



CITY OF WATERTOWN, NEW YORK

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

ROOM 305, WATERTOWN CITY HALL

245 WASHINGTON STREET

WATERTOWN, NEW YORK 13601-3380

(315) 785-7741

MEETING: June 9, 2026

PRESENT:

Michelle Capone, Chair

Scott Garrabrant

Lynn Godek

Maryellen Blevins

Peter Monaco

ALSO:

Michael A. Lumbis, Planning and

Community Development Director

Geoffrey T. Urda, Senior Planner

Joseph Albinus, Planner

Kerinne O'Donnell, Secretary

Angela Gorman, Secretary

ABSENT:

Linda Fields

Planning Commission Chairperson, Michelle Capone, called the June 9, 2026, Planning Commission meeting to order at 5:17 p.m. Ms. Capone asked for a motion regarding the minutes of the April 6, 2026, meeting. Maryellen Blevins made a motion to accept the minutes as written. Peter Monaco seconded the motion, and all voted in favor. Ms. Blevins brought up a correction for the minutes of March 3, 2026, and made a motion to amend the minutes on page 3, paragraph 5, in the second sentence. Peter Monaco seconded the motion, and all voted in favor.

SUBDIVISION FINAL PLAT APPROVAL – TWO-LOT SUBDIVISION OF 424 VANDUZEE STREET, PARCEL NUMBER 1-18-102.000

The Planning Commission then considered a request submitted by Walldroff Properties LLC for a two-lot subdivision of 424 Vanduzee Street, Parcel Number 1-18-102. 000., Thomas H. Ross of Storino Geomatics attended on behalf of Adam Storino, PLS of Storino Geomatics

Mr. Ross stated that the request was a simple two-lot subdivision where Parcel One will be a 0.76-acre lot of City owned property being purchased by Walldroff Properties that will be assembled with the adjacent parcel at 444 VanDuzee St. that is home to Jade Stone Engineering. Mr. Ross provided a property description and complete survey of the entire 8.8-acre lot completed by Storino Geomatics for the City. Mr. Urda stated that staff approved of the suggested description.

Mr. Monaco expressed concern about the cost of the survey of the entire lot. Mr. Lumbis stated that obtaining subdivision approval and thus obtaining a survey was a condition of the sale of the city owned property. Ms. Capone advised this discussion was to address the subdivision only.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

PUBLIC HEARING #1 - SUBDIVISION FINAL PLAT APPROVAL FOR A TWO LOT SUBDIVISION OF 424 VANDUZEE STREET, PARCEL NUMBER 1-18-102.000

PUBLIC HEARING #2 – SUBDIVISION FINAL PLAT APPROVAL FOR A TWO LOT SUBDIVISION OF 430 STATE STREET, PARCEL NUMBER 12-03-220.200

PUBLIC HEARING #3 SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ESTABLISH A DRIVE THRU AT 430 STATE STREET, PARCEL NUMBER 12-03-220.20, AND 440 STATE STREET, PARCEL NUMBER 12-03-220.300.

Ms. Capone read aloud the legal notice for the above Public Hearings that had been published in the *Watertown Daily Times*. She called to order and opened each of the Public Hearings at 5:20 p.m. Hearing no comments, she then closed each of the Public Hearings at 5:23 p.m.

**CONTINUATION OF
SUBDIVISION FINAL PLAT APPROVAL – TWO-LOT SUBDIVISION
OF 424 VANDUZEE STREET, PARCEL NUMBER 1-18-102.000**

Ms. Capone then continued the review and discussion of the 424 Vanduzee Street Subdivision application. She informed the Planning Commission that City Council, as part of the Zone Change approval for this parcel, completed the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) process. The SEQR review considered the “whole action” being contemplated at this site including the sale of the property, the subsequent Subdivision, Zone Change and the upcoming Site Plan Approval application.

She then stated that this was a Coordinated Review and the City Council acted as the Lead Agency. On March 2, 2026, the City Council considered Part 2 of the Short Environmental Assessment and adopted a Resolution finding that the proposed action would not have a significant impact on the environment. She noted that since the environmental review process has been completed, there is no additional SEQR action needed from the Planning Commission.

Ms. Capone offered an opportunity for additional comments at which time no one replied, and she asked for a motion.

Mr. Lumbis noted that since the applicant had submitted the suggested description and Subdivision drawing, the Planning Commission could eliminate Summary Item #2. Ms. Blevins then made a motion to grant Subdivision Final Plat Approval for the request submitted by Adam Storino, PLS of Storino Geomatics for a two-lot subdivision of 424 Vanduzee Street, Parcel Number 1-18-102.000, contingent upon the following:

1. The applicant shall assemble the 0.76-acre northern section with Parcel Number 1-18-103.001 located at 444 Vanduzee Street into a single parcel, by way of a new metes and bounds description that is filed with the Jefferson County Clerk.

Mrs. Godek seconded the motion, and all voted in favor.

ZONE CHANGE- 647 FLOWER STREET, PARCEL NUMBER 4-19-101.000

The Planning Commission then considered a request submitted by Scott Phelps General Contracting, LLC to change the approved Zoning Classification of 647 Flower Street, Parcel Number 4-19-101.000 from Residential to Industrial. Scott Phelps attended to represent the request.

Ms. Capone asked the applicant if there was previously a building located on the property. Mr. Urda advised that there is a building on it now, and that the Zone Change would facilitate a future Site Plan Approval where the applicant would have an expandable footprint. Mr. Monaco recalled that the neighborhood was previously zoned Industrial. Mr. Urda replied that the entire neighborhood was zoned Residential as part of the 2023 zoning re-write. Ms. Capone asked if someone was there to speak on the Zone Change.

Mr. Phelps began by identifying himself as the owner of 647 Flower Street and said that he would like to construct an addition to the existing structure to gain covered storage for his construction company. He advised that when he purchased the property over a decade ago, it was zoned industrial. Mr. Monaco asked if Residential zoning was the best use of the land in this neighborhood.

Mr. Urda explained that Staff and the City's consultants looked at the entire City, parcel-by-parcel, and believed the most forward-looking use was to develop the remaining vacant land with residential uses. Mr. Monaco asked if there was City water provided to Flower Street. Mr. Phelps replied that there was water provided but stated that he did not think that it was City water service.

Mr. Lumbis advised that over the years, the residential homes in this area were unable to expand or even add on a deck due to the previous Industrial zoning, as it would have been an expansion of a nonconforming use, which is not allowed. He said that since most of the existing land uses in this neighborhood were residential in nature, Staff made the decision to zone it Residential. Mr. Urda continued to reinforce that the updated zoning allowed a for homeowners to expand without a difficult process.

Mrs. Capone then stated that it appeared that the Zone Change request was in harmony with the Comprehensive Plan. She stated that since the Planning Commission was just making a recommendation on this request, they do not have to complete the SEQR form. She then asked for a motion to make a recommendation to City Council.

Ms. Godek then made a motion to recommend that the City Council approve the Zone Change request submitted by Scott Phelps General Contracting, LLC to change the approved Zoning Classification of 647 Flower Street, Parcel Number 4-19-101.000 from Residential to Industrial, Mrs. Blevins seconded the motion, and all voted in favor.

SITE PLAN APPROVAL 111 BREEN AVE, PARCEL NUMBER 8-01-214.000, AND 710 ARSENAL STREET, PARCEL NUMBER 8-01-219.001

The Planning Commission then considered a request for site plan approval submitted by Thomas H. Ross of Storino Geomatics, PLLC on behalf of Puccia Olive Oil Company, LLC, and The Marcy Spa & Salon Inc. for the construction of a 10-space parking lot expansion at 111

Breen Avenue Parcel Number 8-01-214.100 and 710 Arsenal Street, Parcel Number 8-01-219.001. Mr. Ross attended to represent the request.

Mr. Ross said that the request would expand parking for two businesses. This agreement between the two businesses would include shared maintenance and parking. The two businesses have heavy traffic at different times of the day, so this would benefit both businesses. He said that the proposed lot is currently vacant.

Mr. Ross noted that this request required two variances. He said that the proposed plan was too tight on each of the property lines to have full landscaping and meet the setbacks of parking from the Right-of-Way.

Addressing the summary items listed in the staff report, Mr. Ross advised that the storm water will be directed to an existing drywell behind Pete's Trattoria restaurant that works well. Mr. Ross also advised there is lighting along the fence which is solar. He said that they would be tracking the lighting and making sure it complies with spillage maximums.

Mr. Ross also mentioned that the existing entrance to Marcy's Spa would be more heavily used and that they would be submitting the plan to the New York State Department of Transportation (DOT) to obtain a Highway Work Permit to improve the driveway throat and make it a full commercial driveway.

Mr. Ross discussed the remaining summary items noting his team did not have any issues with any of them.

Mrs. Capone advised that, with Mr. Ross's comments, the Site Plan appeared to be in harmony with the Comprehensive Plan, and that the Planning Commission would need to complete part two of the SEQR. Mrs. Capone felt that she did not see any reason to hold up approval of this request if the board agreed.

Mr. Urda advised the request still required County review and the Planning Commission cannot act on the application pursuant to General Municipal Law Section 239-m until after the Jefferson County Planning Board reviews it. He noted that Planning Staff would be referring it to Jefferson County for the June 30, 2026, County Planning Board meeting.

Ms. Capone proposed making a contingent approval. Mr. Urda advised that the board could not do so until the County considered the application. Ms. Capone proposed moving forward with part two of the SEQR.

Mr. Lumbis and Mr. Urda proposed that the board wait to complete the SEQR as the drawings will likely change after that applicant addresses the various summary items.

Ms. Capone asked for a motion to table; Ms. Godek made the motion to table the request. Ms. Blevins seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

**SUBDIVISION FINAL PLAT APPROVAL 430 STATE STREET, PARCEL
NUMBER 12-03-220.200**

The Planning Commission then considered a request submitted by Kayla Kibling of Barton & Loguidice, D.P.C. on behalf of 454 State Street NNY, LLC, for a two-lot subdivision of 430 State Street, Parcel number 12-03-220.200.

Ms. Kibling was present to explain their proposal for the Subdivision request. Ms. Kibling talked discussed how the lot would be divided with a lot line adjustment stating that the 0.534-acre lot would be divided in two with a 0.319-acre eastern section that would be assembled with the adjacent parcel at 440 State Street and a 0.215 acre section that would lose its State Street frontage and would require a new Parker Street address. Mr. Urda then stated that the SEQR would need to be completed for the whole action, including the Special Use Permit and Site Plan and not just the Subdivision Approval.

Mr. Monaco and Mrs. Blevins expressed concerns on the traffic in the immediate area of State Street with the addition of a high-volume coffee drive thru.

Mr. Lumbis suggested that the board review the Site Plan application prior to completing the SEQR. Mr. Urda added that it should be completed before voting on the Site Plan and the Special Use Permit.

**SPECIAL USE PERMIT AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL
430 STATE STREET, PARCEL NUMBER 12-03-220.200 AND
440 STATE STREET, PARCEL NUMBER 12-03-220.300**

The Planning Commission then considered the request for a Special Use Permit and Site Plan Approval submitted by Kayla Kibling of Barton & Loguidice, D.P.C. on behalf of 454 State Street NNY, LLC to construct a 544 square-foot (SF) coffee shop with an accessory drive-through and associated site improvements at lands that currently comprise **430 State Street**, Parcel Number 12-03-220.200 and **440 State Street**, Parcel Number 12-03-220.300.

Ms. Kibling began by describing the site plan layout, including the walk-up order window, landscaping, dumpster placement, sidewalk, and storage shed. She also said that the plan was to include six parking spaces that would be used for the main coffee shop and an additional seven parking spaces that would be used by both the coffee shop and the neighboring State Street Market. She said there is also snow storage in the rear of the property.

Ms. Kibling outlined the interior and exterior ordering lanes, and the traffic flow for all orders, showing there was a lane for mobile/pick up orders and orders made at the traffic window. She stated that the interior lane can accommodate nine cars safely, and the exterior lane can accommodate fourteen cars safely for a total of twenty-three (23) cars without blocking the egress. Finally, she noted there is an additional outside lane that will allow motorists to pass through without any restriction if they choose during the proposed business hours from 5:30 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Mr. Garrabrant then asked about how the snow storage would be handled on the parcel. Mr. Urda then said that the snow storage is proposed for the site and that the property owner will be responsible for any damaged trees.

Mrs. Capone asked about potential driveway and curb cut improvements. Ms. Kibling said that there are no proposed driveway improvements. Mr. Lumbis said that it was a relatively new curb cut that was constructed as part of the State Street Reconstruction Project that occurred about 20 years ago.

Mrs. Capone then began reviewing the various summary items, briefly discussing Items 1-through-3, and then asked about Summary Item 4, which required the applicant to be prepared to discuss expected peak traffic volumes and vehicular stacking capacity both for cars queuing to place and pick up orders and for cars queuing to exit the site. Mr. Urda stated that the Planning Commission had discussed the lines for picking up, but not for leaving the site.

Mr. Monaco asked if there would be 23 internal spaces for cars. Ms. Kibling stated that there were and the spaces would not block the entrance or exit and that the egress queue could stack five vehicles without blocking internal circulation for each of the lanes. She also reiterated that some parking on the site could be used for State Street Market.

Mrs. Blevins asked if there were alternative entrances and exits. Mr. Urda replied that there was an alternative means of egress on Parker Street.

Ms. Capone then asked if the Planning Commission could remove Summary Item 4. Mr. Urda replied that it could.

Ms. Capone then asked what the hours of operation were. Ms. Kibling stated that the hours would be the same as the jumping goat location, which she said were 5:30 a.m. to 8 p.m. daily. Ms. Capone then said they could remove Summary Item 5, which asked for the hours of operation.

Ms. Capone then asked about Summary Item 6, which required the applicant to submit a revised grading and drainage plan and stormwater calculations to the City Engineering Department in sufficient detail to determine the impact on public facilities. Mr. Compo stated that the applicant had submitted a revised plan and the drainage calculations. He said the calculations showed an 11 percent decrease in site discharge, which was a positive result.

Ms. Capone then said that the Planning Commission could eliminate Summary Item 6 and asked about Summary Item 7, which required the applicant to either relocate the proposed water service connection or prove that there is no conflict with the existing light pole. Mr. Compo stated that the foundation would be removed. Ms. Kibling confirmed that it was just an old foundation and its removal would not affect the sewer connection in any way. The Planning Commission members agreed that they could eliminate Summary Item 7.

Mrs. Capone then moved onto Summary Item 8, which required the applicant to revise the Site Plan to show the installation of two pedestrian crossing signs (11-2 in the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices) on either side of the crosswalk connecting from State Street to the internal sidewalk island, as required by the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) as a condition of Area Variance #616.

Mrs. Capone asked if the signage was like what was in front of Stewart's Shops on Washington Street. Mr. Urda stated that it would not be Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons, stating that it would be the standard yellow diamond showing a pedestrian symbol. Mrs. Capone then said that the Planning Commission would need to keep Summary Item 8 as a condition of approval.

Mrs. Capone then asked about Summary Item 9, which required the applicant to construct all pedestrian accommodations to American Disability Act (ADA) standards, including but not limited to running slope, counter slope and cross slope. She simultaneously asked about Summary Item 10, which required the applicant to add a detectable warning plate on the landing at the northern end of the crosswalk across the pass-thru exit lane where the internal sidewalk crosses the landscaped setback area.

Mr. Urda stated that the main concern with slope was running slope and that the ADA crossings would be at grade with the ground and that the rest of the internal sidewalk would be elevated. Therefore, he said, the applicant would need to chase the concrete to get below the maximum 8.3 percent running slope. He then pointed out the proposed locations of the detectable warning plates.

Mrs. Capone asked if a detectable warning would really be needed. Mr. Urda replied that since it is an active vehicle zone the warning was appropriate.

Mrs. Capone then asked about Summary Item 11, which required the applicant to clarify if and where any interior curbing is proposed. Ms. Kibling then stated that there would be curbing around the building, sidewalk, and along the parking on the east side of the site which is for the State Street Market.

Mrs. Capone then asked if the internal crosswalk needed the signs since it is internal. Mr. Urda stated that the sign requirement did not come from Staff; rather it came from the ZBA.

Ms. Godek stated that she thought that the detectable warning plates should not be required since it is not a signalized crossing.

Mr. Urda clarified that the requirement for 11-2 signs came from the ZBA and the requirement for detectable warning plates came from Staff, and that the Planning Commission cannot override the ZBA, but Planning Commission could override Staff.

Ms. Godek stated that she feared that adding detectable warning plates would make it look and feel like an intersection without it being an intersection. She then asked if they could have it be at level with the sidewalk, so it reads and acts like a continuous pedestrian circulation route. Ms. Kibling then stated that they are currently proposing the sidewalk as a ramp.

Mr. Compo then said that he was not sure they could ask the applicant to add more concrete across a paved surface since it might cause maintenance issues in the future as the two surfaces would move and flex at different rates. He recommended that the Planning Commission not require a concrete sidewalk through the asphalt area.

Ms. Godek then said that she felt they should still omit the detectable warning plates.

Mrs. Capone then asked Ms. Kibling what her thoughts were. Ms. Kibling replied that she would prefer to leave it as asphalt and hopes that the Planning Commission just decides on whether there should be a detectable warning or not.

Mrs. Capone then asked if it would be like the crossing at Stewart's on Washington Street. Mr. Urda then used Google Street View to contrast the sites.

Mrs. Capone then said that the Planning Commission should keep Summary Item 10.

Mr. Lumbis then stated he felt they should talk more about Summary Item 2, which required the applicant to record a cross-access easement in the deed for the expanded 440 State Street parcel and in the deed for 426 State Street (Little Caesars). Mr. Lumbis then stated that there was an easement shown in the survey, but it was still a question as to whether it was still a valid easement.

Mr. Urda said that this Summary Item was necessary because while Jake Johnson owns the whole block currently, if he decided to sell one or more of the parcels to different owners, it could create issues with accessibility. He then stated that having the easements written in the deeds would be for future cases.

Ms. Kibling said that it would be preferred if the easement requirement was a condition of approval. Mrs. Capone then said that while it can be a condition, it would be needed before permits are issued since it could become an issue in the future. Mr. Urda stated that Staff wants to avoid a worst-case scenario of a future 426 State Street owner being able to block off access to 440 State Street.

Mr. Lumbis then stated that the Planning Commission could also remove summary items #1 and #11 as those items have been satisfied or addressed.

The Planning Commission then considered each of the Special Use Permit Review Criteria found in Section 310-116 of the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Capone read each of the criteria and discussed the conclusions that staff had reached and had written in the Staff Report. The Planning Commission generally agreed with the conclusions that were reached by Staff.

Further discussion ensued regarding the crosswalk signage and cross access easement. Mr. Compo requested that the applicant research the easement leading to Parker Street and confirm if it is for egress or ingress.

Ms. Capone then suggested that the Planning Commission move a reworded Summary Item #2 from the Special Use Permit to the to the Subdivision Final Plat Approval.

Hearing no further discussion on the Subdivision, Special Use Permit or Site Plan Approval, Ms. Capone suggested that the Planning Commission complete the SEQR review. The Planning Commission then proceeded to complete Part 2 of the Short EAF.

The Planning Commission determined that a moderate impact may occur when answering Question 2, which asks if the proposed action will result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land, and for when answering Question 5, which asks if the proposed will action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walking.

For each of the other questions, the Planning Commission determined there would be no, or small impact. While they determined that there would be a moderate impact regarding those two items, the Commission felt that they still could issue a Negative Declaration.

Mr. Lumbis said that since they determined that the project would result in a moderate impact regarding Questions 2 and 5, the Planning Commission would need to include an explanation in Part 3 as to why the impact would not be significant.

Ms. Godek said that it was not significant because the site plan provides an appropriate pedestrian facility within the site, clarifying that it was only a moderate impact. The Commission also noted that the change in the intensity of use of land was compared to the existing vacant lot.

Ms. Capone then asked for a motion regarding SEQR. Ms. Godek then moved to issue a Negative Declaration for the proposed Subdivision, Special Use Permit and Site Plan according to the requirements of SEQR. Mr. Garrabrant seconded the motion, and all voted in favor.

Ms. Blevins then made a motion to approve the request submitted by Kayla Kibling of Barton & Loguidice, D.P.C. on behalf of 454 State Street NNY, LLC, for a two-lot subdivision of 430 State Street, Parcel number 12-03-220.200, contingent upon the following:

1. The applicant shall assemble the 0.319-acre eastern section with 440 State Street, Parcel Number 12-03-220.300, by way of a new metes and bounds description that is filed with the Jefferson County Clerk.
2. The applicant shall record a cross-access easement in the deed for the expanded 440 State Street parcel and in the deed for 426 State Street (Little Caesars). The applicant shall also perform research into commons Right-of-Way for ingress/egress along the eastern and southern property lines of 426 State Street and report the findings of that research to the City Planning and Engineering Departments.

Mr. Garrabrant seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

Ms. Blevins made a motion to approve the Special Use Permit and Site Plan for the request submitted by Kayla Kibling of Barton & Loguidice, D.P.C. on behalf of 454 State Street NNY, LLC to construct a 544 square-foot (SF) coffee shop with an accessory drive-through and associated site improvements at lands that currently comprise 430 State Street, Parcel Number 12-03-220.200 and 440 State Street, Parcel Number 12-03-220.300 contingent upon the following:

1. The applicant will have to conform to the 40 percent ground floor, front façade transparency requirement of the UMU District.
2. The applicant shall revise the site plan to show the installation of two pedestrian crossing signs (11-2 in the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices) on either side of the crosswalk connecting from State Street to the internal sidewalk island, as required by the Zoning Board of Appeals as a condition of Variance #616.
3. The applicant shall construct all pedestrian accommodations to the American Disabilities Act (ADA) standards, including but not limited to running slope, counter slope and cross slope.
4. The applicant shall add a detectible warning plate on the landing at the northern end of the crosswalk across the pass-thru exit lane where the internal sidewalk crosses the landscaped setback area.

5. The applicant shall revise the landscaping plan to conform to the requirements of Section 310-83 of the Zoning Ordinance.
6. The applicant shall obtain, minimally, each of the following: Building Permit, General City Permit and a Zoning Compliance Certificate.
7. The applicant shall submit a revised set of drawings that satisfies all summary items for approval of the Planning and Engineering Departments, prior to the issuance of any permits.

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

Mr. Monaco made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Godek Seconded the motion, all voted in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 6:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Angela Gorman, Secretary