

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 March 21, 2017 at 4:30 PM.

- **Members Attending:**

(5 present) Chair- Gene Berman / Joe Membrino / Richard Blabey / Paul Kuhn / Fred Schneider-alternate

- **Members Absent:**

David Pearlman

- **Others Attending:**

Zoning Enforcement Officer-Jane Gentile / Clerk (PT) – Mikal Sky-Shrewsberry
/ (4) Member(s) of the Public

Mr. Berman Called the Meeting to Order at 4:30 PM

PUBLIC HEARING (0 ITEM(s))

AGENDA (5 ITEMS*)

**Note: Listed as 6 items on the original agenda but #4 and #5 were addressed together during the actual meeting to focus efforts and make the best use of time*

- **Proposed Signage (73 Main Street) John Orilio - proposed rewording of sign located on Pioneer Street at side door)**
 - **Present/ Participating: John Orilio**
 - **Discussion**
 - **Sign Location and Specs**
 - John Orilio stated
 - The original sign has been taken down and is being redone because
 - There are new tenants in the building so new wording is required
 - The old sign had come loose from the building and needed to be remounted
 - The original sign will be used for the proposed sign
It will just be repainted
 - The original color scheme will be used
 - Black background
 - Cream Lettering
(the original color may have been gold but it looks like cream due to fading)
 - Original Old English Style font will be replaced with one that better reflects the age of the building
 - An image of a hand with a finger pointing to the door
(not on original sign)
 - Sign will be professionally hand painted
 - Will be hung in original location (to the left of the door) using same style anchors
 - A carriage lamp will be hung above the sign
(HPARB has already approved the light)
 - Sign content will include
 - The name of the building: Augur Block

- The name of the 2nd floor tenant: "Cooperstown Escape Rooms"
 - Jane Gentile, ZEO stated (In response to an inquiry by Gene Berman)
 - she assumes the size of sign complies with the law because it was an existing sign that is just being repainted
 - **MOTION**
 - To approve the sign at **73 Main Street** as submitted
 - Made by: Richard Blabey / Second: Paul Kuhn
 - Results:
 - Ayes (5): Berman / Membrino / Blabey / Kuhn / Schneider
 - Nays (0)
 - **MOTION CARRIED**
- **Proposed Signage (134 Main Street) Katelyn Lanza (Kate's Upstate) - proposed wall and hanging signage**
 - **Present/Participating: Kate Lanza, Jess Lanza**
 - **Discussion**
 - Proposed Location and Content of Sign
 - Sign will read:
 - Kate's Upstate
 - Sign Appearance
 - Black font /Black border /Gold Arrow Shooting It
 - 3/8" PVC with decorative molding around it in black
 - Size
 - Will be the same size as the Mt. Fuji sign
 - Bracket
 - Brought in the metal bracket they intend to use
 - Richard Blabey (PB) stated/read law 227-6 (RE projecting signs)
 - Maximum dimensions area= 12 sq. ft. height four feet, width three feet
 - Extension of a bracket cannot be more than 39" from a façade unless hung from an existing historical structure
 - Proposed bracket is longer than 39" and needs to be replaced
 - The Lanza's agreed to replace the proposed bracket with a shorter bracket that complies with the legal requirements
 - The Lanzas stated (in response to Gene Berman's inquiry) that there will be 2 signs: a wall sign and a hanging sign
 - Jane Gentile, ZEO stated
 - sign meets square footage requirements
 - hanging sign is 3' wide x 2' tall (6 sq. ft.)
 - wall sign is 20 sq. ft.
 - hanging sign is basically the wall sign shrunk down, with same white background (it is described by the same sketch used for the large hanging sign)
 - bottom of sign must be hung at least 8 feet high
 - bracket size was not included in the application
 - Business is a year-round women's boutique
 - **MOTION**
 - To approve the signage at **134 Main Street** as submitted

- with bracket to comply with existing law: 227-3A (3)(c) 39" extension max
 - Made by: Richard Blabey/ Second: Paul Kuhn
 - Results:
 - Ayes (5): Berman / Membrino / Blabey / Kuhn / Schneider
 - Nays (0)
 - **MOTION CARRIED**
- **Discussion of a possible amendment to the Sign Law concerning sandwich boards - regulate appearance and location (Board of Trustees wishes to allow them with regulations)**
 - Trustees would like to modify the law to allow regulated use of sandwich boards as follows
 - Only on private property
 - Limited sizes, materials, etc.
(mostly concerned with limiting size)
 - Specify circumstances under which they can / can't be used
 - Planning Board discussion
 - Status of sandwich boards in the Village
 - the law currently prohibits the use of sandwich boards in the business and commercial districts (Sign Law §§ 227-2 and 227-6 (A)(4)(d))
 - the law is not being enforced and some sandwich boards are being used with permission of the Village (probably due to confusion over whether they are allowed on private property)
 - the numbers of sandwich boards being used in the Village is increasing
 - Main discussion points
 - Liability
 - Signs are potential trip hazards and increase the liability of the Village
 - Possible solutions
 - Limit to private property limits potential liability of Village
 - Consider requiring businesses to name the Village as additional insured on their policy
 - Public vs Private
 - Limit use to businesses that can place signs on private property
 - automatically limits the numbers of signs – reducing visual clutter and potential trip hazards
 - Gives advertising advantage to businesses that have private space
 - Reduces Village liability
 - Allowing use on both public and private land
 - Gives all businesses an equal advertising opportunities and increases their ability to be competitive
 - There are no other types of signs in Cooperstown that have distinct regulations if used on public vs private space
 - Cost vs Benefit
 - By impacting the visual landscape sandwich boards effect impressions of Cooperstown
 - may create a sense of visual clutter
 - may generate a sense of excitement and provide indication of a thriving active business community

- Benefits to businesses
 - Businesses use the signs because they feel they drive traffic to them
 - Increase competitiveness with other businesses inside and outside of the Village
 - Provide a way to promote current, changeable elements within the business: food specials, sales, entertainment, etc.
 - Have a very different function from the signs on the side of the building because the sandwich boards are disruptive and cause people to notice and consider whether they have any interest in what's happening
- Risk
 - signs are a potential impediment to pedestrian traffic and increase the risk of tripping
- Data
 - There is no data available to evaluate the actual impact of sandwich boards on businesses
 - Chamber of Commerce may be able to conduct surveys and provide some actual data that is specifically relevant to local business
- How other towns have handled them
 - Require signs be brought in when businesses are closed
 - When allowed on public property a certain amount of clear space is required around them
- Ideas for regulation/use
 - Pay a fee to have a board using a simple filing process
 - Provides opportunity to notify business owners of regulations regarding size, appearance, location and circumstances of use and for the Village to get written recognition that that these regulations have been agreed to
 - Having to pay a little money and spend a little time to get a sign is likely to limit the number of business owners that use them (reducing problems of visual clutter / safety)
 - Signing acknowledgement of rules during registration process
 - Specific approval will not be required so the Planning Board is not the "bad guy" and Planning Board's work load is not increased
 - Locations
 - Place them within the newly fenced, treed areas
 - Place them on the pavers (not the concrete sidewalk)
 - Allow them only when the Village is not having a major event that requires taking advantage of all possible walking spaces
 - Appearance
 - Create a uniform aesthetic to reduce visual clutter and create a classy appearance by
 - limiting colors, fonts, sizes, etc.
 - requiring businesses to select from a predefined set of sandwich board styles chosen by the Village
 - Circumstances

- Prohibit use of signs during high traffic events to maximize area available for pedestrian traffic and minimize risk
 - Content
 - Inquiry: Could they be limited to food establishments or other specific types of businesses?
 - No because regulations are required to be content neutral
 - Next Steps
 - Jane Gentile, ZEO will
 - inform Trustees that the Planning Board recommends either no sandwich boards are allowed at all or they are allowed on both private and public property (with regulation)
 - Work with Cooperstown Chamber of Commerce to explore if and how sandwich boards could effectively and safely be used to support business in the Village
 - collaborate with the entrepreneurial community when creating policy that affects them instead of just imposing rules on them
 - conduct surveys to collect data from visitors and business owners showing actual impact of signage
 - Goal: Establish new signage rules regarding sandwich boards so businesses can take advantage of them for the 2017
- **Discussion of Tourist Accommodation Special Permits / Continued review of Village Comprehensive Plan (listed as 2 separate items: #4 and #5 on the original agenda)**
 - General discussion of the loss of year-round housing in the Village due to the tourist industry
 - Board members agreed
 - Cooperstown's existing tourist accommodation laws needed to be reviewed with the goals of the new comprehensive plan in mind
 - Growth of tourist accommodations in the Village should be curtailed until the situation can be investigated and informed decisions can be made without allowing the problem to grow bigger and become more difficult to handle in the meantime
 - The Planning Board should recommend that the Board of Trustees enact a temporary moratorium on allowing new tourist accommodations to allow time to research and recommend
 - **MOTION**
 - The Planning Board recommends that the Board of Trustees enact a local law imposing a moratorium that prohibits the granting of tourist accommodation special use permits for nine months during which time the Planning Board shall prepare proposed amendments that conform Zoning Law §300-17(A) to the Comprehensive Plan's vision, goals, and recommendations.
 - Made: Gene Berman / Second: Paul Kuhn
 - Results:
 - Ayes (5): Berman / Membrino / Blabey / Kuhn / Schneider
 - Nays (0)
 - **MOTION CARRIED**

- **Review of Minutes for Tuesday, March 21, 2017 Planning Board Meeting**
 - All board members looked over the minutes
 - No Corrections or changes requested
 - **MOTION**
 - To approve the Planning Board Minutes for Tuesday, March 21, 2017 as submitted
 - Made: Joe Membrino / Second: Paul Kuhn
 - Results:
 - Ayes (4): Berman / Membrino / Blabey / Kuhn
 - Abstain (1): Schneider (not present at the March 21, 2017 meeting)
 - Nays (0)
 - **MOTION CARRIED**

Adjournment

- **MOTION**
 - To adjourn the meeting
 - **Made:** Gene Berman / **Second:** Joe Membrino
 - Results
 - Ayes (5): Berman/ Blabey / Membrino / Schneider / Kuhn
 - Nays (0)
 - **MOTION CARRIED**

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:21 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Mikal Sky-Shrewsberry, Clerk (PT)