

Minutes of a meeting of the Johnson City
Planning Board held on October 22, 2024 at
7:00pm at 60 Lester Avenue, Johnson City, NY.

Present: Gerald Putman, Chairman
Marcia Ward, Vice Chair
David Michalak, Secretary
Lori Thorn
Michael Sheredy

Also Present: Keegan Coughlin, Attorney for Village
Stephanie Yezzi, Director of Planning
Kim Cunningham, Planning Board Clerk

Absent: None

A work session was held at 7:00pm.

Attorney Coughlin, Stephanie Yezzi and the Board discussed the agenda and the applications:

- 627 Field St
- 214 Main St – last mural allocated for the Village
 - Across from the Reveille, on the old Health Beat building
- 290 Grand Avenue

Ms. Yezzi stated:

- it was an approved use variance with the maximum of two seats and for the required three parking spaces. She confirmed it is the only use that can go in there.
- Parking is on the street but not directly in front of the building.
- There is already a variance for the three parking spaces required.
- 601 HLD
 - Declare lead agency

Chairman Putman called the Planning Board meeting to order at 7:31pm. He welcomed Trustee Walker.

Chairman Putman noted the fire exits.

PRIVELEGE OF THE FLOOR

Chairman Putman opened the privilege of the floor. There being no one who wished to speak, Chairman Putman closed the privilege of the floor.

MINUTES

A motion for approval of the September 24, 2024 meeting minutes was made by Ms. Ward and seconded by Ms. Thorn. Mr. Michalak abstained due to not being in attendance at the previous meeting. The motion carried with all those present, with the exception of Mr. Michalak, voting in the affirmative.



OLD BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS

627 Field Street – Amerco Real Estate

Advisory Opinion to the ZBA for Sign Area Variances at U-Haul

No one appeared on behalf of the application.

Chairman Putman stated they are looking to put two signs on their new building. Chairman Putman explained the variances needed. The signs will face the south so they can be seen from the highway.

The Area Variance Requests were added to the record.

Area Variance Requests:

The following area variances are being requested from the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) by Amerco Real Estate Co. for proposed signage at U-Haul at 627 Field Street:

- Section 300-52.3 I: Increase the size of directional signs from 12 square feet to 35 square feet, 58 square feet and 65 square feet.
- Section 300-52.5 Table 52-6: Increase the square footage of one wall sign to accommodate 169 square feet (exceeding the allowed 100 square feet).
- Section 300-52.5 Table 52-4: Increase the number of allowed wall signs from 1 to 4.
 - Check the total number of wall signs on the full parcel (one other building situated on 627 Field)

Chairman Putman read the Environmental Summary and Department Head Comments and Planning Staff Recommendations.

Environmental Summary and Department Head Comments

The project was routed to Broome County Planning for 239-review as well as department heads for comment. The applicant's proposal is a SEQRA unlisted action, and the ZBA shall claim lead agency and complete their review following the public hearing on November 18.

- **Broome County Planning** – The Planning Department has reviewed the above-cited case and has not identified any significant countywide or inter-community impacts associated with the proposed project. However, we have the following comments:
 - The project site is located entirely within the Preliminary FEMA Special Flood Hazard Area. While not the regulatory floodplain, the Village ZBA should exercise caution in approving and the applicant should know the risks of developing a project within the SFHA and within a flood-prone area.
- **NYSDOT** – No comments.
- **Water, Police and Fire Departments** – No compelling interest.
- **Code Enforcement** – Awaiting comment.

Planning Staff Recommendations

The Planning Department staff advises that the Planning Board recommends the ZBA's approval of the requested variances with all 239 or department head comments. Granting the requested variance will not have negative impacts on the surrounding uses, recreational uses or natural environment.



Chairman Putman stated this is an unlisted action and the ZBA claimed lead agency on October 21, 2024. The public hearing will be on November 18th.

Motion that the Johnson City Planning Board recommend that the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the requested variances for 627 Field Street including the Department Head Comments was made by Mr. Michalak and seconded by Ms. Ward.

Motion Carried - Vote:

Yes – 5 (*Sheredy, Thorn, Michalak, Ward, Putman*) **No** – 0 **Absent** – 0

214 Main Street – Broome County Planning

Advisory Opinion to the ZBA for Mural Area Variance

Stephanie Brewer appeared on behalf of the application. Ms. Brewer explained the project. This is the fifth and final mural through this grant project for the Village. They are asking for an area variance for a mural on the east façade on 214 Main St. David Whalen is the owner of the property. The artist, Danae Brissonnet is familiar with the village history and is planning on incorporating different styles of boots. She likes to draw inspiration for the local flora and fauna as well. The installation is planned for early spring or summer of 2025.

Ms. Brewer confirmed the grant deadline is May 2026. They only have the summer to complete any final mural projects. This particular mural will take about two weeks.

Chairman Putman questioned how they protect them from graffiti.

Ms. Brewer responded they use an anti-graffiti top coat. They have not experienced any issues with graffiti with any of the projects. Any issues and the maintenance is the responsibility of the property owner. The owner can work with the artist or they may hire a local artist to address the issue.

The Variance Request has been added to the record.

Variance Request:

In 2019, Broome County was awarded a grant through the Greater Binghamton Fund to install public art in the Binghamton, Johnson City and Endicott iDistricts. Since then, they have worked closely with local officials to establish a public art program and identify properties of interest for such murals within the iDistrict. The proposed location at 214 Main Street is at a property owned by David Whalen and requests an area variance for the 2,700 square foot mural.

Broome County submitted the application for the mural as a sign authorized without permit as it is a “work of art not displaying a commercial message.” The parcel is in the Central Business zoning district and a wall sign is limited to a maximum of 48 square-feet and 50% wall coverage.

Chairman Putman read the Environmental Summary and Department Head Comments and Planning Staff Recommendations

Environmental Summary and Department Head Comments

The project was routed to Broome County Planning for 239-review as well as department heads for comment. The applicant’s proposal is a SEQRA unlisted action, and the ZBA shall claim lead agency and complete their review following the public hearing on November 18.



- **Broome County Planning** – The Planning Department has reviewed the above-cited case and has not identified any significant countywide or inter-community impacts associated with the proposed project.
- **NYS DOT** – The Regional Site Plan Committee has no comments on this proposal, provided that no work in the State right-of-way is required.
- **Water, Police and Fire Departments** – No compelling interest.
- **Code Enforcement** – Awaiting comment.

Planning Staff Recommendations

The Planning Department staff recommends that the Planning Board recommend to the ZBA approval of the variance as this is part of the ongoing Broome County public art initiative and meets the goals of the health and cultural district. Granting the requested variance will not have negative impacts on the surrounding uses, including the historic district per the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation.

There were no further questions from the Board.

Chairman Putman asked for a motion.

Motion that the Johnson City Planning Board recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals approval of the variance for 214 Main Street including the Department Head Comments was made by Mr. Michalak and seconded by Ms. Thorn.

Motion Carried - Vote:

Yes – 5 (Sheredy, Thorn, Michalak, Ward, Putman) **No** – 0 **Absent** – 0

290 Grand Avenue – Sarbost Doski

Site Plan Review (Type II Action)

Sarbost Doski and Maria Perez, the business owner appeared on behalf of the application.

Chairman Putman read the Site Plan Review, Environmental Review, Department Head Comments and Planning Staff Recommendations

Site Plan Review:

Mr. Sarbost Doski applied to use a 400 square-foot existing commercial building for a barber shop/hair salon business at 290 Grand Avenue. The 1,600 square-foot property is zoned Urban Multi-Family, and the Zoning Board of Appeals granted a use variance for a barber shop on November 18, 2019. In addition, an area variance for three parking spaces was granted, as Mr. Doski plans to have a maximum of two barber service chairs in the building and there is no legal parking on the property.

Environmental Review:

The reuse of an existing commercial building is classified as a Type II action under SEQRA, and is not subject to further environmental review. The property is also not subject to a 239-Review.

- Two-chair hair salon
- Open Wednesday through Sunday
 - Wednesday – Friday 10am-5pm



- Saturday 9am-6pm
- Sunday 9am-2pm
- No parking in front. Parking on side street or down the street
- Ms. Perez confirmed there will be a combination of walk-ins and appointments.
- Chairman Putman stated their clients need to know there is no standing between 10-6.

Department Head Comments:

- **Code Enforcement:** The applicant shall use plumbing and electrical contractors licensed by the Village of Johnson City, and apply for appropriate building permits.
- **Police Department:** No compelling interest.
- **Fire Department:** Once all construction is complete, the Fire Marshal shall inspect the building prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Compliance from the Building Permits Office. Please contact the Fire Department to arrange the inspection.
- **Public Works & Water:**
 - The applicant should be made aware that there is a parking restriction in front of the property, “No Standing Anytime 10 AM to 6 PM,” per Section 264-92, Schedule XVII.
 - The backflow prevention device shall be test annually and a report submitted to the Water Department.

Planning Staff Recommendations:

The Planning Department recommends the Planning Board approve the site plan for a hair salon, with the Department Head requirements and the following stipulations:

1. The maximum number of personal service stations is two (2).
2. Before opening, contact Code Enforcement to schedule a fire safety inspection and for the issuance of the Certificate of Compliance.
3. All proposed signage shall be submitted to the Code Enforcement Officer for review and approval prior to installation. All temporary signs including price signs, portable signs, and sidewalk signs shall be reviewed and approved by the Code Enforcement Office prior to being placed on the property. Per Section 300-52.5, signs that blink, rotate, or move are not permitted, except barber poles during business hours.
4. Prior to the installation of any additional exterior lighting, cut sheets for the proposed signage shall be submitted to the Code Enforcement Office for review and approval.
5. Site plan approval shall be valid for one year, unless substantial improvements have been made pursuant to the approved site plan and a valid building permit.
6. The applicant shall be required to acknowledge all of the above conditions, in writing, prior to the issuance of a building permit. The applicant agrees to construct the project in strict accordance with the site plan approved by the Planning Board. Changes to the site plan following approval may require a minor site plan review or resubmittal to the Planning Board, depending on the degree of change per Section 300-63.2. Applicability.

Chairman Putman questioned the location of the signs on the building. Ms. Perez confirmed there will only be a sign sticker on the window.

Attorney Coughlin advised the owner to talk to Randy in Code Enforcement before placing the sign.



Motion that the Johnson City Planning Board approve the site plan for the hair salon 290 Grand Avenue with Department Head Comments and Planning Staff Recommendations was made by Ms. Thorn and seconded by Mr. Michalak.

Motion Carried - Vote:

Yes – 5 (Sheredy, Thorn, Michalak, Ward, Putman) **No** – 0 **Absent** – 0

601 Harry L Drive – Spark JC, LLC

Preliminary Site Plan Presentation

Chairman Putman stated this project will require SEQRA and so it is appropriate that this Planning Board make a motion to declare lead agency for the purposes of SEQRA.

Motion that the Johnson City Planning Board declare lead agency for the purposes of SEQRA for 601 Harry L Drive was made by Ms. Ward and seconded by Ms. Thorn.

Motion Carried - Vote:

Yes – 5 (Sheredy, Thorn, Michalak, Ward, Putman) **No** – 0 **Absent** – 0

Attorney William Demarest, Marc Newman, Jeff Smith, John Mastronardi and Gordon Stansbury appeared on behalf of the application.

There are three parts to the application

- First to construct a new multifamily residence building for 125 workforce housing units.
 - Four floors
 - Mix of 20 studio units, 85 one-bedroom units and 20 two-bedroom units
 - Requires 198 parking spaces
 - Located at the north end of the Oakdale Commons
- Second portion is a partitioning of the portion that will have the workforce housing. Single lot that continues down and it is joined with other portions of the Oakdale Mall area. They would like to partition that portion off. There are agreements in place regarding easements and parking and both the Spark JC and Spark Broome LLC which owns one of the other parcels there and they have both signed off on the application. There is plenty of parking and there are agreements in place to allow for that to continue.
- Final part is to amend the site plan as to the existing structure that has already been approved to add a day care center into the existing structure and the existing square footage would not require any additional construction and then an outdoor play area to be associated with the day care for 15000 sq ft exterior with day care. The Board has designs showing the location. They are located adjacent to each other and the access will be outside along sidewalks. They won't be going through the main parking lot or crossing any of the primary roads that provide access and they won't be going in front of any loading docks. They pass one area that is a current maintenance storage area that is low volume.

In terms of SEQRA they believe it is an unlisted action in terms of the residence portion of it because it is less than 200 units which would meet the threshold for a Type 1. In terms of the other aspects of the project this is all previously disturbed, previously constructed so it is less than 10 acres. They think you



could proceed as an unlisted action. Per comments from the Planning Department, they did provide a long EAF given the size of the project so all the details were in there.

Attorney Demarest spoke regarding the traffic study. He stated the actual housing unit development will have a fairly minimal negligible impact. The traffic estimated at peak hours is less than 50 cars exiting and entering. The background for the project is that there is a recommendation to add traffic signal at Reynolds Road to help address existing traffic impacts, but it is not stemming directly from the housing unit they are requesting approval for.

John Mastronardi of Griffiths Engineering explained:

- Key elements of site plan
 - Removing asphalt
 - ½ acre of greenspace with fauna or landscaping for the courtyard area
- Creating a fire access lane around the rear, northern side of the building
- Utilities
 - Gas and electric will be brought in off of Reynolds Road from the eastern portion of the site
- Water will be tied into existing loop with two lines
 - Fire suppression line and domestic water line
- Sanitary and storm,
 - Two laterals that will be tied into the west side of the building
 - Tie into the existing infrastructure within the parking lot. It runs north south in the Oakdale Commons
- Site lighting
 - Currently has pole mounted lights
 - They don't plan to add anymore site lighting in terms of pole lights; however, the pole lights will be replaced.
 - Mr. Newman confirmed the pole lights that haven't been replaced will be replaced. They will be state of the art energy saving lights.
 - They will be adding lights building or wall pack lights that are dark sky compliant
- Pedestrian improvements
 - Four-way stop sign
 - Proposing crosswalks running NS and EW
 - Sidewalks will extend and tie into existing sidewalks on Reynolds Rd
- Explained location of car charging stations
- Parking is provided for the residents
 - Mr. Newman confirmed the parking spots will not be designated
- Explained the subdivision

Attorney Coughlin and Mr. Newman discussed the Local Laws and Code adopted for the shopping center plaza lines for setbacks.

- Signage is to be determined. There will be some signage on the building, but it will be determined
 - Renderings have Oakdale Commons on side of building.
- No intent to regrade greenspace

The Board discussed their concern about the bank along Reynolds Rd.

- A basic SWPP is being developed right now



Attorney Demarest confirmed advised they have a geotechnical study in the works and they will get back to the Board and the Village. Mr. Mastronardi stated they are under an analysis of that slope as they are aware there is potential movement. They are keeping an eye on it and try to determine what mitigation is possible. Mr. Newman added they have looked at that and talked to Mr. Holland about it and they decided to get in there and do a Geotech study and see what they need to do.

- Pedestrian sidewalks and crosswalks
- No changes to entryway off of Reynolds. No geometric changes are planned.
- Embankment in the middle because of the grade change (5-6ft).5% slope from North to South
 - Possible landscaping
 - Rec space
- Work force housing is a state designation based on the adjusted median income of the area.

Mr. Newman confirmed we are at the highest end at 100-120%. It is very similar to market rate housing like 50 Front Street and they will have as many amenities as 50 Front Street with the mall amenities included. They envision, based on studies that are out there such as the County and IDA they will have young professional housing. They have a good feel for unit sizes and types to bring them to the next level.

- Total parking tally for Oakdale Commons area.
 - They are over code by 117 spaces.
- Spaces with cross parking agreements. Nothing is being specifically designated.

Mr. Newman added parking is important to them and are making sure there is enough parking. They feel very comfortable with the parking.

- Attorney Coughlin stated they have a full variance for parking lot landscaping
- Schedule
 - Mr. Newman responded:
 - Start late summer of 2025 with the completion late 2026.
 - Daycare estimate is early 2026 for projected opening. The County is doing lease agreement and hire a third-party manager that specializes in daycare facilities around the country.
- Playground

Attorney Demarest explained the entryway, exit, sidewalks, maintenance storage shed, trash compactor.

- Will be fully supervised
- Fenced in and secured
- There will be secured access from inside the building

Attorney Coughlin questioned how the numbers work out for the number of peak hour cars for housing portion.

Mr. Stansbury explained the housing trip generation was done using the standard IT which is the national standard. They used land use 220, low-rise apartments which is the highest generator for apartment use; trip generation is 2 cars per unit. The rates based on national counts and many studies. He has done studies on apartments, houses and all sorts of residential over his thirty years and the IT numbers are very solid.

Attorney Coughlin asked Mr. Stansbury if there are any modifiers for workforce housing being at the 100-120. Are there any qualifiers/quantifiers that go along with the type of housing.



Mr. Stansbury responded in the IT there are about 12 residential uses single family homes, standard apartment, senior residential, nursing homes, senior housing, there is not a differentiation in standard apartments. There are different rates if you are close to rail, not close to rail, a more urban setting, but it doesn't differentiate between number of bedrooms. For this one there is some level of conservativeness in the estimate because he would expect with medical, that some of the residents would be working on site, but they did not take any credits for that. They assumed all the residential was leaving the site and entering the site.

Mr. Newman spoke regarding the pedestrian walkways, sidewalks and traffic signal. Mr. Newman and Ms. Goraleski had a meeting with DOT so they are up to speed on what they need to do. Mr. Stansbury stated one of their concerns is the queuing, trying to get out of the northern access. They identified some longer delays under the current situation. It is a border-line signal warrant. It doesn't meet the primary warrants that they usually use. It does meet the four-hour warrant which is a reasonable justification of the signal.

Mr. Stansbury, Attorney Coughlin and Chairman Putman discussed:

- Different ways of going out of the housing
- Traffic signal options
- Fairview intersection
- Options where four-way stop sign is proposed
- Speed bumps

Attorney Coughlin stated he will have Josh Holland reach out if he has any questions.

The Board had no further questions.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn the Planning Board Meeting was made by Mr. Michalak and seconded by Ms. Ward. The motion carried with all those present voting in the affirmative.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:38 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kim Cunningham
Planning Board Clerk

