Board members present: Robert Mastrantoni – Chairperson, Patricia Dow, Dean Howland,

Chuck Luke, Dan Wolfield. **Board members absent**:

Others present: Carol Sullivan (Secretary), Doug Frost (Code Enforcement Officer), Dan Brown (Architectural Consultant to the Planning Board), John Carr, Salim Amersi, Moech Amersi, Dan Neary (Surfside Architect), Tom Hutchins (Hutchins Engineering – engineer to the Surfside), Patty Kirkpatrick, Dave Stanton, Derek Shepanzyk, Jeff Rogeau, Dave Kenny, Roz Wallace, Michael Consuelo

TAX MAP: 264.06-1-1

OWNER/APPLICANT: JOHN CARR

ADDRESS: 1 CANADA ST

ZONE: COMMERCIAL MIXED USE SITE PLAN APPLICATION: # 1422

The Board discussed the engineered stormwater plan which was provided by John's engineer Dennis MacElroy. John explained he is still in the process of cleaning up the property and has added vegetation where he can.

John explained the vegetation around West Brook is pretty dense. He has removed some dead trees and some trees in densely populated areas in order for the remaining trees to have enough space, air and sunlight.

Dan W. commented that the property looks pretty vacant and asked if more trees and vegetation could be planted. John mentioned he has installed new plantings and he is continuously upgrading the property where he can however, what the Board is seeing today is not the overall plan for the property. At some point he plans to develop this property further with an addition to the building and at that time another stormwater plan will have to be presented.

Chuck commented he is comfortable with the plan as submitted this evening and his initial concern was at the front of the building where the pitch of the roof will be changing. He added John has addressed this concern to his satisfaction.

Patricia asked if the current buffer along West Brook would be disturbed when John starts to develop the property in the future. John said the buffer along West Brook is very dense right now. It is likely some trees should be cleared to provide a healthier environment for any remaining trees. Again, John said he would address stormwater requirements as necessary when he actually develops the property for his future plans.

Patricia asked if trees could be planted near the Shoreline Boat Sales property line. John commented the area where his property meets the Shoreline Boat Sales property is a separate piece of property and the stormwater management in that area has been completed according to what was approved at a previous Planning Board meeting.

Robert commented that John has done a lot of work on the property with regard to stormwater management however, as the property is developed in the future more stormwater management should

be considered. As he develops the property, John said more stormwater management will be added as necessary.

Doug asked the Board to include a statement in the motion that he be allowed on the property as necessary to review the stormwater management and to ensure that it is functioning as it should be. John indicated this arrangement is acceptable to him.

MOTION: Chuck Luke made a motion to approve the stormwater management plan as presented contingent upon Doug Frost periodically entering the property to ensure the stormwater plan is working as planned.

2ND MOTION: Dean Howland

Robert Mastrantoni	Patricia Dow	Dean Howland	Chuck Luke	Dan Wolfield
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye

Aye = 4 Nay = 0 Motion carried

TAX MAP: 251.14-3-26

OWNER/APPLICANT: SALIM AMERSI

ADDRESS: 400 CANADA ST ZONE: COMMERCIAL RESORT

APPLICATION - SITE PLAN #1465 AND SHORT FORM SEQR

Applicant is proposing demolition of the center aisle building including the office and rebuilding a new office, rooms, suites, meeting rooms and an underground parking area.

Robert pointed out to Salim that the new law and guidelines for new construction allows for a maximum 10 foot setback. Robert mentioned to Dan N. that in a previous document he (Dan N.) had indicated that all the requirements had been met. Robert said the Board has agreed to continue their review however, they would have to withhold approval until the applicant applies for a variance and the variance is approved by the ZBA.

Dan N. addressed the Board commenting that his understanding of the setback is the building line and he interprets the building line as the greatest projection of the building. Pointing to the building plan Dan N. indicated that the greatest projection of the building penetrates the 10 foot setback by a foot. He added the Zoning Ordinance does not say building face it says building line and the Zoning Ordinance defines the building line as the greatest projection of the building. Pointing again to the plan Dan N. indicated that the canopy pierces the envelope by at least a foot. Patricia pointed out the Zoning Ordinance just says "building" – "where buildings are set back" the area between the building. Dan N. again said the building is the furthest projection of the projecting roof. He added if someone were talking about setbacks that projecting roof – the eave line - would have to be within the setback because the projecting roof is the building line.

The Board discussed the setback issue with Doug and determined the building is within the 10 foot setback envelope and that they (the Board) can proceed with their review and a Variance would not be necessary.

At this point Robert asked to continue the review starting with the plans for the garage, # 101. Van accessible parking spaces have been moved to the outside. Without the van accessible parking spaces the NYS Code sets the minimum head-room as 7 feet and this garage will have head-room of 7

feet 6 inches. Some areas of the garage will have a greater clearance but NYS Code measures from the minimum. The light fixtures are mounted flush against the ceiling and will not affect the height clearance.

Dan W. asked about the left side of the interior of the building near the stairs. Dan N. explained this area consists of two stair towers and the elevator. There are also utility rooms in these areas which are keyed access only.

The total number of parking spaces in the garage is 33 spaces including the two handicapped spaces. The spaces are 21 feet deep by 10 feet wide and the two-way aisle is 24 feet wide.

There are condensers in the garage which will provide ventilation for the garage. Dan N. explained the ventilation and carbon monoxide sensors are mandated by NYS Code.

Patricia asked about stormwater entering the garage. There is a trench drain at the base of the ramp just before the entrance to the garage. Water brought into the garage from vehicles will just dry out on the slab flooring of the garage. If the floor does not dry out the water will flow to a sump. A sump is being used because of the possibility of another substance flowing into the stormwater system which isn't stormwater, i.e. oil, etc. Dan W. asked if there were any other basin drains which could accommodate a large amount of snow melting off of a car. Tom Hutchins mentioned the floor is sloped to the sump so anything that melts will trickle down to the sump. Once the water level in the sump reaches a certain height it can be pumped away.

There is an overhead door on the garage which will likely remain open most of the time. The garage and the egress are designed so that the door can remain open – the roof of the garage and floor of the first floor will be well insulated. There will be a double slab between the garage roof and the upper level. There will be a 5 inch structural slab then 3 inches of insulation and then a 4 inch slab on top of the insulation.

Patricia asked about the number of parking spaces for the site in total. Dan N. responded they have only looked at the parking within the area they are working on. Because the Village Code recently increased the parking requirement they have looked at that only for the area within the envelope of this new construction which is 50 rooms to 50 rooms. Tom H. mentioned the parking numbers are described on plan S2. Tom H. indicated there are currently 148 spaces. When this new work is completed there will be 152. Dan W. asked about the previous discussion regarding the requirement for 55 spaces – 50 rooms plus an additional 10%. Tom H. responded that within the construction envelope they have identified 53 above ground spaces plus 33 spaces in the garage. Patricia asked if these spaces are all dedicated to the new building. Tom H. responded they are not because without assigned spaces they cannot police who is parking where.

Doug mentioned the Village Fire Department asked for a separate sprinkler system in the garage. Dan N. explained it is essentially separate as only the sprinklers in the area of the fire will go off. I. e. if there is a fire in the garage only the sprinklers in the area of the fire will go off and not the sprinklers on the first floor, etc.

At this point the Board reviewed the plans one floor up (1st floor) from the garage. Dan N. went over the details of the first floor diagram. The Board asked for details on the height of the lobby and the transition to the rooms. There is a handicap lift as well as stairs. The entire lobby is at street level.

Patricia asked if there is access from the lobby to the rooms – no, the customer has to leave the lobby in order to gain access to their room and this is no different than the current arrangement.

Dan N. presented the details for the 2^{nd} floor. Meeting room restrooms on this floor also service the meeting rooms on the third floor.

Dan N. presented the details for the 3^{rd} floor. There are some mechanical rooms on the third floor which vent to the roof however, the roof mechanicals are behind the highest parapet and cannot be seen. The third floor has a large porch area on the south side. The rooms on the third floor can access this porch through individual room doors. The rooms on the third floor also have a balcony for each room on the north side. There will be plantings on the third floor porch area -7 large pots will hold small trees 5-6 feet high and approximately 1" to $1\frac{1}{2}$ " caliper. The trees will likely be Ficus trees or something similar.

The Board reviewed the roof plan. The tallest parapet on the building is within the Village/APA envelope of 40 feet. The tallest parapet is 39 ½ feet. Pointing to the plan Dan N. indicated where the mechanical equipment will be located and mentioned that it cannot be seen and is below the parapet line. The elevator penthouse will be located on the roof and is also below the parapet line. Dan N. described the roof drains to the Board. The stormwater will go out through the interior of the building through the parking garage to the north and south side of the building to the stormwater retention basins. There is no public access to the roof. Patricia asked about the height of the elevator and Dan N. responded that it is about 2 feet below the perimeter parapet. He added that it is not a tall "penthouse" structure; the lift portion of the elevator does not go to the roof because there is no public access to the roof. The portion that comes above the roof is the portion that houses the mechanicals and cables. Patricia asked how the elevator projects above the roof that it is sitting in and Dan N. responded that it is approximately 4 feet. Patricia then asked about the parapet height at that point and Dan N. responded that it is 18 inches below the highest parapet around it. It is totally hidden behind the parapet.

The Board reviewed the East and West elevations. Pointing to the Canada St. elevation Dan N. pointed out that one of the columns has been moved at the request of the structural engineer. The two lights, one on each side of the front door have been removed. Dean asked about the color of the railings and Dan N. responded that they will be blue and beige according to the samples provided. The third floor railing is stainless steel.

Dan W. asked if the Board could look at the pictures that were provided showing the new building set into the street scape. Dan W. expressed concern (again) about the overall mass of the building and now that the Board has been provided with the street scape pictures (which were just provided for the first time) the mass is more apparent because of the surrounding buildings. He feels the new building does not compliment the other buildings. He feels the front of the building needs work and provided suggestions such as, bump outs, railings, more color to the top of the building front, maybe recess the upper blocks, maybe add a cantilever using another red line, more windows. Dan W. added he feels something should be done to soften the "big block" look and that he's just trying to come up with some ideas that would soften the look and make it fit into the streetscape according to the Code. Dan N. responded that nothing currently fits into the current Code and some thought needs to be given where the Village is going with regard to the current Code.

Dean added he feels the landscaping should be part of the building as well, the parking lots on the side have to be screened. He feels the mass of the building can be softened by adding another tree or two. One could be placed on the north side in the area right in front of one column. A tree in this area would soften the effect of the mass of the building. Dean suggested the area where the exit is could be made smaller and a tree could be added in this area which would soften the visual impact. Tom H. pointing to the plans asked "in this space, in this triangle" and Dean said yes. On the south side there is one large tree and there is no other vegetation underneath. Dean suggested softening this area as well. This would soften the view as one drives by.

Patricia added when she reviews the regulations, the building is designed around the style of the sign, but the building obscures the sign. The color choice and the mass dominate the streetscape. Patricia added that maybe over time many of the buildings will be replaced and then maybe this building won't be out of character but right now it is the building's mass that is seen and not the sign. The mass of the building does not fit in with the rest of the Village and Patricia added that she understands that the buildings along this part of Canada Street are older however, she still thinks the overall effect has to fit in because no one knows if and when the other buildings in the area will be changed. She added that she feels having the ground level and the second floor the same increases the looming feeling and doesn't contribute to a pedestrian friendly scape. Reading from the Code she pointed out that the ground level shall be distinct from the upper stories. Patricia also mentioned she feels the scale of the covered entry is vehicle friendly and not pedestrian friendly. She also pointed out that the Code states parapets shall provide a cap or similar element to demonstrate that the upper edge is the top of the building and she does not feel this distinction has been made.

Chuck mentioned that he feels the view from the south is excellent and is what he expected and he thinks it does fit in. From the North Chuck mentioned the view seems a little stark. Chuck suggested this may be because of the view the picture was taken from – it seems like you're looking up at it rather than from a streetscape view. Chuck added perhaps Dean's suggestion of adding a tree would soften this view.

Dan N. suggested adding another window on the third floor elevation on the south side. Dan N. pointed out that due to software constraints the lines between the panels appear a lot harsher than they will actually be when the building is constructed. The "skin" of the building will be a lot softer than how it appears in the pictures provided.

Salim mentioned that the front balcony will have hanging flower baskets and this will soften the look as well.

The Board continued to discuss the mass of the building, the appearance and what can be done to soften the look of the building. Robert asked Dan N. if windows could be added to the south side and what other changes can be made. He added the ultimate goal is when someone is coming down the street they don't see a "box". Dean suggested increasing the size of the sign planter at the northwest corner and bring it out to the curb line. Dan B. mentioned adding two additional windows at the third floor line. Chuck suggested adding a red line above the proposed windows on the North side and this would carry the same theme that is in the front of the building around the side of the building. Dan B. agreed this would break up the "box" look. Tom H. mentioned there is one window already in place in this area and they would add two more windows and run the red line over the top of all three. Pointing to the plans Dan N. indicated where the windows would be added and the canopy would be wrapped all the way around to the far side of the last window.

At this point the Board began to review Site Plan. S1 Shows the existing buildings.

- S2 Compares the original configuration with the new proposed configuration. Dan W. asked for signage indicating the aisle on the north side of the building is one-way. The sign should be posted on the northwest corner.
- S3 Layout. A parking space on the furthest northwest corner has been removed to add landscaping. This is shown on the landscaping plan and on S-2. Patricia asked about the parking spaces in this area and Tom H. responded by pointing to the number of spaces within the construction envelope that has been defined on the plans. Total number of parking spaces within the envelope is 53 above ground and 33 in the garage.
- S4 Grading and drainage. Tom H. pointed out there is not a lot of grading needed because the site is pretty flat. The sloped egress to the garage is heated concrete. Tom H. went over the various stormwater management structures that will be installed as depicted on this plan. Dan W. asked how often the system has to be cleaned and maintained and Tom H. responded that all the structures are deep sump structures there is about 2 feet of bed below the inlet pipe; the catch basins should be cleaned every year or every other year. Pointing to the plans Tom explained, P = pond. L= link. 4L= sum of 2L and 3L.

Landscaping and site lighting.

Lighting - There are three LED pole mounts along the south line. There are Ballard lights by the front door. Dan B. commented on the exterior lighting. Referring to the three LED pole lights and the flush building lights Dan B. asked if the light tone of the two devices is similar in color tones. Salim and Dan N. indicated the light tones can be matched. Dan B. commented about the flush mounted wall light. If someone exits their room that light is shining out and illuminating the railing and sidewalls. Dan B. expressed concern that some of that light isn't going back on the wall of the unit that was just exited. Dan N. explained there is a wash that comes out of the sides of the light. Dan B. said his concern is, if all the lights are turned on it will look like headlights or spot lights if the back wall that they are mounted on isn't equally illuminated. Dan B. suggested using the traditional "can" fixture or a bowl fixture which typically has more illumination on the wall. Dan W. suggested mounting the lights on the sidewall so they are not casting an illumination out. Dean mentioned these lights are very bright however, Salim said they were not and they are intended to be a soft warm light. Dean indicated these particular lights will look like headlights along the entire side of the building. The lights are about 11 inches in diameter and about 1 ½" deep; the glass not transparent. Dean mentioned his preference is to see a horizontal shield light. Both Salim and Dan N. indicated they imagined the light to look similar to a porthole where there isn't a lot of light illuminating out of it and that they do not want it to look like a headlight but rather look like a very soft light. There is no lighting in the canopy. A201 depicts the lighting along the balcony and Dan N. mentioned this is indirect lighting that just washes over the surface of the stone. It's only at the first floor and is a continuous light along the walking path. Dan W. suggested breaking up the lighting so that it doesn't appear as one long continuous light. Dean mentioned this type of lighting is typical of what is seen along walkways. Dan N. mentioned there is light provided for the walking surface and glow on the surface of the stone. This lighting starts after the two side entrances and runs to the end of the balcony on the north and south side of the building. Dan N. suggested they submit something for the different fixtures at a later date and Salim agreed they would find something.

APPROVED

LAKE GEORGE VILLAGE 26 OLD POST ROAD SEPTEMBER 17, 2014 PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

<u>Landscaping</u> - Tom H. pointed out where the trees have been added at the request of the Board at the previous meeting. Dan asked for clarification of the trees labelled LL and CP3. Tom H. said the Lindens (LL) will have a 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ inch caliper about 10 feet high and will grow to 40 – 50 high with a span of about 30 – 40 feet. They are a flowering tree. The other is a flowering pear tree (which will be approximately 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ inch caliper and is 25 – 35 feet high with a 15 foot span. There will be Arborvitae in this area as well and these trees should grow above the Arborvitae. Dean and Dan N. discussed the possibility of adding an evergreen tree to the area ("former blacktop area") which will be enlarged. Dean also asked if something could be added to the northwest corner – pointing to the plan – he asked if it could be softened maybe using shrubs.

<u>Colors</u> – Robert asked for the names of the colors for the samples provided. Dan N. mentioned that the panels that are presented this evening have been painted to match the colors on all the other Surfside buildings and the names of the colors on the back of the panel are not the actual name. The red strip is "redwood" which is a deep red. Railings will match the blue tone but will be glossy. Stone = south bay quartz. The edge of the balconies will be a dark gray concrete. Taupe = window frames, sashes, muntins and room door frames.

Short form SEQRA- Part 2.

Questions 1 - 11 all = "no or small impact may occur".

Q1. Patricia indicated she would answer yes to #1 because she doesn't think this project complies with the zoning (220-42). Chuck – no. Dan – no Dean – no Robert – no.

MOTION: Chuck Luke made a motion to accept the SEQRA with a negative declaration. #1 in Part 1 was changed from a Yes to a No.

2ND MOTION: Dean Howland

Robert Mastrantoni	Patricia Dow	Dean Howland	Chuck Luke	Dan Wolfield
Aye	Nay	Aye	Aye	Aye

Aye = 4 Nay = 1 Motion carried

At this point Robert polled the Board on whether or not they can move this forward to a motion. Dean indicated there were some items needed. Patricia is not OK with the building. Chuck is OK with the plan.

Dan W. is OK with the plan to include the additional items as discussed. He also requested a diagram of the roof plan showing the drains for the file.

Chuck went over the additional items to be presented at the next meeting and final drawing(s) submitted.

- Planting in the northwest corner an addition of a tree.
- Landscaping around the sign area to be enlarged.
- Addition of a one-way sign.
- Actual color names.
- Add two windows on the north side.
- Wrap the canopy around the north side and over the windows.
- Change the wall mounted lighting on the south wall to something that has more down lighting.
 Dan B. suggested the applicant come back to the Board with a few choices as there are many lights that can be used.
- Copy of the roof plan.

APPROVED

LAKE GEORGE VILLAGE 26 OLD POST ROAD SEPTEMBER 17, 2014 PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

Fire hydrant on the northwest corner – Zoning office oversees this.

The Board agreed Salim needs to return with updated pictures/plans of the revisions/changes as discussed this evening.

The Site Plan application remains open; next review is scheduled for October 15, 2014.

TAX MAP: 264.06-2-31 & 32 - DID NOT ATTEND THE MEETING THIS EVENING.

OWNER/APPLICANT: MICHAEL RYNN/LAKESIDE HOSPITALITY

ADDRESS: DIESKAU ST

ZONE: RESIDENTIAL MIXED USE

APPLICATION - SITE PLAN #1459 AND SHORT FORM SEQR

Applicant is proposing construction of two, two-unit townhome buildings totaling 4 units in all. Applicant may attend tonight's meeting for discussion purposes only.

MINUTES:

AUGUST 20, 2014 (RM, PD, DH, DW)

MOTION: Dean Howland made a motion to approve the minutes of August 20, 2014 with the correction as noted.

2ND MOTION: Dan Wolfield

Robert Mastrantoni	Patricia Dow	Dean Howland	Chuck Luke	Dan Wolfield
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye

Aye = 5 Nay = 0 Motion carried

Respectfully submitted, *Carol Sullivan*October 1, 2014