



## Village of Saranac Lake

Planning Department  
39 Main St.  
Saranac Lake, NY  
Phone (518)891-4150  
[www.saranaclakeny.gov](http://www.saranaclakeny.gov)

---

### VILLAGE OF SARANAC LAKE DEVELOPMENT BOARD MEETING MINUTES 5/4/2021

#### ATTENDANCE

Development Board Members:

Donna Difara, Chairperson, Present  
Bill Domenico, Present  
Elias Pelletieri, Present  
CJ Hagmann, Present  
Adam Harris, Excused  
Bob Bevilacqua, Alternate, Present

Paul Blaine, Development Code Administrator, Present  
Cassandra Hopkins, Administrative Assistant, Present

#### CONVENE

Donna Difara opened the meeting at 6:00pm.

Difara stated that at this time they will amend the agenda for tonight to start the meeting with the Cedar Ridge Holdings project.

Motion to approve April 6, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes by Bill Domenico, seconded by Elias Pelletieri.

Difara asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Bob Bevilacqua, yes; Domenico, yes; Pelletieri, yes; CJ Hagmann yes; and Difara, yes; all in favor, unanimous approval.

Motion to approve April 20, 2021 Workshop Minutes by Bevilacqua, seconded by Pelletieri.

Difara asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Bevilacqua, yes; Domenico, yes; Pelletieri, yes; Hagmann yes; and Difara, yes; all in favor, unanimous approval.

#### PUBLIC HEARINGS

#### BOARD ACTION

##### 1) Cedar Ridge Holdings, Inc., Special Use Permit with Site Plan Review for Townhouses, 57 Duprey Street

Difara stated that all those interested in speaking will be directed to speak in the order that they use the 'raise-hand' function on Zoom.

Si Flores, neighbor at 77 Duprey Street, stated that a letter was sent to the Board recently that outlines the concerns and information for tonight.

Claudia Braymer, attorney representing neighbors Walter McClure and Mary Beth Wigger, stated that a letter was sent to the Village earlier today. She highlighted a few points from the letter which states reasoning why the project should be denied or at least add conditions that prohibits short term rentals on the property and an HOA to manage the property. She added that the increased traffic and use of the property will add to the congestion and traffic safety hazards on the small streets in that area, which is a concern. She also stated that the proposed development far exceeds the density

that is allowed on lot of that size in the A-2 zoning district. She reminded the Board to consider what has been brought forward tonight and delay the decision or deny the project.

Fred Balzac, Village resident at 128 Shepard Ave., stated his opposition to the project and asked the Board to extend the public hearing or deny the project.

Allen Dunham, neighbor at 141 Duprey Street, stated safety concerns for additional traffic. He stated that there is existing concern for the lack of affordable housing in this community. He asked the Board to conduct more research before making a decision.

McClure, neighbor at 60 Duprey Street, stated that the project is out of place for the neighborhood and for Saranac Lake.

Keith Braun, applicant, addressed the Board to highlight the recent changes to the project, which took into consideration the Board's and the public's comments from the previous meeting. He stated that the phasing of this project allows for the needs of the current tenants on the property.

Flores stated that he is not opposed to development on the property, and that the appropriate action is to allow for a single-family home.

Linda Brousseau, neighbor at 120 Duprey Street, stated concern for the density of the proposed project.

Difara stated that the decision will have to happen at the June meeting and she asked the applicant to submit an application for the new plan on the property.

Motion to adjourn the public hearing until next month by Domenico, seconded by Bevilacqua.

Difara asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Bevilacqua, yes; Domenico, yes; Pelletieri, yes; and Difara, yes; all in favor, public hearing adjourned.

Hagmann is recused from this project.

## **2) Duncan F. Winter, MD., Site Plan Review for a Multi Use Building, 86 Main Street**

Difara asked for the applicant to give an overview of the project.

Duncan F. Winter, MD., applicant, stated that this project is to renovate the front of the existing building and to work on two or three apartments, and that this project is part of the downtown restoration and rehabilitation. He stated that the apartments will remain relatively the same with small changes as they convert them from office space to residential units.

Motion to close public hearing by Hagmann, seconded by Bevilacqua.

Difara asked for a Roll Call.

Roll Call: Bevilacqua, yes; Domenico, yes; Pelletieri, yes; Hagmann yes; and Difara, yes; all in favor, public hearing closed.

Difara stated that she likes this application.

Pelletieri stated that he sees no problem and this is a good project.

Domenico asked if there is adequate documentation to go ahead with approving the third unit in the building.

Difara asked the applicant about the plans regarding commercial use of the third space versus residential.

Winter stated that there is relatively little to do to change the space to residential, and that is the plan.

Motion to issue a negative declaration for purposes of SEQOR by Pelletieri, seconded by Hagmann.

Difara asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Bevilacqua, yes; Domenico, yes; Pelletieri, yes; Hagmann yes; and Difara, yes; all in favor, declaration moved.

Motion to find the project in conformance with LWRP policy standards and conditions by Hagmann, seconded by Pelletieri.

Difara asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Bevilacqua, yes; Domenico, yes; Pelletieri, yes; Hagmann yes; and Difara, yes; all in favor, declaration moved.

Motion to approve Site Plan by Pelletieri, seconded by Hagmann.

Difara asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Bevilacqua, yes; Domenico, yes; Pelletieri, yes; Hagmann yes; and Difara, yes; all in favor, unanimous approval.

### **3) Main Street Saranac Development, Site Plan Review for a Mixed Use Building, 15 Broadway**

Brian Draper, representative of the project, gave a brief overview of the project. He stated that it is a façade renovation and is part of the downtown revitalization initiative (DRI).

Motion to close public hearing by Pelletieri, seconded by Bevilacqua.

Difara asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Bevilacqua, yes; Domenico, yes; Pelletieri, yes; and Difara, yes; all in favor, public hearing closed. Haggmann stated that he will recuse himself from this project due to a conflict of interest.

Domenico asked the applicant about plans for the front façade and if brick will be added around the commercial space. Draper stated that can be done.

Difara asked about the cornice on the property.

Draper stated that the plan is to match it to the existing cornice that is on the building.

Difara asked if the applicant is on board with cleaning up the dumpster area.

Draper stated yes.

Motion to issue a negative declaration for purposes of SEQR by Domenico, seconded by Pelletieri.

Difara asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Bevilacqua, yes; Domenico, yes; Pelletieri, yes; and Difara, yes; all in favor, declaration moved.

Motion to find the project in conformance with LWRP policy standards and conditions by Pelletieri, seconded by Bevilacqua.

Difara asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Bevilacqua, yes; Domenico, yes; Pelletieri, yes; and Difara, yes; all in favor, declaration moved.

Motion to approve Site Plan with conditions that (1) Front façade to be revised to include a base, body and cornice and revised façade to be submitted to the Administrator for approval, and (2) Dumpster to be added to area near garage, by Bevilacqua, seconded by Domenico.

Difara asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Bevilacqua, yes; Domenico, yes; Pelletieri, yes; and Difara, yes; all in favor, unanimous approval.

### **4) Stacey Allott, Site Plan Review for a single-family dwelling, 82 Riverside Drive**

Difara noted that the Board is still waiting on some additional information for this plan, specifically regarding topography, adjacent properties and potential easements for access to the property.

Stacey Allott, applicant, stated that the plan is to construct a single-family dwelling on a lot that was part of the Harbor Hill development. She stated that there is potential for access off of Maryland Ave. and that she has already contacted the neighboring property owner regarding this. She offered to share with the Board the drive profiles and a map with the newly proposed access.

Difara asked Blaine about the new information for the Board.

Blaine stated that it is up to the Board, what to do with that additional information. He asked about water and sewer hookups and stated that more details may be needed.

Allott responded to say that she has worked out that water hookup will be possible from the Maryland Ave. access and that sewer can most likely come in from Riverside Dr.

Blaine echoed that this is the information that he has been looking for with the application, along with information on the retaining wall, cross sections for the proposed driveway, all of that information can help the Board to make a decision.

He added that perhaps it makes sense to look at access off of Riverside Dr. for the driveway, water, and sewer.

Difara stated that she is leaning toward adjourning any decision until the next meeting, in order to ask for additional needed information and review it in time.

Haggmann asked if it is possible to push this project to the second meeting date in May.

Allott stated that she did not know that a Site Plan was needed for this proposed project.

Difara stated that there can be a meeting of the Board on the third Tuesday in May.

Blaine stated that adjourning the public hearing will not require additional public notice for this project.

Domenico asked about DPW conversations surrounding water and sewer hookups from either Riverside Drive or Maryland Ave.

Difara commented that that is a good suggestion. She stated that the applicant continue to look into the existing possibilities for water and sewer.

Allott stated that the elevation allows for gravity feeding down to Riverside Drive for sewer and that she is willing to do what the Village DPW recommends for water hookup.

Difara stated that steeply pitched sewer and storm drains can put great pressure and be very taxing on the Village street hookups.

Allott stated that she will reach out to the DPW and will work to get more information to the Board.

Difara stated that the 6PM meeting on May 18<sup>th</sup> will take place in order to review this application.

Domenico asked about the height of the proposed retaining wall on the property.

Allott stated that allowing the access from Maryland Drive will mean no retaining wall because of the elevation.

Domenico asked that if the applicant has now secured the easement on the Maryland Drive access, are the only outstanding items needed for the Board water and sewer access.

Difara asked for the topographic survey.

Allott stated that there is pretty limited grading required, but stated that she can provide a topographic survey.

Pelletieri stated that he has walked the property and that helped to understand it.

Difara stated that the Board needs to see written information and supporting documents on a decision on the utilities, a topographic survey, and heights and locations for retaining walls on the property, and some type of right of way easement with the neighbor for the potential access, which keep in mind, will eventually be recorded with the property's deed at the county level.

Motion to adjourn the public hearing until May 18<sup>th</sup> by Bevilacqua, seconded by Domenico.

Difara asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Bevilacqua, yes; Domenico, yes; Pelletieri, yes; Hagmann yes; and Difara, yes; all in favor, public hearing adjourned.

##### **5)Cook & Stumpf, LLC, Site Plan Review for a Brewpub, 65 Broadway**

Joe Garso, engineer, stated that he is here tonight to represent the project. He stated that the Brewpub will be part of the operations at Bitters and Bones.

Motion to close public hearing by Domenico, seconded by Pelletieri.

Difara asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Bevilacqua, yes; Domenico, yes; Pelletieri, yes; Hagmann yes; and Difara, yes; all in favor, public hearing closed.

Domenico asked about the proposed new window.

Garso stated that the window will be located on the North side of the building in a slightly shifted location from the existing window. He stated that the type of window proposed is due to functional use as a means to move barley in and out of that part of the building.

Difara read through the Short Environmental Assessment Form for the project.

Motion to issue a negative declaration for purposes of SEQR by Domenico, seconded by Hagmann.

Difara asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Bevilacqua, yes; Domenico, yes; Pelletieri, yes; Hagmann yes; and Difara, yes; all in favor, declaration moved.

Motion to find the project in conformance with LWRP policy standards and conditions by Hagmann, seconded by Domenico.

Difara asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Bevilacqua, yes; Domenico, yes; Pelletieri, yes; Hagmann yes; and Difara, yes; all in favor, declaration moved.

Domenico stated that the proposed condition of approval for a casement-style window may conflict with the applicant's proposed use of that new window.

Difara agreed and asked for the applicant to respond to that proposed condition of approval.

Jimmy Williams, owner, stated that the window really does have a purpose as a slider-style window. He offered to add white trim to the window.

Difara agreed that that is appropriate.

Motion to approve Site Plan with conditions that (1) Delivery trucks to unload in ROW north of the property, (2) New window to have a white trim, (3) Roofing to be concealed fastener metal, color to match existing, and (4) No work for Phase II to be started prior to DB approval and issuance of a building permit, by Bevilacqua, seconded by Pelletieri.

Difara asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Bevilacqua, yes; Domenico, yes; Pelletieri, yes; Haggmann yes; and Difara, yes; all in favor, unanimous approval.

#### **6) Saranac Waterfront Lodge, Site Plan Amendment, 250 Lake Flower Ave.**

Garso, project engineer, addressed the Board to state that being here tonight is a result of not fully understanding each of the conditions that were attached to the approval received at the April meeting, specifically surrounding the proposed outdoor pool area. He stated that features that had been planned for around the pool area will not be implemented after all.

Difara asked Blaine for additional information on this requested amendment.

Blaine stated that the decision on the amendment is up to the Board, he added that the original plan was actually for an outdoor hot tub that had potential to be installed later as part of several amenities to make this property a resort/hotel.

Pelletieri stated that he does not see a need for the patio and fence to be added at this time.

Bevilacqua agreed with Pelletieri that it certainly would not make sense to add those features at this time.

Domenico stated that the original intent of the project was to be a full space with amenities. He added that in the early stages of this project there was public input which means this Board may want to be wary of making too many changes to what was originally approved. He stated that there is some value to keeping that type of seating space, lakeside, on the property.

Difara stated that the applicant may still add those features at a later time.

Haggmann stated that he is fine with the requested amendment. He stated that there is still benefit to having this remain as greenspace along the waterfront.

Difara asked Blaine about the potential for this feature to be added in the future and if it will be an entirely new application for this property.

Blaine stated that it could still be considered an amendment to the Site Plan in the future.

Domenico suggested giving the applicant additional time to install the feature, even if that means a couple of years.

Blaine clarified that if a certificate of occupancy is issued for this project, without the completion of everything on the approved Site Plan, then the Village may look into ensuring something does get done by retaining a set amount of money from the applicant. He stated that this is a performance guarantee to be set within a timeline.

Domenico suggested that to the applicant.

Garso stated that the project manager did not have a certain timeline in mind, even if it is a couple of years off, to install these features.

Difara stated that the applicant can wrap up the project completely without the burden of an extended timeline. She stated that it does make a difference for financing a large project. She clarified that a separate, new application can be submitted at the time that the applicant is ready to add these features.

Difara stated that the applicant can wrap up the project completely without the burden of an extended timeline. She stated that it does make a difference for financing a large project. She clarified that a separate, new application can be submitted at the time that the applicant is ready to add these features.

Domenico stated that the new decision tonight would be to allow the applicant to not install a patio and a fence.

Motion to approve Site Plan Amendment by Bevilacqua, seconded by Pelletieri.

Difara asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Pelletieri, yes; Domenico, yes; Bevilacqua, yes; Haggmann yes; and Difara, yes; all in favor, unanimous approval.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

## **OLD BUSINESS**

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to adjourn by Difara, seconded by Haggmann.

Difara asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Bevilacqua, yes; Domenico, yes; Pelletieri, yes; Haggmann yes; and Difara, yes; all in favor, meeting adjourned.

Meeting was officially adjourned at 7:17pm.

Meeting minutes prepared by Cassandra Hopkins, May 11<sup>th</sup>

Community Development Administrative Assistant