



CITY OF WATERTOWN, NEW YORK

CITY PLANNING BOARD

ROOM 305, WATERTOWN CITY HALL
245 WASHINGTON STREET
WATERTOWN, NEW YORK 13601-3380
(315) 785-7741

MEETING: June 1, 2021

PRESENT:

Larry Coburn, Planning Board Chair
Michelle Capone
T.J. Babcock
Neil Katzman
Linda Fields

ALSO:

Michael A. Lumbis, Planning and
Community Development Director
Jennifer Voss, Sr. Planner
Geoffrey Urda, Planner
Leta Harp, Secretary

ABSENT:

Michael Pierce

Planning Board Chair, Larry Coburn, called the June 1, 2021, Planning Board meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Coburn then asked for a motion regarding the Minutes from the May 4, 2021, Planning Board Meeting. Ms. Fields made a motion to approve the minutes as written and Mr. Katzman seconded the motion, and all voted in favor.

Mr. Urda indicated that the applicant for Agenda item number one was not present, and the Board should consider going on to item number two, all concurred.

SUBDIVISION FINAL PLAT APPROVAL – 834 EMMETT STREET PARCEL NUMBER 8-10-105.000

The Planning board then considered a Request submitted by Thomas M. Storino, P.L.S. of Storino Geomatics on behalf of Sean M. Toole and Angelo A. Guarino, III for a two-lot subdivision of 834 Emmett Street, Parcel Number 8-10-105.000.

Mr. Storino was present to represent the application. He said this proposed project would clean up the encroachment of the new garage, as well as satisfy the 5ft sideline off-set. He said it would be a win/win for everyone involved.

Mr. Coburn read the one Staff summary item as a contingency, and Mr. Storino agreed.

Mr. Coburn read from the Staff Memorandum and stated the application was submitted for Planning Board review under Chapter A322 of the City Code. The Planning Board had the option

of not requiring a preliminary plat submission. Since this was a minor subdivision, Staff was processing the application as a final plat.

The Planning Board then considered each question on Part 2 of the Short Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) one-by-one, answering no to all of them. Mr. Katzman made a motion for a negative declaration for the proposed subdivision pursuant to the requirements of SEQRA. Mr. Babcock seconded the motion. All voted in favor, none opposed.

Mr. Coburn said that there were two public hearings scheduled at 3:05 p.m. for the two proposed subdivisions on the agenda.

**PUBLIC HEARING
SUBDIVISION FINAL PLAT APPROVAL – 834 EMMETT STREET**

Mr. Coburn called for public hearing number one to be convened at 3:05 p.m. for a Final Plat Subdivision of a two-lot subdivision of 834 Emmett Street, Parcel Number 8-10-105.000.

Mr. Coburn read the legal notice for the public hearing that had been published in the *Watertown Daily Times*. He invited anyone from the public to be heard on the matter with privilege of the floor. No one was present to speak regarding comments or concerns in the matter. Mr. Coburn then closed the first public hearing at 3:06 p.m.

Ms. Fields then made a motion to approve the Final Plat Subdivision submitted by Thomas M. Storino, P.L.S. of Storino Geomatics on behalf of Sean M. Toole and Angelo A. Guarino, III for a two-lot subdivision of 834 Emmett Street, Parcel Number 8-10-105.000, contingent on the following:

1. The applicant must assemble the subdivided 0.05-acre western section with 840 Emmett Street (Parcel B), Parcel Number 8-10-105.001 by way of new metes and bounds description filed with the County Clerk.

Mr. Coburn seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

**PUBLIC HEARING
SUBDIVISION FINAL PLAT APPROVAL – 1068 ARSENAL STREET**

Next, Mr. Coburn called for public hearing number two to be convened at 3:06 p.m. for a Final Plat Subdivision of a two-lot subdivision of 1068 Arsenal St., Parcel Number 8-47-106.000.

Mr. Coburn read the legal notice for the public hearing that had been published in the *Watertown Daily Times*. He invited anyone from the public to be heard on the matter with privilege of the floor. No one was present to speak regarding comments or concerns in the matter. Mr. Coburn then closed the second public hearing at 3:07 p.m.

**SUBDIVISION FINAL PLAT APPROVAL – 1068 ARSENAL STREET
PARCEL NUMBER 8-47-106.000**

The Planning Board then considered a request by Stephen J. Gracey, P.L.S. of LaFave, White & McGivern, L.S., P.C. on behalf of Prime, LLC for a two-lot subdivision of 1068 Arsenal Street, Parcel Number 8-47-106.000.

Mr. Gracey was present to represent Prime, LLC. Mr. Gracey said his original submission, in haste had included a paragraph in the cover letter about a proposed car wash. He said that his client, Prime, LLC was not the developer and wanted to clarify that the last paragraph of the cover letter was incorrect, and this application was only for a two-lot subdivision of 1068 Arsenal Street.

Mr. Coburn addressed the Staff comments regarding the easement for the drainage right of way for parcel number two. Mr. Urda said the drainage easement is across the lot that is not proposed for development at this time. He asked if Mr. Gracey's client intended to convey the eastern lot to a separate entity that will develop the parcel and be responsible for their own applications, and approvals. He said the easement would remain on the applicant's client's remaining property, for which there was no development proposal at this time. Mr. Urda then said the car wash project would not affect the easement, and the only time the Planning Board would be considering the easement would be when it is considering Part 2 of the SEQR and its impact on future development should it ever occur on the Western parcel. Mr. Urda then invited Mr. Gracey to share his client's intent to sell or convey the other parcel.

Mr. Gracey said he was not aware of his client's intent for resale. He said his client currently was proposing the two-lot subdivision and would not be the developer. Mr. Gracey said he did not want any confusion and that is why he verbally wanted to omit the paragraph regarding the car wash development from the cover letter.

Mr. Urda said if Mr. Gracey had a written amendment of the cover letter that he wished to submit, he could submit it to the Planning Board Chair. Mr. Gracey then provided the revised letter.

Mr. Coburn said Staff additionally revised the first summary upon receiving new communication from the applicant's client. He said for the purpose of clarity from both the City's perspective, and the landowner's, he would read the amendment to summary item number one.

1. To avoid creating a situation where a structure crosses a parcel boundary and produces two non-conforming lots in perpetuity, the applicant must demolish the existing structure on the lot within six (6) months of the date on which the Clerk of the Planning Board signs the Final Subdivision Plat. If the applicant fails to demolish the structure by this deadline, this Subdivision Approval shall be considered null and void, and the applicant shall reassemble the two resultant parcels by way of a new deed filed with the County Clerk that reestablishes the original subject parcel with its pre-Subdivision metes and bounds description. If the applicant fails to reassemble the parcel as aforementioned then the City of Watertown may bring application to Supreme Court Jefferson County for such relief with all court costs and other expenses including reasonable attorney's fees being paid for by the applicant.

Mr. Gracey then addressed the second summary item, which required the applicant to amend the Final Subdivision Plat drawing to label the proposed subdivision line that divides “Lot 1” from “Lot 2” with identical lengths, or else be prepared to explain this discrepancy to the satisfaction of both Staff and the Planning Board.

Mr. Gracey said that 300 feet was the total length of the line, and the other distance (299.46 feet) was between the monuments. He said because of the concrete sidewalk, it had to be chipped back about half a foot. Mr. Coburn said there was about 4-and-a-half-inch difference. Mr. Gracey said the dimensions were included so it would be visible where the monuments were to the end point of the line. Mr. Coburn confirmed that one side was an offset.

Mr. Urda said if the Planning Board was satisfied with the applicant’s explanation, they could eliminate the second summary condition. The Planning Board indicated they were satisfied, and item number two could be eliminated.

Ms. Capone then asked about making a motion. Mr. Urda said the Planning Board’s motion for approval could eliminate summary item number two, and change summary item number one to what Chairperson Coburn just read.

There were no further questions or comments from the Planning Board on the proposed subdivision request.

The Planning Board then considered each question on Part 2 of the Short Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) one-by-one, answering no to all of them. Ms. Fields made a motion for a negative declaration for the proposed subdivision pursuant to the requirements of SEQRA. Mr. Babcock seconded the motion. All voted in favor, none opposed.

Mr. Babcock then made a motion to approve the Final Plat Subdivision, for a two-lot subdivision of 1068 Arsenal Street, Parcel Number 8-47-106.000, by applicant Stephen J. Gracey, P.L.S. of LaFave, White & McGivern, L.S., P.C. on behalf of Prime, LLC subject to the following condition:

1. To avoid creating a situation where a structure crosses a parcel boundary and produces two non-conforming lots in perpetuity, the applicant must demolish the existing structure on the lot within six (6) months of the date on which the Clerk of the Planning Board signs the Final Subdivision Plat. If the applicant fails to demolish the structure by this deadline, this Subdivision Approval shall be considered null and void, and the applicant shall reassemble the two resultant parcels by way of a new deed filed with the County Clerk that reestablishes the original subject parcel with its pre-Subdivision metes and bounds description. If the applicant fails to reassemble the parcel as aforementioned then the City of Watertown may bring application to Supreme Court Jefferson County for such relief with all court costs and other expenses including reasonable attorney’s fees being paid for by the applicant.

Mr. Coburn seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

Mr. Katzman then moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Capone seconded the motion, and all voted in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 3:16 p.m.