PROCEEDINGS OF A CODE REVIEW MEETING
OF THE VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
March 26, 2019, 5:30 PM

Present	
Trustees:	Margaret Caraberis
	Frank Galusha
	Dan Keating
	Lili Lanphear
Consultant:	Molly Gaudioso
Recording Secretary:	Jo Anne Shannon

Motion by Trustee Lanphear, seconded by Trustee Galusha, to call the meeting to order at 5:45 PM. Vote: Caraberis – yes, Galusha – yes, Lanphear– yes. Motion carried.

CHAPTER 210: DRAFT – ERIE CANAL HERITAGE DISTRICT
PURPOSE
Ms. Gaudioso stated this Article XX will be the first district to be finalized, and that this district should be divided into two different character areas; Schoen Place and Northfield Common. She explained they took Mayor Corby's text and implemented it into the Erie Canal Heritage District draft, and they will make the delineation between the two different areas in the purpose statement.

DIMENSIONAL REQUIREMENTS
Justin Vlietstra gave the Board a list of the footprint square footage of each existing building in the B-4 area.

Ms. Gaudioso stated as far as the dimensional requirements go, we can tie the maximum building footprint to the height. Trustee Galusha asked if the height of the story is included in the definitions. Ms. Gaudioso stated the dimensions will be tailored to the subareas.

Trustee Caraberis stated there is no green space included in the district. Ms. Gaudioso agreed that was a good point, but that lot dimensions would be addressed in the site plan review procedures; that the HPRB and the PZBA would be looking at the application at the same time. Discussion followed regarding the Conservation Easement.

LAND USE TABLE
Trustee Galusha stated a concern about two-family dwellings and Ms. Gaudioso explained the land use table applies only to new construction in the ECH district. Special Permit would be required for any buildings that are more than 2,500 sq. feet. Trustee Lanphear stated that the uses need to be included in this draft, but we need to go along with the Comprehensive Plan committee recommendations. Cautious and sensitive changes to the land use table are:

- RESIDENTIAL - Should we add density restriction to the Multi-family dwelling? It may be difficult to do this here and it will be part of the criteria of the site plan purview. Or put an absolute cap on it, such as 8-10 units. Upper floor dwelling units – acceptable and will be subject to site plan

review. Trustee Keating questioned how to make sure retail use is on the first floor and residential use on the upper floors. Ms. Gaudioso stated there would have to be a non-residential use for that structure, or not allow any residential on the first floor in the mixed-use area.

- INSTITUTIONAL - okay as it stands. (No schools)
- COMMERCIAL - eliminate dry cleaner, and leave laundromat. Tattoo parlors and vape shops should be added as prohibited. Change NOTE: to gross floor use, not footprint. Add equipment to Telecommunications Facility. Can also add at the discretion of the Code Enforcement Officer. Trustee Lanphear questioned the potential of the proximity of restaurant, tavern, brewery, or distillery to the residential homes on State St., and feels there should be a Special Use permit required, and have a 100-foot setback where it abuts existing residential property. Ms. Gaudioso suggested it be either be part of the site plan review process, or just have it required straight out. The Board felt it should be included here.

BULK REQUIREMENTS

Ms. Gaudioso spoke about maximum building footprint and that the 10,000 sf number will be adjusted. The maximum lot coverage number can be very different in that area, and perhaps include a minimum green space requirement for new development; or if there was a parking lot adjustment for existing property. She stated the Comprehensive Plan committee has suggested dedicated public/civic gathering/green space be incorporated, and could include language about requiring that type of space. We could also require pervious surface on any parking space.

SCREENING/BUFFERING

Ms. Gaudioso explained that even though this is in the site plan criteria, here under each district is where we can be more specific with landscaping and sidewalks, etc. Mr. Vlietstra stated there was no place to put screening, that all the screening exists now on the residential property. Ms. Gaudioso explained with a new use or new site plan ultimately the applicant is going to have to find a way to provide for the required screening in some way. There will always be the provision for the PZBA to identify if the screening is adequate. Trustee Caraberis questioned if screening was built in for the conservation easement.

OFF STREET PARKING AND LOADING

Discussion followed regarding shared parking in restricted parking lots with high intensity uses. For instance, the RG&E right of way cannot be counted as RG&E will not sign a long-term agreement. For shared parking there should be maintenance agreement, access agreement and differentiation that it's not the same number of spaces used by others, which is where the 3 spaces per 1,000 sf of floor space is going to come in. The shared parking provision will read that the parking lot exists with the correct number of spaces for the amount of square footage. A new use will have to show how they will add any extra spaces they may need. There is also an alternative parking plan, a public parking provision where some communities allow a waiver of the parking requirement. Trustee Galusha stated a proper parking study that would accompany an application considers all of the uses around where the application applies, and it could be a use that has different operating hours than the other uses. Ms. Gaudioso stated there are two ways to do this: where there is a parking space that is shared by all uses, or the

idea there are shared parking spaces with uses that have opposite peak hours of use. We can have both those provisions.

BUILDING AND SITE DESIGN
Ms. Gaudioso stated this section will have to be differentiated between the two subareas where it comes to the development pattern. The connectivity piece will apply to both. The rehabilitation and reuse section is where the HPRB can give the PZBA feed back as it does the site plan review.

Trustee Keating questioned if the prohibited uses are listed elsewhere. Ms. Gaudioso will make sure they are all listed in this land use section.

Public and Civic Gathering Space –the recommendation discussion from the Comprehensive Plan is that it should be a requirement for any new development. Ms. Gaudioso stated there should be some flexibility allowed in the site plan review in determining what type of space it needs to be.

Trustee Caraberis questioned how the Preservation Code is integrated. Ms. Gaudioso stated the powers of the HPRB will be in Admin and Enforcement in Article 14, the Certificate of Appropriateness procedures will go in Volume 4, and the specific enacting provisions for the Historic Preservation Law will probably be included as an Article in the first volume. Trustee Caraberis would like to have it as a standalone section as well as the entire law fully integrated in the code.

The consultants will provide final draft codes of Administration and Procedures, Introductory Provisions, Subdivision, and Erie Canal Heritage District to the Board by 4/08/19. There will be a code review meeting on 04/09/19 to go over the entire package.

Mr. Vlietstra questioned how temporary use permits are going to be handled as they are the most common things the PBZA deals with. Ms. Gaudioso stated the temporary use permits for special events and activities will be in a separate chapter of the Village code with specific criteria. They could be handled administratively.

Motion by Trustee Lanphear, seconded by Trustee Caraberis, to adjourn the code review meeting at 7:15 PM. Vote: Caraberis – yes, Galusha – yes, Keating – yes, Galusha – yes. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,
Recording Secretary, Jo Anne Shannon