

1 PLANNING BOARD COUNTY OF ALBANY  
2 TOWN OF COLONIE

3

4 \*\*\*\*\*

5 THE PROPOSED PROJECT OF  
6 THE SALVATION ARMY THRIFT STORE LOCATED AT  
7 2145 CENTRAL AVENUE  
8 REVIEW AND ACTION ON CONCEPT ACCEPTANCE  
9 \*\*\*\*\*

7

8 THE TAPED AND TRANSCRIBED MINUTES of the above  
9 entitled proceeding BY NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART  
10 commencing on January 25, 2011 at 8:31 p.m. at the  
11 Public Operations Center 347 Old Niskayuna Road,  
12 Latham, New York 12110

10

11

BOARD MEMBERS:

12

PETER STUTO, CHAIRMAN

13

MICHAEL SULLIVAN

14

TIMOTHY LANE

15

KATHLEEN DALTON

16

THOMAS NARDACCI

17

LOUIS MION

18

ELENA VAIDA, Esq., Attorney for the Planning Board

19

Also present:

20

Joe LaCivita, Director, Planning and Economic  
Development

21

Chuck Voss, Barton & Loguidice, PC

22

Mark Pearson, Schopfer Architects

23

Patrick O'Gara, Captain, Salvation Army

24

Gail Biggerstaff

25

Amy Fox

26

27

1                   CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay before we go into  
2                   our next project I would like to call a public  
3                   hearing for February 1, 2011 for the North  
4                   Ridge Hollow Subdivision, 115 and  
5                   139 Haswell Road.

6                   Our next agenda item is the Salvation  
7                   Army.

8                   Joe, you want to give us an introduction?

9                   MR. LACIVITA: Sure. This project is at  
10                  2145 Central Avenue. This is known as the  
11                  Salvation Army. It has been under the review  
12                  of Barton and Loguidice. The Salvation Army is  
13                  here this evening to review and discuss the  
14                  10,129 square foot addition to an existing  
15                  facility. The project was before us with the  
16                  DCC on February 13, 2008. Since that time the  
17                  project has been advancing through reviews.  
18                  There were several meetings with the TDE's,  
19                  DEC, the Army Corps of Engineers in the  
20                  neighborhood as well. The developer is here  
21                  again tonight to discuss and review a concept  
22                  proposal for this edition of the site plan.

23                  CHAIRMAN STUTO: Would you like to make  
24                  your presentation?

25                  MR. PEARSON: Sure. Good evening, my name

1 is Mark Pearson. I'm with Schopfer Architects  
2 and we are the architects for the project.

3 As stated, the land we are working with  
4 has wetlands on it which we have resolved with  
5 the Army Corps of Engineers and the New York  
6 State DEC.

7 The existing facility is a  
8 12,270 square foot facility. We are proposing  
9 an expansion of just under 10,000 square feet.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: You say you're at 12,000  
11 now?

12 MR. PEARSON: Yes, the existing building  
13 is 12,270 and were at 990-something for the  
14 addition. When were done it's going to be  
15 about a 22,000 square foot store.

16 We have increased the parking to  
17 111 spaces. Per the DCC comments, the entire  
18 building will be fully sprinklered. We have  
19 met all the requirements for landscaping  
20 within the parking areas. Our stormwater  
21 engineer has provided the stormwater  
22 feasibility study and has a concept for  
23 underground stormwater retention under the  
24 back parking lot.

25 The elevations of the

1 building - primarily we're going to resurface  
2 the existing metal siding and will be going  
3 back with mostly EIFS on the existing building  
4 and changing the front from having a shallow  
5 gable into a façade. There will be awnings  
6 here (Indicating). The addition to the  
7 building is a little bit taller. It's a little  
8 over 20 feet tall.

9 I have to apologize this pinkish tone is  
10 not what we intended. Were looking for a light  
11 gray. We consistently have this problem with  
12 the printer that comes out with the pinkish  
13 hue. Were trying to resolve that.

14 Does the Board have any specific  
15 questions?

16 MR. NARDACCI: It's not pink? What is the  
17 color of that?

18 MR. PEARSON: Gray. We'll be more than  
19 happy to provide you with actual samples of  
20 the EIFS that were proposing. It's not pink.

21 MR. LANE: The only thing that I have a  
22 small concern with - I think we talked about  
23 this before - is where the trucks coming in  
24 and the whole maneuver for them getting in and  
25 out? It seems a bit awkward, at least as far

1 as what I'm looking at here.

2 MR. PEARSON: It's straight and then back  
3 in and pull out.

4 MR. LANE: And they're doing that amidst  
5 all of the traffic? Most loading docks are in  
6 the back.

7 MR. PEARSON: Yes, and most loading docks  
8 see a lot of traffic. Typically, were talking  
9 about one or maybe two trucks a day, and it's  
10 a 16-foot box truck.

11 MR. LANE: So, it's not a long truck.

12 MR. PEARSON: No. Typically, you'll see a  
13 truck in the morning that will drop off  
14 supplies and then possibly in the afternoon it  
15 takes off.

16 MR. LANE: So, it's generally off-hours  
17 that they will be doing this?

18 MR. O'GARA: No, primarily it will be  
19 during store operation hours. I just got here  
20 in September. I'm still observing patterns.  
21 There might be a truck parked there receiving  
22 donations. Primarily speaking, there's not  
23 going to be a lot of truck traffic in and out.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chuck, you have some  
25 comments?

1 MR. VOSS: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2 On January 11th we submitted our TDE  
3 concept letter to the Board. We looked at  
4 several different aspects of the project. The  
5 fifth part of the letter clearly covers  
6 initially the information that we received and  
7 we have reviewed for this application. In  
8 general, I think it's important just for the  
9 Board to know that the site is located in the  
10 COR, commercial office residential zoning  
11 district, where the use is allowed. There are  
12 design standards. So, we looked at those as  
13 well. We have outlined those on page 2 of our  
14 letter. I'll just go through some of the  
15 highlights of that.

16 As we know, this is an existing building.  
17 The addition is going off the back side so  
18 that 80 percent of the frontage build-out is a  
19 requirement. The applicants have talked about  
20 putting an iron fence out there to satisfy  
21 that and some additional landscaping. The  
22 maximum setback for that corridor is 25 feet,  
23 but again, if a pre-existing structure -- none  
24 of the COR design standards, pre-existing lots  
25 and so forth are necessarily required to

1 conform to that maximum setback. So, I think  
2 you have some flexibility there. The building  
3 sits back, I think, 55 feet from the front  
4 line. That's a quick calculation, but it's  
5 close. The COR design standards were created  
6 obviously after this building was actually  
7 built.

8 CHAIRMAN STUTO: That's been an issue in  
9 the prior Board meetings that I've been at in  
10 that some people think that some portion of  
11 the code pushed the buildings too close to the  
12 street. You think the distance fits in with  
13 what's around it?

14 MR. VOSS: Yes, it does. When we went out  
15 for our site visit, it's consistent with the  
16 adjacent uses, as well in terms of their set  
17 backs. I think it works for this section of  
18 Central Avenue.

19 In the COR area on-street parking is  
20 encouraged, but certainly it's not going to  
21 work in this location. They are providing  
22 plenty of off-street parking. The site is  
23 certainly big enough and adequate to handle  
24 any increase in parking required by the  
25 project. They are providing some additional

1           landscaping, which will be sufficient. I think  
2           the screen proposed edition is from the  
3           adjacent residential uses that are relatively  
4           close by. There are really no interconnections  
5           possible with this site and the adjacent  
6           sites. The COR design standards encourage  
7           that, as well. We just don't see that as being  
8           practical in this location. They can certainly  
9           meet the COR design standards for greenspace.  
10          The minimum greenspace for the COR was  
11          35 percent. They're proposing upwards to  
12          75 percent of greenspace, overall.

13                 There are sidewalks on this portion of  
14          Central Avenue and they will be tied into  
15          those with a proposed new entryway and  
16          pathway.

17                 With regard to the architectural design:  
18          Again, it's a pre-existing older building. It  
19          wasn't designed with the COR design standards,  
20          obviously. I think the applicants have made  
21          some pretty significant improvements to the  
22          front of that existing building with  
23          relocating the front doorway, adding glass and  
24          façade treatments. That will certainly help.

25                 With regard to stormwater management: I

1 just want to touch on that briefly. They will  
2 be providing full SWPPP stormwater management  
3 details. Again, because this is really a  
4 concept submission they weren't required to  
5 provide super detailed stormwater management  
6 designs at this point. Certainly, this is a  
7 point of notice as they move forward into the  
8 process. We would like to see much more detail  
9 with regard to stormwater design.

10 We had some trip generations and just  
11 looking at their traffic assessments, we had  
12 really no concerns with that. CDTC reviewed  
13 the project and commented. They had some minor  
14 comments about the existing bus stop out front  
15 and enhancing that perhaps with a bench.  
16 Overall, we felt that they met the concept  
17 level review it at the Board's discretion, but  
18 we felt inclined for them to move on.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Kathy, do you have any  
20 questions?

21 MS. DALTON: In my notes there was a  
22 comment here that I saw the Albany County  
23 Planning Board was going to make comments. I  
24 didn't see that any were included here. Did we  
25 receive those?

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chuck?

2 MR. VOSS: I didn't receive any official  
3 copies, but I know Liz Lombardi from the  
4 county was getting her reports out earlier  
5 this week.

6 Joe, I don't know if she sent anything to  
7 your office.

8 MR. LACIVITA: I haven't seen it as of  
9 yet. Usually they meet the third Thursday of  
10 the month and then we get those shortly  
11 thereafter.

12 MS. DALTON: The comment is on page 4 of  
13 the Barton and Loguidice letter.

14 MR. LACIVITA: I don't have them in this  
15 packet, but that's not to say that they are  
16 not in.

17 MR. VOSS: The lack of their comments  
18 would certainly allow you to continue. You can  
19 continue on with the concept review. You just  
20 can't take final approval on the project until  
21 you have their comments.

22 MR. LACIVITA: Kathy, a lot of times we  
23 see deferred to local planning regulations  
24 from the county if there is nothing of  
25 significance. But without having that, I can't

1 speak as to what they saw or what they found.

2 MR. STUTO: Well, we would definitely  
3 need those before final.

4 MR. LACIVITA: Yes, definitely.

5 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Anything else, Kathy?

6 MS. DALTON: No, that's it.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Lou?

8 MR. MION: Presently, you have a gate  
9 that goes across the entrance when you're  
10 closed. At any given time you can find all  
11 kinds of things out there; furniture,  
12 bicycles, beds, or whatever you want out on  
13 the street. Have you done anything to make it  
14 easier for people to take that out back so it  
15 isn't out front?

16 MR. PEARSON: The gate is being taken  
17 out. The gate is being removed, as part of  
18 this.

19 MR. NARDACCI: Explain the improved  
20 drop-offs that you have within the project  
21 narrative.

22 MR. PEARSON: As part of the  
23 reconstruction what were doing is we're  
24 expanding store space by taking back house  
25 operations and moving them into the addition

1 and making part of that part of the retail  
2 store.

3 This portion right here (Indicating) is a  
4 curbed drop-off area. It's a receiving area  
5 and a process area that's going to lead to the  
6 loading dock.

7 The Salvation Army tries to not encourage  
8 dumping, but it does occur. It's something  
9 that they do have to deal with. One of the  
10 methodologies in which they deal with it is  
11 that Sunday afternoon seems to be the time  
12 when a lot of people are deciding to make a  
13 run over to the Salvation Army. Even when the  
14 store is closed, there's an area here  
15 (Indicating), and there are one or two people  
16 manning the drop-off to try to eliminate  
17 dumping.

18 MR. MION: So, this is after hours?

19 MR. PEARSON: No, this is Sunday  
20 afternoon when the store isn't open.

21 MR. MION: I live over there in that area  
22 and I see a lot of that stuff. I'm just  
23 wondering, are they going to be able to get  
24 that off the road?

25 MR. PEARSON: Well, we're not going to be

1 eliminating individuals from accessing the  
2 parking lot because the gate won't be there.  
3 Again, there will be signs here (Indicating)  
4 saying no dumping, and donations only during  
5 operating hours. We'll have the hours posted  
6 on the wall.

7 MR. NARDACCI: There are no drop-off  
8 areas at the Salvation Army locations?

9 MR. PEARSON: You mean a drop-off box?

10 MR. NARDACCI: Yes.

11 MR. PEARSON: I know there are drop-off  
12 boxes, but I don't think we have one.

13 MR. NARDACCI: And you guys have to admit  
14 it's a serious problem, right? People  
15 drop-off stuff on Central Avenue. I know the  
16 location because I can see the stuff on the  
17 curb. It's not your fault, but what can we do  
18 to mitigate that?

19 MR. O'GARA: We have required part-time  
20 drivers at these locations that are very  
21 problematic. We keep them posted there. They  
22 can then receive the donations there. There is  
23 a cost that were saving from illegal dumping  
24 that goes on there. As this unfolds and as I'm  
25 hearing this, I'm sensing that this is

1           probably going to be the course of action  
2           required to eliminate some of that. I can't  
3           promise you that there will be no dumping at  
4           all.

5                       MR. NARDACCI: Do any Salvation Army  
6           locations have those drop-offs?

7                       MR. LACIVITA: I think that at  
8           192 Troy Schenectady Road - I think you put a  
9           practice into play for that one. You had  
10          certain type of time restrictions. You also  
11          had off-hours employees that you put into  
12          practice there. There was a serious problem on  
13          the Route 2 corridor where people were  
14          dumping. So, if you could look at that and see  
15          what it is?

16                      Tom, if you remember during the course of  
17          that review, we were was looking at that.

18                      MR. NARDACCI: I think that it's an  
19          issue. I think that several of us are echoing  
20          it because it's unfortunate. It's not your  
21          fault that folks are dropping off at off-hours  
22          and there are stuff that they're leaving on  
23          the curb of Central Avenue; and maybe isn't  
24          the best stuff. They're just getting rid of it  
25          and thinking well, I will give it there. I do

1 think that you need to put something into  
2 place. I think that not having a gate makes it  
3 more your problem on your property than it  
4 does on the Town, from a visual perspective.

5 MR. O'GARA: At our Gloversville and  
6 Bennington locations we have a driver that  
7 goes out there -

8 MR. NARDACCI: Even with security - what  
9 about security cameras? You have that?

10 MR. O'GARA: And who's going to enforce  
11 that? If we can get that information to the  
12 Police Department, then it would be up to  
13 them.

14 MR. NARDACCI: Right. At least it's  
15 deterrence. Some folks might say this location  
16 has security. I think that it would be good  
17 moving forward as we get to the next step to  
18 first recognize that this is an issue. It's  
19 such a highly visible part of so many cars  
20 passing by. I think it benefits us both to  
21 have it taken care.

22 MR. MION: Very often people it becomes a  
23 traffic hazard because people are stopping or  
24 quickly pulling over and then you have two or  
25 three cars stacked up and looking. They have

1 little kids out there on there running around  
2 and they're more interested in what they can  
3 pick-up and drop-off than they are the  
4 children. I think it's a good move of getting  
5 rid of the gate. At least it keeps them off  
6 the street.

7 MR. O'GARA: I think we can come up with  
8 something that will work.

9 MR. NARDACCI: Thank you for addressing  
10 that. That was one of my issues.

11 The front yard right now - there's a  
12 level of parking spaces there now right?

13 MR. PEARSON: Yes.

14 MR. NARDACCI: There is no parking in the  
15 front of the building, correct?

16 MR. PEARSON: Right.

17 MR. NARDACCI: Just walk me through this.  
18 Going forward, what is the landscape plan? Is  
19 that going to be increased green out front? Is  
20 that what the plan is with regard to where the  
21 parking was?

22 Is that screened right there  
23 (Indicating)?

24 MR. PEARSON: It's on this side.

25 MR. NARDACCI: Okay.

1           MR. PEARSON: It does extend into the  
2 setback. We pushed it back. The existing  
3 parking lot currently wraps around here  
4 (Indicating). We have widened it here. There  
5 is a greater width of the property, and then  
6 we narrow back to just a single stall and  
7 increase parking in the rear. Why get all of  
8 our handicap spaces right in this area  
9 (Indicating).

10           MR. NARDACCI: What is the landscaping  
11 plan for the site that you have a concept of?

12           MR. PEARSON: Small plantings here at the  
13 entry drive. There will be a series of  
14 plantings and all the islands. There will be a  
15 variety of deciduous plants including some  
16 clumping of Serbian Spruce. There will be a  
17 variety of junipers at the hedgerow of  
18 parking. That's basically what you're going to  
19 find in all of these plantings. Actually,  
20 there are two different species of Juniper;  
21 one tall and one groundcover.

22           Over here (indicating) there will be a  
23 series of Black Hills spruce.

24           MR. NARDACCI: I think that in moving to  
25 the next step, I like to see a nice tight plan

1 for landscaping. More and more we like to see  
2 what is the landscaping plan is going to be.  
3 Not just deciduous, but the number of trees.  
4 I'd like to see that detail at the next round  
5 for the landscaping plan. Have a clearly  
6 defined plan

7 MR. PEARSON: Did you read the symbols?

8 MR. NARDACCI: Okay, let me step back.  
9 Let's reverse this. I ask you, what's the  
10 landscaping plan? It seems to me that you're  
11 struggling to tell us what the landscaping  
12 plan is. I'm not trying to give you a hard  
13 time. When you say well, it's a series of  
14 junipers, I'd like to see a little more detail  
15 in a little more depth of understanding of  
16 what you're planting and where.

17 MR. VOSS: Tom, are you saying that you'd  
18 like to see a separate sheet just for  
19 landscaping with some color detail?

20 MR. NARDACCI: Absolutely.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chuck, you're the  
22 engineer, what do you think of the landscaping  
23 plan the way that it is?

24 MR. VOSS: I think that it meets the COR  
25 standards. I can understand Tom wanting to see

1 that as a separate project sheet other than  
2 the main plan just so that you can realize  
3 what is the size of the tree caliper. I think  
4 that he has that on the schedule. A separate  
5 sheet showing green areas and tree plantings  
6 might be beneficial.

7 MR. LACIVITA: Did you depict that on the  
8 elevations too, Mark?

9 MR. PEARSON: No, we didn't depict the  
10 landscaping on the elevation. We can, though.

11 MR. NARDACCI: A more detailed plan would  
12 be helpful for your neighbors and your  
13 residential abutters.

14 MR. PEARSON: There is a series of  
15 residential properties along the north side.

16 MR. NARDACCI: And what is your screening  
17 plan with the neighbors?

18 MR. PEARSON: There is currently a  
19 heavily wooded area. We are cutting that back  
20 to increase the parking area, but we're not  
21 eliminating it.

22 MR. NARDACCI: How much is a lot? How  
23 many feet are we talking about? How much are  
24 you cutting back? How much will exist after  
25 the parking is done?

1           MR. PEARSON: The current line of the  
2 wooded area extends back into the current  
3 parking lot. It's going to be cut back so that  
4 there is 15 feet. This area here will continue  
5 onto the neighboring properties (Indicating).

6           MR. NARDACCI: And there is continued  
7 woods on the next property, right?

8           MR. PEARSON: Yes.

9           MR. NARDACCI: So, it's going to be  
10 15 feet.

11           The final thing that I want to talk about  
12 is architectural. I'm not promoting EIFS,  
13 myself. I don't know if I've seen that here.  
14 I'll do a little more research and try to see  
15 what it looks like, but are there other  
16 Salvation Army properties that use the same  
17 materials?

18           MR. PEARSON: Yes.

19           MR. NARDACCI: So, maybe you can share  
20 with us some pictures to show us what we're  
21 going to be looking at? I think especially as  
22 we're looking at Central Avenue, that's a main  
23 corridor and thoroughfare through town. An  
24 architectural review is very important. It's  
25 nice that you're doing an expansion, but

1           you're also incorporating an older building,  
2           too. To just have a better understanding at  
3           what we're looking at. This is a grey color?

4           MR. PEARSON: Yes.

5           MR. NARDACCI: What's the front of the  
6           building going to look like from Central  
7           straight on?

8           MR. PEARSON: As I indicated, what you're  
9           seeing is a shallow building and a very  
10          shallow peak. We're building a continuous line  
11          of wall so you'll have metal trim, that basic  
12          light color gray with the darker gray band  
13          below, and a series of accents around the  
14          front windows.

15          CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm going to chime in  
16          and I wouldn't normally do this. I'd like to  
17          underscore both things that he said. I'm new  
18          to this as a Board Member and as a Chairman,  
19          but I served as the Attorney for two and a  
20          half years. I know that aesthetics, including  
21          architectural and landscaping is very  
22          important this Board.

23          This is for your benefit as well, Chuck.  
24          We need for you to be our eyes.

25          I, personally, appreciate the

1           redevelopment of this property. My bias would  
2           be towards enhancing it and making it look  
3           really good. I'm not an architect, so I can't  
4           tell. This tends to look a little bit too  
5           plain.

6           Chuck, I would look for suggestions from  
7           you. Even though you say it meets the COR  
8           requirements, I think we're entitled to  
9           suggest to the applicant things that might  
10          improve it. That's where my bias is.

11          MR. VOSS: I can have our landscape  
12          architects take a look at it as well to give  
13          us some suggestions that they might think are  
14          relevant.

15          CHAIRMAN STUTO: Also the roof - it's  
16          just a flat line.

17          MR. NARDACCI: And these are things that  
18          are consistent with other projects that have  
19          come in, too. It's something that we're  
20          looking at with these main thoroughfares. We  
21          appreciate your investment, but we would like  
22          to see something a little bit more attractive.

23          A lighting plan - down style lighting?

24          MR. PEARSON: We haven't generated it  
25          yet.

1 MR. NARDACCI: Are there any HVAC units  
2 that might be on the roof?

3 MR. PEARSON: I don't know yet.  
4 Typically, we would expect to see that on the  
5 back portion.

6 MR. NARDACCI: Screening the neighbors,  
7 obviously, with the trees.

8 MR. PEARSON: We can certainly look at  
9 screening on the roof, as well.

10 MR. NARDACCI: That's really all I have  
11 right now. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Mike?

13 MR. SULLIVAN: I did have a few comments  
14 comments with regard to the lighting in the  
15 drop-off area. I learned that the lighting in  
16 the parking lot will be turned off once the  
17 last of the employees has left. There will be  
18 some building security lighting?

19 MR. PEARSON: Correct.

20 MR. SULLIVAN: Is there going to be any  
21 lighting in the drop-off area either on all  
22 the time or motion sensors-lighting such that  
23 it may discourage drop-offs the middle of the  
24 night?

25 MR PEARSON: we are required by code to

1 have lighting at all the emergency exits all  
2 the time. All of these doors have some form of  
3 lighting. I guess what you're asking is about  
4 the canopy. Will the canopy lights be on?

5 MR. SULLIVAN: Or to have motion  
6 detection so that if somebody drives up it may  
7 or may not discourage somebody dropping off.  
8 They might come back later. I know that even  
9 with the gate they drop-off anyway. I just  
10 worry that with no lighting in the parking lot  
11 they might wait until night time to drop-off.

12 The other question I had was: If you were  
13 to put in units and you screen them, that will  
14 make the roofline of the new building higher.  
15 Is there some way to transition from the  
16 existing? It might be something that the  
17 architects could suggest. In looking at the  
18 buildings, the difference between the old and  
19 the new is very pronounced. I was wondering if  
20 there was some way to transition that with  
21 some sort of screening on the roof edges to  
22 step it down. Again, I'm not an architect.  
23 That's just my opinion. It sticks out to me as  
24 the separation between buildings. The  
25 elevation difference is kind of jagged. I'm

1 open to any suggestions that the architects or  
2 you may have to maybe work on that part of the  
3 building.

4 MR. LACIVITA: Mark, Mike is talking  
5 about your main entryway. Typically, when you  
6 go to a larger building with a focal point or  
7 something like that, a landscape tree or  
8 something like that would take away the eye  
9 where you actually see the transition -

10 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, if you could just  
11 break that up.

12 MR. LACIVITA: To Peter and Tom's point:  
13 If you look at the roof examples in the COR  
14 district under Section 190-4 it talks about  
15 softening. It also talks about breaking up the  
16 roof lines and things like that, which can  
17 certainly dress up the building façade.

18 MR. SULLIVAN: That's all I had; thank  
19 you.

20 MR. NARDACCI: Just with regard to the  
21 architectural again, this EIFS system is what  
22 you're sticking to? Is it the best design?

23 MR. PEARSON: It's really kind of the  
24 stucco texture on top of an insulation system.  
25 We're dealing particularly with the building

1           that is existing. Were taking off the metal  
2           panels and it doesn't have a lot of insulation  
3           value. So, we want to put something on there  
4           that's going to be reasonably energy  
5           efficient. If we were to do any sort of  
6           masonry or something like that, we would only  
7           get a minimal amount of insulation back into  
8           that system. This is a quick way of providing  
9           them with a much better insulated building.

10           CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chuck, have you seen  
11           this?

12           MR. VOSS: Yes, I've seen that at other  
13           locations. The only concern would be is that  
14           it's not a panel sheet.

15           MR. NARDACCI: It looks like a panel  
16           sheet on the plans. That's my concern.

17           MR. VOSS: Maybe that's just an  
18           architectural detail.

19           MR. PEARSON: It's just a scoring  
20           pattern.

21           MR. NARDACCI: The problem is with my  
22           knowledge - and this is my fourth year on the  
23           Board - I haven't seen this before.

24           MR. VOSS: I don't know if we seen this  
25           on other locations are not.

1           MR. NARDACCI: That's what I'm struggling  
2 with. We've seen a lot of commercial  
3 properties improved - a lot of redevelopment  
4 and I just haven't seen this. It's the first  
5 time I've come across this. I'm trying to  
6 understand. In looking at the plan it doesn't  
7 look like stucco. It looks like square panels.

8           MR. VOSS: Tom, I think that we can have  
9 them supply some photographs of some recent  
10 applications and that will give you a better  
11 sense of what it's like. It's almost like a  
12 masonry type of the side. They can score  
13 really any type of pattern.

14           I think what you have provided there is  
15 just kind of the generic scoring pattern.

16           MR. PEARSON: We can change the scoring  
17 pattern and the color and the depth.

18           MR. VOSS: I think that's where the Board  
19 is struggling. How does that look?

20           MR. NARDACCI: Could you think of other  
21 places in Town or perhaps where it's being  
22 used?

23           MR. LANE: Is that typically used in this  
24 region?

25           MR. PEARSON: It's used everywhere.

1           MR. VOSS: It weathers well, and it  
2 stands up well, and the colors don't change or  
3 fade.

4           MR. LACIVITA: On that same component  
5 using that type of material and the type of  
6 design - you could actually make false facades  
7 using that product. You could make the  
8 building stand out that way. You could put  
9 peaks on this building along with your  
10 landscaping design to really make it jump out.  
11 You could draw focal points to the various  
12 paths or entryways along the way to make it a  
13 little bit more appealing.

14          MR. NARDACCI: You have this tremendously  
15 historic organization with this great mission.  
16 It just seems very boxy to me.

17          MR. SULLIVAN: You could also extend the  
18 line at the top of the existing store to the  
19 gray line that's right there such that it  
20 blends more. It looks like it's two separate  
21 buildings. I think that's what's killing it  
22 for me.

23          MR. PEARSON: I did get a good  
24 suggestion. One of the comments that I was  
25 about to make is the existing store has a

1 pitched roof. We could put anything there that  
2 goes above that level like that Gable. We  
3 could extend lines from the existing building  
4 through the new portion and it could be done  
5 much more easily.

6 MR. SULLIVAN: Maybe if we could see a  
7 rendering of that. That might help.

8 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Tim?

9 MR. LANE: I am all set.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Anyone from the public  
11 have any questions?

12 MS. BIGGERSTAFF: My name is Gail  
13 Biggerstaff. I'm one of the neighbors. I am on  
14 the back of the property. I'm not sure, but I  
15 do recall getting one other notice of the  
16 meeting. I don't recall why I was not able to  
17 attend that one. That must be when everyone  
18 else came.

19 MR. NARDACCI: For this project?

20 MS. BIGGERSTAFF: Yes

21 MR. NARDACCI: I think this is the first  
22 time we've looked at this, right?

23 CHAIRMAN STUTO: As far as I know.

24 Joe, is this our first time looking at  
25 this?

1 MR. LACIVITA: Actually, no. The  
2 Salvation Army came before the Board in 2008.

3 MR. PEARSON: Shopfer Architects got a  
4 hold of all the neighbors' names and we put up  
5 a presentation at the local Holiday Inn for  
6 anybody that wanted to come.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: We appreciate that.

8 MR. PEARSON: That was in the summer.

9 MS. BIGGERSTAFF: So, my biggest concern  
10 is the back of my property is heavily wooded.  
11 I see deer in my backyard. So, my biggest  
12 concern is what am I now going to look at?

13 MR. NARDACCI: So, you're going to leave  
14 15 feet of woods? How many feet of words are  
15 you removing to the parking lot?

16 MR. PEARSON: It's all wooded where the  
17 parking lot is going.

18 MR. NARDACCI: So, how many feet of woods  
19 are you removing?

20 MR. PEARSON: For pushing the line from  
21 the building back, about 100 feet.

22 MR. NARDACCI: So, they're taking  
23 100 feet and they're leaving 15 feet of woods  
24 on your side on your property.

25 MR. PEARSON: Can you show me where your

1 house is located?

2 MS. BIGGERSTAFF: It's right here  
3 (Indicating).

4 As I'm listening - I absolutely  
5 understand the issue with the drop-offs. Now,  
6 my concern is there is no gate. They are now  
7 behind my property. I'm growing more concerned  
8 as I'm listening to the fact that there's  
9 going to be drop-offs at all hours of the day  
10 and night when no one is around.

11 MR. NARDACCI: Have you thought about a  
12 fence on your side on your property?

13 MR. PEARSON: We have not made any  
14 provisions for that, but we would be willing  
15 to consider a fence or an evergreen hedge.

16 MR. NARDACCI: I'm just trying to address  
17 concerns about safety at night.

18 MS. BIGGERSTAFF: A fence would  
19 definitely give me a lot of peace of mind.

20 MR. PEARSON: What type of fence to have  
21 in mind?

22 MR. BIGGERSTAFF: Something high enough  
23 so people won't come into my yard.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: What would you suggest  
25 Chuck?

1           MR. VOSS:  Something like a stockade  
2           fence - six-foot stockade.  I think that  
3           15 feet is relatively minimal landscaping.

4           MS. BIGGERSTAFF:  The other thing that  
5           I'm thinking is that 15 feet - at first it  
6           sounds good and then you start thinking well,  
7           it's really not that much when you're used to  
8           thick woods.

9           CHAIRMAN STUTO:  Would you be willing to  
10          communicate with Ms. Biggerstaff?

11          MR. PEARSON:  Sure.

12          CHAIRMAN STUTO:  Any other concerns  
13          ma'am?

14          MS. BIGGERSTAFF:  No, that's really it.

15          MS. DALTON:  Can I ask you a question?  
16          You were saying that you have dear and  
17          wildlife?

18          MS. BIGGERSTAFF:  Yes.

19          MS. DALTON:  Have you done any evaluation  
20          of what kinds of displacement there will be of  
21          the animals and where they're going to go?

22          MR. PEARSON:  No, we have not done  
23          anything like that.

24          MS. DALTON:  Are we required to?

25          MR. NARDACCI:  Not on this part.

1                   CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chuck, are we required  
2 to do a displacement study?

3                   MR. VOSS: No, you're not required to do  
4 that. Unless you're concerned about a sort of  
5 species or habitat, which there's really no  
6 indication of. This is a pre-existing site.  
7 This area has been disturbed over the years.  
8 We could certainly look and see if there's any  
9 habitat, but my guess is there wouldn't be.

10                  MS. DALTON: I would be really happy if  
11 you did.

12                  MS. BIGGERSTAFF: The deer - I've  
13 actually seen on a very regular basis.

14                  CHAIRMAN STUTO: Yes, ma'am.

15                  MS. FOX: Good evening. I'm Amy Fox. I  
16 just have observational thoughts as I'm  
17 listening to the meeting.

18                  If you're looking at any material that  
19 would produce a buffer for the neighbor -- as  
20 the applicant in the Board were talking about  
21 where air conditioning would go - I would just  
22 ask the Board to consider if any barrier is  
23 actually producing an amplifying effect for  
24 her for the sound.

25                  Also, I would just ask the Board to look

1 at the final review to double check any  
2 environmental factors that would affect  
3 neighbors such as sound and lighting. There  
4 are some fencing materials that could actually  
5 amplify and there are fencing materials that  
6 can buffer. It could be a double benefit and  
7 the type of material that could be considered  
8 for this application.

9 Just a comment about the deer: They are  
10 the most flexible species in our area. They  
11 have a very easy time with relocating because  
12 of their grazing nature and they adapt. They  
13 are extremely able to adapt.

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Anybody else on the  
15 Board?

16 ***(There was no response.)***

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Since I'm new and I'm  
18 not sure how much of the Board has been  
19 involved in these types of discussions, before  
20 we take a motion, I'm going to ask Elena to  
21 talk about SEQRA and what the concept  
22 acceptance would mean and how we should  
23 suggest to make a motion.

24 Are you comfortable talking about that,  
25 Elena?

1 MS. VAIDA: Yes. Actually, I was going to  
2 ask Chuck because the Board Members had some  
3 environmental issues raised. Are there any  
4 other documents you might feel that this needs  
5 before this project comes back for final?  
6 Chuck has reviewed that from that viewpoint  
7 and I've asked him to make some comments.

8 MR. VOSS: Just for the Board's  
9 information, the applicant did submit a short  
10 environmental assessment form to help us  
11 classify the action under SEQRA. Initially, we  
12 felt the project should be classified as an  
13 unlisted action for SEQRA. I think for this  
14 type of project - it's initial impact is  
15 adequate and accurate. Basically, that means  
16 that now we have the action classified. The  
17 Board is free to ask for additional  
18 information that they feel is appropriate to  
19 help you make further SEQRA determination,  
20 which would take place after all of the  
21 information has come in for this project. At  
22 this point, I think were comfortable with that  
23 as a classification. Certainly, as new  
24 information comes in and as you look at this  
25 project through its initial review phases,

1           some new additional information may come in.  
2           But I think once we have everything in place,  
3           at the end you be able to make your final  
4           SEQRA determination and take action.

5           MS. VAIDA: One suggestion that I have is  
6           based upon the concerns of the Board Members  
7           and as to the design of the issues raised by  
8           the neighbor, do you think it would be  
9           advisable to have them come back for another  
10          review and not vote tonight since there are  
11          concerns on the design standards?

12          MR. NARDACCI: That would be my  
13          inclination. I think that there are a lot of  
14          outstanding issues. Before we move forward,  
15          I'd like to see some of the neighbor's  
16          concerns addressed. I like to see more detail  
17          on the landscaping. I'd like to get a final on  
18          this architectural because it's hard to say  
19          move forward when we really don't know what it  
20          looks like. I can honestly say that I don't  
21          know what it looks like. I think as things  
22          move forward, I'd like to see more  
23          architectural details.

24          MR. LACIVITA: I think that it's the  
25          elevation and the standards that are at issue.

1           MR. NARDACCI: I have no problem with  
2 anything else other than what I mentioned.  
3 It's the aesthetics that are of concern. It's  
4 hard because you have provided us with some  
5 architectural detail, but it doesn't look  
6 right. It's hard to visualize when it's  
7 industrial looking this way. It sort of the  
8 back side of a Rite Aid.

9           MS. VAIDA: I think it's up to the  
10 applicant if you want us to vote tonight, but  
11 it seems like from the comments it would be  
12 better to come back with more detail and stay  
13 in keeping with the concerns that have given  
14 you some direction for the site plan review.  
15 It's up to you.

16           MR. PEARSON: I personally would like to  
17 see a vote for the concept so that we can go  
18 forward. I would like to get through all the  
19 stormwater, erosion, sedimentation control  
20 plans and the lighting plans. But I would like  
21 some commitment that this is the scheme that  
22 were working with. I don't want to invest all  
23 of the time and effort - I can bring you back  
24 renderings - three dimensional renderings.

25           MS. VAIDA: I guess that's what I'm

1 suggesting.

2 MR. PEARSON: Can we move forward with  
3 this site plan?

4 MR. NARDACCI: Personally, for myself, I  
5 have a lot of concerns about the aesthetics. I  
6 personally have no problem with the site plan  
7 with the addition and the expansions as long  
8 as we meet the aesthetics and some of the  
9 buffering concerns that have been raised.

10 MS. VAIDA: Maybe we can vote on the  
11 concept since this is an informal procedure -

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Elena, one which talk  
13 about concepts.

14 MS. VAIDA: I think the Board understands  
15 it. We're trying to make things very clear to  
16 the applicants that concept doesn't entitle  
17 you to anything in terms of the site plan  
18 approval process. What has happened here is a  
19 discussion of your design and concept that you  
20 get feedback on. You can hopefully use that  
21 when you put together your final site plan  
22 application. I just want to make it clear that  
23 you understand that concept acceptance is not  
24 to be construed as approval of the project in  
25 the application for site plan approval. It's

1 not complete until the final site plan is  
2 actually prepared and the requirements of  
3 SEQRA have been met. Obviously, we're not in a  
4 position to act on that. I think everyone  
5 understands that.

6 MR. NARDACCI: Before we vote on it for  
7 the concept, what would you intend to come  
8 back to us with in regards to the aesthetics  
9 based on what you've heard from a lot of us  
10 tonight?

11 MR. PEARSON: We would have to find a way  
12 to integrate the existing building more into  
13 the new build design. From what I'm hearing,  
14 there is a building A and building B and they  
15 are kind of merged together. I appreciate  
16 that. I think it would have the landscaping  
17 plan here. I think we should bring back a 3-D  
18 rendering of that, showing trees up against  
19 the buildings. The third option is, of course,  
20 the buffer. What we're going to propose there  
21 in terms of fencing and landscaping.

22 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can I make a comment on  
23 the architectural? What about some type of  
24 façade along the top along the front? Do you  
25 still have the same drainage issues in the

1 back?

2 MR. PEARSON: Along the front?

3 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Yes, facing Central  
4 Avenue

5 MR. PEARSON: Facing Central Avenue we  
6 are proposing to put a façade in front of  
7 what's currently there.

8 CHAIRMAN STUTO: To have that depicted on  
9 the drawing?

10 MR. PEARSON: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: The peaks that go along  
12 the top of the building - I'm thinking for  
13 example with a place on Route 9. I believe  
14 Fresh Market has one. Newton Plaza has one.

15 MS. DALTON: They did a really nice job  
16 of making it not just a straight cut.

17 MR. PEARSON: Yes, we can create whatever  
18 we want.

19 MS. DALTON: It's just not a particularly  
20 attractive building. It looks very  
21 institutional. I think that we're hearing here  
22 is that this is an opportunity to include a  
23 look of a very large piece of property along  
24 Central Avenue. I think that's what we would  
25 like to see.

1                   CHAIRMAN STUTO: Let me ask you this: If  
2 you get a positive vote on concept could you  
3 come back before final and show us what you  
4 think you have in mind?

5                   MR. PEARSON: Absolutely.

6                   MS. VAIDA: That's what I was actually  
7 going to suggest. It might be to their benefit  
8 to just to make sure they're on the right  
9 track before they waste a lot of money.

10                  MR. NARDACCI: That's fine. I agree with  
11 the façade. It's a historical organization and  
12 a proud one. It's kind of a plain looking  
13 building. For not a lot of money I think you  
14 can do a lot with that. The site plan is fine  
15 and I'm fine with moving forward as long as we  
16 have a commitment that were going to see some  
17 elevations.

18                  CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can we have a motion,  
19 then, with what Elena had already talked about  
20 and has informed the applicant of for concept  
21 acceptance?

22                  MR. NARDACCI: I make a motion.

23                  MR. MION: I'll second it.

24                  CHAIRMAN STUTO: All those in favor?

25                                   ***(Ayes were recited.)***

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: All opposed?

2 ***(There were none opposed.)***

3 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Concept acceptance has  
4 been approved.

5 MR. PEARSON: Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Motion to adjourn?

7 MR. MION: I make a motion.

8 MR. NARDACCI: I'll second.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: all those in favor?

10 ***(Ayes were recited.)***

11

12

13 ***(Whereas the proceeding concerning the above***  
14 ***entitled matter was adjourned at 9:29 p.m.)***

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

**CERTIFICATION**

1  
2  
3  
4            ***I, NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART, Approved***  
5            ***New York State Transcriber and Notary Public***  
6            ***in and for the State of New York, hereby***  
7            ***CERTIFY that the record taped and transcribed***  
8            ***by me at the time and place noted in the***  
9            ***heading hereof is a true and accurate***  
10           ***transcript of same, to the best of my ability***  
11           ***and belief.***

12  
13  
14  
15            \_\_\_\_\_  
                  ***NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART***

16  
17  
18            ***Dated February 14, 2011***