

**CITY OF PLATTSBURGH
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
May 29, 2018**

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

Board Members Absent: Laurie Booth-Trudo, Curt Gervich

Also Present: Adam Frazier, Engineering Aide

PB#2018-08, 59 Clinton Street

Ryan's Masonry

PB#2018-04, 82 Court Street

Jacques Rouillard

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

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

Raymond Plante

PB#2018-02, 2 Pike Street

Aaron Ovios, RMS

Pledge of Allegiance

Abdallah called the meeting to order at 7:04pm

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Kanoza, to approve the April 23, 2018 Board meeting minutes as presented to the Board was unanimously carried and passed.

PB#2018-08, 59 Clinton Street

Abdallah stated that there was a misprint in the application and meeting notice noting that the location is actually 59-61 Court Street and called for applicant. Smith described project as the concrete steps have been removed with the building inspector giving permission for temporary pressure treated wood to prevent anyone from being hurt and now they need permission to pour concrete steps as done across the road at the Doctor's office. Abdallah commented that in pre-review the Board had a question of concern about wrong notice going out to the paper because of the error (of location) on the application and getting the notice correct for the neighbors. Abdallah added that the steps were brick steps and the other three entrances on the property were brick questioning if those were the only set of stairs to be replaced with poured concrete.

Smith explained that yes but the matching landing was to remain. Abdallah questioned what reason was there not to go with brick, matching the existing. Gilbert also questioned about the window to which Smith explained the window on the other side was all rotted and ready to fall out.

Abdallah stated that with the application and public notice incorrect, the Board wants applicant to return next month, to which Gilbert noted there are stairs for entering and exiting so nobody will fall down if waiting another month and would really like to see it in brick to match. Gilbert requested Smith convey that to the owner. Discussion followed regarding cost of brick construction being \$2,500 more and being consistent with the existing steps.

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Kanoza, to table PB #2018-08 for further information was unanimously carried and passed.

PB#2018-04, 82 Court Street

Abdallah called for applicant and Rouillard stated that he looked into the Board's recommendation that was previously approved and the cost difference is \$7,500.00, total cost \$21,000.00 to replace the roof which he can't do. Rouillard added that he has photos of the walls falling inside the ends and needs to do something. Rouillard explained that he went back and looked at what the present roof is, noting that the red is just red paint, and looked at 2 different shingle samples which he presented to the Board and described. Ferris questioned what the warranty was on the sample shingles, to which Rouillard responded 30 years, stating that it was the most costly of the samples.

Abdallah posed the question to the Board of cost consideration. Abdallah noted that the Board has had applicants come before them looking at architectural shingles as well to which the Board came back and asked for the similar shingle Rouillard's application was approved with and doesn't recall any coming back with an objection for cost. Abdallah asked if Rouillard had any comparative quotes to which discussion followed.

Rouillard offered to return back with information and Gilbert suggested temporarily tabling the application, holding his position, until he returns and can be put back into discussion.

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Kanoza, to table application 2018-04 for an half hour while Rouillard goes to get additional information from home was unanimously carried and passed.

8:20pm Discussion resumed

Rouillard stated that he had the quote on the presented shingle and the warranty is 50 years, adding that he has the cost (but no written quote) and name, Berkshire Colonial

Collection, of the shingle the Board had authorized and the owner of the company of the new proposed shingles, Mr. Rivers of New Image Roofing was now present.

Rivers stated that he looked at the shingles at the Vilas Home and the shingle that he's proposing, an over lay 50 year shingle, to put on Rouillard's property is a lot closer to looking like slate than what the Vilas Home has, 25 max 30 year shingle. Rivers added that the red line that the Board questioned was painted on the slate, not red slate and if necessary could be painted on these shingles but can't guarantee it'll stay on. Rivers explained that when the shingle is totally laid it out it looks almost totally like slate.

Gilbert asked for photos from a distance to see what it looks like. Discussion followed.

Abdallah stated to Rivers that there have been a number of applications in the past where the approved shingles for this application were a standard or conditioned acceptable substitute for slate versus the more costly alternative of either slate or composite slate shingle.

Rivers commented that to put that shingle on it'll be \$25,000.00 for the whole roof and the alternative being proposed is \$13,500.00 and will outlive the other. Abdallah questioned if that is because of cost of material or cost of installation, to which Rivers responded that it was based on everything.

Abdallah stated that the Board hasn't had anybody come back in front of them for a cost request.

Rivers explained that the difference between the approved shingle and the new proposed shingle is that the approved shingle has the corner cut. Gilbert asked why such a price difference. Rivers explained that the labor is more, twice the amount of time to apply and described the application process of the shingles. Discussion followed.

Abdallah summarized there were a couple items to consider, first and foremost the past application history utilizing the previously approved shingles, to which Kanoza reaffirmed the Board not hearing anything before on price issue and extra labor as compared to standard shingles. Abdallah commented that in his opinion an architectural shingle does not match, to which Kanoza agreed.

Rouillard stated that it was not that he didn't want to install them but doesn't have the capacity for that \$10,000 additional expense with everything else that needs to be done and explained additional needed improvements and willingness to make concessions. Discussion followed regarding Gilbert's suggestion that with future work coming up if the Board makes an accommodation on the roof, future projects can be held to a higher standard of architecture of the building due to freeing up the cost and noted the urgency of the roof at this time.

Abdallah summed up that the Board is at this point considering the architectural grey shingle with the caveat that the applicant's future improvements on the project (home or rental) may be considered at a higher level as a concession. Discussion followed.

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Kanoza, in regards to SEQR with amended description to roof replaced with Duration Shingles by Owens Corning in quarry gray with a 50 year warranty that the Board finds no adverse environmental impact was unanimously carried and passed.

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Kanoza, regarding PB application #2018-04, 82 Court Street roof replacement to allow removing existing slate roof recognized as historic and replace with Owens Corning Duration Shingles in quarry gray that have a 50 year warranty and recognizing that future projects on the building will be held to a certain standard as agreed to by the owner to reveal certain architectural features, any damaged fascia or soffit will be replaced in-kind light color, wood for wood, of original was unanimously carried and passed.

PB#2017-14A, 38 Iowa Street

Abdallah called for applicant and Allen explained that they had been here last month with the sketch of the subdivision plan and the resubmittal for this meeting addresses all concerns from the last meeting.

Gilbert addressed for the record that question 12B on the short form SEQR about an archeological sensitive area the system automatically checks the box yes if anything is within several miles of anything archeological. Gilbert noted that there is nothing archeological on site that would cause the Board to have an environmental concern so even though the system answers it yes, the Board can realize that it's not an issue with these lots.

Abdallah opened the public hearing at 7:19. No one approached the Board. 7:20 Abdallah closed the public hearing.

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Kanoza, with regards to the short form SEQR for 2017-14A the Board finds no adverse environmental impact under the application was unanimously carried and passed.

On a motion by Ferris, seconded by Kanoza to approve PB2017-14A, 38 Iowa Street as amended in the plan was unanimously carried and passed.

PB#2018-06, 102 Miller Street

Abdallah called for applicant and Allen stated for the record that the applicant for this project is KLM Development. Discussion followed regarding submission error with SEQR noting Kenneth Mousseau as applicant and application noting KLM

Development. Gilbert stated to amend the SEQR correcting applicant as KLM Development

Gilbert addressed for the record that question 12B on the short form SEQR about an archeological sensitive area is "no" regardless that the system automatically checks the box "yes" and that they are correcting the computer. Allen explained that with the algorithm the SEQR form compares the site, tax map parcel, with a big round circle about ¼ - ½ mile. Discussion followed.

Allen stated they've complied with last month's comments and discussion explaining that they provided screening, elaborated on lighting plan and added handicap parking.

Abdallah agreed that Allen addressed most of the comments and the only concern that came up in pre-review was whether or not he could utilize the same consistent vinyl fencing both for enclosure and screening fence between the properties. Allen stated that he thought that was the same style fence they were proposing, white vinyl.

Abdallah added that another question was as you're heading back towards Miller St, the fence along the property line stops at the refuse area, whether or not it could be continued on to about the front yard setback so it basically screens the whole parking lot area. Mousseau questioned the reason for the fence and discussion followed regarding ordinance for screening requirement for parking areas from adjacent properties, the ordinance, its interpretation, variance if not complied with and accommodating neighbor.

Kanoza summarized that what they are discussing is the fence line being consistent with the fencing around the refuse area and extending the fencing to within 20 feet of the front yard setback so there'll be some openness towards Miller Street but clearly providing a screening from the other property.

Abdallah offered his opinion that he is ok with the wood fencing as long as it's all consistent.

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Kanoza regarding the short form SEQR for application 2018-06, 102 Miller Street, that the Board finds no adverse environmental impact and the SEQR is amended to note KLM Development LLC as name of applicant and the answer to 12B regarding archeological sensitive area is corrected to "no" was unanimously carried and passed

On a motion by Gilbert, seconded by Kanoza approving application PB #2018-06, 102 Miller Street, to renovate existing home and connect five (5) additional apartment units to the existing single family home via a shared utility room and adopting the Board's recommendations regarding fencing and wood fencing as long as it's uniform is acceptable around the enclosure and lot line bringing it up to the 20ft setback was unanimously carried and passed.

PB#2018-07, 127 South Peru St

Abdallah called for applicant and Gilbert verified applicant as Mousseau Development and owner as Sara Imhoff with a letter of authorization being on file for Allen to present on her behalf.

Allen explained that the comments similar to the last application from last month's meeting were addressed which included fencing being added along the parking area extending to dumpster area, a granted 10ft wide easement to MLD to run underground to the transformer on the south property line, added handicap parking area and added detail to lighting plan. Discussion followed regarding parking area screening.

Kanoza stated to Allen that on notes 2 and 6 on C101 drawing, "vinyl fence around the refuse area versus six foot tall wood fence for parking lot screening" needs to be consistent fencing.

Abdallah summarized that they would propose keeping a consistent fence style in wood and as far as extending the fence any further there is an MLD easement with an existing transformer that hinders an extension and the Board is of the opinion that there is sufficient screening for parking area as proposed.

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

On a motion by Ferris, seconded by Gilbert, to accept application 2018-07, 127 So Peru Street, with wood fencing screening for parking as submitted was unanimously carried and passed.

Frazier asked Abdallah if the Board would be hearing the application for vinyl window replacement submitted by Albert Ball. Frazier explained that the application had not been distributed to the Board as it was received after the deadline for submission for this meeting, however the owners were in the audience requesting to be heard.

Abdallah called for the Board's position to consider hearing the late application at the end of the agenda, to which Kanoza, Ferris and Abdallah were acceptable to it and Gilbert was not. Abdallah stated that the Board would hear the application with three of the four Board members present in agreement.

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 stating the revised plan correcting the parking area has been submitted to the Board for approval.

Abdallah stated that at the last meeting the presenters had elaborated that a variance was received for the depth of lot deficiencies and commented to note the actual zoning variance designation with the variance number for the setback for the depth right on the plan when bringing final plans in for signature.

Judith Plante verified that she needs from the surveyor the actual language in the variance printed on the certified survey plan, to which Abdallah confirmed.

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

On a motion by Ferris, seconded by Gilbert to approve PB#2018-05, 42 Smith Street and 53 Standish Street subdivision as submitted with proper variance language added onto the final plan was unanimously carried and passed.

PB#2018-02, 2 Pike Street

Abdallah called for applicant and Ovios began that they had been before the Board last month and there were concerns about the size of the development and talking with the applicant have submitted a downsize of the project renovating only the existing structure and there will be no new additions. The project will replace aging windows with more energy efficient modern but keeping existing wood jams but painted & cleaned up on the inside of the building and leaving the outside of the building looking identical. Ovios added that there were some concerns about the porches on the buildings and the intent is to restore all of the porches to look like the existing northerly porch with white wood spun spindles, lattice on 45 degree angle with the white band. Ovios continued that they would be removing the garage and moving the driveway to the far north end of the property getting rid of the intersection conflicts of getting in and out of the current driveway. Ovios explained details for screening, lighting, water upgrade with sprinkler system and a new sanitary sewer system. Ovios provided additional renderings for the Board to review.

Gilbert verified that the old driveway will be completely removed, to which Ovios confirmed stating that all the old asphalt will be gone, grass planted and the garage, a small dilapidated wood structure, completely gone.

Ferris questioned what kind of fence was going to be put up, to which Ovios described board on board wood fence to keep the character trying to stay away from white and go with earth tones that blend. Abdallah asked if the existing chain link fence would be removed, to which Ovios explained that they would remove any of the chain link fence on the property.

Gilbert commented on the windows as Alside Flare does not show it's divided light and Ovios described the windows as some are 6 over 6 and 2 over 2 explaining that they would keep the same that are there, 6 over 6 in front and 2 over 2 on sides and rear. Gilbert commented that the proposal shows 6 over 6 on all of them, to which Ovios stated it would be 6 over 6 and 2 over 2. Ovios explained they would get rid of the fixed glass triangular window. Discussion followed.

Ferris questioned the roof and Ovios described it as a green asphalt shingle that had been replaced at some point and is in good shape.

Gilbert verified that A1 Remodeled First Floor Plan shows deck and it should be corrected to covered porch, to which Ovios confirmed.

Abdallah requested Ovios update renderings for final plans with colors and proper notations, to which Ovios agreed stating they'll add the lattice, change the 2 over 2s to match the meeting's discussion.

Abdallah commented that there must be a lot of repointing and Ovios stated not too bad with most of it on the driveway side. Discussion followed on border color.

Abdallah questioned if some of the sills and headers were different colors and if applicant was looking to maintain the front of the building as is and paint all the rest, to which Ovios responded yes, that the intent of the paint was to try and seal them to prevent moisture from leaking through. The Board was of thought to keep consistent and the front to be maintained with a clear sealer if needed while the rest of the sills and header stripped to original with no paint, original color with clear sealer if needed to try to match the front of the building.

Abdallah inquired if Ovios had any follow through with SHPO, to which Ovios stated he was not aware of any. Discussion followed and Ovios will check into any response and the submission date.

Discussion was had on trees and landscaping on the property. Public comment included what was to be done with the trees in the back southeast corner and chimneys in bad condition. Ovios explained that the chimneys will be aesthetic only, no longer in service and blocked up.

Abdallah noted on the S3.01 board on board fencing for enclosure see detail 7 and detail 7 is a chain link, to which Ovios stated it is board on board and will correct.

Gilbert asked in regards to lighting is there anything a little more historic, to which Ovios stated that a lot of historical fixtures are lantern style too much bleeding while LED keeps a low profile. Discussion followed.

Gilbert commented that she was so happy the project was scaled down.

Abdallah opened the meeting up to public comment to which a neighbor adjoined to the property made comment that it was an improvement from the original but is still concerned that he'd be once again confronted with college housing instead of what he had hoped would have been just a residence when purchased, to which discussion continued and Ovios stated they didn't intend to rent to college.

Abdallah summarized the Board offered a number of revisions and discussion points for applicant to finalize on plans. Ovios requested a final approval with conditions, to which Abdallah stated that the Board would keep it consistent with recent site plans having conditions and required to come back before the Board with conditions met before final approval and SHPO review is still out there which the Board would like to see prior to the Board taking an action.

Discussion followed on the deadline date to submit for June's Planning Board Meeting being Friday, June 1.

Abdallah, Gilbert and Kanoza stated their approvals of the downsizing of the project.

Added Item:

35-37 Hamilton Street

Abdallah stated there was an added application to the agenda, applicant Albert Ball, property owners are Jennifer Culver and Mike Kulik for property location 35-37 Hamilton Street.

Culver explained that her contractor Albert Ball did all the paperwork but was called away for a family emergency but she will do her best to explain the project.

Culver explained that they had been working on this old house on Hamilton Street for about 20 years on and off doing what they could when they could. Culver added that they obtained a building permit for the inside and when they got to the windows they discovered problems with the 30+ years old worn out windows and thought it time to replace the 8 windows. Culver described the single screen Pella windows that will look just the same to replace the existing windows and take 4 weeks to come in. Discussion followed regarding Historic District projects referred by the Building Inspector's office to the Planning Board for approval. Culver commented that she felt it was too involved a process to just change windows that are going to look the same. The Board explained that the Historic District was adopted by the City which leaves a lot of considerations to the Board. Culver expressed her approval and was proud of the historic status but still

felt this project went too far. Kulik commented that they were having very low impact on the historic district and are just changing windows already there.

Gilbert explained about submittal deadlines and the applicants missing it for this month but was still heard at this meeting advising the applicants that anything they do to their house that needs a building permit in an historic district will need to be brought before the Board. Gilbert added that even if it had been a complete application and made the deadline, the Board needs information such as what the window looks like and the make of the window, fact sheet and samples, in order to make a complete application.

Culver continued that when purchased the house, there was a woodstove on the east side and a chimney was constructed that went up through the roof but have since replaced the roof so it's down below the roof. Culver explained that they have a very narrow driveway on that side and Cassella could not bring in a dumpster because the driveway was several inches too narrow and people have trouble driving in and out of there. Culver explained that they want to take down the chimney which isn't attached to the building and doesn't belong there and then referred to photos showing that the brick had not been cut to set it in at all.

Culver expressed her concern and frustration about how long the process will take explaining they've torn out the lap and plaster that was in bad shape exposing all of the frames of the windows right now and will have to close them up. Discussion followed regarding the difference between replacement of a window that go into an existing frame and an entirely new window and that it's not clear what the project is because Ball is unavailable to ask.

After Culver expressed her frustration again and her concern that she will lose her contractor, Albert Ball because of the time it's taking to get approved by the Board. Ferris commented to Culver that he didn't think it would be difficult to approve but she needs to bring a fact sheet of exactly which windows are going in because the Board doesn't want approve something that they don't know what it is and she should include the chimney as part of the project that's being done.

Gilbert advised Culver that the application deadline is Friday for the next meeting so if she wants to be on the agenda she needs to get it in and include the Pella information spec sheet on the windows explaining if they are to be a replacement or whole new windows.

On a motion by Kanoza, seconded by Ferris, unanimously carried and passed, the Board adjourned at 9:06pm.