

Olean Planning Board Meeting Minutes

Monday, May 8, 2017
Council Chambers
Olean Municipal Building

Attendance:

Chairman: Tom Barnes
Members: Mary Fay
Craig Polson
Mark Sabella
Phil Smith

Applicant: Donna Kahm, Southern Tier Health Care
Tammy Hilmey, Architect for Southern Tier Health Care
Gordon Scott, Believers Chapel

Staff: Keri Kerper, Sr. Account Clerk Stenographer

Other(s): None

1. Roll Call

Chairman Tom Barnes called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. and requested the roll call show all members present except George Pancio and Jerry Steiner.

2. Reading and approval of the April 24, 2017 meeting minutes

A motion was made by Mary Fay, seconded by Craig Polson to approve the April 24, 2017 meeting minutes. Voice vote, ayes all. Motion carried.

3. Old Business

i. Southern Tier Health Care System (SP #02-17) 150 North Union Street

Mr. Barnes advised the Department of Public Works Divisions reviewed the project and had no comments. He then read the memorandum from Code Enforcement Supervisor Jennings advising that if the building accommodates ADA accessibility on the first floor, and provides the same services in the basement then an elevator system would not be required; however, if separate services were being offered or are to be offered in the future in the basement than what is on the first floor, an elevator or lift system would be required per Code. Mr. Barnes reiterated if something is done differently in the future than the applicant must install a lift or elevator. He noted staff provided the applicant with a copy of the memorandum; therefore, it is on notice. Ms. Kahm acknowledged she received a copy of the document.

Mr. Barnes explained Code Enforcement has advised that they will work with the applicant to make sure the project signage meets the regulations under the Form Based Code (FBC).

Mr. Barnes indicated there are no parking regulations under the FBC, however, he suggested that one of the parking spots directly in the back of the building be made into a handicap space with the loading area and the remaining be striped.

A motion was made by Craig Polson, seconded by Mark Sabella to approve SP #02-17, as submitted. Voice vote, ayes all. Motion carried.

4. New Business

There was no new business to discuss at this time.

5. Miscellaneous

i. GML Section 239-l. –m, -n Referral Exemptions – Cattaraugus County Planning Board

Ms. Kerper advised there is no update to report on the above-referenced item.

**ii. Believers Chapel (SP #01-17)
2000 Constitution Avenue**

Mr. Barnes explained the Board received information at the meeting advising that Believers Chapel would like to add a second ingress/egress west of the existing ingress/egress.

Ms. Fay questioned what the “straight T” is as referenced on the drawing, and Mr. Scott indicated that a “T” would be installed so that water flow isn’t restricted. He explained they would extend the pipe to the middle of the swale (additional 3’) and put in two perpendicular lines so the parking lot would drain into the swale east and west. Mr. Scott advised that the current ingress/egress would be changed to ingress only and the proposed would be egress only (left and right turns). He noted the reason for the proposed egress is

so they don't create a "bottle neck" after the service. Mr. Scott explained that the 9:00 a.m. service parks to the left of the building and the 11:00 a.m. service parks to the right of the building (bumper to bumper) in the gravel (grass) and at the rear of the building. Mr. Barnes responded that explanation clarifies why he saw the back of the parking lot empty when he drove by on a Sunday while services were being held.

Mr. Scott reiterated that they believe the changes to the parking lot will keep traffic flowing in without a bottle neck of drop-offs and it can make traffic move faster.

In response to a question, Mr. Scott indicated he assumes the proposed egress would be blacktop.

Members advised that the applicant would need to go before the Common Council to receive approval for a curb cut for the proposed egress.

There was discussion regarding the amendment made to the site plan after the initial approval in January. It was noted that the request to not install the pole lighting was denied by Code Enforcement, and it needs to be installed. It was further noted that in February the Board approved the amendment to change a portion of the parking lot surface from proposed asphalt to crushed limestone. Mr. Sabella questioned what the applicant would need to do for the amendment, and Ms. Kerper advised that Code Enforcement has determined that it isn't an amendment rather a major change to the site and it would need to come back under a new site plan application for full review by the Planning Board.

In response to a comment, Ms. Kerper explained that Code Enforcement Supervisor Jennings advised that he was at the site and has determined there are parking spaces that are 9' x 16' and a drive aisle width that is 31'. She noted the Code calls for 9' x 20' parking spaces and a two-way drive aisle width is 24', and she is unaware of any previously granted variance by the Zoning Board of Appeal on the project to vary from the Code on said items.

Mr. Barnes suggested that the applicant get a traffic study performed in order to find out the impact of the traffic flow as it would help with the Planning Board's decision and that of the Common Council's for the curb cut. He noted that a new site plan would need to be submitted which incorporates all of the proposed changes.

Mr. Gordon explained he has not seen the approved site plan or the previously revised, and Ms. Kerper advised that she and Code Enforcement Supervisor Jennings could meet with him first thing tomorrow morning to show him the previous site plans and help with the revisions to meet Code for the proposed project.

Mr. Polson referred to the aerial picture provided and advised that there is a portion of the parking on the outside that is angled and doesn't believe the drive aisle width to be sufficient. He suggested squaring off the edge by adding asphalt so that the parking is in a complete row without the angle.

Mr. Barnes advised that the applicant should get the traffic study first to try to convince the Common Council with supporting data to do a second curb cut then the applicant could come to the Planning Board for site plan review and the Board would be happier knowing a traffic study was done and data shown. Mr. Polson commented that the peak time for the study will be really simple.

6. Next Meeting Date

The next Planning Board meeting has been scheduled for Monday, May 22, 2017, if there is business.

7. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn was made by Mary Fay, seconded by Mark Sabella. Voice vote, ayes all. Motion carried. The meeting ended at approximately 7:40 p.m.