

**CITY OF PLATTSBURGH
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
October 24 , 2016**

Call to Order: Meeting was called to order 7:08pm by Acting Chairman Ferris

Board Members Present: William Ferris, James Abdallah, Gerald Hofmaister, Maurica Gilbert, John Kanoza

Board Members Absent: Joe Rotella, Craig Worley, Curt Gervich

PB2016-23: 62 Brinkerhoff Street, 11 Plattsburgh, LLC

PB2016-24: 61 Beekman Street , Samuel F. Vilas Home, Scott A. Farquharson

PB2016-25: 98 Ohio Ave, Helen Nerska, Jules Lapoint, Clinton County Historical Association, AES Northeast

On a motion by Kanoza, seconded by Hofmaister, to accept the minutes of the regular meeting for September 26, 2016, as presented to the Board this evening with the revision to correct the spelling of Hofmaister's name, was unanimously carried and passed.

PB#2016-23: 62 Brinkerhoff Street

Ferris stated that corrections were made on the original SEQR submission (marked in red) but his corrections were completed and the corrected SEQR in the a was included in Board members' packets.

Gilbert inquired if there was written permission from the owner for the applicant to apply, to which Farrington responded no and it could be treated as a formality and make sure to get it before finalizing and adding it as a condition.

Abdallah asked if the applicant was present. No applicant or representative was present.

Discussion followed about the sign specifics such as free standing, a wood carved sign (as described to Farrington) and 2 driven wood posts but based on the photo it couldn't be determined for sure so those requirements were to be added as a condition to the motion. Hofmaister asked the distance from the sidewalk and discussion followed about the diagram showing it right in front of the wall but to leave it to the approval of the Building Inspector as to where they will place it and sign size and height.

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Kanoza, that the Board finds no adverse environmental impact on the SEQR was unanimously carried and passed with the one additional noted correction:

- Page 13 of 13, E. Site and Setting of Proposed Action, E.3., e. Correct answer is “yes”, i. Historic Building or District” and ii. “City Historic District”

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Hofmaister, to approve PB2016-23, 62 Brinkerhoff, to install a 2 by 4 sign made of carved wood as shown in the application, with wooden posts, and that the application to be perfected by providing written permission of the owner to apply for the sign was unanimously carried and passed.

PB#2016-24 : 61 Beekman Street

Hofmaister stated that he refrained from discussion last time applicant came before Board to avoid any sense of impropriety as a family member was a neighbor of the property but he has nothing to gain or lose himself by these discussions so he will include himself in the discussion.

Abdallah recused himself as he is a member of the Board for the Vilas Home.

Leora Schneider introduced herself and Scott Farquharson, Maintenance Director, from the Vilas Home. Leora explained that they were seeking approval for a 12 by 20 prefab gazebo for the side lawn, on the southwest side of the lawn, to be purchased next spring from Adirondack Storage Barns already in stock but looking for prior approval.

Ferris asked what the material it was made out of, to which Farquharson explained pressure treated and that particular model is white vinyl clad over the pressure treated.

Ferris asked if that was a historic district, to which Farrington responded that the building was listed on the State Historic Registry. Discussion followed regarding vinyl clad over the pressure treated wood being an issue and the visual appropriateness of it next to something on the registry being a decision for the Board to make and possibly setting precedence.

Ferris stated that because it is a historic building there could be a problem with the vinyl because whenever dealing with historic there is not to be anything vinyl, composite type material but supposed to be type of material back in that type of day.

Discussion followed regarding clarifying directional placement of gazebo.

Gilbert inquired about the height as it was not noted in application anywhere, to which Farquharson answered it was about a 10 foot high peak. Gilbert also asked if it was screened. Schneider described removable screen panels and wired for one inside light.

Ferris asked if there was a pad, to which Farquharson explained they were doing an asphalt sidewalk and asphalt pad that would be attached.

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Kanoza, that the Board finds no adverse environmental impact on the SEQR was unanimously carried and passed as amended to change:

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

On a motion by Hofmaister, seconded by Gilbert, to approve installing a sidewalk and gazebo with the amendment that material is not vinyl but painted pressure treated wood and location to be verified by Building Inspector, allowing relocation in general area if needs to be, was unanimously carried and passed.

PB#2016-25: 98 Ohio Ave

Nerska presented the project to rehabilitate the front porch explaining that the steps are deteriorating, crumbling and becoming dangerous where they put a cone in front of them and they have some money to do it which brings them before the Board. Nerska added they have SHPO letter of approval for the design. Nerska went on to state that they were here before wanting to totally demolish it but they can't afford to do that so they revised the plans to refurbish it and both plans had been approved by SHPO.

Abdallah asked if applicant was keeping part of the front porch because the demolition plan shows complete removal of the existing (“remove and dispose of entrance canopy including support posts”), to which Nerska replied yes they were keeping part of it, not removing the overhang, refurbishing the roof framing, not replacing it or the existing roof, reusing the existing foundation with no change in appearance on the stair landing. Gilbert added that they were confused as to what they were keeping. Nerska was uncertain as to exact plan specifics and contacted the site manager and Board Trustee, Jules Lapoint, by phone as discussion continued about the confusion as to what the project specifics were.

Lapoint explained that they were renovating the front entry to the Clinton Country Historical Association, he will do the construction oversight and is a code compliance official for the State of NY at SUNY Plattsburgh. Lapoint explained that the steps will be coming down, being demolished and replaced along with the platform retaining just the foundation for the last portion of the steps using the existing footer for that portion of the steps. Lapoint added that they are retaining the existing canopy and porch overhand, to which Gilbert commented that that was not on the plans. Discussion followed on the

differences with the plans and what was being stated by applicant who determined that the wrong plans were given to them by AES and submitted to the Board.

Discussion followed regarding the roof stays but replaced with asphalt shingles and fiberglass wrap posts. Lapoint stated that basically they are bringing in a nonconforming pre-existing condition into code compliance with the building code.

Farrington commented that the plan on the table right now calls for taking out the concrete steps, putting in composite wood steps, wrought iron rails and taking out the canopy and taking it out and replacing the roof. Farrington went on to state that keeping and preserving is generally always ok so if they want to salvage and preserve something they would have permission to eventually change it out.

Discussion followed regarding square posts versus round posts, SHPO approval for both and the fiberglass cover

On a motion by Kanoza, seconded by Hofmaister, that the Board finds no adverse environmental impact on the SEQR was unanimously carried and passed as amended to change:

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

Discussion followed on the use of architectural asphalt shingles or alternate shingle product of recycled plastic or vinyl made to look like slate (synthetic slate or slate reproduction product).

Ferris questioned the composite decking. Discussion followed that the wood grain composite deck had already been previously approved last time.

Ferris called for a motion to include square wood columns of like colors, no vinyl, no fiberglass, removal of canopy, asphalt synthetic slate appearance shingle product.

Discussion followed regarding questions about the material to be used for roof shingles as in alternate one for slate roof, hybrid method composite vinyl and imitation asphalt shingle. Additional discussion was had on the canopy condition and intentions to keep it.

Ferris called for a motion to approval as shown with square columns made of wood material, no vinyl or fiberglass allowed, everything else as proposed, allowing removal of canopy leaving as much as they want, some type of a slate appearance shingle of some sort on the roof, architectural asphalt slate appearance shingles (not granular roofing) with an alternate number 1 being slate as per the plans. Discussion followed regarding roof material. Farrington stated that architectural asphalt shingles were previously approved last time.

Abdallah commented that this is an application seen before and since then there have been many approved applications before the Board that have been held to a much more complete standard than what is here now (usually at this point the Board would have finished boards, samples and colors). Abdallah continued that with that being said, the Board should still try to move this forward so applicant can get this done within the original approval from a year ago and that is his biggest difficulty. Abdallah stated that the only thing that he could see that was being changed ultimately was trying to salvage the canopy, salvage the foundation that supports the footing to support the canopy and all the rest is essentially the original approval.

On a motion by Abdallah, seconded by Gilbert, to approve the modification of the original approval that the owner can work with salvaging the existing canopy reusing the footing support for said canopy and columns being allowed as square wood per SHPO's updated review of their application, was unanimously carried and passed.

New Item Added:

Farrington discussed Planning Board to be Lead Agency for a Subdivision and Site Plan Review of the Ed Zukowski project. Farrington explained that he has preliminary information that Zukowski is purchasing the parcel at the Old Base Hospital, the one immediately south of Glens Falls National Bank. Farrington continued that there were mixed signals on whether Zukowski wants to develop it like a PUD with multiple buildings on a single lot even though it'd be a variance situation or do a possible 4 lot subdivision. Farrington stated that he doesn't really have any information but he has met with him and Zukowski actually provided something to the Zoning Board but wasn't heard yet so it's likely to require a coordinate review with Planning Board, Zoning Board & SHPO, calling it a Type 1 action substantially contiguous across the street from the Historic Cemetery. Farrington added that the Zoning Board had suggested that the Planning Board be Lead Agency if they are OK with it.

Abdallah asked if PARC was going to remain owner of the property until Zukowski makes it through all the approvals so the Board knows to get all the right authorizations, who's the buyer, who's the owner, are they under contract, to which Farrington responded that he was not sure. Discussion followed describing the actual location of the property, its access and where it was in proportion to Latinville property.

Abdallah asked if there was a formal request in to the Zoning Board, an application with a SEQR and the Zoning Board made a motion to request Planning Board to act as Lead Agency, to which Farrington replied that the Zoning Board had made a motion and gave a letter requesting Planning Board to act as Lead Agency which is usually just the opposite where the agency requests (Zoning) from the other agencies (Planning Board & SHPO) their permission for the originating agency (Zoning) to be Lead Agency. Farrington commented that he would send a formal letter to the Zoning Board and SHPO for permission for the Planning Board to be Lead Agency.

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Kanoza, to act as Lead Agency for the potential Zukowski property, was unanimously carried and passed.

On a motion by Kanoza, seconded by Abdallah, unanimously carried and passed, the Board adjourned at 8:04pm