

VILLAGE OF ROUND LAKE  
PLANNING BOARD

Peter Sheridan, Chair - Absent  
Fred Sievers, Member  
Tim Lesar, Member  
Lance Spallholz, Member  
Marybeth Murphy, Member

Tom Peterson - Attorney  
Gary Putnam - Mayor/Cameraman

**MINUTES - Meeting 2/12/20**

Lance Spallholz called the meeting to order at 1902.

**Public Hearing Topic:** Griffin's Ridge Drainage

Background: Belmonte Builders installed a curtain drain in the Griffin's Ridge Subdivision. There have been problems with the installation and operation of the drain. Belmonte Builders is aware of these problems, as is the planning board.

Discussion:

Public: The public doesn't know what is going on and they would like an update. They have been waiting on a status update from Peter [Belmonte] and the Engineer. The drain was put in on a weekend. The Village didn't know about it [because there was no permit] but allowed it to continue. One of the neighbors has a serious water issue. There has been a lot digging and remediation going on over the last week. Surveyors have been on several people's properties to determine where the curtain drain currently is. It appears to be on the owner's side of the property line instead of in the easement in several areas. The survey also appears to be incomplete. Several people noted areas that were not done. Additionally, the curtain drain appears to be routed under one property owner's concrete patio and within four feet of another owner's foundation, and it will likely cause damage when repairs need to be made.

Response: Peter Sheridan had shared that video was being shot of the curtain drain area, but the Planning Board has no additional information to share.

Public: The public doesn't feel they should need to babysit the project to ensure the appropriate permits are being obtained and that work is being performed to plan.

Response: The Planning Board agrees, but again has no additional information to provide.

Public: There is a pattern where the builders tend to do most of the work just before a public meeting. The people in the development were promised to have routine updates but have received none. They just want to know what is going on. One of the owners has filed a formal complaint with NCON and the ACOA regarding the drain curtain placement, and he was told someone be coming out to investigate it.

Response: The Planning Board has limited power regarding the concerns shared. We are going to call a meeting with Belmonte and an Engineer to be able to answer those questions.

Public: The public is concerned that if the curtain drain problem is "kicked down the road" long enough that it will become their problem or the HOA's because it's on their property instead of Belmonte Builders'.

Response: The Planning Board will email everyone on the sign-in list with an update regarding the curtain drain by the end of the week. They asked that copies of the property deeds be provided in preparation for the next meeting with Belmonte Builders. The Attorney reminded everyone that the interpretation of the local building code is up to one person, the Code Enforcement Officer, which is Peter Sheridan. If the public disagrees with his decision, the matter can be brought to the Zoning Board of Appeals for an interpretation. He should be included on any correspondence. Any response or potential solution provided by Belmonte Builders should be obtained in writing. It is also recommended to have photographs of where the curtain drain has been staked out. Marybeth pointed out that the Attorney General had to sign off on the HOA manual and complaints can be filed with the Attorney General while building is in progress but not after. She said the process takes time and recommends that multiple people sign the complaint and to make monthly phone calls for updates. It is also recommended that members of the HOA and the builders have a monthly meeting of their own through at least the first year of completion.

Public: There are no parking concerns in the new development. However, there is a foundation that has been dug at least nine feet deep with no snow or safety fence surrounding it. If someone were to trip and fall into the hole, they would be impaled by the bars sticking out of the hole. The foundation in question is next to a heavily used walkway.

Again, the public brought up their disappointment in the lack of communication from Belmonte Builders. They also feel they chose to build their homes based on false knowledge, that they wouldn't even know about the incorrect curtain drain location is one owner's home hadn't had water problems. There is no trust for the builder.

There is a concern that if additional homes are added to the curtain drain, additional problems will arise because it isn't meeting the current capacity. The owners have also heard that blockages were found in the curtain drain, and it isn't even two years old yet.

Response: We sympathize but there is nothing we can do other than call a meeting with Peter Belmonte, the COE, and the Village Engineer. The meeting will be tentatively held on 2/26/20.

**Public Hearing Topic:** Historic Preservation - No person present had any information regarding the details of what was to be discussed.

**Public Hearing Topic:** Parking

Discussion:

PB: The problem with parking in the Village is that there are some homes that have no room to park their vehicle on and others who have property but choose not to use it for parking. The result is residents and visitors parking on Village property or park property and causing those areas to deteriorate. A survey was suggested to determine how many vehicles are owned in the Village and of those, which are parked on their own property. However, attempts to come up with a solution in the past have failed because it is common for more than one vehicle per house and people expect them to be parked within a few feet of their property.

The attorney stated that although the Village does not have the authority to implement certain traffic laws by itself, there are exceptions for specific communities to do things like designate a public parking places and each household is assigned certain parking spaces.

There is a concern from those who park on their own property, that they are not getting the same service as those who don't. For example, the area they park in may get plowed while they are at work.

People who parallel park on park property destroy a few feet of shoulder that is longer than their vehicle. If the Village owned that property, they would have the right to lease it. This could be the case if all of the wheels were off the street. There are certain areas that are already used that could be cleaned up and turned into parallel parking spaces. There would be the potential to plant shrubs or gardens to prevent parking in undesired areas. The recommendation would be that every Village resident get one free space and would pay for any additional space they required.

Public: It is unlikely they will be able to regulate people who have been parking on the roadways or in the community lots long-term to begin paying for those spaces. When the Village plows those areas, it is for everyone in the Village and not just one person since the spot is not guaranteed. It is agreed that the areas already being used for parking should be made presentable. The parking committee's recommendation was to use turf-type product. It is also agreed that there should be a barrier to prevent parking in undesired areas, but DPW would likely not appreciate it being shrubs or plant life since they often plow the snow deep into the park areas. The number of spots needed is ever changing based on the generation of the Village residents, so a survey may not yield the information desired. The current number of spaces seems to be working, and a plan should be developed around that number.

PB: There are areas the Village owns that could be used for parking, but is not. An example is Triangle Park. People park along the side of the park, but rarely use the designated parking spots that are 25 feet away. Using a parking prohibition program where people are notified of available parking and given clear signs of areas where it is illegal to park, may help encourage residents and visitors to use what already exists. Using a survey would help identify the actual demand instead of what is convenient.

Public: There is agreement on preventing further encroachment of parking into the Village and park owned property, but there is concern/disagreement that the suggested action would decrease available parking spots. This is particularly a concern on Second Street and Whitfield Ave. The parking committee was particularly concerned with the degrading of the edge of the roads and the cost of repaving in those areas, which is why it suggested installing turf blocks. This is noticeable in areas along Prospect Ave. There is also the option to ask for a safety edge to be installed in future paving jobs where it would shore up that edge. This would also be valuable for areas where the road is crumbling from cars needing to give each other space when passing each other on the narrow streets.

PB: Road edges also deteriorate from the roads being built so high, that it causes wash out from the rain running off the edge and down into yards.

We could simply look at the survey data used to determine sewer and water costs instead of spending money on a different survey that many people will not respond to. Then we can also look at the number of parking spaces on public streets and determine how many parking tiles each home would be entitled to. Anything over that number would park in a satellite lot. We can also look at using paper streets.

Public: The parking committee found any turf areas cannot be installed using money from the usual paving funds. It would have to come out of general funds, although it would not cost enough to need to raise taxes. If we wanted to do any sort of permitted parking, we would need state legislator approval.

PB: Another issue with dealing with parking is that it is only an issue for a small group of the Round Lake tax base. ~20 years ago, the Village gave back to itself a number of properties to be considered park land. The problem is that once it is declared park land, it can't be used for anything else with state legislation. However, one of the exceptions was allowing parking space for access to the park. There were several ideas posted by members of the Village on Facebook. It was suggested that those ideas be analyzed by the parking committee, eliminate the non-starters, and then slowly remove the remaining ideas using more thorough analysis until only the best one(s) are left.

Public: The members of the parking committee committed to consolidating their own ideas and passing them along to the Planning Board.

No additional parking discussions.

**Public Hearing Topic:** Planning & Zoning Board Conference - Everyone necessary attended, and there are materials available online.

Meeting Adjourned at ~2019.