

**CITY OF PLATTSBURGH
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
April 23, 2018**

Board Members Present: James Abdallah, William Ferris, Maurica Gilbert, Curt Gervich, John Kanoza

Board Members Absent: Laurie Booth-Trudo

Also Present: Adam Frazier, Engineering Aide

PB#2018-02, 2 Pike Street

Aaron Ovios, RMS

PB#2018-03, 17 Cumberland Ave

Don Wickman

PB#2018-04, 82 Court Street

Jacques Rouillard

PB#2018-05, 42 Smith St & 53 Standish St

Raymond Plante

PB#2017-14A, 38 Iowa Street

Scott Allen, AES

PB#2018-06, 102 Miller Street

Scott Allen, AES

PB#2018-07, 127 South Peru Street

Scott Allen, AES

Pledge of Allegiance

Abdallah called the meeting to order at 7:06pm

On a motion by Kanoza, seconded by Gervich, to approve the March 26, 2018 meeting minutes was unanimously carried and passed.

PB#2018-02, Pike Street

Abdallah called for applicant and Ovios began the presentation by stating that they understood that parking was a concern and would require a variance. Ovios presented handouts to the Board explaining that on the original submission the addition sat in the back of the site and the existing structure was on Pike Street with the addition off to the back so it didn't take away the historical character of the structure when viewed from Broad St, a much better aesthetic appearance to the overall architectural package. Ovios commented that they could rotate the building 90 degrees and place the parking along the side in the rear but they were concerned that the negative of that is it brings the addition closest to the road almost to the same street set back as the original structure referring to the rendering handout. Ovios stated they were looking for

comments from the Board regarding variances, windows, green asphalt shingles, concerns and what they'd like see while trying to minimize the number of times the applicant needs to come before the Board.

Abdallah stated that one of the things that came up in the pre-review was that under the site plan zoning table notes an r2, two family zoning designation but should be multifamily which changes some of the setback requirements. Ovios stated they've adjusted that and it meets that on the original submission as well. Ovios continued that the original submission really isolated the addition so it's not intended to look like an add-on but a separate structure with a little connection to satisfy the zoning ordinance and with the new submission there's a porch on the north side (referring to handout) that would be turned into a breezeway.

Abdallah commented that on the zoning table he thinks the biggest question will be building coverage under the existing site plan at 23 and when multifamily at 20. Gilbert added that the handout shows it shrunken down but the Board doesn't have a revised drawing. Gilbert suggested a smaller addition with less parking. Abdallah summarized that if applicant stays with first drawing, which seems to be the direction they'll be taking, they'll be going to the Zoning Board to which Ovios responded that he is looking for input from the Board and if they are ok with the addition being green asphalt, keeping the same windows throughout, brick corners and field stone on the bottom, taking some features from the existing structure and applying them to the new but not all brick to make it look distinct and separate but accent complimenting.

Gilbert commented that that was not her interpretation and read out loud from the historic site code, "the treatment of the addition should not be so different that it becomes the primary focus", "such additions should be as inconspicuous as possible from the public view". Gilbert stated examples in town where they've done this kind of thing would include the Vilas Home addition or North Country Kids addition, where those additions are actually brick or look like brick as opposed to vinyl siding and long skinny porches which are being proposed on the version submitted. Gilbert suggested coming up with something different, more appropriate such as slightly different color of brick to look obviously like an addition. Gilbert referred negatively to color coordination of St. John's church addition. Gilbert stated her opinion was that this project was not what she wanted for that neighborhood and with this particular description of the building, it doesn't belong no matter where it's seated and they need to come back with a materially different plan explaining that the Board puts in so much into just windows alone.

Gervich stated that his comments are essentially the same as Gilbert's and read from the historic site code "every effort should be made to provide a compatible use for a property which requires minimal alteration of the building structure or site and its environment", "distinguishing original qualities or character of a building structure, its site and its environment should not be destroyed" adding that he didn't see a reasonable effort for compatible site design and it does destroy the character of the site which is one of the oldest buildings. Discussion followed

Kanoza commented that he felt Ovios made a good effort with the design, working hard with the windows, field stone on the bottom and maybe go with some brick overlay on that to match it or make it look like it goes with it.

Ferris commented that it's a very overgrown lot and agrees with Kanoza about the windows and understands Gilbert and Gervich's concerns about it being a pretty massive structure and that it does come close to overpowering it.

Abdallah offered his comment that staying consistent with other applications coming through recently and as with Gilbert's comment, he doesn't think vinyl siding is the appropriate finish. Discussion followed. Abdallah added that site parking requires variances with the initial site plan.

Abdallah asked for comments on the alternate site plan submitted, to which Gilbert maintained that a big white vinyl addition is not what she wants to see whether it's shifted up or shifted back.

Gervich stated that his comments were the same as Gilbert's.

Kanoza commented that he wants it to blend and no vinyl.

Ferris commented even cement board that's red or something. Abdallah referred Ovios to prior applications as examples.

Frazier stated there were comments from MLD and DPW and they had been discussed.

Gilbert asked about historic building's windows and why they can't be rehabbed, to which Ovios stated they would be non-energy efficient as single pane to replace in kind. Gilbert responded with wood, double paned with a certain look. Discussion followed.

Abdallah stated that his primary question was whether the applicant feels one way or the other about the parking in the front yard versus parking on the side and the rear as proposed on the second submission, to which Gilbert added or a small addition with less parking. Kanoza added that a smaller addition alternative would blend better and a couple alternatives with fake brick on the side to make it blend a little bit better.

Ferris stated that he didn't mind the parking in the front, to which Kanoza agreed. Abdallah commented that he would like parking in the rear in this district but if applicant came up with a better screening plan through landscaping or some other means it would be helpful.

Abdallah summarized to Ovios that when he returns, make sure lighting and landscaping is addressed. Abdallah noted that one administrative item is that being in an historic district, it is a type 1 SEQR action and if the applicant does decide to go down the Zoning Board route, request lead agency at tonight's meeting and start it. Discussion followed regarding applicant creating an initial SHPO submission.

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Kanoza, to request lead agency status from the Zoning Board and all other interested agencies if the Board ends up with a coordinated review was unanimously passed and carried.

PB#2018-03, 17 Cumberland Avenue

Abdallah called for applicant and Wickman presented the project with a background that a little over a year ago they took the nine pair of shutters on the front southern façade off the building partly due to deterioration and the object is to look at maybe repair versus replacement but they are deteriorating. Wickman continued that they may have a solution and was coming before the Board to ask if they could put nine pairs of replicas of best western red cedar shutters on the front of the house already matched painted green. Wickman added he found one company Shuttecraft out of Madison, Connecticut, to custom make the shutters, replicas of what was taken down, because he wasn't able to find available matching styles. Wickman explained that with the shutter hardware already up on the house are old backs and the pintles that hold the hinges and would rather not risk taking off the old hinges but can get full duplicates to put up on the house that would match in the curved portion and not seen because it's on the front of the shutter if it was open. Wickman stated that he wants to restore the house to correct time period (previously approved wood fence received my comments after finished) and they have images of the house, eastern and western facades that have shutters from 1925. Wickman explained that the goal is to take the best of the old shutters and put them back where they were almost 100 years ago except for two because they are different sizes not matching but will be replicated according to what is being used of the old measurements and the company in Connecticut. Wickman summarized that they'll use the existing hinges that are on the old hinges, order pintles that look very similar to the south front and the whole backs will resemble hardware (sample shown by Wickman) from his basement but noted that the old part used to be driven into the wood itself so rather than play around with 8 inch spikes into a 200 year building, he'll use a matching lag bolt that would be correct to go into the wood for security. Wickman added that the time table would be (after Board permission) to order them, the house painted in July, shutters up in August and all ready for the Battle of Plattsburgh.

Gilbert commented that it sounds great and they'll last forever going with Western Cedar.

Gilbert noted that on the SEQR page 13 of 13, that although yes there are archaeological sites but not disturbing any archaeological sites with the shutters.

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

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Kanoza, to approve the application 2018-03 as stated for 17 Cumberland Avenue regarding replacing and recycling its own shutters was unanimously carried and passed.

Wickman inquired about a board fence on the front of the house that they are looking to replace and would it require an historic review process or just that they are going to match it. Abdallah responded that that is probably a repair and the Building Inspector would probably offer whether their office feels that it rises to the occasion of a referral or not.

PB#2018-04, 82 Court Street

Abdallah called for applicant and Rouillard presented that project as repairing the roof which is currently leaking changing slate to highest quality architectural style shingles. Rouillard referred to sample shingle brought with him and stated it's an older sample and the shingle will have more reddish grain in it, not finding an imitation of slate. Rouillard commented that he looked at all the properties around him and could not find similar aged homes and it's about an \$8,000 more costly roof replacement for slate which is above the \$15,000 just to do shingles.

Gilbert stated that she was not unrealistically referring to individual slate or composite but that there's tab shingles that just look more like slate and from a distance there's a visual color accent (referring to photo submitted) not mentioned in the description of the building with the historic properties. Discussion followed regarding significance/requirement of the color accent when replacing the roof keeping with the character and the Board's different opinions not coming to a consensus.

Ferris commented on the building next to this property having architectural shingles and vinyl siding to which Gilbert responded that that had happened prior to the district being created.

Rouillard commented that he felt that the red band of shingles, two color shingles, would look quite odd and he hasn't noticed any in the area.

Abdallah commented that he would like to see instead of an architectural shingle, the scalloped looking slate asphalt shingle (referenced Vilas Home and Maplefields).

Rouillard responded that the project is costly already but he can look into it.

Discussion followed on whether to bring applicant back next month with samples or conditionally approve while agreeing that shingle type is to be exactly what Vilas Home used on their construction.

Abdallah stated to Rouillard that if he's willing to accept this approval and it comes back that it's something not acceptable then he can always come back to the Board with a

new application. Gilbert explained that they'll give Rouillard an approval with a certain type of shingle this evening, he can find out exactly what the shingle are that are on the Vilas Home make and model, and get the price. Rouillard asked if the shingle was as durable (sustaining 140 mph winds, very durable technology for steep high pitch roof, 50 year warranty) as the one he brought in for the Board, to which Abdallah responded that the Board can't offer the technical details being asked and Rouillard should research it but other applicants coming before the Board have put it on and were happy with it, not returning as a major cost deterrent.

Abdallah stated to Rouillard, that if applicant was open to that condition the Board could vote on it but if he is still concerned, the application could be tabled and he could return next month with more information. Gilbert advised Rouillard he was probably better off to have the Board vote on it and if he finds it acceptable after researching it then he doesn't have to come back while if it's tabled he has to come back regardless, to which Rouillard agreed to go with a vote.

Ferris added that if Rouillard finds the shingle is too expensive, he should bring samples he likes next month should he have to come back so they can approve the sample.

Rouillard commented that when he looked at all the properties around his, he doesn't see anything close to what the Board would like in the end, to which Gilbert stated that the entire district is much larger than just a few houses around him and houses were added at different times so some of the work may have been done prior to those being added to the district. Rouillard stated that he'll get a quote to find out if it's beyond what he can do.

Gilbert stated that in regards to the SEQR the Board is addressing it as if discussing the Vilas Home type shingles (PB#2011-05, 61 Beekman Street, Highland Slate Premium Series Shingles) as opposed to the original application which didn't mention a brand of shingle. Gilbert commented that page 13 or 13 is the site on a register of historic places is yes and the Board pulled the CRIS application describing the building to be added to the file but site not archaeologically active per SHPO.

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

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Ferris, to approve PB2018-04, 82 Court Street Historic Site Review roof replacement with the same Vilas Home type slate-looking shingle in the same approximate color as the current roof with disregard to the red was unanimously carried and passed.

PB#2018-05, 42 Smith Street and 53 Standish Street

Abdallah called for applicant and Ray Plante and Judith Plante, father and mother of applicant Ray Plante, introduced themselves explaining that Ray was out of state for

business, to which Gilbert stated to have a written authority from Ray, to which Judith had available and presented to Frazier for file. Ray Plante presented the project as subdividing property, to which Gilbert noted they were successful in front of Zoning Board the week prior. Plante commented that for aesthetic purposes they would match the garage to the house.

Abdallah explained that this is a minor subdivision which is a two meeting process, the first meeting to receive comments from the Board and then next meeting applicant would come back with Plan for final approval.

Gervich confirmed that it will be an "L" shaped lot, to which Plante stated it was reshaped for variances.

Frazier commented that the driveway being proposed needs to be shifted back on Standish or they'd be parking on the sidewalk, to which Plante responded that he thought that had been done. Frazier stated it was not presented on the Plan. Abdallah advised Plante to coordinate with Frazier regarding appropriate drive and Gilbert added to come back with the revised Plan for next month's meeting, Tuesday after Memorial Day.

PB#2017-14A, 38 Iowa Street

Abdallah called for applicant and Allen began by requesting that this be considered a combined preliminary and final subdivision as it had been previously approved and looked at before in the subdivision review process so this will be the third visit where they are slightly modifying the lot line between lots 8 & 9 to accommodate the construction of the garage and both lots 8 & 9 will continue to be compliant with the City ordinance with regards to lot size and frontage.

Gilbert stated her opinion was to hold two meetings to abide by the rules even though there won't be any changes from this meeting to the next, to which Allen responded that he only asked because it was just an amendment to a previously approved subdivision.

Abdallah stated that he wanted to stay consistent and follow the minor subdivision process of two meetings and doesn't remember any time that the Board varied from that, to which Kanoza agreed.

Gilbert asked Allen to explain what happened with the garage and having to move the lot line. Allen explained that the approved subdivision lot line was straight and that he wasn't sure when the garage was built but it may have just been reuse of an existing slab which is consistent with other developments in this subdivision. Allen added that that was not taken into account with the original lot line and now that the issue has been discovered they are requesting a modification of the lot line.

Gilbert inquired about another foundation shown on the plan that does not have anything there any longer and if whether there will be a 5ft setback off that or require variances if presumably someone builds on that foundation later, to which Allen responded that there were no plans to put a garage on it.

Gilbert stated that they were no changes but just doing formalities and Allen would return next month for final.

PB#2018-06, 102 Miller Street

Abdallah called for applicant and Allen presented the project referring to the overhead projection showing the current conditions and then the proposed improvements, explaining that the lot was formerly a mobile home park, about 10 mobile homes there at one time that have since been removed. Allen commented that he has been working with Mr. Mousseau on urban renewal and redeveloping some of these properties that are due for redevelopment. Allen pointed out an existing slab that was constructed under a building permit under the threshold for site plan. Allen described (referring to overhead projection) the L-shaped division and utility room connection to the existing residential structure and the parking lot accommodating 2 spaces for each dwelling unit, utilities will be brought in from the street. Referring to grading Allen stated they are equal to existing coverage disturbing less than ½ acres and a pretty straight forward drainage plan with the runoff following the existing pathways taken now. Allen noted that shrubbery was to be added throughout the site referring to the landscaping plan showing the existing shrubbery in front of the residential building.

Abdallah asked Frazier about comments from DPW/MLD, to which Frazier stated DPW commented the waterline had to have type K copper noted on sheet C501 and MLD stated applicant needs to provide electrical load data, grant MLD electrical easement to service the pad mounted transformer and metering requirements need to be discussed and finalized with PMLD meter department, to which Allen stated they would incorporate them into the final plans.

Abdallah summarized that the Members comments during the pre-meeting had the most significant comment come about the parking component of the project and one item right out of the ordinance requires screening by a solid wall or fence, or continuous hedge at least 6ft in height which the applicant needs to consider. Abdallah added that there was question about the proposed dumpster at the front of the lot may be the ultimate location for access but the Board collectively had concern about it being the welcoming point of the lot and maybe more could be offered in terms of a screening detail for that to perhaps tie into the proposed screening for the parking lot, to which

Allen commented fence or cedar hedge. Abdallah continued that it was noted that there was no handicap parking and under code with the number of spaces one may be required and needs to be verified with the Building Department.

Abdallah stated there was comment about two drives and verified that one existing is to remain to serve the home and the other to serve the parking, to which Allen confirmed explaining they'll use the existing driveway to serve the existing residence (designating one space there in the total number of parking spaces) and the other will wide off to the curb cut that essentially served the mobile home park so there's no new curb cut.

Abdallah discussed lighting and that it appears to indicate 2 building wall packs and more should be offered on the plan on the throw and foot-candles of the those lights and how they spread on the site, downward shielded or not.

Abdallah added to coordinate with DPW and MLD on their comments.

Abdallah commented on building elevations asking if they planned to match the shutters color with the shutters on the existing home or switching to black to which discussion followed with emphasis on just that they match, not the color.

Abdallah noted that the Building department already issued a permit for the first 3 units determining that the interconnection is acceptable for a building permit.

Abdallah stated to Allen to come back with outlined revisions next month to proceed.

Allen asked if a site plan was a 2 month process like a subdivision, to which Abdallah explained that it depended on the level of conditions, to which Allen asked if they could tie the conditions to an approval. Abdallah stated that the Board has looked at some of the changes that have occurred over the last several months and they don't necessarily have the ability to handles conditions like in the past and other applications have proved some extreme difficulties in closing out conditions. Discussion followed regarding resubmission requirements (13 sets now) and deadline being Friday. Allen voiced his concerns about the resubmission deadline dates having such a quick turnaround after meetings and being able to complete revisions within that short time.

PB#2018-07, 127 South Peru St

Abdallah called for applicant and Allen presented the project as an L-shaped addition to an existing residential structure (referencing overhead projection of site plan) using the existing curb cut and noted a massive back yard and side yard to the property to remain in its current condition. Allen explained the plan drawings as shown on the overhead projection.

Gilbert noted that there is an existing building permit under the threshold and work has started for construction that (part one) one story wood frame and applicant is here because they are adding on the "L" back building, two units. Gilbert questioned how dense is the wood area and if there was any chance of a recreation area, to which Allen explained there is a large area of maintained lawn area (back, side and front) and his recommendation to the developer would not to go in and disturb as it's a nice buffer, to which Kanoza and Gilbert agreed.

Gilbert inquired about color scheme, to which was commented that the siding was already started. Discussion followed.

Frazier offered MLD and DPW comments as nothing from DPW but MLD commented the same as 102 Miller Street (easements, load data, meter data) which he'll provide to Allen.

Abdallah stated that pre-meeting Board comments were similar to prior application to include parking lot, screening conditions, dumpster location detail because even though there's 2 parking spots in front of it it's still in the front, identify handicap parking location coordinated through Building Department, pole mounted lights directly on property line needs a lighting detail providing no overthrow to other adjacent residential parcel, and screening.

Abdallah asked Allen if the drainage is staying similar, to which Allen explained it's basically the same runoff pattern that's there now and referenced sheet C102 grading plan explaining they are elevating the rear of the property a couple feet to meet existing grade and runoff would still be through the wooded area.

Abdallah advised Allen to bring application back addressing the comments next month. Abdallah added to Allen that with regards to application submission time frames that changed this year, they (Frazier, Building Inspector & Abdallah) are trying to work with applicants in pre-review meetings to assist in detail to lead to a complete application. Discussion followed.

The Board called for a 5 minute break.

Added Item:

PB#2016-27, Enclave Estates, US Ave

Abdallah stated that the Building Department approached him regarding a change proposed and the Building Department had questions for the Board's opinion on the original approval and what is now being proposed.

Scroggins introduced himself as the project manager for EZ Properties and stated the building is going up now but they came across a little glitch that Styrofoam has become a requirement for residential buildings within the past few years and the original project product will not go over Styrofoam, sticking out and not looking very aesthetic pleasing. Scroggins provided siding samples that had been approved by the Board and provided samples of the new more expensive and labor intensive stone to be used. Discussion followed on applying the stone and how one product sticks out but the new one doesn't and ½ inch mortar will clean up the deceiving appearance of the samples as having uneven edges.

Scroggins gave a brief update on the project status.

Kanoza expressed his approval of applicant figuring out that the material would stick out and not work because of the Styrofoam and that they approached the Board on their own, self-identifying the problem and bringing it to the attention of the Board while providing an alternate option.

Additional discussion followed on the product choice and installation thereof.

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Ferris, to amend application #2016-27 by removing stone façade Certainteed Adirondack Snowfall stone as the chosen stone façade and replace with Environmental Stone Works brand, Cut stone style with the San Francisco color with mortar joints was unanimously carried and passed.

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Gervich, unanimously carried and passed, the Board adjourned at 8:52pm.