

**CITY OF PLATTSBURGH
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
June 26, 2017**

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

Board Members Absent: Curt Gervich, Laurie Booth-Trudo

Also Present: Kevin Farrington

Pledge of Allegiance

Abdallah called the meeting to order at 7:02pm and stated that the first item on the agenda is the approval of Planning Board minutes for May 22, 2017.

On a motion by Ferris, seconded by Dantes, to accept the minutes of the regular meeting May 22, 2017, as presented to the Board this evening was carried and passed.

Approved: Kanoza, Ferris, Dantes

Abstained by Worley and Gilbert as they were not present last month but noted that they had read through them.

PB#2017-11: 107 Court Street
Ryan Smith, Ryan's Masonry

PB#2017-12: 29 Hamilton Street
Albert Ball

PB#2017-13: Lot 23 West Shore Subdivision, West Side of Maine Road
Scott B. Allen

PB #2017-14: 38 Iowa Street
Scott B. Allen, AES

PB#2016-27: Enclave Estates, US Ave (South of New York Rd & Glens Fall Bank)
Erik Sandblom/Ed Zukowski

PB#2017-11: 107 Court Street

Abdallah called for applicant and Smith stated that the project was replacing just as it was, tearing it out and replacing new, keeping everything the same. Abdallah verified that the last pages of the application pictures show the existing steps that he (owner) just wants to replace as exactly the same with sidewalk and keep curbing, to which Smith confirmed.

Gilbert noted corrections to SEQR on page 3 of 13, C.3., a. is changed to state "RH and Historic" districts; Page 8 of 13, D.2., m. regarding noise levels during construction changed to "yes" and detail "1 day, no earlier than 8am, 8am-5pm"; Page 13 of 13 E.3., f. archeological changed to "No".

Gilbert stated that what he was proposing was appropriate.

On a motion by Ferris, seconded by Worley, that the Board makes a negative declaration on SEQR with corrections was unanimously carried and passed.

On a motion by Kanoza, seconded by Gilbert to approve application as presented in the application was unanimously carried and passed.

PB #2017-12: 29 Hamilton Street

Abdallah called for applicant but Ball was not present. Next item on the agenda was called to give additional time should the applicant become present. Gilbert also included that permission should be obtained from the owner for the applicant.

PB#2017-03: 8 Lake Forest Drive

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

Ferris stated that last month SEQR was done and applicant needed to go through zoning for variance. Farrington stated the variance was for a third accessory structure.

Ferris stated that the plan was the same as last month's review and everything looked good but needed that one variance for the third accessory structure and asked for any comments.

On a motion by Kanoza, seconded by Gilbert to approve application as submitted was unanimously carried and passed.

Abdallah returned as Planning Chairman

PB#2017-13: Lot 23 West Shore Subdivision, West Side of Maine Road

Abdallah called for applicant.

Worley recused himself as he is related to applicant.

Allen stated it was a straight forward application, had a Lot 23 that was part of the West Shore Subdivision out on Maine Road that was a generously sized lot. Allen continued that they figured they could adequately fit two single family homes on it, one on each lot if they split Lot 23 in 23A & 23B which is consistent with the smaller homes in the area and both lots meet zoning requirements for single family residential.

Ferris commented that they had reviewed it pretty thoroughly in pre-meeting downstairs and it looked standard and deferred to Farrington for his comments. Farrington responded that the lots look to comply with all the subdivision rules and understands that there are no variances needed.

Abdallah inquired if the utilities and poles, the laterals, replacements as needed, like the sewer and water. Allen responded that they tie into the manhole on the east side of Maine Road and come across then split at property line and bring a lateral over to the house at 23B and new lateral at 23A. Allen continued that water line will come off existing water main on the west side of Maine Road there's a lateral shown for 23A.

Ferris questioned Farrington about construction on Maine Road and are they putting all them in. Farrington explained that sanitary he wasn't sure since they're not doing sanitary there but replacing the water so would put in the water service, curb cut, apron, probably sidewalk.

Allen inquired as to the schedule for those improvements as they want to cut the trench before they come through. Farrington stated soon that they hope to be out to bid sometime in July and not expected to break ground before August with at least 90 days construction time so there shouldn't be any problem.

Discussion followed regarding subdivision code and order of appearance to Planning Board as in Preliminary and Final submissions.

Allen asked what was being done with the water main, to which Farrington explained replacing it with a new main through that area, middle road more towards applicant. Allen commented they'll wait for them to put a stop and shut off on that.

Abdallah asked about coordination with curb cuts as well, to which Farrington and Allen commented they had been communicating about that and will be sharing plot plans, preliminary design and ideas, avoiding cutting into a brand new road.

Farrington stated that Public Works was not thrilled with the bend in the sanitary line (the 45). Allen explained that it was a possibility to do in 2 separate trench but they had thought it better to connect into manhole rather than tap into the pipe.

Ferris asked if they could go straight across the street perpendicular then just y it off go to the upper lot. Allen explained that they would have the same situation and they shot for the property corner so each person had their own lateral to be responsible for.

Dantes commented that the road is going to be replaced anyways so it wouldn't hurt to go straight across the street to the sanitary of 23B.

Abdallah stated that with those bends there would be some sort of clean out. Allen responded that they need some sort of clean out the only thing with that kind of clean

out, he'd want to make sure he'd get the clean out on the back side of the sidewalk. Farrington stated that now you get a clean out on the right of way or on someone else's property. Allen commented that they'd have to increase the angle between those two laterals so much might as well increase it all the way and bring it down straight across for 23B.

Abdallah suggested to Allen to coordinate with Public Works and the Engineering Department before coming back next month. Allen responded that they would take a look at that and they were just thinking it would be nice to have both laterals and one trench. Allen stated that they will come back with some sort of clean out structure or drop the lateral down straight across. Allen asked if they agreed that Public Works will want to tap right into the manhole rather than tap into the line, to which Farrington agreed adding that with the road being done, they don't need to do a lot of restoration or even a temporary cold patch, just bring it up to the surface and they'll take it from because they are basically in construction at the same time they are trenching.

Dantes had a question that on 23B on the south side shows fence 6ft over line, is that a fence that belongs to 23B, to which Allen responded that no, it was 24's and that the edge of 24 is the paved driveway and they went a little rambunctious with the landscaping. Dantes questioned if it would be removed, to which Allen explained yes, that they have staked out the property line and the owner is on notice.

Dantes pointed out that in the site notes, left hand side, no. 1, extra word in last sentence to be corrected (if if).

Abdallah questioned Farrington if a vote on the sketch plan was required, to which Farrington explained that no vote was needed as it was just considered a preliminary review, passing along any comments the Board may have.

Abdallah thanked the applicant and moved on to the next agenda item.

PB #2017-14: 38 Iowa Street

Abdallah stated to Allen that just looking at the description on the agenda, there was uncertainty as to the description and asked him to offer an explanation.

Worley recused himself as he has an interest in the project.

Allen read his description on the transmittal letter and proceeded to explain that phases I through III on the plans were previously approved by the Planning Board between 2009 and 2013. Allen continued that phase IV is the final phase containing lots 4, 5 & 6 to be combined, merged into one lot for a 6plex apartment building that's already there. Abdallah verified with Allen that they are already merged today but just solidifying it in the subdivision map. Allen added that phase IV will also contain lots 8, 9 & 10, referring

back to early master plan, to be combined into just lots 8 & 9. Abdallah verified that 8, 9 & 10 are technically one lot today, to which Allen explained that after Phase III, they had remaining lands, one tax map parcel with a land hook that spanned across lot 7 (single family lot approved in Phase II) so what they are doing is taking that tax map parcel and splitting it up into three new tax map parcels.

Dantes questioned if the Planning Board ever approved the 4,5 & 6 lots, to which Allen explained that it was just remaining lands. Dantes commented that they don't really care if they are merging them back, just cleaning up the master plan, to which Allen explained there is a master plan on file when doing Phase I showing where lots 1-10 were and just wanted to show and clarify the light dashed lines on the earlier version of the subdivision. Dantes asked if all of phase IV there will be a land hook on the tax map, to which Allen explained no, there will be three different tax map parcels.

Abdallah summarized with Allen that 4, 5 & 6 were never technically lots and just shown on the master plan and the Board is just approving them as one lot now.

Ferris verified that everything was pretty clean cut with setbacks and lot size dimensions and this was just a formality more than anything, to which Farrington stated it appears to meet the minimum zoning requirements for each of the lots and no variances appear to be required. Abdallah commented that it was almost easier to forget the master plan component of it and look at it as remaining lands being subdivided. Abdallah added that this also goes through the two step process.

Abdallah stated that the larger parcel looks to already be serviced by water and sewer and the two lots 8 & 9 being created looking at sewer coming across Kansas and water a joint trench (Allen added it comes right off the water main on the west side on Kansas) and new laterals to be installed. Allen explained both the sanitary laterals are coming into manholes referencing plans and the water laterals are connecting to the existing water line on the west side of Kansas.

Kanoza verified with Allen that there was nothing currently on 8 or 9 and it was all vacant.

Farrington questioned the lot line next to lot 7 as being a proposed line, to which Allen replied no and explained that had been approved as part of the phase II Lot 7 house. Discussion followed to clarify line details, boldness showing existing or proposed.

Abdallah inquired from Farrington if there was any review and comments from Public Works, to which Farrington replied no comments were received from any departments.

Dantes questioned if the new lots 4, 5 & 6 were already fed by utilities, to which Allen stated yes as there is an existing occupied 6plex served by utilities water and sewer. Dantes asked for the final, next set of plans to show inverts and rim elevations on the two sanitary manholes being tied into on Kansas, to which Kanoza added to show the

laterals coming into the combined 4, 5 & 6 lot existing 6plex building. Allen explained that it was on the plan but hard to see.

Abdallah asked if both curb cuts are proposed off Kansas, to which Allen explained one off Iowa but unsure at this stage but lot A garage will face Iowa so there will have to be a curb cut to serve that garage. Discussion followed that it wasn't important at this point and Allen stated that they will not be shown when he comes back but to be shown on plot plan submitted to building department when time comes.

Farrington stated that the Board could use its discretion to ask for it as the Subdivision Code reads the Board may also ask for anything else that is required for a Site Plan.

Abdallah stated that he isn't hearing any major objections at the Board level but would ask that Allen has talked with DPW and Engineering before coming back to make sure there are no conflicts that may come up.

Allen asked if he had to submit 15 more sets of the application, to which Farrington explained yes but only 14 being one board member down.

PB #2016-27: Enclave Estates, US Ave, South of New York Rd and Glens Falls Bank

Sandblom began with the history of the project stating how the project got to this point and explained the project requires variances that the applicant brought before Zoning Board to approve but it was determined at the time that Planning Board would be lead agency for purpose of SEQR so the Zoning Board was unable to make a decision and an application was filed with the Planning Board. Sandblom stated that at the time it was considered to be a Historic Site Review application because it was continuously adjacent to a historic area. Sandblom clarified that it has since been determined that that is not the case but before the Board is a historic site plan application even though it is a regular site plan review. Sandblom added that they completed the Long Form SEQR receiving some comments from SHPO recommending a Phase I investigation which delayed the project through the winter with the Phase I investigation being completed this spring. Sandblom continued that they came before the Board in May again hoping to finalize the SEQR but even though the Phase I Archeological Assessment was completed, they were at day 28 of a 30 day review period for SHPO and they had not responded to the report yet. So last month they used the opportunity to update the Board on the details of the project and feedback items. Sandblom stated that it was ultimately decided and got the impression that everything looked good as far as making a determination on SEQR except for not having that SHPO acknowledgment. Sandblom continued that the primary objective for this meeting was for SEQR determination to be able to go to Zoning for variances approvals, adding that they also continued to update the plans based upon Board comments and how they were

addressing them, new information and determinations that impacted plan design slightly.

Sandblom stated that on the SEQR form on page 6 question f. it was identified that combustible fuels would be used in the heating and that was in error as it's electrical heat so that should be a "no".

Abdallah broached the application type and requested Farrington give some detail regarding it as it is substantially contiguous to a historic district and is not a Historic Site Plan Review. Farrington clarified that it is a Type 1 SEQR action based on being contiguous to the historic military cemetery which is eligible to be listed on the State Federal Registry and according to Local Code being contiguous doesn't necessarily trigger a Historic Site Plan Review as opposed to a Site Plan Review but the State Environmental Law does so the review should be based on SEQR criteria for being contiguous to a historical property. Gilbert added that the contiguous definition is easily found in the SEQR Law and gives examples that if a public street is the divider between the historic property and the non-historic property, the public street is ignored. So the answer on Page 13 of 13 on top question e. needs to be changed to yes it is substantially contiguous.

Abdallah clarified that technically this is a Site Plan Review under City Zoning but it's still considered a historic review under SEQR regulation because of its proximity.

Farrington stated that the next question down page 13 of 13, f. should be changed to yes since SHPO asked for an Archeological Study because they deemed it in a potentially sensitive area even though the results showed no archeological issues.

Sandblom stated he could agree with that.

Sandblom stated that they are in the process of responding to comments so everything has not yet been worked into the plan and showed that the alignment of the walkway connecting from the sidewalk onto the site should be aligned with the mailboxes and should be incorporated but not shown yet.

Sandblom stated that one of the biggest changes is two of the buildings, the 3 bedroom townhouse rather than having two buildings with 4 units each (now eliminated), there's one building with 6 units. Sandblom added that the Board wanted the separation distances of the buildings which referred the applicant to a formula in the Zoning regulations that pertained to Planned Unit Developments so there's not a true jurisdiction without another standard to apply. Sandblom stated the variances required would include number of principle structures, number of accessory structures and number of dwelling units. Sandblom added that on a regular site plan would allow one principle structure there's no concern for distances between buildings therefore reports that all the buildings meets the separation requirement with the exception of the two garages.

Dantes commented that they show three garages instead of four, to which Sandblom explained there are three and three instead of four and four, and outdoor storage units have been added. Dantes stated the wording needs to be changed and Sandblom responded that a lot of things still need to be changed (not a final document). Sandblom explained that this has been a progression that they have been reluctant to invest a lot into the final design because they still need variances but want to show enough that they have vetted the site so number one it meets SEQR and that it's going to work from a practical stand point.

Ferris asked if at the side of the garages and on the back side of the large buildings, is it all storage, to which Sandblom stated that it was, Zukowski added there was a gap, a storage, a gap then a storage (not shown on submission).

Zukowski stated that MLD decided to service off the front adding that in the garden style apartments there is an alarm sprinkler room, telephone cable and also meter room which is the reason for two doors. Zukowski continued to explain layout and stated they will have floor plans next time.

Zukowski stated that storage was one of the comments last time and noted the 3-bedroom townhomes have their garages with 24ft deep, the last 3 or 4ft for storage.

Worley asked if each unit has one water meter, to which Sandblom explained yes that they are all on the west side of the building, entrance through a mechanical, sprinkler room. Zukowski added there will be two transformers, one between the buildings on the south, the other between the two on the north.

Sandblom stated that they are still working on getting information from Public Works on the sewer system, adding that they will need to pump from this site and the pump station will located on the northwest corner of the property with an easement in place to run a line to a manhole on New York.

Zukowski stated there was a comment for passive semi-active recreation and explained that they plan on putting in two speed bumps, one in each corner on the loop on the back side and the west side, moved two parking lots to the outside to where the dumpster areas are, put in basketball hoop facing the parking lot, a swing set, tether ball, and picnic tables. Sandblom added that from a SEQR component there will be minor changes to level of coverages but any other changes will reduce coverage so they will have more open space as a result.

Ferris commented that they would be very interested in seeing the elevation from the road side to see what it looks like as you come down the road. Zukowski explained that they wanted greys, so they incorporated granite stone (showed sample), above that cedar shake, body of the building a darker grey, top board & batten dark grey, red accent for doors. Zukowski went on to describe different buildings stating he'd bring back materials samples next time.

Worley stated that he liked the way attention was given to comments and concerns the Board had brought up.

Kanoza stated that he liked the combining of the two buildings making it one.

Abdallah summarized that at this time there is presentation of new material, agenda item application on file is actually constructing two multi-family low-rise residential structures and two townhouses, not three. Sandblom commented that as far as stormwater goes, they have run the number and meet State standards and explained detailing stormwater while referring to plan and stating that they plan to try to keep everything above grade or will have to start running underground.

Ferris questioned Farrington if SEQR could be voted on, to which Farrington replied yes. Abdallah stated that the first thing is to clarify the record. Abdallah asked if there was some reason it hadn't been updated as part of the application. Sandblom responded that it's been ongoing every time they come to the Board there's been more comments which they've been tucking away as something to bring to final Site Plan but have been focusing on SEQR. Abdallah stated that again the biggest thing is to clarify for the record the different application item structure, Site Plan Application which is not a Historic Site Plan Review. Sandblom stated they would submit correct application next time and just looking to get SEQR determination now so they can go to the Zoning Board. Abdallah added that on SEQR there are things not matching up with the Plan just presented to the Board tonight.

Abdallah noted correction Page 1 of 13, A. Project and Sponsor Information, Brief Description of Proposed Action corrected to two (2) townhouses. Dantes requested noting storage units as well but discussion noted these to be part of the building and Abdallah stated the minutes will note that they will providing storage and will provide more detail at next final design.

- Page 2 of 13, B. Government Approvals, Funding or Sponsorship, c. include "Site Plan"

Abdallah questioned Page 2 of 13, B. Government Approvals, Funding or Sponsorship, g., involved agencies to which discussion concluded to include "New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)"

Sandblom noted correction to Page 4 of 13, D.2. Project Details, f. correct to "46"

Gilbert noted Sandblom's acknowledgment of Page 6 of 13, D. Project Operations, f. (air emissions) correct answer is "no"

Sandblom stated that on the previous section (Page 6 of 13, D.2., e.) where it identifies the acres of impervious for the parcel size, to note that the acres of impervious will decrease by a small amount by decreasing the footprint of that building but they are not reducing any pavement, only reducing roof impervious.

Abdallah commented the same applied to page 9, to which Sandblom stated it would be same numbers as impervious.

Discussion was had about the need for a lighting plan and Farrington mentioned no spillage over or glare, to keep full cut off and low enough not create a nuisance for neighboring properties.

Abdallah commented to Sandblom that if they do propose underground, they will come back with soils, to which Sandblom explained that they need to do additional detailed infiltration testing to meet the requirements of the stormwater. Kanoza asked as to what were the best areas, to which Sanblom explained southeast corner is just sand, reddish-orange down to 6 or 8ft but there's a clay layer under that. Dantes stated that during construction, they cannot penetrate that clay layer in any way (Airforce condition), to which Sandblom responded they are building the site up. Abdallah stated that when applicant comes back the final details need to address that if it becomes a concern.

Abdallah noted correction Page 13 of 13, E.3. Designated Public Resources On or Near Project Site, e. correct answer is "yes"

Abdallah noted correction Page 13 of 13, E.3. Designated Public Resources On or Near Project Site, f. correct answer is "yes"

Abdallah questioned Farrington about the comment regarding separation of garages from the townhouse and the formula for distances, seeing it in other projects, is it applicable outside of a P.U.D., to which Farrington explained it is a bit of a grey area because there is no code for separation between buildings when you have multiple buildings on a single site because you're not allowed to have multiple primary structures on a single site. Farrington continued that except in the case of a Planned Unit Development which is typically, historically only for 5 acres sites and now that you get into variances granted for multiple structures on a single site, it can be looked at as a guideline or look at setback rules as a guideline because normally principle structures are separated by at least a setback. Zukowski commented that he had spoken with the Building Inspector and mentioned that if they connect the buildings with a roof, they become one structure but was trying to avoid that. Sandblom discussed the formula as being complicated takes into account the longest length of the building, the height of the building and all the buildings meet the calculated setback with the exception of separation between garage and the one bedroom unit with the formula calculating about 40ft. Sandblom added that they just couldn't figure a way to modify the site plan to achieve that without detrimentally impacting the site so it is a reasonable 15 to 17ft separation without clustering the site too much.

Abdallah verified that in other applications where they've seen this distance rule implemented, last time was between apartment structures (Latinville project) not apartment structure and garage, to which there was discussion and comment that that had been a P.U.D. with 5 acres and this application is only 3.77. Abdallah commented

that he could speak for the whole Board but would not want to see a connection between the garages, to which Board members also agreed. Abdallah added that being the separation was between the building and garage, he did not have that much of an issue with the distance as long as the Building Official for the City was comfortable with it knowing it was not a P.U.D. and needed Zoning variances. Sandblom commented that he had discussed it with Joe and he did confirm that it only applied to P.U.D.s but knows it's within the Planning Board's preview to look at that. Kanoza stated that he felt applicant made an effort, to which Worley added that it was plenty of room to get through.

Abdallah noted letter from SHPO states the opinion is that the proposed project won't have adverse impact for historic or archeological concerns.

Gilbert asked if with so many changes to SEQR should applicant re-sign on original, to which Abdallah responded that applicant should come back to solidify record with clean application, clean SEQR with outlined corrections, plans just presented this evening are on file in Engineering Department for the record and next time will have final application and detailed plans.

Dantes noted that on SP.1 last month's submission showed proposed stone fence along Route 9 has since disappeared except for a section on the north end, to which Zukowski stated it was a change that they took it out because they didn't believe it would hold up to the winter so close to the water ditch adding that there is a stone entrance gate. Dantes stated there was still a section of the fence showing, to Sandblom responded it needed to be corrected. Dantes added she was looking at the one bedroom garden profile or elevation and it doesn't match up to the sidewalks going into that on the Site Plan. Discussion followed.

Dantes verified that currently there is not impervious service on this lot, no black top or structures, to which Sandblom responded for all essential purposes it is undeveloped but there's a small building up by the road.

Discussion followed regarding easements and the City's infrastructure.

Dantes commented that putting 44 units on 3.77 acres, less the 5 acres for P.U.D., other lots were given more issue for putting less on 5 acres so she doesn't get the logic, to which Zukowski commented they are allowed 51 units and Dantes returned that it is still under 5 acres. Zukowski stated there is a formula regardless of 5 acres or 1 acre for RC2. Dantes commented again that she's seen the Planning Board give more issue to projects for less units on larger parcels and they are setting a big precedents. Discussion followed regarding RC2 and density. Abdallah stated that the Planning Board has the option, as the applicant moves down into the approval, to recognize that concern again at Site Plan Review.

Abdallah requested applicant clarify Zoning variances required for the project, to which Sandblom stated the number of principle buildings, number of accessory buildings,

number of dwelling units (more than 24), no building coverage variance (at 19.5% can't go over 20%), no set back variance.

Dantes added another comment that they back up to B2 parcel behind them to the west and the tetherball, basketball and swings are all backing up to B2 parcel so is there plans for a fence. Zukowski stated it will be up to whoever develops that property as for now it's just vegetation back there. Dantes added that children playing with these things will have to cross between parked cars to get to it even though there are speed bumps. Zukowski responded that the tetherball is in the grassy area, to which Dantes commented she wants these put on the final plan to include fencing

Kanoza stated that he likes the project using a piece of property that isn't being used for anything and putting it to good use.

Abdallah stated that he did not realize that with this new plan presented just tonight, they were moving the fence along the frontage and one of the items while considering SEQR with SHPO is the review of October 4, 2016 Site Plan where they make comment about new construction and the buffer with Route 9 and asked if there were any changes with that review that their office be coordinated with. Sandblom responded that it won't be a change from that because the fence wasn't on the plan by October and it had been in response to thinking it was a Historic Review, to which Abdallah requested applicant clarify that in the final application. Kanoza verified that they were definitely removing that stone fence, to which Zukowski yes after seeing deterioration of these fences around town after 10 years and the ditch water will create a lot of problems such is the reason for the stone entry which will set it off nice. Zukowski commented adding trees along Route 9, to which Kanoza stated to put on the plans as well. Sandblom stated the plan will be broken up into a utility plan, landscaping plan, lighting plan, about 5 sheets with everything going on.

On a motion by Dantes, seconded by Kanoza, pending all changes made to the SEQR are confirmed to be correct to accept the SEQR for 2016-27.

Abdallah questioned Farrington if the SEQR could be approved with conditions, to which Farrington stated no, cant' do any kind of conditional approval on a SEQR but it be understood that the corrections discussed are made part of the record and those correction treated as a formality.

Dantes amended the motion as stated was unanimously passed and carried.

Abdallah moved on to other items, one non-applicant requested to speak to the Board.

Don Whitman from the Kent Delord House addressed the Board explaining that a group called the Catholic Heart Work Camp was looking for jobs and asked if he had any projects. Whitman had two immediate ones, one being the replacement of their very unsafe deteriorating handicap ramp and two erect a more historically accurate 19th Century fence along the western border. Whitman continued that the project moved

along until he became aware of necessity for permits, Historic Site Review and planned to submit in July but wanted to know if there's anything that can be done for prep or preconstruction to keep this group of high energy teenagers busy.

Abdallah commented that first off there is no formal application submitted so the Board cannot make any kind of decision on anything that night and any prep work be coordinated with the City Building Department where they can guide on work that is maintenance not requiring coming before Planning Board.

Wickman explained already started removing deteriorating fence back through a Community Service Project by Seton Catholic and plan to reuse the same holes. Wickman stated he would be back in July to address total project at that time.

On a motion by Dantes, seconded by Worley, to table 2017-12 due to applicant no show was unanimously passed and carried.

Abdallah took this time to update the Board on the meeting with the Zoning Board regarding meeting schedule and coordination of review. Abdallah added that one of the suggestions was the Planning Board moving their application time frame to receive them the same date and time as the Zoning Board and moving the Planning Board Meeting to the second Monday of the month. Discussion followed and the decision was made to take a poll of the Board Members for preferences of meeting days and times due to conflicts changing the day.

Discussion was had on getting Planning Board Minutes to Zoning Board before their meeting regarding Enclave Estates as the Zoning Board is looking for Planning Board Members' comments or providing a summary, excerpt, commentary of Planning Board Members' comments extracted from the Minutes as relevant to variances.

On a motion by Ferris, seconded by Dantes, was unanimously carried and passed, the Board adjourned at 9:15pm.