



DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION

MINUTES (FINAL)

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 8, 2022

6:00 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL ROOM

CALL TO ORDER: Tamie Ehinger, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:01 P.M.

PRESENT: Tamie Ehinger, Chair; Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair; Chris Bennett; Jeff Gritsavage; Tad Roemer; Christinia Vagvolgyi, Alternate

ABSENT: Ellen Sheehan

STAFF: Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, City of Saratoga Springs

A. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, made a motion to approve the May 4, 2022 DRC Meeting Minutes as submitted.

Leslie DiCarlo seconded the motion.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair; in favor; Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor;

Tad Roemer, in favor; Jeff Gritsavage, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 6-0

B. POSSIBLE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS:

NOTE: The intent of a consent agenda is to identify any application that appears to be “approvable” without need for further evaluation or discussion. If anyone wishes to further discuss any proposed consent agenda item, then that item would be pulled from the “consent agenda” and dealt with individually.

1. **#20220481 THE MISFIT AWNING REPLACEMENT,** 1 Caroline Street, Historic Review of awning replacements within the Transect-6 Urban Core District.

2. **#20220482 75 CLINTON STREET ROOF MOUNTED SOLAR,** 75 Clinton Street, Historic Review of roof mounted solar panels within the Urban Residential-3 District. ****ADJOURNED****

3. **#20220488 94 NELSON AVENUE EXT., TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY MODIFICATIONS,**
Pole #120/3 Adjacent to 94 Nelson Avenue Extension, Architectural Review of modifications to a

Telecommunications facility within the Rural Residential District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if there were any questions or comments from the Commission regarding these applications.
None heard.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on these consent agenda item. None heard.

DISCLOSURE:

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, disclosed he is personal friends with the applicant for the Misfit Awning Replacement.
He has no financial interest in this application and can remain objective in voting on the application.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, made a motion in the matter of The Misfit Awning Replacement, 1 Caroline Street, and 94 Nelson Avenue Ext. Telecommunication Facility Modifications, Pole #NG120/3 adjacent to 94 Nelson Avenue Ext. that these applications be approved as submitted. Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, seconded the motion.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor;
Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor; Christina Vagvolgyi, Alternate, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 7-0

C. DRC APPLICATIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION:

1. #20220359 CAFÉ LENA FREESTANDING SIGN, 47 Phila Street, Architectural Review of a new freestanding sign within the Transet-6 Urban Core District.

Agent: Peter Martin

Mr. Martin stated we were before the Commission a month ago and there were questions from a **neighboring café owner**. We have had discussions with our neighbor, and they no longer have any concerns. The sign will be placed on our property. It will be a design consistent with our archway. A visual of the proposed signage was provided to the Commission. The total height of the signage is 6ft. 6in to the top and 2ft. wide. It will be lit from within the box.

Discussion ensued among the Commission regarding anchoring of the sign, concern for the pavers, a suitable base, location of the signage on this property, and lighting.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair stated this is an area where children play, and he is concerned with any protruding edges which could injure a child.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if anyone in the audience who wished to comment on this application.
None heard.

Jeff Gritsavage made a motion in the matter of the Café Lena Freestanding Sign, 47 Phila Street the DRC issues the following decision on June 8, 2022 - Approved with the following

conditions - the lighting should be 2700k. Christina Vagvolgyi, Alternate, seconded the motion.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor;

Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor; Christina Vagvolgyi, Alternate, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 7-0

2. #20220483 28 MARION PLACE EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS, 28 Marion Place,
Historic Review of exterior
modifications to an existing single-family within the Urban Residential-3 District.

Agent: Matthew Hurff, Frost Hurff Architects

Mr. Hurff stated the applicants are proposing modifications to the rear of the house, which is not original. Views of the project were provided to the Commission. We are proposing to remove the octagonal deck and the sunroom addition and replace them with a new porch on the southeast corner of the house. We are also proposing to update the fenestration. On the north side of the addition, we are proposing to add two windows. The only change on the second floor is the removal of one window on the southwest corner of the house. This room is exceedingly small and there is no place to put a bed. Mr. Hurff provided views of all elevations. Mr. Hurff provided views of the new porch taking the language from the front porch and incorporating that here.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated we received a letter from the Preservation Foundation late this afternoon expressing concern regarding the removal of the historic window on the south elevation. The Chair voiced this same concern noting this would not be appropriate in terms of historic design standards, original window size and location should be preserved, rather than replaced or removed.

Mr. Hurff stated he cannot make any representation that there is anything wrong with that window. It is in perfectly good condition.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, echoed what the Chair noted. The back porch is great; however, he cannot approve the removal of the historic window.

Chris Bennett stated he also agrees with the Chair and Vice Chair. The back porch looks great. He questioned the number of columns, and there are too many.

Mr. Hurff stated it is difficult to represent them correctly in this type of drawing.

Leslie DiCarlo stated she echoes the concern of her fellow Commission members regarding the removal of the historic window.

Jeff Gritsavage stated everything looks fine, except for the removal of the historic windows.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application. None heard

Matthew Hurff stated he does not want to hold up the application over the window. Now he would like to note that the proposal for the historic window removal is removed from the application. The historic window will remain in place.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, made a motion in the matter of the 28 Marion Place Exterior Modifications, 28 Marion Place, the DRC issues the following decision on June 8, 2022 - Approved with the following conditions - the second-floor window and opening on the south façade will remain as is. Jeff Gritsavage seconded the motion.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor;

Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor; Christina Vagvolgyi, Alternate, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 7-0

3. #20220486 457 BROADWAY EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS, 457 Broadway, Historic Review of entrance modifications to an existing single-family within the Urban Residential-3 District.

Agent: Chris Burdick

Mr. Burdick stated this is an interior modification project to provide two apartments and a rated stair tower at 457 Broadway known as Compton's. The stair tower is the reason for the appearance before the Commission and how it affects the streetscape. We have tried to push this back into the building to meet code compliance. Our initial application noted the Replacement of the front door. We have since heard the Commission would like to save the front door. We now know we can with a simple modification. The owner would like to make modifications which is a 3" trim to the door to bring into compliance and reuse the existing front door.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, questioned the applicant's agent if the trim around the door would be modified to accommodate the compliance.

Mr. Burdick stated the actual door would be modified to meet ADA compliance.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated you are looking at trimming the door down.

Mr. Burdick stated correct we would need to trim the door down about 6 inches in width to make it narrower.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated in terms of clarification, in preserving a historic door there is an argument to be made for not trimming it down. There are members here that may be comfortable with that in terms of violating our standards and guidelines. To take it apart and rebuild it or replace it in kind.

Mr. Burdick stated they would not be replacing it in kind but restoring it back in place after the 6" modification was made.

Discussion ensued among the Commission and applicant regarding dimensions both inside and outside the door. and outside.

Mr. Burdick stated there is another option and that would be to impede upon Compton's.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, questioned staff if that is accurate, based on the applicant's agent's conversation with Patrick Cogan, Building Inspector/Zoning Office.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner stated that the rating issue of the door is not an issue. This must be a rated staircase because it is a means of egress. What Mr. Burdick is stating is there is not enough of clearance on either side to allow for the push pull clearance which is required by code.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner questioned Mr. Burdick if there was any exception because this is a historic building to the current code.

Mr. Burdick stated there is no exception by code, and this was confirmed in his conversation with Mr. Cogan.

Chris Bennett noted the staircase is there, if you are in a wheelchair how do you access or exit the area?

What would this entail to make this ADA compliant? The staircase is not complaint, I do not understand the reasoning behind this, what renovations are being made that triggers the ADA compliance?

Tad Roemer stated the clearance is not just for wheelchairs, it is for other disabilities.

Mr. Burdick stated the staircase is not compliant at all. Any renovations at all to the building triggers adherence with code compliance.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated she is happy the applicant's agent spoke with Patrick Cogan, Building Inspector/Zoning Officer. There is still clarification needed from Patrick Cogan.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, stated the conversation that she recalls the Commission had with Patrick Cogan was regarding the fire rating of the door. She does not recall anything about the clearance aspect.

Mr. Burdick stated the easiest way to accommodate this without changing or modifying the historic door is to impede upon Compton's.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the entire goal here is to preserve the historic door.

Tad Roemer spoke about why the applicant could not make a smaller copy of the door to accommodate the change.

He feels the objective here is to not make a weird rule to accommodate a convoluted entry and disturb a business.

Discussion ensued among the Commission regarding the renovations proposed by the applicant and **the effect on the front façade of the building.**

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated we do need clarification from Patrick Cogan. We appreciate the applicant's willingness to accommodate the door. That will require a change to the exterior of the building.

Mr. Burdick stated the applicant wishes to do what is right for this community.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, stated she will speak with Patrick Cogan, Building Inspector, Zoning Officer as to what is required.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated we will obtain the answers the Commission is seeking and will see the applicant in two weeks.

4. #20220262 29 MADISON AVENUE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE ADDITION, 29

Madison Avenue,

Consideration of an Advisory Opinion to the ZBA regarding Historic Review of mass, scale, and general design

of proposed addition to an existing carriage house, as well as the addition to the home within the Urban

Residential-1 District

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, this application is before the Commission this evening for an Advisory Opinion regarding mass, scale, and general design of the addition to the carriage house. The applicant will return before this Commission following approvals from the ZBA.

Agent: Michael Tuck, Balzer Tuck, Architecture

Mr. Tuck stated the applicant has appeared before the ZBA to obtain necessary variances for the proposed project. There are interior alterations to the existing house to meet the needs of the homeowners as well as expanding the current carriage house to facilitate a two-car garage. The proposed additions are to the rear of the structure. To accomplish this, there is the removal of existing additions and an inground pool. A visual of the proposed project was provided to the Commission. Mr. Tuck reviewed the variances requested as well as noting the lot coverage exceeds what is allowed in this district. Neighborhood comparables were provided to the Commission and this is consistent with the neighborhood character. Mr. Tuck reviewed all elevations for the Commission's information. The intent is come off the rear of the home maintain the existing width of the home adding 15 ft. of living space and add additional 10 ft. to replace the screen porch. We are also proposing to change the configuration of the roof on the second floor to obtain additional second floor space. On the accessory structure/carriage house we are proposing an additional 12 ft. addition to the east. Mr. Tuck reviewed the floor plans and elevations for the home and carriage house for the Boards information and review. **No changes are proposed to the front façade of the home facing Madison Avenue.** Perspective views were provided from all elevations. Materials and color choices have not yet been determined. Alternative designs were considered but were not in keeping with the historic nature of the home or meeting the client's needs.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the ZBA has requested and Advisory Opinion on the mass, scale and general design of this project which entails an addition to the existing historic home and an addition to the carriage house as well. The Chair

Read the Secretary of the Interior Standards for additions to historic structures in a historic district. An addition should be smaller in scale than the original buildings so that it does not overshadow the existing building. It should complement the original building's roof form, massing, floor heights, proportion and window and door fenestrations. Secondly, additions should not obscure damage or destroy the character defining features of the primary building or streetscape. A letter which was received his date notes the Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation does object to the proposed mass, scale, and design of the addition to the garage nor to the removal of the non-historic rear additions of the house. They do have concerns regarding roof form, massing, floor heights, proportion, and window and door fenestrations. The Chair the carriage house addition is too large in comparison to the original historic structure. It overwhelms it. This addition and scope are inappropriate. The addition to the main house while large is appropriate it. She does not have concerns with that.

Jeff Gritsavage stated the mass and scale of the addition to the home are appropriate. On the carriage house you can give relief especially along the alley. Shortening up the garage would help.

Chris Bennett stated the house addition is fantastic and keeps with the architectural details of the original home. The carriage house addition overwhelms the historic home.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated he does not have an issue with what was presented this evening, he feels it works.

He noted the bulk of the lot coverage comes from concrete walks.

Mr. Tuck stated the concrete walks count toward permeability, and we do comply with these district requirements.

It is the structures and accessory structures which count toward total lot coverage.

Tad Roemer agrees with fellow Commission members on the house addition. Another look at the carriage house to see if it can be reduced in size at all.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application. None heard.

Discussion ensued among the Commission regarding providing the Advisory Opinion to the ZBA.

Mr. Tuck spoke about the process and questioned if he could return before the DRC prior to issuance of the Advisory Opinion to the ZBA to avoid going back and forth between Boards.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the Commission will table this application for this evening. The applicant's agent will return before the Commission at a future meeting

5. #20220269 ESPEY MANUFACTURING DEMOLITION AND NEW STRUCTURE , 223

Ballston Avenue,

determination of Architectural/Historic significance and review of demolition for an existing structure.

Architectural Review of a new structure within the Transect-5 Neighborhood Center District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated this is a determination of architectural/historic significance. Based on the Commission's determination, it could be a review for demolition. We could then potentially be performing SEQRA Review as well and Review of the applicant's proposal for a new structure.

Agent: Jim Davis, Espey Manufacturing

Mr. Davis stated what is before the Commission is review of a shed which was built in the 1960's, it is an eyesore and in state of disrepair. We have leaks in several bays, the sides are falling apart, and has become animal infested. We are proposing to demolish this structure and replace it with a new prefabricated building. The other buildings are to remain as is. A visual of the proposed site was provided noting the building requested to be demolished.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated she feels comfortable following this presentation to continue with the discussion regarding determination of historic/architectural significance. The Chair stated in terms of reviewing this structure she finds that there is no historical or architectural significance.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, stated Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation commented that they have no objection to the demolition.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, questioned the Commission if they had any comments regarding the historical/architectural significance of the existing structure. None heard.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, made a motion in the matter of the application for Espey Manufacturing Demolition - Determination of Significance, 233 Ballston Avenue, involving the determination of Architectural/Historic significance for an existing commercial structure, the DRC determined on June 8, 2022, that the structure noted does not have Architectural/Historical Significance contributing to the historic fabric and resources of the City of Saratoga Springs. Jeff Gritsavage seconded the motion.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor;

Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor; Christina Vagvolgyi, Alternate, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 7-0

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the structure has been deemed not to have Architectural/Historical significance. In terms of the demolition of the structure since it is not Architecturally or Historically significant and based on the visual presentation the structure is badly deteriorated and looks unsafe the Chair has no objection to the demolition of this structure.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if there was any further questions or comments for the applicant. None heard.

SEQRA REVIEW:

The Commission reviewed Part I of the SEQRA Short EAF and determined that it was complete and accurate.

The Commission reviewed Part II of the SEQRA Short EAF. No large or important areas of concern were noted.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair made a motion in the matter of the application for Espey Manufacturing Demolition - SEQRA Review
233 Ballston Avenue, in accordance with 6NYCRR Part 617, the DRC classifies this request as a SEQRA Unlisted Action.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated she makes a motion for the issuance of a negative declaration of environmental significance because analysis of the information provided and presented in the environmental assessment form demonstrates that the project will not result in any large and important impact and therefore, is one that will not have a significant impact on the environment. Leslie DiCarlo seconded the motion.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor;

Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor; Christina Vagvolgyi, Alternate, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 7-0

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated in the matter of the Espey Manufacturing Demolition, 233 Ballston Avenue, involving Architectural Review of the proposed demolition of an existing commercial structure. In accordance with 6NYCRR Part 617, the DRC acting as the only involved agency issued

a SEQRA Negative Declaration of environmental impact on June 8, 2022. In accordance with the objectives, standards and guidelines contained in the City Zoning Ordinance Article 240-7.5 Architectural Review, the DRC issues the following decision on June 8, 2022 - approve the demolition as submitted or shown on the attached plans. Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair seconded the motion.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor;
Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor; Christina Vagvolgyi, Alternate, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 7-0

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the Commission is now ready to review the proposed new two-story structure.

Mr. Davis stated they have been working with LaBella. In the exact same footprint, they are planning to place a two story structure to accommodate cranes. Our company makes large transformers and need a structure with this increase in size capability. These transformers are about 2500 lbs. and to move them around we need the use of a 15-ton crane to accommodate the height of these units. The proposed structure is a prefabricated steel building to replace the existing structure.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated it is important for code purposes that the applicant meet the existing footprint of the demolished structure with the new structure, and they are. The DRC does not typically review commercial structures. The Chair did voice concerns regarding the fact that this is now two stories in height versus one story. The current structure is not visible from Ballston Avenue, but the new structure will be because it is higher. Recognizing the limitations and the fact that it is a long mass of a building. The breaking up of the mass, a color change to help break up that view. The fencing which runs along Ballston Avenue and is an eyesore and should be replaced. The Chair provided the applicant with information concerning the vines which have overtaken the fence is a Japanese Knotweed, a dangerous species and should be removed. You may wish to connect with Cornell Cooperative Extension.

Mr. Davis when they replace the fence, they will remove the existing invasive vines and replace with new landscaping.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated it is considered dangerous because it spreads very effectively, a new plant can take root with just dropping a leaf. The location of the building and the fact that it must stay in the same footprint as the previous building does present limitations. Planting additional trees to shield the building from the roadway would help.

Mr. Davis stated they can add faux windows on the side of the building to help with the massing.

Discussion ensued among the Commission regarding the size of the building, the massing on the street elevation side, new black chain fencing and additional plantings and a color change to help mitigate the building size.

Mr. Davis stated they are still discussing materials due to the global material shortage.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the Commission does have purview over color. The Chair stated she has heard suggestions for the building, dark green, two shades of a lighter color to help with the massing, light grey in color.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application. None heard.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair made a motion in the matter of the application for Espey Manufacturing New Two-Story Structure, 233 Ballston Avenue, the DRC issues the following decision on August 4, 2021

Approve with the following conditions:

- The fence be replaced.
- The invasive knottweed be removed.
- Appropriate vines be replanted.
- New fence should be black chain link to tie in with current fencing.
- The new structure should be light grey in color and narrow ends of the new structure be one color versus multi-color.

Jeff Gritsavage seconded the motion.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor;

Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor; Christina Vagvolgyi, Alternate, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 7-0

7:50 P.M. The Board recessed.

7:55 P.M. The Board reconvened.

6. #20220502 ADVISORY OPINION TO CITY COUNCIL - UDO AMENDMENTS,

Consideration of advisory

Opinion to the City Council for proposed amendments to the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO).

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the City Council has presented two amendments to us which they would like us to comment on. We have reviewed these in the past. The Chair noted the DRC can review them and make comments. There were two amendments we proposed which were not included in the UDO and this would be the appropriate time to propose them To the new council in the Advisory Opinion.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, provided a review of the four amendments.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated Sustainable Saratoga are suggesting the UDO should be amended to remove inappropriate uses from the green belt.

AMENDMENT 1:

RURAL RESIDENTIAL (RR) ZONING DISTRICT:

Country Club
Educational Facility - Primary and Secondary

GATEWAY COMMERCIAL-RURAL (GCR) ZONING DISTRICT:

Community Center
Medical/Dental Office
Office

Dwelling-Multi-Family (Above Ground Floor & Residential Only Structure)
Dwelling-Townhouses
Eating and Drinking Establishments (More than 40 seats)
Educational Facility-Vocational
Hotel (More than 20 Guestrooms)

Chris Bennett stated he agrees with the proposal from Sustainable Saratoga. If someone proposes a use which is not allowed, then they can go before the ZBA for relief. This is a gateway into the city. We should do as much as we can to protect that gateway as much as possible. This amendment has stopped short. The entire amendment should be reworked.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated he agrees with Chris, but it is odd that housing development is not something that is considered at the same time since it would be far more detrimental than an office building. A housing development with over 100 houses would potentially clear cut an entire area and destroy a rural area. He does agree that removing these uses is a smart thing to do.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, provided uses that are permitted - car washes, daycare facilities, adult care facilities and drive thru facilities. If the intention is to avoid a tacky commercial gateway, there are so many other uses that do fall within the use.

Restricting these at all seems foolish. There are enough check points between the ZBA and Planning Board and the DRC

That we do not need to target specific uses. Removing these uses is the best way to manage this. Using the land use boards for the purpose they were intended is a more efficient use.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, provided additional uses with Special Use Permit for the DRC's information and review.

Jeff Gritsavage spoke regarding the uses allowed, what could be built, what could be built and abandoned because it is not an attractive place, and there is no public transportation. The sustainable people have done their research. The inner district should be different than the outer district.

Discussion continued among the Commission regarding development, core development and the gateway development.

AMENDMENT 2: ESTABLISH CLEAR CRITERIA AND REQUIREMENTS FOR LAND USE BOARDS TO MAINTAIN

RURAL CHARACTER IN THE GREENBELT

FOR GATEWAY COMMERCIAL-RURAL:

Article 4.5.8.1.b of the UDO should be amended to add an additional requirement as follows:

"iv. Design Standards in the GC-R District may be exempted by the Design Review Board or Planning Board

with a written explanation detailing the exemption as follows:

- a. The uses in the structure are unique and preclude meeting the rural design standards of the ordinance or;
- b. The lot configuration is unique and precludes meeting the rural character of the ordinance; or
- c. That there are extraordinary circumstances unique to the parcel that demonstrates that the design standards cannot meet the rural character objectives of the ordinance."

FOR THE SUBURBAN AND RURAL RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS:

Article 16.10 should be amended to provide an introductory statement as follows:

16.10 DESIGN STANDARDS:

“The design standards should be followed but may be exempted by the Design Review Board or Planning Board with a

Written explanation detailing the exemption as follows:

- a. The uses in the structure are unique and preclude meeting the rural design standards of the ordinance; or
- b. The lot configuration is unique and precludes meeting the rural character of the ordinance; or
- c. There are extraordinary circumstances unique to the parcel that demonstrate that the design Standards cannot meet the rural character objectives of the ordinance; or
- d. The applicant has demonstrated a better way to achieve this rural design objective.”

Discussion ensued among the Board regarding the proposed Amendments to the UDO, how the Board feels about these amendments, what do they want to provide to the City Council in their Advisory Opinion, what should be included and how this should be worded.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, spoke about vacant lots. Also, structures scheduled for demolition, in the historic district. These two areas are of concern to the Commission and would like to have these two areas included in the UDO which currently are not. The Chair also noted the Board discussed any city project on city owned property are not required to appear before this Board. Currently, the City Council does ask for an Advisory Opinion, but it is not mandatory. The Chair feels city projects on city owned properties should appear before the Board for an Advisory Opinion which is not mandatory and would not be binding.

Jeff Gritsavage thanked Todd Fabozzi from the Planning Board for his help in providing additional information in this regard for the DRC to review.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated as of July 15th the DRC will become the Design Review Board.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated we have come to some conclusions regarding Amendment #2 but there is still room for discussion on Amendment #1. The Chair suggest we continue to revisit this at the next meeting.

Leslie DiCarlo requested a review of the comments from Sustainable Saratoga and why these specific items were chosen.

AMENDMENT TO THE UDO

AMENDMENT 2: ESTABLISH CLEAR CRITERIA AND REQUIREMENTS FOR LAND USE BOARDS TO MAINTAIN

RURAL CHARACTER IN THE GREENBELT

For Gateway Commercial-Rural:

Article 4.5.8.1.b of the UDO should be amended to add an additional requirement as follows:

“iv. Design Standards in the GC-R District may be exempted by the Design Review Board or Planning Board

with a written explanation detailing the exemption as follows:

- d. The uses in the structure are unique and preclude meeting the rural design standards of the ordinance or;
- e. The lot configuration is unique and precludes meeting the rural character of the ordinance; or
- f. That there are extraordinary circumstances unique to the parcel that demonstrates that the design standards cannot meet the rural character objectives of the ordinance.”

For the Suburban and Rural Residential Districts:

Article 16.10 should be amended to provide an introductory statement as follows:

16.10 DESIGN STANDARDS:

“The design standards should be followed but may be exempted by the Design Review Board or Planning Board with a

Written explanation detailing the exemption as follows:

- e. The uses in the structure are unique and preclude meeting the rural design standards of the ordinance; or
- f. The lot configuration is unique and precludes meeting the rural character of the ordinance; or
- g. There are extraordinary circumstances unique to the parcel that demonstrate that the design Standards cannot meet the rural character objectives of the ordinance; or
- h. The applicant has demonstrated a better way to achieve this rural design objective.”

Discussion ensued among the Board regarding the proposed Amendments to the UDO, how the Board feels about these amendments, what do they want to provide to the City Council in their Advisory Opinion, what should be included and how this should be worded.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, spoke about vacant lots. Also, structures scheduled for demolition, in the historic district. These two areas are of concern to the Board and would like to have these two areas included in the UDO which currently are not.

The Chair also noted the Board discussed any city project on city owned property are not required to appear before this Board. Currently, the City Council does ask for an Advisory Opinion, but it is not mandatory. The Chair feels city projects on city owned properties should appear before the Board for an Advisory Opinion which is not mandatory and would not be binding.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated as of July 15th, 2022, the DRC will be formally known as Design Review Board.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated we have come to some conclusions regarding Amendment #2 but there is still room for discussion on Amendment #1. The Chair suggested we continue to revisit this at the next meeting.

Leslie DiCarlo requested a review of the comments from Sustainable Saratoga.

Jeff Gritsavage thanked Todd Fabozzi from the Planning Board for his help in providing additional information in this regard for the DRC to review.

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

Design Review Commission Caravan, Wednesday, June 22, 2022, at 5:00 P.M.
Design Review Commission Meeting, Wednesday, June 29, 2022, at 6:00 P.M.

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

There being no further business to discuss Tamie Ehinger, Chairman adjourned the meeting at 8:57 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Buzanowski
Recording Secretary

Meeting minutes approved August 24, 2022