1	PLANNING BOARD	COUNTY OF ALBANY
2	TOWN OF COLONIE	
3	**********	*****
4	MOHAWK RIVERFRONT 1360 LOUDON RO	
5	APPLICATION FOR FINAL	
6	**********	*****
7	THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of	of the above
8	entitled matter by NANCY STRANG Shorthand Reporter, commencing	G-VANDEBOGART, a
9	2013 at 9:40 p.m. at The Public 347 Old Niskayuna Road, Latham,	Operations Center,
10		
11	BOARD MEMBERS: PETER STUTO, CHAIRMAN	
12	LOU MION BRIAN AUSTIN	
13	KAREN GOMEZ TIMOTHY LANE	
14	SUSAN MILSTEIN KATHY DALTON	
15		
16		
17	ALSO PRESENT:	
18	Elena Vaida, Esq., Counsel to the Pl	anning Board
19	Joe LaCivita, Director, Planning and	d Economic Development
20	Jamie Easton, PE, WSP Sells	
21	Pat Cavanaugh, Applicant	
22	Victor Caponera, Esq.	
23	Robert Ballard	
24	Russel Harding	
25	Thomas Wade	

1	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Last on our agenda is Mohawk
2	Riverfront Estates PDD, 1360 Loudon Road, application
3	for final site plan. The proposal is for 92
4	condominium units, 30 rental apartments, a 10,000
5	square foot office retail and 4,000 square foot club
6	house.
7	Joe LaCivita, do you have an introduction on
8	this?
9	MR. LACIVITA: Sure, I can give you some times and
10	dates of when the project has been before the Town.
11	It all started back in May 30, 2007 when they
12	came to the DCC and we went through a couple of
13	public hearings in the process because the zoning
14	had been changed under Resolution 323 of 2009
15	adopting the PDD legislation for this project from
16	it's COR zoning. There was a negative declaration
17	by SEQRA adopted on May 26, 2009. The project has
18	not changed from its original concept. It's here
19	tonight for final approval under Mr. Cavanaugh and
20	Jamie Easton is here tonight from WSP Sells to get
21	our final approval on the project.
22	I'll turn it over to Jaime.
23	MR. EASTON: Good evening, Ladies and Gentlemen.
24	I'm Jamie Easton from WSP and I'm here tonight
25	representing Pat Cavanaugh, the owner of the project.

I'd like to thank the neighbors who have come out tonight. I'll try to make this short for you guys. I think that some of you guys have been through this process and the Planning Board - a month ago we kind of went through this. So, I'm going to go through the highlights of the project.

Currently right now we have an 11-acre

trailer park site that consists of approximately

50 trailers. The proposed project back in 2007

through 2009 was developed by Clough Harbour. We

took this existing trailer park and changed it

into seven condominium units that comprise 96

units in them, one clubhouse, one apartment

building that houses 30 units, and 10,000 square

feet of commercial space. As we've gone through

this process, from the Town Departments and things

like that -- Clough Harbour had represented us and

there have been changes.

If the general public would like plans, I'll put out these 11 by 17's out front. The general difference was really two things. One, the clubhouse that was in the center got moved down to the very end. The next thing was that there was a proposed pump station right here in the center of the project that got moved the farthest to the

north property corner near the existing trailer
park to the north of our project due to the fact
that the Town of Colonie Pure Waters Division
wanted this to be a regional pump station. The
lands that are the farthest to the north would
drain back to this location (Indicating) in this
pump station instead of having multiple pump
stations and saving the tax payers money. So,
those are the two real big changes that happened.
You can see the seven condominium buildings and
they are the same footprint that they originally
were. That hasn't changed. The clubhouse the
orientation has been reduced in square footage.
The apartment building is closer to the existing
trailer park. We reorientated the parking lot and
made it a little more efficient. The 10,000
square foot commericial space is exactly where it
was. That hasn't changed. The road and access
points have not changed from the original PDD. A
lot of this stuff is still the same since 2007.
So, basically this past fall, we went through
and did the final site plans for this and
submitted to the Town of Colonie; Pure waters and
Sewer the ice jam reports and stormwater
management reports. The full plans contained

about 130 sheets. The TDE for the Town of
Colonie, Barton and Loguidice, has reviewed that
set of plans and provided comments. We then
addressed those comments and then gave an informal
Planning Board update meeting this past January
29th. We then revised the plans and sent them
back to the Town and had them reviewed again. At
this point we're asking for conditional final
approval which basically means that we're asking
the Board to issue us a final approval based on
satisfying any additional comments that the
Planning Board or the Town Departments may have.
Just to let you know, this project also will
be phased. What I mean by phased is phased
construction only. The subdivision plan and
things like that will be filed immediately, but
the construction is going to be phased. Under the
first construction phase, we're proposing to build
the apartment building, the general parking lots
pump station, the access road coming in, the club
house and the first condominium. We're working

Legal Transcription
Ph 518-542-7699 Fax 518-831-1710

www.albanylegaltranscription.com

basically north to south. That's where sewer

will then build-out a second phase which will

contain two condo buildings and the third phase

wants us to go. Depending on how units sell, we

1	would be the rental units. Everything else that
2	has been talked about with you in conversations
3	with and with letters that we've documented in our
4	project narrative reports those will still be
5	in place.
6	At this point, I'd like to turn it over to
7	the Planning Board and we'll go from there.
8	I don't know if the whole Planning Board has
9	seen this. I know that some Members have seen it
10	before. The typical elevation views of the
11	commercial space these haven't changed since
12	some of you guys have seen this since 2007 to
13	2009. A lot of this stuff is still offered
14	online. If you google Mohawk Riverfront Estates,
15	you're able to see floor plans of all these units.
16	You'll see elevation plans of all these units.
17	Like I said, the only difference is the clubhouse
18	changed. When you go online and look, that has
19	changed. But it actually gives you square footage
20	of the units and layouts of the units; two-bedroom
21	and three-bedroom apartments. It's very well
22	detailed. If anybody is looking for a place or a
23	condo, you can see them there.
24	There are typical elevation views of the
25	14-units and that's basically a side elevation

1	view. It's a little bit easier to see from that
2	end (Indicating). That's basically the side view
3	of what one would look at from the garage. This
4	is a general representation of what it would look
5	like from the water onto the project site. Some
6	of the Planning Board and the public already knows
7	that we went to SEAMAB. That was required for
8	this project because we are within the 50-foot
9	buffer of the Mohawk River. A lot of that
10	vegetation, but not all of it, is going to be
11	maintained with a minimum 10 to 20 foot and we
12	have satisfied that requirement to obtain our
13	SEAMAB permit for this project.
14	At this point, I'd like to turn it over to
15	the Planning Board and see if they have any
16	comments.
17	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you. You did a great job.
18	We've seen it before. Most of us are familiar with it.
19	There are a couple of us that are new here.
20	I'd like to hear from our Town Designated
21	Engineer. Let's be clear what we are doing
22	procedurally.
23	MR. GRANT: Okay, it's my understanding that if
24	you would take a vote tonight, that it would be on the
25	subdivision and the PDD. The PDD statement of findings

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is something that was prepared in 2009.

2 MR. LACIVITA: It was adopted in 2009.

MR. GRANT: The project is essentially the same.

There are some subtle changes that Jamie has touched on. We have reviewed all of the various plans and reports in the 130 sheets and Jamie's response letter of January 21st.

In response to our comment letter of January 11th, we have a letter in response to this. We have received comments from Town staff; departmental comments; Planning, Stormwater and Latham Water District. They got those today. DPW had a wild flux of projects to review in February, so I have not received all of the Town comments at this point. Typically, we don't issue our comment letter until we have received those to ensure that we're all on the same page and not contradicting the comments regarding the plans. You won't find my letter in your packets because it's in my computer in Syracuse with my IT guy who is trying to rebuild it. I apologize for not having a comment letter in your packets, but I'm prepared to talk about this tonight. I've gone through Jamie's letter and my previous comment letter, and there are a few things that I want to touch on

1	specifically. In essence, 95 percent of the items
2	have been appropriately addressed more or less.
3	There are a few things that we still need to
4	verify and a couple of minor points that we want
5	to still talk about.
6	There is one of the more significant ones
7	that I talked to Jamie Easton on today. It was
8	the pump station and the sizing for the future and
9	the force main. We can get together with Chretien
10	and hash that out as we work through towards
11	final. There are a number of regulatory permits
12	that the project still has to secure, not the
13	least of which is the Army Corps, DOT, DEC - that
14	regulatory process is in the works and proceeding.
15	Any approvals tonight would be contingent
16	approvals on the project obtaining all regulatory
17	permits and approvals required of this project.
18	Second, complying with staff comments that
19	have either been received or are going to be
20	subsequently received shortly.
21	Lastly, the existing comment letters and the
22	one forthcoming regarding the project.
23	CHAIRMAN STUTO: From the TDE?
24	MR. GRANT: Yes, from the TDE.
25	CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm taking notes.

1	MR. GRANT: Essentially, from our January 11th
2	comment letter, they often call these things
3	housekeeping but when you do 130 sheets of plans, there
4	is no one on the face of the earth that is going to do
5	those perfectly. There are things that have to be
6	coordinated between one sheet and another and that's a
7	lot of what is going on here. I think that the more
8	significant points are the sewage pump station and
9	there were some stormwater comments regarding the water
10	quality proprietary vault units so far as routing the
11	pipes through them and around them.
12	Essentially, there are other things that are
13	infrastructure related with these types of
14	comments. There are a number of easements that
15	had to be secured from people around the site;
16	Seymour's and more particularly out on Crescent
17	Terrace. The applicant has worked with some
18	landowners who have existing properties and
19	getting water and sewer through there as they have
20	limited space to do so. There has been some
21	competing comments, but I think that we're fairly
22	close on this.
23	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Victor, are you counsel on this?
24	MR. CAPONERA: Yes, I am.
25	CHAIRMAN STUTO: What is your opinion of what we

1	are voting on this evening here?
2	MR. CAPONERA: Procedurally?
3	CHAIRMAN STUTO: In other words, site plan?
4	Subdivision? PDD?
5	MR. CAPONERA: It's already been done. In my
6	opinion, the PDD has already been approved years ago.
7	CHAIRMAN STUTO: This is site plan review; is that
8	what you're saying?
9	MR. CAPONERA: Yes, and it's basically site plan.
10	MS. VAIDA: There have been no changes to the PDD.
11	I think that we went over that last time.
12	MR. CAPONERA: That's right.
13	MR. LANE: What was the issue with the retail
14	space and the proposed possible restaurant? Can you
15	explain that to me?
16	MR. EASTON: With the commercial space out
17	front the 10,000 square feet the design engineer
18	designed that space to accommodate a restaurant
19	facility, but that restaurant space is not approved.
20	So, engineering wise, it's designed in accordance for
21	pump station flows, parking requirements and things
22	like that. What we could do is if the applicant so
23	chooses in the future to put in a restaurant type
24	facility, they would have to come back to this Planning
25	Board for approval for that particular item. The

1	10,0000 square feet is only approved for retail office.
2	MR. LANE: Does that change the status of the PDD?
3	MS. VAIDA: Tim, if you look on page 8, it has all
4	the conditions of the PDD and it explains the
5	restaurant.
6	MR. LACIVITA: You have to go deep into it. It's
7	not just page 8. You have to go into the PDD findings
8	and page 8 of those is actually where it details those;
9	it's 10. If you'd like, for the record, I can read it
10	so you can actually see what it's talking about. As 10
11	goes down, it says:
12	"Any food service establishment proposed on
13	this site will be subject for further review and
14	approval by the Town of Colonie Planning Board
15	which will require an amended narrative and
16	parking analysis that demonstrates the parking
17	required can be accommodated with the approved
18	conceptual parking capacity and amended traffic
19	study that provides verification of the level of
20	traffic service at the intersections of Route 9.
21	A significantly sized food service operation may
22	require provisions for more parking that would
23	alter the conceptual plan and perhaps the adjacent
24	areas."

Legal Transcription
Ph 518-542-7699 Fax 518-831-1710
www.albanylegaltranscription.com

So, that's what we talked about specifically

25

1	to Jamie's point of the 10,000 square feet. Brad
2	articulated that at the last meeting in January.
3	So, they would be back before us if that was
4	proposed in the future.
5	MR. EASTON: Basically, the only thing that I've
6	done is blocked off a sewer flow rate for the pump
7	station. That's in reality what I've done. A
8	restaurant uses much more water and sewer. I'm taking
9	that reserve capacity and assigning it to that
10	building. In the event that he does want to do it next
11	year or 20 years from now, that assigned value is
12	already there. But, he would have to come back to the
13	Planning Board.
14	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Any members of the public want to
15	be heard on this project?
16	MR. BALLARD: My name is Robert Ballard and I have
17	a couple of issues with when you run your gas and
18	water. It's going to go by my property.
19	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Where is your property?
20	MR. BALLARD: It's Crescent Terrace and Route 9.
21	I'm at the top of Crescent Terrace, north to their land
22	and then it goes adjacent to the back -
23	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Does that show on your map?
24	MR. EASTON: Yes, Mr. Ballard owns two properties
25	under two different names. They are these two corner

1	pieces up here, farther south. It's basically Route 9,
2	south of our project site and closest to Route 9. They
3	should be labeled actually with Mr. Ballard on it.
4	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, we have your property
5	located. Tell us your issue please. Are they the
6	residential properties or commercial?
7	MR. BALLARD: One is commercial and the other is
8	residential. When they do the excavating on the water
9	and sewer and get easements for you guys and stuff,
10	instead of them chopping that off, I'd like it to blend
11	into the existing property. So, when your easement is
12	on the state land, I don't want to have it cut down and
13	not have it leveled out to the other properties. You
14	know what I'm saying?
15	CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm not sure I understand what
16	you're saying. Have you spoken to the engineer about
17	this?
18	MR. EASTON: Yes, he has. Mr. Ballard has spoken
19	to me a few different times about this. In some cases
20	the property owners have been in contact the duration
21	of the design of the project. The reason is that we
22	have been able to obtain all site easements from
23	existing landowners to put town infrastructure in. Now
24	the reason that I went to these landowners was down
25	here in the corner of some of Mr. Ballard's property,

Ţ	if we're not able to obtain easements, this would force
2	infrastructure underneath Route 9's shoulder
3	(Indicating). For example, the storm force main or
4	waterline or something like that. That would allow us
5	to occupy lands on his property to put future Town
6	infrastructure in, and then move it out from under DOT
7	roadway so it would make it easer.
8	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can you show us where the lines
9	are?
10	MR. EASTON: One line is actually right here at
11	the corner. Actually, I was able to obtain the 20-foot
12	easement -
13	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Parallel to Route 9; is that what
14	you're saying?
15	MR. EASTON: Parallel to Route 9. There are
16	multiple owners. One is Mr. Ballard and one is Mr.
17	[SIC] Houter's. Seymour's property actually gave the
18	20 foot easement -
19	CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, you're going all along that
20	front.
21	MR. EASTON: All along that front, I was able to
22	obtain easements.
23	CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, what is Mr. Ballard's issue?
24	MR. EASTON: He just wants to make sure that as
25	they grade along Route 9 and install the waterline and

1	force main, he wants to make sure that grade blends
2	into his property smoother than what they currently are
3	right now.
4	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Did Mr. Ballard grant you an
5	easement?
6	MR. EASTON: Yes, he did. He actually granted a
7	total of three easements onto his property.
8	CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, what is your response to his
9	concern?
10	MR. EASTON: In regards to grading easements,
11	grading within the easement or onto his property, the
12	applicant will have to talk to the contractor and see
13	to the extent that he wants graded. I don't want to be
14	open ended with a checkbook, but if it's minor grading
15	to blend between the Route 9 shoulder and his property
16	of the waterline elevation and the sewer force main -
17	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Is there a big elevation change?
18	MR. EASTON: Actually, yes. From Route 9 to the
19	top of his property there is probably 20 feet.
20	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you want to have that whole
21	thing filled in? Is that what you're saying?
22	MR. BALLARD: Oh, no. They can't fill that in.
23	They'd be filling in all of 9.
24	MR. EASTON: Basically, you have the side slope
25	coming from Route 9's shoulder, as you're heading south

1	on Route 9. You have a shoulder and you have a ditch
2	line and then basically you have a one on one, or two
3	on one side slope that goes up on his property which
4	has trees and vegetation. The proposed borderline goes
5	basically in on that two on one side. So, kind of half
6	way up the back. What he wants to do is kind of chop
7	off the top of that hill to blend in and instead of
8	having a two on one slope within DOT's property, make
9	it a three on one slope. I have not looked into the
10	economics of that issue. I need to consult with the
11	owner of the project and see how much grading he wants.
12	If it's minor grading, I have no problem with that.
13	That's one of his concerns.
14	MR. BALLARD: There is that and there is going to
15	be a lot of surveying and moving stuff. I want to make
16	sure that my survey pins are replaced.
17	CHAIRMAN STUTO: You have survey pins in now?
18	MR. BALLARD: Yes.
19	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Delineating your property?
20	MR. BALLARD: Yes. They're going to be ripping up
21	a lot, and I want to make sure that they are replaced.
22	CHAIRMAN STUTO: I would assume that they would
23	guarantee to do that.
24	MR. BALLARD: The other one is where Crescent
25	Terrace and 9 meet at Cemetery. There was one thing

1	that wasn't addressed in the past. There is a storm
2	drain - water comes off of 9 and it goes down Crescent
3	and it fills right up near the mailboxes and stuff, so
4	all the water that comes off the road bypasses. There
5	is a divot in there and it goes down Crescent instead
6	of down 9. So, I have an issue with a storm drain
7	there.
8	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Is that part of the property that
9	you're touching?
10	MR. BALLARD: No, this is where you're going to be
11	digging up for your water and your gas line.
12	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Is that going to be part of what
13	you're touching in the utility aspect of your project?
14	MR. EASTON: The first question was with regard to
15	the pins being reset. So that it's on the record and
16	it's known, we will reset your pins on your property.
17	We're touching five or six of the corners of your
18	property to install future Town utilities in there.
19	So, I have no problem with resetting those.
20	In regard to the intersection of Route 9 and
21	Crescent Terrace, which is approximately a quarter
22	of a mile south of our intersection, we have a
23	sewer line and a waterline going through that
24	existing intersection.
25	CHAIRMAN STUTO: You said you're going to install

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	that;	is	that	what	you're	saying?	Ιt	doesn't	exist
2	now?								

MR. EASTON: There is water down to this part of Town, but the existing line is substandard and there is some problems with the existing waterline. So, the Town of Colonie has requested us to do a 12-inch waterline and to install a sewer force main in this area to get sewage out from this one regional pump station. There is also a project close by; Shelter Cove. We will be trenching through the existing Crescent Road, which is a quarter mile south of this intersection (Indicating). From meeting with Mr. Ballard this morning, there is some existing drainage issues that are currently at that intersection in the Town's property. I didn't know this until I looked at it today. The water sheet flows across Route 9's shoulder. It does not improperly drain on that roadway. I think that in the Town's best interest in putting in infrastructure in this area, as we're kind of putting in infrastructure in there, if we need to pave a larger area or drain a little bit better on that intersection, I think that is amendable to our client. I think that we need to sit down with the DPW Department and really see what issues they've had at this existing intersection and update those plans so

1	that it's corrected. I think that most of it can be
2	corrected by grading and properly putting in new
3	pavement in that area and getting it into pitch
4	correctly. If not, I think that one catch basin would
5	suffice.
6	CHAIRMAN STUTO: And you're on record as saying
7	that you would go to that extent.
8	MR. EASTON: I will go to that extent.
9	MR. AUSTIN: Back to the question, Mr. Ballard,
10	with the grading: What purpose is that going to serve,
11	Mr. Ballard? Is that an aesthetic purpose?
12	MR. BALLARD: No, it would serve their project a
13	little bit better. They're taking a wedge out of that
14	area and it has to be filled in. So, there is more
15	than aesthetic. It's a combination of a lot of things.
16	Plus, at the north end of that property on the Route 9
17	side there is lawn adjacent to their property, maybe 50
18	or 60 feet - I didn't know until this morning that was
19	going to be anticipated into a ditch and I would like
20	to see that stay.
21	MR. LANE: Can you respond to that?
22	MR. EASTON: I'll try to figure that picture out.
23	Down here in this southern entrance way there
24	exists right now a lawn area - a culvert
25	underneath this existing driveway (Indicating).

1	It's not your typical driveway culvert. It
2	extends significantly farther off the roadway
3	which allows the current owner to have somewhat a
4	gentle grade coming out to Route 9. He would like
5	to maintain that gentle slope from going out from
6	here to there (Indicating). He doesn't have any
7	legal access to go out to that point. He still
8	likes the aesthetic of that location. So, that's
9	some of what Mr. Ballard is trying to articulate,
10	due to the large steep grade on that bank. He has
11	pretty much a level property and it falls off like
12	a two on one. We're going to stick a waterline in
13	here and it goes down into a ditch and he's
14	basically saying that any grade that goes somewhat
15	into my property is less than that slope. So,
16	basically it's not really a roadway hazard, or
17	it's easier for him to mow. Right now if you
18	actually drive that area, you see scrub brush is
19	along the banks - along DOT's property. DOT is
20	not mowing it.
21	MR. AUSTIN: So, as a sign of good will -
22	MR. EASTON: It would be a sign of good will by
23	the applicant. It's not really an issue that the
24	Planning Board would be concerned with, but it's on the
25	record that I have to come up with a way to satisfy the

1	existing owner that basically to grade this area out,
2	the grading would revise the waterline profile, grading
3	level, and things like that. There are technical
4	things that we would have to look at, but accommodating
5	grading through this area - it's a very steep slope and
6	we are going to cut some of it down and you're going to
7	make it less steep. Basically, from Mr. Ballard's
8	point of view, after speaking with him, he wants to be
9	able to mow it.
10	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Are you going to get rid of the
11	material, or can you throw it in the ditch?
12	MR. EASTON: I would remove that material and
13	actually there is an advantage to moving the material
14	because the project site needs material. So, there is
15	an advantage. I haven't worked out what those cost
16	advantages are with the contractor in obtaining a firm
17	quote to say what is the net plus to that.
18	MS. MILSTEIN: I have a question for you. The
19	easement has been granted already; correct?
20	MR. EASTON: No, it has not.
21	MS. MILSTEIN: You have something contractual?
22	MR. EASTON: We basically have a signed letter of
23	acknowledgement from the owners what is going on their
24	properties and the easements I'm going to have. Once
25	the conditional file is approved, before we submit the

1	plans to Albany County DOH, those easements have to be
2	executed.
3	MS. MILSTEIN: That's fine. You answered my
4	question and the answer is no, you don't have the
5	actual easements.
6	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Is there a contractural
7	obligation to grant the easements?
8	MR. EASTON: There is a letter of public
9	acknowledgement between the owner and the applicant.
10	MS. MILSTEIN: So, that's why it's important for
11	you to establish a good relationship.
12	MR. EASTON: Absolutely.
13	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Yes, sir.
14	MR. BALLARD: Part of this section where this
15	wedge is - that's where this water is going through.
16	That's part of the easement there. It's more than just
17	cutting the grade down. There is a wedge of like 60 or
18	70 feet by like 20 or 30.
19	MR. EASTON: The existing drainage pattern on here
20	is - you can look at this triangle in here and kind of
21	box it right down the middle (Indicating). Along this
22	existing roadway is a ditch. That's what he's talking
23	about. That goes to the Route 9 drainage system and
24	the other half goes down the existing roadway on the
25	southern part of the roadway. He's concerned about

1	that run-off, where it is going and which direction it
2	is going? Originally, I was taking some of this area
3	and directing it to Route 9's drainage, but he wants to
4	maintain that flat area.
5	MS. MILSTEIN: The bottom line is that you're
6	willing to work with them.
7	MR. EASTON: Yes, I absolute am. To cut to the
8	chase, it's 20 feet of pipe.
9	MR. GRANT: And having a water main and a much
10	gentler slope isn't the worst thing either. That's an
11	advantage.
12	MR. BALLARD: It will be much easier for them to
13	get in there.
14	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Does that satisfy you Mr.
15	Ballard?
16	MR. BALLARD: When they go into that other phase,
17	I want tot make sure the lighting isn't going toward my
18	property.
19	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can someone speak to that?
20	MR. EASTON: There is a analysis in the plan that
21	shows no net impact or photometric or any light goes on
22	his property. That's fine and dandy and we can all say
23	tha,t, but I can look out the window and see the light
24	outside. You can still see the light. It's
25	photometric. That's what Mr. Ballard is concerned

1	about. I have informed him that the lights that we're
2	actually using are actually facing downward, and to go
3	down to the intersection which is the intersection of
4	Delaware and Ontario - we did the bike path down there
5	with LED lights. They are the same light fixtures. It
6	shows the same light intensity and he'll be very
7	surprised with LED lights compared to high pressure
8	sodium lights. The light disburses out very high.
9	It's very bright - versus the LED lights are really
10	very focused and goes straight down. There is an
11	advantage to that. So, I would encourage Mr. Ballard
12	to drive down to that site and take a look at that.
13	It's the same light fixture, same light, same intensity
14	and he can get an idea of what that is compared to.
15	So, the technical answer is that there is no light
16	spillage on your property, but like anybody you can
17	still see a light. If I was someone in my backyard
18	sitting outside, you can still see the light. That's
19	what he is concerned about. I'm going to mitigate that
20	the best that I can and propose the best technology
21	that is available to the site.
22	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Brad, do you agree with that?
23	MR. GRANT: Yes. Trader Joe's has those same type
24	of lights. I'm not sure about the height on them,
25	comparatively speaking.

1	CHAIRMAN STUTU: Any other comments from the
2	public?
3	MR. HARDING: I'm Russ Harding and I live on
4	Crescent Terrace. I think that this project is great.
5	I'm all for it.
6	The first phase is going to be the apartments
7	and then there would be one condo unit?
8	MR. EASTON: That is s correct. It will be the
9	biggest one that consists of the apartment building,
10	the condo building and the clubhouse. So, this whole
11	parking lot, this whole roadway access, all this - the
12	pavement will stop generally somewhere between building
13	five and building six (Indicating).
14	MR. HARDING: My question is: If you build the
15	apartments and the apartments rent good and then you
16	build a condo and you don't sell the condos so well,
17	will you be coming back in to make it all apartments or
18	will those all stay condos?
19	MR. CAVANAUGH: Right now we're leaning towards
20	all condos.
21	MR. HARDING: But you may go to all apartments?
22	MR. CAVANAUGH: No, all condos.
23	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Any other comments or questions?
24	MR. WADE: I'm Thomas Wade and I also live on
25	Crescent Terrace. While you're waiting for these other

Ţ	phases, what condition is the property going of be in?
2	I also look forward to cleaning up the
3	neighborhood. I'm in favor of the project. I
4	think that you have overall bent over backwards to
5	accommodate people, but I'm just wondering on my
6	end what it's going to look like while you're
7	anticipating the completion of that.
8	MR. EASTON: The first thing is the waterline will
9	be installed. Once that is done, one of the first
10	things that we'll be doing on your property is
11	installing the water main. The second is all the
12	trailers will be removed in Phase I, so all the garbage
13	and all things - that's it. Electrical or anything
14	like that - under Phase I, that's what's going to
15	concur. The only thing that we're going to keep is the
16	existing entrance, because that gives the ability for
17	fire and EMS to access our site. Also maintaining
18	existing pavement helps the circulation within the
19	site. The existing trees that you see there are going
20	to stay. The scrub brush and the trailer garbage -
21	that's going to be gone.
22	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Does that answer your questions?
23	MR. WADE: Yes.
24	MR. GRANT: Construction sequence and the
25	temporary earthwork would be on the northern end when

1	they're in Phase I and they wouldn't use that as a
2	stock yard.
3	MR. EASTON: That is correct. The phase grading
4	plans and the construction plans show what is going to
5	be in Phase I, Phase II, and Phase II. The grading for
6	each one of those phases and utilities for each one of
7	those phases there is a detailed explanation as to
8	what is going to occur. All blasting will occur in
9	Phase I and that will be it. The blasting in Phase
10	I there will be monitoring on the noise and so
11	forth.
12	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Any other questions or comments?
13	MS. DALTON: Do you have any idea of what the
14	prices of these will be?
15	MR. EASTON: I'm not the realtor. I do not know
16	actually the construction costs of the units and how
17	much it will cost per square foot. I'm not sure what
18	the land cost is. The only cost I know is what I
19	charge my clients for my plans. If I divide that by 96
20	units, that's pretty cheap.
21	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Mr. Cavanaugh may know.
22	MR. CAVANAUGH: The price point is starting at
23	\$300,000.
24	MR. AUSTIN: Who are you marketing to for the
25	apartments?

1	MR. CAVANAUGH: We'll have a yacht club there
2	eventually and exercise rooms. There will be a mix of
3	people.
4	MR. AUSTIN: We've talked about that. There are
5	apartments going behind Top Tile and different areas of
6	the Town.
7	MR. EASTON: You also have to look at the price
8	per bedroom units and things like that. This apartment
9	complex is more one-bedroom. So, you wouldn't
10	typically have a family there. You're going to get the
11	tax income, but you're not going to have to worry about
12	how it's impacting the schools.
13	MS. DALTON: That's what we said to the people
14	behind Top Tile.
15	MR. EASTON: It all depends on what the density is
16	of the apartment unit. You can't just take every
17	apartment unit and blanket it and say it's going to
18	have this negative effect or this positive effect. It
19	all comes down to what is the price point? How many
20	number of units is the place? How many bedrooms and
21	how much square footage? There are lots of dynamics in
22	that equation.
23	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Comments or questions from the
24	Board?
25	(There was no response.)

1	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, I'll try to articulate a
2	motion if anybody wants to make it.
3	A motion for final site plan approval subject
4	to all regulatory requirements, permit approvals,
5	subject to all staff comments, subject to all TDE
6	comments and subject to the assertions and
7	commitments made by the applicant.
8	MR. AUSTIN: I'll make that motion.
9	MR. LANE: I'll second it.
10	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Any comments or discussions?
11	MR. GRANT: Securing those easements for the
12	infrastructure. It's off site and I realize that they
13	have been working and they are essential to the
14	infrastructure.
15	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, we still have a motion and
16	a second. Any comments on that?
17	(There was no response.)
18	CHAIRMAN STUTO: All those in favor say aye.
19	(Ayes were recited.)
20	CHAIRMAN STUTO: All those opposed?
21	(There were none opposed.)
22	CHAIRMAN STUTO: The ayes have it.
23	Thank you.
24	MR. EASTON: Thank you.
25	

1	
2	(Whereas the above entitled proceeding was
3	concluded at 10:20 p.m.)
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CERTIFICATION
2	
3	I, NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART, Shorthand
4	Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of
5	New York, hereby CERTIFY that the record taken by
6	me at the time and place noted in the heading
7	hereof is a true and accurate transcript of same,
8	to the best of my ability and belief.
9	
10	
11	NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART
12	
13	
14	Dated March 5, 2013
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	