

1 PLANNING BOARD COUNTY OF ALBANY

2 TOWN OF COLONIE

3 *****

FIRST COLUMBIA OFFICE
1199 TROY SCHENECTADY ROAD
BOARD UPDATE

4
5 *****

6
7 THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled
8 matter by NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART, a Shorthand
9 Reporter, commencing on November 18, 2014 at 7:45
p.m. at The Public Operations Center, 347 Old
Niskayuna Road, Latham, New York

10 BOARD MEMBERS:
11 PETER STUTO, CHAIRMAN
12 LOU MION
13 TIMOTHY LANE
14 CRAIG SHAMLIAN
15 SUSAN MILSTEIN

16 ALSO PRESENT:

17 Kathleen Marinelli, Esq., Counsel to the Planning Board
18 Michael Tengeler, Planning and Economic Development
19 Bill Herbert, PE
20 Joe Grasso, PE, CHA

21
22
23
24
25

1 MR. TENGELER: Thanks, Peter. Just to kind of
2 summarize where we are, back in 2009 a final approval
3 was granted for an office building, 77,300 square feet
4 in size. They're here tonight for a Board update and
5 actually request a new amendment that we create an
6 85,000 square feet --

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can I ask a technical question?
8 How long is the final site plan approval for?

9 MR. TENGELER: I believe one year.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay.

11 MR. TENGELER: I'm told that there is an end user
12 in mind that requires the approval for the 77,300 square
13 feet footprint building to be increased to 85,000 square
14 feet. So, Bill Herbert is here to discuss where we have
15 been, where we are and where they're looking to go with
16 the building.

17 MR. HERBERT: I'm Bill Herbert and I'm working with
18 First Columbia on an adoption of an amendment to the
19 site plan and essentially a re-approval of the site plan
20 at its current location which is 1199 Troy Schenectady
21 Road.

22 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Excuse me. I'm sorry to get stuck
23 on the procedural aspects but I'm unclear whether this
24 is an amendment, or whether this is a new site plan
25 application. You said that it's expired. Can somebody

1 help me with that?

2 MR. GRASSO: I'll try to. I would consider this a
3 new site plan application. It's a new building and the
4 other one expired. I think that it's important just so
5 the Planning Board understands that the development site
6 has already gone through a level of review in
7 engineering analysis back about five years ago. Some of
8 the engineering pitfalls that we would typically look
9 for in a sketch plan meeting probably have already been
10 ironed out. I think that it's going to be processed as
11 a new site plan application regardless. I don't think
12 that procedurally it's going to change what we need to
13 do. We can look at it a little bit differently with a
14 little bit more confidence that the concept has already
15 been ironed out before.

16 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Was there a DCC meeting?

17 MR. GRASSO: The DCC meeting is scheduled for
18 tomorrow.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Isn't that usually before concept?

20 MR. GRASSO: This is sketch plan.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: That's not what it says on our
22 agenda. I wish it did say sketch plan.

23 MS. MARINELLI: If the agenda says one thing I
24 don't think that we need to absolutely follow that. If
25 we know that it's at sketch plan level, we can do the

1 sketch plan.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: That's fine with me. So, they're
3 not looking for a vote.

4 MR. TENGELER: There is absolutely no vote tonight.

5 MR. LANE: We're just starting from scratch.

6 MR. TENGELER: It says Board Update on the agenda.
7 Board Update is essentially is the same as a sketch
8 plan. I say that we let Bill go ahead with the
9 presentation. If there are questions from the Board
10 we'll engage them and take it from there.

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, thank you.

12 MR. HERBERT: It may be helpful to let you know
13 that we are looking for the Board's input on tonight's
14 meeting. It will go through a DCC review immediately
15 and come back to the Board with all the information for
16 a full submittal into the process as required for
17 approval.

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, thank you.

19 MR. HERBERT: Basically, this is the Riverhill
20 development and that is a series of existing buildings;
21 three office buildings and another retail building under
22 construction, and the Sunmark headquarters also in the
23 same context along Troy Schenectady Road. The original
24 building was approved toward the back of the property
25 with all the associated site improvements including

1 parking, etcetera. I will have a blow-up on the other
2 side of this map to show you basically the change that
3 you are looking at making the new submission.

4 Just as a reference as far as architectural
5 context, it's very consistent with the other
6 buildings in the park and many are being built by
7 First Columbia. From the front of the building you
8 can see this really three-story view. The overall
9 height of the building is four stories on a sloped
10 site.

11 This is just a blow-up of the area in question.
12 This red image that you see right here is the
13 original footprint. Again, it got to a level of
14 approval for a five-story 77,300 square foot office
15 building. We're looking to change the footprint
16 slightly and adjust the parking to accommodate a
17 larger footprint and inhabit essentially four
18 stories. Part of that lowest level would be a
19 basement space. The overall square footage that we
20 are looking to get approval for is 85,430 square
21 feet, again, on four levels.

22 A lot of the square footage on that lowest
23 level would be support service type things;
24 mailrooms, computer rooms, storage, archive and that
25 type of use that is not inhabited by a lot of

1 employees. They will come and go back into their
2 office space. When we're all done with the overall
3 process we'll have analyzed the actual office square
4 footage as well as the support service areas and the
5 required parking associated with the different uses
6 in the building. It's generally an office space
7 use.

8 All of the parking and the stormwater
9 management systems that we employ and everything
10 else that we will have to accommodate the final
11 square footage will be thoroughly analyzed and
12 vetted out to make sure that the overall project
13 will work. That's the essential change in context
14 with the project.

15 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, we'll turn it over to our
16 Town Designated Engineer again, Joe Grasso, from CHA for
17 his comments.

18 MR. GRASSO: Bill touched on most of the things
19 that I was going to say.

20 Just to remind the Board, the Riverhill Center
21 Plaza was recently before us for a mixed-use
22 building up along Route 7. So, when the parking and
23 greenspace analysis is done for the site, we just
24 want to make sure that we're looking at the site in
25 its totality so that we can understand how the

1 parking is going to fit all the users on the site
2 and not just this office building.

3 Bill described the building as being four-story
4 with a lower level serving what we would consider
5 support space, but nonetheless the gross parking
6 calculation should be looked at as an 85,000 square
7 foot building because the building supports space
8 throughout the structure. If we need to grant
9 waivers for the parking then we can consider it
10 throughout the process.

11 The stormwater design - you can see the plan
12 that you have before you. It has a lot of detail
13 regarding a grade primarily the result of needing to
14 accommodate stormwater management. There are some
15 updated stormwater regs that will need to be looked
16 at so that the stormwater design that was originally
17 approved is probably going need to be tweaked to
18 meet the current design standards.

19 Because that other mixed-use building up along
20 Route 7 has been approved and they didn't need to
21 look at the traffic impacts at the signal and the
22 storage lengths because of the size of this building
23 and that other development that recently got
24 approved, it will probably be a comment from DOT
25 that they will want that looked at. So, that's

1 something that Bill and I can follow up with DOT to
2 make sure that gets integrated into the review
3 process.

4 One of the other things that you may remember
5 when we looked at that mixed-use site was that this
6 site had always been contemplated for a possible
7 north/south multi-use pathway from the Route 7
8 corridor down to River Road and out to the Town Park
9 down at the bottom of the hill to the north of the
10 site. We discussed it very little, primarily
11 because this is the side of the site that multi-use
12 path was always envisioned to go through. So, it's
13 important that we look at how it fits into this
14 proposal and I think that Bill has actually gone
15 through and actually showed a possible route for the
16 multi-use path on the plan. We just want to make
17 sure that when you come off of Route 7 -- the intent
18 is that this multi-use path will be an off-road path
19 and that one that's not squeezed by development, on
20 both sides. So, we would look to see some
21 greenspace around that multi-use path and we want to
22 see it incorporated into the grading so that we know
23 if this is the final chosen spot for the site for
24 that pathway, that it kind of works well with the
25 site plan and we're not needing to reconstruct

1 things within the site.

2 There was one row of dead-end parking. I know
3 that was the way that it originally got approved
4 back in 2009.

5 Bill, it's something that maybe you could look
6 at - whether or not you could eliminate that one
7 dead-end parking row. It's kind of a minor thing.

8 That's all I've got.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I feel a lot better that we're not
10 taking a vote tonight.

11 MR. GRASSO: I checked my notes just to clarify and
12 I originally talked to Joe LaCivita. We thought about
13 doing sketch plan review tonight, DCC tomorrow, coming
14 back for December 2nd for concept review and then final
15 approval as soon as it's ready thereafter.

16 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I have no comments or questions.

17 Do Board Members?

18 (There was no response.)

19 Except to affirm what you said, Joe.

20 MR. LANE: No, I don't think that I have any
21 questions.

22 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.

23 MR. HERBERT: Thank you.

24 (Whereas the above entitled proceeding was
25 concluded at 7:44 p.m.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATION

I, NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART, Shorthand
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 my ability and belief.

NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART

Dated November 29, 2014

