

A regular meeting of the Planning Board of the Village of Cooperstown was held in the Village Office Building, 22 Main Street, Cooperstown, New York on May 16, 2017 at 4:30 PM

#### MEETING ATTENDANCE

- **MEMBERS ATTENDING:**  
(5 present) Gene Berman (Chair) / Richard Blabey / Paul Kuhn / Joe Membrino / Fred Schneider-alternate
- **MEMBERS ABSENT:**  
(1 late arrival) David Pearlman (arrived 5pm)
- **OTHERS ATTENDING:**  
Zoning Enforcement Officer-Jane Gentile / Village Clerk – Mikal Sky-Shrewsberry  
/ (3) Member(s) of the Public (including 1 PIG student)

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER** by Mr. Berman at **4:35 PM**

**PUBLIC HEARING (0 item(s))**

**AGENDA (4 items)**

**1. PROPOSED SIGNAGE (28 RAILROAD AVE) PERRY FERRARA**

proposed sign located on Railroad Ave for hotel

- **Present/ Participating: No representative was present**
- **Sign Location and Specs**
  - Proposing low voltage lights
    - Gene Berman noted there were no specifications for lighting provided and they were not included on the site plan
    - Jane Gentile (ZEO) suggested
      - approve the sign now
      - have applicants return for approval of the lighting
        - can be addressed as a field change
  - Proposing Planter around the sign
    - Gene Berman noted
    - no specifications for the planter were provided and it was not included on the site plan
    - the planter was not significant because it will be a short structure containing short decorative flowers
    - bluestone cap was also mentioned
  - Sign appearance and size
    - 5' x 2'7"
    - Black and White
    - 2 sided
    - Unframed
- **Discussion**
  - All Board members agreed the design was appropriate

- **MOTION**
  - To approve the proposed sign at **28 Railroad Ave** as shown in the amended drawing with the following characteristics:
    - 5' x 2'7"
    - 2 sided
    - Black and white
  - Note: this motion does **NOT APPROVE** any of the other elements depicted in the sketch
    - Stone planter with bluestone cap
    - Wood posts
    - Low voltage lighting
  - Made by: David Pearlman / Second: Richard Blabey
  - Results:
    - Ayes (5): Berman / Pearlman / Blabey / Kuhn / Schneider
    - Nays (0)
    - **MOTION CARRIED**

**2. DISCUSSION OF PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT PROPOSAL (71/73 CHESTNUT STREET)**

Scott White, Bank of Cooperstown and Teresa Drerup, Altonview Architects – preliminary discussion of site plan review (going before Trustees on May 22, 2017)

- **PRESENT/PARTICIPATING:**
  - Scott White, Bank of Cooperstown and Teresa Drerup, Altonview Architects
- **PURPOSE OF THE MEETING**
  - Preliminary / introductory meeting with the Planning Board to address proposed Planned Development District (PDD) application that will be presented to the Board of Trustees on Monday, May 22, 2017.
  - NOTE: Discussion was for informational purposes only
  - No current decision is required by the Planning Board
- **HISTORY OF THE BANK PROPERTY IN RELATION TO ZONING**
  - Scott White
    - Described the bank property as never falling into a residential category throughout its history
      - 1860's: it was a boarding house
      - 1920's: it was a car dealership
      - 1930's: it was the Cooperstown dairy
      - Since: it's been a grocery store, a paint and wallpaper store and antique store
      - Currently: The Bank of Cooperstown
    - Stated the corner of Chestnut Street and Elm Street has always existed as a commercial area located within the residential district.
    - Feels that creating a PDD is the proper solution.
- **DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**
  - Remove existing structure at 71 Chestnut Street
  - Create a total of nine parking spaces on the 71 Chestnut Street site
  - Include stone wall and trees as buffering from residential neighbors
  - Believes that the amount of impermeable surface on the site will be lessened
  - The interior of the bank to be reconfigured to take existing square footage from the rear apartment (add approximately 1250 sf to bank / apartment to be approximately 1250 sf)

- Will return before the Planning Board for site plan approval if the Trustees approve the PDD
- **IDEAL MINIMUM ACREAGE/SETBACKS**
  - 7000 contiguous sq. ft. of land is the minimum
  - Project is well above the minimum of 7000
  - No need to approve waiver of minimum requirements
  - **Gene Berman stated**
    - If looking for a deviation R3 setback requirements it just gets put in the application (for approval along with the rest of the application) because PDD is its own zoning district with its own rules
    - Example: R3 setback = 20 /if part of the 20 was needed than it just gets mentioned in the application itself (it does not require a special process)
    - PDD is not bound by R3 rules
  - **Teresa Drerup stated**
    - Law does not require more parking spaces than available through proposed PDD, so special permission will not be needed
    - When lots are combined into a PDD the lot lines that are contiguous don't have setbacks / only the ones that border parking outside the PDD have setbacks
    - Does not believe the proposed plan encroaches on required setback requirements
    - Existing building already encroaches on setbacks but it is not being changed by the project so it does not affect the application
    - Project is not starting any closer than 20 feet from the curb
  - **Jane Gentile, ZEO stated**
    - Only place that can't be counted as parking is the front yard setback
- **APPLICANTS CHECKED TO SEE IF BOARD HAS ANY ADVICE FOR IMPROVING THEIR APPLICATION**
  - No suggestions given
- **LONG TERM GOAL OF THE PROJECT**
  - Richard Blabey asked if the long-term goal was parking or to provide ability to expand the size of the bank
  - Scott White responded that the expanded needs of the bank were already addressed for the foreseeable future by the addition within the existing building – the goal was to create additional parking
- **LIGHTING**
  - No additional lighting will be installed in the parking area
  - Only light required will be for the ATM

### 3. DISCUSSION OF SANDWICH BOARDS AND THE INCORPORATION INTO THE SIGN LAW -

- **NOTE:**
  - \_this discussion is a continuation from the one held during the April 18, 2017 Planning Board Meeting
- **Goals for permitting sandwich boards**
  - Align Village laws with the goals of the Village comprehensive plan
  - Provide all Village businesses with the opportunity to use public space to promote specials (food, events, sales, etc.) so they can be as competitive and successful as possible
- **What the Trustees are asking the Planning Board to do**
  - **Jane Gentile, ZEO stated that the Trustees are looking to the Planning Board to take the next steps regarding regulating sandwich board use**
    - Identify specific details about the use of sandwich boards in the Village

- Propose specific law(s) that the Trustees can respond to
- Richard Blabey informed Jane Gentile, ZEO of a sign he believes to be illegal
  - “Hilltop Baitshop” sign on Taylors at corner of Beaver and Chestnut
    - Attached to stop sign
    - On village property
    - Not approved by the Board
    - Hand-painted wooden sign
  - Jane Gentile (ZEO) will look into it
- Discussion of guidelines for lighting signs
  - Main guideline = don’t shine in people’s eyes
  - Point downwards
  - There is not wattage limit but there is a brightness limit
  - After discussion, the Board decided that illumination should not be allowed
- **Main Points Discussed**
  - **Location**
    - Balance concerns of safety and visual appeal with effective advertising
      - Place closer to curb or closer to building?
      - Should decision to place by curb or building be made by the business owner?
      - After discussion, the Board decided it was better to require placement close to the building rather than by the curb or offering a choice
        - Help block stairs and prevent tripping hazards
    - How to specify where sign boards can be placed when businesses are located outside of the main business district and do not have a standard, predictable space in front of their location
      - Main Street and other major streets in the business district have or will have fairly standard space in front of their buildings that can be addressed through standard descriptions of clearance, proximity to landmarks (paver areas, curb building façade, etc.)
      - Businesses that are located outside the major business district streets have widely varying property in front of their buildings making it difficult to identify allowed locations based on standardized location regulations
      - Possible Solutions
        - **Consider having businesses outside the main business district come before the board to have potential locations for placement identified on a case by case basis**
          - Identify permitted locations on a site plan and file
          - Make permitted locations available online to enable people other than the ZEO to identify when a business is not complying
          - Concerns
            - Effect on Planning Board work load?
            - Time delays for business owners that reduce potential income
        - Location rules apply only if signs are being place in the Village Right of Way
          - Businesses with private property in front of their establishment can place the sandwich board any place of their choosing on their private area or in the approved locations on the public right of way
            - They are only allowed a total of one sandwich board (NOT 2 boards –cannot have one board for private and one board for public)
    - Consider standardizing placement for all Village businesses regardless of the street they are located on by
      - Using landmarks available to all businesses:  
(distances from curb and/or building)

- Identifying minimum clearance that must be allowed for pedestrian traffic
- **Compliance**
  - Can be addressed by simply relocating signs that have been placed in a problematic area to an acceptable area
    - Since all businesses will be allowed to have sandwich boards the only concern is placement
    - Every Village business will have access to one or more acceptable locations on public right of way for sign placement
    - Sandwich boards are easy to move
    - Some businesses may not place their sign in a consistent location – they may comply sometimes and not others
  - If standardized measurements/landmarks are used compliance can be identified by on-site measurement
  - Should permits be required?
- **Appearance, size, construction**
  - Use existing laws regarding appearance of all signs to regulate color / material choices
    - No DayGlo, mirrored surfaces etc.
  - Consistent appearance will reduce sense of visual clutter and create a “classy” look
  - Should signs all be the same size or should they be limited to a maximum height/width?
- **Process for obtaining permission**
  - Permit
  - Fee
    - For everyone?  
(increase Village income)
    - For just those coming before the Board?  
(to compensate for use of Village time)
    - Free  
(to support local business interests)
  - All businesses come directly before the Planning Board
    - Potentially unnecessarily taxing on both the Planning Board and the applying business
  - Businesses located outside business district comes directly before the Planning Board to identify viable locations
  - Apply go to Jane
    - Jane gives tentative approval
    - Jane submits them in groups to the Planning Board  
(for efficiency and expediency)
- **Process for obtaining the signboards**
  - Considered providing a list of suppliers that offer signs in the desired sizes and materials but decided endorsing specific businesses was problematic
  - Discourage/Disallow home-made signs
  - Signs built by the Village and offered for sale would be a possible liability for the Village
- **When they can be used**
  - Wind/weather/emergency restrictions
  - Village event restrictions
  - Business hours restrictions
- **One year pilot program considered**
  - Decided that this was probably not practical as businesses would probably not want to invest money to purchase signs if there was a possibility they would be totally disallowed after a year (or two?)

- **Elements to be incorporated into a local Village law**
  - **Location**
    - Can't be more than X feet distance from the curb
    - Must allow minimum of x feet distance between the sign and the building
    - Can't be directly across from a staircase
    - Location rules only apply when sign is being placed in the Village Right of Way
    - Signs must always be located at grade level  
(they cannot be placed on top of snow banks or other natural or manmade "hills")
    - For businesses with corner locations signs must be placed on the same side as the business entrance (not on the corner itself)
  - **Time**
    - Signs can only be out during business hours  
(can't be out when business is not open)
    - Trustees can declare "No Sign" days or time periods at their discretion  
(example: event weekends)
    - Signs must be taken in extreme weather situations that make safety a concern  
(Emergency snow days, strong winds (winds more than 20 mph))
  - **Physical Features**
    - **Suggested Dimensions when placed**
      - No more than 2 feet wide
      - No more than 42 inches tall
    - **Colors / Materials**
      - **As per existing laws regarding appearance of all signs**
        - No DayGlo, fluorescent, mirrored surfaces etc.
      - No unfinished plywood
  - **Process**
    - Permits are NOT required
    - Any business can apply for a variance through ZBA if the standard laws are problematic
    - Free
- **Next Steps**
  - Gene Berman will draft a local law incorporating the elements from tonight's discussion and submit it to the Board of Trustees

**4. Review of: Tuesday, April 18, 2017 Planning Board Meeting Minutes**

- All board members looked over the minutes
- No Corrections or changes requested
- **MOTION**
  - To approve the Planning Board Minutes for **Tuesday, April 18, 2017** as submitted
  - Made: Paul Kuhn / Second: Richard Blabey
    - Results:
    - Ayes (5): Berman / Blabey / Pearlman / Schneider / Kuhn
    - Nays (0)
    - **MOTION CARRIED**

**ADJOURNMENT**

- **MOTION**
  - To adjourn the meeting
  - **Made:** Paul Kuhn / **Second:** David Pearlman
  - Results
    - Ayes (5): Berman / Blabey / Pearlman / Schneider / Kuhn

- Nays (0)
- **MOTION CARRIED**
  
- Meeting adjourned at **6:50 PM**

Respectfully submitted,

Mikal Sky-Shrewsberry, Clerk (PT)