 61 Beekman Street, Leora Schneider RN & Scott A. Farquharson, Samuel F. Vilas Home

PB2016-20: 136 US Oval, Shane Chatelle, AEDA, P.C.

On a motion by Worley, seconded by Gilbert, to accept the minutes of the regular meeting for August 22, 2016, as presented to the Board this evening, was unanimously carried and passed.

PB#2016-22: 61 Beekman Street

Hofmaister refrained from discussion to avoid any sense of impropriety as a family member was a neighbor of the property.
Abdallah recused himself

Leora Schneider introduced herself, described the Vilas Home location and the poor condition, including holes, of the north bow window roof, referencing submitted photos.

Rotella asked what kind of shingles are on the main roof, to which Schneider introduced Scott Farquharson, maintenance supervisor, as the person who would know and Farquharson described that the roof was flat membrane, asphalt shingle and partial metal roofing. Farquharson continued that the project proposed to use the same material and color that was approved before on the building.

Comments were made regarding the look of the current roof being metal, slate looking asphalt, the use of a newer glue down rubber membrane product and the slope not being very steep which prevents the use of certain materials.

Gilbert explained incorrect answers on the SEQR:

Page 2 of 13, B., b. Government Approvals. City, correct answer is “Yes”, Planning Board.

Page 2 of 13, B., ii. Coastal Resources, correct answer is “Yes”

Page 2 of 13, C.1. Planning and Zoning Actions, correct answer is “No”.

Page 2 of 13, C.2., a. Adopted Land Use Plans, correct answer is “Yes”; If Yes, correct answer is “No”.

Page 3 of 13, C.3., a. Zoning, correct answer is “Yes”; If Yes, correct answer is “R1”.

Page 10 of 13, E.1., d. Land Uses on and Surrounding the Project Site, correct answer is “Yes”; If Yes, correct answer is “PSUNY, Multiple Group Homes including Court Street, CVPH and own facility The Vilas Home”.

Worley questioned why the cost increased for the project improvements from \$2,960 to \$6,280, to which Farquharson responded that contractor had given a rough estimate and when asked for a detailed estimate, the cost was higher with the specifics on the rotted wood and the paint and finish work.

Gilbert asked if there were any photos available of what the actual replacement roof looks like, to which discussion followed and Farrington displayed on-line example photos of material to be used. Farrington asked if there was a color selection, to which Farquharson replied yes, to match, medium bronze.

Rotella and Gilbert discussed that the roof was to color and product match the other side that was previously done and approved.

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

On a motion by Ferris, seconded by Gervich, to approve PB 2016-22, to replace roof above north bow window with Englert 24 Gauge metal roof, material in metallic medium bronze with repairs to fascia, soffit and wood trim to be like materials and design of existing colors, was unanimously carried and passed.

PB#2016-20: 136 US Oval

Abdallah asked to recuse himself since his firm is representing the applicant.

Shane Chatelle introduced himself from Architectural Engineer Design Associates (AEDA).

Chatelle explained that they received the letter back from Parks & Recs regarding the window replacement, resulting in an outcome to look at other options besides replacement. Chatelle continued that after speaking with the owner, he would like to change the application (last minute) and only replace the one window right at the fire escape to improve the safety of that window egress-wise out of the third level, which was discussed at the last meeting, and retract all others. Chatelle added that measurements were taken and the window was being shown from the interior side, double hung unit with a circle top with a very small egress opening when window is in full open position, top of lower sash only goes up 11" before hitting radius of the circle top so for egress there's 11" by 20" opening for that window, well below code requirements. Rotella commented that the rest of the buildings on the Oval are designed the same way.

Gilbert asked how many inches would be gained with the proposed changes, to which Chatelle explained that what is needed is to have the opening from the start of the radius down to the sill, that entire area operable to meet the building code for egress requirements for that window and that they need 5.7 square feet of opening area.

Chatelle stated that he did not have time before the meeting to find a window that would work within those dimensions but the goal would be to maintain and not go bigger on outside brick and not go any lower than the sill which would entail a lot more work to the fire escape but if they go from the top of the sill up to the radius and maintain the dimension between the brick, they should be able to obtain the code dimensions.

Discussion followed about the other third level windows being the same, as well as other buildings around it and the reason it was being replaced was for egress purposes only, not deterioration.

Gilbert stated that it was a last minute change and would feel more comfortable if there was an actual window available to review and the applicant was able to explain how the window would open that much more. Chatelle admitted that he was not sure how they were going to do that either. Discussion followed regarding possible casement.

Discussion followed regarding why the window was originally put in like that and the Air Force not maintaining the third floor with the purpose of the fire escape being only for the second floor.

Rotella asked if there was any way to redesign the trim on the window that could be popped out quickly in an emergency. Chatelle explained that he had discussed this with the owner, a whole unit that just pops out in whole, and how that would entail some modification and work around brick courses that extend beyond. Discussion followed about window suggestions and tabling the application until known window specifics, details and a resubmission to SHPO.

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Hofmaister, to table again application PB 2016-20 regarding 136 Oval until applicant is ready, was unanimously carried and passed.

On a motion by Hofmaister, seconded by Worley, unanimously carried and passed, the Board adjourned at 7:28pm