

**CITY OF PLATTSBURGH
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
March 27, 2017**

Board Members Present: James Abdallah, John Kanoza, Craig Worley, Kristyn Dantes, Maurica Gilbert, William Ferris

Board Members Absent: Curt Gervich, Gerald Hofmaister, Laurie Booth-Trudo

Abdallah called the meeting to order at 7:03pm and stated that the first item on the agenda is the approval of Planning Board minutes for February 27, 2017.

On a motion by Worley, seconded by Kanoza, to accept the minutes of the regular meeting February 27, 2017, as presented to the Board this evening was carried and passed and entered into the record. Gilbert abstained as she was not present at the meeting.

PB#2017-05: 117 Court Street
Walter Chmura

PB#2016-21: 41 City Hall Place
Jim Abdallah, AEDA

PB#2017-03: 8 Lake Forest Drive
James Abdallah/Kevin Defayette

PB#2017-02: 202-206 US Oval
Scott Allen, AES

**PB#2017-05: 117 Court Street
Walter Chmura**

Chmura presented the application noting that he was in the process of purchasing the property and after going to the building inspector's office discovered that it was in an historic district when he was told to check on whether the changes/improvements could be done. Chmura went to the seller with the changes and provided a letter of authorization from the seller (Dana Barrett) to present the application to the Board. Chmura explained the request was to re-roof with a red or green metal roof in lieu of asphalt shingles, address water pooling in front of the garage, some settling on both porches and take out some sections on one porch that has plastic putting windows in the end facing the street, take the door out, keep the base as it is, keep ornamentation, put 3 windows on the side in each of the 8ft sections and leave a thermal door and one window on the back.

Abdallah inquired as to who the applicant actually was being there was none stated on application, to which Chmura concluded that he was the applicant Abdallah confirmed the signature page was covered by the letter from the owner included in the application.

Gilbert stated that the Board would need more than what was presented. Gilbert continued that when porches are rebuilt or windows installed the Board usually gets more plans than submitted, professionally drawn plans, for the windows a manufacturer's sheet with window specifics (vinyl, wood, description) not just a picture of something similar, a lot more detail. Gilbert added the same was needed for the metal roofing, sometimes a sample with which Gilbert was not even sure if a metal roof was going to be liked or allowed in that neighborhood on that house. Gilbert stated that a building code issue is with the garage in that in order to pull up tarmac and put down crushed stone for better drainage would need repaving because the City requires paving wherever there is parking and he would need a zoning variance to dig up part of the driveway that leads to the garage if he didn't repave. Gilbert discussed lack of details regarding the porch direction and the intention that it is to be converted to a three season porch (insulation, outlets, heating) indicated but not explained in application.

Chmura commented that he thought the focus was on the exterior, to which Gilbert stated that there was more to it with the application going before the Building Inspector so the Board wants to know where the project is headed. Discussion followed regarding Historic District applications and requirement when restoring, replacing or changing.

Chmura thanked the Board for its time and stated that he didn't think he would be purchasing the property.

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Ferris, to table the application was unanimously carried and passed.

**PB#2016-21: 41 City Hall Place
Shane Chatelle , AEDA**

Abdallah recused himself as his firm is representing the application; Ferris stepped in as acting Chairman.

Chatelle presented the project explaining it to be upgrading the windows in the City Hall building with the goal to keep them looking just as they are now. Three options were looked at, rehab the existing windows, complete replacement and another alternative for complete replacement with rehabilitation coming up about \$200,000 cheaper so that's the recommendation.

Ferris commented that there was a very nice letter received from SHPO in favor and approval of restoration, to which everyone agreed.

Gilbert confirmed that Lead Agency had been established and moved on to SEQR review. Gilbert commented that SEQR had been looked at when application was submitted as replacement so some of the answers would change for the **restoration**. Discussion followed regarding abatement issues having been addressed and time frame of work better determined after it goes out to bid since it will be custom work but the bid date was not disclosed.

Worley noted that construction time was estimated at 45 days on the application, to which Chatelle responded that that was aggressive (maybe 4-5 months) and discussion followed about how much time would be needed.

Gilbert stated that even if the windows are rehabilitated, the building is still left with single pane windows. Discussion followed regarding the special glass in the windows and option of taking them out and replacing with thermal panes but it'd be about a 50 year payback on the energy savings due to the conditions of the buildings walls & ceilings.

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

Gilbert stated that rehabilitating windows is the way to go, SHPO agrees, the Board agrees and they will follow historic standards or make sure the contractor follows historic standard and summarized that there was nothing left to look at with the application as it is clear that it's the way to go for this building.

Dantes asked that when the project goes to bid what means and measures would be taken to ensure contractor's methods will comply with Board's approval, to which Chatelle responded that requirements would detailed in the Spec when going out to bid and there would be oversight by either themselves or the City.

On a motion by Dantes, seconded by Gilbert, to approve the Project 2016-21 as proposed and presented to the Board and approved by SHPO was unanimously carried and passed.

**PB#2017-03: 8 Lake Forest Drive
Shane Chatelle**

Abdallah recused himself as his firm represented the application; Ferris stepped in as acting Chairman.

Chatelle presented the Lake Forest application as 5 duplexes, 10 total units with a vehicle building currently on site.

Ferris confirmed that the building would go on the east, near side of the garage (top photo) and previously discussed that due to the number of structures on the premises, a variance would be necessary so the Board would review the SEQR then the applicant would go to Zoning Board for variance for the extra structure on the property and applicant would again return to Planning Board to have everything approved.

Discussion was had on SHPO approval as Lead Agency and Comment (combined in letter sent to SHPO) review was received back without comment.

Gilbert noted that on the application it was stated for a use variance but should be an area (just a numerical count) variance.

Discussion followed as to the use of the building (maintenance garage, storage & workshop), description/look (shown in drawing) of building being consistent and blending in with existing buildings, same finish but taller roof, a bathroom & sink tying in connecting to existing water sewer and heat to the building.

Gilbert stated SEQR needed to be done before Zoning could issue variance. Gilbert confirmed no environmental disturbances, not close to any historical buildings to match, recognizing that project is in an historic overlay district, not historic building. Gilbert continued that it is not an archeological site but realizes system tends to check it if anywhere in the area and questioned if there would be a poured foundation or any excavation, to which Chatelle responded there would be excavation for the utilities, footings and cross walls, nothing out of the ordinary for a building that size. Gilbert also stated she wondered if all the gazebos are also accessory structures but that's a ZBA issue.

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

Chatelle confirmed that Planning Board needed to approve SEQR, then to Zoning Board for variance and then back to Planning Board for site plan approval.

**PB#2017-02: 202-206 US Oval
Scott Allen, AES**

Allen stated that they had been before the Board last month to propose the project and to request Planning Board as Lead Agency for SEQR determination as a type 1 action on the historic district on the Oval. Allen added that they went to ZBA last week as they need variance and asked them to consent to Planning Board as lead agency, which they agreed to do. Allen continued that they were looking for negative declaration for the purpose of SEQR and possibly first subdivision/sketch plan review, if not combining preliminary with final review this meeting based on getting future approval of variance.

Kanoza questioned if application was submitted to SHPO, to which Allen responded it had been (approx. 4/20) and the 30 day clock had expired with no known comments received.

Dantes asked Allen if he could recall why both building were put on one lot because she couldn't, to which he responded that he didn't recall.

Ferris questioned reason for boundary lines where they are. Allen stated that on the right hand side on Lot 16B adjustment was made in conjunction with the Maplefield's project and the division line between 16A & 16B, after many renditions, was determined as requiring minimum amount of variances (just building coverage on 16B). Allen explained they were looking for a 5% variance on Building 16B as the maximum allowed building coverage is 25% and with the proposed 16B will cover 30%. Allen continued that line could be shifted down but that would require variances for two parcels, 16A would need open space variance. Discussion followed regarding shifting lines and variances required, 16B swapping building coverage for asphalt coverage, big lot for tiny building.

Allen stated the Building Inspector and City Engineer wanted to see driveway exclusively on Lot 16A as opposed to shared

Abdallah commented that applicant really minimized variances.

Abdallah questioned Allen regarding SHPO as an involved agency per Programmatic Agreement not about subdivision and what the Programmatic Agreement offers in regards to this subdivision, to which Allen responded it had very little with the subdivision but more to the historic nature of the buildings.

Gilbert commented that if someone was to buy new lot 16A, the small building, with the new lot lines, it only has 6% building coverage and in theory could be expanded. Discussion followed regarding asphalt coverage to building coverage and limitations/difficulties of expanding, no shared access agreement for 16A would allow owner to take driveway out to avoid open space variance and review of table on plans showing variance requirements.

Abdallah stated that when Allen was before the Board with the Maplefield's project, there was a big discussion about parking and asked it that was all included in the table or still in discussion. Allen responded that that was a principle discussion in the meeting with the Building Inspector and City Engineer where they came away from it in agreement that it is related to a site plan review and doesn't really affect a subdivision.

Allen went on to say that the reuse of 16B will be back for site plan review and that is when the parking would be an issue and addressed at that time and being in the Oval Parking district revised the parking for 16B. Abdallah asked that when the subdivision comes back next month for approval, applicant to list presumptive parking based on whatever uses that building could be used for today and that the Building Inspector

concur with that as it's listed in the subdivision the Board is approving. Discussion followed regarding the building's condition and limited future use.

Dantes questioned what the chances are of adverse possession if 16A buyer wants to take out driveway where the City could have an argument on their hands. Dantes suggested getting an access agreement with One Work Source who uses the active driveway now. Allen responded that it would have to be a fairly continuous use for over 10 years and they should be put on notice with the subdivision application and it would be tough for them to go after any continuous use of that driveway. Fesette commented that he could put them on notice and Allen stated that would break the chain.

Abdallah questioned that 17, 16A, 16B have no agreements between them to use any of the drives, to which Dantes responded that they were not required by the City when they did the subdivision as the lots were vacant with no owners. Allen commented that throughout the subdivision there are instances of designated common shared ways, reciprocal easement areas but not with 16A which was intentionally not designated.

On a motion by Worley, seconded by Kanoza, for negative declaration on SEQR was unanimously passed and carried.

On a motion by Ferris, seconded by Gilbert, to approve preliminary sketch plan was unanimously passed and carried.

On a motion by Worley, seconded by Kanoza unanimously carried and passed, the Board adjourned at 8:03pm.