

**VILLAGE OF CHATHAM
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
NOVEMBER 23, 2020
7:30 P.M.
MINUTES**

Call to Order at 7:31 p.m.

Present: Chairman D. Herrick; Members L. Ponter, B. Gaylord, F. Iaconetti; Building Inspector E. Reis; Village Deputy Clerk P. DeLong; Village Attorney Ken Dow, Applicants Amber McPhail, Representatives from Shaker Museum and Members of the public.

- 1) Application: 2 Line Street, Chatham, NY; Amber McPhail, Applicant; Application/Lot Line Adjustment - Approved**
- 2) Application # 2019-092: 5 Austerlitz Street, Chatham, NY; Shaker Museum and Library, Applicant; Application/Amendment to Site Plan/Historic Review. – *Tabled to meeting on December 28th.***
- 3) Approve Minutes from October 26, 2020 Meeting – *Tabled to meeting on December 28th.***

Other Business:

1. None

1) D. Herrick begins the meeting by reading the application number. F. Iaconetti asks if the application came back from CCPB. D. Herrick explains why it did not need to go to CCPB.
Motion made by F. Iaconetti to open up the meeting to Public Hearing on this application, seconded by B. Gaylord.
F. Iaconetti address Dan and states there are a number of neighbors on the meeting and he may want to give them an explanation that this is their opportunity now if they want to comment. Otherwise they may not know that. D. Herrick explains this is the time in the meeting where if you have a comment to make or a question to ask, now is the time to do so. S. Davis asks, what do they want to do when they break it up. D. Herrick states it is unknown to the planning board they only have the right to say if it is legit to do so as far as breaking it up. A. Phail as owner of the property explains her ultimate plan is to build a suitably sized single family home on that lot as it does lend itself as it does lend itself well to that plan and seems to be a nice amount of privacy already with the natural tree borders.

Motion made by F. Iaconetti to close the Public Hearing portion of this application as we have heard no more comments from the Public, seconded by B. Gaylord.

*F. Iaconetti-favor, B. Gaylord-favor, L. Ponter-out of context, abstain/recuse, D. Herrick-yes:
Approved by all*

Motion made by F. Iaconetti to approve the application as it was submitted, it meets the Village of Chatham zoning in regards to lot sizes, seconded by B. Gaylord.

F. Iaconetti-favor, B. Gaylord-yes, D. Herrick-yes: Approved

2) Presentation made by the members of the Shaker Museum project. L. Schutz Introduces herself as the executive director of Shaker museum. She explains this project has been three years of planning and they are privileged to bring new life to the building at 5 Austerlitz St. The structure is known to have historical importance to the Village Chatham. In its new role, Shaker museum will continue to play a meaningful role for generations to come not just as museum but as a place to come together as a community. J. Grant describes his role with the Shaker museum over the past 30 years and his awareness of how important the collections of the Shaker museum are, not only for telling the Shaker story but the American story. He goes on to explain the role of Shaker museum and community, collections, and how this plan supports the museum. A. Selldorf introduces the project they have been working on for the last year as it is important to the museum an important to Chatham. She refers to the drawing and points out where the project is located. She refers to the pictures of the Village, refers to the proposed site plan pointing out where the addition and the entrance will be. She refers to the brick structure and how the landmark needs to be upheld. She also refers to the say outline, keeping the original building intact, and proposed to remove various attachments. She continues there will be one single edition that is connected to the main structure with the most minimal connection via a small bridge. she also explains the size of the building, location of its components, layout of the site plan, floor plan, and goes a history of the building from 1892. She continues with the change to the roof to gable to keep with Shaker and explains how it is not distant from surrounding buildings. She explains the elevations and the nature of the building and how the addition is purposely designed to be completely separate from the original building seeking to keep as pristine and preserved as possible. She shows the materials used in the project inside and outside the building. M. Strieter explains the site landscape, the landscape medians, and refers to the site plan explaining the existing prow and the expansion of that narrow prow. He states that they looked at the history and culture of the site, as well as organization to reflect the values and traditions of Shakers. He describes the prow with easily maintained hardy, one or two species per band of grasses, perennials, and evergreens. He points out the terrace lawn, crushed stone placement, and gathering places to embrace Shaker values. He describes the 6' screen from the Railroad, retaining wall with hedge by the loading area, and the bayberry by the 2 parking stalls in the back. The species of plants being Ginko trees, Amelanchier, screen hedge, sumac, bay berry rhododendron, echinacea, allium, grasses, and sedum. A. Didio introduces himself as the engineer and presents the site plan, explains the existing conditions, the proposed conditions, reclaiming the gravel areas, establishing the main entry way, parking spaces, fire egress tower, garbage receptacle location, on street parking dimensions, establishing the curb line, grading and drainage plan, lighting locations and light type specifications, ADA dimensions and ramps, granite curb detail, garbage enclosure, storm water management. L. Ponter asks why the museum entrance has not been homogenized and similar in style to the brick building. A. Selldorf explains as they worked on it, it didn't feel right. It felt irrelevant to the existing building and decided contrast would bring a welcome reprieve from the existing building and keep the purity and beauty of that existing building while

creating an open porch gesture to celebrate the existing building. F. Iaconetti States he has a list of questions and observes the drawings were different from those that were submitted to the planning board for review with information on them that was not what they saw. First question, he asks about the existing conditions and states that he wanted to note the number of vehicles parked along River street. When he was out in the field he counted at least four in the picture there are five. His second question is regarding the site history shows the roof type. He asks, in all the photos included in the site history all show the front of the building facing the circle except for the proposed photo. He would like to point out that along the existing building as it currently stands is what he would refer to as a band or detail beneath the roof overhang. This detail no longer appears on the photos of the proposed roof, or any of the facade renderings and asked if that detail is being removed. S. Lopergolo explains the current roof as it stands today is not original, therefore the band board is not original. They made the decision to go to the Gable roof as it is more in keeping with the style of the building and the band board did not make sense as they will be in filling the brick at the end with reclaimed brick. F. Iaconetti states that it looks in the pictures of the facade that is removed on all sides of the building, not just there in the front but along the North, South side and the addition. He states that to him it is a detail of that building. He voices a concern that if the roof is changed the amount of exposed brick above the windows changes. He continues, the proportion seemed to get out of whack a bit with that band board that goes around it, it lessens that impact and adds that to him that band board is a historical detail on the building. A. Selldorf explains there is a significant overhang and will have traditional detail on both sides which is customary. The band board speaks specifically to a roof that is a hip roof which may have been installed in the late 60s at the earliest and possibly as late as the 80s. Its construction is not historical. F. Iaconetti insists it is an element of that building which he believes is an important element for the aspect of what he said about the proportion of exposed brick above the windows. It's an element that runs along the sides of the building not just on the gambrel end of the buildings. S. Lopergolo Clarifies the banding would follow the new roof slope. F. Iaconetti asks his third question regarding the proposed South facade looking West And states this train is different than the drawing we had, it addresses the aspect of the roof top wall that screens the rooftop equipment. He states he could not read the plans as carefully as he wanted to and asked about the array of equipment which he is assuming has something to do with solar panels and asks if the array of equipment will be able to be seen. S. Lopergolo confirms that is correct and believes it will not be able to be seen. She explains the drawing perspective and states with the angle of the solar panels there won't be much view of them. F. Iaconetti states he wasn't talking about where the solar panels are but about the new structure. S. Lopergolo confirms they hope to have a smaller array of solar panels on the addition to maximize as much as they can, where they can and take advantage of the energy they can save. F. Iaconetti asks if they will show that on another drawing someplace so they can see what that will look like. S. Lopergolo confirms they can do that in terms of the exact angle. F. Iaconetti Asks his fourth question with regard to the proposed North facade looking East as it was not submitted for review of the stairway, the door, etc. He adds you have that now, we just did not have it when we were reviewing it. He asks about the stair tower and notes there was a comment made by the board members, myself included, that they felt the stair tower should be more reflective of the materials of the building that it is being attached to. He adds he understands personally the aspect that the

addition is different and that you don't want to try to match the existing building with the new addition as it is a very hard thing to do and it's not always a desirable thing. He states that the stair tower does not look like anything you expect to see attached to this historic structure. He continues with his fifth question on the material palette for the addition and states there is a modification from what we were given. He continues one of the things the board has done historically, when we do historic reviews is request samples of the materials being used on the exterior of the building so we can get a better feeling of how to evaluate. A. Selldorf states of course. F. Iaconetti asks his six question and asks two proceed to C-102. He notes the retaining walls and states there is a new retaining wall from what was there before. He continues there are no details or information provided regarding the materials, color, wall height, and if there is drop off protection at the top of the wall and if there is what it would be. F. Iaconetti asks his 7th question Voicing a concern that the proposed work to be done is on Village property and wants to know if it has been seen by the Village, and if the Village will grant the right to use Village property for their development. A. Didio answers the question on the retaining wall and points out there is a 12" knee wall to accommodate grading and a sidewalk slope with a 6" curb reveal in order to tie the grade lines. He states They can add top of wall and bottom of wall spot elevations on the site plan and at the next meeting can give material and color for the retaining wall by the East stair. He refers to the sidewalk on River street side and the expansion beyond the property line. He explains they met with Phil Genovese, reviewed the plan, and have an email that he accepted and agreed to the plan as proposed. F. Iaconetti asks if they are comfortable with the fact that a Village employee can grant approval for the use a Village property and it's not something that needs to be done by the Mayor and the Board of Trustees. A. Didio states, as far as the ADA parking is concerned, the parking on the Austerlitz side was at the request of the planning board and has been previously approved. It was a request made specifically to provide additional parking and was approved in the previous site plan. On street parking happens all over the Village. Typically, anytime we are doing in St work a representative for the Village, being the DPW Superintendent is the one who proves that proposed work. It is essentially a sidewalk that the whole Village benefits from. He adds it is a valid question and would seek input if the Board of Trustees has to approve that. F. Iaconetti addresses Dan and asks if the village approved a previous site plan for this project that includes parking on Austerlitz St. K. Dow confirms the project came before the Planning Board quite a while ago for preliminary review so they could proceed with financing. F. Iaconetti asks his 8th question stating how do you plan on addressing the on-site snow storage for areas such as the sidewalk and parking lot. M. Strieter states that at the entry most of the snow can be shoveled to the planting area, by the service area there are some spots to put snow and the rest can be pushed into the street. F. Iaconetti voices concern about pushing snow into the street. K. Dow confirms property owners cannot put snow in the street. F. Iaconetti states the only reason he mentions the question is all too often in terms of site plans snow is forgotten about, and parking lessons over the winter because snow is piled up in parking spots. He continues with his 9th question noting as most visitors will be walking to the museum, little site parking exists; have you thought about how they will cross Austerlitz Street safely and feels the need for a crosswalk and a handicap ramp. His concern is to get to the shaker museum you have to cross Austerlitz St. and River St. and there are no crossings. M. Strieter notes at the prow there are crossings. F. Iaconetti insists there are no crosswalks, adding, there might be a location to put one but there

are no crosswalks and if there are crosswalks you would need to have handicap ramps. M. Strieter confirms it would not be a problem to put a curb ramp in that sidewalk. K. Dow notes it is up to the municipality who controls the road to put in a natural crosswalk. F. Iaconetti states not necessarily, you end up in a situation where this project is generating the pedestrians and he has seen in many projects in which pedestrian safety had to be addressed, crosswalks were built by the applicant. He continues with his 10th question asking about the exterior stair tower stating he cannot tell if it is at the same location and the same size as first indicated. S. Lopergolo confirms they moved it closer to the brick building. F. Iaconetti asks his 11th question asking about the bin location and the fence, in terms of the height and the materials and states he does not know if that information was there. F. Iaconetti continues with his 12th question and asks if it will be screened by a gate as there does not seem to be any screening on it. His concern is where they have placed the location of the garbage and recycling bins fence eliminates the existing sidewalk along River St. He adds there is an existing piece of sidewalk that runs right in the location and this sidewalk needs to remain as it connects to a walk that extends to two houses and there is a safety concern to look to the East and see vehicles as they are pulling out of the parking area and for pedestrians so they do not have to walk in the street. F. Iaconetti continues with his 13th question; there is a note on C-102 that indicated that around the building sidewalk typical, in another location on C-103 sidewalk located immediately adjacent to the existing building. On C-103 in the footing drain detail it indicates 6" of topsoil to be located immediately adjacent. Schematic drawing indicates a 4' wide crushed granite band. That is 3 different things for the same area. He adds he believes it is much better looking to have the grass go up to the building then a hard surface and that is more keeping historically. He voices concern that the crushed stone will be perceived as a walkway and asks if the gutters and leaders are been taken off the building. A. Didio states that he is correct and that will be adjusted also there is a portion of grass that will go up to the building around the amphitheater. M. Strieter notes the gravel is not an ADA accessible surface and helps create a maintenance edge for the building. F. Iaconetti voices this is a poor solution. He continues with his 14th question; how will the pedestrians use the sidewalk looking up Austerlitz St toward the railroad crossing as what you are proposing now there is no connection to continue on a sidewalk. A. Didio explains they do not control that portion of ground, the Shaker property stops well short of the sidewalk and that is actually controlled by the railroad. F. Iaconetti states that he understands that but when they do their construction they need to make sure there is no disruption in the existing paving that is there So pedestrians can continue along that side of the street. A. Didio explains the ADA parking angles in and is not creating a hard line there, and CSX has the ability to establish a feasible connected sidewalk. S. Lopergolo explains the asphalt is not their property and will remain. F. Iaconetti continues with his question 15; storm water and run off was addressed and asks if they have something in writing from the village that states the storm drain is capable of holding that additional runoff. A. Didio confirms. D. Herrick reminds everyone the plans are sent to Department heads to affirm the needs of those departments are being met. F. Iaconetti continues with his questions 16 regarding C-104 lighting and landscaping. He states he really wants to understand what is taking place there in terms of lighting. That he does not understand the reasoning for the sidewalk that has stairs and the hand rails when you have another sidewalk that is so nearby basically creating an area with two parallel walks. Speaking personally he thought from the success of the planting in the

Arrowhead, that you might have moved it further back and illuminated the other walk. The reason being it is going to be difficult to keep things growing and healthy looking. It will create a tremendous amount of heat and stress on the plants trying to grow. He adds he learned in doing drawings that if you have two steps you can put a ramp instead which is a lot safer. He continues with question 17; in conjunction he hopes they realized the photo of River street showed four or five cars where now you only have two parking spots creating a loss of parking. M. Strieter explains the accessible route around the prow, how the sidewalk cuts through private property, how they have two steps and added a handrailing which is a design element relating to terraces and so they can have an accessible lawn that you can use. He adds a ramp was too steep and explains the benefit of this enhanced landscape and hoped to prioritize landscape over parking As the museum is providing parking on Austerlitz St. A. Didio observes the cars in the photo are pulling over the curb and parking on shaker property. M. Strieter notices the striping narrows down and those cars are not legally parked because it is not wide enough. F. Iaconetti states he was out there on Sunday and paced the curb and determined there was enough room to fit 4 cars. He voices concern that parking is the biggest issue in this village. He asks about a rumor that one of their patrons was purchasing an adjacent property and asks the shaker museum for their comments. P. Cassidy explains they are not at liberty to speak on the project as it is projected because it did not go through the village process yet but, it is their intent to have parking to support the museum and the village at large. They have done a number of outreach to the community, realize parking is the biggest question, continue to try to address it, Metwood has allowed use of parking on evenings and weekends. K. Dow explains a building of this size in this location, this is probably about as low in intensive parking use as you are ever going to find that could occupy and make use of this building. F. Iaconetti Continues with question 18; in terms of the Ginko trees, what caliper and height at time of planting, what will they look like in 15 years and how far apart are they being planted. M. Strieter answers, 4" caliper tree, 14 ' height and spaced 25 'apart. F. Iaconetti continues with question 19; asking about operations, hours, staff and how long visitors would be at the museum. P. Cassidy and L. Schutz discuss visitors, hours, staff and traffic. K. Dow affirms this was already discussed and approved at the meeting on September 16, 2019. F. Iaconetti voices concern that the site plan he saw took advantage of the glass area. K. Dow explains there were a lot of mechanical, practical, and essential elements that have been approved, things that are changed will need to be revisited. F. Iaconetti asks If the museum will be open 52 weeks a year with more visitors on weekends. L. Schutz explains they might close for major Holidays, point is to be open year round and be an anchor for Columbia County, typically museums have more visitors on the weekends. F. Iaconetti asks if there will be any painting on the exterior of the building and states they will need to provide color chips or samples to be reviewed. F. Iaconetti also asks about signage as there are no signs on the site plan and if there will be a separate submittal for the signs. P. Cassidy answers they are still having a conversation about the sign and placement, all will be within the village code. F. Iaconetti voices he has major concerns about the tower, gravel around side of the building, loss of parking, changing the feeling of the circle, and pedestrian issues. D. Herrick confirms if this will fall under old zoning or new zoning. K. Dow explains anything that is different will go under the new zoning and refers to the 2019 minutes, as to the determinations that were made. L. Schutz confirms the rendering for submittal in 2019 it was clear they were just coming for site plan approval with proof of

concept with a firm they decided not to commission to do the building. D. Herrick voices a concern the new building does not fit the aesthetics of that area. A. Didio asks what the board is looking for so they can move forward with public hearing. D. Herrick mentions the stairwell on the outside and the new edition on the back or the entrance his concern being the buildings in the historic area are either brick or wood and look to keep the aesthetic look of the village. L. Ponter agrees he is excited about the project and would like to see a melding of materials on the second building with respect to the neighborhood. A. Selldorf asks if this means going back to the 1920s. L. Ponter the corrugated next to the brick may appear jarring. A. Selldorf explains she has been an architect most of her life and works with historic buildings and sensitive additions to it. She feels the existing building should be celebrated and has made a very careful choice of materials to embody what the museum represents and the incredibly elegant brick structure. F. Iaconetti adds his concerns or with the numerous site issue aspects. D. Herrick calls to recess and continue at the next meeting. S. Lopergolo asks where to send the materials. D. Herrick asks her to call the Village Hall so they can be dropped off.

Motion made by F. Iaconetti to table to the next meeting scheduled on December 28th, seconded by L. Ponter

F. Iaconetti-in favor of tabling, L. Ponter-aye, D. Herrick-aye

Motion made by F. Iaconetti to table the minutes from October 26, 2020 to the next meeting, seconded by L. Ponter.

L. Ponter-aye, F. Iaconetti-aye D. Herrick-aye: Approved by all

ADJOURNMENT: 9:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Patricia DeLong