

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COHOES PLANNING BOARD HELD VIRTUALLY ON  
APRIL 12, 2021 at 6:30PM**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**      **Mr. Jack Carroll, Vice Chairperson**  
                                  **Mr. Joseph Nadeau**  
                                  **Ms. Stephanie Couture**  
                                  **Ms. Kizzy Williams**

**ABSENT:**                    **Mr. Mark DeFruscio, Chairperson**  
                                  **Mr. Bob Bucher**

**ALSO PRESENT:**        **Joseph Seman-Graves, City Planner**  
                                  **Sharon Butler, Administrative Assistant**

Vice Chair Carroll called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.  
Roll Call

**CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 8, 2021 MEETING**

Vice Chair Carroll; first order of business is the approval of the meeting minutes from March 8, 2021. Do any members have questions, amendments?

Member Couture; I make a motion to accept the minutes as presented.

Member Nadeau; I'll 2<sup>nd</sup>

	YES	NO
Bob Bucher	ABSENT	
Joseph Nadeau	X	
Mark DeFruscio	ABSENT	
Jack Carroll	X	
Stephanie Couture	X	
Kizzy Williams	ABSTAIN	

**CONSIDERATION OF A REVIEW OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR 178-182 ONTARIO STREET**

Vice Chair Carroll; next item is consideration of a review of a draft environmental impact statement for 178-182 Ontario Street. Joe can you give us an overview of where we are at?

Joe Seman-Graves; Joe went through the schedule of events and where the application stands now. (the outline of the steps taken and future steps was on the screen) At the March 2020 Planning Board meeting the board started the SEQR process, letters were sent out to other interested agencies. Receiving no comments from other agencies at the May 2020 Planning Board meeting the board declared itself lead agency for this project. At the July 2020 meeting the Board determined that there may be a significant impact on the environment which initiated the applicant to develop an Environmental Impact Statement. The draft scoping document is based on the initial scoping items that the board sent in July as well as comments from the public that have been received. The applicant has taken all comments and concerns and addressed them. At tonight's meeting the board should review the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and either accept it as submitted or they can ask for revisions. If accepted this will start the 60 day review period and the document will be posted for citizen review and comments.

Vice Chair Carroll; is the applicant here with us?

Jesse Batus introduced himself and said he also had with him Senior Project Manager John Montaye.

Member Couture; I have a question. I'm doing the calculations for the number of units and I keep coming up with 35 not 36 as shown.

Mr. Batus; it was probably a clerical error as they are looking at 36 units.

Vice Chair Carroll; any other questions from board members? Being none, it was opened up for public comments

Daniel DeChiaro; 114 Washington Avenue. Is this project going to need a variance, it's going to need a variance.

Joe Seman-Graves; no sir that is not correct, no variances are required.

Mr. DeChiaro; ok even better. So a couple of things, we're adding 36 units ok on to the city public sewer and public water system is that correct?

Vice Chair Carroll; yes

Mr. DeChiaro; ok I'm on the island and I would ask all these boards along with the city council, the city planning, zoning, every board that's affiliated with the city to please take a look at our sewer system ok because when it rains hard I get water in my basement and everybody down here on Third Street does as well, They talked to Rodney, talked to Al talked to all the folks, so we're adding 36 units when we have these problems that exist. Now as far as I know these types of projects should not move forward if they're going to adversely impact or add more adversity or over adversity to systems that are already taxed.

Vice Chair Carroll; you are breaking up sir

Mr. DeChiaro; ok I'm here

Vice Chair Carroll; ok go ahead

Mr. DeChiaro; ok so we're adding 36 units to an already overburdened system ok, are we going to do anything about that? Is that anywhere in the plans, to address what's already going on along with the 90 units that are going in down on Delaware Ave. ok so we keep adding and we're not upgrading and it's very concerning to me.

Joe Seman-Graves; sir, not to interject but we're actually are upgrading as part of this. You'll notice at the 90 Delaware project down on the island there's currently a sewer separation project occurring. So whenever a new building or a new development puts in more than 2,500 gallons into our system they have to do a sewer offset of more than 4 times that to address the problem you're bringing up. So when it does rain heavily the storm water and rain water go into the same pipe.

Mr. DeChiaro; well we'll....

Joe Seman-Graves; I'm sorry sir?

Mr. DeChiaro; we'll see if that works and I appreciate that information. Since you brought up the 90 units or maybe I did, but I'm going to go back to them. That waterfront property and I wanna, I hope we learned a lesson because quite honestly these boards are supposed to be in place to protect the tax payers and the folks of Cohoes right?

Vice Chair Carroll; right

Mr. DeChiaro; I couldn't agree more. Now when we have a 90 unit waterfront property...

Vice Chair Carroll; can I interject here? This is off topic from what we're trying to accomplish.

Mr. DeChiaro; this is public comment, let me get my thoughts out.

Vice Chair Carroll; of this project.

Mr. DeChiaro; listen this is public comment sir, ok when we have a 30 year pilot ok with a 90 unit waterfront property a 30 year pilot is \$30,000 a year that means the City is getting about \$9,000 a year from a 90 unit waterfront property, we're not doing what this board or other boards are supposed to be doing for the tax payers of this City. The tax payers subsidize that project ok, it's not fair to us. 30 year pilot the school district will get 60% of that pilot, that's about \$19,000 a year, 90 units. It cost the tax payer anywhere from \$10-\$12,000 for general ed and if it's a special education student....

Vice Chair Carroll; again sir if you can bring it back to the project that we're dealing with tonight...

Mr. DeChiaro; well I'm going tie in the project that we're dealing with tonight

Vice Chair Carroll; ok

Mr. DeChiaro; because I'm not happy that these projects don't pay their fair share ok? When I take a look at, when I see the development going on and what it takes that we're levying to these places, it's not fair to the taxpayers ok, that's how I'm tying it in this project that is going on and is up for consideration ok, they need to pay their fair share and I'm probably going to be on and I'm going to make the same comment every time because people need to understand what happened down on Delaware Avenue ok, because that can't happen again, it's not fair ok, I'm a taxpayer in the City and it's not fair ok. I also have someone else here that would also like to make a comment, if you may hold for her consideration.

Joe Seman-Graves; if she could just say her name thank you

Yup, hi my name is Jacklyn DeChiaro and I'm at 114 Washington Avenue; so first I'd like to look at what the mission statement of the planning board is. Which is to ensure that the development proposed in the city is compatible with the

orderly development of the immediate neighborhood and surrounding areas that is being proposed right now for development and not discourage the appropriate development or lessen the value of other parcels of land in that vicinity. Do the long time homeowners on Pershing Avenue, will this be good for their value? Do they feel it will be good for the character and aesthetics of their homes and their neighborhood? I'm 6 blocks away and I say no. We boast and boast about being an old mill town, do all these huge buildings contribute to that historic aesthetic? No. Over the past years since 2002 we've had endless plans and studies and report done; Hudson River Park, Rte. 470 studies, Urban Waterfront, Van Schaick Island transportation just to name a few and there's endless pages on how to best develop responsibly our waterfront areas and neighborhoods, I went to the music hall in 2017 to give my suggestions on the comprehensive study. If you open the comprehensive study plan that is on our website right now, there's a picture of comments from the 6<sup>th</sup> ward, not mine but somebody else, that states; no more buildings especially across from the pond, leave green spaces, there are too many apartments, you're destroying the island. A year after that study was complete, the Island became home to yet again another multi apartment complex, Hudson Square with another 165 units, and that same study the community identified community character as the most important value to preserve. This project introduces a much larger land use than any other in that area on Ontario Street, community character will definitely be impacted. In that same comprehensive plan it states that vacant and abandoned property should be targeted as community gardens, public spaces, plantings and community events. Another part of the plan says we the City should create public waterfront accesses and parks to preserve open spaces. We have miles of waterfront with no public access. Our neighboring communities, Waterford, Watervliet, and Troy all have beautiful community parks for their citizens to enjoy. Cohoes has none, we sell it off to developers with no benefits to the taxpayers. This is waterfront property. During the 470 study completed in 2002, it looked at traffic and I heard you say earlier that there's parts of the plan that has traffic in it, and I did not see it yet, along Ontario Street to 787 and this is in 2002, the report states, there is a significant amount of vehicular traffic through this area which presents both opportunity and threat for future development. While the high number of travelers may be potential customers for area retailers and service providers, that heavy traffic flow presents a significant safety concern for pedestrians and bicyclists, that was 2002. Since that report finding significant traffic on that street we have added 222 units from Waterview, 105 from Admirals Walk and 140 from Captains Lookout. We have 90 more units going in on Delaware Avenue. Are we even considering what the 2002 study found of significant safety concerns for our pedestrians? The kids walk to Van Schaick grade school every day, kids walk to the middle school and to the high school every day. Are we concerned for their safety as we continue to put more and more apartments in? Now this is a mixed use transit corridor location and I remember back in July this was pointed out that one of the requirements was that there was retail space on the ground floor. Has that been changed that there's a retail space now being proposed?

Vice Chair Carroll; Joe?

Joe Seman-Graves; is that a question, I'm sorry. They did move their offices there to have a store front atmosphere but there's not a commercial in that sense.

Ms. DeChiaro; so there's no retail ok. So that goes against again one of our plans, one of our big projects we did in the City that designates this a mixed use transit corridor needing to have retail space on the ground floor. So my final comment is and again it comes from our comprehensive plan that was completed and adopted by our City in 2017, that zoning, site plan review and subdivision regulations are the 3 regulatory methods of implementing the comprehensive plan by controlling future land use. Many communities use these tools to prevent unwanted development and its undesirable side effects. Why do we, this City continue to have boards, plans and studies completed and then not follow through on their recommendations? It makes you wonder who benefited, certainly not the property owners of this City of Van Schaick Island. We do not need another multi-unit complex in Cohoes. Thank you.

Vice Chair Carroll; you're welcome. Anybody else out there, concerns, comments, considerations?

Um yes, Jack Carroll, Justin Alesio of 105 Washington Avenue.

Vice Chair Carroll; how are you Justin?

Mr. Alesio; I'm doing well how are you?

Vice Chair Carroll; good

Mr. Alesio; umm I share a lot of the same concerns as I'm sure you know and everybody else's concerns. I feel like that's a terrible corridor for another 36 units. I'm actually amazed that it would even fit there. The traffic will be even more atrocious than it is, not to mention our school system here, Van Schaick grade school is tapped. It cannot be expanded, there's nothing else they can do with it except for try to cram more and more kids in each class. And another 30 something units is just, it doesn't fit for the neighborhood and for them to try to go around the mixed use and just put their

office on the ground floor, it's a slap in the face to the purpose you know of doing a project like that and I think it's a terrible idea. I'm looking forward to looking over the information when it becomes available.

Vice Chair Carroll; it's available now isn't it Joe?

Joe Seman-Graves; no, it can't go online until after the board accepts it.

Vice Chair Carroll; ok

I'd like to comment if I may. Pat Coonrod here, I live on Bridge Avenue. I'm a retired auditor from the Office of the State Comptroller and I have never seen 30 year Pilots before this project down on the river. I was stunned when I saw that they actually gave out a 30 year Pilot, it's obscene especially when it's what \$30,000? Thanks

Vice Chair Carroll; anyone else? Comments, considerations, concerns? Ok, do you want to accept the, I don't hear anybody out there so why don't we move on and.....

Joe Seman-Graves; Jack can I say 3 things quick?

Vice Chair Carroll; yes absolutely

Joe Seman-Graves; I can't respond to everyone's, but I do want to get some information out there that might not be circulating as much. Ms. DeChiaro, public waterfront access, huge problem that we're currently working on, the finished design plans for something or for a waterfront park with docking behind that 70 Delaware project and not stopping there, we're actually talking with the folks at Matson ship yard and the properties in between about creating a waterfront trail that joins the 2 waterfront parks that should be under construction this upcoming year. So I just want to put that on people's radar that is a consideration as well.

Ms. DeChiaro; ok you said we're going to have waterfront being proposed for the new Delaware area across from Cumberland farms?

Joe Seman-Graves; we have an easement on that waterfront and we're trying to connect a proposed waterfront park right there to the Matson ship yard via water.

Ms. DeChiaro; and here's my point. How much do we have to pay as a City, how much do the tax payers of the City have to pay to get that public access to the waterfront at those new Delaware Avenue 90 units?

Joe Seman-Graves; technically there's no, there's nothing in that sense because the planning board has the right in that zoning district to take up to a 50' easement. To the point about the Pilots, while this board does not look at it, we do get a lot of people interested in Pilots and I would just ask how many people were at the IDA meeting this month? I am in no way minimizing anyone's concerns, but your voices also need to be heard at that meeting.

Mr. DeChiaro; here's the point I'm trying to make ok, we are common folks, we have families and jobs. You folks are on these boards to protect us, you going to tell me that a \$30,000 Pilot for a 90 unit waterfront property protects the taxpayers of this city? The city is going to get \$9,000 a year for the next 30 years sir, that's a slap in our face, that's why you folks sit on these boards to protect us.

Joe Seman Graves; the only thing I'm saying sir, the other people who make these approvals need to hear this just as much as the folks you're talking to today.

Mr. DeChiaro; and you know what, they will alright? And I'm trying to get the word out there, but how does that happen?? And one last comment, everybody wants to talk about how the school district taxes are so high, let me tell you something it has nothing to do with the school district, it's because of the city, it's because of the city with this irresponsible development that are driving our school taxes sky high ok, we have to, we have to be smarter in what we're doing. Thank you very much.

Joe Seman-Graves; the last point I want to make is just re-say that they're not going for any variances because they do conform to the zoning that is in place, that was adopted in 2017 along with the comprehensive plan in that sense, so I just want to put that on the record as well and then I'll pass it back over to Jack. Thank you

Vice Chair Carroll; alright anybody else? Any final comments, concerns anybody? Ok Joe we'll move on to the determination on accepting a draft environmental impact statement per the SEQR process for 178-182 Ontario Street. Are we going to a vote?

Member Couture; so I just wanted to make note of something and then I'll throw a motion on the table. So I just wanted to make sure that the public, I'm sure you're well aware but this has been a vacant site for 14 years, so it has been an eyesore, it has been an empty location for a large amount of time. I'm not saying this is the most ideal project for this location, but I will put that out there and then also everyone on this board is a taxpayer, so we are also looking out for the city and the taxpayers best interest, absolutely. That is our #1 priority and we do our very best to do that, with that being said I think it is very important that the public does have their comments and that we thoroughly review those comments and take everything into consideration and do what we can collectively for the good of the city and the residents of the

city and the children of the city. With that being said I'm going to make a motion to pass and approve this draft in order for public comments to become available for everyone to view and then provide us with their input for the process, so hopefully we can collectively come together and make a good decision that's a good turnout for the city and everyone who lives on the island.

Vice Chair Carroll; and the city in general

Member Couture; absolutely

Member Nadeau; I'll 2<sup>nd</sup> that motion

Vice Chair Carroll; ok Sharon take a vote

Motion carried unanimously to accept the Draft Environmental Impact Statement

	YES	NO
Bob Bucher	ABSENT	
Joseph Nadeau	X	
Mark DeFruscio	ABSENT	
Jack Carroll	X	
Stephanie Couture	X	
Kizzy Williams	X	

Vice Chair Carroll; ok we have accepted the draft environmental impact statement, it moves on to public comment period Joe Seman-Graves; so everyone knows you'll technically, I'm going to post this tomorrow online and I'm going to have the city Facebook page just kind of announce where it is. You'll have technically 66 days to review it because the 60 days starts after I make a DEC bulletin post which won't take effect until next Wednesday, so you'll have a little bit of bonus time there. Please reach out to me and I'll have my contact information on there should you have any questions about what you're reading or how to take it in or where the information is coming from, thank you.

### **CONSIDERATION OF A NEW TENANT APPLICATION FOR A PROPOSED BUSINESS AT 190 REMSEN STREET**

Vice Chair Carroll; alright with that said on to agenda item #3, consideration of a new tenant application for a proposed business at 190 Remsen Street, it's for Nelly's Treats Bakery. Is there anybody here from Nelly's?

Hello, hi, I'm Renel Turner; I'm the owner currently of Nelly's Treats Bakery. I'm currently in my home, I've had this in home bakery for, I've been baking for about 10 years now and I have a pretty strong customer base and I'm looking to grow, I'm looking to expand and this opportunity came about. Its previous base was occupied by Cake Streets, hopefully I'm saying that correctly, so again this option came up and I'm looking to potentially start my business there.

Vice Chair Carroll; alright, looks like, it's really not changing the nature of the business

Ms. Turner; no, so it kind of worked itself out, you know that it was a previous bakery. Nothing would really change inside or anything major that I'm looking to do for the most part.

Vice Chair Carroll; members have any concerns, questions?

Member Nadeau; will there be any on site tables or café type, anyone in the establishment eating?

Ms. Turner; I'm looking to have minimum seating, just because obviously with the pandemic and so on, but there will be some seating. I'm looking to during the warmer months to have some seating outside as well and also to participate in the city's, when they close down Remsen Street to participate in that. I think that will be a great opportunity as well for the public to come and experience our business.

Vice Chair Carroll; this will just be pastries, won't be regular food will it?

Ms. Turner; no just pastries and so on but not normal food, regular food I should say.

Vice Chair Carroll; Stephanie, Kizzy, Joe any questions?

Member Couture; I just have one administrative thing it looks like on the application the zip code just needs to be changed or corrected I should say for the job site address, other than that I looked over everything and it look like a pretty easy slide since it was formerly a bakery so, no questions from me.

Member Nadeau; I make a motion that we approve this request, oh do you need public comment first, I'm sorry.

Vice Chair Carroll; yes public comment, yes we do. Anybody in the public want to make a comment? Hearing none we can go for a vote

Member Nadeau; ok let me do that again

Vice Chair Carroll; I'll get a 2<sup>nd</sup> to your motion Joe and it will be on a change of use application for a proposed business at 190 Remsen Street.

Member Couture; I'll 2<sup>nd</sup>

Motion carried unanimously

	YES	NO
Bob Bucher	ABSENT	
Joseph Nadeau	X	
Mark DeFruscio	ABSENT	
Jack Carroll	X	
Stephanie Couture	X	
Kizzy Williams		

Joe Seman-Graves; ok Renel, we'll do the historic board next week then you're all set to go with us

Ms. Turner; thank you so much.

### **CONSIDERATION OF A CHANGE OF USE APPLICATION FOR A PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL UNIT AT 17 WILLOW STREET**

Vice Chair Carroll; ok item #4 consideration of a change of use application for a proposed residential unit at 17 Willow Street. Is there someone here to speak about the project? Anybody? I hear nobody out there.

Joe Seman-Graves; I don't see anyone. I can kind of give you a description

Vice Chair Carroll; ok, is it the red building?

Member Nadeau; yes

Vice Chair Carroll; and they've got the front of it already.....

Member Nadeau; it doesn't look like that anymore

Vice Chair Carroll; no you've got just one window by the door

Member Nadeau; yea it's kind of a higher placed window, it's actually, there are 2 side by side

Vice Chair Carroll; right. Without the applicant should we go ahead or because we really don't know?

Joe Seman-Graves; it's your call, I can just describe it in depth because he talked to me for a while about this

Vice Chair Carroll; ok

Joe Seman-Graves; so he pretty much received a building permit last year to do the renovations..

Vice Chair Carroll; and he did

Joe Seman-Graves; he did, he did it above board, we just were not looking, and we should have been historically at changes of use like this at this level. So the building department you know over the past few years had been giving out the building permit to do this and now it's all coming through the planning board because I'm reviewing the building permits as well so I can catch these. So this is one where change of use doesn't necessarily always mean it's a change of use for a business. This is a business going to a residential use, it's been vacant on the first floor. He did the conversion so now he's looking for appropriate approvals, so I can officially write him a letter saying that it was converted.

Member Nadeau; I only have one request, that they, in this picture it doesn't show but the garbage cans have been out for a week and it seems to be the pattern that's popping up along the city, that garbage cans are being left out front for convenience. I would propose that as part of this approval that he places his garbage cans within the yard or the confines of the fencing area.

Vice Chair Carroll; we can do that can't we Joe?

Joe Seman-Graves; yes, they shouldn't be there regardless.

Vice Chair Carroll; right

Member Nadeau; right

Vice Chair Carroll; alright, should we move to a motion?

Sharon; public comment

Vice Chair Carroll; any public comment anybody? I asked for comments from an applicant earlier and there was nobody out there, there doesn't appear to be anybody in the public either. So let's make a motion

Member Nadeau; I make a motion we approve

Vice Chair Carroll; is there a 2<sup>nd</sup>? We need a 2<sup>nd</sup>

Member Williams; I make a motion to approve

Vice Chair Carroll; ok, alright so Kizzy you're seconding Joe's motion?

Member Williams; yes

Vice Chair Carroll; yes, ok so now we can move to a vote Sharon

Motion carried unanimously

	YES	NO
Bob Bucher	ABSENT	
Joseph Nadeau	X	
Mark DeFruscio	ABSENT	
Jack Carroll	X	
Stephanie Couture	X	
Kizzy Williams	X	

Vice Chair Carroll; after seeing that picture, the building does look better now.

### **CONSIDERATION OF A SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR (2) PROPOSED CARPORTS AT 574 SARATOGA STREET**

Vice Chair Carroll; ok moving on to item #5. Applicant apparently wants to build some car ports on the storage lot down across from Mohawk Paper. It think it's where Matt's Fish Fry used to be.

Member Nadeau; I believe so

Vice Chair Carroll; I was down there, they've got plenty of room inside of it. Is there somebody here, the applicant that wants to comment on it? Anybody? Well it's like a 100x100' maybe smaller but, here you go we got his sketch (on screen) he's got plenty of room in there for this type of..and it'll give more protection to the vehicles that he's storing.

Joe Seman-Graves; also where the fence is back there, he owns beyond that fence in that corner.

Vice Chair Carroll; right. I mean this is, it seems to be straight forward. I was trying to think, nobody lives down there, and it's commercial area. Anybody got any concerns about it?

Member Nadeau; I just have a few questions.

Vice Chair Carroll; ok, that's what we want

Member Nadeau; what's the property, it appears the property is for strictly storage right now, with vehicles and...

Vice Chair Carroll; yup, some of them look like they've been there a while too.

Member Nadeau; I guess if the applicant was here on I'd be looking for the reason for the erection of the car ports and...

Joe Seman-Graves; I don't want to speak for him, but the comments he provided were he's trying to attract someone to put a car under a car port.

Member Nadeau; well then, I guess if as it stands now he's asking for car ports, I think if in the future he wants to add walls or side walls or appears to have enclosed garages, that he would need to come back or if he uses it as a retail space he would need to come back and request it. Other than that I don't see any issue with it.

Vice Chair Carroll; and given the dimensions of the car ports themselves, it looks like he might be trying to attract some RV ownership to protect it over the winter, it should have clearance for that, but anyway anybody else have concerns?

Any more questions Joe? We can make them come back if they want to enclose it right Joe?

Joe Seman-Graves; if they do anything they have to come back, so if they enclose, technically they can enclose 3 sides of it and it's still a carport, once the 4<sup>th</sup> side is enclosed it's a garage.

Member Nadeau; ok

Joe Seman-Graves; if they want to put more car ports, I mean any actions taking place on anything that is not a single or 2 family lot, has to come to the planning board.

Member Nadeau; I guess one of my concerns is over the past, locations like this all of a sudden they turn into used car lots. So my concern would be that they would have to come back and put a request in to change it to a retail space, so if he's not asking for that that's fine, he's asking for car ports then that's fine.

Vice Chair Carroll; alright then do we have a motion to accept?

Member Couture; I make that motion

Member Nadeau; I'll 2<sup>nd</sup>

Vice Chair Carroll; ok, now go for a vote on the determination of a site plan review for 2 proposed car ports at 574 Saratoga Street, Sharon..

Motion carried unanimously

	YES		NO
Bob Bucher	ABSENT		
Joseph Nadeau	X		
Mark DeFruscio	ABSENT		
Jack Carroll	X		
Stephanie Couture	X		
Kizzy Williams	X		

**CONSIDERATION OF SKETCH PLAN CONFERENCE FOR A PROPOSED MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT AT 110 HEARTT AVENUE**

Vice Chair Carroll; ok moving on to agenda item #6. Sketch plan conference for a proposed mixed use development at 110 Heartt Avenue. This is the little tiny house on the tiny lot. We discussed this, I don't know if it was last month or in January. I talked with Joe about this, this afternoon and it seems to be a decent project. Is somebody here for the applicant that would like to speak on it?

Rhonda Rosenheck; yes I'm here, but you just had some informational questions that we had to answer about anchoring, about the pad, the skirting things like that. My architect, I'm not sure if Kyle is here from ME Studios but the builder and the architect did a lot of good research to make sure that, I wanted a gravel pad for instance for drainage, for this a concrete pad is best, so he worked on a drainage situation around it with gravel and with other places and lighting. I think those were the things I don't actually have your list Jack in front of me, but he had the list and I know he went through them with this new plan. I should have had that list with me I'm sorry. Oh I remember, it was anchoring, it was insulation, the utility hookups, it was skirting. So the entire house is, except the bottom is currently insulated with blown-in insulation and once we finish everything the, skirting will be put around pillars so that we can lift the tires off the ground. The skirting will be solid and insulated and the connectors will be under there and insulated within that.

Vice Chair Carroll; alright, anybody have any questions, Joe, Kizzy, Stephanie?

Member Couture; I reviewed the additional information and I appreciate you and the architect coming back and answering all the questions that we had Rhonda.

Ms. Rosenheck; thank you it was valuable work we had to do to do it right, anyway it was great

Vice Chair Carroll; do it once do it right

Ms. Rosenheck; exactly. It's like having my own private consult.

Vice Chair Carroll; now you're going to have deck here in the front of it now, not just an awning right?

Ms. Rosenheck; correct

Vice Chair Carroll; are you going to have your awning above that?

Ms. Rosenheck; just over the doorway, you know how you don't want the rain coming right down on you when you're just opening your door? It's just going to be a small awning in front of the doorway and a nice deck the width of the house. And the deck will have a kind of railing that looks like it's on a yacht, its round and its got the steel wires going across so that nobody on the deck could accidently fall of the deck, but I could still have the visuals.

Vice Chair Carroll; there you go. Any more questions?

Member Nadeau; I'm looking at the structural detail of the pad itself, so I'm assuming that is how this is going to be installed on this pad?

Ms. Rosenheck; you mean, ah yea, where you're seeing a sample of it right now?

Member Nadeau; there's an actual cut sheet of the concrete pad A-4, drawing A-4.

Joe Seman-Graves; I didn't include that one in the power point, my apologies

Member Nadeau; ok, well just to verify that the intent is to put it on a structural pad

Ms. Rosenheck; yes it's going to be on a structural pad that does extend slightly beyond it in each direction which is what was advised and then the skirting attaches to the pad.

Member Nadeau; right, it looks like it anchored better, thank you

Ms. Rosenheck; you're welcome

Vice Chair Carroll; I looked at the anchoring specification and it seems like it's pretty solid

Ms. Rosenheck; we did a lot of research, he went to the manufacturer of the trailer itself and also to a structural engineer and my builder so everybody came to a point where they agreed on what would work well.

Vice Chair Carroll; ok, any more questions?

Member Williams; when will this be completed?

Ms. Rosenheck; good question. So my understanding is, I don't own this property, you can't actually approve it but you can give me and Joe a really good idea of what you would say so that Joe can let the Albany County Land Bank know whether you would allow me to use it as planned.

Vice Chair Carroll; so then we're not really here for approval, we're here for advice?

Joe Seman-Graves; this is if, the last meeting was much like Rhonda's saying, the Albany County Land Bank likes to know that the end use is going to be approved by the city. Otherwise they're putting property in people's hands that most likely will go back into foreclosure and off the tax rolls. This property is unique, we've had I think it was 5 people including Rhonda look at it and want to put some form of a tiny house on it. Rhonda was the only one to date that has gone through and done designs and her due diligence to get an ok or a nod to proceed or not proceed. So the uniqueness of this is, its mixed use, this is what the board is ultimately looking at. And I say that for a couple of reasons. One the mixed use element is the public park up front and that she's proposing to put in and it has a couple of different aspects to it, seating, greenery, landscaping. The second would be the poets perch if you will

Ms. Rosenheck; and the little free library

Joe Seman-Graves; yes, sorry. But it's ultimately, it's not the definition of mixed used that people think of, but it's mixed use in the sense that there's 2 uses for the property. It doesn't have to be vertical it can be horizontal use in a sense.

What's interesting about mixed use in this area is its looked at by Special Use Permit by the planning board so not a zoning variance but a Special Use Permit saying that the planning board looks at each of these requests on a case by case basis in the R-2 zone and then can offer advice, criticism, change this, change that, but ultimately if they approve the Special Use Permit it's something that doesn't run with that land. So this would be Rhonda's project, if she sells, it would have to come back and get another Special Use Permit just like what happened at Caliber Collision a few months ago, it was an auto place taking the spot of an auto place, but still had to come in for that Special Use Permit. Secondly the Special Use Permit can be reviewed, the planning board could say in 6 months from now we'd like to review to see how it's going. So Rhonda's done her due diligence in the sense that she's putting her best foot forward now to 1. Get some direction from the planning board and 2. Not necessarily have to come back in 6 months and have to take this out.

Vice Chair Carroll; right so if we put it in the minutes and not vote on it would that be acceptable?

Joe Seman-Graves; yeah, so this is strictly if you guys feel comfortable then I can just tell the land bank that this is a use that is likely to be approved by the planning board because Rhonda has done her due diligence. I can't say it would be approved but, your comments now kind of, it rights my opinion to the land bank.

Vice Chair Carroll; something we look favorably upon.

Joe Seman-Graves; right

Ms. Rosenheck; going back to timing then if I may. So this is April, I believe once I, they are waiting for me to let them know or for Joe to let them know, or both of us and then I believe they have 3 boards that this tiny little piece of land now has to go through, 3 different things. The person who, the staff person who takes it through that process I believe now understand where I'm going and what I'm doing so she's waiting to hear from me and from Joe and then she will start sheparding it through these 3 things. When it and if it gets through all 3 boards and I get back an ok, and I've given them already all the information they need to do their due diligence about me financially, then I have to I believe come back to you for an actual approval at whatever that next meeting is and then from there honestly, this is a, I can't work that quickly because of my body, I have a builder who's going to be working on it part of the time and landscapers part of the time so I would say this is going to take at least 6 months to organize to get it where it is. I already have somebody working on the library but that's the least of it, so I don't know 6 months from whenever I get that ok and that ok could come in June or July. Basically I'm going to miss this season at least and go into the fall and maybe some of the plantings and such will have to wait even until next spring.

Vice Chair Carroll; let's be optimistic. Here's the letter I read it; exterior lighting will include a motion sensor, front door light, low mostly low knee high lights for the walkway placed strategically, sides and back of property illuminate the benches and also LED rope lights along the top of the rail deck and wooden fence, those were the lights.

Ms. Rosenheck; Jack, consideration, we talked about among ourselves there was enough lighting to be safe and have some security but also you know there is one of the houses where the bedroom windows are right there and I don't want so much light or I don't want flood lights that go on and off so quickly that the people trying to sleep in that house are have a strobe effect near them. That's why we thought about low LED lighting that's on most, all of the time essentially.

Vice Chair Carroll; they have a wide variety of products that would address that issue exactly.

Ms. Rosenheck; yea and just the flood light right at the door of the house, right near the door of the house and close in so that it doesn't do that to those people living there.

Vice Chair Carroll; there you go. Alright so you can go to the Albany County Land Bank and let them know or Joe can let them know that we consider this a favorable project. And once you get your ducks in a row come back and we'll have a vote on the approval

Ms. Rosenheck; thank you

Member Couture; this is a great use of a space so thank you for proposing it Rhonda

Vice Chair Carroll; I didn't ask if anybody out there in the public want to make a comment on it. Public comments, concerns? Hearing none, moving on to agenda item #7

Joe Seman-Graves; Ok I'll be in touch Rhonda

No Vote was taken at this time

	YES	NO
Bob Bucher		
Joseph Nadeau		
Mark DeFruscio		
Jack Carroll		
Stephanie Couture		
Kizzy Williams		

**CONSIDERATION OF A SITE PLAN APPLICATION FOR A PROPOSED FOUR-UNIT MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT AT 134 BRIDGE AVENUE**

Vice Chair Carroll; ok item #7, is back to 134 Bridge Street consideration of a multi-family dwelling and associated parking lot. Are the developers here? The applicant that would like to speak on it, on the changes they've made?

Christopher Longo here from Empire Engineering; I'm representing the owner Michael DiBernardo. Yes we are back in front of the board since the last time we were here in February. We initially presented this project at that time, it was 6 units and there was some questions about floor plans and units and how the units would be orientated. So what we've done through the discussion in February, we kind of resolved to that building would be 4 units that we'd come back with at least floor plans so that's what you see there (sketch on screen). The first, so it's still a 3 story building, the first floor being split between the 2 units and then the second and third floor being one unit a flat if you will, so that's the change we made to, or the additional information we got for the building and the layout which is, I don't want to say is an exact replica, but it is similar to the 4 unit building that currently stands there on the site next to it. So it, this one will obviously be a brand new building but some aspects taken to the floor plan that are currently in that building. So also what that does is 4 units would require 8 parking spaces, currently the plan is for 7 spaces on site and also the closure of the existing curb cut on Second Street which would create a new space now available on street. However, we can't take credit for that so, there being 7 spaces instead of the required 8 still will need an approval from the ZBA for a variance from 8 required spaces. However, I do want to mention that this is a little bit more functional parking lot now. There is an existing garage that will be removed to allow for access entirely from the alley so hopefully this really does improve that current parking situation for the existing units and then the newly constructed building. And then so this is a triple lot if you will, 7,500 sq. ft. is the total parcel whereas each lot typically or this row, this block is 2,500 sq. ft. So that third lot is what would be used for recreational space. It's currently used now for that, but according to the multifamily code this area would actually be close to double of what's required of 100 sq. ft. per unit. So at 8 units that would be 800 sq. ft. and that's about 1,400 sq. ft. or so in there. And there would be some nice enhancements to that areas as well in front along the street would be enhanced with a new fencing, new shrubbery to kind of close in this area for the tenants and a new picnic table, garden, gazebo type area that would be amenities for the residents as well as the trash receptacle by the sidewalk. And then also there will be a new sidewalk interior to the site but in addition Second Street would be closed or completed with that sidewalk from the alleyway to Bridge Avenue, which currently doesn't have sidewalks, it's just grassed. So those are the changes and updates and before we move on from here, we, we're back at the planning board not really for any approvals but just to get some feedback before going to any other boards, namely the ZBA and requesting any variances just to make sure that the planning board is receptive to these changes and appreciates what we've got here. So with that I can take any questions or the owner is here as well if you have any questions for him

Vice Chair Carroll; did I read that there is only a 5 foot set from the property line and it's got to be 10 feet?

Mr. Longo; so the property line set back along Second Street is actually a zero lot line. That is allowed and does not require any variances, there is a variance required for the 5 feet between the buildings. So multifamily residences from the multifamily code require 10 feet however, we're proposing 5 which is pretty typical in this row of, in this block. However it being multifamily on the same parcel that's what kicks in that 10 foot code, so yes 5 feet requiring a variance, however if they were 2 separate parcels it would be a little bit different situation.

Vice Chair Carroll; Stephanie, Kizzy, Joe concerns?

Member Williams; none

Member Couture; I'm still leaning towards this is too many units for that property. I realize you took our considerations or you took our comments last time into consideration, but that is a tight spot and I think parking is a concern and the neighborhood overall it's a concern to put this type of project there.

Member Nadeau; I agree with Stephanie and I'm not really impressed with the floor plan. Some of these things just do not ring out. Like the stairwells in an area that's 9x6, I don't see that as being doable, a bathroom 5x7 for a 4 bedroom apartment. I know this is just a sketch, my concern is the effort put into this sketch if it resemble at all the effort of the individual who wants to build there it just, I have concerns.

Vice Chair Carroll; anyone else?

May I speak up, this is Mike DiBernardo, I'm the property owner currently.

Vice Chair Carroll; ok, go ahead

Mr. DiBernardo; ok just in regards to the last comment made there on the sketch that was made. Again this was just more, to hear feedback from the board and if there were any public comments, because last time we didn't have a floor plan. But in regards to all the dimensions and what's shown there on that sketch, it does reference the existing floor plan in my 4 unit currently and the 4 unit that's here now is fully occupied on Bridge Ave. It has been for multiple years, even prior to my ownership and some tenants being here longer than 4 or 5 years. And even with those dimensions and that floor plan and the bedroom layout you know, no complaints and every tenant so far that I've dealt with in this property is real happy as far as the living. It may not be ideal to one person, but again it's referenced off the current structure and it does work for what's here now. And that is where those dimensions and that layout actually came from. As far as the dining and the kitchen area, some of those things are actually opened up where currently you know there's some walls separating where the laundry is, that's where some of the changes are from the existing structure of the new one, but again you know with the current structure that's here now you know it works. A lot of people, everyone's happy living in it, so it does work. But again that's just where the dimensions we're reference from.

Member Nadeau; I'm sorry but the fact that something that was built 50, 60, 70 years ago or maybe longer, especially the stair cases, I'm sure that that particular space would not be allowed, aside from that I understand that this is just a sketch. I'm still thinking that a little more work should have gone into it because of your request. Our comments from the last meeting that I thought something a little more representative of what you're actually going to build and again I agree with Stephanie I would still think that many families, that many individuals living in one building as a new structure I'm not comfortable.

Vice Chair Carroll; I'd like to see some elevations and profiles of the building and what it's going to look like and how it's going to fit in.

Mr. DiBernardo; of course and again from that first meeting that we had and the only reason I went with the sketch you see before, going to an actual architect just because....

Vice Chair Carroll; is this the engineer?

No this is the owner.

Vice Chair Carroll; ok

Mr. DiBernardo; so this, I was just looking to get feedback prior to, I was asking for feedback and I am taking into consideration everything that you guys are saying. I understand you know based on the sketch and what you're looking at, you know on your comments I understand them, but I hope you understand on my end I just didn't want to go any further as far as spending money until I had a better idea, because our original plan was 6 units and there was some concerns that we addressed and we changed to make work. We turned the 6 unit project that seemed to be a problem originally into a 4, so before going and getting renderings and elevations and a final floor plan of what would be here, I went with the sketch kind of just to get feedback before going deeper in the pocket, before moving forward.

Vice Chair Carroll; well personally, I'd like to see what it's going to look like before we can really tell you what we think of it. I mean we need more, again we need more detail.

Mr. Longo; so if I can chime in. I guess that's the difficult spot that we're in right now, you know obviously an architectural plan, and elevations are going to look much different for a 4 unit structure than for anything less than that. I guess I'd wanna try and figure out what the board thinks is appropriate or what's not too many. I guess from a parking perspective we are very close, you consider that on street parking we're creating, we're actually meeting the code there, the recreational areas, we're exceeding the codes, the height restrictions, we're not exceeding. Certainly a 3 story could be constructed, the architectural absolutely could be met and the aesthetics could be worked into this plan. The floor plan, on the first floor we have 2 units @ 700 sq. ft. and 2 units @ 1,400 sq. ft. Those are standard multifamily unit sizes, so regardless of how the unit layout ultimately ends up, you know they are standard living spaces. So you know to have 4 units here that are pretty much are meeting you know all of the sections of the code, I'm not really sure how we could do something different to, to fit.

Vice Chair Carroll; well we're really not asking for anything different. We're just asking for more detail.

Mr. Longo; and that can certainly be provided but you know we're hearing comments that say we don't think it fits, it's still too many units, more detail would be you know additional expense into this project, that if there, if there's something underneath the surface here that's not being exposed at this point and we get further down the road and now there's a squash on it you know.....

Vice Chair Carroll; I'd still like to see what it's going to look like, that's what the public going to see. I mean we get the sense, the flat but I'd still like to see the exterior renderings, computer generated imagery. I mean the layouts I have no issues with, I mean Stephanie and Joe, they're their own people, but I want to see what the building looks like.

Mr. Longo; we can certainly do that and have that in order for this building to get constructed, obviously needs the approval of your board and once we're at that step you will see a drawing and rendering like that. The reason we kind of taken these steps is this project does need a ZBA approval for the as I mentioned the parking space and the separation between the buildings, both of which are explainable in that there, there unique or non-standard conditions here that we have so we have not gone to the ZBA yet, so that's another approval you know looming out there. Obviously no approval is guaranteed, so we haven't gone there yet either. So with all this still in flux the expenditure of the additional architectural plans obviously hasn't been made yet.

Member Couture; can I ask a question?

Vice Chair Carroll; absolutely

Member Couture; what type of tenants do you have in the current apartment building that are 4 bedroom units? Are those 4 individual single people, or are those 4 couples, 2 couples, is it a family?

Mr. DiBernardo; so it's currently, I have 2 social workers in the single units and both the flats are occupied by a mother, father and 2 kids.

Member Couture; and that goes for both flats, you said with the 4 bedrooms?

Mr. DiBernardo; well I currently occupy the top floor flat because it's being renovated.

Member Couture; ok got it, thank you

Member Nadeau; I have a similar question. What is the, what is your desire to have 4 bedrooms versus 3 or even 2? For a much better floor plan with less of a head count per say per building.

Mr. DiBernardo; yea, of course I have, it's not really dead, I kind of have a reference to draw, I did reference the drawing on the existing unit and that is where the 4 bedroom came from. I'm not opposed to you know keeping the square footage layout and just turning that into a 3 or even a 2 bedroom and you know going towards a different tenant, that may not have 2 kids so you know less people occupying the space, but the same square footage layout. And from the current place I'm renovating, and approaching, having tenants approach ready, cause I have tenants that are willing, are ready to pay the rent that I would look to get and you know they've been single people that are either bartenders or school teachers, no kids, no spouse, or no boyfriend or girlfriend that would be willing to occupy what is currently a 4 unit so if it was ever to be turned into construct a 2 bedroom, I can't see that being a problem.

Vice Chair Carroll; anyone else?

Joe Seman-Graves; Jack I have public comments that were sent in, do you want to go to those now?

Vice Chair Carroll; please..

Hi Jack, Justin Alesio again 105 Washington Avenue. I think we had mentioned before too, this is also a mixed use corridor and in my opinion if you're going to put something 3 stories on Bridge Ave. that first floor just like we discussed earlier should have some kind of commercial property on it and it just seems like this individual is into this just being all residential. So as far as I'm concerned that doesn't fit as well and I think we've already set a president down here on the island with some of these you know small residential building lots. You look at what Jeremy Krug or Anthony LaPage

done, you know we set part of a president we put 2 units per lot and if you've seen the stuff that these guys, they do a very good job and it always fits very well with this community. A 3 story conglomerate on the corner of Second and Bridge is, it does not fit this neighborhood. So I think if he's going to go back and look at different plans he should follow the president of what's been going on down here and it's nothing close to the sketches that he put forward to this planning board.

Mr. DiBernardo; if I may speak up, you say on the corner of Second and Bridge Ave. a 3 story multifamily wouldn't fit, but there's on that's currently occupied that there now and it seems to fit well.

Vice Chair Carroll; gentlemen,...

Mr. Alesio; and Jack they're looking for variances Jack, so as far as the size and space to fit it, if you're really looking for a variance to put it 5 feet away from another building, I think you know that says something too.

Mr. DiBernardo; the reason for the 5 feet....

Mr. Alesio; excuse me I'm still talking

Vice Chair Carroll; one person at a time. Mr. DiBernardo you'll get your turn, go ahead Justin

Mr. Alesio; so to, like I said when you're looking for the zoning, they already don't have enough parking spots where they have to ask for an exception to do the one on the side and they really don't have the spaces they need so they need another exception to put it 5 feet away from the other building. It just, it doesn't fit aesthetically or physically. We already, I feel, set a president down here on how we want to handle allowing people to build on these single lots. You know they subdivided my house just before we moved in and Jeremy Krug put in a nice 2 unit on there and it fits great with the neighborhood. Just because you got a you know older 3 unit that's been there for a while doesn't mean you should just throw another one up right next to it. I don't think it fits aesthetically or actually in that spot.

Vice Chair Carroll; ok now you can respond sir

Mr. DiBernardo; yea so I was just referencing the comment about it not fitting physically and the 2<sup>nd</sup> variance for the 5 foot again is only because it's on one parcel. So if it was a separate parcel it actually would be allowed and it's just one of those things in the city code that kind of creates a funny you know, obstacle, but it's not anything about it fitting physically but again everything else that you said I've taken note to and obviously taken in consideration. So I, you know as much as I may not appreciate the comments I have listened to them and I understand where you're coming from.

Joe Seman-Graves; ok so Jack can I read the petition that we've got up?

Jack Carroll wait, wait I have a comment, can I make a comment?

Vice Chair Carroll; who are you?

Jacklyn DeChiaro 114 Washington Avenue

Vice Chair Carroll; ok

Ms. DeChiaro; yes, I also wanted to point out about the 5 feet between the existing building and the proposed building. You know zoning code requires 10 feet and there is a reason for that, its safety and aesthetics. I heard that the planner or the owners of the house say it's similar to the houses on the street that have only 5 feet between them currently. Those houses were built 50 to 80 years ago, that's why we have zoning codes and laws that are now up to what is current and how we want our neighborhood to look and it's not having a 3 story apartment building 5 feet from each other. This property is in a mixed use neighborhood corridor district and in this area we are supposed to according to what our Cohoes zoning code says, it's supposed to preserve single family character buildings, heights of the buildings should be low, examples of appropriate buildings, you can go right in our zoning code for this they give examples of what it is supposed to look like. Mr. Carroll you said you'd like to see what this is going to look like on the outside because that is what the neighbors want to see; here are 4 examples for a mixed use neighborhood corridor; single family house containing a business, a shop front building with varying heights consistent with the surrounding neighborhood, single family house converted to a multifamily house or a small store with an attached apartment. Now I also heard him saying in his current one he has 4 units, 2 have social workers in them and the other 2 flats have a mother, father with children. That is 6 adults if all 6 of them have cars there's 6 parking spots already, that's not even taking into consideration another new 4 unit. So we're going to be short on that, where are they going to park, on the street? I don't know about any of you who are on this board, I'm not sure if any of you live on the island, how many of you drive down here in the winter time and what it looks like when we have snow and snow removal and the cars that don't move, you can't barely go up Bridge Avenue, it's dangerous. The other thing I wanted to mention was that going back to earlier in this meeting, I just want to reference, going back to what Stephanie I believe said about the Ontario Street development. She said she believes that lot has been vacant for 14 years and nothing has been there for 14 years. So with that comment I'm understanding that if something is vacant for 14 years we should just allow development that continues to burden the island neighborhood

when our comprehensive plan states vacant and abandoned properties should be targeted for community gardens, rain gardens, public space, plantings and community events. So because something is empty for 14 years, I'd rather have something vacant than something that's going to burden my neighborhood, burden the traffic, cause more traffic and safety concerns for my children who are down here on the island. Thank you.

Vice Chair Carroll; ok so what I've gotten from the input from the questions from the board members is that we need more detail on this, on size, appearance, use.

Mr. Longo; can I address some of these comments or...

Joe Seman-Grave; can I just read this comment first?

Vice Chair Carroll; Joe Graves first

Joe Seman-Graves; this was sent in from a number of people in the neighborhood who signed, we can see the names here (comment and signatures on screen). The comments were read aloud which included 8 points of concern from several citizens (attached to minutes).

Vice Chair Carroll; a couple of those have already been addressed in the presentation this evening as far as the green space and where the kids can play. There's going to be a yard on the east side of the two buildings so...

Joe Seman-Graves; ok then Jacklyn DeChiaro who commented earlier, sent a comment which was read. Those are the comments sent in.

Vice Chair Carroll; any other public comments? Hearing no one, so I guess you're going to come back then?

Mr. Longo; I guess, could I explain some of the, cause I heard a little bit about you're looking for detail on the project right? I guess at this point I do feel like we've presented quite a bit of detail and are still kind of in an in between spot where there's a lot of opposition to the project but I haven't really heard as far as from the board a position of favorable or unfavorable, so if I could may be go through some of those comments that were just mentioned that really get into the details of what this project is and maybe we can hash out some of the places where you think we'd fit and some of the places where we think we fit and you might not agree. So the first spot was the setbacks and that interior setback between buildings as I mentioned in the presentation, if this were 2 parcels that setback and this is the current zoning code that setback could be zero foot of side yard so if these were 2 parcels those 2 buildings with today's zoning code standards could be right next to each other with no side yard. There was also mention about uses and suggested uses within the mixed use zoning district. Those uses that were reference with examples out of the code and I do understand that's in the code in that section but also a little further down there is a list of allowable uses and multifamily is one of them. Also the height of the building, those examples don't mention a specific height but further down that, in this form based code is a principle building and the maximum height which calls out 36 feet or 3 stories, so it certainly fits within the zoning code today. Parking as I mentioned, the requirement from the zoning code today is 1 space per unit, that's the requirement in the code. 4 units and the other building with 4 units would require 8 as I mentioned there's 7 spaces including the creation of one on street which is not there now. I would say that should be considered but that's for the zoning board of appeals to make a final determination on. And the other one about this being a vacant parcel. I would contend that it's actually vacant, this is on triple lot parcel with a building on it, which from the multifamily code would allow for as many units as would fit and here we're showing that. I feel that we're showing that 8 units would fit on this parcel considering recreational areas, parking, aesthetics can certainly be proven through building architectural, it's within the zoning, within the setbacks, it's within the height restrictions. So you know with all those you know spelled out I think that's the details. I'm not really sure what more details we could bring back to the board unless we went through the process attempted to get a zoning board of appeals approval and brought back to this board a final architectural plan.

Vic Chair Carroll; can we do it that way Joe?

Joe Seman-Graves; it's an option, I do prefer the planning board being favorable to a development to at least give it a nod before going to the zoning board just because we've had some, zoning they're specifically looking at the setbacks and they don't put it into context everything you're hearing today, so if that does get approved, it's always just putting in my opinion, putting the chicken before the egg to a certain extent because their scope is really limited in how they're looking at it. So I do like to have some sort of favorable or somewhat favorable ruling by the planning board before going to zoning in those situations.

Member Couture; when we had public comment I think there was 2 pieces of information that were helpful to the homeowner that they can take away. Because it is in a mixed used are you interested or would you take a look at possibly having commercial use on the first floor so maybe that's a consideration that they can take away. Also the 2 units per lot, if that's more aesthetically pleasing, that's more fitting for the neighborhood, that's also a helpful suggestion that perhaps

the homeowner can take away and develop off of that. So the project is not being completely shut down however, how it's presented it's really not a favorable project in my opinion.

Vice Chair Carroll; anyone else?

Member Nadeau; yes, I'm pretty much not in favor as submitted. I'd be looking for more of a 2 story and I'm certainly not interest in a 10 bedroom building on that corner.

Vice Chair Carroll; anyone else got anything? Alright should, we don't need a motion, we're just saying that you got 2 of the 4 board members not giving a positive feedback if you will. I'm personally not unopposed but with what you presented right now, I'm uncomfortable with. So there's 3 or 4.....

Mr. Longo; we certainly hear what's being said, I do want to mention....

Vice Chair Carroll; are you going to come back to us in the future then with....

Mr. Longo; I guess we're going to have to bring this back to the owner and talk about it. As I mention and tried to spell out we do feel that this project does meet the requirement of the zoning. I guess if you know, we have 2 options to either continue to whatever might be potentially for a vote or go back to consideration of a different project, we're going to have to bring that one back as I mentioned. I do feel this meets the stipulations of the zoning code as we presented it, but you know in understanding that we do want to make accommodations for those who live in the neighborhood and live in the city, we're going to have to bring that back to the owner

Vice Chair Carroll; alright then we'll be willing to accept anything that you bring into us.

Mr. Longo; ok

Vice Chair Carroll; alright that completes the agenda for this evening

Member Nadeau; Jack why did we not vote on that?

Vice Chair Carroll; well he wasn't looking for an approval, my....

Member Nadeau; they were considerations. Everything else was a consideration and we voted on it

Vice Chair Carroll; ok so you want....

Member Nadeau; no I would take Joe Graves lead do we vote on it or no?

Joe Seman-Graves; you can certainly

Member Nadeau; or do we table it once again? I think we should do something more official by way....I'm sorry Joe what we're you saying?

Joe Seman-Graves; you can vote on it in its current form, if the board wants to see revisions they can ask for revisions, like it was said ultimately table it. If you vote on it and vote as a no the applicant can still come back next month with a different proposal just not the same exact proposal within 12 calendar months, that's up to the board.

Member Nadeau; or can we leave it as is as Jack stated and they just walk away with ideas?

Joe Seman-Graves; last month you did table it instead of just walking away in that fashion but I, ultimately it's up to the board.

Vice Chair Carroll; do I have a motion to table the project until revisions are made?

Mr. Longo; I guess can I ask if there could be a consideration to vote on the project as it is so that we can get that official consideration for it and obviously as Joe mentioned we can certainly come back with a different proposal if it's not one that you're looking for here.

Vice Chair Carroll; Joe would that be in his best interest?

Joe Seman-Graves; I'm not the applicant, I couldn't speak on it

Mr. Longo; if I could I have a question for Joe. Certainly a 4 unit building is what's being proposed right here and we're looking for the board to consider a switch to any other type of project such as 2 units, such as commercial on the first floor, those would not fall under the restrictions for 12 months correct?

Joe Seman-Graves; right, it would have to be, the way that I interpret it is, it would have to be the same proposal so in my interpretation if you lower the amount of bedrooms that wouldn't be the same proposal. You would have to come back and submit the same exact application in the way our code reads

Mr. Longo; ok in that, we would be interested in hearing an official ballot from the board.

Member Couture; I'll make a motion to DENY to project as presented today

Vice Chair Carroll; do I have a 2<sup>nd</sup>?

Member Nadeau; I'll 2<sup>nd</sup>

Motion carried unanimously to **DENY** the project as submitted for 134 Bridge Avenue

	YES		NO
Bob Bucher	ABSENT		
Joseph Nadeau	X		
Mark DeFruscio	ABSENT		
Jack Carroll	X		
Stephanie Couture	X		
Kizzy Williams	X		

Vice Chair Carroll; alright any other business that we need to discuss?

Joe Seman-Graves; no I think that closes out the meeting

Vice Chair Carroll; can we have a motion to close the meeting?

Member Nadeau; I make that motion

Member Couture; I'll 2<sup>nd</sup> it

Meeting adjourned at 8:05PM