

Wm. Patrick Madden
Mayor

Christopher Nolin
Deputy Mayor



Steven Strichman
Commissioner of Planning

Phone: (518) 279-7166
steven.strichman@troyny.gov

DRAFT

Planning Commission

433 River St., Ste. 5001
Troy, New York 12180

MEETING MINUTES

The Planning Commission of the City of Troy, New York, conducted a public meeting at **6:00 P.M. on Wednesday, April 19th, 2023**, in person for the Board and available via Zoom conferencing, to act upon the following requests, referred by the Bureau of Code Enforcement of the City of Troy, for review and approval.

6:03 pm – Meeting called to order.

Commissioners in Attendance

James Rath (JR), William Comiskey (WC), Suzanne Spellen (SS), Roddy Yagan (RY), Anthony Mohen (AM), Sara Wengert (SW)

Also, in Attendance

Andy Brick (Planning and Zoning Attorney), Eric Ferraro (Assistant Planner)

Administrative Items

Adoption of Meeting Minutes from February 15th, 2023 & March 15th by Resolution

- **B.C. Motions to: Adopt February and March PC meeting minutes** . **S.S. seconded.**

	Absent	Yes	No	Abstain	Recused
Roddy Yagan		X			
Sara Wengert		X			
Suzanne Spellen		X			
Anthony Mohen		X			
James Rath		X			
William Comiskey		X			

- **Motion to: Adopt February and March PC meeting minutes** . **passed 6-0**

Planning Commission to take a vote on a permanent Vice Chairperson: Postponed to April

- **R.Y. Motions to: Nominate & Elect Anthony Mohen as Vice Chairperson** . **B.C. seconded.**

	Absent	Yes	No	Abstain	Recused
Roddy Yagan		X			
Sara Wengert		X			
Suzanne Spellen		X			
Anthony Mohen		X			
James Rath		X			
William Comiskey		X			

- **Motion to: Nominate & Elect Anthony Mohen as Vice Chairperson** . **passed 6-0**

Continue to Page 2

Written by Eric Ferraro, On Behalf of the Executive Secretary

Additional information regarding the above listed actions is available by contacting the Planning Commission’s Assistant Planner, eric.ferraro@troyny.gov.

As required by the Americans with Disabilities Act, auxiliary aids and services are available upon request. Please give one-week advance notice for services needed.

Consent/New Business

PLPC 2023 0023 – 6 Brunswick Ave – (101.80-4-3) [**B-2 Community Commercial**]
 Change of Use –SEQRA (Type II)

-The Applicant, Nicholas Reinert, wishes to do a cosmetic fit-up of a 300 sq ft space in a commercial building to relocate his business, The Factory Tattoo. Off-street parking provided.

- Applicant presentation: Nick Reinert
- Commissioner comments and questions to applicant.
 1. S.W. asks applicants about signage on site
- Request for public comment: No comments
- Commissioner deliberation:
- Applicant response:
 1. Applicants are new owners of the property. They hate the sign and are going to remove it.
 2. Has an extensive clientele across the country. Contributes to many charity events and activities to support the local community.

• **S.W. Motions to: Approve . . . S.S. seconded.**

	Absent	Yes	No	Abstain	Recused
Roddy Yagan		X			
Sara Wengert		X			
Suzanne Spellen		X			
Anthony Mohen		X			
James Rath		X			
William Comiskey		X			

• **Motion to: Approve passed 6-0**

*Item is pulled from consent. Commissioner wishes to ask applicant/owner questions about the site.

Old Business

PLPC 2018 0003 –141 Congress St. (101.61-3-2) [MULTI]
 Site Plan Approval Extension, SEQR (Type II)

City Station North, LLC is proposing to construct ±90,000 sq. ft. of residential, ±50,000 sq.ft. of commercial, and ±160 parking spaces in a MULTI Zone. The applicant is seeking a 6-month extension of their approvals.

- Applicant presentation: Jeff Smetana
- Commissioner comments and questions to applicant:
 1. R.Y. wants update on timeline to start.
 2. A.B. states (before applicant departs) that there is no provision for a 6-month extension under the new code. The implication being that if this project stalls or changes within the next 6 months, it may be subject to a revised site plan review.
- Request for public comment: no
- Commissioner deliberation:
 1. J.R. asks about formal adoption of a new zoning code and procedures pertinent to current meeting/applications. A.B. Clarifies.
 2. R.Y. - Asks if she thinks there is any substantive change in the neighborhood.
 3. S.W. - Does not believe there has been substantial change in the neighborhood.
- Applicant response:

Continue to page 3

1. Explains stages that are yet to happen. Abatement to start sometime in May for 3 weeks followed by Demo (6-8 weeks). Followed by 3-6 weeks of archaeological and geotechnical work. Then construction.

- **S.W. Motions to: Approve Extension Request . R.Y. seconded.**

	Absent	Yes	No	Abstain	Recused
Roddy Yagan		X			
Sara Wengert		X			
Suzanne Spellen		X			
Anthony Mohen		X			
James Rath		X			
William Comiskey		X			

- **Motion to: Approve Extension Request . passed 6-0**

PLPC 2021 0034 –547-549 River Street (101.22-9-1) [Hoosick Street Waterfront]
 Site Plan Review –SEQRA (Type I)

The applicant, Bargain Block, LLC, on behalf of First Columbia, LLC, proposes to revise an older proposal at 449 River Street by increasing the number of congregate units at the proposed new construction site of a senior housing facility, totaling 150 units. Additionally, the applicant proposes to convert 4 floors of office space into 72 apartments and construct a new rock-climbing gym on the south side of the building.

- Applicant presentation: Kevin and Nate Bette
- Commissioner comments and questions to applicant:
 1. R.Y. & S.W. wishes for clarification on # of newly introduced units between the 2 properties, outdoor waterfront space, water usage and why the increase in density at 549.
 2. S.W. wants to ensure she understands the request. Lists project details.; Asks if parking requirements have changed based on the unit count? A.M. follows up.
 3. A.M. - how does this link to grocery store? Points out there were variances previously approved for parking for this project. Asks A.B. if this needs to be amended. A.B. Clarifies
 4. A.B. - States PC’s requirement to make an updated determination after viewing the EAF long form. Sites water usage and parking.
 5. B.C. - doesn’t see density as an issue and supports affordable housing for seniors. A.M. agrees.
 6. E.F. clarifies the proposal as an amendment.
 7. J.R. - Asks about waterfront access and mass transit.
 8. S.S. asks about units in Flannigan. Senior units, affordable, market rate?
 9. R.Y. asks [to A.B.] about contingent approvals and revised variances.
 10. A.B. “Technically you don’t need to condition any approvals on them obtaining variances because if they need the variance, they have to go get it regardless of what you do as the PC, so it’s rather redundant to make a condition.”; Should as lead agency under SEQRA, consider a motion to reaffirm that there will be no significant or adverse impacts.
 11. S.W. wants to be clear that this project needs to have exterior architectural materials submitted for final approval Engineering and Planning Staff and PC.
 12. A.M. wishes to form a committee to approve these items.
 - Committee to consist of: S.W., R.Y.
 13. A.B. reiterates message to applicant: Valid approvals remain current for 3 years under new zoning code UNLESS there are any future modifications. Any future modifications to this site plan will be subject to the new zoning code.
- Request for public comment: No
- Commissioner deliberation:
- Applicant response:
 1. It’s a conversion of office spaces to apartments (72) in 547. Plus, an additional 27 units at 549.
 2. [Regarding 549] Our footprint doesn’t change. We’re just increasing the # of units.

Continue to page 4

3. Responds to A.M.
4. Responds to S.W. & A.M. about parking.
5. Responds to R.Y. about water usage & density. Sites market studies and ability to manage.
6. K.B. states their intention is to try to make Troy a walkable city.
7. Going to make a portion of the units affordable. Want to make sure it's a mixed housing project. Trying to find balance. Also wants to integrate the waterfront and support mass transit.

- **R.Y. Motions to: Reaffirm previous Negative Declaration on SEORA . J.R. seconded.**

	Absent	Yes	No	Abstain	Recused
Roddy Yagan		X			
Sara Wengert		X			
Suzanne Spellen		X			
Anthony Mohen		X			
James Rath		X			
William Comiskey		X			

- **Motion to: Reaffirm previous Negative Declaration on SEORA . passed 6-0**

- **A.M. Motions to: Approve amended site plan subject to obtaining any required variances or amendments to the existing approved variances from ZBA & subject to approval by our material subcommittee once materials have been submitted. S.S. seconded.**

	Absent	Yes	No	Abstain	Recused
Roddy Yagan		X			
Sara Wengert		X			
Suzanne Spellen		X			
Anthony Mohen		X			
James Rath		X			
William Comiskey		X			

- **Motion to: Approve amended site plan subject to obtaining any required variances or amendments to the existing approved variances from ZBA & subject to approval by our material subcommittee once materials have been submitted. passed 6-0**

[PLPC 2023 0004](#) – 504 Broadway Ave. (101.53-6-2.2) [B-4 Central Commercial]
 Site Plan Review, SEQR (Type I)

The applicant, Phinney Design Group, is proposing to convert an existing 2-story building built in 1970 into a 3-story, mixed use, self-sustaining building with professional workspaces on upper 2 floors and a restaurant on the ground floor. Additionally, the applicant proposes to replace sidewalks, provide bicycle parking, EV charge stations for electronic vehicles and install planters/enhance green footprint.

- Applicant presentation: Phinney Design Group presenting updated site plan based on comments from HRC
 1. HRC did not support the staining of brick on the exterior and to keep the exterior murals.
 2. HRC felt continuity of the storefront on the existing building vs what was/is proposed on the new portion of the building was not discontinuous enough. And emphasized the continuation of the existing building with the new building a little too much. Resulting in a revision of materials/measurements to the façade.
- Commissioner comments and questions to applicant:
 1. R.Y. to the applicant, do you have any street level renderings with the darkened brick? & “Which version do you prefer?”
 2. E.F. clarifies TFD had no objections/comments/statements
 3. B.C. doesn’t understand the historical significance of this bldg. R.Y. concurs. Likes the earlier design. Modifications are okay also. Design is exciting.
 4. S.W. Asks about tenancy for 1st fl.; States the design is beautiful. Thinks the commission should approve the site plan for the original design but wants commissioner feedback.

Continue to page 5

5. S.S. “I don’t see why the HRC wants to preserve this design.” Likes the design. Likes the location its in.
 6. A.M. Agrees with Suzanne and Bill. “There’s a lot of architecture [downtown] that we need to preserve, but there’s also some regrettable architecture that was used to fill empty space.” Sees value of preserving the brick but could go either way. Thinks design is great.
 7. J.R. Doesn’t strongly feel one way or the other. Asks about space to the left of main entrance.
 8. R.Y. Disagrees that this building/arch design constitutes the fabric of Troy’s architectural history. Tends to prefer the previous look and design. Wonders if there’s a way to compromise. Feels strongly about the disconnect between the upper story/addition/stairwell’s setback. Comments on design features. Asks about E.V. stations.
 9. A.B. reiterates message to applicant: Valid approvals remain current for 3 years under the new zoning code UNLESS there are any future modifications. Any future modifications to this site plan will be subject to the new zoning code.
- Request for public comment: Yes
 1. Jeff Mirel-Developer behind 1818 5th Ave. Supports
 2. Jeff Betts- Co-Chair, IDA. Supports. “; net zero aspect is really encouraging”.
 - Commissioner deliberation:
 - Applicant response:
 1. We prefer the original design. Understands the need to preserve architectural history/design. Is happy with either [design]. Feels the functionality that lead to the buildings construction shouldn’t be celebrated, as it was made to compact office space in a downtown location, quickly.
 2. The restaurant portion of the project will be a 100% electric kitchen.
 3. Addresses site plan details for J.R. & A.M.; Addresses ‘bicycle’ infrastructure. Plan to be updated.
 4. [Awnings asked about by R.Y.] Maintenance would prove to be an obstacle. Is happy to move façade back to the original overhangs. Will do what ever board thinks are best. Responds to E.V. stations.

- **A.M. Motions to: Make a negative Declaration for SEORA** , **R.Y. seconded.**

	Absent	Yes	No	Abstain	Recused
Roddy Yagan		X			
Sara Wengert		X			
Suzanne Spellen		X			
Anthony Mohen		X			
James Rath		X			
William Comiskey		X			

- **Motion to: Make a negative declaration for SEORA** . **passed 6-0**

- **S.W. Motions to: Approve site plan the representation of the project with the dark brick co-planer floor levels** , **R.Y. seconded.**

	Absent	Yes	No	Abstain	Recused
Roddy Yagan		X			
Sara Wengert		X			
Suzanne Spellen		X			
Anthony Mohen		X			
James Rath		X			
William Comiskey		X			

- **Motion to: Approve site plan the representation of the project with the dark brick co-planer floor levels** . **passed -**

Mike Phinney wants on the record: “You’re the 1st planning board that has figured out how to make technology work for you and for us.”

Continue to page 6

New Business

PLPC 2023 0022 –15 Northern Drive (70.81-2-10) [**B-3 Shopping Central Commercial**]
 Site Plan Review –SEQRA (unlisted)

The Applicant, Global North Properties Corp., seeks to convert a vacant building and neglected parcel into a used car dealership provisioned with site enhancements and signage. Existing site lighting shall be utilized.

- Applicant presentation: Daniel Morelli of Morelli Design and Construction
- Commissioner comments and questions to applicant:
 1. J.R. Asks about ‘blight’ in staff reports. E.F. clarifies. Asks about potential paving operations, general site plan inquiries. Has concerns about the appearance of parcel and how it interacts with roadway. At minimum want to see sidewalks (concrete) along frontage. Wants one of the entrances removed. Wants increased green space along frontage. Fencing along the front to prevent trash from blowing onto lot and give space more character.
 2. Y. R. asks about security and the existing structure.
- Request for public comment: No
- Commissioner deliberation:
 1. Wishes to see changes to the site plan, submitted to city staff.
- Applicant response
 1. The owner has already engaged a contractor for sidewalks.
 2. In response to J.R., “We can certainly do that.”
 3. Recommends curb cuts to go and stretch new green space.
 4. Recommends a 4 ft fence in the front.
 5. Responds to R.Y.
 6. Most conditions mentioned the applicant has already sought quotes on.

- **S.W. Motions to: Declare PC as lead agency for SEQRA** . **R.Y. seconded.**

	Absent	Yes	No	Abstain	Recused
Roddy Yagan		X			
Sara Wengert		X			
Suzanne Spellen		X			
Anthony Mohen		X			
James Rath		X			
William Comiskey		X			

- **Motion to: Declare PC as lead agency for SEQRA** . **passed 6-0**

- **R.Y. Motions to: Make a negative declaration for SEQRA** . **.. seconded.**

	Absent	Yes	No	Abstain	Recused
Roddy Yagan					
Sara Wengert					
Suzanne Spellen					
Anthony Mohen					
James Rath					
William Comiskey					

- **Motion to: Make a negative declaration for SEQRA** . **passed 6-0**

- **J.R. Motions to: Approve site plan with the following stipulations: To provide a concrete sidewalk along the front edge of the property to be appx. 4 ft in width with a vehicle access ramp also in concrete. Removal of vehicle access on the west side of the site plan. Green space extending along the frontage where there isn’t vehicle access. Provide decorative fencing similar to a 4 ft black aluminum fence along frontage, to be approved by City Staff. R.Y. seconded.**

	Absent	Yes	No	Abstain	Recused
Roddy Yagan		X			
Sara Wengert		X			
Suzanne Spellen		X			
Anthony Mohen		X			
James Rath		X			
William Comiskey		X			

- **Motion to: Approve site plan with the following stipulations: To provide a concrete sidewalk along the front edge of the property to be appx. 4 ft in width with a vehicle access ramp also in concrete. Removal of vehicle access on the west side of the site plan. Green space extending along the frontage where there isn't vehicle access. Provide decorative fencing similar to a 4 ft black aluminum fence along frontage, to be approved by City Staff. passed 6-0**

[PLPC 2022 0001](#) -520 5th Ave (80.64-6-19) [[B-2 Community Commercial](#)]
 Site Plan Review –SEQRA (unlisted)

The applicant, Joseph Mouwad, proposes to convert a vacant structure and neglected parcel into a light automotive repair center and used car sales. The proposal calls for site enhancements/improvements, green infrastructure, use of existing sign infrastructure and pledges to be a good steward of the neighborhood after receiving a special use and area variance in February 2022.

- Applicant presentation: Rosie Karame
- Commissioner comments and questions to applicant:
 1. J.R. & R.Y. asks about drain features on site plan
 2. R.Y. explains implications of drain on site plan vs. above surface grading/direction of water flow and asks where vehicles would be waiting to be worked on.
 3. J.R. wants clarification of drainage to be presented at another meeting. Asks about lighting.
 4. R.Y. thinks drainage should be revised and focused on the center drain with a separator to address any vehicle runoff or contamination. Asks about parking in the alley.
- Request for public comment: Yes
 1. Justin Cockx-Questions about the site plan. States concerns
 - Also states he runs 3 businesses out of his home that do not have C.O.'s.
- Commissioner deliberation:
 1. J.R. & R.Y. discuss survey and grading from east to west.
 2. S.W. The survey and site plan do not appear to be coordinated.
 3. J.R. Thinks a delineation of grass from asphalt is necessary w/provided curbing. Supports plantings on grass along alley and on 5th Ave. It would discourage parking in alley; wants to see revised site plan
 4. A.B.- States revisions of the plan and returning next month would have the capacity to alter the site plan. Alternative would be approval with conditions with a 3-year grace period. Since there is a legitimate question regarding grading/drainage. If catch basin is required...I think you should hold off on taking any SEQRA action.
 5. S.W. wants to prepare these notes so that there's no mistaking what we're suggesting.
 6. R.Y. puts forward an enumerated list of items needed:
 - A grading plan which pitches to a center area drain.
 - A provision for a connection of that area drain to the stormwater system, including a separator.
 - Identification of physical barriers at the edge of greenspace within alley.
 - Delineation of overhead light on rear of building in alley; ensure it's downward facing light. J.R.—Lighting in general. Where it is on the plan. If it's not on plan, but text that says building mounted light fixture.
 - Additional plantings to be specified. Between curb cut and tree and between tree and corner...basically along frontage and alley.

- Wants to see how space between the building and 6 ft fence is to be used.
 - 7. S.S.- “Is there any way we can accommodate her, so she doesn’t have to go through all the changes through zoning?”
 - 8. A.B. states he or the staff at this juncture are not comfortable enough to answer that currently.
 - 9. B.C. Supports approval with conditions. “I think we are at a stage where we should act to try to make something of this property right now.” S.S. agrees.
 - 10. R.Y.’s hesitancy is there are concerned neighbors and the site plan has legitimate issues.
 - 11. S.S. Doesn’t think it’s fair to give conditions to prior approvals and not this one. B.C. concurs.
 - 12. R.Y. asks A.B about SEQRA.
 - 13. A.B. if you set forth an enumerated list of changes that you want to see on the site plan and delegate it to a subcommittee with confirmation that those changes have been properly placed on the plan than you would be able to consider a neg dec because you have mitigated any concerns of adverse effects by delegating to a subcommittee and no building permit can be issued until that subcommittee signed off and confirmed that those mitigating factors have been provided. So, you could neg dec. It would involve the list created as conditions of approval and a delegation of a subcommittee to confirm that all those conditions were provided on the site plan.
 - 14. R.Y. offers himself on the sub-committee. A.M. recommends J.R.; J.R. wants a future meeting.
 - 15. A.B.- If there are any changes beyond that enumerated list of changes sought, this project will be subject to new zoning.
- Applicant response:
 1. Addresses comments about drainage. There is an existing drainage dip.
 2. All repairs would take place inside the garage.
 3. We don’t want repair storage on site. Only cars parked outside would be for used car sales.
 4. Any vehicles needing repair that are leaking would be taken into the garage. (J.R. has concerns this would not alleviate the issue)
 5. Lighting from alley won’t disturb neighbors. Commits to a lighting plan update on site plan with hours addressed.
 6. Exhausted with process, requests commissioners to either approve or deny.

• **J.R. Motions to: Table item to May 17th PC meeting . . . seconded.**

	Absent	Yes	No	Abstain	Recused
Roddy Yagan					
Sara Wengert					
Suzanne Spellen					
Anthony Mohen					
James Rath					
William Comiskey					

• **Motion to: _____ . passed -**

• **B.C. Motions to: Declare PC as lead agency under SEQRA . . . S.S. seconded.**

	Absent	Yes	No	Abstain	Recused
Roddy Yagan		X			
Sara Wengert		X			
Suzanne Spellen		X			
Anthony Mohen			X		
James Rath			X		
William Comiskey		X			

• **Motion to: Declare PC as lead agency under SEQRA . passed 4-2**

• **R.Y. Motions to: Approve site plan with enumerated list of conditions subject to the approval of a subcommittee. S.W. seconded.**

	Absent	Yes	No	Abstain	Recused
Roddy Yagan		X			
Sara Wengert		X			

Suzanne Spellin		X			
Anthony Mohen		X			
James Rath			X		
William Comiskey		X			

- **Motion to: Approve site plan with enumerated list of conditions subject to the approval of a subcommittee. passed 5-0**

Subcommittee to consist of: R.Y., S.W., J.R.

[PLPC 2022 0097](#) –1818 Fifth Ave. (101.53-6-1) [[B-4 Central Commercial](#)]
 Concept Review –SEQRA (Type I)

The applicant, The Rosenblum Companies c/o Bohler, proposes to redevelop the current site of a single story former and vacant bank building into a 4-story, 71 unit, apartment complex seeking to restore the continuous pre-urban streetscape. The building will be the city’s first zero-emission multifamily building and will provide residential amenities, bicycle and limited onsite parking with additional off-site parking.

- Applicant presentation: Jeff Mirel of Rosenblum Co.
- Commissioner comments and questions to applicant:
 1. B.C. – “What’s the difference between a studio and a microunit?”
 2. J.R.- “Can you speak to # of unit’s vs the actual density of people living there?”; Has question about setback portion of façade and stormwater discussions with DPU.
 - 2-hour parking is frustrating. Suggests developer advocate for change.
 3. S.S. has concerns about parking.
 4. A.M. Shares thoughts with J.R. about roofline and façade. Appreciates specific design details. Not opposed to dense development. Shares concern for apts. not being for people who want to live long term.
 5. R.Y. Addresses architectural features of the project. Asks about courtyard space. Opposes microunits. Supports passive house standards. Clarifies opinion. Addresses rooftop activation. Would like to see more street level renderings.
 6. (S.W.) -Sad to see the ornamental trees go. Wonders about natural lighting to adjacent structures. States opinion on the concept of urban infill and architecture to this project.
 7. (R.Y) Is not opposed to reviewing project with a 5th floor despite being divisive topic.
 8. A.B. to the applicant → Long form is required. Identify any agencies involved.
- Request for public comment: YES *See recordings for extended commentary.
 1. Brian Barker, Pastor of local church-Supports
 2. Mrs. De Seve, neighbor-Opposes in its current form.
 3. Jonathan Scurzer of CDTA-Supports
 4. Jason Allen, Dir. @ Ares Power-Supports
 5. Michael Flynn, neighboring landlord-Opposes
 6. Jeff Betts, Co-chair of Troy IDA-Supports.
 7. Evie McQueen, neighbor-Unsure. Cites parking concerns.
 8. Jim De Seve-Opposes in current form.
 9. Claire Normile, neighbor-Has questions to applicant
 10. Wayne Thomas, neighbor-opposes in current form.
 11. Mike Phinney, future neighbor/developer of 504 Broadway-Supports
 12. Tom Curtain, Troy resident in Lansingburg- Opposes in its current form. Cites parking
 13. Mark McGuinness, property manager for Rosenblum-Supports
 14. Katie Sulch, neighbor-opposes in its current form.
- Major public opposition discussion points center around: Parking & Density
- Commissioner deliberation:
- Applicant response.
 1. Our hope is that tonight the PC would take on lead agency status for SEQRA.
 2. Responds to public input.

- Generally wanting to return the street to its historic character by avoiding a 5th story and honoring the setbacks.
- Engaged in a TDMP to look into parking conditions.
- Doesn't expect [units] to be utilized by 2 people. Targeted to young professionals & people over 50. Single, never married, divorced, or widowed. On limited income.
- Units are fully equipped with washer/dryer, full kitchens and balconies.
- Cites studies that show these are the largest growing type of apt. unit being built around the country.; Cites economic impact studies and zero emission features of design.
- Wood frame concept; is code compliant. No gas/fossil fuels in this building.
- ADA accessible
- Made an intentional decision to not put retail in the building.

3. Responding to PC.

- Responds to (B.C.)-40 micro units which are give or take, 400 sq ft. Around 20 studios and 10 1 bdrm; "About 200 sq ft."
- To (J.R.)- Our assessment is they will be single occupancies. Density studies are based on demographics. Cites 2020 workforce study by the Capital Region Economic Development Council and a study showing avg rent in the Capital region as of the end of 2022 is about \$1444/mo.
- 400 sq ft is not ideal to co-habituate. Anticipate largely single occupancies; density is comparable to what's already there. "We also don't take away the importance of the fact that parking is complex."
- Responds to (J.R.) about architectural features; Stormwater-Discussions with C.W/DPU. Initial calculations verified by former engineering went to DEC for signoff. Did not look like additional construction was required based on estimated outputs from the bldg. Addresses mitigating env. Impacts. Will advocate for longer term parking.
- Dedicating roof to solar.
- Responds to (A.M.)- "[the city] has other landlords with larger apts. that they can move up to as [tenants] accrue their own wealth.
- Responds to (R.Y.)-"At the end of the day this is a difficult project to make work economically; we don't arrive at unit count/density lightly. We look at how we balance where we need to be from a capital cost and an operating cost. To begin to put larger units in means we may have fewer units, but we could have just the same if not more occupants, and frankly higher wealth households that have 2 cars instead of 1, so I don't think that addresses the parking concern and the upshot is we're able to provide this type of housing that is the steppingstone for the type of housing that people will eventually be looking for. We agree with more green space on the façade of the bldg."

- **A.M. Motions to: Declare PC as Lead Agency under SEORA . R.Y. seconded.**

	Absent	Yes	No	Abstain	Recused
Roddy Yagan					
Sara Wengert					
Suzanne Spellen					
Anthony Mohen					
James Rath					
William Comiskey					

- **Motion to: Declare PC as Lead Agency under SEORA . passed 6-0**

- **A.M. Motions to: Table item to May 17th . R.Y. seconded.**

	Absent	Yes	No	Abstain	Recused
Roddy Yagan					
Sara Wengert					
Suzanne Spellen					
Anthony Mohen					
James Rath					

William Comiskey					
------------------	--	--	--	--	--

- **Motion to: Table item to May 17th . passed 6-0**

PLPC 2023 0011 – 625 Seventh Ave (80.56-3-1) [[INST, Institutional](#)]
 Concept Review –SEQR (Unlisted)

The applicant, 625 7th Ave, LLC, wishes to convert the former Catholic Central High School building in Lansingburgh into 74 market-rate apartments. Upgrades include new interior amenities and exterior site improvements.

- Applicant presentation: Jeff Buell and Joe Perniciaro of Redburn Development dba 625 7th Ave., LLC
- Commissioner comments and questions to applicant:
 1. J.R.- Needs to see more developed site plan. Understands parking issue. Suggests alternatives but cites need for sports fields in the area. Issue may come at the cost of paving portions of the football field. A.M. echoes sentiment. Would like to see car-sharing.
 2. R.Y.-Do you have any green initiatives in efficiency with housing standards? Asks about rooftop.
- Request for public comment: Yes
 1. Tom Curtin-Has concerns about parking.
- Commissioner deliberation:
- Applicant response:
 1. (R.Y.) We do our own energy systems. There are some complications with applying for state historic tax credits. But we pursue those techniques as best we can.
 2. Understand parking. Working on a TDMP. Open to car-sharing.

- **J.R. Motions to: Declare PC as lead agency under SEORA . R.Y. seconded.**

	Absent	Yes	No	Abstain	Recused
Roddy Yagan		X			
Sara Wengert		X			
Suzanne Spellen		X			
Anthony Mohen		X			
James Rath		X			
William Comiskey		X			

- **Motion to: Declare PC as lead agency under SEORA . passed 6-0**

- **R.Y. Motions to: Table item to May 17th PC meeting . J.R. seconded.**

	Absent	Yes	No	Abstain	Recused
Roddy Yagan		X			
Sara Wengert		X			
Suzanne Spellen		X			
Anthony Mohen		X			
James Rath		X			
William Comiskey		X			

- **Motion to: Table item to May 17th PC meeting . passed 6-0**

- **R.Y. motioned to: Adjourn April PC meeting at: 10:25 PM . S.S. seconded.**

	Absent	Yes	No	Abstain	Recused
Roddy Yagan		X			
Sara Wengert	X				
Suzanne Spellen		X			
Anthony Mohen		X			
James Rath		X			
William Comiskey		X			

- **Motion to: Adjourn meeting at: 10:25 . passed 6-0.**