

**CITY OF GLOVERSVILLE PLANNING BOARD
MAY 3, 2016
7:00 P.M.
CITY HALL**

MEETING NOTES

PRESENT:

**JAMES ANDERSON, CHAIRMAN
GEOFFREY PECK, VICE CHAIRMAN
MATTHEW DONDE
BRENDA LEITT
PETER SEMIONE, ALTERNATE**

**CINDY OSTRANDER, SECRETARY
BRANDON MYERS, CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER
TOM GROFF, FIRE CHIEF
SEAN GERAGHTY, SENIOR PLANNER**

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

DISCUSSION: Planning Board Chairman James Anderson asked Planning Board Alternate Peter Semione to sit in on behalf of Jonathan Kluska.

II. APPROVE MINUTES OF LAST REGULAR MEETING:

MOTION : To approve the minutes to the April 5, 2016 meeting.
MADE BY : Geoffrey Peck
SECONDED : Brenda Leitt
VOTE : 5 in favor, 0 opposed

III. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:

A. Purpose:

The City of Gloversville Planning Board offers a public comment period at the beginning of each of its meetings in an effort to allow the community an opportunity to comment or provide insight on a particular land use planning and/or zoning issue in the City. This comment period is not a public hearing and the Planning Board asks that you save comments regarding a particular project that is before the Board until the actual

public hearing on the specific application itself. The Planning Board also asks that you not use the public comment period as a question and answer session since Board members will not enter into a dialogue regarding any particular issue.

There was no one to speak during the public comment period.

IV. BETSY FIGUEROA – PUBLIC HEARING ON A SITE PLAN FOR RESTAURANT AT 122 EAST FULTON STREET:

A. Background:

Betsy Figueroa would like to open a new restaurant (Fig’s Fish Fry) at 122 East Fulton Street (Tax Map Parcel No. 149.7-12-2). According to her Site Plan application, Fig’s Fish Fry will have both eat in and takeout service and will be open 10 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Thursdays through Sundays. The Site Plan application shows 20 off-street parking spaces, a delivery offload area and an outdoor seating area.

B. April 5, 2016 Meeting:

During its April 5, 2016 meeting, the City of Gloversville Planning Board began reviewing Betsy Figueroa’s Site Plan for a restaurant at 122 East Fulton Street. At that time, the Planning Board asked that the following information be provided on the revised Site Plan drawings prior to the public hearing:

1. A scaled Site Plan drawing showing the boundaries of the property, a title for the project and a location map should be provided.

STATUS: The boundaries of the property are not clearly defined.

DISCUSSION: County Senior Planner Sean Geraghty explained to the applicant that the property boundaries are not delineated on the Site Plan drawing. He indicated that it is easy enough to ascertain where the western property boundary is, but the eastern property boundary is not as discernible.

There was a general consensus among Planning Board members that the property boundaries will have to be clearly shown on the final Site Plan drawing.

2. The number of available off-street parking spaces should be clearly noted on the revised drawing.

STATUS: The revised drawing shows 21 parking spaces on the restaurant property.

DISCUSSION: City Building Inspector Brandon Myers noted that an 8' access aisle will need to be provided adjacent to the handicap parking space. Mr. Geraghty pointed out that this will likely eliminate one (1) of the available off-street parking spaces.

3. City Building Inspector Brandon Myers has indicated that 27 off-street parking spaces must be provided for the proposed restaurant use. Following last month's meeting, a letter was sent to Dale Trumbull, City of Gloversville Director of Public Works, seeking a recommendation regarding the availability of sufficient public off-street and/or on-street parking to support the proposed reuse of the former restaurant at 122 East Fulton Street.

STATUS: In a letter dated April 13, 2016, Mr. Trumbull has indicated that he believes there is sufficient on-street parking available to go along with the spots that are available on the restaurant property.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board had no questions regarding Mr. Trumbull's recommendation.

4. If an outdoor seating area is to be provided, it must be moved to the rear portion of the property and should be displayed on the revised Site Plan.

STATUS: A notation has been provided on the revised drawing indicating that no outside seating area is planned.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Figueroa indicated that, due to the steep slope behind the building, there will be no outdoor seating area proposed.

5. The location and screening of any dumpster on the property should be identified.

STATUS: Two (2) dumpsters are shown on the southwest corner of the property. However, the type of screening to be provided around the dumpsters has not been identified.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board held a lengthy discussion with the applicant concerning the proposed location of the dumpsters. Eventually, the applicant agreed to place the dumpsters near the northeast corner of the rear parking lot. The Planning Board did not ask for any screening to be provided at this new location.

6. If any additional outdoor lighting is to be provided, its location and design must be noted on the revised drawing.

STATUS: Existing light locations are identified on the exterior of the building.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board had no comments regarding the existing light locations.

7. The size, location and design of any additional signage on the property should be noted.

STATUS: One (1) 4' x 6' sign advertising the business is identified above the front doorway to the restaurant. A picture of that sign was provided for the April 5, 2016 meeting.

DISCUSSION: The applicant indicated that she did not intend to have any additional signage at the present time. Planning Board members were comfortable with the picture that was provided during the April 5, 2016 meeting and did not request any additional details.

8. Any additional exterior improvements to be made to the building should be noted on the revised Site Plan.

STATUS: A note has been added to the Site Plan indicating that no significant exterior improvements will be made other than painting.

DISCUSSION: Planning Board Chairman James Anderson asked the applicant if she had a schedule for completing the exterior painting of the building?

Ms. Figueroa indicated that she began painting the structure this past week and realized that she will need a sprayer to efficiently complete the job. She indicated that she hoped to have the painting done as soon as possible.

9. A note should be placed on the drawing indicating that a Knox Box will be provided for the building.

STATUS: A notation has been added to the drawing indicating that the Knox Box will be located by the side entrance to the restaurant.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board had no questions regarding the location of the Knox Box.

C. State Environmental Quality Review:

In accordance with Section 617.5 of 6 NYCRR, the Planning Board felt that the applicant's proposal to reopen a restaurant at 122 East Fulton Street simply represented the rehabilitation of an existing structure for a similar purpose and should be classified as a Type II Action under SEQR.

D. Public Hearing:

1. The public hearing was opened at 7:12 P.M.

2. Speakers:

James and Catherine Brown
9 Market Street

Mr. Brown noted that the previous owners of the restaurant placed the dumpsters near the northeast corner of the rear parking lot adjacent to the steps. Mr. Brown asked if the applicant, during the winter months, could push snow toward the eastern property boundary and not towards the back line adjacent to his home. He explained that, in the past, he has had damage to windows in his home when the snow is plowed up against his house. Mr. Brown then explained that he also planted a flower garden along his property boundary and asked if the applicant could place a sign in the rear parking lot prohibiting customers from backing into spaces. He explained that when vehicles back into the spaces, the exhaust fumes do damage to his flower garden.

Mr. Geraghty noted that the applicant could place a sign in the parking lot prohibiting customers from backing into spaces, but noted that it may be very difficult to police this type of problem.

Betsy Figueroa then explained that she didn't think she was going to need the larger dining room in the restaurant that is approximately 830 sq. ft. in size. She explained that she has begun exploring the idea of renting out the space for a retail shop or office. She asked if she would need to resubmit her Site Plan application if she wanted to lease the space out for those purposes?

Mr. Geraghty suggested to Ms. Figueroa that if she was unsure of what she would like to do with the space, she may be better off simply proceeding with the current application and getting approval from the Planning Board. He explained that, at some future date, when she knows what she would like to use the space for, she could submit a Site Plan amendment to the Planning Board.

Mr. Myers agreed and noted that if she wanted to use the additional dining hall space for a retail or office use, she would have to determine the fire separation requirements for those uses.

Mr. Brown added that the applicant may need to put signage on her property indicating that the parking spaces are for customers only. He explained that, in the past, individuals using the basketball court at the Market Street Park have typically parked on the restaurant property.

3. The public hearing was closed at 7:25 P.M.

E. Planning Board Action:

In accordance with Section 300-80 of the City of Gloversville Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Board, within forty-five (45) days after the public hearing, shall approve, approve with modifications or disapprove the Application for Site Plan approval. Consequently, does the Planning Board wish to issue its final decision on Betsy Figueroa's Site Plan for a restaurant at 122 East Fulton Street at this time?

DISCUSSION: After briefly discussing the application, Board members felt that no additional changes would need to be made to the plans.

MOTION: To conditionally approve Betsy Figueroa's Site Plan for a restaurant at 122 East Fulton Street with the following stipulations:

1. The final Site Plan drawing must show the actual property boundaries of the site.
2. The final Site Plan must also identify the new location for the dumpsters in the northeast corner of the rear parking lot.
3. A notation must be made on the final Site Plan indicating that a sign will be provided in the rear parking lot requesting that vehicles not back into spaces.
4. A notation must be placed on the final Site Plan drawing indicating that the snow removal plan for the site will involve moving snow in the rear parking lot towards the eastern property boundary and not towards the southern property boundary and the adjacent residential dwelling.

MADE BY: Geoffrey Peck
SECONDED: Brenda Leitt
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

V. **FULTON COUNTY DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY:**

A. Background:

Fulton County currently has a multitude of economic development initiatives underway. At the same time, many local communities have recently developed or updated Comprehensive Plans for their communities.

In an effort to tie together all of the local economic development initiatives that are being pursued by the County and various economic development groups and to incorporate local plans and concepts into a coordinated cohesive document, Fulton County has decided to prepare a Development Strategy for the entire community.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty reminded Board members that, during last month's meeting, they began talking about Fulton County's effort to put together a County Development Strategy. Mr. Geraghty pointed out that there are several components to the Development Strategy, one of which will involve communicating a vision for the City of Gloversville's Central Business District and identifying specific projects that can be pursued in that area.

B. April 5, 2016 Meeting:

During its April 5, 2016 meeting, the Planning Board began discussing Fulton County's effort to have a County Development Strategy put together by River Street Planning & Development Associates of Troy, NY. As part of the discussion, Planning Board members were asked to begin considering the following issues that are going to be addressed by River Street Planning & Development in the County's Development Strategy:

1. What are the boundaries of the City of Gloversville Downtown area?
 - Historic District
 - Business Improvement District (BID)
 - New Overlay Zone

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty displayed a map of Downtown Gloversville showing the Historic District boundaries, as well as the Business Improvement District boundaries. Mr. Geraghty reminded Board members that, during last month's meeting, City Councilman Steven Smith, P.E. talked to them about an Overlay District that will be proposed as part of the Zoning Ordinance Update. He indicated that he spoke with Mr. Smith earlier in the day about the boundaries of the Overlay Zone. He explained that Mr. Smith stated that the Overlay Zone will encompass both the Historic District boundaries and the Business Improvement District boundaries and extend a short distance up a few of the streets that lead to the Central Business District.

Mr. Myers indicated that he could get the City's consultants, Greenman-Pedersen, to forward a copy of the Overlay District boundaries to the County Planning Department so that the boundaries can be put on the County's GIS.

The Planning Board then held a lengthy discussion concerning the group's perceived boundaries of the Central Business District. Individual Board members offered several variations of the perceived Central Business District boundaries including properties along North and South Main Street extending from Eighth Avenue down to Harrison Street and, at the other end of the spectrum, properties extending only from Fulton Street to Prospect Avenue. Mr. Geraghty explained that he didn't think

it was necessary for the Planning Board to specifically identify every property that should be included in the Central Business District, but felt it was important for the Board to recognize the different perceived boundaries of the Central Business District that may change depending on the person or entity describing its parameters.

2. Describe the City's vision for developing its Downtown area?

- Residences
- Retail Shops
- Offices
- Restaurants
- Attractive Public Space

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty noted that the potential uses listed above in the Agenda are the types of projects Planning Board members, over the years, have indicated they would like to see developed in the Downtown area. Mr. Geraghty asked if there were other uses that Board members felt should be listed in the vision for developing the Downtown area? After a brief discussion, there was a general consensus among Board members that a mix of the uses listed above would be the ideal development scenario for the Downtown area.

3. Identify ideas, projects and initiatives that can be pursued in order to achieve that vision.

- Bring residences to Central Business District
- Target neighborhoods
- Infill opportunities
- Public Park

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty stated that he recently attended the NYS Innovative Communities Network meeting in downtown Gloversville and listened to speakers from the City of Albany BID's and the City of Ithaca BID. He indicated that, while the City of Albany and City of Ithaca have much different circumstances than the City of Gloversville, it was interesting listening to the types of efforts that are underway in those communities and the types of events the BID's promote. Mr. Geraghty explained that the overriding message from the BID representatives was that residential development must come first to the Downtown area before any of the other development occurs.

Planning Board members then talked at length about opportunities to redevelop buildings and create infill sites in the Downtown area. Properties that were discussed by Planning Board members included:

- JKMB Realty, Inc.'s building at 24 Washington Street
- The former Estee Middle School building
- The former glove shop building at 51 East Fulton Street across from the Gloversville Library
- The JRS Realty Company building at 102 South Main Street adjacent to Nethaway's Garage
- Vacant church buildings at 7 Elm Street and 16 West Fulton Street

Mr. Geraghty talked about a concept for an infill project using the properties that are identified as parcels 7-7.5 on the list that was handed out to Board members. Mr. Geraghty explained that the properties are located on one of the main traffic corridors into the City's Central Business District. He reminded Board members that, during the summer months when individuals from outside of the community are heading towards their Caroga Lake, Peck Lake and Canada Lake homes, they pass directly through this corridor. He noted that, in its present condition, it is a community eyesore. He indicated that a possible infill project for the City would be to take down the six (6) residential buildings that are located on the properties and redevelop the site with offices and retail shops on the ground floor and residences on the upper floors. He indicated that this type of project would create a more attractive and functional corridor as you enter the City's Central Business District. Planning Board members felt that this potential project would be very worthwhile to share with River Street Planning & Development.

Mr. Geraghty also talked about the need to create attractive public spaces in the Downtown area.

Planning Board Member Geoff Peck pointed out that the individuals working on the Downtown Plan are looking at the City-owned property adjacent to the former Woolworth's store along Main Street and are hoping to turn the space into a public park and create a pathway from Main Street to the pavilion area on Elm Street where the Farmer's Markets are held.

Mr. Geraghty agreed that the site would be an excellent location to create usable, attractive public space in the Downtown area.

Mr. Geraghty expressed how important he felt it was to reuse or redevelop the former Frontier Communications' building across from City Hall on Church Street. He indicated that a potential use for the property would be to demolish the existing building and construct an indoor recreation center on the site. He pointed out that there is sufficient parking on the property to support an indoor recreational facility for youth soccer, basketball, lacrosse, etc. He pointed out that these types of facilities are very popular in the Capital District and there currently is no such facility that serves the various School Districts throughout Fulton and Montgomery County. He noted that this type of facility could also be used for large events on the weekends that would bring more people into the Downtown area.

Mr. Peck agreed that the site would make a very good location for a recreational center. He noted that there is an entity that is currently looking at the site for another potential use.

4. Specifically identify three (3) projects in the Downtown area.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty pointed out that River Street Planning & Development is going to be asked to obtain feedback from various entities in the City, including the City Planning Board, the City Council and the business

community and identify a project that can immediately be pursued in the Downtown area and could have a significant impact on future development efforts.

Planning Board Member Peter Semione noted that he felt the biggest concerns he has with redeveloping the Downtown area of the City is the amount of substandard and low-rent housing and the demographics of the City's population. He indicated that he didn't feel investors would be enticed to pursue projects in the City of Gloversville if the demographics of the community can't support higher rents.

Mr. Geraghty agreed with Mr. Semione and pointed out that the City of Gloversville contains an overwhelming majority of the individuals living below the poverty level in Fulton County. He indicated that the City needs to change this. There was then a lengthy discussion concerning the need to tear down more substandard homes in the community and not recycle them back into new ownership through tax sales. The group talked about the need to create housing that appeals to a moderate to high-income demographic. Board members then expressed the concern that many local landlords simply collect rent payments from the County's Social Services Agency and make very few upgrades to properties other than those necessitated by NYS Building Codes.

Mr. Peck talked about a potential project in the former Estee Middle School building. He indicated that it does not look like Liberty Enterprises will have the ability to pursue the project it proposed to the Planning Board for the past couple of years. He indicated that the City needs to use the demolition funding that it received before the end of this year and remove the building. He indicated that there is an entity looking to create office and retail space on the first floor of a new building and potentially market-rate senior housing on the upper floors.

The Planning Board then talked at length about the Two Great Guys' buildings at the intersection of West Fulton and South Main Streets. Planning Board members felt that the consultants should reach out to David Eger and talk to him about his future plans for those buildings. Mr. Myers and Mr. Anderson both talked about the condition of the properties and some of the interior renovations that were started and never completed.

Mr. Geraghty indicated that, if any Board members have a project they would like to offer to River Street Planning & Development, to please contact him and let him know. Mr. Geraghty indicated that he did not know if or when the consultants would be sitting down with the Planning Board to discuss potential projects in the Downtown area.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. Code Enforcement Update:

Brandon Myers distributed a handout to Board members containing language from the City's Site Plan Regulations. He indicated that he felt the current regulations contain everything that is needed to enforce the

Planning Board's approval of Site Plan applications. Board members briefly discussed the idea of putting together a cover letter for applicants to explain what a Site Plan approval means and what is going to be expected of an individual who receives a Site Plan approval from the Planning Board.

Mr. Myers indicated that he would send Board members a You Tube video from a national expert on redeveloping blighted areas.

Mr. Myers indicated that Larry McGillis may be coming before the Planning Board in the near future with a project involving the development of two (2) homes on Broad Street. He indicated that Mr. McGillis is currently before the City's Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) attempting to obtain multiple area variances.

Mr. Peck then talked briefly about the potential of requiring Site Plan applicants to post a completion bond for projects.

VII. CLOSE OF THE MEETING;

MOTION: To close the meeting at 8:33 p.m.
MADE BY: Geoffrey Peck
SECONDED: Peter Semione
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed