

**CITY OF GLOVERSVILLE PLANNING BOARD  
JANUARY 5, 2016  
7:00 P.M.  
CITY HALL**

**MEETING NOTES**

**PRESENT:**

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

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

MOTION : To approve the minutes to the December 1, 2015 meeting.

MADE BY : Geoffrey Peck  
SECONDED : Jonathan Kluska  
VOTE : 5 in favor, 0 opposed

**III. ELECTION OF OFFICERS:**

In accordance with Section 27 of the NYS General City Law, the Chairperson of the Planning Board is to be appointed by the Mayor or other duly-authorized appointing authority. However, in the absence of this appointment, the Planning Board is authorized to designate a member to serve as the Chairperson.

The City of Gloversville Planning Commission Bylaws stipulate that the Planning Commission shall have a Chairman to reside over all meetings and a Vice Chairman to assume those responsibilities in the absence of the Chairman. The Bylaws also stipulate that the officers will be subject to election at the annual meeting which shall take place in January of each year.

DISCUSSION: After a brief discussion, Board members felt that the current Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Planning Board should remain the same for 2016.

MOTION: Nominating James Anderson to serve as Chairman of the City of Gloversville Planning Board for 2016.

MADE BY: Matthew Donde

SECONDED: Brenda Leitt

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

MOTION: Nominating Geoffrey Peck to serve as Vice Chairman of the City of Gloversville Planning Board for 2016.

MADE BY: Matthew Donde

SECONDED: Jonathan Klusa

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

**IV. 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.

**V. NATHAN LITTAUER HOSPITAL – SITE PLAN FOR MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING:**

A. Background:

Nathan Littauer Hospital would like to construct a 7,722+/- sq. ft. medical office building on its property along Easterly Street (Tax Map Parcel No. 134.7-9-12.12). The Hospital's property is approximately 3.58 acres in size and is located on the same site as the Nathan Littauer Nursing Home. The Nursing Home building and the new medical office building, which will be used as an out-patient dialysis center, will be connected but separated by a fire wall.

Planning Board Member Geoff Peck indicated that he would abstain from the discussion on the application since he is employed by the Hospital.

Planning Board Alternate Peter Semione was asked to sit in for Mr. Peck.

Jessica Marquard, RLA, C.T. Male Associates, gave Planning Board members a brief overview of the medical office building project. She indicated that the building will be used as an outpatient dialysis center. She explained how patients would be dropped off along the Easterly Street side of the building. She pointed out that there is approximately a 12' grade change along that side of the building that will need to be addressed. She pointed out that the new building

will have a finished floor elevation approximately 9' lower than the Nursing Home facility. She indicated that the medical office building will have 12 employees and there will be an overall net loss of one (1) parking space on the Hospital property as a result of this project. She then talked briefly about the need for a permit from the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation for construction work that will take place within the 100' buffer zone of the adjacent wetland.

B. Planning Department Review:

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

1. A location drawing showing the entire Hospital complex and the property holdings of the Nathan Littauer Hospital should be provided with the Site Plan documents.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty explained that the location map, included with the Site Plan drawings, does not give the Planning Board an indication of how the medical office building fits into the entire Hospital Complex. Mr. Geraghty stated that he felt the Planning Board needed to see a location drawing showing the entire Hospital Complex with all buildings and parking areas shown and the extent of the Hospital's property boundaries delineated.

Planning Board members agreed that the entire complex should be shown on a location map in order to give them a better understanding of how the project will fit into the current layout of the Hospital Complex.

2. The Site Statistics table shown on Drawing C-110 needs to be clarified.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty asked Ms. Marquard to explain the existing and proposed front and side setbacks identified on the Site Statistics Table.

Ms. Marquard pointed out that the column labeled "existing" identifies the setback requirements found in the City's Zoning Regulations.

Mr. Geraghty indicated that he felt it was somewhat confusing to have the table labeled "existing" and "proposed" and that the column should be relabeled "zoning requirements."

3. The finished floor elevation for the new medical office building is identified as 867.12 on several of the Site Plan drawings. This elevation does not seem consistent with the surrounding elevations.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Marquard indicated that the finished floor elevation on all of the drawings should be identified as 876.12.

4. Although a project narrative for the Site Plan application has been submitted, it is difficult to ascertain from the drawings the exact number of parking spaces that are going to be eliminated from the site before the new spaces are created.

DISCUSSION: There was a brief discussion between Ms. Marquard and Planning Board members concerning the number of additional spaces that would

be needed as a result of the addition of an outpatient dialysis center on the Hospital property.

Mr. Geraghty asked Planning Board Member Geoff Peck, who previously recused himself from participating in the discussions on the project, to offer additional insight to the Planning Board with regards to this project.

Mr. Peck talked about the current parking situation on the Hospital property. He pointed out that there are specific employee parking areas that do not include the area on the north side of the proposed dialysis center. He indicated that the additional 12 employees who will be working in the dialysis center will easily be able to find parking spaces on the Hospital property, which often times has a large number of unused parking spaces.

Mr. Geraghty once again pointed out that a drawing of the entire Hospital Complex showing the layout of the buildings and parking areas on the property will greatly assist the Planning Board in getting a perspective of how this dialysis center will fit into the Hospital Complex.

5. Additional information regarding the new 8" sanitary sewer line serving the dialysis center should be provided. The Site Plan drawings seem to show that both a 6" line serving the existing Nursing Home and the new 8" line serving the dialysis center will be fed into a lift station located east of the project site. From there, there is no explanation of how sanitary wastewater leaves the property.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty suggested that specifications for the lift station be included on the detail drawings.

Ms. Marquard indicated that she would provide those details on the revised plans.

6. The hours of operation for the proposed dialysis center should be identified in the project narrative.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty asked Mr. Peck how long the dialysis center would operate each day?

Mr. Peck indicated that, to start, the dialysis center will be a daytime operation.

7. Is there a reason why the new paving around the proposed dialysis center does not include the entire northernmost access driveway off of Easterly Street and a larger portion of the adjacent parking lot?

DISCUSSION: Both Mr. Geraghty and City Building Inspector Brandon Myers pointed out that the Hospital may want to reconsider the extent of paving to be undertaken on the north end of the building. Mr. Geraghty indicated that if only a portion of the access driveway and parking area along the north end of the new building is paved, the appearance of the property could be negatively impacted.

Mr. Myers agreed and indicated that he felt it would be very difficult to have the new paved area match the grade of the existing blacktop.

Mr. Peck indicated that the Hospital would look into this issue.

8. Additional details concerning the pedestrian access along the north side of the building should be provided on the elevation drawings.

DISCUSSION: After a brief discussion, Board members felt that the ramp on the northwest corner of the new medical office building should be shown on the building elevation drawings. Mr. Myers asked that the elevation DATUM match the actual elevations on the property.

9. What is the new structure shown off of the northeast corner of the existing Nursing Home?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty noted that the structure, which Ms. Marquard previously identified as an outdoor storage area, be labeled on the revised drawings.

10. The location, size and design of any new signage advertising the medical office building/dialysis center should be identified.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Marquard indicated that she would have to speak with Hospital officials to find out if they intend to provide any new signage.

11. Mr. Myers asked for a clarification on the location of the construction staging area and how parking and traffic circulation will be impacted during construction.

Ms. Marquard showed Board members approximately where the staging area will be located during construction.

Planning Board Chairman James Anderson asked if the building will be tied into the Hospital's fire alarm system?

Mr. Marquard indicated that she wasn't sure, but thought that a new system would be provided in the dialysis center. She indicated that she would check with Hospital officials to clarify that issue before the Planning Board's next meeting.

Mr. Anderson asked that a Knox Box be provided on the new medical office building.

Planning Board Member Matthew Donde had a question concerning the availability of space in the new medical office building that was answered by Mr. Peck.

Mr. Anderson asked if the Hospital would be offering a PILOT payment to the City of Gloversville since the new medical office building would essentially be a rental property?

Mr. Peck indicated that the Hospital would not be offering a PILIT to the City since the building will be owned and operated by a not-for-profit entity. Mr. Peck explained that, originally, a nephrology practice was going to be located within the building along with the dialysis center, but the Hospital has since determined that there is only enough space for the dialysis center.

Planning Board Alternate Peter Semione asked if the Hospital would operate a third shift in the dialysis center?

Mr. Peck indicated that, initially, the Hospital only intends to operate the facility during daytime hours. He indicated that the need for the project has been based on NYS Department of Health projections for this type of facility. He pointed out that there are two (2) other outpatient dialysis centers operating in Amsterdam and both are at maximum capacity. He speculated that it won't be long before this new dialysis center is also operating at full capacity.

Mr. Anderson asked how wide the driveway is beneath the overhang entrance?

Ms. Marquard indicated that the driveway beneath the overhang is approximately 20' in width.

Mr. Myers pointed out that traffic will definitely need to be reconfigured during the construction of this project.

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)(3) of 6 NYCRR states that, when an agency proposes to directly undertake, fund or approve a Type 1 or Unlisted Action undergoing a Coordinated Review with other agencies, it must, as soon as possible, transmit Part 1 of the Environmental Assessment Form completed by the Project Sponsor or a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and a copy of any application that has been received to all Involved Agencies and notify them that a Lead Agency must be agreed upon within thirty (30) calendar days of the date the Environmental Assessment Form or DEIS was transmitted to them.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty asked Mr. Peck if the NYS Department of Health (NYSDOH) had issued a certificate of need for the facility?

Mr. Peck indicated that the NYSDOH has issued the certificate.

Mr. Geraghty suggested that the NYSDOH not be included in a coordinated review for the SEQR process. He indicated that the only other Involved Agency will be the NYSDEC, which will have to issue a permit for any construction work that takes place within the buffer zone of the adjacent wetland area.

MOTION: To classify the proposed project as an Unlisted Action and to propose that the City of Gloversville Planning Board act as the Lead Agency for the purpose of issuing a Determination of Significance under SEQR and to offer other Involved Agencies twenty-five (25) calendar days to comment on the proposed action or the City Planning Board's proposal to act as Lead Agency.

MADE BY: Matthew Donde  
SECONDED: Jonathan Kluska  
VOTE: 5 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 Nathan Littauer Hospital's Site Plan application for a medical office building at this time?

MOTION: To schedule a public hearing on Nathan Littauer Hospital's Site Plan for a medical office building for 7:00 p.m., Tuesday, February 2, 2016.

MADE BY: Matthew Donde  
SECONDED: Jonathan Kluska  
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

**VI. OTHER BUSINESS:**

A. Code Enforcement Update:

Mr. Myers explained to Board members that Marae Tesi and Chad Taback have parted ways on their parking lot project on the corner of East Fulton Street and Littauer Place. He indicated that Ms. Tesi has made some additional changes to the retaining wall that has been constructed on the property. Mr. Myers indicated that he is still working with Ms. Tesi to make sure that the project is properly developed.

B. Training:

Mr. Geraghty indicated that this year's training at FMCC will take place on Thursday, February 25, 2016. He indicated that the topics for this year's session will be a Case Law Update and Solar Power Regulations. He indicated that the County Planning Department would send out a flyer in the near future for those sessions.

Mr. Anderson noted that the training sessions sponsored by Saratoga County will be held on January 27, 2016.

Fire Chief Tom Groff indicated that there is money in the budget to reimburse Board members who would like to attend this training.

**VII. CLOSE OF THE MEETING;**

MOTION: To close the meeting at 7:51 p.m.

MADE BY: Jonathan Klusa

SECONDED: Brenda Leitt

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed