

1 PLANNING BOARD COUNTY OF ALBANY
2 TOWN OF COLONIE

3
4 *****

5 THE SALVATION ARMY
6 190 TROY-SCHENECTADY ROAD
7 APPLICATION FOR CONCEPT ACCEPTANCE
8 *****

9 THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled
10 public hearing BY NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART, a
11 Shorthand Reporter, commencing on
12 January 24, 2012 at 8:04 p.m. at the Public
13 Operations Center 347 Old Niskayuna Road,
14 Latham, New York 12110

15 BOARD MEMBERS:
16
17 PETER STUTO, CHAIRMAN
18 MICHAEL SULLIVAN
19 BRIAN AUSTIN
20 LOUIS MION
21 TIMOTHY LANE
22 KATHLEEN DALTON
23 BRIAN HAAK
24 ELENA VAIDA, Esq., Attorney for the Planning Board

25 Also present:

26 Joe LaCivita, Director, Planning and Economic
27 Development

28 Mark Pearson, Schopfer Architects

29 Dominick Arico, Boswell Engineering

30 Ken Wersted, Creighton Manning Engineering

31 Carol Miller

32 Moon Tse

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Next on the agenda is
2 the Salvation Army; application for concept
3 acceptance. We have seen this before, I think,
4 in a sketch plan. Maybe it was a prior concept
5 application.

6 Joe, do you have any introduction on
7 this?

8 MR. LACIVITA: Yes, Peter, this is
9 actually a relocation of the current site
10 which is a little further west on
11 Troy-Schenectady Road. The application calls
12 for a new building constructed. It's going to
13 be 23,775 square feet.

14 Schopfer Architects are the ones
15 presenting tonight. Barton and Loguidice is
16 our TDE for the Town of Colonie.

17 You are correct, this project has been
18 before us a couple of times. It is here
19 tonight for concept acceptance.

20 MR. PEARSON: My name is Mark Pearson.
21 I'm with Schopfer Architects and we're
22 presenting this evening.

23 Previously, we were here on May 10th and
24 at that time there was an issue with a zoning
25 verification, and we were not able to conclude

1 the concept acceptance phase.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can you refresh us on
3 what that issue was?

4 MR. PEARSON: The issue was that we need
5 to be 100 feet from the zoning district
6 boundary. Although we always carried the line
7 here, perpendicular to this property, the
8 zoning district boundary goes out into the
9 middle of the street and turns right here
10 (Indicating). So, we have to be 100 feet from
11 that point. That's what this part is. What it
12 did was force the building to go forward a few
13 feet.

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, you've clarified
15 that and your plan conforms with that
16 interpretation.

17 MR. PEARSON: We received the approved
18 zoning verification shortly after that.

19 This is a 3.25 acre site on
20 Troy-Schenectady Road. We're opposite the
21 Kmart building. Our utilities - we're gaining
22 access to electric and telephone poles along
23 Troy-Schenectady Road. Our sanitary connection
24 connects into Semons Road and water is brought
25 in along Troy-Schenectady Road.

1 Our landscaping - I should say that we
2 have two issues for waivers. The first is a
3 setback of the building. We initially had the
4 building within 20 feet of the property line.
5 In previous discussions, the neighborhood
6 really preferred the building back from the
7 road which forced parking forward. Comments
8 from the Board asked for landscaped screening
9 of that part. So, what we have created is a
10 series of large deciduous trees about 100 feet
11 down the center. At full height they'll grow
12 to 55 or 65 feet in height. Within that we
13 have a low hedge behind the fence line. This
14 should provide adequate screening year round
15 of the parking lot.

16 In the rear lot, we have a six-foot high
17 berm and a combination of Austrian Pines and
18 Serbian Spruce, which will be a relatively
19 quick growing evergreen trees that provide an
20 adequate screen within two or three years.
21 Within the interior parking layout we have a
22 series of Juniper and Red Twig Dogwoods, all a
23 variety of different colors for different
24 seasons.

25 We are currently showing one building

1 sign. The Salvation Army shield directly above
2 the entrance and one pole sign. The pole sign
3 will be located right at the entrance and the
4 pole - we'll have to work that out finally
5 with DOT of the location of that signage. From
6 our understanding of the Code, the ordinance
7 of the sign will comply with all of the square
8 footage of both the building and the pole
9 mounted sign.

10 The building is 16 percent. The paved
11 area is 36 percent with a greenspace of 48
12 percent and we are required to have 115 spaces
13 per Code; we have provided 117. So, we're two
14 over.

15 At this point, I'd like to turn it over
16 to Dominick and let him go through the
17 stormwater concept. He's had some back and
18 forth with Brad and I think that they have all
19 their issues resolved.

20 MR. ARICO: Hello. My name is Dominick
21 Arico from Boswell Engineering.

22 If everybody remembers the previous plan
23 before that, we did a lot regarding the
24 capturing a lot of stormwater. It is a fairly
25 flat site as it stands there today. We

1 originally had a surface pond here
2 (Indicating). We were collecting water and
3 having standing water for a period of
4 time - going back and forth with Bradley. We
5 moved all storage under the parking area of
6 the pavement so there is storage pipe
7 underneath there. Since we don't have any
8 forebay or anything for water quality here,
9 porous pavement really wasn't an option for
10 quality control. So, we put in an actual model
11 from Crystal Stream that will actually treat
12 the water quality volumes through that and
13 that's all shown on the maps here
14 (Indicating). We have worked out the pipe
15 restrictions, recalculating everything and
16 based on the comments that Brad has made, we
17 modified some flow values. We meet the water
18 quality standards that the MS4 in the Town of
19 Colonie is required to meet.

20 The construction of the site in terms of
21 erosion control - the site will pretty much be
22 the perimeter with erosion control;
23 construction will be located here which will
24 be the only entrance into the site. There is a
25 swale along the back here to collect roof

1 water (Indicating). That's pretty much the
2 summary.

3 I believe that we've answered all the
4 questions and comments that were made and have
5 addressed them to date. We still have some
6 modifications to make.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you want to respond
8 to that when you go through your letter, Brad?

9 MR. GRANT: Yes, I will. I just have one
10 question.

11 Has that been submitted to DOT?

12 MR. ARICO: This connection here
13 (Indicating)?

14 MR. GRANT: Your stormwater management
15 plan?

16 MR. ARICO: Yes. Ken is going to take you
17 through correspondence that we've had with DOT
18 regarding the intersection between our
19 property and Troy-Schenectady Road.

20 MR. WERSTED: Ken Wersted, Creighton
21 Manning Engineering.

22 Just to carry on with that conversation,
23 the stormwater report was submitted to DOT in
24 June of last year as part of our submission.
25 There were some responses to a couple of

1 comments that they had when they were
2 reviewing the project.

3 Basically, the DOT had looked at this
4 site several times over the years and they
5 said that they would grant access as a fourth
6 leg to this intersection pending a couple of
7 conditions. One of those conditions was that
8 an access easement would be granted to the
9 property to the east because this property
10 frontage comes all the way across the signal.
11 The property to the east would not have access
12 to it if there was no access easement.

13 Another condition was also to look at the
14 traffic signal there. Right now it's set up as
15 a three-legged intersection. It has traffic
16 lights and everything just for three lights.
17 The question was: Can the poles there handle
18 the additional signal heads, the additional
19 signs and whatnot to accommodate a fourth
20 light?

21 The other condition was basically
22 restriping Route 2 to accommodate a left turn
23 into the site. In our response, we looked at
24 the loading on the signal span and we had
25 calculated what the existing loads were - what

1 the proposed loads were. We compared that
2 basically the size of the poles that are out
3 there today. We basically found that the 5,000
4 pound poles out there now would be maxed out
5 at the proposed condition when you added in
6 the fourth light. If the poles are 5,000
7 pounds and we calculated those, it would be
8 4,999. They would be right at capacity.

9 There was some additional correspondence.
10 The applicant agreed that we would replace the
11 traffic signal here (Indicating), most likely
12 with larger poles to be able to accommodate
13 the additional loading, but also to relocate
14 one of the poles on the site side.

15 With those comments, they had also
16 provided or also spoke about the sidewalk that
17 runs along the frontage of the site.
18 Basically, the way that it's shown on a
19 previous plan is that the sidewalk basically
20 went straight across the site driveway. You
21 could have the effect where a vehicle stops at
22 the light and pedestrians will be crossing
23 behind the vehicle. So, the sidewalk really
24 needed to move up to the front so that
25 pedestrians could cross in front of vehicles.

1 That's now shown on this current plan. The
2 sidewalk and pedestrians will come out closer
3 to the road, across the driveway and in front
4 of vehicles.

5 As part of the redevelopment or redesign
6 of the intersection, new striping would take
7 place on Route 2 and provide a left turn in
8 with new traffic signals, but also pedestrian
9 accommodations across the driveway and across
10 Route 2 as well.

11 That pretty much summarizes the
12 correspondence that we've had with DOT. We've
13 provided responses to those comments. They
14 replied back and said that everything is
15 acceptable and to just provide us with updated
16 plans that show this new design. That would be
17 our next step.

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Anything else from the
19 applicant at this point?

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

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Before we go to the Town
22 Designated Engineer, I just want to remind the
23 residents if you could sign in and we'll call
24 you.

25 Now, we're turning to the Town Designated

1 Engineer who works for us.

2 Brad, you have a comment letter?

3 MR. GRANT: Yes, the comment letter is
4 dated January 17th of this year. I'll start off
5 on page 2 under general.

6 The more important things that the
7 applicant's team has responded to was
8 providing the access and ingress easement just
9 spoken of on the eastern side of their site.

10 "A rectangular size and shape easement
11 that will provide access for any future
12 development to the east of the project. That
13 was responsive to both the TDE and DOT and
14 Town comments."

15 I'll get right into the plans. There were
16 some very minor comments as far as plan
17 content, legend, key on plans, erosion and
18 sediment control when in conformance with the
19 blue book. Some of these comments are for
20 further phases. They are necessary at a
21 concept acceptance stage. Final submission
22 will include the bounds and description of all
23 easements. That access and ingress easement
24 would be along those lines.

25 "Clearly indicate lamp type of light plan

1 to provide optimum color redemption. Lamps are
2 preferred in the following order; high
3 pressure sodium, low pressure sodium and avoid
4 mixing the lamp types."

5 You have some on the building and some
6 down cast that you have proposed out in the
7 parking area.

8 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can we let the applicant
9 speak on that? It's probably of concern to the
10 residents, as well; particularly the down
11 lighting and all that.

12 MR. PEARSON: This is a photometric plan
13 and I understand Brad's comment. We didn't
14 specifically call out the type of light, but
15 we did designate the preferred light source
16 that we use.

17 We also incorporate a system of a timer
18 and photocell to control the lighting. What we
19 have shown is two photometric plans here. One
20 is up until 9:30 at night. Store hours are
21 until 9:00. Closing, getting into your cars
22 and leaving the site gives them one-half hour.
23 All of the pole lights will then turn off,
24 leaving just the security lights on the
25 perimeter of the building so that it's

1 minimal.

2 MR. GRANT: So, it's 9:30 at night.

3 MR. PEARSON: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Are those hours on the
5 plan somewhere? Are they in writing?

6 MR. PEARSON: Yes, they are.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: That will become part of
8 the approved plans.

9 MR. GRANT: I think that there was some
10 Board concerns and we'll probably want to do a
11 pause after this one.

12 "Roof pitch, hip, gable, gambrel or
13 mansard roofs are recommended. A flat roof
14 should incorporate a parapet with cornice
15 details along facades facing public streets.
16 Plain parapets are discouraged."

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: There is a lot of
18 architectural terminology. I only sort of
19 understand half of it. I'm not sure about the
20 other Board Members; particularly the new
21 ones.

22 MR. GRANT: I don't know if we want to do
23 a pause and have Mark respond to that and talk
24 about the roof styles proposed.

25 MR. PEARSON: The roof is proposed as a

1 flat roof and internally drained for this size
2 facility. That's the type of roof that looks
3 best.

4 Parapets are notorious for water
5 infiltration and other maintenance issues over
6 time. We have minimized them. We do, however,
7 have a few projections about the roof line to
8 break up the length of the façade. One is at
9 the entry and one is at the family store sign.

10 My question back to Brad when I got this
11 letter was: How tall of a parapet does the
12 Board want to see? Do you want it consistent?
13 Do you want larger cornices on larger
14 elements, or a smaller trim below? I guess I'm
15 looking for some feedback on what it is that
16 you're looking for in that comment.

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I personally agree
18 generally with Brad's comment. I think that
19 it's a little too plain, but I'll turn it over
20 to the other Board Members who may have other
21 distinct feelings or can articulate it better
22 than I can. I think that it needs to be jazzed
23 up a little bit. Anybody want to help me out?

24 MR. GRANT: Mark, what is your parapet in
25 the non-towered portions?

1 MR. PEARSON: We don't have a parapet.

2 MR. GRANT: What is it at the tower?

3 MR. PEARSON: It's about three and a half
4 feet.

5 MR. GRANT: And there is going to be
6 rooftop units which will have some screening.

7 MR. PEARSON: We were just discussing
8 that before the meeting. The nature of the
9 site is that the neighbors are uphill. We
10 would screen around the units.

11 MR. GRANT: All the way around.

12 MR. PEARSON: All the way around.

13 CHAIRMAN STUTO: What did we just go
14 over, Brad? Did you recommend any
15 enhancements?

16 MR. GRANT: I guess I'm looking to the
17 Board also. I like how the projections - I
18 like how that breaks up how it would otherwise
19 be a pretty routine and a long linear element.
20 I think what the Board is looking for is some
21 kind of parapet, but I guess I wanted to hear
22 their opinions on it.

23 MR. AUSTIN: Is there any way to do some
24 sort of a gable, rather than just a flat
25 surface? It looks very industrial. I'm not

1 thinking higher but bringing it down.

2 MR. PEARSON: Are you suggesting at the
3 top of one of these projections -

4 MR. AUSTIN: Well you could bring the
5 entry gable up a little bit and then make a
6 matching gable on the other side where the
7 Salvation Army sign could be. It's just as a
8 façade and not necessarily as an actual
9 function. Even on the sides because it's a
10 very square building.

11 MS. DALTON: It looks like a warehouse.
12 When I looked at the comments that we had at
13 the last time you were here, we talked about
14 the fact that you're looking to make this more
15 of a family store now. You're trying to
16 rebrand yourself. When I look at this
17 building, that's not what I see. I see kind of
18 warehousy and industrial type building. It
19 doesn't look like the kind of more attractive
20 and ornate -- I understand that we're talking
21 Salvation Army, so the name isn't the first
22 thing that you'll think of but the building is
23 just not inviting. I guess inviting is the
24 best word. It looks like a converted warehouse
25 to me. There is just nothing about this that

1 says that this is a store that I want to go
2 into. I'm not sure what you need to do to make
3 it more inviting, but I don't see it yet.

4 MR. PEARSON: It is a utilitarian
5 building. It's got three rooms. It's a big
6 retail space, a processing area and a
7 receiving area. That's the entire floor plan.

8 MS. DALTON: Yeah, but you could say the
9 same thing about Fresh Market. It's
10 utilitarian. It's a market, but it's a very
11 attractive building. You want to go in it. I
12 understand that we're not talking about a
13 Fresh Market type environment, but I still
14 think that there are things that you can do to
15 make it more attractive.

16 MR. PEARSON: I think that the
17 competition that's out there is TJ Max or
18 Marshall's. Yes, they have a motif at their
19 entry, but they're a box and they don't have a
20 lot of windows in them because windows take up
21 retail space on the walls. These are many of
22 the same concerns and the Salvation Army is
23 dealing with this. How do you make the
24 building attractive, but also how do you make
25 it so that you maximize your retail

1 capability?

2 MS. DALTON: I think that it has to do
3 with the entryway. I think that the entryway
4 maybe needs to be made a little bit higher and
5 make the windows around the doorway somewhat
6 more attractive.

7 MR. AUSTIN: I've driven by the one on
8 Central Avenue. This is starting to look like
9 the one on Central Avenue. If you're planning
10 on redoing that, that's all well and good but
11 you have a lot of windows on the one on
12 Central Avenue, is that correct?

13 MR. PEARSON: Yes.

14 MR. AUSTIN: So, that's similar to this.
15 I don't know if that's a converted store
16 previous -

17 MR. PEARSON: That's a pre-engineered
18 metal building.

19 MR. GRANT: I know that sometimes an
20 architectural treatment that can help a flat
21 industrial type of roof is cornicing at the
22 edge.

23 MR. PEARSON: That's something that we
24 can do. We can do the cornicing here
25 (Indicating) or other elements. We can beef

1 this up here towards Troy-Schenectady Road and
2 Semons so that there is more character there.

3 MR. LACIVITA: Mark, where these
4 protrusions come up and go up to three
5 feet - this may be premature, but how does
6 that relate where your mechanicals are going
7 to be laid out and whatever type of treatment
8 you're going to be doing around there?

9 MR. PEARSON: These are on the front of
10 the store and the mechanical treatment is
11 generally further to the rear. I don't think
12 that you're going to see any of the rooftop
13 equipment from Troy-Schenectady Road and from
14 the neighbor's side.

15 MR. LACIVITA: That's what I'm trying to
16 get at is how you can incorporate the
17 placement of that mechanical with some of this
18 treatment that you're talking about here.
19 Maybe hide it and use it in the architectural
20 as well.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Those are our comments
22 and we'd like to see some improvement there.
23 As long as we're on architectural features,
24 you want to talk about the colors and the
25 surfaces? What we're looking at now is in

1 black and white. I know that we had some
2 discussion last time.

3 MR. PEARSON: We have a number of
4 facilities that we've done with this two-tone
5 gray charcoal and a layer of masonry. The red
6 is recent. Previously we have done blue, but
7 the Salvation Army has been shifting and they
8 want us to move all of the stores over to the
9 red. I have actual samples here of the
10 materials that you're seeing in this façade. I
11 can pass these around.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: And I'm sure that we'll
13 get more discussion after we hear from the
14 neighbors.

15 Do you want to continue with your letter,
16 Brad?

17 MR. GRANT: Yes. Comment six discusses
18 the awnings. The Town Code basically says that
19 awnings and canopies are building design.
20 However, their use is encouraged on facades
21 that face public streets. If awnings and
22 canopies are used, their covering shall be
23 made of canvass. Plastic, metal or wood
24 covered awnings are not permissible. Mark has
25 responded. The preference is painted aluminum

1 for maintenance purposes.

2 MR. PEARSON: A painted standard metal
3 roof is preferred for maintenance.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: For which awning?

5 MR. PEARSON: For all of these awnings
6 all the way around to this level (Indicating).

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Let's discuss the
8 canvas. I'm not sure why that's there in the
9 Code.

10 MR. GRANT: I have a hard time arguing
11 what the rationale is.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can we waive that, if we
13 need to? We can waive any of the requirements,
14 right?

15 MR. GRANT: Yes. Canvas fades. It's
16 something that you're going to have to replace
17 in 10 years. That aluminum is probably going
18 to be powder coated. I think that it makes
19 sense.

20 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Unless somebody objects
21 with your comment, it should be metals.

22 If we have to specifically make that a
23 waiver, we will incorporate that into our
24 thing for final.

25 MR. GRANT: Windows should have anodized

1 aluminum or wood frame and not bare aluminum
2 frame. Please verify frame material.

3 Mark has responded back. I think that it
4 would be aluminum with a Kynar finish?

5 MR. PEARSON: We've shown it here as red
6 and we've toned that down on other facilities
7 to a gray or white.

8 MR. GRANT: But the Kynar has a color to
9 it?

10 MR. PEARSON: Yes, that metal sample that
11 went around -

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: That red color?

13 MR. PEARSON: Yes.

14 MR. GRANT: There were some comments on
15 SWPPP. Again, those are something that will
16 shake out in the final stages of this.

17 As Dom has mentioned, we had met to go
18 over the conceptual design and I'm not going
19 to go through these point by point, but there
20 are some requirements on pre and post
21 development maps. Long story short, we were
22 looking for the Crystal Clear - the
23 proprietary stormwater treatment unit. We
24 wanted it off-line so that the water quality
25 storms go through it and not the larger

1 storms. Then you can route it back to the
2 storage units - underground storage pipes
3 under the pavement after that. It's
4 essentially not going to see the 100 year
5 storms.

6 There are statements that need to be
7 said. In the SWPPP. I wanted Dom to check out
8 his values on runoff and forward any DOT
9 approvals of the final SWPPP stormwater
10 management plans they have commented on.
11 They're waiting for the final, too. I think
12 that they are amendable to what is being
13 proposed. It does tie into the DOT system.

14 That was my letter. I want to go back to
15 the minutes.

16 Going back in time, the applicant and
17 their team have looked at with the
18 neighborhood and looked at four different
19 scenarios of the building placement. One time
20 there was curb and sidewalk proposed on Semons
21 avenue. It really didn't seem to be part of
22 what the neighborhood wanted and was removed.

23 As Mark had said earlier, 48 percent of
24 the site is left for greenspace. That fence
25 that you were talking about along the

1 periphery of the site - that is the wrought
2 iron fence.

3 For the front yard there will need to be
4 a waiver on the building setback. It is 20
5 feet off of the road.

6 MR. PEARSON: I think that we need a
7 waiver at the sidewalk, too.

8 MR. GRANT: That sidewalk isn't going to
9 be 15 feet. I think that it's 11.5 feet.

10 There was some discussion about window
11 glass and that kind of ties into the
12 elevations. Shelving space is important. There
13 is talk about expandable glass panels or faux
14 windows where it appears that there is a
15 window on the outside, but not on the inside.

16 I think that was it.

17 On the rooftop equipment, there was some
18 local concerns about the existing facility
19 across the street. Some of those rooftop units
20 could be heard. I mentioned another project
21 that I heard in front of the Planning Board.
22 Sometimes equipment needs maintenance and I
23 think that on that particular project there
24 was a rooftop unit that I think developed some
25 sounds over its life. It needed some TLC more

1 than anything. I see a comment here about 60
2 decibels.

3 MR. PEARSON: I did go back and check our
4 specifications on the project and we do in
5 fact specify sound deafening enclosures on the
6 rooftop units. It's the metal that has a spray
7 foam on the inside and it normally keeps the
8 decibel level in that 60 decibel range, which
9 is pretty reasonable.

10 MR. GRANT: That would be something that
11 we would be looking for.

12 I think that's it.

13 CHAIRMAN STUTO: A couple of the members
14 have said that they want to hear from the
15 public before we make our comments.

16 Moon Tse.

17 MR. TSE: Last time I thought that we
18 chose the red and brown color.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I think that the colors
20 were still in the open. You're saying that we
21 chose what over what?

22 MS. MILLER: Unfortunately, it was the
23 other gentleman from Schopfer who presented
24 and he had all of the different samples up
25 there -

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you have any other
2 renditions there of color?

3 MR. PEARSON: That was me, but we had
4 this in a reddish brick tone scheme and we had
5 the other facility to compare and discuss. I
6 received the meeting minutes and it seemed to
7 me that more people were in agreement with
8 this scheme which is also the Salvation Army
9 colors. So, that's what we brought back. We
10 realize that some people like the red, but it
11 seemed to be that most people liked the gray.

12 MR. MION: I think that we also said that
13 it would blend in with some of the buildings
14 around here; the Kmart building and the Toyota
15 building over on Central Avenue; if I remember
16 correctly.

17 MR. PEARSON: That's what I gathered from
18 the meeting minutes that were sent to me.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I've looked through the
20 minutes and I haven't read them thoroughly. I
21 didn't notice that was resolved. That's just
22 my recollection of the color. I thought that
23 was one of the things that we had to talk
24 about.

25 MR. MION: I think that it was resolved.

1 It was just an opinion.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Let's just leave color
3 as an issue right now as unresolved. That's so
4 we don't get bogged down.

5 Carol Miller?

6 MS. MILLER: On the color - just to
7 finish that -- the concern that I think that
8 the neighborhood had of the people that are
9 here that remember the conversation was that
10 if you have it that light tone gray and
11 black - off gray and dark gray - that it
12 matches the building on the other side of the
13 street, which already looks like a big huge
14 warehouse. We were trying to make it look
15 different. It doesn't have to be red or brown
16 or whatever; just something that makes it look
17 less like a warehouse than All Star Baseball.
18 That's where our concern was with the color.
19 It's not that we're opposed to gray and black,
20 it's just we don't want it to look so much
21 like All Star does because then it looks like
22 two big boxes.

23 CHAIRMAN STUTO: We were saying that we
24 were leaning towards the red. Is that what
25 you're saying? Are we saying the same thing?

1 MR. MION: And to go along with what
2 you're saying - that's why we're talking about
3 the design of the roof and that so that it
4 doesn't look like a warehouse.

5 MS. MILLER: Right, but color can make a
6 difference too.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Are we in agreement on
8 the red?

9 MS. MILLER: Yes, we like the red.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, then that's
11 resolved.

12 MS. MILLER: I'd like what Mr. LaCivita
13 said about the rooftop units because that was
14 one of the concerns from Paul Robetor at the
15 last meeting. It was with regard to screening
16 for sound and sight of the roof mechanicals
17 and to incorporate the parapets in the front
18 to screen some of that and direct the noise
19 level more towards the road and less toward
20 the neighborhood. That would be a nice
21 feature.

22 You said something about pedestrian
23 accommodations. I'm hoping that means
24 crosswalk. That's what we were going to ask
25 for as a neighborhood. The only crosswalk that

1 exists right now is at Swatling. So, to cross
2 Route 2 is kind of -- you're either crossing
3 and hoping for the best, or going all the way
4 up to Swatling Road.

5 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Let's take these one at
6 a time. Let's take the air conditioning units.
7 You want to talk about noise and visual on
8 that?

9 MR. PEARSON: Typically, a facility this
10 size - we would have two rooftop units. They
11 are relatively small. They're four feet wide
12 and as I said they have sound deadening foam
13 on the inside of the metal panels. That's a
14 feature that we always specify for these
15 units. Because this is the lower site relative
16 to the neighborhood, we've intended all along
17 to have some sort of screening around the
18 units. Typically, they're done towards the
19 back of the building because that's where the
20 processing is and receiving areas are. The
21 duct work is not over the retail space. It
22 also allows access up to them because we don't
23 have ceilings in the processing and receiving
24 spaces. We can actually get up on ladders and
25 work under them.

1 From a practical standpoint, we're in the
2 back third of the building with these units.
3 They're mostly right in this area
4 (Indicating).

5 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Which is toward the
6 houses, I guess.

7 MR. PEARSON: There are some over here
8 (Indicating), but there will be the Austrian
9 Pines and Serbian Spruce. Those trees are
10 going to eventually be 70 feet tall.

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Brad, you made a
12 comment. It was after Mr. Robetor spoke and
13 then Mr. Pearson - when the Siena dorms were
14 being looked at, there were different levels
15 of noise that they were looking at. There is
16 different equipment that is manufactured that
17 might change attenuations like panels on the
18 side.

19 MR. GRANT: That's what Mark is talking
20 about - those panels on the sides.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, that's probably the
22 best we're going to do.

23 MR. GRANT: It's a sound attenuation and
24 the mechanical equipment. Some can achieve low
25 levels. There is economy equipment which might

1 be above 60 decibels. That would be
2 discouraged.

3 MS. MILLER: So, we appreciate this berm
4 that you're putting in. I'm not sure if this
5 is supposed to be a berm, but this screens it
6 nicely from the adjacent property which is
7 Moon Tse's property. But from driving up and
8 down the road, this higher back of the
9 building is exposed to the road and as you can
10 see from here, this is what the back of the
11 building looks like. So, from what we see
12 every day, if you guys could at least consider
13 here like a diagonal island berm and also put
14 some trees up and block some of the back of
15 that building for those that have to drive up
16 and down the road every day.

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: It sounds good to me.
18 I'd like to hear from Brad.

19 MR. GRANT: I'm looking at the planting
20 plan - the landscaping plan. There are some
21 trees.

22 Mark, could you point those out?

23 MR. PEARSON: These are deciduous.
24 They'll be 55 and 65 feet tall. These are in
25 the 30-foot range. These are low hedges along

1 the fence (Indicating). These trees right here
2 are the Serbian Spruce which have full height.
3 All of these evergreens are going to be fairly
4 quick growing. At full height they will be 70
5 feet tall.

6 MS. MILLER: The 70 feet tall sounds
7 great, but I'll tell you that the pine trees
8 that grow 70 feet tall have nothing at the
9 bottom and all branches at the top. So, we're
10 still looking at the back of a building
11 eventually. When the ground is raised up with
12 some plantings that don't get 70 feet
13 tall -- they are mixed in with that to just
14 block it. You've seen these pine trees that
15 grow and the bottom 10 feet have no branches.

16 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Is there any reason not
17 to berm that?

18 MR. GRANT: There is a drainage swale
19 proposed that takes the roof drainage away. As
20 part of the infrastructure, more or less at
21 that corner - that will be fairly gently
22 sloped. You can plant within it. Typically
23 that species has underscored growth though.

24 MR. PEARSON: That swale was part of the
25 DEC regulations. We can turn this berm a

1 little bit and try to tighten the swale up.

2 MR. GRANT: And you've got the wrought
3 iron fence down through there, too.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can we see what we can
5 do about improvement the berm there?

6 MR. PEARSON: Sure.

7 MR. GRANT: You might be able to drag
8 that berm out a little towards the road and
9 put a tail on it. The swale doesn't have to be
10 quite as wide as it is, but there does need to
11 be a swale there.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: We'll work on that for
13 the next time.

14 Anyone else on this project from the
15 neighborhood?

16 MR. CRUDO: My name is Nick Crudo and I
17 live at 16 Semons. I just want to make sure
18 that there is no entrance on Semons. I haven't
19 heard any discussion on that yet.

20 MS. DALTON: There is one.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Board Members want to
22 talk?

23 MR. AUSTIN: The only thing that I would
24 have is the general aesthetics of the
25 building. It's all about making it look

1 appealing to the community. I don't know
2 whether that is going to be in changing the
3 materials that are used on the front of the
4 building, or replacing them with some sort of
5 siding. I like the stone. It's very nice. It's
6 a very appealing scheme that you have here.
7 But going with what the residents are saying
8 too, we saw the Stewarts building come in just
9 a few hours ago and they went from a very
10 industrial looking Stewarts to a nice sided
11 façade. It's a very large building to have
12 siding on it. Maybe you could think of
13 something else; some gables or something
14 different.

15 MR. PEARSON: It's hard to upscale that
16 to a residential look. It's 28,000 square
17 feet.

18 MR. AUSTIN: Is this new one bigger than
19 the presently on Route 2?

20 MR. PEARSON: The one presently on Route
21 2 is about 18,000 and we're proposing a 9,000
22 square foot addition.

23 MR. AUSTIN: Do you have any idea what
24 will happen to the building that's on Route 2
25 right now?

1 MR. PEARSON: Closing it and selling it.

2 MR. LANE: It looks like you were
3 agreeing with pretty much all the comments
4 from all the Town departments.

5 CDTA had submitted a letter last year
6 about a bike rack and a possible future bus
7 stop, striped sidewalks toward Schenectady and
8 Kmart, extending the post sidewalk to
9 Delatour; have any of those things been
10 addressed?

11 MR. PEARSON: Initially, we had public
12 space by this bus stop and the neighbors were
13 very much against that because of the issues
14 with the facility across the street.

15 In earlier renditions we had sidewalks
16 going all the way down Semons and that was all
17 eliminated per the discussions with the
18 neighbors.

19 The other comments that you have on there
20 about crosswalks across Route 2 and pedestrian
21 signals - that's all going to be incorporated.
22 I think that we have addressed all the
23 comments.

24 MS. MILLER: I think that it's great that
25 there is a sidewalk across the Route 2 side of

1 that building but it connects to nothing.
2 There is no sidewalk requirement for All Star
3 and literally that's where people end up
4 walking. They walk up to the corner to go to
5 Stewarts and back down to go to the bus stop.

6 MR. LANE: We are requesting these things
7 now, but -

8 MS. MILLER: But you can't go back in
9 time for those.

10 MR. LANE: Right.

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I don't know if you want
12 to address that, Joe. I don't know if you know
13 off the top of your head. I don't think that
14 Joe was around when All Star was approved. I
15 don't know if they set money aside, or how
16 they addressed the pedestrians down there.

17 MR. LACIVITA: That wasn't proposed at
18 that time, Peter, during the course of that
19 review.

20 One of the things that we are trying to
21 do is a Town wide bike and pedestrian plan to
22 incorporate the future build out of other
23 sites. That's the best that we can do at this
24 point in time because there are acquisition
25 costs and everything else that goes along with

1 it, but we are trying to plan ahead for a Town
2 wide plan which will incorporate those
3 connections.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Mike?

5 MR. SULLIVAN: All of my questions have
6 been answered, thank you.

7 MR. HAAK: I would just echo the other
8 comments about looking at the roof line and
9 seeing what you can do to make that a little
10 bit more aesthetically pleasing. I understand
11 a little bit different situation than Stewarts
12 which might be a for profit corporation as
13 opposed to a not for profit but still trying
14 to improve the sight line and just what it
15 looks like helps.

16 Other than that, I think that adding the
17 berm or extending the berm in the back is a
18 good idea. Everything else has been covered.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: In our file we have a
20 memo from the Town Attorney's office saying
21 that the applied for action is an unlisted
22 SEQRA action. We have an EAF in which Part I
23 has been filled out. I reviewed that and I'm
24 sure that all of you have. Part II has not yet
25 been filled out by either us, or the Town

1 designated engineer - we're not going to take
2 action on SEQRA today.

3 Do you have any comments on the EAF at
4 this point in time?

5 MR. GRANT: No.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, we would yield to
7 approving the SEQRA before we have final
8 approval. Before us now is the concept
9 approval with all the comments that we made
10 tonight. I'll repeat the speech that we said
11 to Stewarts.

12 Concept acceptance is not approval and is
13 not a binding action upon this Board. It's
14 just an invitation to bring forth your final
15 application. That's a legal interpretation of
16 what our concept acceptance is. I want to make
17 sure that the applicant understands that. That
18 being said, I'll take a motion or comment or
19 anything else from the Board.

20 MR. MION: I'll make a motion.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, Lou makes a motion
22 for concept acceptance.

23 MR. AUSTIN: Second.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Seconded by Brian
25 Austin.

1 All those in favor?

2 ***(Ayes were recited.)***

3 CHAIRMAN STUTO: All those opposed?

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

5 CHAIRMAN STUTO: The ayes have it.

6 We appreciate you going back to the
7 drawing board and taking into consideration
8 our comments.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 ***(Whereas the proceeding concerning the***

17 ***above entitled matter was adjourned***

18 ***at 8:55 p.m.)***

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

