



CLINTON COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

135 Margaret Street, Suite 124 · Plattsburgh, New York 12901-2980
Planning (518) 565-4711 • C.A.R.T. (518) 565-4713 • Facsimile (518) 565-4885

CLINTON COUNTY PLANNING BOARD DECISION ON 239M REFERRAL

TO: City of Plattsburgh Planning Board

REFERRAL NUMBER: 68-18

SUBJECT: Applicant Michael Racine, Site Plan Review for Retaining Wall, 3 Circle Grove.

The following action was taken by the Clinton County Planning Board regarding this zoning referral, in compliance with New York State General Municipal Law, Article 12B, Section 239M. This decision is not binding upon the local municipality, but may impact the local board's voting requirements to act contrary to the County decision. A County Decision of Disapproval or Approval With Modifications may only be overturned by the local municipal board by a majority plus one vote of the full membership of the board (4 votes for 5 member board, 5 votes for 7 member board).

DATE OF COUNTY ACTION:

9/5/18

ACTION TAKEN ON REFERRAL:

- APPROVAL
 APPROVAL (see comments)
 APPROVAL WITH MODIFICATION (see comments)
 DISAPPROVAL (see comments)
 LOCAL ISSUE
 LOCAL ISSUE (see comments)

VOTE RECORDED:

7 YES

0 NO

4 ABSENT

0 ABSTAINED

9/6/18
DATE

[Signature]
CLINTON COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

PLEASE RETURN A COPY OF THE FINAL DECISION BY YOUR BOARD TO THE CLINTON COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT WITHIN 30 DAYS OF DECISION.



CLINTON COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

135 Margaret Street, Suite 124 · Plattsburgh, New York 12901
Planning (518) 565-4711 • C.C.P.T. (518) 565-4713 • Facsimile (518) 565-4885

CLINTON COUNTY PLANNING BOARD REFERRAL RESPONSE

September 6, 2018

Decision Regarding Referral 68-18, City of Plattsburgh Planning Board, Applicant Mike Racine, Site Plan Review for retaining wall, 3 Circle Grove.

The Clinton County Planning Board, at its September 5, 2018 meeting, voted 7-0 to consider this request a local issue, but to provide the following comments to the City:

The adjacent neighbor to this project provided photographs and information that brings up many of the problems with allowing retaining walls on the actual property line, or in some cases, allowing them at all. This is a dense residential area, and drainage issues are certainly impacted easily by the addition of fill and creation of a retaining wall, especially at 6 feet in height in some places. The impact on neighboring lots is not easy to quantify, but they are generally negative, not positive. The impacts of additional water runoff from this property onto surrounding properties should be closely reviewed. In most cases, retaining walls should not be permitted on property boundaries, especially within dense residential areas. The aesthetic impacts on neighboring properties are also substantial as well. It is often left to the neighbor to keep weeds cut and prevent the lower side of the retaining wall from being overgrown with brush – which often is not done. This project also appears to be built with drainage from the roof of the structure dumping onto neighboring properties, with non-perforated pipe as well. This should be unacceptable to the City Planning Board.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sheridan Garner".

Sheridan Garner, Chairperson

cc: County Planning Department Files