



City of Binghamton Planning Department

SUMMARY OF MINUTES CITY OF BINGHAMTON PLANNING COMMISSION	
MEETING DATE: December 12, 2022	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 (vice-chair)	X	
Christopher Dzedzic	X	
Mario DiFulvio	X	
Paul O'Brien	X	
Kelly Weiss	X (5:21 PM)	
Emmanuel Priest	X	
STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:	TITLE & DEPARTMENT:	
Dr. Juliet Berling	Director, Planning Department	
Tito Martinez	Assistant Director, Planning Department	
Shalin Patel	Planner, Planning Department	
Dylan Pelton	Building, Construction & Code Enforcement	
Elisabeth Rossow	Corporation Counsel	
Brian Seachrist	Corporation Counsel	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES		
MOTION to approve the November 15, 2022 meeting minutes as written		
FIRST: De Angelo	SECOND: Dzedzic	VOTE: Carried (6-0-1)
AYE(S): De Angelo, DiFulvio, Dzedzic, O'Brien, Priest, Corcoran	NAY(S):	ABSTENTION(S): Weiss

SEQR DETERMINATIONS	
ADDRESS: 131 Hawley St	CASE NUMBER: PC-2022-0019
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Site Plan Review and special use permit for the conversion of an existing 2-story building into a Congregate Living facility with 6 sleeping units in the R-3 Multi-Unit Dwelling District	
APPLICANT: Eagle Properties LLC	
REPRESENTATIVE(S): Kyle Weeks (Designer) and Jeff Smith, Chianis & Anderson Architects, LLC	
DISCUSSION POINTS:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant has no plans to do interior renovations to the building ▪ On the exterior, almost the entire lot in the back is paved – there will be at least 8 compliant parking spaces with a drive aisle ▪ Chair (Corcoran) asked about the current use of the building, whether it is being used as a rental apartment building? ▪ Applicant (Weeks): it was being used as a single-family residence until the new owner purchased the property 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commissioner (Dziedzic) asked about the garbage situation. The overall site plan shows that the garbage will be put on the back porch. The plan is to not have a covered dumpster or a roller and will have individual cans, correct? Applicant (Weeks): Currently the owner is planning to use the individual cans 		
VOTING		
MOTION that the Planning Commission intends to act as Lead Agency in SEQR review and that the action is Type II under SEQR		
FIRST: Corcoran	SECOND: O'Brien	VOTE: Carried (6-0-1)
AYE(S): Corcoran, O'Brien, DiFulvio, De Angelo, Dziedzic, Priest	NAY(S):	ABSTENTION(S): Weiss
MOTION to schedule a public hearing at the January regular meeting		
FIRST: Corcoran	SECOND: De Angelo	VOTE: Carried (6-0-1)
AYE(S): Corcoran, De Angelo, DiFulvio, Dziedzic, Priest, O'Brien	NAY(S):	ABSTENTION(S): Weiss

PUBLIC HEARINGS & FINAL DELIBERATIONS	
ADDRESS: 183 Water St	CASE NUMBER: PC-2022-0012
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Site Plan Review and special use permit for the construction of a 10-story building with a 549-vehicle public parking garage and 120 upper-story dwelling units in the C-2 Downtown Business District	
APPLICANT: United Group-Pike Development Joint Venture	
REPRESENTATIVE(S): JACOB VON MECHOW (Senior Designer, Whitham Planning Design Landscape Architecture)	
DISCUSSION POINTS:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area variances (building height, lot coverage, and rear setback) were approved by ZBA, as well as receiving a certificate of appropriateness from CAUD last week Commissioner (DiFulvio) asked about the number of spaces in the old parking garage and compare it to the new garage. Furthermore, with 120 units, he asked how many they would need for the residents? Applicant (Von Mechow): the spaces will not be reserved for the tenants, it will be a public parking space, but there will be a parking pass that will be available to the tenants that will give them access to the parking garage while duration of their lease. With the expectation that the upper stories will most likely be used by residents, while the lower stories that tends to serve the downtown business district will be more attracted to the public. 	
VOTING	
MOTION that the requirements for Site Plan Review and Special Use Permit have been met	
FIRST: Corcoran	SECOND: Dziedzic
AYE(S): Corcoran, Dziedzic, O'Brien, Weiss, De Angelo, DiFulvio, Priest	NAY(S):
VOTE: Carried (7-0-0)	
ABSTENTION(S):	

PUBLIC HEARINGS & FINAL DELIBERATIONS	
ADDRESS: 26-34 Wall St	CASE NUMBER: PC-2022-0016
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Site Plan Review and special use permit for the conversion of the ground floor of an existing office building into a Place of Worship in the C-2 Downton Business District	
APPLICANT: Chabad House	
REPRESENTATIVE(S): Levi Slonim	
DISCUSSION POINTS:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Made necessary changed to the parking lot, which was discussed during the 1st meeting (added bike racks, etc.) Chair (Corcoran) commented about the presence of green space in front of the building as seen from the plans 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant (Slonim): we do not have the specifics of what the space will look like yet, but the idea is to have outdoor seating option for few months a year that it is nice outside, so people can sit outside to study, hangout, work and create that kind of vibe at the entrance ▪ Staff (Martinez) commented, anything pertaining to the variances in the 239 review comments can be disregarded, because the applicant did not end up needing it. Only things that applied to the site plan are curb should be repaired and closed off wherever a curb cut is eliminated on the site plan and that landscaping should be added where possible ▪ Applicant (Slonim): plans to change the façade of the building, from a Warehouse or office building into something warmer and more for the vibe of a community center ▪ Applicant is not opposed to making changes recommended by the County Review. Further cites that the parking lot is open right now, random people park there at night, there is no accountability. We will do something to keep it more intact and all. ▪ Staff (Seachrist) asked how many curb cuts were being eliminated? ▪ Staff (Martinez): 2 on Henry St, 1 on Center St is being reduced from width of the parking lot to a 24' apron. Where your architect drew new curb and sidewalks where it used to be ramps, that should be filled in with a sidewalk and curb 		
PUBLIC COMMENT:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No one spoke for or in opposition of the project 		
<p>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: the understanding that the site work that happens in the parking lot area of the project matches with what is on the submitted site plan that was labeled A-100 Proposed site plan that was submitted as part of the package</p>		
FIRST: Corcoran	SECOND: Weiss	VOTE: Carried (7-0-0)
AYE(S): Corcoran, Dziedzic, O'Brien, De Angelo, DiFulvio, Weiss, Priest	NAY(S):	ABSTENTION(S):

PUBLIC HEARINGS & FINAL DELIBERATIONS	
ADDRESS: 221 Washington St	CASE NUMBER: PC-2022-0014
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Site Plan Modification to add basement social/assembly space to multi-unit dwelling with 12 existing units and 45 total bedrooms in the C-2 Downtown Business District	
APPLICANT: Stonebridge Campus Living	
REPRESENTATIVE(S): Martin A. Miranda (Associate, Toohar & Barone, LLP), Alyssa Post (Management, Stonebridge Campus Living)	
DISCUSSION POINTS:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 12 units, 45 bedrooms ▪ Lawyer representing applicant (Miranda) commented the following: feedback from the last hearing was incorporated into the new plans, consulted with designers to address all of the concerns raised at the last meeting, provided surrendering to show the visuals of what the space will look like upon approval, diagram of an overview of what the space will look like. ▪ 8 cameras in the basement ▪ Chair (Corcoran) asked about the shown walls and where or not they will be fixed in place and there is no moving them with temporary partitions or anything? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Applicant(s) agree ▪ Commissioner (Dziedzic) comments regarding the concerns the Chief of Police has expressed opposition to the plan and the space. "I have concerns that even with some of the edition of the revised site and floor plan, there is still large open space which could be used as a party space with tables and couches removed. There is still significant opposition from the neighbors, all those are still concerns that I have." ▪ Staff member (Seachrist) commented the following: there are existing codes that would be applicable for future violations that we can apply to keep things on lockdown, but it will take time. I advise the commission to look at the plans as you are looking at two owners from now in 10 or 20 years, the issue right 	

now is who are owners and not who are the tenants. But is this a good plan on its own standing? Some people will propose operation controls for these types of issues. They are doing such thing with cameras. In 10 years are they going to be maintained, broke, spray painted, etc.?

- **Commissioner (Weiss)** asked if “the pit” has been dismantled, do we know where they relocated?
- **Staff member (Seachrist)** commented saying the pit may have been an APES location as well, read from reports from a year ago.
- **Commissioner (Weiss)** commented if there was a way to modify this plan to allow for gym space and some of the small, segregated study spaces from the laundry and sectioning off into the big place that would be more for congregating? So, you’d have very small study spaces for people to go in individually without having larger space for people to go in.
 - **Applicant (Post):** “we didn’t want it to look like a cubicle office space, because it does not look enticing for future, ex: a group of 3 girls who want to go down and watch TV, they would be able to. It would get too crowded.”
- **Staff member (Pelton)** asked why the applicant hasn’t thought about putting this space on the 1st floor of the building?
 - **Applicant (Post)** replied saying the first floor is a retail tenant, which brings in financial separate from residents, trying not to jack up their rent even more. It is hard to pull in the retail tenant because that is a separate from the residents upstairs
- **Commissioner (De Angelo)** commented saying “if it is at all possible for someone like a Fire Marshall to take a look at this before we go further? I would abstain from voting on this project until it got an input from somebody else. Because I am concerned about the level of safety, sprinklers, alarms, which is way more details than we get involved with in Planning. It would be unfair to your group to say we approve it; it goes there, and you come back, you need to spend \$500,000 on fire improvements. We’ve been through this once.
 - **Applicant (Post)** commented saying they have annual 5- and 10-year reports from a business. Full sprinkler system, full smoke alarms, carbon monoxide, two fire exists. You can walk right out on the road from the back off the gym, instead of going all the way up. Already have talked with the Fire Marshal about the occupancy limits, which will be obtained after site plans are approved.
- **Commissioner (Dziedzic)** commented saying he would want to see another plan, based on what he has seen he is no on voting. “I can tell you what I would be comfortable voting yes on, I want to see a honeycomb. I don’t want any potential low party space, and I know that may defeat what you are looking for in this special user permit. But my attitude is underground open congregate spaces, I am a no. If you want to break this into 10-12 study cubicles that helps residents’ study, that is something I can stomach, but that may defeat the purpose of congregate living space for watching TV and playing pool.
 - **Applicant (Post)** commented saying “we are trying to do what these other similar places are already doing, Chenango Place, Hawley St, etc., that are downtown with amenity space they gather at, but if we honeycomb it then it will make the space unattractive.”
- **Commissioner (Priest)** commented saying he would like to see a revised plan with 3 more TV study spaces, 1 or 2 more TV viewing spaces partitioned off, I may be more comfortable. **Commissioner (Weiss) agrees.**
- **The final approval would be confirmed by the City Planning Department following changes of the site plan after the applicant talks with their engineer/architecture regarding certain supporting structure and walls in the basement space.**

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- **Josh L (Tenant at 221 Washington St)** spoke in favor of the project. *(Full length of the comment can be obtained from the Planning Department or from the recording of the meeting upon request).* Goes on to talk about hardships created by the condemnation of the basement area of the building and not being able to use the amenities agreed upon in the leasing contract (supposed to provide an amenities space with full laundry room, fully equipped gym, study rooms and relaxing hangout space). Each resident pays about \$825/month + utilities to stay at 221 Washington St. “As a student with inconvenient class schedule, I am only able to do laundry at night, but due to the condemnation, the room is only open during office hours, which forces me to resort to do laundry in a laundromat. Not being able to use the gym in the basement

forces many of us to use membership-based gyms which adds another finance-based burden to a long list of expanses.” **Replies back to the Shop owner (Zoran N):** “As a person who is a college student and knows what is going on in Binghamton, “the pit” being associated with 221 Washington St is wholeheartedly and unequivocally untrue. “The pit” is actually located in 81 State St, which is not occupied by anyone residing at 221 Washington St, so that name is being assigned to this building is slanderous and unfair. The laundry machines are all in the basement and not upstairs in the rooms, we can prove that.”

- **Zoran Nenadich (Co-owner/operator of The Shop at 219 Washington St)** spoke in opposition of the project. Does not have problems with student housing, says he has students living upstairs above his business, most of them are employees as well, they house and feed them, give employment, write recommendation letters for grad school, and find employment after school. Talks about aforementioned club of some sort called “the pit”, and part of the financial struggle faced by tenants might be not being able to operate this club. Says there is someplace else where this sort of activity is a better fit, but just not at this part of Washington St, because it disrupts the way of life and quality of life for the residents of the building. Says the student (Josh L) will be gone in a semester or so, same as the owner Stonebridge who will sell the building in couple years (looking at the track record, this building gets sold every 2-3 years), what we are doing here is I am trying to prevent this from happening in the future so we can have little peace at night. There are other clubs and venues that can be visited and used for these purposes, this looks like a good party space. We talked to a lot of people and some realtors, apparently Stonebridge, maybe its hearsay, they are pursuing a group called AEPS, to comeback and occupy the building come next fall and this is not the best group of boys.
- **Jacob S (Tenant at 221 Washington St)** spoke in favor of the project. “There are no laundry machines upstairs, I live there, and I walk down 5 staircases to do my laundry. I am not a part of any partying or social thing; the basement has been condemned the entire time I have been living here. It has been a big inconvenience between not being able to do laundry at certain times, not having a space to relax and hangout, at the of the day it is not changing my life for the worst, not the end of the world, but the students of Binghamton it could be a really nice space. I came with a couple of friends and thought it would be a really nice space to live in. The building has potential to be developed into something like Hawley St with a nice lounge area, really makes the property better for students and everyone living there. College kids will find spots to do dangerous things anywhere.
- **Ben (Tenant at 221 Washington St, lives with Jacob)** spoke in favor of the project. Talks about the commotion, “we live on Washington St - the bars are maybe 30 seconds walk away from the building. College kids are walking up and down, we deal with the same commotion, I am hearing the same yelling, screaming, and noises as all the other residents are hearing as well. Having a nice little study spot in the basement, where it won’t be as loud would be nice to have, because on the street of Washington the basement is more level with the parking lot behind at Double Tree, so obviously a lot of that noise wouldn’t reach the basement area, which would be a nice hangout area for us. As of now if we want to hangout somewhere, we have to leave and go to campus to study and don’t have space to hangout and study.
- **Eugenie Nenadich (Co-owner/operator of The Shop at 219 Washington St)** spoke in opposition of the project. We’ve submitted multiple public comments and ask you to deny it. If it is possible to come up with some sort of way to make sure that future owners of this property are not able to provide this space as a public space to the tenants.

APPLICANT RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Lawyer (Miranda) thanks tenants for coming to the meeting to show their support for the project and that this matter is very important to them. Their comments have been helpful to dispel any information from the opponents of this project, this project is trying to move past the history of this space and transform it in a way that will be productive and positive for the future regardless of who is living there. By transforming the current space (which was fairly open, containing a stage, a bar, a DJ section, looking like it was ready for party), now with the partitions with study rooms, cameras, tv rooms, we have provided a promising plan that is consistent with the neighborhood and preventing any history of the past from occurring again.
- Alyssa Post comments referring back to Commissioner Dziedzic’s last comment regarding concerns expressed by the Chief of Police. “I was under the impression last time that the chief of police letter was not

to be taken into account for this vote. We were told that last time by a council. There should be no negative inference drawn by his comment.”

VOTING

MOTION for a conditional approval that the requirements for site plan modification have been met: 3 additional rooms roughly the size of the study rooms shown on the plan in review and 1 additional room the size of the TV room be added, so there will be a total of 2 TV rooms and 6 study cubicle areas in the basement. And that revised plan gets submitted to the Planning Department for final approval.

FIRST: Corcoran	SECOND: Priest	VOTE: Carried (5-1-1)
AYE(S): Corcoran, O’Brien, DiFulvio, Weiss, Priest	NAY(S): Dzedzic	ABSTENTION(S): De Angelo

Commissioner Dzedzic recused himself (at ~6:46PM) due to the geographic location of his residence being in a close proximity to the address of Fairview Recovery Services Project. He returned promptly (at ~7:48PM) after the conclusion of aforementioned case.

PUBLIC HEARINGS & FINAL DELIBERATIONS

ADDRESS: 110 Fairview Ave | **CASE NUMBER:** PC-2022-0015

DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Site Plan Review for the construction of a 12,750ft² building with 20 sleeping units on an existing Social Services campus in the R-2 One-and Two-Unit Dwelling District

APPLICANT: Fairview Recovery Services

REPRESENTATIVE(S): Sarah Campbell (Hinman, Howard, Kattell, LLP) and Kenneth R. Gay (Keystone Associates)

DISCUSSION POINTS:

- Applicant commented saying they have listened to the neighbor’s comments, many of them suggesting that any new construction be done at the corner of Merrick and Fairview, which is where it is now proposed.
- Facility is licensed for 48 clients; number would increase to 68 clients with the new proposed building with 45 maximum staff at any given time totaling 113 people from 82 people at present time
- 70% max lot coverage is permitted, applicant is at 35%
- No cars for clients permitted at the facility
- Merrick St house would be demolished to make space for parking and new building
- Internal reductions of traffic in and out, meals transported off site to another location, but it will be done on site and on campus with the new proposed building – which will save 6-7 trips of vehicle movements
- Commissioner (De Angelo) asked about if the lighting concerns were addressed
 - Applicant commented saying they are implementing something called dark sky compliant lighting (point towards the location and such on the site plan). They will only be putting in the lights where they are building the new building, not elsewhere.
- Commissioner (DiFulvio) asked about the applicant to address the question from the public comments regarding the women and children program that never really existed or took off or did what it was supposed to do?
- Commissioner (DiFulvio) asked if there has been any consideration into any offsite location or other areas to put this facility into?
- Commissioner (DiFulvio) asked what facilitated this, what made the applicant decide they needed 20 beds facility? This isn’t State thing or a federal thing, correct? Do you get reimbursements?

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- **Daniel Grassi (Neighbor at 121 Fairview Ave)** spoke at length in opposition of the project. *(Full letter of the opposition can be obtained from the Planning Department upon request).* Mr. Grassi made the following comments: new plans does not change the core problems with this construction, 20 bed crisis facility for seriously addicted patients, all in same building, same block, and same neighborhood. Building is moved few feet only. This consolidation should occur at another location. This is a completely inappropriate construction for this quiet neighborhood, it would make the neighborhood unlivable for resident

homeowners, reducing market value to 0, it would become the Fairview Recovery neighborhood inhabited by drug addicted individuals receiving rehab services funded ironically by us. We have experienced with a previous construction on 8 Clapham St (8 bed women's resident facility – sold this project as respite for mothers and their children, which is the only reason it was passed through Planning), within 6 months this program was gone. During warmer months traffic triples in volume, when it was promised that it wouldn't.

- **Anthony Mazza (Neighbor at 11 Clapham St)** spoke at length in opposition of the project. (*Full letter of opposition can be obtained from the Planning Department upon request*). Mr. Mazza made following comments: all of the letters of opposition received in the previous application for this same project should be included in this meeting. Applicants are providing an inaccurate analysis of cars coming in/out of street on Fairview (from 6:30 - 9), it is an inaccurate and a bias survey, it is meaningless. They talk about the lighting, they never said they would put any lighting in the women's facility, now it bombs the land that "I own, my wife I paid for that land, we saved money to buy that land. They compromised that land, they compromised it." People living there right now, they mow their lawns, they plant flowers, they have a right to be safe. Elderly woman wrote a letter saying she did not feel safe living in the neighborhood. Not one piece of information the applicants gave you mentions anything about safety besides lighting. Applicants feel entitled to this space and the neighborhood, people living in the neighborhood are more entitled of safety and traffic. They need to relocate; it is the best thing they can do for the people they are serving.
- **Becky Ewing (Neighbor at 22 Clapham St)** spoke in opposition of this project. Says it is a Quiet, out of the way area from the busy traffic on Robinson and Court St. With increased potential car and pedestrian traffic, will increase potential for accidents and liabilities in this area. There are no sidewalks, none. It is not a good place to drive in the winter, but with increased traffic, it would be a big problem. People living at this facility are transient people, not permanent residents and when they wonder around out in the neighborhood, it creates a problem of personal safety. They are building something that is commercially, a business, which is concerning. The state hospital already has rehab services there, it would be beautiful to have the services there. When they built the housing for elderly and disabled above us, one thing they did not do before approval was if the City buses could get up there, access to public transportation is a nightmare.
- **Kathy Gross (Neighbor at 15 Merrick St)** spoke in opposition of the project. Ms. Gross had the following to say: she appreciates the newer plan from the applicants. The plan keeps going and going with so much construction. Having ambulance(s) come to my house in the last 10 years several times, during middle of the night and day, they are close to several ambulance services near their location. So many underground springs near my house, it is torturous, they are terrible to get through. There are many concerns about why they need to be there right now, please consider the neighborhood.

APPLICANT RESPONSE TO THE PUBLIC COMMENT:

- This is not a crisis center
- Smoking areas are built into this project on site as indicated on the site plan (were mentioned by the neighbors)
- There has been no report of violence, the police have not been called ever with respect to this facility
- There was a question on what will happen with the green space that is there right now. If they didn't hear about it loud and clear last time around that green space will be a very difficult development ever, I don't what else to be said (Sarah Campbell). Rest assured should there ever be a project purposed in that area, they would have to go through the same process to comeback and get the PC approval.
- Clients do not work at this location or offsite, they are always accompanied on site or in the area, they are allowed to go on walks and get some fresh air, but are always accompanied by staff members, they are not by themselves.
- With the addition of 11 staff members and 20 residents will not turn this quiet neighborhood into something else
- It is untrue the addition of this small amount of people will change the traffic patterns of the neighborhood. We worked really hard to create a plan that would limit the access beyond which is what is currently in place. These aren't people that have visitors often, these are people in a treatment program, well

controlled program and they are there because they want help. These people are also citizens of Broome County and getting the treatment they need is only a benefit to us all

- Applicant (from Fairview Recovery Services) commented saying the program did exist, it was a combination of single women and women with their children (2 beds), 2 moms could have their kids with them. We unfortunately had a death out in supported living, which is another program of ours offsite and we were advised liability wise to not have that program any longer.
- Applicant lawyer (Campbell) commented saying it is a hard conversation to have. The building on Court St has been sold and renovated into permanent supportive housing. Yes, they have looked at other locations. The nice thing about this location is that infrastructure for the treatment is already available there and it provides a streamline of services that wouldn't have to be separated into different areas as it is there now.
- Applicant commented saying the Fairview Recovery Services get reimbursed via Medicaid. The state/federal staff comes in and looks at the facility to approve it before its operation as a social services facility. These are not new beds, they are existing beds, we are not adding to our population, we are just moving the physical location of the beds. We are doing this for fiscal reasons, limit the food deliveries, etc., for 2 levels of care that we provide. 20 beds are what we are licensed for, there would be no expansion for this level.

MOTION for a negative declaration

FIRST: Corcoran	SECOND: Priest	VOTE: Carried 6-0-1)
AYE(S): Corcoran, O'Brien, De Angelo, DiFulvio, Weiss, Priest	NAY(S):	ABSTENTION(S): Dzedzic

MOTION that the requirements for site plan review and special use permit have been met

FIRST: Corcoran	SECOND: Priest	VOTE: Carried (5-1-1)
AYE(S): Corcoran, Priest, De Angelo, O'Brien, Weiss	NAY(S): DiFulvio	ABSTENTION(S): Dzedzic

OTHER BUSINESS

DESCRIPTION: Rezoning of 115-135 Conklin Ave. The city is looking to rezone the Crowley Plant at 135 Conklin Ave. Right now, it is zoned for light medium industrial, which does not allow residential use. Rezoning it to C-4 Neighborhood Commercial, which is what the other side of Conklin Ave is, would allow commercial or light industrial on ground floor and apartments on elsewhere in the building. The city has interest in redeveloping this for housing and we are trying to make that allowable by rezoning this. If we rezone at 135 Conklin Ave, we might as well rezone rest of the land from 115 – (before 135) as well.

MOTION: for a negative declaration under SEQR as unlisted action and a recommendation for approval zoning change to the council

FIRST: Corcoran	SECOND: Dzedzic	VOTE: Carried (7-0-0)
AYE(S): Corcoran, Dzedzic, Weiss, De Angelo, DiFulvio, O'Brien, Priest	NAY(S):	ABSTENTION(S):

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION to adjourn		TIME:
FIRST: De Angelo	SECOND: Everyone	VOTE: Carried (7-0-0)
AYE(S): De Angelo, Corcoran, Weiss, Dzedzic, Priest, O'Brien, DiFulvio	NAY(S):	ABSTENTION(S):