1	PLANNING BOARD COUNTY OF ALBANY
2	TOWN OF COLONIE
3	**************************************
4	144 WOLF ROAD REVIEW AND ACTION ON PROPOSED PARKING WAIVERS
5	REVIEW AND ACTION ON PROPOSED PARKING WAIVERS
6	THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled matter BY NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART, a
7	Shorthand Reporter, commencing on June 19, 2012 at 7:20 p.m. at
8	the Public Operations Center 347 Old Niskayuna Road, Latham, New York 12110
9	DOADD MEMBEDC.
10	BOARD MEMBERS:
11	PETER STUTO, CHAIRMAN LOUIS MION
12	BRIAN AUSTIN KAREN GOMEZ
13	TIM LANE ELENA VAIDA, Esq., Attorney for the Planning Board
14	Also present:
15	
16	Michael Tengeler, Planning and Economic Development
17	Daniel Tompkins, Environmental Design Partnership
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Next on the agenda is
2	Lazare Kia, redevelopment, 144 Wolf Road.
3	Mike, you want to give us an
4	introduction?
5	MR. TENGELER: Yes, sure.
6	This is Lazare Kia. This is a
7	redevelopment project that has been it's in
8	the middle of review, administrative review
9	with the Town in conjunction with DPW and
10	Planning and Economic Development. They're
11	basically here today for review and action
12	from the Planning Board on one waiver and
13	that's to allow parking within the front yard
14	setback.
15	Just to put on record, this is concurrent
16	with every other car dealership in Colonie.
17	It's part of the nature of the beast of the
18	visibility in the front for cars and vehicles.
19	Without further ado, I'll turn it over to
20	Dan Tompkins.
21	MR. TOMPKINS: For the record, my name is
22	Daniel Tompkins. I'm with Environmental Design
23	Partnership.
24	Mr. Joseph Lazare is also here, in case
25	there are any questions about the operation.

As Mike had indicated, other than an application specific to redevelopment for Lazare Kia. Lazare Kia is over on one end of a six-acre parcel that's shared with Lazare Lincoln. The work that we've been involved with has been concentrated on this end over here (Indicating). It's bordered by Cerone Commercial, Automation Lane and of course, Wolf Road.

1

2

3

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Right now they're selling Kias on the building that's less than 3,000 square feet. It's basically a glassed in box and it's unusual to say the least, in terms of co-compliance issues and other things like that. The floor sits about three feet up in the air and there are ramps coming into the building. They've been successful with the Kia franchise and are trying to move onto the next stage. The next stage would be a larger full sized facility. It's going to have a foot print of 15,000 square feet. It's going to have service coupled in with the sales and it's going to have a drive in for service. If it's raining or snowing, you can physically drive into the building and be greeted someone who would take your car and get it right into the service department.

So, this is what Kia, the manufacture, is looking for.

2.0

The pink outline is where the existing building is - just so you have a sense of what's going on. The footprint is imposed over the existing building. It's larger. It's going to be closer to Wolf Road. Part of this overall improvement on this end of the parcel is to reconfigure the circulation for parking.

I put together an argument as far as the parking wavier is concerned. It's all for the plus. Instead of having 69 cars between the building and Wolf Road and along Cerone, we're going to be dropping down to 32. We're going to have a proper 15 foot setback of the pavement edge off of the right of way line along Wolf Road. Right now for this portion of the site, the pavement is actually right up to the right of way. It has been for years. Now, we're going to get that into the guideline's compliancy.

The same thing over in this area as well (Indicating). We're going to get a lot of the

1	kinks out of the circulation for the overall
2	alignment. There is going to be parking spaces
3	that are going to clearly be for customer
4	parking. There is a lot going forward with
5	this. We do need to have parking in front of
6	the building. It's just part of the retail
7	industry of car dealerships.
8	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Excuse me, I need to
9	interrupt you for one second.
10	This is only here for waiver review, is
11	that what you're saying, Mike?
12	MR. TENGELER: Correct.
13	CHAIRMAN STUTO: In our discussion before
14	the meeting you said that it's not here for
15	site plan review because it's over a 10,000
16	square foot building?
17	MR. TENGELER: Yes.
18	CHAIRMAN STUTO: But you said because
19	it's under the redevelopment legislation, it
20	doesn't have to be?
21	MR. TENGELER: Correct. It's being
22	reviewed administratively under the
23	redevelopment legislation, administratively
24	between the DPW office and the PEDD offices.
25	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Elena, can you just

1	verify that it doesn't have to go before full
2	site plan for the Board as the presentation is
3	being made?
4	MS. VAIDA: Yes, there is that new
5	section that was passed in 2011 -
6	redevelopment site plan review. It says:
7	"It provides a streamline mechanism for
8	and to encourage the redevelopment and
9	revitalization of areas within the Town which
10	contain vacant and underutilized properties
11	and/or properties that are being used in a way
12	that is inconsistent with or counterproductive
13	to the vision for the Town.
14	Applicability - application for
15	redevelopment site plan review is made to and
16	decisions are rendered by the Planning and
17	Economic Development Department. It's
18	available only for commercial redevelopment or
19	lots less than one acre which meet the
20	following conditions"
21	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Is that applicable here
22	MR. TENGELER: The reasoning behind this
23	particular project - and this was a decision
24	made your Director, Joe LaCivita - that the
25	area of work being done is limited to that of

1 an acre. This is kind of an unusual parcel in 2 which you have two buildings and two different 3 businesses on the same parcel. Again, this was an administrative decision made by Joe 5 LaCivita. CHAIRMAN STUTO: Elena, can you think about that as we go through this presentation and if that's a correct interpretation of 9 this? 10 MS. VAIDA: Okay. 11 MR. TOMKINS: I don't know if you heard 12 me -- I guess we were talking at the same 13 time. 14 The impacted area is less than one acre. 15 Because we are working over pavement surfaces 16 a lot of which aren't being taken up -- when 17 using a scalpel, if you will, dropping that 18 building in and doing a minimal amount of 19 impact to the surface and any grading -2.0 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm not saying that it's 21 not a good project. I just want to make sure 22 that it gets the appropriate review. 23 MR. TOMPKINS: The other thing that we 24 really need in terms of the reason that the 25 parking is in the front and the drive aisle is

1	in front is that the interconnectiveness*
2	between this portion of the site and the other
3	portion of the site - no one wanted it to be
4	more disjointed than it already is. What I
5	mean by that is that this building is up very
6	close to the site. There is a green area.
7	Circulation has to go around the back of the
8	building and through the service areas on the
9	site. What we don't want to do is effectively
10	land lock this existing area here that's
11	actually allocated for the Lincoln franchise.
12	So, we want a drive aisle that continues
13	connection between this area right here
14	(Indicating) and the Kia area. So, those are
15	all part of the arguments. The bottom line is
16	that our car dealership - you need
17	presentation along the front of the street. If
18	this was Ferrari or Mazaradi, then everybody
19	is making appointments to go to the showroom
20	and that's one thing. There doesn't need to be
21	a presentation in front of the street. That's
22	the argument.
23	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Is that the end of your
24	presentation?
25	MR. TOMKINS: It is.

1	CHAIRMAN STUTO: We have a letter from
2	one of your neighbors and I think that you've
3	gotten a copy of it. Do you want to talk about
4	that or have somebody else talk about it?
5	MR. TOMKINS: Do you want me to read it
6	into the minutes?
7	CHAIRMAN STUTO: I just want you to tell
8	us what they were saying and how you responded
9	to it.
10	MR. TOMKINS: Albany Management owns -
11	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Is there somebody here
12	from Albany Management?
13	(There was no response.)
14	MR. TOMKINS: They own 6 Automation Lane,
15	which is right here (Indicating). They had
16	four basic complaints and concerns.
17	Employees, parking on Automation Lane and
18	on the greenspace within the site and within
19	the right of way. Car carriers off-loading on
20	Automation Lane, a public address
21	system you can hear them sometimes in
22	dealerships if someone is being paged and
23	landscaping issues. I want to address each one
24	of those things.
25	I did it in written form, so it's in the

1 file.

2.0

With the redesign of the site, one of the things that we were able to do is set up a simulation so that a tractor trailer or car carrier can better accommodate it on site. So, as of now, car carriers are going to be delivering on site and not utilizing Automation Lane. So, Lazare worked out a pattern, if you will, for a truck to go in and exit. Right now, without any improvements and when the improvements happen, it will better facilitate -

CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can you show where they go now and where they will go?

MR. TOMPKINS: Yes. This is the Kia building (Indicating). There is a curb cut here off of Wolf Road and there is a curb cut here onto Automation (Indicating). So, they'll circulate in either direction. But with a car carrier, you really don't want them backing up. So, it's going to be nose in and nose out. But they can circulate through without much interference with the cars parked or anything like that. That's how we're going to solve the problem right now - by utilizing the curb cut

on Wolf Road and Automation.

2.0

After the improvement, it will come through an existing curb cut here (Indicating) and it will go this way and out onto Wolf Road.

Through the years, car carriers just used Automation Lane. It was easier and no one had complained up until now. We thought that they were okay.

As far as greenspace parking and parking on Automation Lane by employees, Mr. Lazare has instructed the managers to instruct the employees to stop doing it. It's just overenthusiastic folks trying to pack cars in certain areas of the site; out of site, out of mind. We did notice it and the policy now is:

Don't do that.

On the next point - the landscaping is going to reinforce that.

The complaint of 6 Automation is this area here (Indicating). This is an area where cars were what's called dense packed. As they were coming off of car carriers, they would be parked nose to tail. Some of the people would also be putting them on greenspace. They've

been told not to do that. There will be plantings put there. What's happened is that over the years - and we're talking a lot of years; probably 35 or 40 years, a row of scotch pine has grown and matured and gotten so that the branch radius, if you will, has gotten very large. The lower limbs were taken off, and it kind of facilitated people driving on the grass.

2.0

We've indicated that there is some gaps in the tree line. We're going to plant Austrian Pine, which is a dense tree and keeps its low branches and put them in the areas where they need them the most, which is actually on either side of this driveway (Indicating). Because of the shade that the mature trees are putting out at like 2:00 in the afternoon, we're going to put in some lower shrubs. So, we're going to fill the understory, if you will. They'll have the existing mature trees. That's how we propose to do that to sort of help remedy that issue.

The last issue of the public address system - they don't have one. So, we're not sure where that came from other than sounds

1	carry and it might be somebody else. But
2	Lazare Lincoln Kia doesn't use an exterior
3	address.
4	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you have any idea
5	what she is referring to?
6	MR. TOMKINS: No.
7	MR. LAZARE: Sometimes we can hear
8	DeNooyer across the street.
9	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Have you communicated
10	with them - with Albany Management?
11	MR. TOMKINS: We wrote the letter and
12	because of the timing, there wasn't a lot of
13	conversation. The only communication that we
14	received from them was heads-up that a letter
15	was coming into the department. There was
16	never any direct communication.
17	CHAIRMAN STUTO: You wrote a responsive
18	letter; is that what you're saying?
19	MR. TOMKINS: I did and it went to Mike's
20	attention.
21	MR. LANE: So, it only came to the
22	Planning Department and not to the neighbor.
23	MR. TOMKINS: That's right. We weren't
24	sure if we should be sending anything to
25	anybody.

1	CHAIRMAN STUTO: That's fine.
2	Have you communicated with them?
3	MR. TENGELER: I have not. The letter
4	from Albany Management just asks for the four
5	points to be addressed. In talking to Dan and
6	now hearing his presentation now, I feel like
7	he's addressed each point, with the exception
8	of the PA system which they don't have.
9	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Whenever we review a
10	project, we like to at least listen to what
11	the neighbors have to say.
12	MR. TOMKINS: We had to send
13	notifications to the neighbors and this is
14	what came out of those notifications. We're
15	not trying to blow anyone off. We're trying to
16	be responsive to the neighbors.
17	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Does anyone in the
18	audience have an interest in this project?
19	(There was no response.)
20	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you have more to your
21	presentation that you'd like to make?
22	MR. TOMKINS: No. I'm just here to answer
23	questions.
24	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Any comments from the
25	Board?

1	MR. LANE: We have a site plan here, but
2	it doesn't actually show the parking and how
3	it's going to be laid out.
4	MR. TOMKINS: That's not the site plan
5	that you have there. I put the existing
6	conditions in at the last minute, so you'd
7	have a before and after. What we're really
8	talking about is this area.
9	MR. LANE: So, there will be landscaping
10	there, as well (Indicating).
11	MR. TOMKINS: There is landscaping there
12	in the area of the pavement. Of course there
13	is going to be grass.
14	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Was your question
15	answered?
16	MR. LANE: Yes, it was.
17	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Anything else?
18	(There was no response.)
19	CHAIRMAN STUTO: I am looking for an
20	interpretation here of whether this falls
21	under the redevelopment. The particular
22	question is the lot size of an acre or less, I
23	think. That's what counsel is thinking about
24	right now.
25	MS. VAIDA: I also had a question and I'm

1	not sure what might be the language - the
2	drafting - but it says on lots less than one
3	acre I saw that your SEQRA says that you're
4	disturbing less than an acre, but if you read
5	this literally, it says lot and not area of
6	disturbance. The first condition says
7	"addition or other site change other than
8	demolition". I don't know if that means that
9	you're doing a demolition and replacing it
10	that this doesn't apply, or because you are
11	doing the demolition you can't rely on this
12	section. It's not clear.
13	MR. TOMKINS: What's our recourse? If
14	it's not clear, what's our recourse?
15	CHAIRMAN STUTO: To come back to us for
16	site plan review. If we're not clear, she has
17	to give a definitive interpretation. That
18	might not be tonight. If she decides that you
19	need to come for site plan review before this
20	Board, that's what we'll do. Then we would
21	have a Town Designated Engineer reviewing it
22	for us, as well.
23	MS. VAIDA: Did you speak with the Town
24	Attorney about whether you fit under this
25	section?

1	MR. TOMKINS: We had a DCC meeting and
2	everyone was there, including a representative
3	from the Town Attorney's office. No one
4	objected to that.
5	MR. TENGELER: Rebekah Kennedy was at the
6	DCC meeting and offered her expertise in
7	regards to SEQRA.
8	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can we take five and get
9	her on the phone? SEQRA is different than when
10	it comes before us or not.
11	MS. VAIDA: Was there a SEQRA review
12	done, or no?
13	MR. TENGELER: It's in the process of
14	being done. The classification was made as an
15	unlisted action.
16	MR. TOMKINS: I'm going to have to
17	emphasize that there was no dancing around the
18	fact that it was called a redevelopment
19	application at the DCC meeting.
20	CHAIRMAN STUTO: This is what I suggest:
21	Let's take a five-minute recess and we'll try
22	to get a hold of one of the Town Attorneys. We
23	just want to do it right.
24	MR. TOMKINS: I understand, but these
25	folks have months invested in this.

1	CHAIRMAN STUTO: The process is not that
2	dissimilar. It's pretty similar, except we
3	review it as a site plan review instead of
4	reviewing just one waiver.
5	MR. TOMKINS: I understand that.
6	CHAIRMAN STUTO: We'd be taking a closer
7	look at everything there and we'd have the
8	benefit of a Town Designated Engineer
9	reviewing it on our behalf.
10	MR. TOMKINS: It sounds like it takes
11	more time.
12	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Well, you'd have to come
13	back for another meeting.
14	Let's take a five-minute recess and we'll
15	see.
16	I don't mind you advocating for your
17	position at all. We're just in a gray area
18	ourselves. We just want to clarify.
19	MS. VAIDA: I'm actually troubled by the
20	procedure because I don't think that it's
21	right to have that happen to the applicant.
22	It's not really their fault. I'm also troubled
23	that maybe we need to change our review
24	procedures so that either myself or the Town
25	Attorney's office double checks to make sure

1 that these projects are meeting the definition. CHAIRMAN STUTO: That's fine. Let's take 3 five and try to get a hold of Rebekah or Mike 5 on this. (There was a brief recess.) CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, the recess is over and we're going to call the meeting back to 9 order. We were lucky enough to get the Town 10 Attorney on the phone with myself, Mike 11 Tengeler and our counsel, Elena Vaida. 12 Elena, could you make a recommendation as 13 to where we should go from here, based upon 14 our conversation? 15 MS. VAIDA: We're going to go ahead with 16 the project, as is, in light of the history 17 here and the fact that you were led to believe 18 that it is a redevelopment and the fact that 19 substantively, it would appear that the 2.0 project meets all the guidelines under the 21 Land Use Law, anyway, other than this parking 22 waiver that you need - we're going to treat it 23 as such and move forward. 24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Any other questions from 25 the Board?

1	(There was no response.)
2	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, where are we on
3	SEQRA?
4	MR. TENGELER: It's been classified as an
5	unlisted action. I'm waiting for the neg dec
6	to come in from Rebekah Nellis Kennedy, but
7	she has classified it as an unlisted action
8	and it will be handled administratively.
9	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can we grant a waiver
10	before we have the neg dec?
11	MR. TENGELER: I spoke to Rebekah about
12	that today and the answer is yes because she
13	has made the classification.
14	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you agree with that,
15	Elena?
16	MS. VAIDA: No.
17	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can we grant a waiver
18	contingent upon the neg dec -
19	MS. VAIDA: Yes. I assume that you've
20	done it's your department that's doing the
21	review and it's probably just a question of
22	putting your findings to paper.
23	MR. TENGELER: It's literally a question
24	of her sending me the negative dec document
25	with her information filled out.

1	MS. VAIDA: So, you basically found that
2	there is no impact to the environment by these
3	improvements that are being made.
4	MR. TENGELER: Correct.
5	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can you restate what the
6	wavier is, just so that the Board knows what
7	they are voting on?
8	MR. TENGELER: Yes. It's to grant relief
9	from the NCOR design standards to allow
10	parking within the front yard setback of the
11	building.
12	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Anybody want to make a
13	motion on that?
14	MR. MION: I'll make that motion.
15	MR. LANE: With the condition that the
16	procedure of a neg dec be issued.
17	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do we have a second on
18	that motion?
19	MR. AUSTIN: Second.
20	CHAIRMAN STUTO: All those in favor?
21	(Ayes were recited.)
22	CHAIRMAN STUTO: All those opposed?
23	(There were none opposed.)
24	CHAIRMAN STUTO: The ayes have it.
25	Thank you and good luck.

Legal Transcription

	22
1	
2	(Whereas the proceeding concerning the above
3	entitled matter was concluded at
4	7:55 p.m.)
5	
6	
7	
8	
g	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CERTIFICATION
2	
3	
4	I, NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART, Shorthand
5	Reporter and Notary Public in and for the
6	State of New York, hereby CERTIFY that the
7	record taken by me at the time and place
8	noted in the heading hereof is a true and
9	accurate transcript of same, to the best of
10	my ability and belief.
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART
16	
17	
18	Dated July 9, 2012
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	