



Village of Saranac Lake

39 Main Street, Suite 9 Saranac Lake, NY 12983-2294

Phone: (518) 891 – 4150 x235

Email: comdev@saranaclakeny.gov

Web Site: www.saranaclakeny.gov

DEVELOPMENT BOARD MEETING MINUTES

2/21/2023

ATTENDANCE

Development Board Members:

Elias Pelletieri, Chairperson, Present

Adam Harris, Present in a non-voting capacity

Rick Weber, Present

Paul Herrmann, Present

Meg Cantwell-Jackson, Present

Bill Domenico, Alternate, Present

Dan Reilly, Alternate, Excused

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Elias Pelletieri opened the meeting at 5:02pm.

Motion to approve February 7, 2023 Regular Meeting Minutes by Paul Herrmann, seconded by Rick Weber.

Pelletieri asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Weber, yes; Meg Cantwell-Jackson, yes; Herrmann, yes; Bill Domenico, yes; and Pelletieri, yes. All in favor, meeting minutes approved.

II. ITEMS FOR BOARD ACTION

1) Application of: Ferruzza, Site Plan Review, 11 Woodruff Street

Stephen Ferruzza, applicant, stated that he worked with his project engineer and made a few changes to what is before the Board tonight for his Site Plan. He stated that the outdoor area is drawn out to include the side stairwell, he described the outdoor seating area, and he noted where the garbage is now located with screening on all sides.

Pelletieri noted that the building foot print is distinguishable from the property lines and thanked the applicant for correcting that.

Konkoski asked the applicant if the rear deck is existing, and if the proposal is to change the dimensions as it exists now to what is on the Site Plan.

Ferruzza stated that it will be an updated rear deck.

Weber stated that there is a sloped driveway and that there is a slight change in elevation from one side of the property to the other, and asked if the deck will be at level from front to back of the property.

Ferruzza stated that yes, it will be.

Konkoski asked if any portion of the deck or garbage storage area will be at level with the driveway.

Ferruzza stated that the deck is above the driveway and showed where the change, or level up, will occur on the Site Plan.

Pelletieri asked for any additional comments from the Board. He addressed the applicant about the next step in the process of working with the Village, which is to submit for a building permit. He asked for a motion from the Board.

Motion to approve Site Plan Review by Herrmann, seconded by Cantwell-Jackson.

Pelletieri asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Weber, yes; Cantwell-Jackson, yes; Herrmann, yes; Domenico, yes; and Pelletieri, yes. All in favor, project approved

2) Application of: Allott, Area Variance, 644 Lake Flower Avenue

Pelletieri introduced the reasoning for the applicant seeking an area variance on a parcel that the Development Board had seen for a Site Plan Review two weeks prior. He stated that the three front yards, created by the parcel fronting on Turtle Pond Rd., both to the southeast and to the northwest, and on Lake Flower Ave., present an issue with the Site Plan as it was drawn up, and that the Board is here to evaluate that issue and whether a variance to the rule is warranted.

Domenico asked about the proposed screening of a parking area on the parcel.

Konkoski stated that in conversations with the applicant, the use of hybrid, berm screening and utilizing both earth features and plantings on top was mentioned. She added that the applicant had indicated in a conversation that she will try to do her best to match other screening along that stretch of roadway on Lake Flower Ave.

Weber asked if there was more detail in the application submitted since the Board first saw this project.

Konkoski stated that the Site Plan that was submitted on February 14th is before the Board here tonight.

Cantwell-Jackson stated that she recalls a section of the Code that dictated all native plantings to be used in landscaping.

Konkoski stated that in her conversations with the applicant, that was the applicant's intent, to use native species for all new plantings.

Domenico asked about any potential requirement, if this Board sees reason or if it is dictated in the Code, to merge the two parcels.

Weber stated that he recalls the County's tax map listing a different owner on each parcel.

Konkoski made a note that she will relay to the applicant to check with the County about the merging of the parcels, as that what she has been in the practice of, deferring applicants to the County.

Weber asked about the criteria for the Area Variance and the detail that was provided by the applicant for a stated need for requesting this variance. He stated that the Variance, as he understands it, is the applicant's proposed parking areas on this parcel do not meet the requirement for locating parking in the side or rear yard.

Konkoski stated that it is up to this Board to look at the application and how the information is presented in the revised Site Plan to determine whether or not this need for a variance is 'self-created.'

Cantwell-Jackson stated that this Board cannot know whether the applicant was aware that the parcel she purchased had the frontage, as defined in the Code, to look like three front yards. She stated that the parking area as it is proposed is not out of character for other parking at businesses you see on Lake Flower Ave.

Pelletieri stated that he thinks the same thing, and that this Board has made exceptions in the past. He stated that the location of designated parking has come up in recent years at the Board level and that they have always had good conversations about it and acknowledged that the Code does not fit for best practices on every parcel in the Village.

Konkoski stated that the applicant has now joined the meeting and posed the Board members' earlier questions to her about plantings and the merging of lots.

Stacey Allott, applicant and owner, stated that the screening and additional landscaping will be comprised of all native species and that intends to contact the County.

Weber asked the applicant if, on the eastern part of the parcel, the intention is to create a loading or unloading space or, if the public will recognize that as more parking.

Allott addressed the Board to state that her intent is to keep it as a pull-through area.

Domenico encouraged the applicant to add signage.

Konkoski stated that the next time this Board meets they will hold a public hearing on the Area Variance for this project, then the Board can decide on approvals for this project, which involves an Area Variance and a Site Plan Review.

III. OLD BUSINESS

IV. NEW BUSINESS

Public Hearings for Site Plan Review- The Board discussed what changes have been made to the Code in recent years regarding public notification of neighbors and a public notice in the paper for Site Plan Review.

Konkoski will make edits to the 'Public Hearings for Site Plan Applications Memo,' but any changes to the language in the Code will not be immediate. Board members discussed the process of providing proof to the Community Development Department of public notification to neighbors and how the burden of proof falls on the applicant.

Harris acknowledged that this can be a lengthy list of neighbors depending on what district your property is in. Pelletieri stated that there isn't any push back to change it the way it has been done, at least that he's heard from applicants.

Cantwell-Jackson stated that its part of the process and that applicants are aware of that.

Konkoski gave a brief overview of upcoming topics/projects for this Board. She noted that this ties into the public hearings discussion as to determining when a potential application is a complete application, which sets the clock on public notification if a hearing is required before any approvals (such as, subdivision applications, site plan review, special use permit and/or variance applications). She added that it is not uncommon for site plan applications to require multiple meetings because it is often the case that the planning board determines when an application is complete, however, in Saranac Lake, the Development Code Administrator has that authority to determine when an application is complete.

Board Members briefly discussed the Code requirement for continuing education credit hours and signed up for a training to be held in Saranac Lake in April.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn the meeting by Herrmann, seconded by Domenico.

Pelletieri asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Weber, yes; Cantwell-Jackson, yes; Herrmann, yes; Domenico, yes; and Pelletieri, yes. All in favor, meeting adjourned.

Meeting was officially adjourned at 6:40pm.

Meeting Minutes prepared by Cassandra Hopkins, Administrative Assistant.