



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 2, 2016

PRESENT:

Larry Coburn, Chairperson
Linda Fields
Neil Katzman
Anthony Neddo
Steve Rowell

ABSENT:

Michelle Capone

ALSO:

Michael A. Lumbis, Planning & Community
Development Director
Jennifer Voss, Senior Planner
Geoffrey Urda, Planner
Jeffrey Polkowski, Planner
Justin Wood, City Engineer
Dale Herman, Fire Chief

The August 2, 2016 Planning Board Meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m. by Planning Board Chair Larry Coburn. Mr. Coburn called for a reading of the Minutes from the July 14, 2016 Planning Board Meeting. Ms. Fields made a motion to accept the minutes as written. Mr. Katzman seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

SUBDIVISION APPROVAL

**218 STONE STREET, 123 MASSEY STREET SOUTH, 253 and 271 ARSENAL STREET
– PARCELS 7-16-114.000, 10-02-113.000, 10-02-118.000 and 10-02-116.000**

The Planning Board then considered a request submitted by Catherine Keib Johnson of COR Development for a three-lot subdivision of 218 Stone Street, Parcel Number 7-16-114.000; and two-lot subdivisions of 123 Massey Street South, Parcel Number 10-02-113.000; 253 Arsenal Street, Parcel Number 10-02-118.000 and 271 Arsenal Street, Parcel Number 10-02-116.000, and a subsequent series of assemblages into two resultant parcels.

Ms. Johnson was in attendance to represent the request.

Ms. Johnson began by saying that COR sought Subdivision Approval for the adjacent property owned by St. Patrick's Parish as well as its own property. She said that COR wanted to reconfigure the lots, and that COR and St. Patrick's would both own the same amount of land when the subdivisions and assemblages were finished as they each do presently. She added that this would allow St. Patrick's to have a site that makes more sense for them and COR would get to develop the frontage on Arsenal Street and provide all its parking internally. She then identified the proposed resultant parcels on a map.

She said that it would create a nice city block, with buildings lining the streets and parking behind them. She then added that the site plan with which this request was associated had already been to the County Planning Board, and that there should be no issues with the subdivision.

Mr. Coburn asked if anyone was in attendance on behalf of St Patrick's. Ms. Johnson replied that Deacon Kevin Mastellon was present. Mr. Coburn then stated that a Public Hearing was required for the subdivision. He then called the Public Hearing to order at 3:05 p.m. He began by reading the legal notice that had been published in the *Watertown Daily Times*. Mr. Coburn then asked for public comments on the request. Hearing no comments, Mr. Coburn closed the Public Hearing at 3:06 p.m.

Mr. Coburn asked if any members of the Planning Board had further comments. Ms. Fields and Mr. Neddo replied that the Planning Board would have to answer all of the questions on Part 2 of the SEQR Full Environmental Assessment Form. The Planning Board considered each question one-by-one and answered no to all of them.

Ms. Fields then made a motion to issue a Negative Declaration for the proposed subdivision according to the requirements of SEQRA. Mr. Neddo seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

Ms. Fields then moved to approve the request submitted by Catherine Keib Johnson of COR Development for a three-lot subdivision of 218 Stone Street, Parcel Number 7-16-114.000; and two-lot subdivisions of 123 Massey Street South, Parcel Number 10-02-113.000; 253 Arsenal Street, Parcel Number 10-02-118.000 and 271 Arsenal Street, Parcel Number 10-02-116.000, and a subsequent series of assemblages into two resultant parcels, contingent upon the following:

1. The applicant and St. Patrick's Parish shall assemble all newly created parcels as proposed to create the two resultant parcels described in the application by way of new metes and bounds descriptions that are filed with the County Clerk.

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

SITE PLAN APPROVAL

218 STONE STREET, 123 MASSEY STREET SOUTH, 253 and 271 ARSENAL STREET – PARCELS 7-16-114.000, 10-02-113.000, 10-02-118.000 and 10-02-116.000

The Planning Board then considered a tabled request for Site Plan Approval submitted by Andrew M. Hart, RLA, ASLA, of Bergmann Associates Inc. on behalf of COR Arsenal Street Company, LLC for the construction of three 3-story, 36,402 square-foot residential buildings, two 2-story, 17,000 square-foot office buildings, a 5,588 square-foot community center, an interior parking lot and associated site improvements at 218 Stone Street, Parcel Number 7-16-114.000; 123 Massey Street South, Parcel Number 10-02-113.000; 253 Arsenal Street, Parcel Number 10-02-118.000 and 271 Arsenal Street, Parcel Number 10-02-116.000.

Mr. Hart and Ms. Johnson were in attendance to represent the project, as was Amy Dake of SRF & Associates.

Ms. Johnson began by saying that she was just going to give the Planning Board an update from the June meeting, and that Mr. Hart and Ms. Dake would handle any technical questions.

Ms. Johnson said that her team had applied for and obtained setback variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals. She then drew the Planning Board's attention to the site plan and pointed out that the proposed office buildings on Arsenal Street were 10 feet off the property line instead of 20 feet, that the two proposed residential buildings on Stone Street were also 10 feet off the property line instead of 20 feet, and that the proposed residential building on Massey Street S was 10.5 feet off the property line instead of 20 feet.

Ms. Johnson said that her team had compromised with the City to arrive at these setbacks, and that they had reduced the size of the office buildings slightly because they needed to reduce parking.

Ms. Johnson then said that SRF & Associates had completed a traffic study since their previous appearance before the Planning Board. She added that they submitted a revised version of the study on the previous day that corrected an error regarding traffic signal timing, and submitted a revised site plan on the previous day as well as a result. She then said that the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) had sent COR a letter stating that the proposed project would have no adverse impact on historic resources.

Ms. Johnson then drew the Planning Board's attention back to the site plan, and pointed out that as a result of the traffic study, the proposed driveway connecting to Arsenal Street was now a right-in/right-out only, and was no longer full access. She noted that the other four driveways would still provide full access.

Ms. Johnson then said that the site plan, as proposed, still met the parking requirement for both individual properties. She said that the church had enough parking on its own, as did the proposed offices and residential buildings, and added that there would be reciprocal parking easements executed so the all three uses could share the interior parking lot.

Ms. Johnson then said that the proposed site plan had gone before the County Planning Board and they determined that the project was of local concern only. She then asked if any members of the Planning Board wanted to talk about engineering issues and said that Mr. Hart could answer their questions.

Mr. Coburn asked what the issues were with traffic light timing. Ms. Johnson deferred the question to Ms. Dake, who replied that when SRF performed the traffic study, one of their technicians was observing the light at the intersection of Arsenal and Massey Streets. She said that on Massey Street, only northbound or southbound traffic can go through the intersection at any given time. She said that the observation team had mistakenly assumed that both directions went at the same time, because that is how it works in other places, and then said that Mr. Wood pointed out to SRF that they had that wrong. She added that in the initial

analysis, the traffic study rated the level of service as an F for northbound left turns, and now rated it as a D.

Mr. Coburn then asked about the potential for converting Stone Street from one-way westbound traffic to a two-way street. Mr. Wood replied that there had been passing remarks from various City Council members over the years, most recently from previous Councilwoman Roxanne Burns. Mr. Wood added that he does not anticipate a one-way to two-way conversion any time soon, but the possibility remains open.

Mr. Coburn asked if the City had jurisdiction over such decisions. Mr. Wood answered in the affirmative. Ms. Fields then noted that the Planning Board brought it up at the previous meeting. Mr. Wood said that Stone Street being a one-way street might help it serve its function of providing a route for westbound traffic to use to access the Mercy site. Mr. Wood added that he thought that two-way traffic on Stone Street was an independent discussion for another time.

Mr. Rowell then asked if both driveways on Massey Street S remained in and out. Ms. Dake replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Coburn then asked Mr. Herman if he could speak to the Fire Department's concerns. Mr. Herman replied that his primary concern was the configuration of internal curb islands. He said that Mr. Wood had forwarded him an email from Mr. Hart, which said that the movements depicted on the site plan were not where a fire truck's tires would go over a curb, but where the edge of the vehicle would go over the curb. Mr. Herman then said that this was still a concern, because of potential snow accumulation on the curb islands during the winter.

Mr. Herman then said that the other issue he needed to raise was that the bucket on a City fire truck is eight feet in front of the cab, and that because of this, the site plan should be conscious of poles or trees in the bucket's swing radius.

Mr. Neddo then said that this segued into Summary Item 1, which dealt with fire truck movements. Mr. Coburn asked Ms. Johnson if she would like to go through the summary items, noting that items 2, 3 and 5 need no longer apply, and she replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Johnson then addressed the first summary item, which required unobstructed fire truck access into and throughout the site. Ms. Johnson said that she thought her team had fixed this concern, since they did make some changes. She asked if the Planning Board could recommend Site Plan Approval with conditions, as long as COR worked out those concerns with Staff. Mr. Coburn replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Johnson then addressed the fourth summary item, which required New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) approval of the traffic study, and said that Mr. Wood told her that he anticipated receiving such communication from NYSDOT in the near future. Mr. Wood then said that he had spoken with someone at NYSDOT, and that he expected NYSDOT would provide the City with a letter of No Concern. Mr. Wood then added that the Planning Board could eliminate the fourth summary item.

Mr. Hart then addressed the sixth summary item, which required the applicant to perform a hydrant flow test and submit hydraulic calculations to the City Engineering Department. Mr. Hart said that he had been working with the City Water Department, that his team had hydrant flow data at two locations on the site, and that the Water Department told him that two existing taps provide a loop through the site. Mr. Hart then said that COR would provide a water system through the middle of the site and that they just received updated flow test data earlier in the day. Mr. Hart said that there was plenty of water for the site.

Mr. Hart then addressed the seventh summary item, which required the applicant to provide correspondence from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) approving of the proposed sanitary sewer design. Mr. Hart said that he had submitted the design to the DEC, but had not received a response yet.

Mr. Hart then addressed the ninth summary item, which required the applicant to provide correspondence from the New York State Department of Health (DOH) approving the proposed water system design. Mr. Hart said that the DOH asked him for a sanitary sewer profile and that he had sent them one, but he had not received a response yet.

Mr. Hart then addressed the eighth summary item, which required the applicant to submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to the DEC and forward the acknowledgement letter to the City upon receipt. Mr. Hart said that he did not intend to submit the NOI until the City no longer had any comments on the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.

Mr. Hart then addressed the tenth summary item, which required the applicant to address all concerns listed in the "Other Engineering Comments" section of Staff's memorandum. Mr. Hart then addressed these concerns one-by-one. He said that his team would use a regular sanitary manhole in lieu of a doghouse manhole on Sherman Street. He said that they would also work to confirm the existing manhole construction materials, verify conformance to Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines and depict new curbing all along the Arsenal Street side on the site plan.

Mr. Hart then addressed the eleventh and final summary item, which listed the permits that the applicant would need to obtain, and said that COR and Bergmann understand the permitting process and would obtain all necessary permits.

Mr. Coburn then asked if any Planning Board members had further questions. Hearing none, he asked if there was a motion.

Mr. Neddo then moved to recommend that City Council approve the request for Site Plan Approval submitted by Andrew M. Hart, RLA, ASLA, of Bergmann Associates Inc. on behalf of COR Arsenal Street Company, LLC for the construction of three 3-story, 36,402 square-foot residential buildings, two 2-story, 17,000 square-foot office buildings, a 5,588 square-foot community center, an interior parking lot and associated site improvements at 218 Stone Street, Parcel Number 7-16-114.000; 123 Massey Street South, Parcel Number 10-02-113.000; 253 Arsenal Street, Parcel Number 10-02-118.000 and 271 Arsenal Street, Parcel Number 10-02-116.000, as shown on plans submitted to the City Engineering Department on August 1, 2016 contingent upon the following:

1. The applicant must allow for unobstructed fire truck movement into and throughout the site, either by removing all curbs from a fire truck's path or by installing curbs with low enough heights as to be unobstructive.
2. The applicant shall perform a hydrant flow test and submit hydraulic calculations to the City Engineering Department.
3. The applicant shall provide the City Engineering Department with correspondence from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) that either approves the proposed sanitary sewer design or indicates that the DEC determined that a review was not necessary.
4. The applicant shall submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to the DEC and forward the acknowledgement letter to the City upon receipt.
5. The applicant shall provide the City Engineering Department with correspondence from the New York State Department of Health (DOH) that either approves the proposed water system design or indicates that the DOH determined that a review was not necessary.
6. The applicant must address all concerns listed in the "Other Engineering Comments" section of the July 28, 2016 Planning Office memorandum to the satisfaction of the City Engineering Department prior to the issuance of any permits.
7. The applicant must obtain the following permits, minimally, prior to demolition and construction: Building Permit, Fence Permit and General City Permit and a Sanitary/Storm Sewer Connection Permit.

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

**SITE PLAN APPROVAL
1340 WASHINGTON STREET and 115 BROOK DRIVE –
PARCELS 14-21-102.100 and 14-21-131.000**

The Planning Board then considered a request for Site Plan Approval submitted by Michael Altieri, P.E. of Bernier, Carr & Associates on behalf of Dr. Abdul Latif of Sundus and Sarah, LLC for the construction of an 11-space, 4,000 square-foot parking lot and associated site improvements located at 1340 Washington Street and 115 Brook Drive, Parcel Number 14-21-102.100 and 14-21-131.000.

Mr. Coburn stated for the record that he worked for Bernier, Carr & Associates, but had no professional or personal interest in this matter.

Mr. Altieri and Brett McBoy of Bernier, Carr & Associates were in attendance to represent the project.

Mr. Altieri began by saying that this project was at the corner of Washington Street and Brook Drive, adjacent to the existing North Country Neurology building, with the Tops grocery store across Brook Drive and the Watertown High School campus across Washington Street.

Mr. Altieri said that the property at 115 Brook Drive had recently undergone a zone change from Residence A to Limited Business, and the previous residential structure on the property has been torn down. He then described the existing conditions on the site.

Mr. Altieri then drew the Planning Board's attention to the site plan and pointed out the proposed parking lot, the majority of which was on a the pie-shaped parcel that he identified as 115 Brook Drive. He said that the property owner intended this proposed parking lot to be for employee use. Mr. Altieri then pointed out where the proposed parking lot would connect to the existing parking area. He added that the proposed parking lot was shaped very carefully to meet zoning and setback requirements while still providing a workable parking space layout.

Mr. Altieri then drew the Planning Board's attention to the side of the parcel that bordered a residential zoning district, where proposed landscaping would run along the existing stockade fence. He said that proposed additional trees would supplement existing trees and that another landscaped strip would separate employee parking from patient parking.

Mr. Altieri then said that to provide suitable drainage, they proposed to grade the site to collect stormwater in a swale and pipe it out to an existing catch basin. Mr. Altieri then identified a stretch of sidewalk on the Brook Drive side that was in poor condition and subsequently targeted for replacement as part of the project. He then asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Katzman then asked if the storm drain could handle additional stormwater. Mr. Altieri replied that drainage capacity was the subject of one of the summary items on Staff's memorandum, and added that his team had not done any hard engineering modeling yet.

Mr. Katzman then said that he recalled a concern related to a catch basin and drainage the last time that the property owners improved their lot. Mr. Wood replied that the applicant needed a swale because the site directs drainage poorly due to a lack of elevation. Mr. Wood added that there were no concerns about capacity stemming from this proposed site plan. Mr. Altieri then referred to the site plan and described how they intended to direct stormwater into the proposed swale.

Mr. Coburn then asked Mr. Altieri if he would like to go through the summary items, and Mr. Altieri replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Altieri then addressed the first summary item, which required the applicant to clarify plans for site lighting and ensure adequate light levels. Mr. Altieri said that the proposed solar light fixture depicted on the site plan would illuminate the new parking lot on its own. He added that all the other existing lights would remain as they are and this new fixture would only serve the new employee lot.

Mr. Altieri then addressed the second summary item, which required the applicant to provide drainage calculations to the City, which Mr. Altieri said he would do.

Mr. Altieri then addressed the third summary item, which required the applicant to verify sizes and locations of sanitary and storm sewers. Mr. Altieri acknowledged the discrepancy between the utilities depicted on the 2012 site plan for the property and their depiction on this submission. He then said that his team would investigate and clarify the discrepancy.

Mr. Altieri then addressed the fourth summary item, which required the applicant to assemble the two parcels across which the site plan occurs. Mr. Altieri said that he would assemble them and file a new deed with the county.

Mr. Altieri then addressed the fifth summary item, which required that the applicant provide a stamped and signed boundary and topographic survey. Mr. Altieri said that his team would provide one.

Mr. Altieri then addressed the sixth summary item, which required the applicant to identify the zoning districts of neighboring parcels on the site plan. Mr. Altieri said he would make this modification to the site plan.

Mr. Altieri then addressed the seventh and final summary item, which listed the permits that the applicant would need to obtain. Mr. Altieri said that he would obtain all necessary permits.

Mr. Polkowski then said that the second condition also required the applicant to clean out the catch basin adjacent to the existing driveway from Brook Drive, as it is currently full of debris. Mr. Altieri said that Bernier, Carr & Associates would oversee removal of all debris from the catch basin.

Mr. Lumbis then said that the Planning Board could eliminate the first summary item prior to voting, and explained that the concern was over what would happen to light levels if the applicant removed the light pole, but since it would remain, then it was fine.

Ms. Fields then moved to recommend that City Council approve the request for Site Plan Approval submitted by Michael Altieri, P.E. of Bernier, Carr & Associates on behalf of Dr. Abdul Latif of Sundus and Sarah, LLC for the construction of an 11-space, 4,000 square-foot parking lot and associated site improvements located at 1340 Washington Street and 115 Brook Drive, Parcel Number 14-21-102.100 and 14-21-131.000, contingent upon the following:

1. The applicant must provide drainage calculations and maps and the catch basin located west of the entrance to the existing parking shall be cleaned of all debris.
2. The applicant shall investigate and verify the true location and sizes of the sanitary and storm sewer utilities on the 1340 Washington Street property as they are displayed differently than on the submitted expansion plans from 2012.

3. The applicant shall assemble parcels 14-21-102.100 and 14-21-131.000 by way of a new metes and bounds description that is filed with the County Clerk, and that describes the entire property as a single parcel.
4. The applicant must provide at least one original stamped and signed boundary and topographic survey of both parcels that includes all utilities within the street and project area.
5. The site plan shall be modified to show the zoning districts of neighboring properties.
6. The applicant must obtain the following permits prior to construction: Storm Sewer Permit, General City Permit, and a Fence Permit.

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

**SITE PLAN APPROVAL
1425 WASHINGTON STREET – PARCEL NUMBER 13-22-101.000**

The Planning Board then considered a request submitted by Matthew R. Morgia, P.E. of Aubertine and Currier, PLLC on behalf of the Sisters of Saint Joseph for the construction of a 2,730 square-foot infirmary addition, a 633 foot-long, 20-foot wide emergency access drive and associated site improvements located at 1425 Washington Street, Parcel Number 13-22-101.000.

Mr. Morgia and Sister Mary Eamon were in attendance to represent the project.

Mr. Morgia began by saying that his team had received Staff's initial review comments and had prepared some draft responses. He then distributed written copies of the draft responses, and copies of a revised site plan, to the Planning Board and to Staff.

Mr. Morgia then said that the Sisters of St. Joseph were planning some renovations to the infirmary part of their building. He noted that with the proposed dimensions, City Code would require emergency access to the rear of the building and therefore the site plan depicted an emergency access drive around the north side of the building. He then pointed out proposed lighting on the site plan along that access drive.

Mr. Morgia then addressed water service needs. He said that the existing building was un-sprinklered at this time, and added that the proposed addition needed to be sprinklered. He said that the existing water system on Washington Street consisted of a 12-inch main on the opposite side of the street and a six-inch main on the near side of the street.

Mr. Morgia then said that he would like to begin discussing the summary items if that was all right with the Planning Board. Mr. Coburn agreed, and Mr. Morgia addressed the first summary item, which required the applicant to meet the parking requirement in the Zoning Ordinance and provide 58 parking spaces, rather than the originally proposed 42.

Mr. Morgia said that the existing building and proposed addition would result in 72 rooms, although planned interior renovations would reduce that number in the future. He said that rather than seek a variance to reduce the parking requirement, which would have taken too much time, his team had revised the site plan to provide 58 parking spaces, which he then pointed out in various places on the site plan.

Mr. Katzman then said that just because the convent had so many rooms, that did not mean that an equivalent number of occupants owned cars. Mr. Morgia replied that the facility was greatly underutilized as far as beds went, and said that even though there were 72 rooms, only 48 people lived there, and that Sister Mary Eamon told him that half of them do not drive. Mr. Morgia then said that the requirement was what it was, however.

Mr. Morgia said that planned interior renovations would aim to reduce the facility to 50 rooms. He then said that the convent realistically would not need more parking, but that the project could not spare two months to seek a variance. He then said that the required parking expansion would likely end up as snow storage in the winter, and added that occasionally, the Sisters of St. Joseph's have used the lawn as overflow parking for special events in the past, so the added parking would have some utility.

Mr. Morgia then addressed the second summary item, which required that each accessible parking space have an adjacent eight-foot wide loading zone, in accordance with New York State Building Code. Mr. Morgia then pointed out reconfigured accessible spaces on the site plan that met this requirement.

Mr. Morgia then addressed the third summary item, which required the applicant to submit a Vehicle and Pedestrian Circulation Plan that depicts the movements of a City fire truck through the site. Mr. Morgia then said that he had created the plan and given it to Mr. Wood earlier during the Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Morgia then addressed the fourth summary item, which required the applicant to provide sufficient access to water at the rear of the site for the Fire Department to fight a fire in the proposed addition. Mr. Morgia said that his team would provide a new water line, with fire hydrants in the front and the rear of the building. He then said that this fire line would also feed a new sprinkler system in the proposed addition.

Mr. Morgia then addressed the fifth summary item, which required the applicant to investigate the necessity of, and potential locations for, Knox Boxes. Mr. Morgia said that his team would coordinate with the City Code Enforcement Bureau on this.

Mr. Morgia then addressed the sixth summary item, which required that the entire site meet all requirements of the International Building Code that New York State recently adopted. Mr. Morgia said that all architectural plans would meet IBC requirements.

Mr. Morgia then addressed the seventh summary item, which required the applicant to provide letters from SHPO and the DEC that determine any respective potential impacts to historic resources and/or endangered species. Mr. Morgia said that he had received a

letter from SHPO and given a copy to Mr. Wood, but that he had not yet received a response from the DEC.

Mr. Morgia then addressed the eighth summary item, which required the applicant to prepare a SWPPP and submit it to the City. Mr. Morgia acknowledged that the project involved the disturbance of greater than an acre, and said that his team would prepare and submit a SWPPP.

Mr. Morgia then addressed the ninth summary item, which required the applicant to prepare an NOI and submit it to the DEC. Mr. Morgia said that his team would submit an NOI and forward all correspondence with the DEC to the City.

Mr. Morgia then addressed the tenth summary item, which required the applicant to provide an original plan set and engineering report stamped by a licensed Professional Engineer. Mr. Morgia said that he would submit a stamped set to the City once his team finished making the modifications that the summary items necessitated.

Mr. Morgia then addressed the eleventh and final summary item, which stated that the applicant would need to obtain a building permit prior to construction. Mr. Morgia said that he would obtain the necessary permit.

Ms. Fields then asked if this project would have any impact on the animal hospital next door, which was just beginning work on an expansion of its own. Mr. Morgia replied that it should not affect the animal hospital. He said that he did the design for the animal hospital and their improvements were on the opposite side of their lot from the convent. He then said that the Sisters of St. Joseph would approach the animal hospital with a courtesy update, just as the animal hospital had done when they planned their own expansion.

Ms. Fields then moved to recommend that the City Council approve the request for Site Plan Approval submitted by Matthew R. Morgia, P.E. of Aubertine and Currier, PLLC on behalf of the Sisters of Saint Joseph for the construction of a 2,730 square-foot infirmary addition, a 633 foot-long, 20-foot wide emergency access drive and associated site improvements located at 1425 Washington Street, Parcel Number 13-22-101.000, as shown on the plans submitted to the City Engineering Department on August 2, 2016, contingent upon the following:

1. The applicant must provide sufficient access to water at the rear of the site for the Fire Department to fight a fire in the proposed addition.
2. The applicant must coordinate with the Fire Department regarding necessity of and locations for Knox Boxes.
3. The entire site must meet all requirements of the International Building Code that New York State recently adopted.

4. The applicant shall provide a letter from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation that determines whether the proposed project has the potential to affect any endangered species or their habitats.
5. The applicant shall prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and submit it to the City.
6. The applicant shall submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) and forward all correspondence between the applicant and the DEC to the City Engineering Department.
7. The applicant shall provide an original plan set and engineering report stamped by a licensed Professional Engineer.
8. The applicant must obtain a Building Permit prior to demolition and construction.

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

Mr. Katzman then moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Neddo seconded the motion and all voted in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.