

**CITY OF GLOVERSVILLE PLANNING BOARD  
MAY 5, 2015  
7:00 P.M.  
CITY HALL**

**MEETING NOTES**

**PRESENT:**

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

**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.

**II. APPROVE MINUTES OF LAST REGULAR MEETING:**

MOTION : To approve the minutes to the April 7, 2015 meeting.  
MADE BY : Geoffrey Peck  
SECONDED : Matthew Donde  
VOTE : 4 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. GLOVERSVILLE PUBLIC LIBRARY – SITE PLAN FOR NEW PARKING LOT AND STORAGE SHED:**

A. Background:

The Gloversville Public Library would like to turn a vacant piece of property at 66 East Fulton Street (Tax Map Parcel No. 149.6-14-4) into a parking lot for Library patrons and install a storage shed on the back portion of the lot. According to the Library's application, the parking area will also be used by the Fulton County Office of Probation.

Jason Dell, P.E., Lansing Engineering, gave the Planning Board a brief description of the project. He noted the location of the property and the size of the parcel. He indicated that the property is currently a gravel lot which will be improved as a paved lot for 15 new parking spaces. Mr. Dell talked about the maintenance storage shed to be constructed on the project site and the municipal infrastructure to be extended into the property.

Planning Board Member Geoffrey Peck noted that the building shown on the Site Plan drawing has two (2) stories. He questioned the use of this building as simply a maintenance shed?

Mr. Dell indicated that the Library intends to use the building to store maintenance items and janitorial supplies.

Barbara Madonna, the Director of the Gloversville Public Library, indicated that the building may also be used to store additional shelving and possibly books that will sold at one of the Library's book sales.

B. Planning Department Review:

The Fulton County Planning Department has reviewed the application in accordance with the City's Site Plan Regulations and would like to offer the following comments:

1. A metes and bounds boundary description of the property should be shown on the Site Plan drawing.

DISCUSSION: There was a general consensus among Planning Board members that a metes and bounds description must be included on the Site Plan drawing so that paving does not take place on an adjacent property.

2. The sidewalk leading from the parking area to the new maintenance shed should be labeled.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty asked if there was a lengthier sidewalk to be constructed as part of the project?

Mr. Dell indicated that the only sidewalk to be constructed is the small walkway between the parking area and the new maintenance storage shed.

3. The area labeled “exterior storage area” should be explained in a narrative.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Madonna indicated that the location of the “exterior storage area” as shown on the Site Plan drawing will simply be an extension of the foundation to allow access around the entire building and will not be used for exterior storage.

Mr. Peck asked if the building would be heated?

Ms. Madonna indicated that the Library will probably heat the building with an electric heater, but will not provide air conditioning during the summer months.

Mr. Peck again questioned the size of the building and the use of the term “shed” to describe the structure.

Ms. Madonna pointed out that the only reason that the building is shown as two (2) stories is that the lower level sits at a lower elevation and that the building will essentially still only be one (1) story in height.

4. The catchbasins to be installed in the parking lot are very shallow and may freeze during the winter months.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty indicated that he wanted Board members to recognize that the shallow depth of Catchbasin #1 may cause problems during the winter months if the storm sewer freezes. He indicated that this type of problem has occurred in the Town of Johnstown.

Mr. Dell indicated that, given the layout of the site, it would be difficult to tie into the City’s storm sewer system on Fulton Street if the catchbasin is set any lower. He indicated that the other alternative was to allow water to sheet off of the site towards the south.

Mr. Geraghty pointed out that there may be times during the winter months where water will not collect in Catchbasin No. 1 and it will sheet off to the south. Mr. Geraghty asked that Lansing Engineering consider any other alternatives for collecting stormwater on the site.

5. Is any lighting needed or proposed for the back portion of the maintenance shed?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty noted that if the back portion of the shed is not going to be used as an exterior storage area, then lighting may not be needed.

Ms. Madonna confirmed that no lighting would be provided on the back portion of the maintenance shed.

Planning Board members held a brief discussion concerning the need for a Knox Box on the building.

Tom Groff noted that the Knox Box for the Library building is actually on a pole in front of the building. It was suggested that a key for the maintenance storage shed also be included in that Knox Box.

6. Building elevation drawings for the maintenance shed have not been provided.

DISCUSSION: Travis Rosencranse, Lansing Engineering, explained that the building elevation drawings are currently being prepared and will be included in the revised submission.

7. Will any additional landscaping be provided on the site?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Dell indicated that no additional landscaping is being proposed. He noted that almost the entire site will be paved.

8. An estimated project construction schedule should be included with the application.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Madonna indicated that the Library would like to finish the project by this summer.

Mr. Geraghty asked if all three (3) phases of construction that are identified on the Site Plan drawings would be completed by this summer?

There was then a lengthy discussion concerning how much of the work would be completed in the next few months.

Ms. Madonna explained that the schedule will be dependent upon financing for the project. She did indicate that Phase I of the project will include the installation of the pavement binder on the site, but she did not go so far as to indicate that the proposed maintenance storage shed would be finished this summer.

Planning Board Chairman Jim Anderson asked if the construction trailer to be parked on the site would be hooked up to an electric service?

Mr. Dell indicated that he did not believe the trailer would be hooked up to an electrical service.

Mr. Geraghty asked if the sewer lateral shown on the drawing is existing?

Mr. Dell indicated that the sewer lateral will be new.

Mr. Geraghty pointed out that the legend on the Site Plan drawing shows the sewer lateral as existing.

Mr. Dell indicated that he would amend the drawing before resubmitting to the Planning Board.

Planning Board Member Matthew Donde asked that the elevation drawings show the lighting to be attached to the building.

C. State Environmental Quality Review:

Section 617.1 of 6 NYCRR states that, the basic purpose of SEQR is to incorporate the consideration of environmental factors into the existing planning, review and decision making processes of State, regional and local government agencies at the earliest possible time. To accomplish this goal, SEQR requires that all agencies determine whether the actions they directly undertake, fund or approve may have a significant effect on the environment, and if it is determined that the actions may have a significant effect, prepare or request an environmental impact statement. Under these terms, the review of a Site Plan application is subject to SEQR. Therefore, the following issues must be addressed:

1. Does the Planning Board feel that the Short Environmental Assessment Form, provided by the applicant, has been completed adequately?

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board felt that the Short Environmental Assessment Form had been completed adequately.

2. Does the Planning Board feel that any additional information should be provided as part of the SEQR process?

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board did not ask for any additional information.

3. Section 617.6 (b) of 6 NYCRR states that, when a single agency is involved, the agency will be the lead agency when it proposes to undertake, fund or approve a Type 1 or Unlisted Action that does not involve another agency. If the agency has received an application for funding or approval of the action, it must determine the significance of the action, within twenty (20) calendar days of its receipt of the application, an Environmental Assessment Form or any additional information reasonably necessary to make that determination, whichever is later. Therefore, does the Planning Board wish to issue a Determination of Significance under SEQR at this time?

MOTION: To file a negative declaration under SEQR for this proposed action since:

1. The reuse of the vacant lot as an improved parking lot will provide much needed off-street parking for both the public library and the County Office of Probation.
2. There will be no traffic implications resulting from the proposed action.
3. The aesthetic appearance of the property will be improved by the paved parking area and maintenance shed.
4. Any utilities extended into the site as part of this project are readily available at the curb.

MADE BY: Matthew Donde  
SECONDED: Geoffrey Peck  
VOTE: 4 in favor, 0 opposed

D. Planning Board Action:

In accordance with Section 300-79 of the City of Gloversville Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Board must fix a time within forty-five (45) days from the day the Planning Board determines an application for site plan review to be complete for a public hearing on the application for Site Plan approval. Consequently, does the Planning Board feel that a public hearing should be scheduled on the Gloversville Public Library's Site Plan application at this time?

MOTION: To schedule a public hearing on the Gloversville Public Library's Site Plan for a new parking lot and maintenance shed for 7:00 p.m., Tuesday, June 2, 2015.

MADE BY: Matthew Donde  
SECONDED: Brenda Leitt  
VOTE: 4 in favor, 0 opposed

V. **VICTOR TRIPPODO - SITE PLAN FOR TRAINING GYM AND PROFESSIONAL BOXING VENUE:**

A. Background:

Victor Trippodo owns the building at 93 South Main Street (Tax Map Parcel No. 149.6-22-39). Mr. Trippodo would like to convert the building into a training gym and professional boxing venue. The property is approximately 9,740 sq. ft. in size, and the building consumes almost the entire parcel.

B. January 6, 2015 Meeting:

During its January 6, 2015 meeting, the Planning Board discussed a concept plan for the property with the applicant, Victor Trippodo. At that time, the Planning Board identified several pieces of information that would need to be included on a Site Plan drawing before a formal review of the application would be commenced:

1. The actual boundaries of the property should be clearly shown along with the neighboring property.

STATUS: The drawing provided by the applicant is based on tax map information and not a certified survey of the boundary lines.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board felt that, given the fact that no new construction will take place on the property, the boundary lines shown on the drawing based on the tax map information would be sufficient.

2. The location of exits and entrances to the building should be shown on the drawing with dimensional specifications.

STATUS: The main entrance to the facility is shown along the west elevation of the building which means access will come from Main Street. A handicap access ramp will be constructed to an access door on the Forest Street side of the building. A fire exit has also been identified on the Forest Street side of the building.

DISCUSSION: Steven Smith, P.E., representing the applicant, pointed out that all three (3) of the exits will be on the main floor of the building.

Mr. Peck asked if bathrooms would be provided on both levels of the building?

Mr. Trippodo indicated that he may eventually provide bathrooms on both levels.

Mr. Peck pointed out that when Mr. Trippodo explained his concept plan to the Planning Board, he estimated that upwards of 1,000 individuals may attend an event in the building. He pointed out that the application now indicates that up to 100 individuals may attend an event. Mr. Peck asked for a clarification on the maximum number of individuals who could conceivably attend an event in the building?

Mr. Smith pointed out that the original number was based on the amount of public parking that is available within a given distance from the building. He indicated that he has not done an in-depth analysis of what the occupancy limits for the venue will be.

Mr. Peck asked if there was room to expand the bathroom facilities?

Mr. Smith indicated that he believed there is. He pointed out that New York State's Building Code is actually very lenient on the amount of bathroom space that is necessary for this type of occupancy.

3. The location and design of any new signage on the buildings must be identified.

STATUS: The location of a sign has been identified on the Main Street side of the building. The narrative provided by the applicant's engineer indicates that the sign is 50 sq. ft. in size. However, the design of the sign has not been clearly identified.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Trippodo indicated that the sign will simply be painted on the building just as the existing sign was painted on the building. He indicated that he has already appeared before the City's Historic District Review Board to discuss this issue.

4. The location and design of any new outdoor lighting on the property must be identified.

STATUS: Several gooseneck light fixtures are provided around the building. These fixtures will need to be examined by the City's Historic District Review Board.

DISCUSSION: There was a general consensus among Board members that the gooseneck light fixtures would be a nice touch for the building.

5. Any exterior changes to take place on the building should be noted on the drawing.

STATUS: A new handicap ramp has been identified on the Forest Street side of the building. A new door has also been provided at the base of the former delivery ramp. The only other exterior changes to take place on the building will be the repointing of brick in multiple locations.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Smith pointed out that there is a significant amount of cracking, bowing and movement on the exterior wall of the building.

Mr. Trippodo added that there is actually three (3) layers of material on the outside of the building and that he may remove a layer or parge the outer surface in order to provide a cleaner look.

6. The total square footage of space to be occupied by each of the uses in building should be identified.

STATUS: There are two (2) room dimensions shown on the Site Plan drawing. Room 1 is identified as 3,184 sq. ft. in size, while Room 2, which includes the proposed boxing arena, is 3,339 sq. ft. in size. It is not clear

from the Site Plan drawing how the room 1 will be used, nor has the approximate occupancy of Room 2 been identified.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty asked Mr. Trippodo to clarify how Room 1 in the building is proposed to be used?

Mr. Trippodo explained that Room 1 will not be used like a typical health club facility. He indicated that classes will be scheduled by appointment in the building and there won't be a lot of the weights or cardio machines that are typically found in a health club.

The Planning Board asked Mr. Trippodo how often he would hold events in the boxing arena?

Mr. Trippodo indicated that he would likely hold events once each month on a Saturday night.

Board members asked if food would be served in the facility?

Mr. Trippodo indicated that the event would likely be catered. He pointed out that he has already spoken with the owners of the Brass Monkey about catering events at the facility.

Planning Board Member Matthew Donde asked what type of items would be sold in the store that is shown on the Site Plan drawing?

Mr. Trippodo indicated that the store will simply be a place where boxing gloves are rented and other various items for fighters are sold.

7. The location of a sprinkler system in the building should be noted.

STATUS: A sprinkler riser has been shown in the basement of the building.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty asked Mr. Smith what shape the sprinkler system was in?

Mr. Smith indicated that he did not believe it was in good shape and would likely have to be redone.

8. The location and number of stalls in each bathroom.

STATUS: Provided.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty noted that the Planning Board had already discussed this matter and asked Mr. Trippodo and Mr. Smith to provide an estimate of the number of individuals who could conceivably attend an event at the facility so that the size of the bathrooms can be ascertained.

9. The location of a Knox Box should be noted on the drawing.

STATUS: Provided.

Mr. Geraghty pointed out that there is no conceivable way for the applicant to provide any off-street parking on the property for this proposed use. He explained that the City of Gloversville Zoning Ordinance contains language that allows the Planning Board to request a recommendation from the City Engineer/DPW Director regarding the availability of publicly-owned off-street parking and on-street parking spaces. He asked if the Planning Board would like to authorize him to send a letter to the City's DPW Director Kevin Jones asking for a recommendation on the parking availability for Mr. Trippodo's project.

MOTION: Authorizing County Senior Planner Sean Geraghty to forward a letter on behalf of the Planning Board to City DPW Director Kevin Jones asking for a recommendation on the availability of parking for Mr. Trippodo's proposed training gym and professional boxing venue.

MADE BY: Geoffrey Peck  
SECONDED: Brenda Leitt  
VOTE: 4 in favor, 0 opposed

C. State Environmental Quality Review:

Section 617.5 of 6 NYCRR identifies Type 2 Actions which are actions or classes of actions that are not subject to review under the State Environmental Quality Review Act. Replacement, rehabilitation or reconstruction of a structure or facility in-kind on the same site, including upgrading buildings to meet building and fire codes, unless such action meets or exceeds any of the thresholds of Section 617.4 of this part, is considered a Type 2 Action.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board briefly talked about Mr. Trippodo's project and the lack of any potential environmental impacts that could result from the proposal. The Planning Board recognized that Mr. Trippodo is proposing to use the existing building for a use that is significantly different from its previous use, but is still simply reusing an existing building. The Planning Board noted that Mr. Trippodo will make minor exterior structure upgrades that will enhance the appearance of the building which is located within the City's Historic District. The Planning Board felt that Mr. Trippodo's Site Plan application should be classified as a Type 2 Action and not subject to the State Environmental Quality Review Act.

D. Planning Board Action:

In accordance with Section 300-79 of the City of Gloversville Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Board must fix a time within forty-five (45) days from the day the Planning Board determines an application for site plan review to be complete for a public hearing on the application for Site Plan approval. Consequently, does the Planning Board feel that a public hearing should be scheduled on Victor Trippodo's Site Plan application at this time?

MOTION: To schedule a public hearing on Victor Trippodo's Site Plan application for a training and professional boxing venue at 93 South Main Street for 7:00 p.m., Tuesday, June 2, 2015.

MADE BY: James Anderson  
SECONDED: Matthew Donde  
VOTE: 4 in favor, 0 opposed

**VI. OTHER BUSINESS:**

A. Code Enforcement Update:

City Building Inspector Brandon Myers indicated that he attended the first meeting of the Zoning Update Committee. He indicated that the Committee is working with Greenman Pedersen Associates on updating the City's Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Myers also indicated that the Sign Commission has begun reviewing the City's Sign Regulations.

Planning Board Member Geoffrey Peck asked about the sign that was recently installed at New York Pizza on North Main Street. There was then a lengthy discussion amongst Board members concerning the status of the Historic District Review Board's review of this sign and how the City's existing sign regulations are being interpreted with regards to this sign. Mr. Myers pointed out that he has asked the owner of the business to not have the sign blinking. He pointed out that the Historic District Review Board will be meeting again shortly to hopefully decide on this issue.

**VII. CLOSE OF THE MEETING;**

MOTION: To close the meeting at 7:57 p.m.

MADE BY: Brenda Leitt  
SECONDED: Matthew Donde  
VOTE: 4 in favor, 0 opposed