

CITY OF AUBURN PLANNING BOARD
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2014 6:30 PM, MEMORIAL CITY HALL

Present: Sam Giangreco, Anne McCarthy, Andy Tehan, Crystal Cosentino

Absent: Tim Baroody, Frank Reginelli

Staff: Stephen Selvek, Senior Planner; Andrew Fusco, Corporation Counsel

Agenda Items: SEQRA Environmental Review for Application of a Major Site Plan at 72 Owasco Street; PUBLIC HEARING: Zoning Amendment to rezone existing real property at 60/62 Van Anden Street.

Items Approved: SEQRA Negative Declaration for 72 Owasco Street and SEQRA Lead Agency for Zoning Amendment to rezone real property 60/62 Van Anden Street.

Applications Denied: None

Applications Tabled: None

Chair calls the meeting to order. The Pledge of Allegiance is recited. Roll is called.

Agenda Item 1: Approval of November 5, 2014 Meeting Minutes.

Chair asks for a motion to approve the minutes of the November 5, 2014 meeting. So moved by Andy Tehan, seconded by Anne McCarthy. All members vote approval. No members opposed. Motion carried.

**Agenda Item 2: SEQRA Environmental Review for Major Site Plan Review of the construction of a 1,160 SF addition to an existing building and site improvements located at 72 Owasco Street.
Applicant: Louise Vasile, D&L Truck Stop**

Chair requests applicant to update the Board on the project.

Michael Palmieri, the applicant's architect, distributes updated drawings to Board members with Design Review Committee (DRC) comments.

Michael Palmieri- The changes made on the site plan in front of you include DRC comments and includes six parking spaces and a buffer between properties, which would be a six foot fence. The existing wooden fence would remain. Traffic flow is proposed come from Owasco to Bradford for truck deliveries.

Louise Vasile, 72 Owasco Street- What I am looking at here is the proposed addition where it curves back onto Bradford Street to Owasco Street does not seem to be a problem. We are going to propose a driveway in a half behind the addition and put in grass and a fence. One thing that concerns me on the proposed plan is the curbing and the sidewalk all around the existing property.

Stephen Selvek- The Plan shows that there is sidewalk along the Bradford side but there is not proposed sidewalk along Owasco Street side.

Louise Vasile- That means where the pumps are there would be curbing and sidewalk. Is that the proposal?

Stephen Selvek- As shown on the plan the only new curbing is directly on the side of the building itself. The proposal will not change the traffic patterns that you have on the front side of the building. The difference there would be the addition of the sidewalk that will connect to the existing sidewalk to the east side to the curb cut and curb ramp on the Owasco /Bradford Street side. Ideally, the sidewalk would progress down the Owasco Street side but at this point you are not changing the situation on the Owasco Street side so we felt it was not necessary. However the Board may choose differently. So, as proposed, the sidewalk would continue from the point most east of your property all the way down to the corner or curb pie at that location.

Mike Palmieri- The drawings reflect the comments that were made by the DRC. The sidewalk is a cost and the nature of the business with the amount of traffic is a concern. We are not in total agreement with the sidewalk and would like to discuss it with the Board.

Anne McCarthy asks if the area is blacktop now and if any of it is sidewalk now.

Louise Vasile- It is blacktop. It is a high volume traffic area. The sidewalk stops where 2 Bradford was. The driveway is proposed to be there.

Andrew Fusco- What is staff recommendation on what is done in the area to the far north end where it is labeled deed parcel lines (on the proposed site plan)

Stephen Selvek-That is still up for discussion. That is where the location for entering the store would be. That can be a hardscape area such as concrete. The area between the sidewalk and the curb would need to comply with tree/lawn area.

Louise Vasile- That would be on the Bradford side of the building and would take away roughly four or five parking spaces.

Stephen Selvek- The parking poses a traffic safety issue. There are limited constraints on the site and we would like to address deficiencies and safety hazards on the site. The request simply is to continue the sidewalk from where it exists on Bradford Street, down to the corner where there is an existing cross walk and eliminating parking against the building where people back out on Bradford street. This is staff recommendation. More discussion is needed as staff from engineering and others have not seen this plan. The decision ultimately remains with the Board as to how far they want to go in bring the site up to code compliance. I would like to request from you and your architect, a plan that you are willing to do because if you are going to put things on a plan that you are not going to do, it is difficult to recommend that plan to the Board and have them review it.

Louise Vasile- It is not a matter of not wanting to comply but I would think some of this is grandfathered in and some of this is not related to what we want to do. Last year when we were asked to put green space in along Owasco Street, we went along with it and it really messed with our entrance and exit and we learned to live with it. I have never had an issue with the Bradford Street side.

Stephen Selvek- The site as it is today is grandfathered in. There is not a requirement to change anything on the site as it operates now. What happens is when you want to expand by more than 25% that is what brings it in front of this Board. The Planning Board looks at the site and brings it into compliance with code. The Board has some flexibility with regards to compliance but that depends on how much of the site is impacted. This site is small so any change has the potential to impact the site. My view is to focus on where the impact is but the Board can have the discussion as to where they are at with the sidewalk and bringing it into compliance. If eliminating parking on the Bradford Street side poses significant hardship, the Board can at least consider it.

Anne McCarthy asks if parallel parking can be created (on the side of the building)

Louise Vasile- The spaces in the back would be best suited for employee parking. The parking next to the building is for quick in and out like any other convenience type store. I feel like we are being stressed and cannot operate like we are use to. We know how our customers come in and how traffic flow is in and around the business. Parallel parking may work next to the building and that is something we can look at.

Andrew Fusco- There is a utility pole that may make that difficult. I am wondering if the area where a sidewalk is recommended if a painted crosswalk asphalt area could be put in instead. Cars are constantly in and out of there.

Stephen Selvek- That is an option. This is within the City right of way and is a public sidewalk so I would look to the engineering department for their recommendation.

Mike Palmieri-These drawings are in respect to DRC. They are not all of what we completely agree with but something like a painted asphalt area can be put in there and does make some sense. The parking in front of the building may change the economics on how people come into the building and may create a hardship.

Stephen Selvek- Tonight we are going through the Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) and making a determination on environmental impacts. We have enough information on the proposed development to go through the environmental review.

I suggest the applicant draft a proposal on what the overall intent of the site from the owner's perspective. The plan as shown is not what the owner agrees with. What we may have is a plan that does not address all of the DRC concerns but the concerns and recommendations can be brought to this board and the Board can make the determination. We are going to need a variance for the adjacent use buffer area since it is 60 feet wide adjacent to a residential area. Last week the ZBA authorized the Board to continue with environmental review.

Andy Tehan- The current drawing on the Bradford Street side has street, green space, sidewalk and then the blacktop area and then the parking area? So by adding the green space and the sidewalk this would be eliminating quite a bit of your parking area, which is probably the big issue here.

Louise Vasile- Yes and our accessibility. This could compromise the whole project, over 40 years we have learned to live with a lot of things.

Stephen Selvek- just to clarify, the intent was not to continue the green space in front of the canopy, just the sidewalk. It would be between the curb edge and the sidewalk on the Bradford side to define pedestrian access.

Louise Vasile- at 2 Bradford Street adjacent to 4 Bradford, that sidewalk continues all the way down and can stay with the existing green space.

Anne McCarthy- Where parking is now, what is being suggested?

Stephen Selvek- Parking would not be available there because the edge would be curbed. Parking there now is from the building edge to the street edge. There is not enough room there now. The issue is that it obstructs pedestrian traffic on that area.

Louise Vasile- My strong request is that the Owasco Street side remains the way it is

Anne McCarthy- Questions if Louise wants the curbing on the Bradford Street side.

Louise Vasile- I would like to leave it the way it is but the curbing from the driveway would stay the way it is.

Stephen Selvek- Tonight let's look at the Environmental Impact, continue to refine the drawing and go in front of the ZBA and then this Board in January.

Stephen Selvek reviews the short EAF in the packets and comments that he adjusted the Part I brief description of the project to note that it is an approximate 1,416 sq. ft. addition to the existing commercial building, which is greater than the 50x20 that was initially proposed. Also that the zoning board of appeals would be an involved agency and noted the acreage was just over a half acre.

Generally speaking the impacts are limited to size and scope since we are dealing with an existing building with an ultimately small addition. *Reviews part II of the short EAF* Staff recommends a Negative Declaration.

Chair asks for a motion to adopt the SEQRA Negative Declaration Resolution for 72 Owasco Street. So moved by Crystal Cosentino, seconded by Anne McCarthy. All members vote approval. None opposed. Motion carried.

Stephen Selvek asks the applicants architect to propose a plan that the owner wishes to accomplish in that area and we can review and provide recommendations from DRC and the Board.

Anne McCarthy- questions if there is a sidewalk on Owasco

Stephen Selvek- They installed curbing and green space and now have controlled access into the site.

Crystal Cosentino- Isn't there concern by proposing this addition that you are creating a buffer for increased parking there because where the current structure is, it is much further back. So you have the current building and now you are building a new structure. So now you are going to have 7 vehicles park, running into the store, than backing out onto Bradford and across the street where the drug store and restaurant is, that street is does not come all the way up, it is an odd intersection. So putting the curbing in is a good safety mechanism because it could decrease the amount of cars backing up onto Bradford, decreasing the amount of cars creating challenges.

Stephen Selvek- Adding the 24 ft. of width would allow 2-3 vehicles, depending on how it is laid out.

Louise Vasile- The back of the building is available for parking.

Crystal Cosentino- I am questioning that creating this addition is creating the opportunity for more parking on the side, increasing more people backing out on Bradford which is creating more of a traffic safety issue. That intersection is not the best intersection.

Andrew Fusco-The anchor that anchors the light pole where the new driveway will be located, how difficult is it to have that moved to run west to east to get it out of the way?

Mike Palmieri- I can contact the utility company to see if that is something that can be moved. The proposal right now protects the guide wire with curbing and plants.

Stephen Selvek- It is planted behind the sidewalk to define the edge to guide people away from the guide wire.

Andrew Fusco- Moving the guide wire would give you a couple more feet in space to get in and out of there. Even with the directional signage proposed, if people are coming down Bradford and wanting to go to the carwash they will take advantage of the new driveway.

Louise Vasile- That is something we hope not to happen. We do not want it to be a cut through to Owasco Street.

**Agenda Item 3: PUBLIC HEARING: Zoning Amendment to rezone existing real property at 60/62 Van Anden Street from R-2: Multi Family Residential to C-1: Neighborhood Commercial.
Applicant: Clifford Bond**

Chair opens the Public Hearing.

Amy Bloss, Architect representing Clifford Bond- Distributes drawings to Board members. We are proposing a zoning amendment to change the zoning of 60 Van Anden Street from R2 residential to C-1 commercial as well as the portion of 62 Van Anden Street that is R2 Residential to C-1 commercial. The applicant is also the owner of 58 Van Anden Street, located adjacent to the properties. Mr. Bond wishes to expand his business and a zoning amendment to the two parcels would allow Mr. Bond to have the flexibility to expand. With the current property zoned R2 there are restrictions on the existing buildings.

Andrew Fusco- Is an expansion being contemplated?

Amy Bloss- Yes, an expansion is being contemplated. It started off with the possibility of putting a building on 58 Van Anden Street, which is currently vacant but on review of the zoning of the three parcels we noticed that two (60 & 62 Van Anden St.) parcels were zoned R2 and the one (58 Van Anden St.) was commercial or C1. The setback requirements would not allow us to attach the buildings or even bring the parcels together.

Chair opens the Public Hearing. There being none the chair closes the Public Hearing.

Chair asks for staff comments.

Stephen Selvek- With the proposal there is discussion of an expansion in the future but there is not specific direction around the details as to what might happen in developing these sites so what we are going to do is move forward with this particular request as it is, for the rezoning of these particular parcels. Eight or nine years ago this rezoning came in front of the Planning Board and it was a staff driven request since it was a commercial request on a residentially zoned property. The Planning Board did recommend rezoning the parcels but the staff left shortly after and the request was lost due to staff transition. I thought it was important for the Board to review this again. City Council will ultimately need to approve this. Tonight we will be declaring lead agency for Environmental Review. In January the Board will be able to make a recommendation in regards to the rezoning of these parcels. The recommendation would go to City Council for approval.

Andrew Fusco- Steve, did you have the opportunity to read the minutes from 10 years ago? Was there any opposition?

Stephen Selvek- Yes, I did read the minutes and there was not any opposition at that time.

Both parcels serve an automotive shop, which is an existing use but when zoning lines were drawn in the 90's it was designated residential rather than commercial.

Brings the Board's attention to the short EAF and states that the proposed project is change on paper. Tonight I recommend adopting the SEQRA Lead Agency Resolution. If there are questions please let me know.

Anne McCarthy questions what the 12B question is

Stephen Selvek- The question asks if the area is located in an archeological sensitive area. The NYS SHPO has designated areas that have the potential to be archeological sensitive area. What I will do is send a correspondence out to the SHPO office as an interested agency. There is no public funding with this project but we will send communication to SHPO.

Chair asks the Board for questions.

Chair asks for a motion to adopt the SEQRA Lead Agency Resolution. So moved by Anne McCarthy, seconded by Crystal Cosentino. All members vote approval. None opposed. Motion carried.

Agenda Item 4: Other Matters

Application for Major Site Plan Review for the construction of a 14,000 SF gymnasium located at 17 Clymer Street. Applicant: Tyburn Academy.

Item was not on the agenda. Applicant's representative attended the meeting and presented the opportunity to update the Board on the project.

Chair invites applicant to update Board members on the project.

Mike O'Neill, representing Tyburn Academy- We are prepared to move ahead with the project. We do owe the City a grading plan and drainage plan. Otherwise nothing else has changed on the site plan. We are here to see if there are any recommendations from the Board on the plan.

Stephen Selvek- For clarification last meeting we reviewed the plan and I think we concur that the layout of the plan was adequate and ultimately it is about design details. From a staff standpoint, we are waiting on the items that Mr. O'Neill mentioned.

Chair asks for Board questions. There are none.

Mike O'Neill- We should have the plans in this week.

The date of the next Planning Board meeting is Tuesday, January 6, 2014 at 6:30 pm.

Motion to adjourn made by Crystal Cosentino, Seconded by Andy Tehan. All members vote approval. None opposed. Meeting adjourned.

Respectively submitted by Renee Jensen