



# CITY OF WATERTOWN, NEW YORK

## CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

ROOM 305, WATERTOWN CITY HALL  
245 WASHINGTON STREET  
WATERTOWN, NEW YORK 13601-3380  
(315) 785-7741

MEETING: April 2, 2024

### PRESENT:

Michelle Capone, Acting Chairperson  
Larry Coburn  
Maryellen Blevins  
Peter Monaco  
Linda Fields

### ALSO:

Michael A. Lumbis, Planning and Community  
Development Director  
Jennifer Voss, Senior Planner  
Geoffrey Urda, Planner  
Sharlice Bonello, Planner  
Thomas Compo, P.E., City Engineer

### ABSENT:

T.J. Babcock  
Lynn Godek

Planning Commission Acting Chairperson Michelle Capone called the April 2, 2024, Planning Commission meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Ms. Capone then asked for a motion regarding the minutes from the March 5, 2024, meeting. Linda Fields made a motion to accept the minutes as written, Peter Monaco seconded the motion, and all voted in favor.

Before discussing the second agenda item, Michael Lumbis introduced the new City Engineer, Thomas Compo. Mr. Lumbis stated that Mr. Compo has reviewed the applications on behalf of the Engineering Department and can answer any questions that the Commission may have. The Commission welcomed Mr. Compo and then introduced the second agenda item.

### **SKETCH PLAN APPROVAL– 1248 WASHINGTON STREET PARCEL NUMBER 14-13-101.001**

The Planning Commission then considered a request for Sketch Plan Approval submitted by Michael B. Lasell, P.E., of MBL Engineering on behalf of DRZ, Inc. to reconstruct and reconfigure the interior parking lot circulation at 1248 Washington Street, Parcel Number 14-13-101.001. Mr. Lasell attended to represent the request.

Mr. Lasell began by saying that he previously attended a Sketch Plan Conference with Planning Staff, which initiated some changes to the previous iteration of the plan. Mr. Lasell pointed out the two access points to the parcel; one at the north end of the parcel via an easement across Dunkin' property and one at the south end of the parcel from Barben Avenue.

Mr. Lasell then stated that there is no existing striping on the site and that the proposed Sketch Plan would improve vehicular circulation and would include other improvements, such as repairing pavement. He also said the proposed changes would not affect stormwater movement.

Mr. Lasell said that the plan proposes 15 parking spaces, with four primarily intended for employees. Mr. Lasell stated that during the Sketch Plan Conference, Planning Staff requested that a pedestrian walkway be added along Washington Street from the sidewalk to the front entrance.

Mr. Lasell then drew attention to proposed hatched striping and to a proposed stop sign intended to stop drivers from cutting the corner and causing conflicts with drivers leaving the Dunkin' drive thru. Additionally, Mr. Lasell mentioned that he investigated creating one-way entrances and exits, but that raised new conflicts. Mr. Lasell said that believes the proposal is the best layout to improve and organize parking on the site.

Mr. Lasell also pointed out that striping has been added all along the eastern side of the parcel, adjacent to the Washington Street sidewalk for additional control. Mr. Lasell said that he did not consider grass for this area because he believes that the striping would accommodate most of the issues during the winter.

Mr. Lasell then said that he planned to approach Dunkin' ownership regarding the potential for a sign controlling traffic exiting the Dunkin' drive thru that would alleviate a conflict with inbound Jreck's traffic. However, after discussing this with the owners and their representatives, he reported that there is not a great relationship between the businesses, making adding such a sign unlikely at the moment.

Ms. Capone then asked Mr. Lasell to address the summary items in Staff's memorandum to the Planning Commission. Mr. Lasell addressed the first summary item, which required the applicant to install a new curbed island in the area that separates the southern drive aisle entrance from the four parking spaces directly accessed from Barben Avenue, in lieu of the hatching depicted on the C-102 drawing, to better delineate the access points from one another.

Mr. Lasell then asked Staff to clarify the reasoning behind curbing the entire island. Mr. Compo replied that the curbing would delineate the entrance better than its current state, as the curb cut is around 140 feet which is very atypical. Ms. Capone stated that Summary Item one must remain as a condition of approval.

Mr. Urda then addressed the second summary item, which required the applicant to address the vehicular conflict point that exists on Dunkin' property at the northern entrance to the site. Mr. Urda stated that the applicant has shown a good faith effort by talking to Dunkin' about installing signage to alleviate the conflict at the northern entrance. Mr. Urda stated that the City may still pursue signage in the future, but it need not remain a condition of approval.

Ms. Capone then read Summary Item three, which required the applicant to strongly consider planting grass in the four-foot-wide buffer between the Washington Street sidewalk and three proposed interior parallel parking spaces, instead of the proposed hatched paint. She then asked about the potential for grass.

Mr. Lasell replied that he did not add grass to the sketch because it gives the restaurant a little more space, as the parking lot is a tight space, and the hatching provides a 4-foot offset for the parallel parking. Mr. Lasell then suggested that instead of grass, he would like to propose concrete planters with some spacing to save some money. Ms. Capone stated that she believes that if grass were to be put along the eastern side of the parcel, the grass would not be there for long

and turn into dirt and mud quickly. Mr. Lasell mentioned that he was thinking about planters that are 2'x 6' or 2'x 4' with 10-to-12 foot spaces. Mr. Capone stated that the Commission would be amendable to the suggestion and directed Mr. Lasell to work out the details with Planning Staff.

Ms. Capone then addressed the fourth summary item, which required the applicant to reconfigure the single ADA accessible parking space on the site to meet the United States Department of Justice's standards for a van accessible space. Mr. Lasell replied that there is sufficient room to meet the Department of Justice's 8-foot requirement and he would make the necessary changes. Mr. Urda added that DOJ guidance describes two ways to create a van accessible space, and the applicant could choose which to implement. Ms. Capone said that Summary Item four shall remain as a condition of approval.

Ms. Capone then addressed the fifth summary item, which required the applicant to provide an ADA accessible curb ramp providing access from the hatched ADA access aisle to the front entrance to the building. Mr. Lasell replied that the entrance to the building is currently flush with the pavement, thus not requiring a ramp. Mr. Urda stated that he included Summary Item five to have this discussion at the Planning Commission meeting since no ramp was depicted on the sketch. Mr. Lasell stated that he would add a few dashed lines to call out the path for ADA accessibility.

Ms. Capone then addressed the sixth summary item, which required the applicant to install a multidirectional breakaway post for the proposed Stop sign at the northern end of the interior drive aisle. Mr. Lasell acknowledged this requirement and said he would add it to the plans.

Ms. Capone then addressed the seventh summary item, which required the applicant to obtain a General City Permit prior to construction for all work within the City Right-of-Way (ROW). Mr. Lasell acknowledged the need for the permit.

Mr. Coburn arrived at the meeting during the summary item discussion for the Sketch Plan.

Hearing no further discussion, Ms. Fields made a motion to waive further Site Plan Review and approve the Sketch Plan for the request submitted Michael B. Lasell, P.E., of MBL Engineering on behalf of DRZ, Inc. to reconstruct and reconfigure the interior parking lot circulation at 1248 Washington Street, Parcel Number 14-13-101.001, contingent upon the following requirement:

1. The applicant shall install a new curbed island in the area that separates the southern drive aisle entrance from the four parking spaces directly accessed from Barben Avenue, in lieu of the hatching depicted on the C-102 drawing, to better delineate the access points from one another.
2. The applicant shall install planters in the four-foot-wide painted buffer area between the Washington Street sidewalk and three proposed interior parallel parking spaces and shall coordinate the exact locations with Planning and Engineering Staff.
3. The applicant must reconfigure the single ADA accessible parking space on the site to meet the United States Department of Justice's standards for a van accessible space.

4. The applicant shall install a multidirectional breakaway post for the proposed Stop sign at the northern end of the interior drive aisle.
5. The applicant must obtain a General City Permit prior to construction for all work within the City Right-of-Way (ROW).

Mr. Monaco seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

**SITE PLAN APPROVAL – 848 IVES STREET  
PARCEL NUMBER 14-49-118.000**

The Planning Commission then considered a request for Site Plan Approval submitted by Kayla Kibling of Barton & Loguidice D.P.C on behalf of Jake Johnson of Ives Hill Country Club 465 Inc., to construct a 1,950 SF storage building and a 20-foot asphalt drive at 848 Ives Street, Parcel Number 14-49-118.000. Ms. Kibling attended to represent the request.

Ms. Kibling began by describing the proposed building to be located at the southeast corner of the 848 Ives Street parcel and noted that the access point would be off Weldon Drive, near Kieff Drive. Ms. Kibling stated that the storage building would be used to store equipment for the golf course and the building would not have heat, but there would be electrical power for internal lighting. Ms. Kibling noted that there are no municipal water or sewer connections proposed and noted that stormwater typically flows from east to west on the site and that there are existing municipal stormwater catch basins along Weldon Drive.

Ms. Voss then distributed a revised layout that Ms. Kibling provided that contained three deciduous trees that the Planning Department requested in the required 10-foot buffer with an adjacent residential parcel. Ms. Kibling also provided a revised elevation drawing that showed a new window configuration on the front façade to meet the transparency requirements. Ms. Kibling stated that to be conservative, she had edited the SEQOR form to reflect an increase in the disturbance area from .16-acres to .22-acres due to the addition of the trees.

Ms. Capone then started going through the Summary Items, starting with the first summary item, which required the applicant to submit a new survey map showing the two parcels assembled into one to reflect the recent assemblage, and asked Ms. Kibling if she submitted a new survey map. Ms. Kibling answered in the negative but stated that it is something that she is aware of and will complete, keeping Summary Item One as a condition of approval.

Ms. Capone stated that Summary Item two had been satisfied and then stated that Summary Items three and five shall be kept as conditions of approval.

Ms. Fields then asked Ms. Kibling about exterior lighting, particularly whether it would be needed around the structure. Ms. Kibling replied that there is pedestrian scale lighting along the driveway, which is near the proposed structure and no additional lighting is being proposed at the exterior of the structure. Additionally, Ms. Kibling noted that the equipment stored in the structure will only be used during the daytime. Ms. Fields stated that she was concerned about theft.

Nancy Storino who introduced herself as a local realtor attending the meeting on behalf of friends and her brother, who own property near 848 Ives Street, and asked if the equipment stored in the structure was going to be used only during the daytime and what would be stored in the structure since it is so big. Ms. Kibling stated that the purpose of the structure is to store equipment for the golf course, which only operates during the day, and noted that she could not speak about what would be stored in the structure since she is just the engineer for the project.

Ms. Storino stated that currently, she sees a lawnmower, backhoe, and a few other things that are always on the 848 Ives Street parcel and said that it looked like a four-car garage was going to be installed on the parcel, which would be facing 522 A-1 Weldon Drive. Ms. Kibling replied that the structure would have four overhead doors. Ms. Storino asked if the equipment would be used in the middle of the night or after dark. Ms. Kibling replied that it should not be the case.

Ms. Storino then said she was concerned about how the property values of her brother and friends were going to be negatively impacted by the proposed structure. Ms. Storino then said that 522 A-1 Weldon Drive presently has a phenomenal view of the golf course, since it is the last home before the golf course. She then said that she was under the impression that there is going to be a barrier obstructing the view, causing the home to decrease in value from its previous purchase price because of the lost aesthetic value.

Ms. Storino then said that discussed the situation with another realtor and a local attorney, and they all came to the conclusion that if one of the property owners were to sell their townhouse at 522 Weldon Drive, or any other property adjoining 848 Ives Street, the property owner would be required to disclose the proposed building at 848 Ives Street, and failing to do so would hold the property owner liable.

Ms. Storino reiterated that she is concerned about the home values of neighboring and adjoining properties and stated that a view from a home is a major part of an appraisal. Ms. Storino gave an example, saying if she were to buy a home for \$450,000 and across the road, mobile homes are constructed; when it comes time to sell the home, the seller will not recoup \$450,000.

Ms. Fields stated that the Planning Commission's task was to approve or deny a Site Plan for the proposed storage building. Ms. Fields stated that the Planning Commission was not going to discuss any property values and noted it would not affect the decision of the Commission, but thanked Ms. Storino for her comments.

Mr. Coburn stated that there was a comment on Staff's memorandum that noted that trees were going to be cut down and asked Ms. Kibling to clarify what trees were going to be removed. Ms. Kibling replied that the trees planned for removal are shown on the revised drawing. She continued that initially, they were not going to be cut down, but an evaluation by Michael DeMarco revealed that the trees were in deteriorating condition. Ms. Kibling then once again pointed out the three new trees on the revised map to make up for the two trees being removed.

Ms. Capone then referred to the revised plan, asking if the brownish grass surrounding the proposed structure was wetlands or scrub. Ms. Kibling replied that it was just taller grass.

Patricia J. Schreck approached the stand and introduced herself as a concerned neighbor at 522 A-1 Weldon Dr. Ms. Schreck stated that the proposed structure would be built in a residential

neighborhood and would affect her property as her townhouse is directly across from the proposed storage building. Ms. Schreck said that she looks out her dining room window every day and sees a view of the golf course and does not want to look out her window and see a storage building.

Ms. Schreck then referred to the City's Zoning Ordinance adopted in February 2023, and stated that she believes the proposed structure is an accessory structure which cannot be more than 900 SF, and that the golf course is the Primary Use of the land. Ms. Schreck said that the applicant is requesting to build a 1,950 SF structure and she is concerned about noise and air pollution. Ms. Schreck continued that there is a lot of traffic on her street due to the Ives Hill Retirement Village, Maple Court apartments and the Fairway West Townhomes where she lives, which all make up the residential neighborhood.

Ms. Schreck asked what kind of guarantee anyone could give her that the storage building would be used exclusively for storage. Ms. Schreck said that believes that anyone living in a residential neighborhood would not want the proposed storage building next door to their home and that her property value will decrease, which she feels is not fair to her nor the neighborhood.

Ms. Capone referred to Staff's memorandum and stated that the storage building is a primary structure and not an accessory structure, as it is the only building located on the parcel. Ms. Capone stated the storage building is required for the operation and maintenance of the golf course operations that meets all setbacks and transparency requirements for primary structures in the Residential Zoning District.

Mr. Lumbis then assured Ms. Schreck if the golf course ceases to exist, the only thing that would be allowed in the building would be uses allowed in the Residential District, such as one-and-two-family residential dwelling units.

Ms. Capone noted that the proposed trees would be provided as a barrier.

Arthur Zaremba, residing at 772 Massey Street South, approached the Planning Commission and stated that he did not review the application prior to the meeting, but believes there is already a storage facility that was used for the golf course that was used as a maintenance structure and believes it is near the Immaculate Heart Central School, located at 1316 Ives Street. Mr. Zaremba noted that the golf course is now a 9-hole instead of an 18-hole course and stated that he was curious if the development of the proposed structure was for the storage of golf carts.

Mr. Zaremba then suggested that the existing structure that was once used for the 18-hole course be used as the storage building for the current 9-hole golf course instead of the new proposed building. Ms. Capone stated that the Planning Commission can only review what is being proposed on the application. Ms. Voss stated that it would not be possible as the existing structure is located on a different parcel that is not owned by the current owner of the 9-hole golf course.

Neil Katzman, residing at 193 Green Street, approached the Planning Commission and stated that he is concerned about the proposed storage building and based on his interpretation of the regulation and definitions in the Zoning Ordinance, the primary use of the land is the golf course, and the accessory use would be the building that the application is proposing. Mr. Katzman continued that he therefore does not believe that the proposed storage building is a

primary building since the golf course is the primary use, and therefore the proposed structure should be considered an accessory structure and be required to stay under 900 SF.

Mr. Katzman noted that the garage doors were going to be facing Ms. Schreck's home and said that he believes that the garage doors should be located on the opposite end. Mr. Katzman stated that when he hears "storage building," he thinks of a structure that stores equipment that will stay put for a while and believes that a maintenance/storage building is more appropriate since the equipment will be stored in the building at night and then used early in the morning during normal golf course maintenance.

Mr. Katzman also stated that he was concerned about sand for bunkers and topsoil being stored in the storage building and stated that the applicant will require water and is concerned about where the water will go. Ms. Capone stated that the applicant has already stated that no utilities are being proposed and would need a utility permit to add such utilities. Mr. Katzman stated that the storage building that was used for the 18-hole golf course was not in good condition and equipment was stored around the storage building making it an eyesore for neighboring properties. Mr. Katzman reiterated that he believes the definitions of Primary Use and Accessory Use should go before the Zoning Board of Appeals for an Interpretation.

Mr. Katzman then asked if there was any guarantee that this storage building was only going to be used for storage. Ms. Capone reiterated that the storage building was for maintenance and operations of the golf course. Mr. Katzman asked how maintenance would be done on lawn mowers and greens cutters since they need to be washed. Mr. Katzman also asked how fertilizer and pesticides are going to be addressed when the DEC has special regulations for proper storage and knows this because he is a licensed pesticide applicator.

Mr. Katzman then referred to the 10-foot landscape buffer and the proposed three trees, stating that this is not adequate to shield noise and visual appeal. Mr. Katzman stated that the buffer needs a denser screened barrier.

Jake Johnson, the owner of 848 Ives Street, said that he would like everyone to note that the current zoning would allow him to develop the entire site into duplexes if he wished.

Mr. Coburn stated that the applicant is proposing a storage building and that the Planning Commission is not going to assume that the storage building will be used for anything other than what the applicant is proposing. Mr. Coburn stated that the Bureau of Code Enforcement would enforce the code as needed and that the applicant will be working with Code Enforcement for any permits needed.

Mr. Monaco appreciated that the applicant is proposing five windows high up on the building to avoid the possibility of break ins.

Hearing no further discussion, Ms. Capone directed the Planning Commission to Part 2 of the Short EAF, reading each question aloud and answering all of them in the negative. Ms. Fields then made a motion to issue a Negative Declaration for the proposed site plan pursuant to the requirements of SEQRA. Ms. Blevins seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

Hearing no further discussion, Ms. Fields made a motion to grant Site Plan Approval, for the request submitted by Kayla Kibling of Barton & Loguidice D.P.C on behalf of Jake Johnson of Ives Hill Country Club 465 Inc to construct a 1,950 SF storage building and a 20-foot asphalt drive at 848 Ives Street, Parcel Number 14-49-118.000, contingent upon the following:

1. The applicant shall submit a new survey map showing the two parcels assembled into one to reflect the recent assemblage.
2. Information must be provided to the City Engineering Department regarding roof drainage, and the proposed cover over the existing sanitary line.
3. The applicant must obtain the following permits and other documentation, minimally, prior to construction: Building Permit, a Curb Cut Permit, and a Zoning Compliance Certificate.

Ms. Blevins seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

**ZONE CHANGE – 1316 REAR IVES STREET & 1200 REAR JEWELL DRIVE  
PARCEL NUMBERS 14-49-116.000 & 14-49-117.000**

The Planning Commission then considered a request for a Zone Change submitted by Robert J. Busler, PLS of LaFave, White & McGivern on behalf of Prime, LLC to change the approved zoning classification of **1200 Rear Jewell Drive**, Parcel Number 14-49-117.000, and **1316 Rear Ives Street**, Parcel Number 14-49-116.000 from Residential to Planned Campus.

Mr. Busler attended to represent the request. He began by reading aloud the following prepared statement:

*“I am here this evening on behalf of Prime LLC to discuss a request for a zone change regarding properties designated 1316 Rear Ives Street and 1200 Rear Jewell Drive.*

*Although recommendations given by Jefferson County Planning and the subsequent City Planning Memorandum dated March 28, 2024 indicate that allowable commercial uses in the requested Planned Campus District are not compatible in the Sherman Neighborhood and its Residential Low-Density character, my client is offering to place restrictions on the Prime LLC property in order to disallow these commercial uses. The primary reason for the zone change request is to allow potential housing opportunities for senior housing, apartments, low income housing or townhouses. These housing uses presently exist at nearby Ives Hill Community Retirement, The Lodge at Ives Hill, Maple Court Apartments and Fairway West Townhomes. My client’s request will not be adding the PC District to the Sherman Neighborhood, as about 64 acres of PC Zoned land already exists immediately adjacent to the east of the Prime LLC parcels.*

*The Prime LLC parcels have somewhat become isolated from the residential portion of the Sherman Neighborhood. (See map). In January 2023 a deed restriction limited Ives Hill Golf Course to nine holes. Upon the sale of the active nine-hole portion of the golf course on the west and east sides of Ives Street, the current Prime LLC parcels located within the city limits are now bounded on the east by IHC School and Ives Hill Retirement, north by Ives Hill Golf Course and*



*west by an active railroad. Its present and potential uses are no longer that as a golf course like it was during development of the Comp Plan and February 2023 zoning law. There is merely 1 privately owned residential property located at 801 South Massey Street that adjoins the Prime LLC parcels to the north. My client feels that the isolation of these parcels and their proximity to existing senior, apartment and townhouse uses already in the Planned Campus District makes the Prime LLC parcels a suitable and practical fit for the PC District.*

*My client understands that there are engineering and code enforcement concerns that are unable to be addressed at this time. These will be addressed and negotiated during site plan development. My client feels that it is premature to commit to the expenses to develop these plans. Access has also been a noted concern. Prime LLC owns the adjoining land to the south located in the Town of Watertown. This property has frontage along County Route 65 which can potentially provide access to the parcels within the city. Access and utility development are often a major effort with housing developments, as will be the case here.*

*The Comprehensive Plan has set goals to ‘Strengthen Community Building Efforts’ and ‘Make Watertown more attractive to developers. To achieve these goals the Comprehensive Plan suggests promoting a variety of housing types including townhouses and multi-unit buildings, and supporting new apartment development at a variety of price points. The Comp Plan also suggests promoting senior housing, amenities and facilities, to support variety in senior housing, and to support future efforts to create a senior center. My client feels that changing the Prime LLC parcels to the PC District will open opportunities to achieve these goals and visions.*

*My client is aware that at the City Council meeting on March 4, 2024, Resolution No. 3 was passed, which was a resolution to Adopt the New York State Pro-Housing Community Pledge. The resolution is in support of Governor Hochul’s act to have local governments support housing growth. The resolution included statements such as, ‘we believe that every community must do their part to contribute to housing growth’, and ‘we believe that supporting housing production of all kinds in our community will bring multiple benefits’. The resolution vowed ‘an endeavor to take the following important steps’, which included “streamlining permitting for multifamily housing and affordable housing” among others. My client feels that a zoning change to the PC District would be an act in accordance with the intention of Resolution 3.*

*In summary, given the proximity to existing PC District properties, the isolation from the current residences in the Sherman Neighborhood, the goals and visions supported in the Comp Plan, and compliance with the goals set forth in the Pro-Housing Pledge, my client sees this as a golden opportunity to provide potential housing growth to 16 acres of land within the Watertown city limits.”*

Ms. Fields thanked Mr. Busler’s client for keeping his options open and emphasized that the Planning Commission asks that every applicant seeking to rezone a property to be specific regarding what they propose to develop if the City rezoned the property. Ms. Fields asserted that the applicant has not yet provided sufficient details and stated that if the Commission were to recommend that the City Council approve the request as submitted, it would be unfair and discriminatory to past and future applicants. Ms. Fields then asked Mr. Busler exactly what his client proposed to do with the two parcels. Mr. Busler replied that all he could say was that the proposed development focused on housing and his client’s goal was to market the property with housing opportunities and is presently unable to do that under its current zoning.

Ms. Capone then stated that in situations where an applicant seeks to rezone an area for marketability, the Planning Commission has consistently told applicants that they can market the

property but either the applicant or the potential buyer must explain to the Planning Commission why a zone change is necessary for what the buyer seeks to develop.

Ms. Capone stated that no one on the Planning Commission nor Staff are opposed to developing housing in the area, but Ms. Capone and Ms. Fields do not feel justified in rezoning two parcels when there is no guaranteed end use for the parcels. Ms. Capone then stated that she has voted against other proposed Zone Changes even if there was an end use proposed because she was not sure if the parcels even needed to be rezoned.

Pat Fields, residing at 302 Gale Street, approached the Planning Commission, and stated for the record that he was married to Planning Commission member, Linda Fields. Mr. Fields then stated that what the Planning Commission asked of Mr. Busler and his client was no different than what was provided for the Site Plan Approval submitted for 848 Ives Street. Mr. Fields stated that the applicant for the Site Plan provided all the required plans to the Planning Commission knowing that the Planning Commission would approve or deny the application. Mr. Fields noted that the Planning Commission is asking Mr. Busler to go back to his client and create a proposal specifying what the client would like to propose as an end use.

Mr. Monaco stated that the two parcels are the areas in the City where nice homes can be developed and understands that it would be expensive to develop since there is no infrastructure currently in place. Mr. Monaco noted that the Sherman neighborhood is comprised of nice homes and believes that the neighborhood should be kept as single-family homes and duplexes.

Ms. Blevins agreed with Mr. Monaco and acknowledged that single-family homes and duplexes on the two parcels would not require a Zone Change. Ms. Blevins then said that she had concerns with putting deed restrictions on the two parcels because there is no way to enforce the restrictions and the entity that created the deed restrictions could just as easily remove them.

Ms. Blevins elaborated that she has seen too many times where the City rezoned a property for an applicant with the best intentions, with the Planning Commission and City Council stating that they don't want a certain future use to ensue, but later that exact use occurs because there is no way to prevent it from happening. Ms. Blevins stated that the Comprehensive Plan clearly designates the land proposed for rezoning as Residential Low Density and the current zoning is not in in anyway in conflict with Governor Hochul's pro housing proposal because it is legal to develop housing on the subject parcels today. Ms. Blevins reiterated that she does support the proposed Zone Change.

Don Metzger, residing at 1200 Jewell Drive approached the Planning Commission and asked if the Planning Commission could leave the map prepared by the City's GIS Staff that depicted the proposed Zone Change. Mr. Metzger then asked someone to explain the "Sherman District." Mr. Urda replied that the Comprehensive Plan breaks Watertown into six neighborhoods, one of which is the Sherman Neighborhood. He continued that the designation does not carry any legal weight as far as zoning, but rather in terms of the Comprehensive Plan's planning goals for that section of the City.

Partrick Signor then spoke on behalf of his mother, who is a resident at 1200 Jewell Drive. Mr. Signor stated that he also had concerns about the open-endedness of the request and said that while housing is an important goal, there are different kinds of housing that are better situated in

one neighborhood compared to another. Mr. Signor also said that he is concerned with the applicant's proposal of deed restrictions, because he believed that such a practice essentially amounted to zoning by parcel instead of zoning by district.

Mr. Signor then raised concern over the type of housing that has been proposed in the area since subsidized housing was proposed in the past for the entire golf course, including the parcels in the Town of Watertown, and said that the current proposed application still leaves subsidized housing as an option.

Ms. Capone reiterated that the Planning Commission and Planning Staff support housing and Mr. Busler made valid points as to why housing is important in City of Watertown and why although the Planning Commission supports housing, it does not believe that the application contains sufficient information to recommend that City Council approve it.

Ms. Fields then made a motion recommending that City Council approve the Zone Change request submitted by Robert J. Busler, PLS of LaFave, White & McGivern on behalf of Prime, LLC to change the approved zoning classification of **1200 Rear Jewell Drive**, Parcel Number 14-49-117.000, and **1316 Rear Ives Street**, Parcel Number 14-49-116.000 from Residential to Planned Campus. Mr. Monaco seconded the motion, and all voted against.

Nancy Storino then approached the Planning Commission and asked if anyone seeking to develop subsidized housing on the two parcels would need to apply for a Zone Change first. Ms. Capone replied that establishing any uses not permitted in the Residential District such as multi-family housing would require an applicant to request a Zone Change to a district where their proposed use was legal.

At 6:57 p.m., Mr. Monaco moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Fields seconded the motion, and all voted in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharlice Bonello  
Planner