1	PLANNING BOARD	COUNTY OF ALBANY
2	TOWN OF COLONIE	
3	********	*******
4	MABEY'S SELF STORAGE SPECIAL USE PERMIT	
5	910 LOUDON ROAD	EVIEW AND APPLICATION
6	FOR CONCEPT ACCEPTAN	
7	*************	******
8	THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES entitled public hearing and su	
9	NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART, a Sh- commencing on March 12, 2013 a	
10	Public Operations Center, 347 Latham, New York	-
11		
12	BOARD MEMBERS: PETER STUTO, CHAIRMAN	
13	BRIAN AUSTIN SUSAN MILSTEIN	
14	KATHY DALTON	
15		
16	ALSO PRESENT:	
17	Elena Vaida, Esq., Counsel to	the Planning Board
18	Joe LaCivita, Director, Planni	ng and Economic
19	Development	
20	Frank Palumbo, CT Male and Ass	ociates
21	Joe Romano, PE, Clough Harbour	and Associates
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, we'll call up the next item
2	which is Mabey's Self-storage special use permit and
3	application for concept acceptance.
4	What we're going to do right now is commence
5	a public hearing which is required to consider a
6	special use permit. I don't think that we're
7	going to vote on that tonight. We may consider
8	the concept review after the hearing and all the
9	discussion and questions.
10	This is to raze three existing buildings and
11	replace with three two-story self storage
12	buildings totaling 54,240 square feet.
13	Elena, can you read the notice for the public
14	hearing?
15	MS. VAIDA: This was the legal notice published in
16	the Spotlight newspaper, March 6, 2013.
17	"The Town Planning Board of the Town of
18	Colonie, Albany, New York: notice is hereby given
19	that pursuant to section 276 of Article 16 of Town
20	Law, the Town Planning Board of the Town of
21	Colonie, Albany County, New York will meet and
22	conduct a public hearing in the Public Operations
23	Center, 347 Old Niskayuna Road, Latham in said
24	Town of Colonie, County of Albany, New York on the
25	12th day of March 2013 at 7:00 p.m. for the

1	purpose of hearing all persons on the approval,
2	modification or disapproval of a certain special
3	use permit in the Town of Colonie, County of
4	Albany known as Mabey's Self-storage special use
5	consisting of two proposed buildings totaling
6	54,240 square feet at 910 Loudon Road"
7	It's dated February 27, 2013. The notice is
8	from the Town of Colonie Planning Board, Peter
9	Stuto, Chairman.
10	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, thank you.
11	Before we start, for the public: this is a
12	hearing, so we'll be hearing from the public. If
13	you'd like to speak, please sign in on the sign-in
14	sheet on the table on the side of the room.
15	Any other introduction you want to give it,
16	Joe, before we turn it over to the applicant?
17	MR. LACIVITA: No, I think that you have
18	identified this, Peter. We won't be voting on this
19	special use permit as we will need to adopt SEQRA at
20	that time and make recommendation at the final through
21	the TDEs. Tonight we're trying to look at the
22	conceptual acceptance and the process.
23	CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, we're conducting a hearing
24	and then considering that when we actually vote on the
25	special use permit

1	Mr. Palumbo?
2	MR. PALUMBO: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I will go
3	as far as you wold like for the public's benefit. I
4	know that it was just two weeks ago that we had quite a
5	lengthy dialogue.
6	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can I see a show of hands of
7	anyone who has an interest in this project?
8	(There was no response.)
9	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, I do know that there are
10	neighborhood people. We want to accommodate that, too.
11	Okay, why don't you very briefly talk about
12	this project?
13	MR. PALUMBO: As everyone has seen, more than
14	likely if they have driven by, the buildings are
15	knocked down. They've all been done under a proper
16	demolition permit. Mabey's continues to make
17	investments on the property. They are interested in
18	pursuing this. There will be no school aged children,
19	and no active adults but we will store all their
20	belongings.
21	The site presently has three buildings and 27
22	percent greenspace. We're upping that to 45
23	percent greenspace, overall. That's an increase
24	of over 18 percent in total. The area that we are
25	working, from this driveway up, has always been

1	green and will stay green. The area where we are
2	doing the work that area itself is increasing
3	25 percent, giving us a stormwater classification
4	that has allowed us to not have some of the rules
5	and regulations that apply and has made the
6	project more developable. The applicant has
7	already reduced the amount of square footage from
8	the DCC meeting in order to reach that 25 percent
9	greenspace. As I said, we realize that the
10	special use permit won't be able to be voted on
11	until SEQRA is done and then that will all
12	happen
13	CHAIRMAN STUTO: I have to interrupt you for one
14	second. Elena, can you pull out a special use permit?
15	I'd like to get that into the record.
16	MR. PALUMBO: The main issue that our applicant is
17	interested in is getting a sense from the Board that

MR. PALUMBO: The main issue that our applicant is interested in is getting a sense from the Board that they want to continue to make the investment in this property. Architecture work is continuing. They've been working with a particular builder to start to get all the important cost estimating that relates to the elevations that we have been talking about. So, we're looking for a sense from the Board in terms of the direction if they are in favor of the project.

25 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm going to cut to the chase,

but I'm not cutting off the Board Members. They are obviously free to focus on whatever issues are important to them. As I see it, you have convinced me that circulation is the only feasible circulation for the internal traffic flow. That's me, personally. You only have one egress and ingress for a public road, which I think is a good thing.

MR. PALUMBO: Right, and cutting out two that were there before.

CHAIRMAN STUTO: The architecture and the landscaping and the appearance particularly from Route 9, and also the side roads are the issues that I thought were still in play.

MR. PALUMBO: What you have in front of you and what I'll talk about here is that we have made some adjustments. You realized at the last meeting that we made one step and we've done another step. We took some of the comments that the Board made. Specifically on the corners of the building — this is the side that faces Loudon Road and there was a lot of particular discussion about how it would look on the corner from this direction (Indicating). Clough Harbor actually had some architectural comments on that and we agreed that to put something on the one corner with the buildings that have the short facades, that it would

really make it look a little bit better if we mimicked
that on all four corners. So, the applicant did that.
They worked with us and we extended the siding all the
way down on those corners and tried to do some
treatment above the windows. The finality of that, as
I said, will be worked on with the architecture. We
want to have the appropriate size windows. We know
that we are below the amount of windows that the
architectural would call for. But I think that you
understood that from our last meeting. We do have some
of the units backing up to the door. So, they would be
fake windows, if they were anything. So, we made some
improvements. We added some vertical. Again, with
comments from both the Board and from Clough Harbour,
we razed the cornis on the corners as well. We razed
the block up to the second floor. Before it was just
up nine feet up to the second floor. We think that the
proportions have achieved some of what you were talking
about last time.
CHAIRMAN STUTO: What kind of brick is that going
to be?
MR. PALUMBO: It's an architectural masonry block.
We will get to the specifics of that and as Joe's
comment letter had suggested, when we come back at the

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

preliminary final phase, we would have a board with the

types of samples. So, those decisions would all be
made by that point.

The long access, which is along Sparrowbush Road -- we've again brought that down so that the corners also mimic each other. We tried some different verticals down in the center razing up higher there in the center, similar to how we had done it in the corners. We wanted to project the sign to you there. We have a proposal for having the climate control storage there. We didn't want that to be a surprise later. We wanted to talk about that now. But we think that actually we will be within the code for the sign on the building at that point.

CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can you point to that?

MR. PALUMBO: That will be right here

(Indicating). We wanted to show you that and we wanted to have discussions on that and know if it was a concern now. We wanted to give you a sense of what it would look like. As we said, these trees will be substantial. They will fill in over time. That being at the height of the building, it will allow people to know where it is. We want people to head up this way to know where the entrance is. The sign on that side of the building is helping that. We intend to meet the

sign code and we don't expect to go for a variance on the sign. So, at this point, I would prefer to see if there is more questions from the Board.

CHAIRMAN STUTO: Joe Romano is our Town Designated Engineer.

Do you want to make any comments?

MR. ROMANO: As Frank had said, we had one of our in-house architects provide a couple of sketches which I believe are included in the plan. Obviously, some elements have been included. The extension of the horizontal band of the brick or masonry was one which you talked about. Largening up the windows - I think that our architect had recommended more full length.

MR. PALUMBO: One of the reasons that we opted not to do that -- that corner, the way that we felt that it looked would be ideal for a certain type of building. Inside our windows will be faces of storage units, unlike a corner that you would have an opening in there. It's not a lot. So, we thought that the windows should be more in line -- not just opening it up and seeing into doors of a storage unit. So, had it been more of a lobby type entrance, we might have gone right to that. Because we are working the windows with the space inside and not having the windows that you could see into it, but not expressing that too overtly

1	in terms of what's inside that was one of the
2	decisions that we made on the widows.
3	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you have any opinion on that,
4	Joe?
5	MR. ROMANO: I understand the logic.
6	CHAIRMAN STUTO: What if you darkened the windows?
7	Then, you can't see inside.
8	MR. PALUMBO: We have no problem as we advance
9	towards preliminary final approvals and working on
10	that. As I said, our architecture is now progressing.
11	The applicant had a good feeling about the last Board
12	meeting that people seemed positive about it, so we're
13	moving in the direction and we'll get more details on
14	it. So, if there is a happy medium in between, we'll
15	find it.
16	MR. ROMANO: I'll just go through the other items
17	that we had.
18	He had an extended parapet. I believe that
19	you have incorporated that into the plans.
20	The last item, which I don't think had been
21	added, was on his sketch; a trellis along the
22	front.
23	MR. PALUMBO: I don't know if you have a copy of
24	the e-mail that I sent back to Joe. One of the things
25	about the trellis is that the trellis would extend out

from the bullding and we are right at the corner with
that at the setback line. I think that was a two foot
extension trellis. We thought that it was emphasizing
that one corner again. Actually, it would cause us to
shift the building back and over to get off of that
corner point which was where we had brought it forward
in the first place to get that to bring the building
forward to that point. So, that would cause us to push
that back and over, influencing a little bit here
(Indicating). Also, the trellis wasn't in the
applicant's view as being the type of architecture that
they want.

from the building and we are right at the corner with

MR. ROMANO: I think that the intent from our architect was just to try to break that facade and provide some relief. It's been a concern of the Board due to the viability.

MR. PALUMBO: And I think that the e-mail that I sent back to Joe - and I apologize that I don't have it tonight - is that I think that we meant a lot of the intent, and there were those little details. I think that the Board sees that the direction is going the right way. That's why we'd like to get the concept acceptance and the details like that can be certainly worked out further.

MR. ROMANO: I think that it would be important at

1	the preliminary stage to bring in samples of what the
2	colors and the materials are going to be.
3	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Personally, I'd like a closer
4	look at that. I like Clough's concepts a little bit
5	better. If we can work on the architecture between now
6	and the next time that we come in, I would appreciate
7	that.
8	MR. AUSTIN: Does that mean that you'll need to go
9	for a variance?
10	MR. PALUMBO: It would be much preferred for us
11	not to go for a variance.
12	CHAIRMAN STUTO: We can waive that requirement.
13	MS. DALTON: I'm not sure that I'm understanding
14	the recommendation. I thought that when you said add
15	an extended cornis across both the buildings on the top
16	that it would be something to tie these two buildings
17	together, is that not what you meant?
18	MR. PALUMBO: No, I didn't interpret it that way
19	at all.
20	MS. DALTON: Because I thought that was a great
21	idea. Some kind of arch across the two that would tie
22	them together.
23	MR. PALUMBO: Speaking of that distance that we
24	have there, that would be quite a span. You couldn't
25	have intermediate post surface. As we articulated, the

1	trucks have to maneuver.
2	CHAIRMAN STUTO: What is the span?
3	MR. PALUMBO: I think that we talked about the
4	span as being 52 feet. These canopies come out 16
5	feet.
6	CHAIRMAN STUTO: I like the ide, a, too.
7	Joe Romano, do you want to keep going?
8	MR. ROMANO: No, I think that was it.
9	CHAIRMAN STUTO: We don't have a new letter on
10	this, correct?
11	MR. ROMANO: No.
12	MR. PALUMBO: No, and at the last meeting we
13	talked about that we really had no issues. We felt
14	that we could accommodate all of it and actually took
15	care of some of the items that were in the first
16	letter. We expect that we'll be able to address all of
17	those.
18	CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'll ask if anybody from the
19	public wants to be heard. No one has expressed an
20	interest here before.
21	Would anyone from the public like to speak on
22	this project?
23	(There was no response.)
24	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Kathy, is there anything that you
25	would like to say?

1	MS. DALTON: I think that we're moving in the
2	right direction. I don't mind the sign at all. I
3	think that it's fine. I think that it still needs a
4	little bit more, but I think that you're going in the
5	right direction.
6	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Brian?
7	MR. AUSTIN: I prefer Clough's renderings, too.
8	The extended parapet - for lack of a better
9	description, they did it a little differently here.
10	MR. PALUMBO: If I may ask about you being able to
11	waive that - I didn't think that was one of the things
12	that was allowed to be waived from the setback line.
13	CHAIRMAN STUTO: He's mentioning the parapet.
14	You're talking about the trellis.
15	MR. PALUMBO: If we did go pretty much straight
16	up, as you extend out, that parapet goes over that
17	plane of a 20-foot setback. Both the trellis and the
18	parapet would do that. If the Board has the ability to
19	do that and waive that, that's great. We can give that
20	full consideration and make sure that we would work
21	with the applicants to be sure of that. But we
22	definitely do not want to take a large step back to
23	have to go for a variance for that. I don't know if
24	that is something that can be waived.
25	CHAIRMAN STUTO: We'll look at that between now

1	and the next application.
2	Joe, do you ou have an opinion, or do you
3	want to hold it?
4	MR. LACIVITA: Frank is right. If, in fact, you
5	want to have something extend pass that 20, we have to
6	take it back to the Zoning Board for them to act.
7	CHAIRMAN STUTO: The one where we pull it back
8	further than the 20 feet - we can waive that
9	requirement?
10	MR. LACIVITA: Right, because then there are
11	utilities and everything in there. Correct me if I'm
12	wrong, but I believe that there are other setback
13	issues that you have in there.
14	MR. PALUMBO: We're just outside of the easement
15	line. I think that there might be one that I'm not
16	remembering, but I think that the one that is most
17	applicable here is that we brought that corner right to
18	the 20 foot line. So, anything that extends over that
19	would be a violation of the setback.
20	MR. LACIVITA: That's the Route 9 corridor area.
21	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, well lets look at it after.
22	MR. PALUMBO: I think that there are things that
23	we can do - we may not end up with that exact drawing,
24	but I think that there are things that can be done. I
25	think that we've gone to a certain step to work out

those details without having to move the building.

MR. AUSTIN: I also like, how Clough put the full size windows in there. I know that it's a warehouse and I know that it's a storage facility. I'm thinking a little more moderate maybe. The full length windows and some low level lighting just to kind of illuminate. You say that there are storage units and that they will be visible there, but on those storage units, putting the Mabey's logo and wrapping it around the corner so people that are looking at the southeast corner - I don't know. I guess it's hard to describe. I think that there's something to address and make it a little more fancier -- forget about it.

MR. PALUMBO: I will double check with the applicant and the Town on this. You may recall that we talked about the trucks and backing into the corners of the exit. The same thing can happen on the inside.

One of the reasons that I believe that we had the window wall is that people will be moving stuff around in there and the more glass, the more opportunity to break glass. The window, the sill, actually prevents something that's low to the ground rolling from doing that. We will work on the architecture. We will continue to. I think that we're really close.

MR. AUSTIN: I think that it's great; I really do.

1	If it stays like this, I don't have a problem.
2	CHAIRMAN STUTO: I agree.
3	MR. AUSTIN: I think that it's really a very nice
4	job.
5	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Susan?
6	MS. MILSTEIN: I agree that it needs a little
7	something else.
8	CHAIRMAN STUTO: I agree. I think that we want
9	you to try a little bit harder. If there are issues,
10	let's explore whether we can resolve them and move
11	forward toward the Clough drawing.
12	Elena, do you have anything that would be
13	constructive on special use permits that you would
14	like to share hare with us?
15	MS. VAIDA: I think that we discussed the special
16	use permit standards last time and we stated that this
17	is a major site plan review and we're supposed to be
18	reviewing the special use permit standards at the same
19	time that we are reviewing the site plan. The standard
20	looks to see if the use conforms with the specific
21	special use permit standards bound in the use
22	regulations, which I looked back at and it wasn't
23	particularly helpful, but they want to make sure that
24	it's consistent with the Town's current planning
25	documents including the Comprehensive Plan which I

1	assume t	hat it	is. I	don't	know	if you	looked	at	that.
2	MR.	PALUME	30: I'	m prett	y sur	e that	we are		

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Joe, would you like to speak to 5 that?

6 MR. LACIVITA: Yes, we discussed that at the DCC review.

CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.

consistent with that.

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. VAIDA: It's consistent with the purposes of the land use district in which its located. Just to look to see if it's suitable for the property on which it's proposed, considering the property size, location, topography, vegetation, soils, natural habitat, hydrology and if it needs to be buffered or screened from the neighboring property or roads. It's sort of some of the same things that we've considered during site plan anyway - that it's compatible with the adjoining properties with the natural and manmade environment, it won't adversely effect surrounding land uses, create excessive noise, dust, odors, glare, pollution and other uses and cause undue congestion and unduly impair pedestrian safety and overload the existing roads considering the current widths, service an addition, that it will have appropriate parking and be accessible to fire, police and other emergency

vehicles. They look at these issues during site plan,

so that will be covered there too.

It won't overload any public water, drainage or sewer system. It won't degrade any natural resources and that all the relevant site planning criteria can be satisfied and that a site plan approval can be granted under this chapter. It says that the site plan approval is a required step in consideration of all special use permit uses and shall be carried out either prior to or in conjunction with these special use permit procedures. You're supposed to have a public hearing, and that's what we're doing tonight.

Then, once we go over everything, we have to issue a written decision and the reasons that we granted or denied it.

CHAIRMAN STUTO: It seems to me that it meets all those criteria. I didn't see one that it didn't meet.

MR. PALUMBO: I think that everything that we've been talking about is like you said, it's almost parallel to the site plan issues that we've been talking about. I think that we've addressed all of those. When we submit for the preliminary final besides answering the questions from Clough Harbour, if we need to write a specific document that says how we

1	have addressed those, we're willing to do that. If we
2	get concept acceptance tonight and we're coming back in
3	for preliminary final and eventually we're going to be
4	asking you for that decision, if that decision has to
5	happen and then the special use permit - whichever the
6	order is, I think that where we are is on a parallel
7	track right now and I think that if all the conditions
8	are being met, what the applicant is really looking for
9	is to say that by granting concept acceptance to the
10	site plan, essentially that they are granting concept
11	acceptance of the special use. That's my language and
12	not necessarily the code language there. They want to
13	know that they're not going to get to the end and find
14	out that no, that doesn't really meet the special se
15	permit.
16	CHAIRMAN STUTO: I don't detect that there is any
17	major objection from this Board about the special use
18	permit. They can speak up if they do.
19	We do have to draft some kind of findings.
20	Are we going to put that on the applicant?
21	MS. VAIDA: If you wanted to do like a draft of
22	that following the language of the Land Use Law - the
23	findings that have to be made -
24	MR. PALUMBO: Whichever way you want to do it. If
25	you want us to do it or Clough Harbour to it I don't

1	know Joe, if you guys normally do that, but whenever
2	you want to do.
3	CHAIRMAN STUTO: I think that Joe Grasso likes to
4	do that.
5	MR. ROMANO: Sometimes similar to the waivers, we
6	can ask for an initial outline from the applicant and
7	we can incorporate it.
8	CHAIRMAN STUTO: However you normally do it. I'll
9	leave it to the TDE and the applicant. You can draft
10	it and then shoot it to Joe and Elena for review. We
11	may have one that we have used in the past as a model
12	that we can use.
13	Do we close the hearing or adjourn it to the
14	next meeting?
15	Do we have a motion to close the hearing on
16	the special use permit?
17	MR. AUSTIN: I'll make that motion.
18	MS. DALTON: I'll second.
19	CHAIRMAN STUTO: All those in favor?
20	(Ayes were recited.)
21	CHAIRMAN STUTO: All those opposed?
22	(There were none opposed.)
23	CHAIRMAN STUTO: The ayes have it.
24	The hearing is closed.
25	Concept acceptance? Any discussion or

1	comments or questions on concept acceptance?
2	MS. DALTON: I'll make a motion on concept
3	acceptance.
4	MR. AUSTIN: I'll second that.
5	CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'll just make a comment. We're
6	gong to vote on concept acceptance. It's not a binding
7	act by this Board. You've heard all of our comments
8	tonight with respect to architecture and other matters.
9	We request and require that you consider that between
10	now and the next meeting that we have here.
11	Any other discussion?
12	(There was no response.)
13	CHAIRMAN STUTO: There's a motion and a second.
14	All those in favor say aye.
15	(Ayes were recited.)
16	CHAIRMAN STUTO: All those opposed say nay.
17	(there were none opposed.)
18	CHAIRMAN STUTO: The ayes have it.
19	MR. PALUMBO: Thank you very much.
20	CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.
21	
22	(Whereas the proceedings were concluded at
23	8:45 p.m.)
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 15, 2013
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	