

Village of Endicott Planning Board Meeting November 18, 2021

Board Members Present

Cynthia Totolis (CT): Board Room
Larry Coppola (LC): Board Room
Bob Gazda (BG): Board Room
David Powell (DP): Board Room

Board Members Absent

Genevieve Riker (GR)

Others Present

Robert McKertich (RM): Attorney for Village, Board Room
Brian Botsford (BB): Fire Marshal, Board Room
Lynda Broadfoot (LB): PB alternate, Board Room
Richard Greco (RG): PB Advisor, Board Room
Alicia Thoennes: Recording Secretary, Zoom

Quorum (5) 4 regular members present plus 1 alternate

DP called the meeting called to order at 5:06pm. Two items on the agenda: site plan review for 121-125 infill project and variance for digital sign at EPAC

CT appointed Lynda Broadfoot (LB) to join the PB members and DP invited her to sit with them at the tables as an alternate for the meeting.

The meeting began with a recap of the infill project located at 121 - 125 Washington Ave., Endicott. Width of alleyways was a concern at the previous meeting. Documentation showed that accessibility standards have been met. It was decided that the gates will remain open. Lighting and cameras were also discussed.

DP asked the Planning Board for comments. None were offered.

Sarah Campbell (SC), Attorney representing the applicant, reviewed the project with respect to comments made by CPTED specifically easy identification of the building from the street and the potential for graffiti.

DP acknowledged that they met site plan review process and will move to the 11 questions on the SEQR. Each question was read aloud and the PB voiced their opinion regarding the type of impact that may occur:

Village of Endicott Planning Board Meeting November 18, 2021

1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulation?

PB agreed: No, small

2. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?

PB agreed: No

3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?

PB agreed: No

4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)?

PB agreed: No

5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or effect exiting infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway?

PB agreed: No or small

6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?

PB agreed: Small

7. Will the proposed action impact existing:

- a. public/private water supplies? PB agreed: Small
- b. public/private wastewater treatment utilities? PB agreed: Small

8. Will the proposed action impair the character of quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?

PB agreed: No

9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)?

PB agreed: No

10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems?

PB agreed: No

11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?

PB agreed: No or small

DP checked box #2 on the form indicating the proposed action with not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

DP made a motion for a negative declaration under SEQR for the 121-125 Washington Ave SEPP infill project. LC seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

CT: yes DP: yes LC: yes BG: yes LB: yes unanimous vote

In rendering a final decision, the Planning Department or Planning Board, as applicable, shall consider and make findings that:

RM read the following aloud and the PB gave their answer:

A The proposed site plan is consistent with the purpose and specific requirements of this chapter and generally consistent with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan;

LC said yes and the PB agreed

B Adequate services and utilities will be available prior to occupancy; and

PB agreed. BB, engineer and water department reviewed: water, sewer, storm water, and NYSEG

C The site plan is consistent with all other applicable laws.

DP going through code. PB agreed

SC said everything on record is part of the application

DP made a motion to approve the site plan for 121 – 125 Washington Ave following procedures and acceptance of 300.63.7 LC seconded the motion.

CT: yes DP: yes LC: yes BG: yes LB: yes unanimous vote

DP move to the application for a special permit for EPAC. The Village Board met and took the PB's suggestions to keep the law as stated with respect to the proposed distance change from 500' to 100'. Washington Ave. is zoned for residential and commercial use. BB reviewed the procedure for filing for a variance and special permit.

DP opened the Public Hearing at 5:39pm.

Sarah Campbell (SC), Attorney representing the applicant, reviewed the sign at EPAC. SC reviewed the sign and its history including its involvement with both the revitalization of Washington Ave. and the Comprehensive Plan. The sign will not alter the character of the neighborhood and will benefit the neighborhood.

Residents were invited to speak during the Public Hearing, but none did.

DP made a motion to close the Public Hearing. LC seconded the motion . All in favor. The Public Hearing was closed at 5:42pm.

SEQR review for the EPAC sign:

1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulation?

PB agreed: No

2. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?

PB agreed: No

3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?

PB agreed: No

4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)?

PB agreed: No

5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or effect exiting infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway?

PB agreed: No

6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?

PB agreed: No

7. Will the proposed action impact existing:

- a. public/private water supplies? PB agreed: No

- b. public/private wastewater treatment utilities? PB agreed: No

8. Will the proposed action impair the character of quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?

PB agreed: No

9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)?

PB agreed: No

10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems?

PB agreed: No

11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?

PB agreed: No

DP checked box #2 on the form indicating the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

DP made a motion to make a negative declaration under SEQR for the EPAC sign. LB seconded the motion.

CT: yes DP: yes LC: yes BG: yes LB: yes unanimous vote

Review of the special use permit for the Digital sign EPAC

Sarah Campbell (SC) Attorney for the applicant (EPAC), stated they received an area variance. The sign is still a sign and will not depreciate values, pose a hazard or alter the neighborhood. And if there is a problem it can be addressed.

Special use permit review criteria 300-66.7

In rendering a decision, the Planning Board shall consider and make findings that the proposed use:

A Will be generally consistent with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan;

PB agreed: Yes

B Meets any specific criteria set forth in this chapter;

PB agreed: Yes

C Will be compatible with existing uses adjacent to and near the property;

PB agreed: Yes

D Will be in harmony with the general purpose of this chapter;

PB agreed: Yes

E Will not tend to depreciate the value of adjacent property;

PB agreed: will not tend to depreciate values

F Will not create a hazard to health, safety or the general welfare;

PB agreed: no hazard to health, safety, welfare

G Will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood nor be detrimental to the neighborhood residents; and
PB agreed: no

H Will not otherwise be detrimental to the public convenience and welfare.
PB agreed: no

DP asked the Planning Board if they were in agreement that no adverse conditions would be created. All agreed.

DP made a motion to approve the special use permit for the digital sign with no conditions. CT seconded the motion and all agreed. Variance was granted
CT: yes DP: yes LC: yes BG: yes LB: yes unanimous vote

The PB discussed topics for the upcoming 12/16/2021 meeting:

- Final site plan approval for Altura
- New microbrewery and the process/steps they need to take

The PB reviewed its advisory role for a new tobacco license application submitted by Go Natural Deli.

DP because their data is incomplete, the motion is to make a recommendation to the Village Manager to deny their application based on incomplete submission of the application.

BG seconded the motion

CT: yes DP: yes LC: yes BG: yes LB: yes

BB will send a letter to Anthony.

CT made a motion to adjourn the meeting. DP seconded the motion. All in favor? Yes.
Meeting adjourned at 6:25PM.