



Village of Saranac Lake

Community Development Department

39 Main Street, Suite 9 Saranac Lake, NY 12983-2294

Phone: (518) 891 – 4150

Fax: (518) 891 – 1324

Web Site: www.saranaclakeny.gov

**DEVELOPMENT BOARD
MEETING AGENDA 5:00PM
TUESDAY, March 4, 2025**

**This meeting will be held in the Village Board Room and may be viewed through ZOOM
Enter at the side door of the building, 39 Main Street**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/5184919884?pwd=Nk5ISVZQNjgvdS9tbitMZG93M2xZUT09>

Meeting ID: 518 491 9884

Passcode: 704556

ATTENDANCE

Development Board Members:

Bill Domenico, Present

Meg Cantwell-Jackson, Present

Rick Weber, Present

Dan Reilly, Present

Tim Jackson, Alternate, Present

A. Approval of Minutes

- February 18, 2025 Meeting Minutes by Domenico, seconded by Jackson.
Weber asked for a Roll Call Vote.
Roll Call: Cantwell-Jackson, yes; Domenico, yes; Weber, yes; Reilly, no vote; Jackson, yes. Meeting minutes approved.

B. Application of: Chase Jermano and Autumn Poppleton, Special Use Permit for a Short-Term Rental at 159 Prospect Ave., Saranac Lake, NY 12983 (Tax Map Parcel #446.76-1-7).

Board Action

Application of: Chase Jermano and Autumn Poppleton, Special Use Permit for a Short-Term Rental at 159 Prospect Ave., Saranac Lake, NY 12983 (Tax Map Parcel #446.76-1-7).

Jackson reviewed adjacent properties, existing permits, and reports, noting that STR utilization in this district is approximately 2%, the lowest among all districts allowing STRs. The district permits two STRs, yet remains in the lowest tier. Discussion arose on whether pre-existing STRs should be given the benefit of the doubt due to the timing of the law's enactment and how to ensure consistency in decision-making. Reilly pointed out that the analysis does not account for lot sizes. He expressed concerns about the broader challenges of STRs. The issue of density is now a concern, whereas in past reviews of pre-existing STRs, there was little to no opposition or public comment.

Weber noted that the regulatory environment has shifted and that prior approvals were made under different circumstances. Reilly acknowledged that while conditions had been imposed on past

approvals, there had been no significant opposition at the time. Cantwell-Jackson concurred. Domenico reflected on previous concerns raised about pre-existing STRs, particularly regarding fire safety and code compliance, adding that the last meeting was atypical and that the board is in a phase of refining its approach. He emphasized the importance of clear guidelines, noting that as many as 180-200 STRs could emerge in the coming years, making density a key factor to consider. He suggested density should be assessed on a street-by-street basis.

Cantwell-Jackson expressed a preference for properties to be occupied if rented, questioning what differentiates this application from others that have been approved. Weber consulted the Department of State, which highlighted that clustering density can impact neighborhood character but reaffirmed that STRs remain a residential use. Under special use permit review, STRs are deemed a compatible use. The trustees amended the table of uses to classify STRs as a residential use with a special use process, meaning there is a presumption of compatibility under the revised law. Additionally, the cap on STRs was established by the trustees, effectively making the density determination at that level. However, the board retains authority to deny an application if a unique situation arises where an STR would negatively impact neighborhood character.

Weber created a map displaying STR clusters, including a 200-foot radius (notification zone for hearings) and a 500-foot radius (regulations for marijuana use). He found clusters scattered throughout the Village and questioned whether this application presents a unique circumstance warranting denial. After consideration, he found no clear justification for denial. Domenico asked if the map could be added to the public record, to which Glynn confirmed. Weber described the map's details.

Domenico raised concerns that STR conversions of single-family homes are negatively affecting property values. He argued that STRs are driving up home prices, making density a critical issue. Domenico ultimately abstained from voting. Weber emphasized that the board must base decisions on measurable thresholds, not just public sentiment. Reilly pointed out that no one attended past STR reviews. Cantwell-Jackson noted that another STR application discussed at the last meeting is located about 500 feet away, yet no opposition was voiced at that time.

Jackson referenced a petition from neighbors in support of the application. Weber reiterated that STRs are a residential use unless evidence suggests otherwise. He questioned the legal basis for denial. Reilly argued that the neighborhood's character is evolving. Weber acknowledged that adding another STR could influence the area but emphasized that community feedback is considered. Domenico reminded the board that STRs are not a use by right, while Weber countered that they are presumed compatible unless specific criteria are unmet. Domenico distinguished between "permissible" and "allowed." Weber asked if conditions could be imposed to address concerns. Domenico suggested fencing might help but wouldn't resolve all issues, especially given the topography. Reilly was unwilling to approve. Weber concluded that density needs a clearer definition, but based on special use criteria, denial would be difficult to justify.

- Motion to issue a negative declaration for purposes of SEQR
Motion: Reilly seconded by: Jackson
Weber asked for a Roll Call Vote.
Roll Call: Cantwell-Jackson, yes; Domenico, yes; Weber, yes; Reilly, yes; Jackson, yes. All in favor, declaration moved.
- Motion to find the project in conformance with LWRP policy standards and conditions
Motion: Cantwell- Jackson seconded by: Jackson
Weber asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Cantwell-Jackson, yes; Domenico, yes; Weber, yes; Reilly, yes; Jackson, yes. All in favor, declaration moved.

- Motion to approve Special Use Permit for Short Term Rental

Motion: Jackson seconded by: Cantwell- Jackson

Weber asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Cantwell-Jackson, yes; Domenico, no; Weber, yes; Reilly, no; Jackson, yes. Declaration moved.

- C. Application of:** Bobs North, LLC, Special Use Permit for a Short-Term Rental at 18 Virginia Street, Saranac Lake, NY 12983 (Tax Map Parcel #446.76-5-1).

Board Action

Application of: Bobs North, LLC, Special Use Permit for a Short-Term Rental at 18 Virginia Street, Saranac Lake, NY 12983 (Tax Map Parcel #446.76-5-1).

Weber notes that the application is for a non-owner-occupied short-term rental, encompassing the entire house with three bedrooms and accommodations for up to eight guests. Reilly inquires about new trees being planted in the backyard. Glynn states that if trees are being planted, they must be done correctly and in compliance with the code. It appears the plantings are intended to enclose the property for privacy. Weber asks whether this was included as a condition in the application. Glynn clarifies that the applicant was not instructed to plant the trees. Weber adds that no neighbors have requested the separation of the plantings. Reilly raises a question regarding the garage, but Weber states that it is not the focus of the current discussion.

- Motion to issue a negative declaration for purposes of SEQR

Motion: Cantwell- Jackson seconded by: Jackson

Weber asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Cantwell-Jackson, yes; Domenico, yes; Weber, yes; Reilly, yes; Jackson, yes. All in favor, declaration moved.

- Motion to find the project in conformance with LWRP policy standards and conditions

Motion: Weber seconded by: Domenico

Weber asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Cantwell-Jackson, yes; Domenico, yes; Weber, yes; Reilly, yes; Jackson, yes. All in favor, declaration moved.

- Motion to approve Special Use Permit for Short Term Rental

Motion: Jackson seconded by: Weber

Weber asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Cantwell-Jackson, yes; Domenico, yes; Weber, yes; Reilly, yes; Jackson, yes. All in favor, declaration moved.

D. OLD BUSINESS

- **Local Law 1-2025**

Seeking input from the Development Board. A working session with the Village Trustees is scheduled for March 18th, where this law will be the sole topic of discussion. Trustee White mentioned the Village Board is reviewing the overall Short-Term Rental process. Weber asked Glynn if she had forwarded the comments from the last meeting to the board. Glynn responded that she had not but suggested bringing up those comments during the working session. White stated that any input is welcome, though there is no need to focus on specific language. Weber inquired if further discussion was

necessary at this time, to which Glynn replied that anything discussed now would be repeated at the session. Jackson agreed, emphasizing the importance of addressing density and guidelines.

E. NEW BUSINESS

- **Woodruff Street Fence**

Glynn brought this issue forward after being informed that snowmobilers were using the Woodruff Street property to access the brewery. The brewery's engineer mentioned in a side discussion that the fence would not be there. However, the 2022 construction plans indicate that a fence was included. When Glynn previously asked the board if anyone recalled this, the response was unanimously no, and there is no record of it in the minutes. Reilly recalled that fencing was discussed during the Trestle Street meeting and that it was stated a fence would be installed. Glynn noted that a fence was originally requested, but the plans have since changed, and no updated version was ever presented to the board. Reilly stated that the approved plans did include a fence. Domenico added that if any changes were made after the approval, the brewery could present them for discussion and potential approval. Glynn emphasized that there is no confirmation of any agreement regarding the presence or absence of a fence.

- **Short Term Rental- 36 Broadway**

This unit is located upstairs of Left Bank Café. The pre-existing application was submitted and paid for on time. However, the owner was in France, and emails and phone calls were not going through. The Community Development assistant at the time initially communicated with the property management, but after she left, there was no further correspondence. This unit would qualify as a pre-existing STR.

Glynn noted that STR reviews would likely still not be completed unless processed in batches of 20-30 at a time. While the applicant submitted everything on time, the lack of received communication prevented the next step from moving forward. Weber and Domenico agreed that the process remained fair since all materials were submitted within the deadline.

Reilly inquired if any further action was needed. Glynn explained that a public hearing would be required but that they were unable to get in touch with the owner, as the contact information provided was a U.S. phone number rather than one in France. Domenico emphasized the importance of supporting applicants in a small village whenever possible. Weber agreed, reiterating that everything had been submitted on time.

- Domenico mentions a 2023 CED project related to privacy slats in existing fencing and asks if the Code Enforcement Officer could review certain projects with conditions to ensure they are being implemented. Glynn replies that she is happy to inform Chris (CEO) if any issues arise.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion: Reilly Second: Domenico

Weber asked for a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call: Cantwell-Jackson, yes; Domenico, yes; Weber, yes; Reilly, yes; Jackson, yes. All in favor, meeting adjourned.

Meeting was officially adjourned at 6:21 PM.

Meeting Minutes prepared by; Community Development Assistant, Bayle Reichert