1	PLANNING BOARD COUNTY OF ALBAN	Υ
2	TOWN OF COLONIE	
3		
4	***********	*
-1	STEWARTS SHOP	
5	1218 TROY-SCHENECTADY ROAD	
6	APPLICATION FOR CONCEPT ACCEPTANCE	*
7	THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled	
0	public hearing BY NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART, a	
8	Shorthand Reporter, commencing on	
9	January 24, 2012 at 7:06 p.m. at the Public Operations Center 347 Old Niskayuna Road,	
	Latham, New York 12110	
10	, and the second se	
11	BOARD MEMBERS:	
12	PETER STUTO, CHAIRMAN	
	MICHAEL SULLIVAN	
13	BRIAN AUSTIN LOUIS MION	
14	TIMOTHY LANE	
14	KATHLEEN DALTON	
15	BRIAN HAAK	
	ELENA VAIDA, Esq., Attorney for the Planning Board	
16		
17	Also present:	
	Joe LaCivita, Director, Planning and Economic	
18	Development	
19		
10	Tom Lewis, Stewarts	
20		
0.1	Joe Grasso, Clough Harbour and Associates	
21	Chris Potter, Stewarts	
22		
	Eric Coleman	
23		
24		
25		

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Next on the agenda is Stewarts at 1218 Troy-Schenectady Road. This 3 is an application for concept acceptance. I think that some of us may have seen 5 this as a sketch plan, Joe. This is the first 6 time for concept approval. Do you want to give us an introduction? MR. LACIVITA: The same thing with this 9 one here - this one is before us for concept 10 acceptance. They're going to demolish an 11 existing building and replace it with a 2,900 12 square foot convenience store with fuel at 13 this location. It's currently under review by 14 the Town Designated Engineer, Clough Harbour. 15 The address is 1218 Troy-Schenectady Road and 16 Mr. Lewis has been before us for a number of 17 locations. I can turn it over to him for 18 information. 19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you. 2.0 MR. LEWIS: Thank you, very much. 21 The yellow is what we have now and the 22 overlay is what we will have. 23 I'm Tom Lewis and I'm the real estate 24 rep. We're once again hoping to do what we had 25 done on our Route 9/Loudon Road which is that

1	we have another existing site that really
2	doesn't work well. We wouldn't do it if it was
3	just a vacant seven-tenths of an acre - which
4	it is. I'm not sure that we could do it. We
5	want to make it better. There are about 75,000
6	cars every day on that road. That's even more
7	than Route 9. There is not enough parking and
8	the building is too small. There are a number
9	of waivers that we're asking for, again.
10	The existing shop is 1,865 and the rental
11	is 3,347. So what we're going to do is knock
12	that down.
13	MR. LANE: Currently there is 1,300
14	there?
15	MR. LEWIS: The shop is 1,865 and the
16	rentals are 3,347 square.
17	The new shop will be 2,990 down from
18	5,212. However, we're now adding gas tanks and
19	it fits. What is existing now is that it has
20	19 parking spaces for all four uses. What we
21	hope to have is 25 if this is approved for
22	just one use.
23	Just like Route 9, again, there are two
24	curb cuts on the main road that we reduced
25	down to one and we're doing the same thing

1	here. We had a lot of discussions with the
2	TDE, DOT and we think that we have reached
3	something that they're comfortable with.
4	Greenspace, unlike Loudon Road, actually
5	increases 20 percent to 23 percent.
6	The number of employees remains the same.
7	There are six part-time and six full-time. The
8	hours of operation remain the same; 5:00 a.m.
9	until midnight.
10	The sequencing just like Loudon - we
11	build the new building while leaving the old
12	building open so that we don't close. A day
13	later, the old building is down and we're open
14	for business and then the gas island gets
15	built. So, we're asking for a number of
16	waivers and I can go over them, but I think
17	that you have them all. That would be the
18	overview.
19	I have Chris Potter, our engineer, who
20	can answer anything about the DEC comments and
21	other things.
22	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, I want to repeat
23	Tim's question because I was a little bit
24	distracted when you answered it.

We're going from a multi-use building to

1	just a single purpose Stewarts shop
2	MR. LEWIS: That's correct.
3	CHAIRMAN STUTO: And we're going from how
4	many square feet to how many square feet?
5	MR. LEWIS: From 5,212 down to 2,990;
6	unless you want to count the gas canopy.
7	CHAIRMAN STUTO: I don't want to do that.
8	We get the picture.
9	MR. LEWIS: Less is more.
10	CHAIRMAN STUTO: And you have no gas now,
11	right?
12	MR. LEWIS: That's correct. We had gas
13	years ago. We had one tank and we pulled it
14	because it was too small.
15	CHAIRMAN STUTO: It wasn't working.
16	MR. LEWIS: Right.
17	CHAIRMAN STUTO: If you have no further
18	comments, I'm going to ask our TDE to go over
19	his comments.
20	Joe Grasso?
21	MR. GRASSO: In your packets, I think
22	that it's about in the middle of your packets
23	we have our December 28 th concept site plan
24	review letter. I'm going to go through just
25	about all of the items in there. The first one

has to do with access which has been a large topic of discussion during the initial presentation regarding the project.

2.0

The current Stewarts store as well as the other businesses that are there have two full access curb cuts on the Route 7 and one full access on the curb cut on Vly Road via the common access drive. One of the existing curb cuts on Route 7 is only 90 feet from the intersection with Vly. We say that in order to promote access management along Route 7 and minimize conflicting movements. We support the consolidation of curb cuts and relocating them further from the intersection of Route 7 and Vly Road. The current proposal consolidates the two existing curb cuts on Route 7 into one which is approximately 140 feet.

During the initial DCC review of the project, DOT expressed some concerns about continuing to allow full access onto Route 7 but because of the closing of the one curb cut, which is closer to the intersection, they had provided us additional comments also included in your packets which states that:

"The access configuration proposed

1	including a full movement driveway on Route 7
2	appears to be an improvement over existing
3	conditions and in our opinion is an acceptable
4	compromise, given the other site constraints
5	involved."

2.0

So, the current access configuration is supported both by our office as well as New York State Department of Transportation.

Obviously, the final approval of that curb cut onto Route 7 is going to require a formal approval and work permit from DOT.

The second comment in our letter goes through some of the waivers that are required. I'll list them.

They include a maximum building setback and the building orientation because it doesn't face Route 7. It faces towards Vly Road. The parking and drive lanes are located in the front building setback, the pavement setback from the front lot line, five parking spaces less than the required minimum required by Code, and also the fuel canopy being located in the front yard.

The applicant has provided additional information in support of all the waivers and

1 we are in agreement with all of the waivers 2 except for the amount of interior landscaped 3 island that they provided which we feel that they could accommodate through a redesign and 5 some increased landscaped islands within the paved areas of the site. CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you mind going through them one by one and tell us why you 9 think that they are a good idea - or the ones 10 that you don't like? 11 MR. GRASSO: Yes. They're enumerated. We 12 summarized them, but they are enumerated in a 13 better format in the PEDD's comments which is 14 also in your packet. 15 There is a memo to you from the Planning Department on January 13th. It was sent out to 16 17 Pete Stuto from Planning and Economic 18 Development Department. Assuming that you have 19 printed both sides, it was the fourth page in 2.0 my packet. January 13, 2012. 21 I'm going to read staffs comment:

"The following waivers from the Planning Board will be necessary with the design as proposed. The PEDD does not support the waivers as the project is new construction and

22

23

24

1	no attempt has been made to conform to the
2	Land Use Law design code.
3	The building exceeds the 20-foot maximum
4	front yard setback. As this is a corner lot,
5	the setback would only apply from
6	Troy-Schenectady Road."
7	This waiver has been applied for and
8	successfully granted by the Planning Board in
9	the past because of the circulation throughout
10	the Stewarts site and the need to have access
11	to the fuel canopy and sight lines along the
12	major thoroughfare.
13	Is that a summary of the waiver comment,
14	Chris?
15	MR. POTTER: Yes.
16	CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, the building is
17	pulled further away from Troy-Schenectady Road
18	than would normally be required.
19	MR. GRASSO: Exactly. The Code requires a
20	maximum setback of 25 feet which would
21	basically put it right up on Route 7.
22	MR. LANE: Is there any particular reason
23	why it couldn't be pushed closer to the
24	Troy-Schenectady Road and the parking that's
25	on that side could be put to the opposite

1 side? MR. POTTER: It would get tighter for our 3 deliveries. This would be the width of the property line (Indicating). Also, when you 5 pulled into the entrance, you'd be basically 6 driving into where cars are backing out and there would be no separation from that. It would give it more room for stacking. If 9 somebody is pulling up here (Indicating) you 10 wouldn't be able to get off of Route 7 and 11 stop. If it was flipped, they'd be backing out 12 and someone could come in from Route 7. They 13 would have a little bit of room to stop. They 14 would be stopping on Route 7, if someone was 15 backing out of the spaces. 16 MR. LANE: I would think that would 17 improve it. If you didn't have parking spaces 18 toward Troy-Schenectady -19 MR. POTTER: No, you would have all these 2.0 ones in the front face right here 21 (Indicating). 22 MR. LANE: Okay, you're talking about the 23 front spaces. 24 MR. POTTER: Yes. 25 MR. GRASSO: And this building also - the second waiver is similar. Parking in the front yard is not permitted. Obviously, it's their intent to have some parking spaces between the building and the main road out in front so that they have customers that could park there and it's visible. They can show that they're open and for ease of circulation through the site.

2.0

MR. HAAK: So, we're measuring the space on Troy-Schenectady Road.

MR. GRASSO: Any time between the building and the road out in front - that's considered the front yard.

I'm just going to go through the waivers and then if you want we can come back to them.

The parking lot pavement within 10 feet of Vly Road, 10 feet of Troy-Schenectady, west of the curb cut, as close as two feet from Troy-Schenectady Road east of the curb cut and the parking lot access aisle with the 30 feet for parking spaces exceeds the standard width at 24 feet, but it's standard for Stewarts just because of the high turn over of vehicles and they like to keep their drive aisles wider, which we support.

The next waiver is: The layout doesn't conform with the Corps design standards for building placement which requires a main façade and entrance toward Troy-Schenectady Road. Right now the building is oriented towards Vly Road and not Troy-Schenectady Road. I think that the rationale provided was because the building is rectangular in shape and when you rotate it so that it was parallel with Troy-Schenectady Road, they wouldn't have a line of sight towards the pumps and it would compromise their drive lane which they need between the building and the pumps. Chris, is that correct about the building orientation? MR. POTTER: Yes. MR. LANE: I'm having a little trouble seeing why they can't just change the configuration. It would just require that you

1

2

3

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

change the configuration inside the store, as well. Seeing the pumps only requires a window.

MR. POTTER: The way that the cooler and the freezer and the bathroom and everything would be on the side walls - we don't have visibility out of the sides of the store. It's only out the front.

2.0

MS. DALTON: Isn't there some way that

you could shift it to the corner?

MR. POTTER: You would lose the parking
on the sides if you did that.

MR. GRASSO: When they came in for a sketch plan review, they provided us eight concept sketch layouts. This was referred to as layout 7. Based on the Planning Board minutes and our notes, they had gotten favorable feedback from the Board. There is a layout 8 that had the building oriented kind of angled towards the corner.

CHAIRMAN STUTO: Is the orientation an aesthetic thing?

MR. GRASSO: There is a comment later on in our comments about concerns over views towards the back of the building. When we look at the building, aesthetics — this is the elevation that would be facing all of the westbound traffic. We thought that there would need to be some substantial upgrades to the architectural treatment so this didn't appear to be the back of a building. We talked about adding dormers. We talked about adding faux

1 windows so that they could look more like the 2 front of a building. 3 It's vehicles on Route 7 heading west that would be looking right at that. 5 MR. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, you may remember from Loudon Road and Boght Road - we don't do the gas canopy behind the building, but on Vly Road one of the options that we 9 gave - I said, if you flip it, you're still 10 going to see everything. I think that it was 11 the curb cuts that would have to be shifted 12 back this way (Indicating). 13 CHAIRMAN STUTO: At least as far as I can 14 think of now, I have no problem operationally 15 with where it is and the setbacks. It's the 16 aesthetics from the travelers that are 17 westbound, or if you're looking directly at it 18 from Route 7, you're going to see the side 19 rather than the front. So, the aesthetics 2.0 bother me here and also, the back view; as Joe 21 just pointed out. It's just a comment. We're 22 still going through it. 23 Where will your sign be? Brian is asking 24 that. 25 MR. LEWIS: One free standing sign and

1	one building sign.
2	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Where will they be?
3	MR. LEWIS: The freestanding sign will be
4	on the corner and the one on the building will
5	be on the front.
6	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Only the eastbound
7	traffic will see the front sign.
8	MR. LEWIS: Our main sign would be the
9	freestanding sign.
10	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Mike Sullivan is just
11	suggesting that the landscaping on the
12	easterly corner might be able to help the
13	aesthetics.
14	MR. LANE: Could they be extended the
15	whole length where the trucks enter?
16	MR. LEWIS: If it's up to me, we'll do
17	landscaping wherever it fits.
18	CHAIRMAN STUTO: You're saying here
19	(Indicating).
20	MR. SULLIVAN: No, near the dumpster.
21	MR. POTTER: We could do that. This was
22	planned as the snow storage area.
23	CHAIRMAN STUTO: You still have some
24	greenspace there, don't you?
25	MR. LEWIS: We're fine with that.

1	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, we can continue
2	with the presentation.
3	Joe?
4	MR. GRASSO: "A minimum of 20 square feet
5	of landscape island shall be included in the
6	interior of the parking lot for each stall.
7	The design and layout of the interior
8	greenspace within the parking area does not
9	meet the definition of at least 75 percent of
10	the green island perimeter abutting the
11	parking area of pavement."
12	We went into a little bit more detail on
13	our comment letter and said that it looks like
14	a minimum of 500 square feet is required.
15	Can you just point out the one interior
16	landscaped island that you've got as right at
17	the corner? That's probably 150 square feet.
18	So, they would need roughly three or four of
19	those. Seventy-five percent of the perimeter
20	has to abut parking spaces and you're not
21	going to meet 50 percent there.
22	MR. LEWIS: Joe, where do you think that
23	we should put it?
24	MR. GRASSO: I think that you're going to
25	have in increase the size of that corner

1 island. MR. LEWIS: We'll lose this space. 3 MR. GRASSO: Yes. MR. LEWIS: We're short five now; we might as well be short six. Is that what you mean? MR. GRASSO: Yes. "In order to obtain increased interior island greenspace we recommend the elimination 10 of parking spaces in the vicinity of spaces 11 number 7 and 8."12 I think that if you did that, you would 13 meet that. 14 MR. LEWIS: This is one of these things 15 that if it's important enough to the 16 Board - you know that we'd rather say yes than 17 no, but the function of this building and 18 these buildings is that you get a lot of cars. 19 They demand to park as close to the building 2.0 as possible. We've had a number of cars go 21 through the building. We've documented it. 22 It's a true story. If you look at what's there 23 now and consider the aesthetics of the whole 24 project, we're going to make this look a whole

lot nicer. If it's important to the Board that

1	we lose either one or two one would be
2	better than two - we'd rather not lose any.
3	We're short, as it is, by the Code. With that
4	many cars, I think that they will all be used.
5	That's up to the Board.
6	MR. GRASSO: We have a comment regarding
7	the parking, so I'll just touch on that.
8	"Per the Town Code, the existing site
9	requires 36 and only provides 17."
10	That's comment five in our letter.
11	"Based on the elimination of the retail
12	space in the proposed site plan, it requires
13	30 parking spaces whereas they provide 25.
14	Although we support the reduction in parking,
15	additional parking spaces will be lost in
16	order to satisfy the interior island
17	greenspace requirement."
18	If sufficient parking is anticipated,
19	based on that reduction, then we would
20	recommend a corresponding decrease in the size
21	of the building. I think what I've heard Tom
22	say is that they're willing to sacrifice the
23	two additional parking spaces and feel like
24	they can still accommodate their parking

25

needs.

1	CHAIRMAN STUTO: What do you think about
2	the parking?
3	MR. GRASSO: Understanding that they only
4	have 17 right now and the fact that you add a
5	fuel pump does not increase your parking
6	demands on the site.
7	CHAIRMAN STUTO: But it's an increase
8	from the current situation.
9	MR. GRASSO: That's right. Right now they
10	are providing 47 percent of what is required
11	by Code. The current plan proposed 83 percent
12	even if you lose two more; you're still going
13	to be in the 65 or 75 percent range of what is
14	required. We support that.
15	MR. LEWIS: The reason for that is that
16	it will aesthetically look nicer.
17	I'll refer back to my comment. We think
18	that the aesthetics - without losing the
19	practicality and the practical side of things.
20	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Well, you have set a
21	high standard for yourself on Route 9.
22	MR. LEWIS: That's good.
23	MS. DALTON: The building looks great.
24	CHAIRMAN STUTO: I've had a lot of
25	positive comments about that.

1	MR. LEWIS: I'll thank the Board for
2	that. You guys voted yes and you could have
3	voted no.
4	CHAIRMAN STUTO: We massaged the original
5	plan.
6	MR. GRASSO: Going back to comment four:
7	"Per the design standards, the minimum
8	frontage build out of 80 percent should be
9	provided. This is just a recommended design
10	standard. An ornamental black fence with stone
11	columns is proposed in order to try to satisfy
12	this requirement which is similar to what they
13	did on Route 9."
14	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Are you in your letter?
15	MR. GRASSO: Yes, on number four.
16	"However, the fence only occurs for
17	approximately 50 percent of the site's
18	frontage. Consideration should be given to
19	extending the fence along Route 7 in order to
20	more fully meet the requirement."
21	Can you just show, Chris, where there
22	fence is currently proposed?
23	MR. POTTER: It's all up to the corner of
24	Vly all the way around to this entrance on 7 .
25	MR. GRASSO: We thought that they could

1	possibly pick it up on the other side of the
2	curb cut and extend it if that was something
3	that the Planning Board thought would be an
4	improvement.
5	MR. POTTER: The only thing that we
6	haven't shown here is their right of way is
7	like two feet from our curb line. So,
8	physically there is not enough space to keep
9	the fence in and on our property.
10	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Any response to that,
11	Joe?
12	MR. GRASSO: There is no room to tighten
13	that -
14	MR. POTTER: We're at 28 feet. We'd like
15	to have 30.
16	MR. GRASSO: How wide is that aisle?
17	MR. POTTER: This is 28 here
18	(Indicating).
19	MR. GRASSO: Yes, I would take the aisle
20	down a couple of feet.
21	MR. LEWIS: In the Town of Wilton, the
22	Code calls for 24 feet. We offered them 28
23	feet. The Code calls for 24 and they demanded
24	32.
25	MR. GRASSO: When you're between the

1	building and the fuel canopy, I definitely
2	think that an increased drive aisle width of
3	30 feet is beneficial. The normal parking
4	aisles are 24 feet and I could see that could
5	go down to that minimum, if it's going to
6	allow greater greenspace and accommodate the
7	fence.
8	MR. LANE: That will increase their
9	greenspace, right, if they bring that out?
10	MR. GRASSO: Yes.
11	MR. SULLIVAN: Would that solve the
12	island?
13	MR. GRASSO: No. But it's all give and
14	take. These are all things that we could look
15	at. If they do something like this, we could
16	then bring more support for the waiver of the
17	interior island.
18	CHAIRMAN STUTO: What is the interior
19	island situation on Route 9? I know that you
20	have the fence and the post.
21	MR. LEWIS: The sewer easement was what
22	messed that up.
23	MR. GRASSO: He's talking about the other
24	site.
0.5	

MR. POTTER: It's similar to this and it

1 went out more and the only reason that this 2 isn't going out more is because of the 3 entrance of our fuel trucks. CHAIRMAN STUTO: And Joe wants to 5 increase the size of that. I'm just wondering 6 what's on Route 9. I can't recall. I've driven in and out of there a few times. MR. GRASSO: They have an island. 9 MR. LEWIS: Why don't we bring in 10 something of a compromise and we'll show you 11 what that is and what this is. We can see if 12 we can work that out at the next meeting. 13 CHAIRMAN STUTO: That sounds good. I like 14 the idea of the fence and Joe's suggestion. 15 MR. GRASSO: Narrowing up the drive 16 aisles of 24 and 26 feet give you enough room 17 to keep the fence on the property line? 18 MR. POTTER: It would be close. The only 19 other comment was that they were concerned 2.0 about sight line with these columns. It's 21 something that we'll have to look at. If that 22 can even be where it is or if it has to be 23 pulled further away from the right of way. 24 MR. GRASSO: If you do like you did on 25 Route 9 and use that low fence - 36 inches -

1 MR. LEWIS: One of the reasons why it was 2 such a long time between when we appeared here 3 last time for concept on this on is that there was a lot of back and forth between the DOT 5 and Joe. MR. GRASSO: I'm going to keep going through our comments. "We're concerned with the aesthetics of 9 the building when it's viewed from vehicles 10 heading west on Route 7, seeing that views 11 would be to the back of the building, loading 12 and dumpster enclosure area. In order to 13 enhance aesthetics, additional architectural 14 treatment should be given to the east building 15 elevation including potential use of faux 16 windows, dormers and/or copulas. In addition, 17 additional landscaping should be provided 18 along the east side of the site and along the 19 south building elevation." 2.0 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I think that's a 21 critical comment. 22 MR. GRASSO: Will doing those things 23 address the orientation of the building? 24 MR. LANE: I especially like the idea of

the cupola.

1 MR. GRASSO: Yes, Route 9 has the cupola. CHAIRMAN STUTO: You made the comment on 3 the orientation. MS. DALTON: I would rather provide a 5 variance on the setback in the back, if they 6 got enough parking spaces around. CHAIRMAN STUTO: We just went over comment six which said they were going to do 9 some work on the architectural aspects of the east side of the building, the landscaping and 10 11 the cupola to make it look better from - if 12 you're coming west. That's to address the 13 orientation comment. I don't know if you have 14 any comments on that. 15 MS. DALTON: Not yet. 16 MR. GRASSO: "The plan depicts a white 17 vinyl dumpster enclosure that appears too 18 small to accommodate typical refuse. Since 19 this area would be highly visible from Route 2.0 7, the extension of the north wall that wraps 21 around the dumpster area should be considered. 22 The wall could be constructed with the stone, 23 veneer and siding to match that proposed for 24 the building exterior." 25 With your finger or your pointer, could

1	you just show where that is referring to?
2	(Mr. Lewis indicates.)
3	MR. GRASSO: Right, just wrapping around
4	that corner.
5	All of our other comments are relatively
6	minor.
7	"The sidewalk along the front of the
8	building should be extended to connect to the
9	private access drive. The sidewalk along Vly
10	Road should be extended across the private
11	access road and a landing should be provided.
12	So, the crosswalk along Vly Road and the
13	landing on the other side of the curb cut -
14	MR. LEWIS: you want a striped crosswalk
15	MR. GRASSO: Just a striped crosswalk on
16	the landing pad.
17	MR. LEWIS: I forgot to mention that
18	after many months, we obtained an easement
19	along here (Indicating) - the whole thing.
20	This is owned by the people who own the
21	bowling alley. The agreement was that we have
22	to maintain it and snow plow it and repave it.
23	CHAIRMAN STUTO: That's a private drive?
24	MR. LEWIS: Yes.
25	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can we go over the

1	sidewalk comment again so that we understand
2	that?
3	MR. GRASSO: The sidewalk along the front
4	of the building should be extended to connect
5	to the private access drive; the one across
6	the front of the building. That one little
7	extension - so that if someone is coming from
8	the bowling alley and then the other one is
9	just a crosswalk that we already talked about.
10	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Got it. No sidewalk on
11	Route 7, right?
12	MR. GRASSO: Yes, there is. It's
13	continuous. We thought that one was fine.
14	CHAIRMAN STUTO: What's on either side?
15	Is there one in front of the bowling alley?
16	Does that continue?
17	MR. POTTER: We're replacing it along the
18	front of the parcel.
19	CHAIRMAN STUTO: And it continues on?
20	MR. POTTER: Correct.
21	MR. GRASSO: I just want to check and see
22	if there are any other comments from the other
23	departments that I didn't touch on.
24	The comments from CDTA:
25	"We appreciate the sidewalks along Route

1	7 and Vly Road. It could be clear how a
2	pedestrian would walk safely to the Stewarts
3	from the sidewalk."
4	I think that our comment addressed that.
5	One or two bike racks would be a good
6	addition.
7	MR. LEWIS: Sure.
8	MR. GRASSO: I think that might have been
9	a comment from the Planning Department, as
10	well, to accommodate a bike rack.
11	CHAIRMAN STUTO: What is your opinion on
12	the bike rack?
13	MR. GRASSO: We support it for this type
14	of use.
15	That's it for our comments and those that
16	we thought we worthy of talking about from the
17	departments.
18	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Brian, do you have any
19	comments or questions?
20	MR. HAAK: No. I agree with a lot of what
21	Joe said. I would like to see a sidewalk
22	extended.
23	I guess it's on the north toward
24	Route 7 - in your drawings here you have faux
25	windows. Is there any possibility at least - I

1	guess what would be in the front section of
2	putting a real window in there to sort of open
3	up more lighting - natural lighting and
4	perhaps improve the aesthetics?
5	MR. POTTER: This side is grocery
6	shelving, which is six feet high. The other
7	window is the cooler area.
8	MR. GRASSO: So, could you do a clear
9	story over the top of the shelving?
10	MR. POTTER: We could.
11	MR. GRASSO: Maybe you could frost the
12	bottom panel and the top one clear?
13	MR. HAAK: Can you at least take a look
14	at it to see what it might look like?
15	MR. LEWIS: Sure.
16	MR. GRASSO: Even if it was frosted glass
17	at least you would get some natural light
18	inside.
19	CHAIRMAN STUTO: You're saying that it
20	would look different from the exterior though.
21	The top wouldn't match the bottom.
22	MR. POTTER: Correct.
23	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Well, we can take a look
24	at it.
25	MR. LEWIS: We'll see if there's a way to

1	depict how that would look.
2	MR. HAAK: Or it could be all clear glass
3	and you would just see the back.
4	MR. LEWIS: Which is kind of tacky.
5	MR. HAAK: I don't want it to look tacky,
6	but I'm thinking of how you would open it up
7	onto Route 7 and also make it a little bit
8	more light in there? Other than that I agree
9	with a lot of Joe's comments, certainly about
10	the landscaping in the back.
11	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Mike?
12	MR. SULLIVAN: The one question that I
13	have that remains is: Do you know who your
14	fuel supplier will be? Do you plan on using
15	Sunoco?
16	MR. LEWIS: It won't be because the
17	fellow across the street in Niskayuna is
18	Sunoco.
19	By the way, don't take this personal but
20	years ago, there was talk about us buying that
21	corner. It was decided no and it was a good
22	thing for us. Now we give you tax money
23	instead of them.
24	We will not be Sunoco.
25	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Tim?

1	MR. LANE: I don't have any questions. I
2	would like you to consider the cupola. I think
3	that would be a great addition to the
4	aesthetics on it; extending the fence,
5	sidewalks and bike racks - all the usual
6	extras.
7	MR. LEWIS: I'm sure that we will be able
8	to cover if not all, almost all.
9	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Brian?
10	MR. AUSTIN: I really don't have any
11	questions. My only thing is the aesthetics as
12	well, especially on the east elevation in the
13	backside of the store. I don't know what you
14	can do with that to try to hide it a little
15	bit more. You're driving westbound on 7 and
16	you can see the back of the store.
17	MR. POTTER: You'll see these trees and
18	you're not going to see through the dumpster
19	enclosure.
20	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can we get a berm on
21	there or no? Can we raise it up a little?
22	MR. LEWIS: Sure.
23	MR. AUSTIN: The Route 9 one looks
24	fabulous. If this looks anything like that, it
25	will be great.

1	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Lou?
2	MR. MION: I don't have any questions. I
3	think you're doing a good job.
4	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Kathy?
5	MS. DALTON: The Route 9 has a cupola,
6	right?
7	MR. LEWIS: It does.
8	MS. DALTON: The fence and the
9	sidewalk - I too have a problem with the
10	exposure of the back of the building and the
11	way that it is. I think that the berm could
12	work. I do understand your concern with regard
13	to the parking.
14	MR. POTTER: There are a bunch of
15	existing trees that are off our property in
16	this green area.
17	MS. DALTON: There is, but I do know that
18	there are little stores along the side and
19	that whole side is open.
20	CHAIRMAN STUTO: I agree with all the
21	comments that have been made.
22	Is there anyone here from the public on
23	this particular project?
24	MR. COLEMAN: I am.
25	CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'll give you a chance

Legal Transcription

1	in a minute.
2	There is another memo in the file. One of
3	our Committees suggested that we use
4	indigenous plantings. I think it was from the
5	CAC. I'm not sure what that would be.
6	Counsel is pleased to see a slight
7	increase in the greenspace. Unfortunately, the
8	landscaping plan, S3, did not list specific
9	names of trees and shrubs being planted.
10	Counsel asked that the developer use plantings
11	that are native to this area.
12	MR. POTTER: That would be basically the
13	same as Route 9.
14	CHAIRMAN STUTO: I don't know what that
15	might be, but I wanted to put that on the
16	record.
17	Can you say your name for the record?
18	MR. COLEMAN: Eric Coleman.
19	I hadn't really planned on speaking. My
20	only concern - that is my house that white
21	part that is between the access road I was
22	hoping that access - the one on Vly Road could
23	be made a one-way. I don't know if that's
24	possible. There is a decent amount of traffic
25	that goes through there right now. You're

1	going to add this space which is going to
2	increase the traffic. You're talking about not
3	being up to Code as far as parking is
4	concerned - they're going to park in that
5	access road. They do it now and they're
6	definitely going to do it when these changes
7	come in.
8	CHAIRMAN STUTO: What customers park in
9	there? Stewarts?
10	MR. COLEMAN: Yes. The bowling alley has
11	been closed for about three or four years so
12	all the trucks -
13	CHAIRMAN STUTO: How many spaces are you
14	gaining from the current parking and the
15	building size is getting smaller.
16	MR. LEWIS: It's gone from 17 to 25, but
17	the uses go from four to one. The cars that
18	were parking for the rental units and some
19	of our customers, I don't doubt, parked over
20	here (Indicating). We think that this will
21	work substantially better.
22	MR. COLEMAN: I can tell you right now
23	that nobody parks where those businesses are.
24	The UPS trucks park there. That's it.
25	MR. LEWIS: I think that there is only

1	one business that's there. Once we knew that
2	we were going to do this, we didn't extend
3	leases.
4	MR. COLEMAN: If that road does stay
5	there, it would be nice for speed bumps or
6	something. Maybe we could get permission from
7	the people that own the bowling alley to get
8	some speed bumps or something because cars do
9	rip through there. I have two kids. They shoot
10	hoops out in the back.
11	MR. AUSTIN: Say, you're going from 17 to
12	25 and I count 19 -
13	MR. LEWIS: The extra six is the pumps.
14	MR. AUSTIN: So, they can park at the
15	pump.
16	MR. LEWIS: They do; they do park at the
17	pump.
18	MR. AUSTIN: So, that's a legal parking
19	spot.
20	MR. LANE: Because you're going into the
21	store from the pump.
22	MR. LEWIS: I know that I said this on
23	Loudon Road, but if you ever go to a gas
24	station, I'll bet you a cup of coffee that at
25	some point you leave your car at the pump and

1	you go inside and you pay. That's just what
2	people do. They park there.
3	MR. LANE: Does public safety have any
4	say over traffic on private roads? They
5	couldn't direct a one-way?
6	MR. GRASSO: It's not enforceable.
7	MR. LANE: Because it's private.
8	MR. GRASSO: I was going to make that
9	recommendation. We could look at no parking
10	signage along that stretch. Trucks are going
11	to park there. Let's try to control it with
12	signage and try to adjust it from an
13	operational standpoint.
14	MR. COLEMAN: We can talk with regards to
15	some things that we'd like to have done. I
16	understand that we chose to live there, but at
17	the same time, I don't want to have to deal
18	withal the stuff that comes with the building
19	of this. I'm going to have construction going
20	on along with the store being open. That's a
21	lot to deal with.
22	MR. LEWIS: And we'll do as little as we
23	can. There will be stuff; hammer and nails
24	that will be going on for awhile.
25	MR. COLEMAN: I understand. As far as the

1	aesthetics, I don't really care.
2	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Joe Grasso, do you think
3	that the parking situation will improve with
4	the complaint that this gentleman is making
5	with the new store - with more parking spots
6	and also the no parking signs?
7	MR. GRASSO: I think that the biggest
8	thing could be signage and operational
9	controls by Stewarts. People that go to
10	Stewarts go there regularly and if they're
11	being parked out there, then somebody needs to
12	tell them to please park onsite.
13	MR. LANE: The signs would be put up by
14	the Town?
15	MR. GRASSO: No, they would be put up by
16	Stewarts and maintained by Stewarts. They're
17	going to be part of the site plan that they
18	have to be there.
19	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Anything further?
20	Questions or comments?
21	(There was no response.)
22	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Anybody else from the
23	audience?
24	(There was no response.)
25	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Anything else from the

1	Board before we consider this?
2	MR. LANE: Maybe a slow or children sign
3	that might be at the end of the street?
4	MR. GRASSO: Do you feel comfortable with
5	that sign?
6	MR. LEWIS: That's fine.
7	MR. COLEMAN: Well, there's nothing there
8	right now. There is nothing there.
9	MR. LANE: It would make people aware to
10	be on the lookout.
11	MR. GRASSO: So, this is up for concept
12	acceptance. There are findings but findings
13	get acted on at final. We will prepare written
14	findings in support of each of those based on
15	the minutes.
16	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, and the applicant
17	has heard everything that we had to say.
18	We don't do SEQRA at this point. We will
19	consider that.
20	MR. GRASSO: Everything is in order.
21	There is a full EAF in the file. There is one
22	comment regarding the maximum build-out
23	density which I'm sure that they will address.
24	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Is there anything in
25	SEQRA that we want to talk about now? I know

1	that we're not going to vote on it.
2	MR. GRASSO: No.
3	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do we have an EAF in the
4	package?
5	MR. GRASSO: That's correct.
6	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Which everyone has read
7	and we can reread them again.
8	MR. GRASSO: The only comment on the
9	SEQRA form was the question regarding what is
10	the maximum development permitted on the site
11	under the existing zoning and we didn't think
12	that it was a reasonable answer.
13	MR. LEWIS: You didn't get an answer to
14	that? It wasn't appropriate?
15	MR. GRASSO: No. I didn't see a response
16	in the file to that. It's a minor issue.
17	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Elena, do you want to
18	give your speech before concept, or do you
19	want me to do it?
20	MS. VAIDA: Why don't you do it?
21	CHAIRMAN STUTO: The applicant has been
22	with us before and we've said this before
23	every concept acceptance.
24	The concept acceptance - the Land Use Law
25	deliberately doesn't use the word approval

1	because you're not getting an approval. You're
2	getting a non-committal and we're happy to
3	take your application for final acceptance.
4	So, legally we view this as not binding on the
5	Planning Board or the Town. Consequently, we
6	don't have to complete SEQRA at this point in
7	time, either. You understand what I'm saying.
8	MR. LEWIS: I totally understand.
9	CHAIRMAN STUTO: You've received all of
10	our comments today and I think that you'll
11	incorporate them in the next go-around.
12	Do we have a motion for concept
13	acceptance?
14	MR. AUSTIN: I'll make a motion.
15	MR. LANE: Second.
16	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, Brian made it and
17	Tim seconded it.
18	All those in favor?
19	(Ayes were recited.)
20	CHAIRMAN STUTO: All those opposed?
21	(There were none opposed.)
22	CHAIRMAN STUTO: The ayes have it.
23	(Whereas the proceeding concerning the
24	above entitled matter was adjourned
25	at 7:53 p.m.)

	1 CERTIFICATION
	2
	3
	I, NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART, Short hand
	reporter and Notary Public in and for the
	State of New York, hereby CERTIFY that the
	record taken by me at the time and place
	noted in the heading hereof is a true and
	accurate transcript of same, to the best of
1	my ability and belief.
1	1
1	
1	
1	NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART
1	
1	6
1	Dated February 9, 2012
1	3
1	9
2	
2	
2	
2	3
2	4
2	5