



Village of Saranac Lake

Community Development Department
39 Main Street
Saranac Lake, NY 12983
Phone (518) 891-4150
Fax (518) 891-1324
www.saranaclakeny.gov

VILLAGE OF SARANAC LAKE DEVELOPMENT BOARD MEETING MINUTES February 20, 2018

Location

Village of Saranac Lake Offices
39 Main Street
Saranac Lake, NY 12983

Attendance

Members: Leslie Karasin- Chairperson, Present
Donna Difara- Present
CJ Hagmann- Present until public hearing opened
Bill Domenico- Present
David Trudeau- Present
Craig Catalano- Alternate
Tom Boothe- Alternate, Present

Paul Blaine, Code Enforcement Officer- Present
Courtney Temple, Assistant-Present

Public: As per sign in sheet

Mayor Clyde Rabideau, Trustee Paul Van Cott and Trustee Elias Pelletieri present for public meeting.

Convene

Karasin opened the public meeting at 5:14PM

Karasin opened meeting asking Mayor Clyde Rabideau to explain the purpose and timing of the mayor's request to meet with the Development Board.

Mayor Clyde Rabideau began by thanking the Development Board for their volunteer service to the Village and emphasized the importance of the board. Mayor Rabideau discussed the importance of the Aldi project, noted the public pressure that was put on the development board and stated the development board can get what they want out

of a project if they give clear direction to applicant and adhere to the development code. Mayor Rabideau emphasized the many hours of time and effort that the Village Board and others invested to make sure that the Development Code serves the Village well and ensures that Development fits the Village.

Trustee Paul Van Cott stated his attendance at this meeting is to review the initial process of applications with the development board.

Van Cott stated the development code contains important standards for the gateway, downtown and historic areas of the Village to help convey the vision of the comprehensive plan. He stated the applicant must either follow code or give good reason as to why they can't meet requirements.

Van Cott stated the pre-application process should be the CEO, Paul Blaine giving a good clear direction to the applicant from the beginning of process so the applicant will comply with code, and if necessary explain why they need a waiver and what is the basis of the waiver needed. Blaine could then identify issues as early as possible, ensure terms of information and direction to applicant is clear from the beginning.

Van Cott stated the board needs to be consistent on common practices for public understanding.

Trustee Elias Pelletieri stated the code applies to every applicant and the development board should remain an independent board and remove any politics that may be apart of a project. Pelletieri stated his appreciation for all the development board accomplishes.

Public Hearing: Aldi's

Public Hearing was opened at 6:06 p.m.

Karasin stated Essex County has yet to make a comment on the referral of the Aldi's project.

No public were in attendance for public comment.

Difara made a motion to adjourn the public hearing until March 6, 2018 at 6:00 p.m. Trudeau seconded the motion. All in favor, motion carried.

Items for Board Action: Aldi's

Board discussion of listed topics below with comments to be referred back to Kurt Charland for review.

- a. Site plan and alternatives: Board reviewed the revised site plan submitted by Aldi reflecting the general concepts of PTAB option 1. Karasin indicated a variation that would remove additional impervious surface and bring the green space and pedestrian access closer to the front of the building, by removing the additional drive lane and instead access the single lane of parking by the main existing drive lane. Trudeau stated that he felt it was too late to suggest such an amendment. Difara stated that she did not support having the parking be accessed from the drive lane for the store. Karasin said that the layout would function exactly the same as it does with the current store in place. However, since a majority of members of the board were not interested in proposing additional changes to the site plan, the recommendation will not be brought forward to Aldi.

- b. Parking, layout and impervious surface variance: The board discussed options and alternatives but there were no items that a majority of the board wishes to be brought forward to Aldi for further amendment. The vote for the variance will require the board to go down each criteria item for variances and make comments.
- c. Architecture: The board reviewed revised building elevations submitted by Aldi reflecting some changes in materials. Aldi changed the tower background material to smoky glass as the board had requested at the previous meeting and added #6 of material palette, not because of clear board direction, but reacting to comments that were made from February 6th meeting. Blaine discussed the applicant's intention to bring a design option to the March meeting reflecting the comments at the previous meeting favoring an architectural design more rooted in Saranac Lake styles. Aldi was hoping to have that alternative available for this meeting but was unable to do so. The board discussed the pros and cons of bringing a new architectural design into the process at this stage of project review. Karasin stated her preference that the applicant should still be strongly encouraged to demonstrate a design alternative that would be less corporate in nature and reflect a revised roofline that would meet the development code. The board identified a number of additional questions and preferences regarding the existing elevations to be referred back to the applicant, including: Where are the mechanicals on the roof located? Will they be visible? Remove # 3 off side elevations and replace with material # 6. Insert #2 on back slant of building. Bring all material samples of color and material to the March 6th meeting including options for brick, stone and echo board.
- d. Landscaping, screening and pedestrian design: The Board discussed the landscaping plan. Board was unable to determine what the applicant is proposing regarding the bermed landscaping areas in the front along Lake Flower Avenue. Clarification is needed. The board reviewed the planting schedule and looked at whether adequate screening has been proposed along the main facades of the building. The board requested a sketch model with sizing of plantings as proposed to show the extent of screening that the plantings will provide. The board discussed moving 8 of the existing cedars to the north façade of the building to provide screening, or alternately adding additional JSB along that wall to better break up the façade. Domenico stated that he would like to see more deciduous trees along Lake Flower Avenue; they were shown in the 3-D rendering of the approach that the applicant provided but they are not in the landscaping plan. The board decided to request that Aldi add deciduous trees along this corridor, but will not request a certain species or number.
- e. Storm water, erosion control, and grading: Board requested an explanation on what method Aldi will use to excavate the esker and how are they going to stabilize the esker during construction. The board also requested clarification from Aldi: what additional area of impervious surface was engineered for in the stormwater engineering to accommodate additional future development on the outparcel?
- f. Utilities: There were no substantive comments.
- g. Lighting-Board requested answers to how are the signs being lit, and style of luminaire? Board prefers downward tilt shining.
- h. Signage: Karasin asked where the signage plan is in the application materials. Blaine provided references to two answers in two back-and-forth discussion documents between the Village and applicant.
- i. Garbage: The board discussed whether the garbage would need to be screened per village code, given that it will sit two feet lower than the parking lot level on the sloped area in to the loading dock, and will be shielded by the esker and retain wall in the rear and by the building to the south and west. It will only be visible from the north for someone standing close to the entrance of the loading dock, so the board agreed that screening would not be necessary in this case.

Karasin discussed the procedures for the approval process for the March 6th meeting. Karasin stated the board hopes to receive a response from Essex County prior to the March 6th meeting and that the board must develop a findings document to include draft conditions such as success of landscape and merging of the parcels. Blaine volunteered to assist the board in completing the written findings and requested any input from the board.

The board reviewed the Waterfront Assessment Form. Domenico made a motion to find the project in conformance with LWRP policy standards and conditions. Difara seconded the motion. All in favor, motion carried.

The board reviewed and completed Part Two of the SEQRA. Boothe made a motion to make a negative declaration on the unlisted action under SEQR. Trudeau seconded the motion. All in favor, motion carried.

Meeting Minutes

Domenico made a motion to approve February 6, 2018 regular meeting minutes. Difara seconded the motion. All in favor, motion carried.

Adjourn

Trudeau made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Domenico seconded the motion. All in favor, motion carried.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:26 P.M.

Minutes prepared by:

Courtney Temple
Administrative Assistant