

**CITY OF PLATTSBURGH  
PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
May 23, 2016**

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

Board Members Present: Joseph Rotella, John Kanoza, Craig Worley, James Abdallah, Gerald Hofmaister, Curt Gervich, Maurica Gilbert

Board Members Absent: William Ferris

Also Present: Kevin Farrington

PB2016-07: 68 Court Street  
Matthew Douthat

PB2016-08: 104 Bridge Street  
Allsun Ozyesil

PB2016-09: 18 White Street  
No Representation (Jeffrey Burns)

On a motion by Hofmaister, seconded by Kanoza, to accept the minutes of the regular meeting for April 25, 2016, as presented to the Board this evening, was carried & passed.

Discussion included correcting the spelling of Hofmaister's name and removing Abdallah from the last two motions since he was not in attendance.

**PB2016-07: 68 Court Street**

Douthat introduced himself as the other member of 68 Court St LLC (applicant), stating that they purchased the building a few years ago from Jim Keable who appears to have been patching the grout and the bricks and replacing individual bricks for years and this past winter they started to fall apart from the combination of salt and warm & cold winter. Douthat explained that they were breaking apart, coming loose and dangerous to walk on so they applied for the emergency permit after which they brought in pavers, patios, poured some cement, got the color as close to the building as they could get and stamped it to look like brick, just the steps going up at the platform at the front of their door.

Rotella questioned how long the color of the dye would last, to which Douthat responded that the way it was explained to them was that the cement was dyed so if it faded on top or chips away it would still be the same color beneath it. Worley asked if it was already completed, to which Douthat confirmed that it was. Discussion followed and Douthat provided the Board a view of the final product on his phone.

Worley asked if the handrail was put up as it was before and connected to the column down to the concrete, to which Douthat explained that it was the same handrail put in and concrete poured around it while before it was drilled into the concrete. Rotella inquired who did the work, to which Douthat answered Pavers & Patios, David Griffith. Rotella asked how long it took to do, to which Douthat explained that they had them there on a Saturday to break it down and they did all the work on that Monday, two days and it was dry the next, so they weren't down very long.

Abdallah questioned if it was just replacement of the steps not the landing, which Douthat confirmed. Worley verified with Douthat that it was an emergency fix through the Building Inspector's office.

Douthat went on to explain that they have not taken the second step if they keep it to put a seal on it so the color will stay, more weatherproof. Discussion followed regarding the color match and brick form work.

Discussion was had on the emergency permit being issued, the work being completed already, the Board's involvement after the fact, and if there would be any required action on the Board's part.

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

Abdallah stated for the record that he didn't know if he would have voted for that style of form work on those stairs.

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Kanoza, to approve the 68 Court Street Historic Site Review with the condition that it is re-stained a more appropriate color, to be determined by City Engineer, Kevin Farrington, to closely match building, making it less apparent that it was changed was unanimously passed and carried.

## **PB2016-08: 104 Bridge Street**

Allsun began that they are finishing their 3<sup>rd</sup> year at 104 Bridge St and love it except for the occasional 2:00am Naked Turtle traffic which has occasionally included intoxication and police involvement. Allsun explained that they wanted to put in a pressure treated lumber picket fence, not painted but stained & sealed, as a pleasant looking barrier, 48" high with no gate.

Gilbert asked if it would weather grey and if the house had grey on it, to which Allsun described her house as having some grey on it, primarily tan with red, green, then some grey with detail work and even more detail work with a gold color.

Discussion was had about putting in a gate and Rotella suggested having it approved now to prevent having to come back before the Board later. Hofmaister questioned if it was necessary to have 48" which would look a little opposing from the street, to which Allsun explained that they have a dog that can jump and it was the standard height for the fence at 4' or 6'.

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

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Worley, to approve 4 foot picket, pressure treated wooden fence, to be installed at 104 Bridge Street including a future gate was unanimously passed and carried.

#### **PB# 2016-09: 18 White Street**

No representative was present.

Farrington stated that the Board could discuss the Preliminary Subdivision and he would forward questions and comments to the applicant.

Discussion was had on the requirement that an applicant be present and the Board's ability to act on the application.

Gervich noted that there was no letter from Mesick or Aurilio, neighboring properties. Abdallah added that no question was asked as to what Lot #3 is or the reasoning. Discussion followed.

Hofmaister questioned if the three deed lots to the south are consolidated as one lot. He continued that if so, they are fine but if not then they are granting one parcel of the three lots and it's not showing how they divided into that.

Farrington stated that he thought they were a single lot because the tax map shows them as a single lot but the survey map provided show they are separate lots by deed. Farrington continued that if they went to the Assessor, they would probably find that they are combined for tax purposes only but they are separate deeded lots. Worley also commented that the lot lines go through 2 buildings. Abdallah asked Farrington if they should be merged (the three lots) and Worley asked if they had in the past. Farrington responded that he thought they had been merged but he'd have to clarify with the surveyor about the faint and bold lines with respect to tax parcels and deed properties being identified.

Gervich presented a question about last month's applicant 176 US Ave and the minutes reflecting the discussion regarding Subdivision being a two-step process, Sketch Plan Review and Final Plan Review and what was the determination with whether the Subdivision Review could be considered as the Sketch Plan Review so applicant could return for Final Subdivision and Historic Site Plan Review approval. Farrington responded that applicant had that a little wrong and that for a major subdivision it requires 3 visits, a sketch plan review, preliminary review and final, but for a minor subdivision just a preliminary and final is all that's required. Farrington continued that assuming that it qualifies as a minor, 5 parcels or less, then preliminary and final would suffice. Farrington stated that applicant is asking for just two appearances and for a minor, two appearances are standard. Gervich questioned if last month's was appearance one then and when appearing again on June 27 that will be final, to which Gilbert agreed unless the Board is unsatisfied by what is presented to them. Discussion followed and Farrington commented that the Board should also keep in mind that they are part of a Special Assessment Parking District and there may be some questions in regards to that such as to what is the existing parking on site and the amount that is paid is based on a deficiency calculation. Farrington explained the difference between the Durkee Street District parking and US Oval District parking. Farrington suggested to the Board to look at general layout, circulation, driveways, connections, lot line configuration and good land use questions.

Abdallah inquired if there was a Site Plan at last month's meeting, to which Farrington responded yes, not complete but there were some drawings, some layout, driveway, curb, some utility, architectural renderings. Abdallah questioned if a more final complete application was presented to the Zoning Board for them to make their SEQR determination on a lot of the information the Planning Board will be looking at as a basis of the SEQR determination. Abdallah expressed his concern as to the Zoning Board's actual review towards the Site Planning and the Historic nature of the property being limited in nature and whether they were the appropriate Lead Agency or not under the Environmental Review. Discussion followed regarding giving the Zoning Board consent as Lead Agency. Farrington stated that SHPO did not give a formal response and did not respond within 30 days therefore consented by default since they were notified appropriately even though there was uploading to CRIS technical difficulties.

On a motion by Kanoza, seconded by Worley, unanimously carried and passed, the Board adjourned at 7:40pm