

Village of Central Square ZBA Public Hearing and Regular Meeting  
June 28, 2012

Attendance: Deputy Chair Jacques Monica, Board Members Mike Sperling, Keith Lindstrom, Debbie Bilello, Codes Enforcement Officer Dale Hodge, Zoning Board of Appeals Attorney Steve Primo, Secretary Kim Cusson, Oswego Health, applicant representatives, Marion Ciciarelli and Jamie Cullen; Also in attendance: Village Mayor Millard Murphy and Trustee John Urbaniak.

Meeting called to order at 7:00 pm by Jacques Monica.

Public hearing notice for the Oswego Health Center application for area variances relative to parking space area and signage total area was read by Jacques Monica.

Opened to the applicant and public for comment.

No comments or questions from the public other than comments and Applicant's representatives above named.

Regarding the Parking Variance Request(s): it was acknowledged by the Applicant that 10 x 20 ft. per space is required per Village Code (NOTE - actual requirement is only for a total of 200 sq. ft.). Applicant had wished to keep the existing parking spaces which dimensions are 9' x 18'.- to accommodate more parking in the lot. However, when plans (for the modified site plan) were presented to the Planning Board, based upon the Planning Board's requirements relative to site plan review, the Applicant then agreed to 10x18-existing spaces are presently nonconforming uses; because of building and site modifications they have to conform to current code and therefore need variance.

The Applicant maintained a loss of 12 parking spaces would occur if the Applicant had to provide 10' x 20' spaces. Also a path or corridor for two way traffic (aisle width) would be more problematic with the 10' x 20' spaces. Reviewing the drawings, based on the existing conditions plan, the 9' x 18' spaces that presently exist are being used and are working. The Applicant stated spaces are now at 138.

The Zoning Board expressed concern with the width of the spaces. Mike Sperling expressed concern with minimal space in between parked vehicles, as impacting physically handicapped. The applicant advised paved areas would be sealed and restriped to 10ft. widths.

There are enough spaces for the size of the building accounting for both front and back parking of the building. A 10 ft. parking space width is fairly normal the ZBA Attorney advised.

The ZBA Attorney then asked the Zoning Board what they might be comfortable with; it was indicated that 10' x 18' spaces may be acceptable. He then also questioned whether there was a minimum required aisle width in the Village Code. The Codes Enforcement Officer advised there was no such requirement in the Code but the project engineers may have suggested a width in their plans. He also confirmed the number of spaces appeared adequate for the square footage and number of employees- 113 spaces being required. The employee parking lot is in the back of the building. It was acknowledged the new canopied area will have some nearer parking for patients.

Regarding the Signage Variance Request: Marion Ciciarelli, for the applicant, provided particulars relative to the Area Variance for signage to permit a freestanding sign of 71" W x 174" H-illuminated internally. Variance is for 70 square ft. - as current zoning is 20 sq. ft. for each sign face. The current sign existing is 28 sq. ft., a non-conforming use, and the desire is to put the new sign in the same location.

The Board's comments related to concerns as to the sheer size, as proposed the sign will be much taller and wider than is generally the case (for this type of signage) in Central Square and was also believed to be larger than really needed by the Applicant. There was considerable discussion of the necessity for the size of the sign. The Applicant stressed the special needs of patients who because of age, health conditions, not being ambulatory, or simply unfamiliar, and perhaps unusually stressed, would need greater signage visibility.

The sign would include seven or eight 10" x 71" sign panels listing the various occupants/ services and the question was whether they could they be smaller. Attorney Primo also asked whether the Applicant could use a pylon instead of a monument style sign (discussion was had relative to whether airspace between pylons was included in calculation of face area; per Dale Hodge same did not affect the calculation of face area, i.e. was not included in calculation of face area).

Board comments included that because the Medical Center name/label assumes that certain medical services are available, is there really a need to list all of the names? Can the Applicant put signage on the side of the building to denote the other services available in the building. Dale Hodge advised that a separate section of Code provisions governed signage on the building. The Applicant felt that tenant occupants required a separate listing of their names and that patients often would not necessarily connect the "Medical Center" signage with their particular specific destination and would continue to look for it along the highway.

John Urbaniak asked about the services listed on the sign, there was no competition in Central Square, and how were they going to market services in community. He acknowledged interest in being able to see the Urgent Care sign- without regard to the other services being on the sign.

Deb Billelo had a concern that the entrance way/intersection was already dangerous and whether the sign would block the traffic flow.

It was also suggested they consider moving the sign back from the road, and observed that with a pylon sign, the Applicant would still have enough height but would lose the 30 sq. ft. part that is not currently used at the base and provide through visibility at the base for traffic safety. The top of sign will be totally lit.

It was then questioned by the ZBA Attorney whether, of the 86 sq. ft. total proposed (per face) signage, would the ZBA be comfortable allowing 51 sq. ft. which would require only a 31 sq. ft. variance instead of 66 sq. ft.?

The ZBA indicated it would, but also with the following conditions: landscaping along the bottom, however low plantings to not impede visibility; configuration of the sign substantially similar to the drawing attached to application; 33.53 allowed square foot for usable signage for tenants; 34" x 71" for Central Square Medical Center; 71" x 34"/144=33.53=50 square feet per face instead of 20 - allowing a 31 square foot variance.

Public hearing closed per Deputy Chair Jacques Monica at 8:21 pm.  
Motion to close public hearing by Mike Sperling; seconded by Debbie Bilello ; motion carried unanimously.

Minutes read from 6/12/12 meeting.  
Motion to accept minutes by Deputy Chair Monica; seconded by Debbie Bilello; motion carried unanimously.

The Special Meeting was then opened for discussion of the public hearing, and the parking spaces and area variances requested.

The ZBA Attorney questioned if the application had been referred to the County Planning Board for GML §239 review, for both the sign and parking variance requests, and advised, that same must be sent. It was acknowledged the Codes Enforcement Officer would forward same to the County on Friday morning (6/19/12) and place a call to indicate the urgency (including perhaps to amend the site plan review to include the variances).

The ZBA Attorney indicated a notice should also be faxed or e-mailed to the press advising of the special meeting and also posting the notice. A motion to approve (with conditions) the variances could then be made at the Special Meeting to be held on Tuesday July 10<sup>th</sup> at 7:00pm at Village Offices.

The ZBA Attorney requested the Board indicate a comfort level with the Applicant if possible. Jacques Monica stated that the Board would probably be receptive to 51 sq. ft sign, and that a 31 sq. ft. variance with a pylon sign with a six foot open area at the base and the height same as requested.

The ZBA Attorney also asked that a blanket resolution be adopted, such that all applications in the future that have to go out for GML §239 referral automatically go without requiring a separate meeting and motion for each referral..

Motion was made by Debbie Bilello to authorize the Code Enforcement Officer, ZBA Chairman or secretary, or ZBA Attorney to refer filed applications to Oswego County Planning for their prior review under (NYS) GML §239 (and subsections), including the Oswego Health Center's applications; seconded by Jacques Monica; and unanimously approved.

Motion was made by Keith Lindstrom to continue this matter at a special meeting scheduled on July 10, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. and authorize Village Clerk to notify the press and post notice as required under Open Meetings Law; seconded by Mike Sperling; and motion unanimously carried.

Old Business-None

New Business-None

Motion to adjourn- Jacques Monica- Mike Sperling- motion carried-Meeting Adjourned at 9:00 pm.

**(Note- some testimony at hearing inaccurate as to Village Code requirements, plans details and existing conditions however was noted as stated- see final approval resolutions for corrections).**