



# 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: August 4, 2020

PRESENT:

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

ALSO:

Michael A. Lumbis, Planning and Community  
Development Director  
Geoffrey Urda, Planner  
Michael Delaney, City Engineer

ABSENT:

Kerry Johnson

Planning Board Chair, Larry Coburn, called the August 4, 2020 Planning Board meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Coburn then asked for a motion regarding the Minutes from the July 7, 2020 Planning Board Meeting. Mr. Katzman made a motion to accept the minutes as written. Ms. Fields seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

## **SUBDIVISION FINAL PLAT APPROVAL 650 STATE STREET, PARCEL NUMBER 12-05-232.000**

The Planning Board then considered a request submitted by Timothy Farley, P.C. on behalf of C. William Stoodley, Jr. for a two-lot subdivision of 650 State Street, Parcel Number 12-05-232.000.

Mr. Farley attended to represent the request.

Mr. Coburn noted that this application required a public hearing, and that he would stop discussion at 3:05 p.m. to conduct the hearing.

Mr. Farley then began by saying that the proposal was to split the parking lot on the site and convey half to Mr. Stoodley with the former Great American parcel retaining the other half. Mr. Farley then said that the Planning Board had approved this Subdivision once before but that he did not get the subdivision plat filed with the Jefferson County Clerk within the required 62-day window.

Mr. Coburn then asked if any Planning Board members had questions or comments. Mr. Katzman asked if this would create a problem for the former Great American parcel; specifically whether it would leave it without enough parking area for a new occupant to meet the parking requirement.

Mr. Farley replied that the remaining parking area was more than sufficient, as the parcel extended all the way south to Boyd Street, and there were entrances on Boyd and State. He added that Mr. Stoodley was taking less than half the area and the rest would remain with the Great American parcel.

Mr. Lumbis then said that when Professional Land Surveyor, Patsy Storino originally put together the Subdivision Plat, he laid out the property line to accommodate two rows of parking on either side of the line. He then added that Staff calculated there was room for 108 spaces on the lands to remain with the former Great American parcel. He then explained that the exact parking requirement would depend on how much of the building a new use would occupy, but that whatever went into the building, Staff would evaluate it using the Zoning Compliance Certificate (ZCC) process.

Mr. Katzman reiterated that he did not want to see a hardship imposed on the former Great American building. Mr. Urda then said that it was 3:05 p.m. and that the Planning Board needed to open the required public hearing.

Mr. Coburn then called the public hearing to order at 3:05 p.m., read the legal notice that had been published in the *Watertown Daily Times* and asked for public comment on the request. Hearing no comments, Mr. Coburn closed the public hearing at 3:06 p.m.

Mr. Coburn then noted that the request also required the Planning Board to complete Part 2 of the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) Shore Environmental Assessment Form (EAF). Mr. Urda suggested finishing the parking discussion first.

Mr. Lumbis then said that as he recalled, the size of the building was very close to yielding a parking requirement of 108 spaces, but that until you knew the proposed use, interior layout, etc., it was impossible to make an exact determination. Mr. Katzman then asked Mr. Lumbis his gut feeling as to whether the site would continue to have adequate parking. Mr. Lumbis replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Coburn then suggested the Planning Board complete the SEQR form. The Planning Board then considered each question on Part 2 of the Short EAF one-by-one, answering no to all of them. Ms. Fields then made a motion to issue a Negative Declaration for the proposed subdivision pursuant to the requirements of SEQRA. Mr. Babcock seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

Mr. Babcock then moved to approve the request submitted by Timothy Farley, P.C. on behalf of C. William Stoodley, Jr. for a two-lot subdivision of 650 State Street, Parcel Number 12-05-232.000, contingent upon the following:

1. The applicant must assemble the subdivided Parcel "B" with the existing Parcel "C", known as 632 State St., Parcel Number 12-05-228, by way of new metes and bounds description filed with the County Clerk.
2. The applicant must show proof of ownership at the meeting. Otherwise, the applicant must be prepared to provide written permission from LKR Enterprises, Inc authorizing the applicant to apply for a subdivision on the property owner's behalf.

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

**WAIVER OF SITE PLAN APPROVAL  
1155 COFFEEN STREET, PARCEL NUMBER 8-18-217.000**

The Planning Board then considered a request for a Waiver of Site Plan Approval submitted by Dr. Dale S. Porter for a 496 square-foot (SF) one-story building addition at 1155 Coffeen Street, Parcel Number 8-18-217.000.

Dr. Porter attended to represent the request.

Mr. Porter began by saying that he wanted to construct a small addition to his building, enough space for two treatment rooms and a small office, and he was not aware of any problems. Mr. Coburn asked Dr. Porter if he would respond to the summary items in Staff's memorandum to the Planning Board, specifically the third summary item, which said that the applicant should consider widening the access on to Coffeen Street in order to allow for better access for emergency responders.

Dr. Porter said that Staff's memorandum was the first time that anyone from the City had raised that issue with him, but that he had no problems with it. He added that there was a large, doublewide driveway that accessed the site, but if it was too awkward, he had no problem with another lane.

Mr. Coburn then asked for Staff's thoughts. Mr. Lumbis replied that this comment had come from Code Enforcement, and that 24 feet was the standard width and it may be close to that now. Mr. Lumbis then said that the driveway would shift east a little bit and the comment primarily applied to widening the apron. Mr. Coburn then asked for the record if the driveway was 24 feet wide.

Dr. Porter replied that it was a double lane. Mr. Coburn said that there were numbers missing so he had to ask the question, adding that fire trucks need to be able to access the site. Mr. Delaney said that 24 feet was the standard width if there was only a single access point and if there was a another means of ingress, the width could be less. Dr. Porter said that he had access from Coffeen Street and Glenn Avenue. Mr. Delaney then said the preference would be, minimally, to maintain the present width. Mr. Coburn then noted that the summary item just said, "consider."

Mr. Coburn then asked about the first summary item, which required the applicant to restripe the existing parking spaces, and provide the required access aisle and signage for the ADA spaces. Dr. Porter replied that he had already started that process and said that he had far more parking than he needed and had no problem designating an ADA parking area.

Mr. Katzman then asked if the Planning Board should condition approval upon widening the driveway. The other Planning Board members said that was already a summary item.

Ms. Fields then moved to waive the requirements of Site Plan Approval for the request submitted by Dr. Dale S. Porter for a 496 square-foot (SF) one-story building addition at 1155 Coffeen Street, Parcel Number 8-18-217.000, contingent upon the following:

1. The applicant must restripe the existing parking spaces, and provide the required access aisle and signage for the ADA space.
2. The applicant must obtain a Building Permit and a Zoning Compliance Certificate prior to construction.
3. The applicant should consider widening the access on to Coffeen Street in order to allow for better access for emergency responders.

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

**SITE PLAN APPROVAL – 1348, 1352 and 1356 WASHINGTON STREET  
PARCEL NUMBERS 14-21-106.000, 14-21-107.000, and 14-21-108.000**

The Planning Board then considered a request submitted by Michael Altieri, P.E. of BCA Architects & Engineers on behalf of Sundus and Sarah, LLC to construct an 11,532 SF mixed-use building, a 28-space parking lot and associated site improvements at 1348, 1352 and 1356 Washington Street, Parcel Numbers 14-21-106.000, 14-21-107.000, and 14-21-108.000.

Mr. Coburn then stated that since he worked for BCA Architects and Engineers, he would recuse himself from discussion on this matter. He then asked Ms. Capone to chair the meeting for this application.

Mr. Altieri and Dr. Sarah Latif attended to represent the project. Mr. Altieri began by orienting everyone as to the directions on the plan drawing, and said that Washington Street and Watertown High School were at the bottom of the page. He then said that this proposal was centered on three existing residential properties that the Latifs had acquired, that it included an approximately 11,000 square-foot (SF) building with parking in the front and to the side, and that they would make use of the existing curb cut on Washington Street.

Mr. Katzman then asked if the applicant proposed to connect the new parking lot to the existing parking lot next door at North Country Neurology. Mr. Altieri replied that they only proposed a pedestrian connection between the lots.

Mr. Altieri then said that he had previously appeared before the Planning Board to discuss rezoning the subject properties to Neighborhood Business, a request for which the Planning Board recommended approval, but which City Council had tabled, citing the need for more information about the proposed development.

Mr. Altieri said that project had green infrastructure components, including rain gardens in the front and back. He then said that other drainage practices on the site included French drains along the perimeter of the site and a series of underground pipes and retention tanks that he would discuss during the engineering review.

Mr. Altieri then discussed buffering efforts, which he said included a stockade fence along the south and west sides of the property, which he said would match the character of nearby fences, as well as a landscaped buffer and rain garden area at the rear of the property. He summarized that it was a nice, compact development, and then asked if any Planning Board Members had questions before he went through the summary items in Staff's memorandum. Not hearing any questions, Ms. Capone told Mr. Altieri that he could continue.

Mr. Altieri then addressed the first summary item, which required the applicant to clarify the envisioned future use for the second floor and the potential effects on future parking calculations. Mr. Altieri said that his clients would use the second floor like an attic, entirely for storage. Ms. Fields asked why the second floor had windows if it was to be an attic. Mr. Altieri replied that the intent of the windows was to match the architectural style of the neighborhood and give the appearance of living space.

Ms. Fields then asked what would prevent the second floor from becoming living space in the future. Mr. Altieri replied that it was not in the site plan. Dr. Latif then said that she had no intention at this point in time to make the second floor anything other than storage. She added that if you walked into her office, you would see boxes on top of boxes. She then said that she and Mr. Altieri were just trying to follow the City's rules. Mr. Altieri then said that stairs would be the only means of accessing the second floor, and that while he was not an architect, he believed that it would need an elevator to be a liveable location.

Mr. Altieri then addressed the second summary item, which required the applicant to discuss the width of the drive aisle with the Planning Board and consider finding a way to increase the width to 24 feet. Mr. Altieri said that per building code, the proposed mixed-use building would need to be 30 feet apart from the neighboring North Country Neurology building. Adherence to that requirement, he said, was the reason for the narrower drive aisle, as well as five compact car spaces.

Mr. Katzman then said that there was no such thing a compact car parking in any building code he had ever seen or anything that he had ever done. Mr. Altieri replied that compact car parking was a legitimate technique that he had seen used in other communities, but acknowledged that Watertown did not have a specific provision for it.

Mr. Katzman then said that most people today drove sport utility vehicles (SUVs) and there were not many smart cars in the area. He then questioned whether a standard car could maneuver in and out of a compact space. Mr. Altieri said that the BCA Architects and Engineers

building on Mullin Street was a local example of successfully implementing compact car spaces and narrower drive aisles.

Following some further discussion on the topic, Ms. Capone said the Planning Board wanted to see a 24-foot wide drive aisle and no compact car parking. Mr. Altieri said that to accomplish that, he would need to ask his architect to shrink the building.

Mr. Altieri then addressed the third summary item, which required the applicant to confirm the intent of the shared driveway to remain at the southeast corner of the site and the benefit of the proposed easement to the neighboring property owner. Mr. Altieri said that they wanted to maintain the shared driveway cut with the neighboring property owner at 1358 Washington Street and proposed a permanent easement across the flared driveway.

Ms. Capone asked if that satisfied Staff. Mr. Urda replied that the intent of the condition was to discover whether that this proposal originated from a request that that neighboring property owner made at a previous Planning Board meeting to maintain the shared driveway. Mr. Urda also asked if the applicant had discussed preserving the entire length of the driveway. Following some additional discussion on this topic, Mr. Lumbis said that the applicant had confirmed the intent of the easement, but that filing the easement should be a condition of Site Plan Approval.

Mr. Altieri then moved on to the fourth summary item, which asked the Planning Board to determine whether the six-foot lawn area and stockade fence adequately buffer the southern property line. He said that the area was tight for vegetation, which was why the current plan only proposed a stockade fence, with the intent to match the style of nearby residential fencing. Ms. Fields then asked if any neighboring property owners in attendance had landscaping concerns.

Paula Trainham, 1355 Sherman Street, then approached the microphone. Ms. Trainham said that the area had many water problems and Sherman Street is at a lower elevation level than Washington Street. She then said that she would like to know the distance between the proposed development and her property. Mr. Altieri drew her attention to the proposed landscaped buffer on the site plan. She asked again for the distance. Mr. Urda then said that she wanted to know how wide the buffer would be. Mr. Altieri said the landscaped buffer would vary from 10-to-13 feet in width. He added that with the proposed rain garden, there would be an aggregate 25 feet of buffer immediately to the west of the proposed building and parking lot.

Ms. Trainham then asked if the building would be one or two stories. Mr. Altieri replied that it would be two stories. He then discussed the neighbors' preference, when he canvassed the area, was for the parking to be at the front of the site to reduce disturbance from overhead lighting and from cars' headlights. Mr. Altieri and Ms. Trainham then discussed lighting and parking orientation further.

Ms. Fields then asked Ms. Trainham if she was comfortable with the proposed landscaping. Ms. Trainham replied that she was still confused by the distances. Mr. Altieri said the aggregate buffer would be a little wider than the width of her house.

Ms. Capone then asked to move on to the fifth summary item, which required the applicant to discuss the rationale for making the design decision to set the building back from the

street, which is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Altieri said that when he and Dr. Latif canvassed the neighborhood, they presented two site plan concepts to the neighboring property owners, one with the building at the front of the property closer to the road, and one they submitted, with the building at the rear. He said that the neighbors preferred the latter option almost unanimously because the building would screen the parking and mitigate concerns about light spillage into residential properties from overhead lights and headlights from cars.

Mr. Lumbis then said that Staff brought up the recommended land use character in the Comprehensive Plan at a previous Planning Board meeting. He elaborated that the Comp Plan is supposed to be a guide for future decision-making and it will become stronger once the new Zoning Ordinance was complete. Mr. Lumbis then said that he knew there were concerns at an earlier meeting about the building being in the rear, with a second floor overlooking the back yards of the properties on Sherman Street, and the current preference seemed to contradict that.

Scott Connell, 1357 Sherman Street, then approached the microphone. He said that his primary concern was with a two-story building was privacy. He said the proposed landscaping would not stop light spillage and would not stop a second story view into his yard. Ms. Fields then asked Mr. Connell if he thought the landscaping was acceptable. Mr. Connell replied that he was surprised the neighborhood was all right with any of this and said that he was not polled by the applicant. He expressed a strong desire for the properties in question to remain single-family residential and that other uses represented an unknown future.

Mr. Altieri then addressed the sixth summary item, which required the applicant to have all utility easements in place prior to the issuance of any permits. Mr. Altieri acknowledged the need for this.

Mr. Altieri then addressed the seventh summary item, which required the applicant to comply with all requirements of Section 301-18 of the City Code, which governed combined water services, and questioned if that section of code applied to this building type. Mr. Altieri and Mr. Delaney discussed the issue and Mr. Delaney recommended the summary item remain for now.

Mr. Altieri then addressed the eighth summary item, which required the applicant to use a minimum six-inch diameter sewer lateral. Mr. Altieri agreed to the condition.

Mr. Altieri then addressed the ninth summary item, which required the applicant to discuss the design process and assure the Planning Board that the underground storage will adequately retain drainage and remove stormwater from the site without compromising the ability of the City's storm sewer to perform its function and without affecting adjacent properties.

Mr. Altieri said that he showed this in plan view earlier, but also had a profile view to show the Planning Board. Using the profile view, he explained every step of the stormwater collection and underground retention system running from the rear to the front of the site. He explained that the intent was to hold water back from and discharge it slowly over time into the Washington Street sewer system. He added that to perform a conservative analysis, they did not factor in the benefit of the rain gardens.

Ms. Capone then asked what role, if any, gravity played in getting the water to the storm sewer. Mr. Altieri replied that the system used gravity slowly by design, explaining that the

entire underground storage tank would be available to stormwater. He said this system was capable of handling a 100-year storm. Mr. Altieri then said that in the event of two 100-year storms in tandem, the system contained an emergency weir to provide another level of protection.

Mr. Katzman then asked how many places had rain gardens locally and if systems like this could stand the test of time. Mr. Altieri replied Samaritan Medical Center and Jefferson Community College were prominent local examples. Extended discussion then ensued between Mr. Altieri and Mr. Katzman about the technical aspects and capacity of the proposed retention system.

Following this discussion, Ms. Capone asked Staff if this was satisfactory. Mr. Delaney replied in the affirmative and said that any issue would be an existing issue with the City's current system. He said that he was comfortable that the proposed on-site system would handle any additional runoff that the proposed development would generate, and any other issues would most likely be the result of aging City infrastructure.

Ms. Capone asked if it would successfully move water away from the Sherman Street side. Mr. Delaney replied that he was aware of concerns related to natural grade flow in that area and that the proposed system would direct water away from Sherman Street. He added that in a major rain event, flooding will occur no matter what you do, and it's not practical to design for a 500-year storm.

Mr. Katzman then said that he was getting the impression that the City's system could not handle any additional stormwater. Mr. Delaney replied that that was why the applicants proposed to retain water on site, so the City system could drain before they discharged their own runoff into it. He said he was confident this would not overtax the City's sewer system.

Mr. Connell then said that he was concerned that there was no guarantee that it would work, and although two experts were vouching for it, there was no way to know for sure. He said that the City's Department of Public Works (DPW) has to park on Sherman Street occasionally to pump the existing system out, and he was concerned the proposed development would add to that.

Ms. Trainham then added that much of the water that caused flooding was groundwater, and she did not see how that would go into the proposed system. She said that her back yard floods every spring and it comes from the ground as well as from the existing parking lot at North Country Neurology. She said that everyone she spoke with was concerned about water issues.

Mr. Delaney then said that historical drainage issues were not a problem that this proposed development could correct. He then said that he was confident that this development would not exacerbate any of those issues. He acknowledged that this neighborhood was a low point in the City, but reiterated his conclusion that this development would not increase any water flows to the back yards of Sherman Street properties.

Mr. Connell then asked if an independent evaluation was possible. Mr. Delaney replied that he did not have a stake in this project as Mr. Altieri did, and that he was looking at it from an objective technical standpoint. He then said that if someone wished to commission a

third-party review, that was fine, but the City would not finance a third-party review. He added that any information submitted to the City is open to the public.

Mr. Altieri then addressed the tenth summary item, which required the applicant to supply missing invert elevation information and correct other invert elevation errors on Sheet C-103 of the design drawings. Mr. Altieri acknowledged that they had an elevation correction to make, and they would correct that in the drawings.

Mr. Altieri then addressed the eleventh summary item, which noted that while the proposed project would disturb less than one acre, the applicant must still be cognizant of and comply with any potential New York State permitting requirements for stormwater management discharge. Mr. Altieri said that their intent when designing the site was to meet the requirements of the State's stormwater design manual.

Mr. Altieri then addressed the twelfth summary item, which required the applicant to modify the lighting plan to eliminate any more than 0.5 footcandles of spillage over the property line. Mr. Altieri said that they were very successful with limiting spillage onto neighboring residential properties; however, the spillage onto the North Country Neurology parcel was intentional to illuminate the shared pedestrian connection.

Mr. Urda then said that the intent of that summary item was that while the Latifs owned both properties right now, they could always sell one in the future and the spillage would still affect the neighboring parcel. Mr. Altieri replied that they could amend both deeds to include easements for the shared lighting.

Mr. Altieri then addressed the thirteenth summary item, which required the applicant to submit a photometric shielding plan for the entire site prior to the issuance of any permits. Mr. Altieri said that they proposed to shield a particular fixture to achieve better die-off at the side property line to the south. Mr. Delaney asked if the light contours were representative of that shielding. Mr. Altieri replied in the negative. Mr. Katzman then asked about dark sky compliance. Mr. Altieri replied that the proposed fixtures would be dimmable, but also be capable of coming on when they detected motion, such as from vehicles or pedestrians.

Mr. Altieri then addressed the fourteenth summary item, which required the applicant to fulfill all requirements related to asbestos surveying and abatement prior to the issuance of a Demolition Permit for the existing structures at 1352 and 1356 Washington Street. Mr. Altieri pledged that they would follow all required procedures.

Mr. Altieri then addressed the fifteenth summary item, which required the applicant to relocate the proposed refuse storage area to the rear yard or eliminate it from the site plan. Mr. Altieri said that this was a difficult requirement because they did not want to locate the dumpster near the residential properties. He said that they would remove it from the plans and schedule more frequent refuse collection.

Mr. Altieri then addressed the sixteenth summary item, which required the applicant to combine the three subject parcels by way of a new metes and bounds description that is filed with the County Clerk. Mr. Altieri said they would combine the parcels.

Mr. Altieri then addressed the seventeenth summary item, which identified all the required permits the applicant would need to obtain. Mr. Altieri acknowledged the need for all the listed permits. Mr. Altieri then said that they would also finalize the zone change.

Ms. Capone then said that she wanted to talk more about the building location's inconsistency with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Urda then acknowledged that the Comp Plan did recommend this segment of Washington Street for an Urban Mixed Use land use character area, which recommended situating buildings at the front of their sites. He then explained that although the proposed site layout was inconsistent with the plan's vision, it nonetheless met all applicable zoning code, and while Staff could recommend in the strongest terms reversing the layout, there was no mechanism for requiring it. He added that such enforcement was something the upcoming zoning rewrite could address.

Ms. Capone then said that the proposal was acceptable for present purposes. Mr. Lumbis then said that if any modifications to the parking lot layout became necessary, Staff wanted to establish for the record that moving the building to the front was the City's preferred layout. Ms. Capone then said that from a design perspective, locating the building in the front looked better, but she did not want to go against the neighbors' wishes either.

Ms. Fields then expressed her support for sound urban design and visual appeal moving into the future. Ms. Capone then said that locating the parking in the back was a crucial part of creating visual appeal, so that parked cars aren't the first thing you see on the site. She noted that from a planning perspective, building closer to the curb should be encouraged.

Mr. Babcock then asked if translucent rear windows on the second floor would solve the privacy issue. Mr. Katzman then suggested eliminating the windows and using skylights. Following a brief discussion, the Planning Board dismissed both these ideas.

Ms. Fields then asked what type of retail the applicants proposed. Mr. Altieri replied that retail was not the priority use and that they had not yet given it significant thought. Ms. Fields then asked again about the second floor space and the potential to use it for something other than storage. Mr. Urda then explained that any future second floor use would need either to meet parking requirements or receive relief from those requirements in the form of an Area Variance. He then noted that part of the Variance process involved proving that the hardship had not been self-created.

Ms. Capone then asked if there were any other questions. Hearing none, she said she felt comfortable making a motion since the applicant had addressed all the summary items. Ms. Capone then moved to recommend that City Council approve the site plan submitted by Michael Altieri, P.E. of BCA Architects & Engineers on behalf of Sundus and Sarah, LLC to construct an 11,532 SF mixed-use building, a 28-space parking lot and associated site improvements at 1348, 1352 and 1356 Washington Street, Parcel Numbers 14-21-106.000, 14-21-107.000, and 14-21-108.000, contingent upon the following:

1. The applicant should clarify the envisioned future use for the second floor and the potential effects on future parking calculations.

2. The applicant must widen the southern drive aisle to 24 feet in width as well as remove the compact car parking spaces and replace them with standard spaces.
3. The applicant must file proposed easement for driveway access at the southeast corner of the site, benefitting the neighboring property at 1358 Washington Street.
4. The Planning Board should determine whether or not the six-foot lawn area and stockade fence adequately buffer the southern property line.
5. The Planning Board's recorded preference is to locate the building at the front of the site, in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan.
6. The applicant must have all utility easements in place prior to the issuance of any permits.
7. The applicant must comply with all requirements of Section 301-18 of the City Code.
8. The applicant must use a minimum six-inch diameter sewer lateral.
9. The applicant should discuss the design thought process/rationale and assure the Planning Board that the underground storage will adequately retain drainage and remove stormwater from the site without compromising the ability of the City's storm sewer to perform its function and without affecting adjacent properties.
10. The applicant must supply missing invert elevation information and correct other invert elevation errors on Sheet C-103 of the design drawings.
11. While the proposed project would disturb less than one acre, the applicant must still be cognizant of and comply with any potential New York State permitting requirements for stormwater management discharge.
12. The applicant shall modify the lighting plan to eliminate any more than 0.5 footcandles of spillage over the property line.
13. The applicant must submit a photometric shielding plan for the entire site prior to the issuance of any permits.
14. The applicant must fulfill all requirements related to asbestos surveying and abatement prior to the issuance of a Demolition Permit for the existing structures at 1352 and 1356 Washington Street.
15. The applicant must relocate the proposed refuse storage area to the rear yard or eliminate it from the site plan.
16. The applicant must combine the three subject parcels by way of a new metes and bounds description that is filed with the County Clerk.

17. The applicant must obtain the following permits, minimally, prior to demolition and construction: Demolition Permit, Building Permit, General City Permit, Sanitary Sewer Connection Permit, Water Supply Permit and a Certificate of Zoning Compliance.

Mr. Babcock seconded the motion.

Mr. Lumbis then said that summary item number two, which could result in more asphalt and a smaller building footprint, had considerable potential to alter the site plan significantly. He said that the Planning Board would be recommending a different site plan than what the City Council might ultimately consider. He said that he did not want to slow the approval process down but approving the site plan is the Planning Board's main function in this instance and that they should consider and make a recommendation on the final version of the plan, not one that has the potential to change drastically.

Ms. Fields then asked again about summary item number four, and specifically if all the neighbors were satisfied with a 25-foot wide landscaped buffer. Mr. Katzman then asked where the applicant proposed to locate the air conditioners and if the noise they generated would be too loud for the neighbors. Mr. Altieri replied that the air conditioning units would face north.

Ms. Capone then said that she agreed with Mr. Lumbis that because of the potential for summary item number two to affect the size of the building and the site layout, the Planning Board should see the application again so that it recommends the same site plan that the City Council considers.

Ms. Capone then withdrew her previous motion from consideration. Mr. Babcock also withdrew his second of the motion..

Ms. Fields then moved to table the application submitted by Michael Altieri, P.E. of BCA Architects & Engineers on behalf of Sundus and Sarah, LLC to construct an 11,532 SF mixed-use building, a 28-space parking lot and associated site improvements at 1348, 1352 and 1356 Washington Street, Parcel Numbers 14-21-106.000, 14-21-107.000, and 14-21-108.000.

Mr. Altieri then asked if moving the building line in would truly represent a significant change to the site plan. Ms. Fields replied that there were too many 'what ifs.' Ms. Capone then told Mr. Altieri that he would not need to discuss all of the items again, only the layout concerns.

Mr. Babcock then seconded the motion to table and all voted in favor.

Ms. Capone then told Mr. Altieri that she thought he would be able to come back with a revised version of the site plan that the Planning Board would be able to vote on. Mr. Lumbis added that Staff would evaluate the revised plans and eliminate any summary items that would no longer be necessary.

Mr. Katzman then moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Fields seconded the motion and all voted in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 4:44 p.m.