



CITY OF WATERTOWN, NEW YORK

CITY PLANNING BOARD
ROOM 304, WATERTOWN CITY HALL
245 WASHINGTON STREET
WATERTOWN, NEW YORK 13601-3380
(315) 785-7740

MEETING: February 2, 2021

PRESENT:

Larry Coburn, Planning Board Chair
Michelle Capone
Michael Pierce
T.J. Babcock
Linda Fields

ALSO:

Michael A. Lumbis, Planning and Community
Development Director
Jennifer Voss, Senior Planner
Geoffrey Urda, Planner
Michael Delaney, City Engineer
Matthew Timerman, City Fire Chief
Leta Harp, Secretary

ABSENT:

Kerry Johnson
Neil Katzman

Planning Board Chair, Larry Coburn, called the February 2, 2021 Planning Board meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Coburn then asked for a motion regarding the Minutes from the January 5th, 2021 Planning Board Meeting. Ms. Fields made a motion to approve the minutes as written. Ms. Capone seconded the motion, and all voted in favor.

SITE PLAN APPROVAL – 1290 ARSENAL STREET, PARCEL NUMBER 8-53-108.100

The Planning Board then considered a request for Site Plan Approval submitted by Clint Mattson of Chick-fil-A Inc. to construct a 5,000 square-foot restaurant building, and a 1,233.6 square-foot order-point canopy at 1290 Arsenal Street, Parcel Number 8-53-108.100

Mr. Robert Osterhoudt, P.E. of Bohler Engineering was present to represent the project. He said that Clint Mattson was with Chick-fil-A out of Atlanta, Georgia, and was not able to make it today, but was available by phone if necessary, to reach him with any questions. Mr. Osterhoudt said he was accompanied by Paul Van Cott of Whiteman, Osterman & Hanna LLP attorneys at law and he was *Land Use Counsel* for Chick-fil-A and was in attendance to answer any questions as he went through the presentation. Mr. Osterhoudt said his plan was to run through the Site Plan with the Planning Board and describe what they were proposing, solicit

feedback, and seek recommendation from the Board before the plan went to City Council for final review and approval.

Mr. Osterhoudt then displayed an aerial exhibit of the proposed Site Plan location in the Watertown City Center shopping plaza at the NE corner of Arsenal Street and Interstate-81. He then indicated access from Western Boulevard and Arsenal St. with a signalized intersection with internalized access drives that circulate through the larger development. He said the parcel they were on was comprised of several different uses on the site.

Mr. Osterhoudt then said the location in question was the former Ruby Tuesday's building, which they were proposing to redevelop as a Chick-fil-A restaurant. Mr. Osterhoudt said it was a great redevelopment project because they would be replacing a former fast and casual sit-down restaurant with a brand-new quick serve with a drive-thru restaurant. He then showed a zoomed in view of the site itself from Arsenal St. and Interstate-81 with the site boundaries identified. He said the current restaurant was primarily accessed by the main access drive that came down between the AT&T and I.H.O.P., and then between Starbucks and Ruby Tuesday's. He said there was also shared access to the driveways all around the site.

Mr. Osterhoudt then said that the site was served by public utilities from private water and sewer mains that provide service to the whole shopping plaza. Mr. Osterhoudt then said that storm water management is all accommodated on site and discharged into a series of storm water management pipes and catch basins that discharge off to the NE of the property. He said those were the highlights of the existing conditions.

Mr. Osterhoudt then indicated the proposed site plan boundaries outlined and stated there would be about 1.3 acres of site disturbance area. He explained the leased area is an odd-shaped parcel, and the outline around the building would be about .6 acres. He said the total impact area where they would install curbs and making improvements as well, would be 1.3 acres. He said as the proposed site is compared with the existing parcel there would be an increase in green space with added landscape, and trees, which would help reduce the storm water runoff and internal circulation on the site.

Mr. Osterhoudt then addressed the vehicular access to the site and indicated on the drawing that it would come down from the north. He said there would be some shared parking spaces with Starbucks, nine shared spaces in total. He said there would be a 5,000 SF newly constructed building and a drive-thru that would circulate around the building and the pick-up window would be on the east end of the building, adding that the drive-thru entrance would be on the NW side of the site and would be striped with pavement striping to start out as a single drive-thru lane at the drive-thru clearance part, and would then quickly transition into a double drive-thru lane to accommodate more vehicles quickly through the drive-thru.

He said Chick-fil-A has an impressive history of operational speed and efficiency with their focus on customer service, and that was the main purpose of having the double drive-thru lanes. He continued that another aspect of Chick-fil-A's distinction is having a canopy over the order-point menu boards and speakers for the comfort and protection of the patrons from the weather conditions. He said the customers would then circulate thru the drive-thru and at the pick-up points on the east side of the building there would be another canopy extending over that location that would also aid in protection of the customers as they receive their orders.

He then said Chick-fil-A adds another aspect to their drive-thru speed-of-service as there would be employees that would be outside the building delivering meals to vehicles, not just at the pick-up window. If an order is complete, they would walk the order out to cars behind the pick-up window and cars in the outside drive-thru lanes. The hatched marked areas down through the middle of the drive-thru lanes are indicated for employees to walk down through and gain access to vehicles to hand off their completed orders and take new orders manually via iPad or take payments before cars arrive at the pick-up window to help traffic quickly through the drive-thru.

Mr. Osterhoudt then showed on the drawing the green space between the building and drive-thru area, concrete sidewalks around the perimeter of the three sides of the building, and an outdoor dining area at the NW corner of the building. He also showed the trash enclosures on the drawing and all the ADA parking spaces. He said the proposal included new sidewalks and crosswalks along the two drive aisles into the site for pedestrian safety, and that connection would come up to the front of the building. He then explained the vehicular access to the site would come in from the east into the main parking lot or alternative access would be to circulate around the I.H.O.P facility and obtain access in the NW corner.

Mr. Osterhoudt then continued by saying that they proposed to demolish the existing Ruby Tuesday's and replace it with the proposed Chick-fil-A building, and in the process, increase green space on the site by 10,000 SF, which essentially equaled two of the Chick-fil-A building footprints on the drawing. He said that there is an existing electric transformer in the parking lot where they would be able to add green space that benefits this redevelopment. He said the restaurant use is an allowed use in Planning Development District #23. He said they were proposing 61 parking spaces, including the nine spaces shared with Starbucks. He said they meet all the Zoning requirements, with the exception of the setback requirements for the order-point canopy. There is a 50-foot setback requirement at the property line along the Interstate-81 ramp, and the proposed setback was only 31.8 feet, so they would have to request relief from the Zoning Board of Appeals in the form of an Area Variance.

Mr. Coburn then asked Mr. Osterhoudt to address the summary items included in Staff's Memorandum and to give an update on any missing items.

Ms. Capone asked Mr. Osterhoudt to address any changes or alterations in the vehicular-pedestrian circulation plan after meeting with the Jefferson County Planning Board. Mr. Osterhoudt said there were no revisions, and they had spoken to Mr. Urda, Mr. Lumbis and Mr. Delaney, and there were no revised plans at this point.

Mr. Osterhoudt addressed the first summary item, which required the applicant to submit a new Vehicular and Pedestrian Circulation Plan that depicts the entirety of parcel 8-53-108.000 and includes parking calculations for all four restaurants, as well as illustrates vehicular circulation throughout the entire parcel, including emergency vehicles. Mr. Osterhoudt drew the Planning Board's attention to the site plan drawing and stated that primary access would come in by the AT&T building and the I.H.O.P. building, with traffic circulating around the backside, or as an alternate route, motorists could take a left and enter on the other side into the parking lot via the curb cut they are proposing.

He said that for pedestrian access they would have the sidewalks coming down on the front of the site with crosswalks providing connectivity to the rest of the shopping plaza, including for the hotels to the North, where there were existing sidewalks that extend north for that connectivity.

He said from a vehicular access perspective, the drive-thru will typically have a lot of use, which is why they proposed two drive-thru lanes. He said they anticipated that many vehicles would be coming straight thru the four-way intersection and around the back side of the I.H.O.P. to access the drive-thru. He speculated that first-time visitors might not take that route, but after repeated visits, this would be the main route for drive-thru traffic. He then said they have circulation with perpendicular parking stalls and two-way traffic for circulation through the site that would open the most opportunities for vehicles to circulate without being impacted by parked cars or in a one-way traffic pattern. He said there may be concerns about the stacked-up traffic at Starbucks and the nine shared use spaces and said those could easily be designated as employee-only parking spaces. These spaces would have much less turn over and would not be impacted by any stacking from the Starbuck's drive thru. He said they could document on a plan with arrows what those intended driving patterns would be, if that would be helpful to the Board, or City Council when they arrived at that point.

Ms. Fields then asked what would prevent cars from coming around the building and cutting through the parking lot to get to the drive-thru lane. Mr. Osterhoudt replied that in his opinion, many patrons will use the flow around the I.H.O.P since that north side of the site entrance is less busy, and motorists bound for the drive thru would avoid coming through the parking lot to avoid interacting with cars backing out and parking. Mr. Osterhoudt said he thought that would be the trend generally over time.

He said that visually on the site today, there are no separating islands, or curbed areas and the chaotic vehicular flow is the reason they proposed adding the curbed island between the two parking fields, to get some separation so you would not have that type of situation with cars cutting across parking lots. He said the curbed islands along the road would define the access points which would help make that clear along the shared access drive. He said there would also be a curb between the nine shared employee parking spaces and the drive thru.

Mr. Babcock said there should be some signage directing the access point and flow of traffic to be around I.H.O.P. Mr. Osterhoudt said that they intend to approach the landlord about this, however it is outside of the leased area, and they would need to obtain their approval.

Ms. Capone asked if Staff was looking for more specifics on summary item number one. Mr. Urda replied that Staff was looking for the site drawing to give the scope of the circulation plan for the whole parcel, and how traffic would move through it, including emergency vehicles. Ms. Capone asked if Staff was satisfied. Mr. Urda said that ultimately the Staff would like a drawing similar to the one in the package but zoomed out. He said it would be up to the Board's discretion if they were comfortable with keeping that as a condition. Ms. Capone asked if the Staff was comfortable with the review regarding emergency vehicles. Mr. Urda said he would let the City Fire Chief handle that response.

Chief Timerman said he reviewed the drawings but had some questions. Chief Timerman said that according to the zoomed in drawing, they were still deliberating if the larger fire

apparatus traveling down the access road could navigate the corner. Mr. Osterhoudt responded that in the packet was a truck turning plan showing both a firetruck and garbage truck. Chief Timerman said he would review that plan, but also noted he was concerned about ladder truck access, although given that it is a single-story building, the requirements were minimal for the use of an aerial device.

Chief Timerman then asked if it was possible for cars to transition between lanes in the drive-thru. Mr. Osterhoudt said there was there was much open area to the back of the drive-thru and the markings on the drawing were just stripping and then said the canopies were 9.5 feet in height, adding that a large truck would not be able to navigate that, but a fire truck should be able to hop the curb in an emergency.

Chief Timerman then said another concern was if there was a motor vehicle fire while in the drive thru. He said he would be concerned that an emergency vehicle with the 9.5-foot canopy restriction would not be able to access the site to assist a disabled vehicle. Chief Timerman said that would impose restrictions and limited access under the canopies and the emergency responders would not gain access from either direction. Mr. Timerman asked if there was a way to improve access for large trucks by adding a service road.

Mr. Urda said that where Mr. Timerman was recommending an additional road was also where Starbucks stack of drive-thru customers started, noting that Starbucks' order point was at the south of that building. Mr. Timerman said that curbing compounds the lack of access. Mr. Osterhoudt said that to put it into perspective, the building is about 83 feet wide with another 40 feet to the driveway, making it approximately 125 feet of driveway. Mr. Timerman added that the fire truck hose lines could stretch around cars etc. and he and was not asking for access with a ladder truck. Mr. Osterhoudt said he was reluctant to offer an additional access road because it may become just another cut thru point for vehicles. Mr. Timerman asked where the hydrants were located on the drawing. Mr. Urda pointed to the drawing and showed where an existing hydrant was. Mr. Osterhoudt said there was a utility plan, and he was unsure if the other hydrant was marked on it but would follow up.

Ms. Fields said that after looking at the drawing she was assuming there was only one pick-up window for two lanes of traffic. Mr. Osterhoudt said that Chick-fil-A has now transitioned their pick-up window to a door. He said with periods of normal activity, food would be passed out through the window, but during peak activity, employees would deliver food to vehicles down the walkway, which were depicted as hatched areas on the drawing, and there would be access for employees to serve those vehicles from a safe location. Ms. Fields asked if the two lanes from the drive-thru could transition down to a single lane prior to exiting the drive thru. Mr. Osterhoudt said there was room to transition to a single drive-thru egress lane.

Mr. Lumbis said that regarding Ms. Capone's earlier comment on summary item number one, Staff also required the applicant to provide a parking calculation for all the other restaurants' buildings, confirming that they would continue to meet the requirement in the Zoning Ordinance, and Staff would want to see that on a revised drawing as part of the vehicular and pedestrian circulation plan.

Mr. Pierce asked if a revised circulation plan would capture the potential movement behind the back of I.H.O.P. Mr. Osterhoudt said yes because that circulation plan would depict the larger view, and his team would coordinate with Staff on that.

Ms. Capone said she noticed that Starbucks usually has long lines that could block the Chick-fil-A entrance. She said it seemed necessary to have the alternate route to access the drive thru. Mr. Osterhoudt said they had been back and forth negotiating with the landlord and I.H.O.P., this access is confirmed, and I.H.O.P. has approved and signed off on it.

Mr. Osterhoudt then addressed summary item number two, which required the applicant to widen the access gap at the north end of Starbucks' dedicated drive aisle to ensure consistent safe access to the Starbucks parking bay for both customers and emergency vehicles. Mr. Osterhoudt said this comment referred to the north end of the Starbucks site where the drive-thru traffic exits with a one-way traffic pattern. The condition is to widen the egress so it could potentially get two-way traffic through the parking field in front of Starbucks. He said again that this was outside of their leased area, and not within Chick-fil-A's control, but he is reaching out to the landlord and to Starbucks to see if they are agreeable to modifying that cub cut. He said if Starbucks is agreeable, they will work with them and Chick-fil-A will do that, but it is ultimately up to Starbucks if they want to fix this.

Mr. Osterhoudt said if they do not agree to going with a two-way drive aisle in front of their building, his team talked about the option to help with the emergency access to Starbucks and said this was for Chief Timerman's consideration. Mr. Osterhoudt said right now, this is a single lane width, and you cannot get an emergency vehicle into that site very easily. One option was to modify the curbing so that it is mountable instead of a vertical curb, which a fire truck could still go over, but it makes it easier on the equipment.

Mr. Pierce asked if the north end was applicable for what the Chief was speaking of earlier at the bottom end of the drive-thru parking area with the mountable curbing without being identifiable for any other traffic. Mr. Osterhoudt said he would take this option back to Chick-fil-A, but they are very sensitive about the drive-thru scheme because it is an integral part of the success of their business, and he said there will likely be some hesitation on changing that as an access point, but he would mention it to them. Ms. Fields asked how Chick-fil-A would feel about the request of a single egress instead of two vehicles coming to the point and then turning right. Mr. Osterhoudt said he will bring all these suggestions to the table and felt they would be able to work something out.

Chief Timerman asked how Chick-fil-A handled disabled motor vehicles in the drive-thru area, for example would a roll-back or tow truck be able to access that area. Mr. Osterhoudt responded that he has had that question before, and it is a very rare occurrence that a car would be stuck in the drive-thru lane. He said if it does happen, they would have a Chick-fil-A staff member come out and push the vehicle out to a parking stall and get it out of the drive-thru lane, and then a tow truck would get it from there.

Mr. Osterhoudt then moved on to summary item number three which instructed the Planning Board to consider all four criteria contained within Section 310-57 and determine whether the site plan meets those criteria to the Planning Board's satisfaction. Mr. Osterhoudt read aloud the four criteria:

- A. Harmonious Relationship between proposed uses and existing adjacent uses.
- B. Maximum safety of vehicular circulation between the site and the street.
- C. Adequacy of interior circulation, parking and loading facilities with particular attention to pedestrian safety.
- D. Adequacy of landscaping and setbacks to achieve compatibility with and protection of adjacent uses.

Mr. Osterhoudt said from the perspective of the list of criteria, they had already addressed circulation, both vehicular and pedestrian, and the uses in this area are very similar, again they were replacing an existing restaurant with a new restaurant. He said the adequacy of landscaping and setbacks have all been addressed earlier except for the setback to Interstate-81 that will need relief from the ZBA.

Mr. Lumbis said he felt this list was more for the Planning Board to review and determine if the site plan met the identified criteria. Mr. Coburn said the traffic pattern of vehicles was not shown on the plan and asked if Mr. Osterhoudt planned on submitting revised drawings based on the concerns of the Planning Board. Mr. Osterhoudt replied that he was there to present the project and solicit feedback, which he felt was very good, and if the Planning Board puts stipulations on the revised site plan to address before the plan went before City Council, that was what he was there to do.

Ms. Fields asked if there would be loading facilities. Mr. Osterhoudt replied there were no separate loading facilities, and that off-loading was usually done overnight, when the restaurant is closed. Ms. Fields asked for the restaurant's hours of operation. Mr. Osterhoudt said the hours of operation are typically 6:00 a.m. until 10:00 p.m.

Ms. Capone said the Planning Board would like to strongly encourage the access route to the drive thru be adequately marked with signage, and that the Planning Board would prefer that to be the drive-thru access road. Mr. Osterhoudt said that was a topic he planned to speak to the landlord about. Mr. Urda stated that the Planning Board is empowered to impose reasonable conditions, and that most people would interpret that as a reasonable condition for the applicant. Mr. Urda then said that it ultimately comes down to I.H.O.P. and the landlord granting them that permission, even if the Planning Board did impose that condition, the landlord and the neighboring tenant would ultimately have the right to balk at it.

Ms. Capone then said she was not stating the Board make it a requirement, but merely strongly encourage it, and we would prefer that alternative access route with signage. Mr. Urda said the Board could add a condition that said the applicant "should" rather than "shall," rewording however they were comfortable. Ms. Capone said that like the summary item number two is worded "the applicant shall" she would like to have that verbiage added in connection to the traffic pattern of accessing the drive-thru and signage.

Mr. Pierce agreed with Mr. Coburn that there were many questions and good feedback, but the Planning Board would like to see a revised drawing and site plan. Mr. Coburn said specifically if the ZBA does not approve the variance, many things would have to change. Mr. Urda said the ZBA would consider the variance at its Wednesday, February 17th meeting, and the city attorney, Christina Stone had advised that the City Council not consider it until the ZBA

has met and made a determination. Mr. Lumbis said if the Planning Board would like to see the site plan back, it would be at the March 2, 2021 meeting, which would push the City Council approval to March 15, 2021, a difference of two weeks.

Mr. Pierce said he would like to make a general overall statement that this was a great development for the area, but that the Planning Board needed to walk into it with both eyes open and address all aspects of the project that needed to be covered. He then said he felt the location on the West end of Watertown was a great choice with the high traffic of Route 3, and he could not have thought of a better location. He said the board was just concerned about the applicant getting their homework done. Mr. Osterhoudt asked if it was the preference of the Planning Board to come back with revisions before it goes before the City Council meeting. Mr. Coburn said that was not the initial intent, but after today's meeting it was moving in that direction to come back with revisions.

Mr. Osterhoudt addressed summary item number four, which recommended the applicant to change the Green Pillar pin oak tree species to a species that is more tolerant of alkaline soils. Mr. Osterhoudt said that they would coordinate with their landscape architect providing an alternate species.

Mr. Osterhoudt addressed summary item number five, which required the applicant to provide a plan for managing snow storage and/or snow removal without affecting the adjacent businesses. Mr. Osterhoudt said they will add some snow storage labels to the plan to identify those locations. He added that with the addition of 10,000 SF of green space, that is opening a lot of area for snow storage that will be noted on the revised plans.

Mr. Osterhoudt addressed summary item number six, which requires the applicant to receive an Area Variance from the ZBA granting relief from the 50 ft. setback requirement before the City Council will act on the Site Plan. Mr. Osterhoudt said they would be attending the ZBA meeting on February 17th.

Mr. Osterhoudt addressed summary item number seven, which requires the applicant to address the SEQR issue identified in Staff's January 28, 2021 Memo to the Planning Board. Mr. Osterhoudt said that particular item is relevant to an endangered species of bat habitat, they had talked about it and would make the revision and change to a "YES" on the SEQR form.

Mr. Osterhoudt then addressed summary item number eight, which requires the applicant to commission an asbestos survey prior to issuance of a Demolition Permit and perform subsequent abatement prior to demolition if the survey reveals the presence of asbestos. Mr. Osterhoudt said yes, this was standard procedure for them.

Mr. Osterhoudt addressed summary item number nine, which requires the applicant to contact the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) to verify that the Department has no outstanding concerns related to this project and provide the City of Watertown Planning Department with proof of correspondence. Mr. Osterhoudt said there has been correspondence that has come from NYSDOT and Mr. Urda concurred that he had copies which he forwarded to Timothy Freitag. Mr. Delaney said that based on the correspondence with Thomas Compo with NYSDOT, he said he had no comment, and the City would do an internal review. Mr. Delaney then said after review, he came to the same conclusion and he saw no issue.

Mr. Osterhoudt said they would be submitting a Storm Water Pollution Prevention (SWPPP) plan and agreed that Mr. Delaney had sent the recent Phase II to Mr. Osterhoudt's office.

Mr. Osterhoudt addressed summary item number ten, which requires the applicant to obtain the following permits, minimally, prior to demolition and construction: Demolition permit, Building Permit, Sign permit, Sanitary Sewer Connection permit, and a Water Supply Permit. Mr. Osterhoudt said there are no issues with obtaining the permits and securing them as they moved on in the later stages of the project.

Mr. Pierce requested that when the revised plans were done that the hydrant sources were identified so the Planning Board can obtain clarification from a safety standpoint. Chief Timerman said in relation to Starbucks high traffic, just as Chick-fil-A will be, the location of those hydrants may not be easy to access. Mr. Osterhoudt said he would coordinate with Staff on that location looking over the plans.

Mr. Coburn said he wanted to add summary item number eleven which is the signage for traffic circulation and access as well as item number twelve which is converting the exit of the drive-thru to a single egress from the double lanes. Chief Timerman said he would also like to see the location of the hydrant and where the City Fire Department would connect the sprinkler system. Mr. Osterhoudt responded that there would be FDC connections on the front outside of the building, and he could go over building elevations. Chief Timerman said the only reservations he had were emergency vehicular access to the back as that would be an issue for both the public and the business.

Mr. Pierce said after looking at the vehicular traffic pattern around the building, it was unlike anything he had seen in the city with another quick serve restaurant. Chief Timerman said they can carry ladders and maneuver hoses around vehicles. Mr. Pierce wondered how one would get emergency access if you were backed up at Starbucks with that much traffic in close proximity of the new Chick-fil-A. Mr. Pierce then said most of the quick serve restaurants on the Route 3 corridor had single lane egress.

Mr. Lumbis said he took some notes and made a list of the issues and concerns raised by the Planning Board. The list of items for the applicant to address was as follows:

- The nine spaces located between the Chick-fil-A drive thru and the Starbucks leased area should be designated for employee parking shared by Chick-fil-A and Starbucks.
- The applicant should consider adding signage outside of the leased area near the main entrance to the plaza near Western Blvd. that directs drive thru traffic to the western edge of the property and around the I.H.O.P. building.
- The applicant should consider transitioning the drive-thru back to a single lane of traffic after the pickup window.
- The applicant will reach out to the landlord & Starbucks to see if they are willing to allow the widening of the Starbucks North entrance drive to allow for better traffic circulation between the two businesses.
- The applicant should consider installing mountable curbing south of the nine dedicated parking spaces to allow emergency access to the drive-thru lanes.
- Applicant will provide location of the hydrants on the plans.

Referring to the summary items in the report, Mr. Urda said that based on Mr. Delaney's comments, Staff could eliminate number nine. Pending the outcome of the ZBA meeting on February 17th, the sixth item could come off the list at the next Planning Board meeting. Mr. Lumbis then said that summary number eight was redundant, and Mr. Pierce agreed saying it was mentioned several times.

Ms. Fields made a motion to table the Site Plan application. Mr. Pierce seconded the motion. Mr. Osterhoudt clarified that tabling meant he would be coming back before the Planning Board before the Site Plan approval went before City Council. Mr. Urda replied yes and noted that March 2, 2021 would be the next Planning Board meeting. Mr. Osterhoudt said he would coordinate with Staff to review everything discussed and address all the comments. Ms. Fields said it was a great project and Watertown needs it. Mr. Osterhoudt said they were looking forward to it.

Ms. Fields made the motion to table the Site Plan for Chick-fil-A Inc. to construct a 5,000 square-foot restaurant building, and a 1,233.6 square-foot order-point canopy at 1290 Arsenal Street, Parcel Number 8-53-108.100, and return before the Planning Board at the March 2nd meeting. Ms. Capone seconded the motion. All voted in favor, none opposed.

Mr. Babcock then moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Pierce seconded the motion, and all voted in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 3:53 p.m.