



City of Binghamton Planning Department

| SUMMARY OF MINUTES CITY OF BINGHAMTON PLANNING COMMISSION | |
|--|---|
| MEETING DATE: May 7, 2024 | LOCATION: City Council Chambers, City Hall |
| CALLED TO ORDER: 5:15PM | RECORDER OF MINUTES: Shalin Patel |

| ROLL CALL | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---------|
| COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: | PRESENT: | ABSENT: |
| Nicholas Corcoran (chair) | X | |
| Joseph De Angelo | | X |
| Christopher Dziedzic (vice chair) | X | |
| Mario DiFulvio | X | |
| Kyle Nedlik | X | |
| Kelly Weiss | X | |
| Emmanuel Priest | X | |
| STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: | TITLE & DEPARTMENT: | |
| Tito Martinez | Assistant Director, Planning Department | |
| Shalin Patel | Planner, Planning Department | |
| Greg Buell | Zoning Officer, Planning Department | |
| Robert Heary | Corporation Counsel | |
| Juliet Berling | Director, Planning Department | |

| APPROVAL OF MINUTES | | |
|---|-----------------------|---|
| MOTION to approve the April 2, 2024 meeting minutes as written | | |
| FIRST: Dziedzic | SECOND: Nedlik | VOTE: Carried (4-0-3) |
| AYE(S): Dziedzic, Weiss, Nedlik, Priest | NAY(S): | ABSTENTION(S): De Angelo, Corcoran and DiFulvio (not present at April meeting) |

| SEQR DETERMINATIONS | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| ADDRESS: 181, 185, 187 & 205 Clinton St; 2 & 7 Hudson St; 9 Slauson Ave | CASE NUMBER: PC-2024-0007 |
| DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Site Plan Review and special use permit for the construction of a mixed-use structure with 288 dwelling units and ground-floor commercial space, in addition to Ancillary Parking in the C-4 Neighborhood Commercial District and I-2 Light & Medium Industrial District. | |
| APPLICANT: The Metro Group Properties, Inc. | |
| REPRESENTATIVE(S): Robert McKertich (Attorney, Coughlin & Gerhart LLP), Steven Sanyshyn (Project Engineer, Delta Engineers), Dustin Welch (Project Architect, Passero Architects and Engineers) | |
| DISCUSSION POINTS: | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It will not be another student housing complex, it is designed to be housing for the workforce (Teachers, EMTs, fire fighters, police officers, office workers, members of the community, etc.), though there will be some income limitations tied to the AMI (income level of the residents have to be within certain percentage of AMI). This will not be a section 8 housing in respect, will just be restricting the income of the people living there (McKertich). | |

- This developmental project will allow residents of Binghamton to live at, work at, and to shop at.
- [2] 5 story structures along Clinton, Jarvis, and Hudson Streets. Two structures will be connected via a courtyard area, with a grand entrance on Clinton St.
- Total of 288 units with a mixture of 1-, 2-, and 3-bedroom(s) apartments.
- Entire ground floor along Clinton St will be reserved for commercial use; retail space, food services, building management offices.
- It includes an outdoor playground area on the rear of the buildings, indoor fitness center for residents, community room for functions, common laundry area, storage (bicycle storage on site), charging stations, courtyard area, sizeable amount of green space, approximately 300 parking spaces behind the structures for residents and guests.
- The Zoning code allows max coverage area to be 70% in the district the project is located in, you as the Planning Commission are allowed to modify it up to 75%, “we” will be asking you for extra 2% up to 72%, commented by (**McKertich**).
- Applicants will be asking the ZBA for a height variance as well as use of ground floor along Jarvis and Hudson St as residential use (where up to 30’ has to be commercial use).
- There will be 2 main intersections at Jarvis and Clinton St; and at Hudson and Clinton St.
- Intention with architectural elevation was to blend in modern aesthetics with influences of some of the historical building elements and specific architectural styles present in Binghamton.
- There will be no basement level
- Phase 1 building (corner of Clinton and Hudson St) will be built first, while 2nd building will be in phase 2 (Clinton and Jarvis St, U shaped). All of the parking will be likely completed (along with site cleaning, soil remediation) in phase 1 of the project (**Sanyshyn**).
- Two main entrances in/out of the property, one on Jarvis St and 2nd one coming off of Crandall St, which will come through parking lot into back of the property for all the apartment traffic. A separate ingress/egress will be provided for the retail space, which will come out on Clinton St.
- Will not need underground stormwater tanks or any remediation system to treat water, it will be stored above ground at green areas indicated on site plan (**Sanyshyn**).
- **Chair (Corcoran) asked**, when doing the calculation, is the applicant considering the existing site as complete impervious already or is the existing site pervious since there is nothing on the site but 3 years ago it was almost completely paved? And based on it, is the applicant able to get all the storm water into the green spaces?
 - **Representative (Sanyshyn) commented**, some of the stuff has become rubble and turned into something that is permeable, there is still some mix. During last year’s survey, it was found where the contiguous pieces of concrete still remain.
 - There is few more than mentioned green spaces on site, there is a 5’ wide strip in the parking area, etc., most of the water is coming down to the center that will help with treatment of water (4 major areas).
- The project will require approximately 292 parking spaces, which will be provided on site, should not need any off-street parking, **Sanyshyn commented**.
- **Commissioner (Nedlik) asked** about the lighting in the portion of parking lot between Slauson and Crandall St area, as it was not indicated on the site plan.
 - **Representative (Sanyshyn) commented**, the lights are not shown/presented on the site plan(s), but they would be located on the centers of the parking lanes. All of the lights would be dark sky compliant, so there would be no light shining into people’s houses (there will be shielding on there) from the parking lot.
- **Chair (Corcoran) asked** about the presence of couple buildings (197 and 201 Clinton St) standing and if it will affect the project in any way and if the 187 Clinton St project will have any affect on those smaller lots.
 - **Representative (McKertich) replied**, the applicant inquired about acquiring those properties but received no answer. Regardless, the presence of those two buildings will not change the final result of the project, it will still have required parking spaces, housing units, stormwater, etc.

| | | |
|--|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Representative (Welch) commented, the access to the lots on Clinton St (197 and 201) is not impeded by the 187 Clinton St project, so there should not be any problems affecting their development of land in the future. | | |
| VOTING | | |
| MOTION that the Planning Commission intends to act as Lead Agency in SEQR review and that the action is Type I under SEQR | | |
| FIRST: Corcoran | SECOND: Weiss | VOTE: Carried (6-0-1) |
| AYE(S): Corcoran, Weiss, Dziedzic, Nedlik, Priest, DiFulvio | NAY(S): | ABSTENTION(S): De Angelo |
| MOTION to schedule a public hearing at the June regular meeting | | |
| FIRST: Corcoran | SECOND: Weiss | VOTE: Carried (6-0-1) |
| AYE(S): Corcoran, Weiss, Dziedzic, Nedlik, Priest, DiFulvio | NAY(S): | ABSTENTION(S): De Angelo |

| SEQR DETERMINATIONS | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| ADDRESS: 274 Front St | CASE NUMBER: PC-2024-0008 |
| DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Site Plan Review and special use permit for the conversion of an existing residential building into a multi-unit dwelling with four one-bedroom units in the C-1 Service Commercial District. | |
| APPLICANT: First Ward Action Council | |
| REPRESENTATIVE(S): Mark Parker (Keystone Associates) | |
| DISCUSSION POINTS: | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This is one of many renovation projects completed by First Ward Action Council – turning blight properties into better affordable homes that can serve the community. ▪ 276 Front St is another property that is in the development, which does not require Planning Commission review, but there will be location of parking spaces on the rear lot of 276 Front St that will be adjoined with parking on 274 Front St (Parker). ▪ 4 parking spaces for 274 and 2 parking spaces for 276 Front St. ▪ Vice-chair (Dziedzic) commented, looking at the staff report comments, it recommends getting an easement between 274 and 276 Front St owners for shared parking space and driveway to the parking space. Is this something that has been considered by the applicant? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Representative (Parker) commented, it has not been considered as both of the properties are owned by the same owner. If the Commission thinks an easement is required, it will be pursued. ▪ Chair (Corcoran) asked about the garbage plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Representative (Parker) commented, the units are not a lot, so the garbage will be put out onto the curb come garbage day. | |
| VOTING | |
| MOTION that the Planning Commission intends to act as Lead Agency in SEQR review and that the action is Unlisted under SEQR | |
| FIRST: Corcoran | SECOND: Nedlik |
| AYE(S): Corcoran, Weiss, Dziedzic, Nedlik, Priest, DiFulvio | NAY(S): |
| VOTE: Carried (6-0-1) | |
| ABSTENTION(S): De Angelo | |
| MOTION to schedule a public hearing at the June regular meeting | |
| FIRST: Corcoran | SECOND: Weiss |
| AYE(S): Corcoran, Weiss, Dziedzic, Nedlik, Priest, DiFulvio | NAY(S): |
| VOTE: Carried (6-0-1) | |
| ABSTENTION(S): De Angelo | |

| SEQR DETERMINATIONS | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| ADDRESS: 249-251 Front St | CASE NUMBER: PC-2024-0009 |

DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Site Plan Review and special use permit for the construction of a multi-unit dwelling with four one-bedroom units and an ancillary parking area in the R-3 Multi-Unit Dwelling District.

APPLICANT: First Ward Action Council

REPRESENTATIVE(S): Mark Parker (Keystone Associates)

DISCUSSION POINTS:

- This will be a newly constructed building with [4] one-bedroom units
- 2 parking spaces will be constructed for 249 and 4 spaces for 251 Front St in the rear of the lot
- There will be a placement of a gazebo and a playground area in the rear of the property for the enjoyment of the residents of both properties as well as other properties in the area owned by the same owner (241, 242, 251, 274, 276 Front St).
- This set of parcels too will feature a shared driveway to access the rear parking lot
- **Vice-chair (Dziedzic) commented**, referring to the staff report, the two parcels (249 and 251 Front St) should be combined. Asked staff (Martinez) on his thoughts regarding combining the parcels instead of acquiring an easement from both property owners?
 - **Staff (Martinez) commented**, it is up to the applicant. The mix of parking and amenities lands itself to being on one site, so it is clear that residents of both buildings can use all of the facilities, but an easement does the similar thing, it is ultimately up to the Planning Commission to request either or.
 - **Staff (Martinez) commented**, multiple units on the same lot are allowed in that district. It would go from 4 units to 6 units, if there are 2 units in the building at 249 Front St, presently.
- Garbage will be brought out to the curb on garbage day
- The dumpster enclosure in the staff comments is just a recommendation. With the number of units and the space available, a dumpster makes sense (**commented by Martinez**).
- **Staff (Martinez) commented**, for more than 4 dwelling units, a dumpster is not required, but some sort of enclosure is required. So, tenants could put the garbage bins back in an enclosure on non-garbage days.

VOTING

MOTION that the Planning Commission intends to act as Lead Agency in SEQR review and that the action is Unlisted under SEQR

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| FIRST: Corcoran | SECOND: Priest | VOTE: Carried (6-0-1) |
| AYE(S): Corcoran, Weiss, Dziedzic, Nedlik, Priest, DiFulvio | NAY(S): | ABSTENTION(S): De Angelo |

MOTION to schedule a public hearing at the June regular meeting

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| FIRST: Corcoran | SECOND: Dziedzic | VOTE: Carried (6-0-1) |
| AYE(S): Corcoran, Weiss, Dziedzic, Nedlik, Priest, DiFulvio | NAY(S): | ABSTENTION(S): De Angelo |

SEQR DETERMINATIONS

| | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| ADDRESS: 41 Clinton St | CASE NUMBER: PC-2024-0010 |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|

DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Site Plan Review and special use permit for the construction of a mixed-use building with 3 two-bedroom units, 16 one-bedroom units and 2 ground floor commercial spaces in the C-4 Neighborhood Commercial District.

APPLICANT: First Ward Action Council

REPRESENTATIVE(S): Mark Parker (Keystone Associates)

DISCUSSION POINTS:

- There is still settling in on to perform for the correct configuration of the dwelling units for this project (looking at [5] two-bedroom and [14] one-bedroom units) and thinking about putting another accessible unit.
- If there is an addition of an accessible unit, then there will have to be a construction of an additional accessible parking space, which means there will be one less standard parking space available (**Parker**).
- The new site plan (submitted on 5/7/24) will have a two way entrance, in/out on Clinton St.

- Instead of putting in a community room on 2nd floor, the new site plan has the space taken out completely and units squeezed together to take some square feet off the building footprint.
- **Commissioner (Nedlik) asked**, on the site plan, the actual parking spaces are less than the zoning and the code requires, and it will be less if an accessible unit is provided.
 - **Representative (Parker) replied**, that is correct. If the unit is provided, it will be one less space, the accessible space will need to be provided which comes with an accessible isle and it will knock it down to 20 spaces.
- **Vice-chair (Dziedzic) asked** if the applicant is prepared to provide a landscape plan according to the staff report – showing a plan that meets the landscaping requirements to be compliant with the code, before next month’s public hearing.
 - **Representative (Parker) commented**, a landscaping plan does need to be implemented and it will be prepared for next month’s meeting. There are certain landscaping areas allocated on the current site plan, the perimeter trees may be a problem, but we will do our best.
- **Chair (Corcoran) asked**, is it too much building footprint for the site? The constructability of this whole project seems very tight. Was this building designed for another site and it was cookie-cut on to this site?
 - **Representative (Parker) replied**, the applicant is trying to provide the much-needed housing and it is important to be able to fit it within this patch of land.
 - **Representative (Parker) replied**, the building was designed specifically after the specific site was picked, trying to get the appropriate units for the project. It is a need, so this project will try to satisfy it.
- **Commissioner (Nedlik) commented**, looking at the street view of the surrounding street(s), both adjoining streets do not have on-street parking available, just something to note if parking space for dwelling units are decreased.
- **Staff (Martinez) commented**, there are no front or side setbacks required, there is only a rear setback requirement and that is being met.
- **Chair (Corcoran) commented**, the Planning department supports both the reduction in parking requirements and the increase in lot coverage because the applicant’s proposal strikes a balance between sufficient parking without exceeding the maximum lot coverage by over paving the lot.
- **Commissioner (Priest) commented**, it is worth noting there are multiple bus stops on both sides of the property, on Clinton St.

VOTING

MOTION that the Planning Commission intends to act as Lead Agency in SEQR review and that the action is Unlisted under SEQR

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| FIRST: Corcoran | SECOND: Priest | VOTE: Carried (6-0-1) |
| AYE(S): Corcoran, Weiss, Dziedzic, Nedlik, Priest, DiFulvio | NAY(S): | ABSTENTION(S): De Angelo |

MOTION to schedule a public hearing at the June regular meeting

| | | |
|--|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| FIRST: Corcoran | SECOND: Weiss | VOTE: Carried (6-0-1) |
| AYE(S): Corcoran, Weiss, Dziedzic, Nedlik, Priest, DiFulvio | NAY(S): | ABSTENTION(S): De Angelo |

SEQR DETERMINATIONS

| | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| ADDRESS: 162 Water St | CASE NUMBER: PC-2024-0011 |
| DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Site Plan Modification Review for the modification of an existing ancillary parking area to add an additional 5 parking spaces in the C-2 Downtown Business District. | |
| APPLICANT: Owen Blye | |
| REPRESENTATIVE(S): Mark Yonaty (presenting for the applicant) | |
| DISCUSSION POINTS: | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will not be eliminating existing greenery, but cut back into some of it to make room for 5 additional parking spaces; it will not affect the stormwater (Yonaty) ▪ Maximum allowed lot coverage is 90%, however the Planning Commission can increase up to 5% to 95% | |

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Waiting on Engineer to know whether or not the proposed green space covers 5% of the area or not, if the proposed area is more than 5%, then will be applying for a variance (Blye noted). - City estimated that the proposal is only 2.5% green space, but there is an alleyway on the west side of the parking lot that should not be counted as pavement space (Blye continually noted). ▪ Existing stormwater retention capacity of the site will not be reduced, idea is to pour a raised parking pad that will maintain the existing storm drain and it will level with the storm drain lid (Blye). ▪ The landscape plan would just show the size, location, and species of the plantings, it would not have to be a rendering of the plant(s), just show a symbol with a key identifying specific. If none of the plantings are going to be disturbed during construction, then the applicant should just put on the site plan indicating as such (Martinez). ▪ Chair (Corcoran) asked, does the applicant know if there is a 24 feet clearance between the existing parking spaces on the north side and the new proposed spaces (to meet the layout requirements for a parking lot)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Representative (Yonaty) replied, not sure, but the applicant may have it on one end based on the drawing, because it is wider towards to front and tapering down in the back. - Staff (Martinez) commented, the applicant did comment verbally to me that there is 24 feet of clearance, but it should be noted on the site plan. |
|--|

| VOTING | | |
|--|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| MOTION that the Planning Commission intends to act as Lead Agency in SEQR review and that the action is Unlisted under SEQR | | |
| FIRST: Corcoran | SECOND: Weiss | VOTE: Carried (6-0-1) |
| AYE(S): Corcoran, Weiss, Dziedzic, Nedlik, Priest, DiFulvio | NAY(S): | ABSTENTION(S): De Angelo |
| MOTION to schedule a public hearing at the June regular meeting | | |
| FIRST: Corcoran | SECOND: Weiss | VOTE: Carried (6-0-1) |
| AYE(S): Corcoran, Weiss, Dziedzic, Nedlik, Priest, DiFulvio | NAY(S): | ABSTENTION(S): De Angelo |

| PUBLIC HEARINGS & FINAL DELIBERATIONS | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| ADDRESS: 61 Prospect Ave | CASE NUMBER: PC-2024-0012 |
| DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Construction of an 500ft ² storage shed on a mixed-use lot in the C-1 Service Commercial District | |
| APPLICANT: Owen Blye | |
| REPRESENTATIVE(S): Mark Yonaty (presenting for the applicant) | |
| DISCUSSION POINTS: | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 20x25' engineered shed that will be placed on existing stone or pebbles, no foundation with no electric, power, or mechanicals – just to store tools and general storage | |
| PUBLIC COMMENT for this meeting was waived by the Planning Commission because this is a SEQR Type II action and does not require a special use permit, and it is an accessory structure, which makes it eligible for a waiver of the public meeting. Legal noticing was not completed for this project. | |
| VOTING | |
| MOTION to waive public hearing for this project | |
| FIRST: Weiss | SECOND: Dziedzic |
| AYE(S): Corcoran, Weiss, Dziedzic, Nedlik, Priest, DiFulvio | NAY(S): |
| VOTE: Carried (6-0-1) | |
| ABSTENTION(S): De Angelo | |
| MOTION that the Planning Commission intends to act as Lead Agency in SEQR review and that the action is Type II under SEQR, no further environmental review is required | |
| FIRST: Corcoran | SECOND: Nedlik |
| AYE(S): Corcoran, Weiss, Dziedzic, Nedlik, Priest, DiFulvio | NAY(S): |
| VOTE: Carried (6-0-1) | |
| ABSTENTION(S): De Angelo | |

| | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| MOTION that the requirements for Site Plan Review have been met and therefore the application has been met and approved. | | |
| FIRST: Corcoran | SECOND: Dziedic | VOTE: Carried (6-0-1) |
| AYE(S): Corcoran, Weiss, Dziedzic, Nedlik, Priest, DiFulvio | NAY(S): | ABSTENTION(S): De Angelo |

PUBLIC HEARINGS & FINAL DELIBERATIONS

| | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| ADDRESS: 30 Brown St | CASE NUMBER: PC-2024- |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|

DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Site Plan Review and Special Use Permit for the construction of a 110' tall telecommunications tower and associated antennas in the I-2 Light and Medium Industrial District.

APPLICANT: Centerline Communications LLC

REPRESENTATIVE(S): Jeffrey Twitty (Attorney, Nixon Peabody), Brenda Blask-Lewis (Site Acquisition, Centerline Communications)

DISCUSSION POINTS:

- Additional information about the fall zone was submitted to the city – how it would work including a diagram and a revised site plan showing that the fall zone with 60' break point incorporated into the tower would only be approximately 50' and would stay out of the railroad right of way (*Twitty*)
- **Vice-chair (Dziedzic) asked** the representative(s) to describe the significance of a red circle labeled R = 50' on a map. That red circle is imposed over GIS/Google imagery, there is presence of visible tree canopy on the photo, is this from recent time that shows where the current trees are, it is not 40 years ago, where pavement and gravel are, etc.?
 - **Representative (Twitty) commented**, that is the 50' radius, that would be fall zone of the tower with the collapse point. I can confidently say that it is not 40 years ago, but with that said, cannot confirm exactly when the photo had been taken.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- **Peg Smith (neighbor at 40 Brown St; directly next to 30 Brown St) spoke in opposition of the project.** Ms. Smith had following to say about the project: it is a very small space to be putting up a 70x70' pad for a tower. Concerned about the tall tress that will be put up on the border of the pad as they will potentially interfere with 53' tractor trailers that back into the place of business at 40 Brown St. Concerned with any radiation that might come out of the tower, as a health risk. Have AT&T with good coverage, so what other benefit is going to be received from this tower. It is a busy street with a lot of people and businesses present and a lot of tractor trailers that do use that road. Our concern is if the tower tipped over, would it fall on our facility?
- **Jim Spear (Owns multiple properties on Brown St) spoke in opposition of the project.** Mr. Spear had following concerns: applicant is asking the Commission to grant a 100% setback requirement; in previous cases they said the PC can allow up to 5% over what is allowed. 59' tower to 110' tower plus another 10' for a lightning rod. If the fall zone on the tower is at 60', they only have 31' on either side, so if over 60' of it falls over, it is going to be on the railroad, on Brown St, hit my building, it is going to hit Peg and Bill's (40 Brown St) parking lot. This tower will be even taller than the 4-floor tall Ansco building (75' tall, with beautiful restoration) and will ruin the other half of the view from my house. These towers do put off radiation, I am present at Brown St 24/7, living and working there, concerned about the health stuff, and about the tower being knocked down. If the project gets approved, I will fight for adverse possession and there is already a deed for a right of way into my property.
- No letters received.

APPLICANT RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Jeffrey Twitty (Attorney, Nixon Peabody) commented, to address the health and radiation concerns first, in Exhibit G, it shows that this tower and related antennas will be well within FCC's threshold for electromagnetic energy emissions. There would be no danger presented to anybody within the vicinity of the tower. Regarding concerns about the fall zone, as shown in the exhibit V, revised site plan showing the fall zone will be entirely on 30 Brown St parcel, will be outside the railroad right of way. There is no issue

with the tower going onto the adjacent parcels in the very unlikely case of a tower failure. There will not be a blockage of access into any adjacent parcels.

- **Commissioner (Weiss) asked** Mr. Spears and another audience member a question about the accuracy of the drawings as presented.
- **Staff (Martinez) commented**, a very-very rough estimate with a significant margin of error from GIS gives a 138' width of the area between 40 Brown and 2 Brown St. The 100' diameter shown on this scale appears to be more or less to scale.
- **Chair (Corcoran) commented**, circling back to the original staff report comments to make sure everything is covered as such:
 - Gravel access driveway is changed to asphalt
 - Planting of evergreens along the front of the property line
 - Working through the setback requirement(s)
 - Stated that the antennas will be operating at the FCC's designated frequencies and power levels
 - Planning to inspect every 2 years
 - **All of the above comments were agreed upon as presented, by representative (Twitty).**

VOTING

MOTION to issue a negative declaration under SEQR

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|---|
| FIRST: Corcoran | SECOND: Dziedzic | VOTE: Carried (5-0-2) |
| AYE(S): Corcoran, Weiss, Dziedzic, Nedlik, Priest, DiFulvio | NAY(S): | ABSTENTION(S): Weiss, De Angelo (absent) |

MOTION that the requirements for Site Plan Review and Special Use Permit have been met and therefore the application has been met and conditionally approved, subject to the following:

- Plantings of Eastern Redcedar trees to meet the recommendation made by the Shade Tree Commission
- Granting of the required zoning variance(s) by the Zoning Board of Appeals

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|---|
| FIRST: Corcoran | SECOND: Dziedzic | VOTE: Carried (5-0-2) |
| AYE(S): Corcoran, Weiss, Dziedzic, Nedlik, Priest, DiFulvio | NAY(S): | ABSTENTION(S): Weiss, De Angelo (absent) |

PUBLIC HEARINGS & FINAL DELIBERATIONS

| | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| ADDRESS: 245-249 Washington St | CASE NUMBER: PC-2024-0006 |
| DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Site Plan Review and Special Use Permit for the conversion of floors 1-2 of an existing building into a Daycare Center in the C-2 Downtown Business District | |
| APPLICANT: Family Enrichment Network | |
| REPRESENTATIVE(S): Kenneth Gay (Keystone Associates) | |
| DISCUSSION POINTS: | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No changes since previous meeting | |
| PUBLIC COMMENT: | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No one spoke in favor nor in opposition of the project ▪ No letters received. | |

VOTING

MOTION that the requirements for Site Plan Review and Special Use Permit have been met and therefore the application has been approved.

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| FIRST: Corcoran | SECOND: Priest | VOTE: Carried (6-0-1) |
| AYE(S): Corcoran, Weiss, Dziedzic, Nedlik, Priest, DiFulvio | NAY(S): | ABSTENTION(S): De Angelo |

OTHER BUSINESS

DESCRIPTION: 110 Fairview Ave Extension

The applicant requested an additional extension up to 18 months during March’s Planning Commission meeting, but it was not voted upon as a condition on April’s PC meeting, hence it would not have been included on the decision letter. But there was no quorum for an official vote on May 7th, 2024, PC meeting, hence it will now be added as a condition on the official decision letter.

OTHER BUSINESS

DESCRIPTION: Climate Action Plan presented by Dr. Juliet Berling (Director, PHCD)

The climate action plan has been updated since the last meeting on February 6th, 2024 (updated documents provided to the Planning Commission). But following item is what Dr. Berling would like to be added to the plan:

- Heat vulnerability index map – reviews different types of vulnerability
 - o Language vulnerability – highest percentage of non-primary English-speaking populations
 - o Socio-economic vulnerability – low income
 - o Environmental vulnerability – high percentage of urban landscape
 - o Elderly vulnerability – showing certain % of elderly who live alone without support

Updates to the goals of the Climate Action Plan, following the comments made by the Planning Commission members:

- Net zero (0) carbon and energy efficient city facilities (focusing on conservative efforts and initiatives from both residential and community forefronts, the production of energy will hopefully be able to offset the use of less energy.
 - o Action: for city owned facilities, there would be a creation of a benchmark of annual city energy use and greenhouse gas emissions and provide an energy star portfolio. The city would adopt a municipal energy masterplan, which will be developed with city chosen service provider.
- Net carbon is the similar thing, there would be creation of carbon sinks to offset carbon production on a declining scale.
- Transportation and land use goals: reducing community fossil fuel usage, reducing fuel consumption within municipal government operations, reducing energy consumed and greenhouse gas emissions as a consequence of land use.
 - o Hoping to increase number of available public charging stations, providing charging station locations, going to promote and incentivize alternate forms of transportation.
 - o For municipal employees: developing a fleet management plan, supporting virtual meetings instead of requiring virtual meetings, supporting meetings where practical with hardware/software, considering a virtual meeting room for departmental use, more cost effective to have it than providing individual computers per employee (optional).
 - o Funding a complete street and smart growth study for planning options to support compact community development. (Focusing on infill projects such as building on parking lots; would require a grant for support).
 - o Identifying suitable areas for increased residential density opportunities.
 - o Identifying areas of reduced parking requirement opportunities.
 - o Identifying areas and developing policies for low-emission zones (environmental sensitive areas or other factors that would trigger the need).

For community, the plan will be prioritizing city incentive grants, forgivable loans, low interest loans for residential energy efficiency improvement and conversion to electric production.

Concept of open space (green vs. gray) gives a good idea of future development locations and potentially impacted areas. The concept would hopefully lead to a better understanding of information as well as areas that needs to be set outside the realm of development, such as riverbanks.

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| MOTION: for a recommendation to the City Council for approval | | |
| FIRST: Corcoran | SECOND: DiFulvio | VOTE: Carried (5-1-1) |
| AYE(S): Corcoran, Weiss, Nedlik, Priest, DiFulvio | NAY(S): Dziezic | ABSTENTION(S): De Angelo |

| ADJOURNMENT | | |
|---|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| MOTION to adjourn | | TIME: 7:22 PM |
| FIRST: Priest | SECOND: Weiss | VOTE: Carried (6-0-1) |
| AYE(S): Corcoran, Weiss, Dziezic, Nedlik, Priest, DiFulvio | NAY(S): | ABSTENTION(S): De Angelo |