



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: March 3, 2020

PRESENT:

Linda Fields, Acting Chair
T.J. Babcock
Katie Dermody
Kerry Johnson
Neil Katzman

ABSENT:

Larry Coburn
Michelle Capone

ALSO:

Michael A. Lumbis, Planning and Community
Development Director
Jennifer Voss, Senior Planner
Geoffrey Urda, Planner
Michael DeMarco, Planner
Michael Delaney, City Engineer
Benjamin Arquitt, Civil Engineer I

The March 3, 2020 Planning Board meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by acting Planning Board Chair, Linda Fields.

Ms. Fields then called for a reading of the Minutes from the February 21, 2020 Planning Board Meeting. Mr. Katzman made a motion to accept the minutes as written. Mr. Babcock seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

SITE PLAN APPROVAL 268 BELLEW AVENUE SOUTH, PARCEL NUMBER 9-43-105.000

The Planning Board then considered a request submitted by Matthew R. Morgia, P.E. of Aubertine and Currier, PLLC, on behalf of Roth Industries for the construction of 1,880 and 5,460 square-foot building additions, a new 10,400 square-foot storage building and associated site improvements at 268 Bellew Avenue South, Parcel Number 9-43-105.000.

Mr. Morgia attended to represent the request.

Mr Morgia began by saying that he had some updated plan sets to hand out that included revisions made based on the Planning Department's comments. He also said the copy displayed on the easel was the updated version.

Mr. Morgia then said that Roth Industries was planning another addition. He said the proposed 5,460 SF addition was for production, the 1,800 SF addition was for storage and the new 10,000 SF building was for incoming product. He said that new paving would be minor since Roth could use the existing driveway that they constructed in 2016.

Mr. Morgia then said there would be additional storage off to the west end of the yard where finished product is typically stored. He said that incoming product would come to the proposed building and materials could move back and forth across the site as needed. He said there would be a small expansion to the entrance drive from Rail Drive.

Mr. Morgia then said that Staff's memorandum included some comments on parking, just as the 2016 memorandum did. Mr. Morgia said that there was an enormous amount of asphalt at the north end of the site that Roth designated as overflow parking if it were ever needed.

Ms. Fields then asked Mr. Morgia if he would like to go through the summary items on Staff's memorandum one-by-one, beginning with the first summary item, which required the applicant to ensure the area designated on the site plan as proposed un-striped parking area stays clear of stored materials. Mr. Morgia said that he could verify that a sufficient amount of asphalt would stay clear for overflow parking, but he could not guarantee what part of the asphalt that would be at any given time.

Ms. Fields then asked about the second summary item, which required the applicant to show the location of the existing sanitary sewer connection on the drawing. Mr. Morgia replied that Aubertine and Currier was unable to determine its exact location, and added that it was not depicted on the as-built plan. He then said that they thought it came out near the office. Ms. Fields then asked Mr. Arquitt if that answer was sufficient. Mr. Arquitt replied that if the project required digging in that area, he would require the applicant to locate it first, but since they did not need to dig there, it was all right.

Ms. Fields then asked about the third summary item, which required the applicant to show the curb cut length in the city right-of-way as well as a curb detail on sheet CS-100. Mr. Morgia replied that they were not changing that curb cut, and that the only proposed changes were to the radii.

Mr. Morgia then addressed the fourth summary item, which required the applicant to add inlet protection around the existing catch basin on the Southwest corner of the existing Roth Industries Building. Mr. Morgia said that it was actually a trench drain in that location, but he pledged to provide inlet protection as necessary.

Ms. Fields then asked about the fifth summary item, which listed all the permits the applicant would need to obtain prior to construction. Mr. Morgia said that he acknowledged all required permits. Mr. Lumbis then said that the Planning Board could eliminate summary items 2 and 4 as the applicant had addressed them.

Mr. Babcock then moved to recommend that City Council approve the request for Site Plan Approval submitted by Matthew R. Morgia, P.E. of Aubertine and Currier, PLLC, on behalf of Roth Industries for the construction of 1,880 and 5,460 square-foot building additions, a new 10,400 square-foot storage building and associated site improvements at 268 Bellew Avenue South, Parcel Number 9-43-105.000, as shown on the site plans submitted to the City on March 3, 2020, contingent upon the following:

1. The applicant shall ensure the area designated on the site plan as proposed un-striped parking area stays clear of stored materials.

2. The applicant must add inlet protection around the existing trench drain on the Southwest corner of the existing Roth Industries Building.
3. The applicant must obtain the following permits, minimally, prior to construction: Building Permit, General City Permit and Certificate of Zoning Compliance.

Mr. Katzman seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

**SITE PLAN APPROVAL
491 EASTERN BOULEVARD, PARCEL NUMBER 5-26-103.007**

The Planning Board then considered a request submitted by Matthew R. Morgia, P.E. of Aubertine and Carrier, PLLC, on behalf of Parkside Bible Church for the construction of a 9,500 square-foot building and associated site improvements at 491 Eastern Boulevard, Parcel Number 5-26-103.007.

Mr. Morgia remained in attendance to represent this proposal as well, and said that he also had updated plan sets of this project to pass around.

Mr. Morgia then began by saying that Parkside Bible Church proposed a new multi-purpose building that would be two stories, with a first floor and a basement. He said the new building would go behind the church sanctuary and would have shared access with the main church entry via an enclosed corridor that would connect directly across from the main entry doors.

Also proposed, Mr. Morgia said, were a new access drive to the west, and utilities connecting from Huntington Street, which Mr. Morgia said would include combined domestic and fire service, which would provide the proposed building with a full sprinkler system. He then said that there would be a sanitary sewer connection to Huntington Street, as there was no sanitary on the property now.

Mr. Morgia then said that the plans depicted two sheds, both of which already existed and the church proposed to relocate. Mr. Morgia then explained that there were some proposed parking alterations on the site, including reconfiguring the existing ADA accessible parking spaces and adding two more, based on federal requirements. He then said there was no proposed change to the number of overall parking spaces, as there would be no activities in the multi-use building during mass times.

Mr. Morgia then elaborated that the existing parking requirement under the Zoning Ordinance based on the sanctuary was 88 spaces and there were 112 existing spaces on the property. He said that the proposed multi-use building would increase that requirement to 111 spaces, so remaining at 112 still met the requirement.

Mr. Morgia then addressed landscaping concerns on the property. He acknowledged that the proposed construction would necessitate removing 24 trees and then noted that the revised plan depicted 21 proposed new trees along the western property line to replace the lost trees. Ms.

Fields asked what the new species would be. Mr. Morgia replied by reading the proposed species from the planting schedule.

Mr. Katzman then asked if the Fire Department had seen these drawings. Mr. Urda replied that Code Enforcement reviews all site plans and verifies emergency access as a part of their review. Mr. Urda said that if there Codes finds an issue, they will bring it to the attention of the Planning Department, and they had not raised any concerns with this proposal.

Ms. Fields then suggested moving on to the summary items listed in the staff report. Mr. Morgia then addressed the first summary item, which required the applicant to either move all ADA parking signs to the front of all proposed ADA accessible spaces or use wheel stops to prevent vehicles from entering the pedestrian zones. Mr. Morgia explained that they did not want to put the signs or wheel stops at the heads of the parking spaces and would instead widen the walkways to six feet and would use concrete to delineate them from the asphalt parking spaces. Ms. Fields then asked where the ADA signs would be. Mr. Morgia replied that they would be behind the walks in the grass area.

Mr. Urda then explained that Staff's comment stemmed from concerns that vehicles would pull too far forward and encroach into the pedestrian zones since they were at grade and only separated by a painted stripe. Mr. Urda then said that the applicant's proposal to widen the walkways and use concrete to provide a visual distinction was acceptable to Staff.

Mr. Morgia then addressed the second summary item, which required the applicant to widen the proposed asphalt drive aisle that accesses the rear of the site to 24 feet. Mr. Morgia said that the preference was not to widen that drive aisle because it would then get closer to the root systems of two more trees, and added that it was strictly for emergency vehicle access.

Mr. Arquitt then said that Fire Chief Dale Herman¹ told him that the outrigger extended to 24 feet and the fire truck would become unstable if parked on grass. Ms. Fields said that it sounded like it needs to be 24 feet. Mr. Arquitt then said that Chief Herman told him the alternative was to extend the drive all the way to Huntington Street. Mr. Morgia then said that would be too expensive for the church. Mr. Urda then asked if the Planning Board was comfortable leaving this condition in, with the understanding that the applicant would work with Engineering Staff to come up with an acceptable solution. The Planning Board members all agreed.

Mr. Morgia then addressed the third summary item, which stated that applicant should include tree protection on the site plan around trees located immediately adjacent to the proposed project area, including paths and provide a tree protection detail on the site detail sheet. Mr. Morgia said that the revised plan depicted tree protection. Mr. DeMarco then said that it was important to understand why Staff was requiring this. He explained that its intent was to protect the property owner from future liability, and elaborated that any damage caused to trees now might not produce a visible decline in health for several years.

¹ **Editor's Note:** Mr. Arquitt met with Chief Herman on February 27, 2020 to discuss this site plan. Chief Herman subsequently retired on February 28, 2020. This Planning Board meeting occurred on March 3, 2020, so while Chief Herman was no longer the active Fire Chief on the date of this meeting, he was still in the position at the time he reviewed this site plan with Mr. Arquitt.

Mr. Morgia then addressed the fourth summary item, which stated that the Planning Board should decide whether outdoor lighting is necessary at the basement-level entrances, and whether it requires any additional information, particularly about hours of operation, to make such a determination. Mr. Morgia said that all mass services took place during the day, and added that there were canopies over all stairwells with under lighting.

Mr. Urda then explained that the reason for this summary item was not so much mass times as it was potential weekday hours of use for the multi-purpose building, particularly in December, when sunset was especially early. Mr. Morgia then referred to the covered walkway entrance, noting that it connected to the multi-purpose building. He then acknowledged that some of the other areas were darker and that the church would love to add lights as finances permit, but now was not the time.

Ms. Fields then expressed concerns for adequate lighting around other exterior doors to the proposed multi-use building. Mr. Morgia said that all such entrances will be lit underneath the canopies. Mr. Morgia said that those could be motion-sensor activated. Ms. Fields replied that motion sensors were acceptable to her.

Mr. Morgia then addressed the fifth summary item, which required the applicant to address all concerns listed in the “Utilities and Hydrology” section of the February 27, 2020 Planning Department memorandum to the Planning Board to the satisfaction of the Engineering Department prior to the issuance of any permits.

Mr. Morgia said that he believed those were related the sanitary sewer lateral. He noted the requirement to separate valves and shut-offs for the fire and domestic lines, but said they were co-mingled, so separate valves were not possible. He added that this was nothing new in the City. Mr. Arquitt said that the City allowed it, but did not encourage it, and said this was in the City Code.

Mr. Urda had looked up the relevant code (Section 301-18 of the City Code) on his phone and read it aloud, “When a water service line is used for combined fire and domestic use, separate valves or shut-offs shall be required to enable the isolation of the service branches, and approved backflow prevention devices must be installed in conformance with all governing regulations and approved by the City’s Code Enforcement Officials and by the Superintendent or City Engineer.” Mr. Arquitt said that was the basis of his comment.

Mr. Morgia stated that it would not be possible to install the shut-off valves and backflow prevention devices outside the building. Mr. Arquitt reiterated that Section 301-18 of the City Code requires the separate shut-off valves and backflow prevention devices, and then added that these can be installed inside the new multipurpose building and are needed to isolate the water supply line and domestic water supply line in the event maintenance is required.

Mr. Morgia then addressed the sixth summary item, which required the applicant to correct the graphic scale on sheet CG-101 (Grading and Utility Plan) to identify the accurate scale of the drawing. Mr. Morgia confirmed that this correction was completed.

Mr. Morgia then addressed the seventh summary item, which listed all the permits the applicant would need to obtain prior to construction. Mr. Morgia said that he acknowledged all required permits.

Mr. Morgia then said that he wanted to communicate an additional change from the original plan set, which was that the church wished to relocate the majority of the proposed trees to the west property line due to concern over damage from plows pushing snow into the lawn.

Ms. Fields then asked if there were any questions. Hearing none, she then asked for a motion.

Mr. Babcock then moved to recommend that City Council approve the request for Site Plan Approval submitted by Matthew R. Morgia, P.E. of Aubertine and Currier, PLLC, on behalf of Parkside Bible Church for the construction of a 9,500 square-foot building and associated site improvements at 491 Eastern Boulevard, Parcel Number 5-26-103.007, as shown on the site plans submitted to the City on March 3, 2020, contingent upon the following:

1. The applicant shall widen the proposed asphalt drive aisle that accesses the rear of the site to 24 feet in width or work with the City Engineering Department to come up with an acceptable alternative for emergency access.
2. The applicant must obtain the following permits, minimally, prior to construction: Building Permit, General City Permit, Sanitary Sewer Connection Permit, Water Supply Permit and a Certificate of Zoning Compliance.

Ms. Dermody seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

**SITE PLAN APPROVAL
WATERTOWN GOLF CLUB, INC.
1 THOMPSON PARK, PARCEL NUMBER 12-26-104.000**

The Planning Board then considered a request submitted by Michael E. Lundy, President of the Watertown Golf Club, Inc. for the construction of a 320, 480 and 3,744 SF building, an 800 SF building addition, a 2,400 SF event tent, a 50-space parking lot and associated site improvements at the Watertown Golf Club, 1 Thompson Park, Parcel Number 12-26-104.000.

Patrick Scordo, P.E. of GYMO, DPC, Colleen Lundy and Bob Taylor all attended to represent the request.

Mr. Scordo began by thanking Staff for the rapid review of the revised drawings that the applicant had submitted the previous day. He noted that Mr. Urda had given him a copy of Staff's updated memorandum prior to the meeting. Mr. Scordo then asked if the Planning Board would like to go over all 12 summary items or just the outstanding ones. Ms. Fields replied that she would still prefer to discuss all of them.

Mr. Scordo then addressed the first summary item, which required the applicant to remove any existing features that will no longer exist following implementation, such as the existing Hole 18 layout, from the drawing wherever they overlap proposed features. Mr. Scordo said that the revised drawing now omitted these features and he agreed the drawing was clearer and easier to read.

Mr. Scordo then addressed the second summary item, which required the applicant to depict the parking space layout in the existing parking lot and clarify the proposed locations for all required ADA accessible parking spaces. Mr. Scordo said that the revised drawing did depict the layout, however he acknowledged that they would need to provide two additional ADA spaces, for a total of four, as discussed in Staff's subsequent review, and said they would be adjacent to the existing ADA spaces.

Mr. Scordo then addressed the third summary item, which required the applicant to extend the proposed walkway, paralleling the proposed western entrance driveway up to the point adjacent to the westernmost parking space, where the driveway opens up into the full parking lot. Mr. Scordo said that he agreed and the revised plans depicted this required extension.

Mr. Katzman then returned to the topic of ADA spaces and asked if there would be any ADA spaces in the new parking lot. Mr. Scordo replied in the negative, and explained that the reason was grading, as there is a lot of slope in that area and it would be very expensive to re-grade that lot. Mr. Katzman asked how someone with a disability would get to the event tent. Mr. Scordo replied that the walkway would still provide access from the existing lot. Mr. Katzman then said that someone with a disability would want to be closer and that the grades from the existing lot to the event tent were steeper.

Ms. Fields said she would also like to see two ADA spaces closer to the event tent. Mr. Scordo then suggested the location where the walkway connected to the new parking lot. Mr. Lumbis then noted that if two ADA spaces went there, those two spaces would require pavement to make them accessible and noted that the drawing currently only depicted gravel in that area. Mr. Scordo then said they would have to tweak the locations of ADA spaces and discussion then shifted to other requirements.

Mr. Scordo then addressed the fourth through seventh summary items, which respectively required the applicant to submit a Utility Plan, Grading Plan, Landscaping Plan and a Lighting/Photometric Plan. Mr. Scordo addressed these one-by-one, confirming that he had either submitted a new drawing or added the required features to an existing drawing. Staff's updated memo confirmed that all four of these conditions were satisfied.

Mr. Scordo then addressed the eighth summary item, which required the applicant to submit a revised Engineering Report, the contents of which are to the satisfaction of the City Engineering Department, prior to the issuance of any permits. Mr. Scordo acknowledged that they would need to provide more details in the report, and pledged to provide the Engineering Department with everything it needed.

Mr. Scordo then addressed the ninth summary item, which required the applicant to submit detail sheets with notes for various utility, asphalt paving, concrete and other relevant construction details. Mr. Scordo said that he understood and agreed with the comment.

Mr. Scordo then addressed the tenth summary item, which required applicant to correct the label for the proposed golf cart storage building, as described in the “Miscellaneous” section of Staff’s February 27, 2020 memorandum to the Planning Board. Mr. Scordo said that the revised drawing contained a corrected label, acknowledging that the previous building that was there underwent demolition last summer.

Mr. Scordo then addressed the eleventh summary item, which required the applicant to clarify his intentions regarding the future construction of a new clubhouse so that it can be included as part of the environmental review if needed. Mr. Scordo said that he would refer this question to Ms. Lundy, who said that there were no plans for a new clubhouse at this time. She said they went much further with renovating the existing clubhouse than originally planned, including a new kitchen. Ms. Fields then asked Ms. Lundy to confirm that there were no future plans for a new clubhouse. Ms. Lundy replied that there were no plans for a new clubhouse.

Mr. Scordo then addressed the twelfth summary item, which listed all the permits the applicant would need to obtain prior to construction. Mr. Scordo said that he acknowledged all required permits. Mr. Urda then explained that in Staff’s updated memorandum, there were two permitting condition, with the “Private Sewage Disposal” permit split into its own condition, separate from the others. Mr. Scordo said that he would submit a basis of design but that he wanted to coordinate that with the New York State Department of Health (DOH) and asked for advice on timing. Mr. Arquitt said that he should submit simultaneously to the City and DOH.

Ms. Fields then asked Ms. Lundy what her timeframe was for getting under way. Ms. Lundy replied, “Immediately.” Ms. Fields then asked if there were any other questions. Mr. Katzman then asked about the permitting timeline. Mr. Scordo replied that they would not be able to do percolation tests until April, so that would be the earliest. Discussion then ensued on the construction timeline. Mr. Lumbis emphasized that this proposal required 239-m review by the Jefferson County Planning Board, so the City Council would not be able to act on it until April 6, 2020.

Mr. Urda then asked the Planning Board how they wished to re-word Summary Item No.1, regarding where to locate ADA parking spaces. Discussion ensued on this until the Planning Board agreed on a wording.

Once the Planning Board had finished that, Mr. Babcock then moved to recommend that City Council approve the request for Site Plan Approval submitted by Michael E. Lundy, President of the Watertown Golf Club, Inc. for the construction of a 320, 480 and 3,744 SF buildings, an 800 SF building addition, a 2,400 SF event tent, a 50-space parking lot and associated site improvements at the Watertown Golf Club, 1 Thompson Park, Parcel Number 12-26-104.000, as shown on the site plans submitted to the City on March 2, 2020, contingent upon the following:

1. The applicant shall provide four (4) ADA accessible parking spaces per United States Department of Justice regulations under the Americans with Disabilities Act. The applicant must locate two of these ADA spaces in the new parking lot, pave them completely, including paving the access aisles. All four ADA spaces must meet all State and Federal ADA requirements.

2. The applicant must submit a revised Engineering Report to include: Site and project description, all nearby utilities (water, sewer, electrical, communication, gas, etc), site lighting, soil classification & and hydrologic analysis prior to issuance of any permits.
3. The applicant must submit detail sheets with notes for various utility, asphalt paving, concrete and other relevant construction details to the satisfaction of the City Engineering Department.
4. The applicant must obtain the following permits, minimally, prior to construction: Building Permit, a General City Permit and a Certificate of Zoning Compliance.
5. The applicant must obtain a “Private Sewage Disposal” permit prior to receiving a certificate of occupancy.

Ms. Dermody seconded the motion and all voted in favor except Mr. Katzman, who abstained.

Mr. Katzman moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Babcock seconded the motion and all voted in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 3:43p.m.