

FEASIBILITY STUDY:

THE CASTLE

173 HAVILAND DRIVE

PATTERSON, NEW YORK



Prepared September 2018

Stephanie Fox – Architect P.C.

11 Rose Lane • Brewster • NY • 10509 • Stephanie.E.Fox@me.com • 914.391.1514

Project Intent

To determine if the building and property located at 173 Haviland Drive, Patterson, New York, a.k.a. “The Castle” would be a suitable location for a Community Center for the Putnam Lake Park District.

As outlined in a memorandum prepared by the Putnam Lake Park District (PLPD) Advisory Board dated July 23, 2018, it is the intent that the premises shall be used as a multi-purpose building, providing access and services to support the community such as meeting spaces for the PLPD and other community organizations, banquet rental space with light commercial kitchen, emergency warming/cooling shelter, lifeguard/CPR training, and activity center for neighborhood children ages toddler through teenager.

The following report shall provide an overview analysis of site, feasibility and zoning analysis, preliminary building code analysis, including compliance with handicapped accessibility, as well as general cost estimates for proposed improvements.

Existing Conditions:

The existing +/- 5,280 square foot, two story building sits on 18,906 SF of land in the GB (General Business) Zone at 173 Haviland Drive in the Town of Patterson, New York. The building is a wood and steel frame structure with a distinguishable stone veneer front façade fashioned in the motif of a small castle as viewed from the West.

The building is currently vacant, however when previously occupied was a mixed use building. On the first floor of the building was retail and office space totaling +/- 2,640 square feet. The second floor maintained a restaurant with bar also of +/- 2,640 square feet.

The majority of the site is covered by impervious surface, either by the macadam drive and parking area or the building itself. As per a survey prepared by Terry Bergendorff Collins on file at the Town of Patterson, there appears to be 24 existing parking spaces available to serve the building.

Based on the information on file with the Putnam County Health Department, the site is equipped with two 1,250 gallon septic tanks connected to two 8’-0”x8’-0”x5’-0” leaching pits. Additionally, there is also a 750 gallon concrete grease trap on site. It appears that the building had up to date Health Department approvals for its tenants when occupied.

Town of Patterson Site and Zoning Analysis

Zoning District: GB (General Business)
Site Area = 18,906 square feet
Building Area = 5,280 square feet

	REQUIRED	EXISTING
LOT AREA	30,000 SF	18,906 SF
ROAD FRONTAGE	100.0’	+/- 170.0’
MAX. IMPERVIOUS AREA	65%	+/-91.1%
FRONT YARD	15.0’	28.69’
SIDE YARD	15.0’	19.76’
REAR YARD	25.0’	+/- 24.0’
MAXIMUM BUILDING HGT.	38.0’	+/- 25.0’

173 Haviland Drive is a 5,280 square foot, two story mixed use building located on a 18,906 square foot parcel in the GB (General Business) Zone in the Town of Patterson.

Permitted principal uses in the GB Zone include individual retail stores not exceeding 50,000 sf, business offices, restaurants, music or dancing schools, nursery or day cares.

As per Section 154-73 of the Patterson Town Code (1) parking space is required per 200 sf of gross floor area for Recreation Centers:

$$5,280 / 200 = 26.4 \rightarrow 27 \text{ parking spaces required.}$$

Conclusion:

The lot is an existing non-conforming lot in the GB district. The lot is deficient in lot area which contributes to there being an overage in the allowable maximum impervious area. The new proposed use of "Recreation Center" is not listed as an allowable principal use in the GB district. Additionally, the required parking for a Recreation Center is deficient. However, as per Section 154-2D of the Patterson Town Code – "This Chapter (Zoning) shall not apply to lands, or any buildings or structures thereon, that are owned by the Town of Patterson and used for the public benefit.

New York State Building Code Preliminary Analysis:

Construction Classification – VB (Un-sprinklered)

Type VB Construction Classification is described as all elements of the building structure are non-fire rated and in which the structural elements, exterior walls, and interior walls are of any materials permitted by this code.

Conclusion:

Since the existing structure, both interior and exterior framing, is composed of wood framed, non-fire rated construction, and therefore of a combustible material, the only available construction classification for this building is VB.

Occupancy Classification:

Existing Occupancy B – Business to include:

-Professional Services – Architects, Attorneys, Physicians, etc.

Existing Occupancy M – Mercantile to include:

-Retail or Wholesale stores

As per Section 303.1.2 of the International Building Code (IBC) – A room or a space used for assembly with an occupancy less than 50 persons shall be classified as Group B occupancy.

Conclusion:

It is assumed that the previously existing restaurant was classified as a group B occupancy rather than a group A (assembly) occupancy as the existing building does not indicate conformance with building code requirements for an assembly occupancy.

Proposed Occupancy A-2 – Includes assembly uses intended for food and/or drink consumption, including but not limited to:

-Banquet Hall

Proposed Occupancy A-3 – Includes assembly uses intended for worship, recreation, or amusement uses, including but not limited to:
 -Community Halls

Conclusion:

By converting this building into a Community Center, the use and occupancy of the building is changing from a B (Business) Occupancy to a A (Assembly) Occupancy. As part of this change in occupancy, it should also be noted that an A occupancy is also considered a higher hazard occupancy.

Height and Area Limitations for Type VB Construction:

As per Section 1012.5 of the International Existing Building Code (IEBC) – When a change of occupancy classification is made to a higher hazard occupancy category, heights and area of buildings and structures shall comply with the requirements of Chapter 5 of the IBC for the new occupancy classification.

TABLE 506.2 - ALLOWABLE BUILDING AREA	
OCCUPANCY CLASSIFICATION	TYPE VB CONSTRUCTION
EXIST. B OCCUPANCY (NON-SPRINKLERED)	9,000 SQUARE FEET
PROPOSED A-2 OCCUPANCY (NON-SPRINK)	6,000 SQUARE FEET
PROPOSED A-3 OCCUPANCY (NON-SPRINK)	6,000 SQUARE FEET
PROPOSED A-2 OCCUPANCY (SPRINKLERED)	24,000 SQUARE FEET
PROPOSED A-3 OCCUPANCY (SPRINKLERED)	24,000 SQUARE FEET

TABLE 504.4- ALLOWABLE BUILDING HEIGHT	
OCCUPANCY CLASSIFICATION	TYPE VB CONSTRUCTION
EXIST. B OCCUPANCY (NON-SPRINKLERED)	2 STORIES
PROPOSED A-2 OCCUPANCY (NON-SPRINK)	1 STORY
PROPOSED A-3 OCCUPANCY (NON-SPRINK)	1 STORY
PROPOSED A-2 OCCUPANCY (SPRINKLERED)	2 STORY
PROPOSED A-3 OCCUPANCY (SPRINKLERED)	2 STORY

Conclusion –

The existing building conforms to the maximum allowed square footage for the change of occupancy:

*Maximum Allowable Building Area = 6,000 sf
Actual Existing Building Area = 5,280 sf*

However, by changing the building occupancy to an Assembly occupancy, the existing building would need to be sprinklered in order to conform to the Allowable Maximum Building Height requirements of the IBC.

*Maximum Allowable Building Height = 1 story (un-sprinklered)
Actual Building Height = 2 Stories (un-sprinklered)*

Occupant Load:

Assembly without fixed seating (tables and chairs) = 15 net square feet per person
Assembly with fixed seating (chairs only) = 5 net square feet per person
Business Areas = 100 gross square feet per person
Commercial Kitchens = 200 gross square feet per person
Day Care = 35 net square feet per person
Educational Classrooms = 20 net square feet per person

Conclusion – These numbers will be used in analyzing the existing egress requirements, as well as determining the new requirements for the proposed change in occupancy. Existing exits and exit routes need to be analyzed to determine if they conform to code requirements based on the change of occupancy requirements.

Separation Between Occupancies:

No fire separation is required between A-2 and A-3 occupancies.

Conclusion – Although there are no fire separation requirements between occupancies, certain spaces may require fire separation, i.e. exit stairways, kitchens, etc.

Exit Access Travel Distance:

For A Occupancies in a building without a sprinkler system, the maximum length of travel to an exit is 200 feet. However a sprinkler system is required due to the change in occupancy and would increase the length of travel distance to 250 feet when installed.

Conclusion – We will need to evaluate the existing exit locations and determine whether or not these parameters are met. Based on the number of occupants in the building we will also need to determine the number and size of exits from primary spaces within the building to exit access points.

Accessibility:

As per Section 1012.8.2 of the IEBC – When an entire building undergoes a change in occupancy, it shall comply with Section 1012.8.1 and shall have the following accessible features:

1. At least one accessible building entrance.

2. At least one accessible route from an accessible building entrance to primary function areas.
3. Signage complying with Section 1111 of the IBC.
4. Accessible parking.
5. At least one accessible passenger loading zone, where loading zones are provided.
6. At least one accessible route connecting parking and accessible loading zones to an accessible entrance.

*Where it is *technically infeasible* to comply with the new construction standards for any of these requirements for a change of group or occupancy, the above items shall conform to the requirements to the maximum extent technically feasible.

Technically infeasible is defined as – an alteration of a facility that has little likelihood of being accomplished because the existing structural conditions require the removal or alteration of a load-bearing member that is an essential part of the structural frame, or because other existing physical or site constraints prohibit modification or addition of elements, spaces or features which are in full and strict compliance with the minimum requirements for new construction which are necessary to provide access.

Conclusion-

The existing building code is requiring that since the entire building is changing its occupancy classification, that it should be brought up to accessibility standards for new construction. However, it provides an exception that if structural modifications to the existing building are necessary in order to accomplish the changes, then conformance is minimized. Given the use of the building as a Community Center, it would be most beneficial to provide an elevator or other approved accessible device in order to access the second floor of the building. At minimum, first floor entrances, parking areas, and public facilities should be brought up to the latest accessibility requirements.

Existing Structure:

Although a thorough examination of the existing building was not conducted, the initial site visit indicated that the structure of the building was in good condition. The existing structure appears to be a combination of steel and wood framing with a thick stone veneer on the front façade. A wood deck exists on the back of the building.

Conclusion-

A more thorough analysis of the existing building should be conducted primarily to determine the condition of the existing deck and roof. Previous storm damage may require the existing deck to be re-built. The existing roof will need to be evaluated as to its current condition as it is a flat roof and likely prone to leaks.

Construction Costs:

It is difficult to estimate what the cost of construction would be for this project without knowing the functionality of the existing building systems, i.e. septic system, HVAC, electrical, etc. However, if industry standard pricing based on square footage were to be used, some general number ranges could be estimated. The low end of construction renovation for commercial alterations range from \$75 - \$125 per square foot. This would yield a range of \$396,000-\$660,000. These costs could increase or decrease

considerably once further investigation into the existing conditions of the building are made. Additionally, some individual component costs within that price range are as follows:

- New Limited Use ADA Elevator = +/- \$60,000
- New Light Commercial Kitchen with Ansul System = +/- \$40,000
- New S1 Sprinkler System = +/- \$60,000+ depending on availability of water source

Areas of Concern:

New York State Building Code:

- Keeping the building un-sprinklered is not feasible. In order to change to an assembly occupancy, a new sprinkler system is required.
- A closer look at the number of exits for occupancy and the existing exit stair needs to be analyzed. The secondary stair does not seem to be in compliance with building code.
- Providing an accessible main entrance from the site is likely feasible and the cost of adding an elevator to building is likely a good investment.
- The existing building features to remain will need to be analyzed for code compliance as multiple items seemed to be non-conforming.
- The existing building features to remain will also need to be analyzed for accessibility and updated to meet the latest guidelines.

Town Code for the Town of Patterson:

- The Zoning restrictions on the site need to be analyzed should the existing deck be re-constructed or modified. An area variance may be required.
- Additional parking is required. A site analysis should be done to determine a new parking configuration to include handicapped parking.

Additional Comments:

- In a meeting with the PLPD Advisory Board, they expressed that should the Town of Patterson purchase the property, that the renovations to the building did not have to occur all at once. The PLPD felt that the first floor of the building could be renovated and used for community rooms and office space initially. Then the second phase would renovate the upper floor as a banquet facility to offset the overall onset cost. This is certainly a reasonable option as long as the renovations in Phase One take into consideration the requirements of Phase Two.
- There is concern about the viability of a Community Center in this area. Given the property's proximity to Putnam Lake and Warren Beach, I feel that the location lends itself to many opportunities to the Community. Its location is centrally located within Putnam Lake and would be well utilized by the members of the community.

-In addition to some of the uses that the PLPD Advisory Board had listed for this building, I feel that there are opportunities for the Town of Patterson to provide services to the community for a fee that would offset the costs of building. One option would be the establishment of a day care center offering before care, after care, and a toddler program for Brewster Residents. With more research, additional possibilities for profitable programs could be established.

Should you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Thank you.