

1 PLANNING BOARD COUNTY OF ALBANY

2 TOWN OF COLONIE

3 *****

4 FIRST COLUMBIA OFFICE AND HOTEL
227 WOLF ROAD AND 652 ALBANY SHAKER ROAD
5 APPLICATION FOR SEQRA AND CONCEPT ACCEPTANCE

6 *****

7 THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled
8 matter by NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART, a Shorthand
9 Reporter, commencing on December 16, 2014 at 7:20
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 TIMOTHY LANE

17 ALSO PRESENT:

18 Kathleen Marinelli, Esq., Counsel to the Planning Board
19 Joe LaCivita, Director, Planning and Economic Development
20 Kevin Bette, First Columbia
21 Chuck Voss, PE, Barton and Loguidice
22 Kim Goodrich
23 Tony Mantello, Complexions

24
25

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Next on the agenda is First
2 Columbia Office and Hotel; 227 Wolf Road and 652 Albany
3 Road. This is an application for SEQRA and concept
4 acceptance. This is a three-story 4,500 square foot
5 office and seven-story 174 room hotel.

6 Joe, do you have any introductory remarks on
7 this one?

8 MR. LACIVITA: It looks like Chris Bette punted to
9 his older brother and decided to have him take this over
10 the end zone. I'm going to turn it right over to Kevin
11 so that we can go forward.

12 MR. BETTE: Chris had to take his wife for a
13 procedure at the hospital and he asked me to fill in for
14 him. I told him that I promised that I wouldn't screw
15 it up.

16 Kevin Bette from First Columbia. Chris and I
17 are long-time residents of the Town of Colonie and
18 developers here. We're privileged to have a high
19 profile piece of land here that we want to propose
20 what we think is a great addition for the Town. As
21 a lot of you know, we have some office base in the
22 community and we also own some hotels; one in Malta.
23 Two big areas in this market place are the chip
24 plant up in Malta and down at the Nanotech
25 University down in Albany. We always feel that the

1 airport handles a lot of that infrastructure for all
2 those uses and people just hop in their cars and
3 drive to those communities.

4 One of the things that the Town can do is
5 accommodate lodging for that. Our concept here is
6 to take advantage of really what we have worked
7 with. We worked with the Comprehensive Plan back
8 when they changed the laws to try to encourage more
9 mixed-use. What we propose here is an office
10 building along Albany Shaker Road, three-stories and
11 45,000 square feet. Hopefully that's to attract
12 some of that business that the high tech sector
13 brings to this marketplace.

14 Also a hotel - it's planned as an extended stay
15 hotel; seven story is a relatively large structure.
16 It's 150,000 square feet to accommodate a lot of the
17 guests there. That's the quick update.

18 At the last meeting the question surrounded the
19 traffic and we spent a lot of time looking at that
20 and right after the November Planning Board meeting,
21 we met with the Planning Staff, Mike Lyons. Mike
22 had asked us to put connections to all of the
23 surrounding parcels on the property.

24 Then we also heard a comment either from Joe or
25 from the Chairman not to have cut-throughs coming

1 off of Wolf Road if the traffic backed up.

2 Here is Wolf Road and here is Albany Shaker
3 Road (Indicating). There is a slip lane to make a
4 right hand turn on Wolf Road and it starts at
5 Ulenski Drive. So, there is already a slip lane
6 there but we have rights-in and rights-out, but for
7 this intersection back here which I will get to. So
8 the right-in here (Indicating) - in order for there
9 not to be a cut-through here, we've agreed to just
10 make this an entrance. Most of our hotel guests
11 will be coming from the west. They can enter here
12 and they can drop off and they can connect to here
13 (Indicating).

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: That's right-in only.

15 MR. BETTE: Yes; right-in only. The intersection
16 further to the east - Afrim was here last time, our
17 neighbor, and he's agreed to close off his existing
18 entrance point here (Indicating) so there will be a
19 single full access entrance for both of the properties.
20 Then, we have a connector here (Indicating) that ties
21 directly into his circulation in front of the soccer
22 complex and our only concern was that our neighbor has
23 enough parking.

24 There was a section back here just this little
25 area here (Indicating) that wasn't paved. By adding

1 that, he'll add about 30 parking spaces to his
2 parking lot. Then, we're very comfortable that
3 he'll have enough parking spaces, so that his
4 entrance won't take a lot of our parking and it will
5 simply be an access point to share the access out
6 onto Albany Shaker Road. We think that the traffic
7 from those three spots work very well.

8 The connection to the Starbucks/Moe's
9 development - their entrance is the parking aisle up
10 here (Indicating). We think that's fine.

11 Tony's daughter owns the Complexions building
12 right here (Indicating) and I know that some of the
13 Ulenski Drive neighbors were here last time. We
14 were asked to put that connection on the building.

15 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Is there anyone from Ulenski Drive
16 now?

17 (Audience members raised their hands.)

18 You'll have an opportunity to comment. I would
19 just ask that you sign in over on the sheet.

20 MR. BETTE: So, as requested by the Planning staff,
21 we put all the connectors on the parcel. The only one
22 that is essential to us is this (Indicating), now that
23 we have a combined drive. We'll work out a parking
24 easement with the Afirm's neighbor. The other neighbors
25 - we don't have any agreements with yet, but if the

1 Planning staff wants, we have been one of the proponents
2 of shared access to parcels throughout the Town from the
3 beginning. I think that it's a very good idea.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: You're working it out with Afrim's
5 so that's not a problem. When they develop the hotel
6 and developed the mall where the Moe's is, wasn't there a
7 provision that they would have to connect?

8 MR. BETTE: Correct.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, the connection should not be a
10 problem; if you're talking shared parking. Are you
11 talking shared parking, as well, with the other
12 neighbors?

13 MR. BETTE: The only problem that exists when you
14 give cross easements is if one of your neighbors doesn't
15 have enough parking. The approved project has enough
16 parking so that we have no problem with it. I know that
17 was in their approval way back - probably in the 80's I
18 would imagine. So, we don't have a problem with putting
19 them on. We're just saying that we did what the
20 Planning staff wanted us to do.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: We appreciate that.

22 MR. BETTE: Does anyone have any questions?

23 MR. MION: How about the greenspace for Afrim's?
24 If you're going to pave over for 30 more parking spots -

25 MR. BETTE: When the Planning staff looked at that

1 they said that they would handle that administratively
2 with Afirm. When Afirm came to the meeting with Mike
3 Lyons, they asked Afrim to make an application for that.
4 They were going to handle that administratively, I
5 believe.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: You have plenty of greenspace on
7 yours.

8 MR. BETTE: Yes, we have over 47 percent.

9 MR. LANE: Is there a written agreement with Afirm
10 that he close off that other entrance?

11 MR. BETTE: We told him that we'd close off his
12 parking lot when we do this work.

13 MR. LANE: And he'll have access. Is that going to
14 be an easement? Will you also have an easement
15 agreement?

16 MR. BETTE: Right here (Indicating) we'll have an
17 easement agreement - cross easement with him. With this
18 side of his property - the west side - that will be the
19 only other entrance. The attorneys are drawing those up
20 for that section there.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Is there going to be any more
22 complexity to the right/left entrance that you were just
23 pointing to? In other words, will it be three-lane or
24 just two-lane?

25 MR. BETTE: This is two-lane.

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, if somebody stopped there
2 because they can't take a left, will somebody be able to
3 take a right? Say that a number of cars are trying to
4 exit there (Indicating) and a number of cars are trying
5 to exit there (Indicating). The first car is going to
6 take a left and it can't take the left, is that going to
7 block the rest of the traffic that wants to take a
8 right?

9 MR. BETTE: When Albany Shaker was widened a few
10 years ago and they extended the left turn lane to Wolf
11 Road back to here (Indicating), this is actually a full
12 lane in front here and this could end up being stacking
13 for vehicles in this area for people trying to make a
14 left. We don't think that many of our visitors to the
15 hotel are coming from the east. We think that most of
16 them are coming from here (Indicating). But for Afrims,
17 they will need to use this but that's no different than
18 from what happens right now. With the entrances here,
19 it's literally moving over with 30 feet. I think that
20 it's the same situation where they use this area to
21 stack for the left hand turn coming in.

22 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm talking about Afrim's - when
23 there are a lot of people exiting the property.

24 MR. BETTE: That's how we designed there and we had
25 long queue space because as that light cycles people

1 will stack here and there is no obstructions. We are
2 going to put a sign there that says right turns only
3 because we feel that we want to encourage people to use
4 the roundabout.

5 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you think that's the best
6 solution, Chuck?

7 MR. VOSS: We have looked at this with staff now a
8 number of times and this new configuration for that at
9 the western driveway, we think solves a couple of
10 problems. It closes off the Afirm's driveway which is
11 immediately adjacent which is an unrestricted flow in
12 and out.

13 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Did you say that you were going to
14 make a right-out only, or are you only going to strongly
15 suggest it?

16 MR. BETTE: We have designed this as a full access
17 interchange, but we were going to put a sign here saying
18 rights only just to encourage people to use the
19 roundabout. We have to teach people how to use the
20 roundabout these days.

21 MR. VOSS: Again, we looked at the access
22 management study that was done and it basically proves
23 that these intersections will work better now in this
24 configuration than they did before, I think, the last
25 time you guys saw it. So, we really like the combined

1 access points with Afirm's and theirs -- where Kevin was
2 just kind of showing. It solves two problems in one
3 tight area for an access management situation.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I agree with all that. I'm asking
5 a more specific question which is say everyone is trying
6 to leave at one time and they wanted to take a left hand
7 turn -

8 MR. VOSS: That's okay.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Should we widen it, or no?

10 MR. LANE: There is access. It's unnecessary.

11 MR. VOSS: I don't see a need for a third lane in
12 there. You could potentially do it, but then I think
13 that you're encouraging people to make that left
14 movement.

15 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Tim, if you got caught in there --
16 you'd have to do a U-turn and go out someplace else.

17 MR. LANE: He's got another exit there.

18 MR. BETTE: You'd come right in front of Afrim's
19 and come out to this intersection. We look at that for
20 an emergency standpoint. Like, if there was an accident
21 at that interchange, how would the rest of our customers
22 get out? This is a defined lane right in front of their
23 building and it goes out the eastern access point.

24 MR. VOSS: Folks that will go to Afirm's, they will
25 learn soon enough to loop probably back behind the hotel

1 and drop out that western end of the way to Wolf Road.
2 You can do a right out.

3 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, good point. Thank you.

4 MR. VOSS: We like this new configuration. I think
5 that it's much more efficient.

6 MR. MION: Joe, you're going to deal with the
7 Afrim's parking lot. Are they still going to be
8 required to meet the 35 percent?

9 MR. LACIVITA: We have to look at the calculations
10 Lou. We'll work with them directly. We're asking them
11 to do this to make this project better and to work hand
12 in hand, so we'll look at it administratively and see
13 what they have to do. They might be able to pick up
14 some greenspace along the way. We have to really look
15 at it.

16 MR. LANE: I think that you might find people
17 parking on the lawn. It's not very encouraging.

18 MR. BETTE: It does have overflow parking back
19 there. Afrim actually does have an acre under the
20 powerlines that is further to the east that is just
21 green. It looks like it's all built up, but there is a
22 big chunk on the side.

23 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I think that it's a vast
24 improvement. Thank you for that. The outlet to the
25 south that goes into the Hampton Suites and it may

1 impact Ulenski - can you tell us if it really impacts
2 the residents on Ulenski, or not? I think that we left
3 that with a different impression at the last meeting. I
4 do want to address that on the record.

5 MR. BETTE: I'd like to point out one thing. This
6 goes through the parking lot of the Hampton. You
7 actually come through and it's the main entrance of the
8 Hampton that people would be circulating through. It's
9 not a direct access. I just wanted to point that out.
10 It doesn't go to the road. It goes through the
11 Hampton's parking lot.

12 MR. LACIVITA: For anyone coming out of there
13 Kevin, they would be taking a right towards Wolf Road,
14 they can't take that left to go through where the
15 residential component is. Their main movement is right
16 and onto Wolf as they come out of there.

17 MR. BETTE: To us it makes no difference if you
18 connect this because everyone has to come here to make a
19 right. I know that Tony doesn't want the connection
20 actually from here and he was telling me stories about
21 people driving through the pine needles. It creates a
22 lot of confusion in this area right here (Indicating).

23 MR. VOSS: The interconnection was suggested by
24 Mike Lyons. We don't see any efficiency to it, to be
25 perfectly honest.

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Should we open it up to the public
2 on the access? That was the main issue.

3 MS. DALTON: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Did somebody from the public want
5 to speak on that?

6 Kim Goodrich.

7 MS. GOODRICH: We're at 8 Gay Lyn Drive so it's
8 right here. I'm just a little concerned with people if
9 they're leaving Moe's and Starbucks and cutting through
10 and then they're going ot go through this cut through
11 onto Ulenski, take a left onto Wolf Road and then you've
12 got traffic backed up a lot as it is. If I'm trying to
13 get out of here and want to go left down Wolf Road, the
14 easiest way would be to meander through here and I just
15 think that there is going to be additional traffic on
16 Ulenski and cutting over through there.

17 Also, I'm a little concerned with this right
18 here connecting. It's closer to the house and I
19 think that there is some green space there right now
20 that I think they would have to get approval from
21 the environmental group as well, within the 100 foot
22 buffer zone.

23 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Of the waterway - SEAMAB?

24 MS. GOODRICH: Yes, I just think that there is
25 going to be a lot of increase to traffic through

1 Ulenski.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.

3 Tony?

4 MR. MANTELLO: I'm Tony Mantello. We have
5 Complexions which is next door. The concern that we
6 have here - the third lane starts down at Ulenski and
7 starts right at our property. Right now people come in
8 our lot thinking that they can turn around and go back
9 out onto Wolf Road. By putting that road here with that
10 third lane coming here, they're going to cut through our
11 lot and go over that five foot strip of grass and drive
12 in to the hotel. That's going to put a lot of
13 unnecessary traffic in our spot here. Plus, if they're
14 exiting out here and dumping more traffic onto Ulenski,
15 you have already got congestion with the diner, the
16 coffee shop and the doctor's office. I don't think that
17 this can handle more traffic. You're just going to back
18 it up worse than it is. As Kevin said, they don't
19 really need this and listening to everything tonight, it
20 doesn't enhance anything for his project. I don't think
21 that it's necessary and it's just going to add more
22 congestion and confusion.

23 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, anybody else want to speak
24 on that?

25 (There was no response.)

1 Chuck, I'm going to ask your opinion and I'm
2 also going to ask you, Joe Grasso, since we have you
3 here.

4 MR. VOSS: I think Joe will agree that when we
5 looked at the larger access management issues it was
6 Clough Harbor's turn to study the Maxwell Road
7 extension, CDTC, the transportation agency of the
8 Capital Region was looking at this in the broader
9 context of access management. More access management
10 off of Wolf Road and getting vehicles off of Wolf Road
11 and getting them to the north/south linkages or the
12 east/west linkages across this portion of Town.
13 Clearly, this project originally as conceived might have
14 been a catalyst to help alleviate some of that,
15 especially in this corner. However, as the site has
16 been developed now, we're seeing some of those better
17 access management principals now in play. Certainly
18 with the Moe's and Starbucks, but what we're also doing
19 is trying to prevent this site from being a cut-through
20 for people beating the light at Wolf Road and Albany
21 Shaker. I like the new configurations and I like all
22 four new access points. Joe will probably agree that
23 the southern most access point to the Hampton really
24 isn't a critical piece of this project, per se. I don't
25 think that it necessarily serves a large interconnection

1 goal.

2 MR. LANE: Would you say to do away with it?

3 MR. VOSS: In my opinion, I would do away with it.
4 I think that it alleviates the concerns of the neighbors
5 on Ulenski. It solves the concerns for the adjacent
6 commercial business owners and it lessens the stress
7 regarding the Ulenski Drive connector. There is no real
8 need for it. If there was a health or safety issue or
9 if there was a need by Fire Services to get back through
10 there, I can see it. But there is clear access right
11 now around the Hampton Building. There is clear access
12 now around the proposed hotel.

13 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I was at a meeting that I thought
14 all the engineers wanted that connection - sitting at
15 the table representing the Town and greater community.

16 Joe, do you have any opinion?

17 MR. GRASSO: I generally agree with Chuck. I think
18 that these cross connections do provide options and I
19 think that's what we look for in terms of cross
20 connecting between sites and trying to give people a lot
21 of options. It's a good dispersion of traffic. When
22 you look at how much traffic this site is going to be
23 accommodating from what I'm hearing and from what I know
24 about that. There isn't going to be a lot of site
25 generating traffic. I don't think that we're talking

1 about a lot of trips going through these other
2 properties over than what you are going to see on
3 today's current traffic counts. In order to keep it in
4 context, yes, there could be something that could cut
5 through the Hampton Inn to get out through Ulenski, but
6 how likely is it going to occur and is it an impactable
7 movement? Are we changing the conditions that people on
8 Ulenski are currently are seeing. The Planning Board
9 has to weigh those pros and cons with all of these cross
10 connections. In general, we are supportive of providing
11 those options for the businesses.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, are you saying yea or nay on
13 that one?

14 MR. GRASSO: I'm supportive of the connection.

15 MR. LACIVITA: And I think that you're starting to
16 see that there is interest in the diner site now, Peter.
17 We are working with a couple of applicants and talking
18 about that. So, that is going to develop in the future.
19 We have an applicant before us tonight seeking approvals
20 that is willing to put that in. If it doesn't connect
21 tonight, my suggestion was that we provide the access
22 for a future access site because as we develop to the
23 south of the hotel, it's going to make for a greater
24 access point because those sites are not going to remain
25 the way that they are. People are looking at them now

1 and I'm sure that in a couple of years you're going to
2 see that diner probably change.

3 MR. BETTE: Again, from our standpoint it's
4 insignificant either way. If I were to look at it from
5 a traffic engineering standpoint, any of the connections
6 for peak hours -- you have a mass of traffic heading up
7 north on Wolf Road. Because Ulenski is a dead end and
8 it's a single point - and there are no peak hour users
9 really on Ulenski - it doesn't add to that problem.
10 It's kind of not as important as some of the other
11 connectivity that is more peak hour or adjacent shopping
12 or wherever you wanted to go.

13 When we did Newbury Plaza and you wanted to go
14 to Trader Joe's you had to go back out onto Wolf
15 Road. That makes sense if you have those
16 adjacencies. The main adjacency is if you are
17 staying at the hotel to go to the spa, Tony would
18 rather not have a connection because the people are
19 just going to walk over. Again, it really doesn't
20 matter to us.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, any other questions?

22 (There was no response.)

23 Kim Goodrich mentioned the other connection
24 towards Afrim's on the south. She suggested to
25 eliminate greenspace and that would also violate the

1 100 foot buffer from the waterway under the SEAMAB
2 rules. Can we address the SEAMAB rule first?

3 MR. BETTE: The existing pavement goes to here
4 (Indicating). From a traffic standpoint if we could
5 eliminate these 11 spaces right here and make the
6 connection so there is asphalt currently right here --
7 I would guess that we're adding 25 feet in width. Right
8 now there is just a giant aisle. It was just kind of a
9 weird parking layout in the beginning. There is a
10 double aisle with about 40 feet in between. So, by
11 expanding this 25 feet plus or minus, you end up picking
12 up this whole center aisle (Indicating) and making the
13 parking lot uniform.

14 The SEAMAB line is this heavy dotted line here
15 (Indicating). That's the 100 foot setback from the
16 stream. The stream ends here because it goes into a
17 pipe. It's from the head of the pipe 100 feet and
18 100 feet around it still exists, but it's piped
19 underneath Wolf Road. The SEAMAB Board wanted us to
20 do is not having any buildings within the 100 foot
21 limit and they were willing to allow the parking to
22 be in it and you see that is the same distance away
23 from the stream. We'd be fine with pulling this up
24 a little bit just for a traffic standpoint.

25 We would also put screening up. We have plenty

1 of room to the property lines here. So, it looks to
2 me that we have 40 feet to the property line which
3 we wouldn't cut down any of those trees.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chuck, I think that connection is
5 even more credible for how the impact is.

6 MR. VOSS: Joe and I were discussing the existing
7 site plan. It doesn't show on this plan but immediately
8 south of that interconnect point, the Hampton Inn has
9 about 30 parking spaces directory across the property
10 line. So, there is really no kind of direct visual
11 impact to the neighbors. They're a little bit further
12 over to the east. Certainly I think that an
13 interconnect point is a critical piece that they had
14 discussed earlier on with Afrim's. I also think that as
15 Kevin said there is available area for screening. We
16 could put some additional trees or something in there
17 just to help out. That can come later on when we look
18 at the site plan.

19 MR. BETTE: Ms. Goodrich's house is right here
20 (Indicating). That's the property line.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I think that the impact can be
22 mitigated to the Goodrichs with screening as you're
23 proposing. I think that the connection is pretty
24 important. That's what I'm hearing from the engineers.

25 Just on the circulation and the traffic and all

1 that, I'm inclined to vote for approval of concept
2 or concept acceptance and reserve opinion for myself
3 on that. I'd really like to give it a harder look.
4 My understanding having left meetings at the
5 Planning Department was that everybody was
6 supportive of that connection. I'd like to study it
7 a little bit more. I don't think that would impede
8 the progress of the project. That's my opinion.

9 MS. MILSTEIN: My concern is that it's Albany
10 Shaker. What you're saying is most of your clientele is
11 going to be coming from the airport and taking a right
12 turn in. That also means they are the ones that are
13 going to be taking a left hand turn to get back to the
14 airport. It really concerns me when the clientele that
15 you have with that whole parking situation at the peak
16 time. I really do have some concerns about the left
17 hand turns onto Albany Shaker.

18 MR. BETTE: We talked about that extensively on
19 this interchange. The Planning staff wanted us to
20 maintain it as a full interchange. We're fine with
21 asking this right turns only.

22 I think at the last meeting they talked about
23 the pork chop. That's just a dedicated turn lane
24 that is concrete raised median here that forces you
25 to make a right hand turn. When talking to the

1 Planning staff we said we'll just put a sign there
2 saying right turns only, but leave it full access.
3 When you put that in it does create a problem for
4 snow plows and people do drive over it and then you
5 have to put a sign there and it gets clipped off all
6 the time. We agree with your comment and we would
7 like to encourage everyone to make a right hand turn
8 and to spin around the rotary.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Was that the Town Engineers or was
10 that Afrim that didn't want to give up the left hand
11 turn?

12 MR. BETTE: It was Mike Lyons. After I had met
13 with Mike Lyons and the Planning office, that's what
14 they wanted us to show.

15 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Afrim wanted the pork chop?

16 MR. BETTE: He wanted the same thing but he didn't
17 know how to do that with this existing - he said that
18 there are a lot of dangerous situations where people are
19 to try to take a left. All they need to do is make a
20 right.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chuck and Joe, what do you think?

22 MR. VOSS: I agree. I know the Afrim's site very
23 well through the kids playing soccer there.

24 I understand what you're saying. People try to
25 make that left movement going west to Albany Shaker

1 all the time. I think that the encouragement in
2 listening to Mike Lyons and staff was that the idea
3 that you want to push everyone to the right to the
4 east and then push them to the circle and have them
5 come around the circle and then back out.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm in support of that. Is
7 anybody against that?

8 MR. VOSS: No. For a more definitive right out -
9 as Kevin was saying there, the applicants are certainly
10 willing to do that. It doesn't hurt the flow of
11 traffic.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you mind commenting, Joe
13 Grasso?

14 MR. GRASSO: We would prefer having the lefts-out
15 being restricted. The only reason why we supported the
16 full is because trying to respect Afrim's -- he's given
17 up a lot here and doesn't have a stake in this.

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Kevin, you're sure Afrim doesn't
19 mind?

20 MR. BETTE: I talked to him about it.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay.

22 MR. BETTE: Our main focus is safety of all of our
23 guests. That would make it safer.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I think that it also leaves your
25 other exit and take a right on Wolf and then take a left

1 at the light.

2 Is everybody in agreement on that?

3 (All Board Members agreed.)

4 Is that going to change the striping on Albany
5 Shaker Road?

6 MR. BETTE: We didn't think so because it's no
7 different from the current situation. It's wide enough
8 for stacking in core areas and a safe traffic flow.

9 MR. LACIVITA: But you will be able to take a left
10 in.

11 MR. BETTE: A left in is important to Afrim.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Are people in agreement with
13 studying the one connection a little bit more or do they
14 have other opinions?

15 MS. DALTON: No, I think that we should study it
16 more.

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: We have studied this so much we
18 really didn't think a lot about your architecture and
19 stuff like that. We'd love a presentation about
20 everything else about your project.

21 MR. BETTE: Again, this is designed as an extended
22 stay prototype, but we don't have a flag pinned down
23 yet. Recently we have been talking to some of the other
24 flags that may change a little bit in configuration but
25 we had looked to do something very nice as far as the

1 hotel architecture here and I'm not happy with the
2 office building architecture. Chris needed a rendering
3 to kind of show you and Chris isn't the architect in the
4 office. I assure you that our building will look much
5 better than this when we get into more detail. We
6 actually wanted to make it more of the hi-tech building
7 because we are going after that hi-tech market. I think
8 that's where the growth is in this area for the
9 businesses that serve that infrastructure. That's what
10 we look for. This is a building that we have looked at
11 for Century Hill that's more in keeping with that style,
12 but I would like to enhance that and make it a more
13 attractive office building.

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: You won't know until you get your
15 tenant; is that kind of what you are saying?

16 MR. BETTE: They will have some influence over it.
17 We talked to a couple of different tenants, one of which
18 wanted more of the Angio Dynamics style building, which
19 we thought would be great. We have a little bit of a
20 timing problem because without knowing when we can
21 start, we can't secure them. So, if we got concept and
22 we got closer I think that we'd be able to secure
23 certainly some tenants for this building. The class A
24 market - office market is getting very tight. We don't
25 have any space at Century Hill. I think that we would

1 secure some tenants for this building here.

2 As far as the hotel, there are a number of
3 major brands that are interested in the hotel.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: They're not going to have an
5 opinion on the architecture?

6 MR. BETTE: They are going to have an opinion on
7 the architecture. It's up to us. We have to meet the
8 brand standards. They are very accepting of higher
9 architecture, which is what we want. This parcel, I
10 think, is a very important parcel in the Town. I think
11 that we take very seriously what this is going to look
12 like long-term and how it's going to affect the area.
13 Hopefully, in a very positive manner. Just a little bit
14 on the hotel market - it is very strong.

15 Mr. Hoffman's Homewood Suites which he did a
16 very nice job on - does very well. That's the
17 standard that we want to try to beat and I think
18 that it's going to encourage a lot of capital
19 improvements in some of the other properties on Wolf
20 Road. That's kind of what happens. I think that
21 you'll see other hotels trying to spruce up and
22 that's good for the community when everyone has
23 better products.

24 I look at the Hampton here and they do
25 extremely well. There is no motivation for them to

1 invest at all in his properties. He's an out of
2 town owner and does very well. They haven't touched
3 the property since it was built 30 years ago. You
4 do need to reinvest in your properties. With all of
5 our properties, we always invest in them and try to
6 keep them current and try to keep them as nice as
7 possible.

8 CHAIRMAN STUTO: As you refine your architectural
9 concept can you do an interim presentation - a 10-minute
10 presentation for us or send us the drawings?

11 MR. BETTE: Yes, I would like to.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: What else do you want to tell us
13 about the project?

14 MR. BETTE: I think that it's pretty straight
15 forward. It will be tall and its within the height
16 limits - seven stories; 75 feet; and the gross area is
17 153,000 square feet. It's a large property. I think
18 that it's the trend to build larger properties to
19 provide better amenities and services to the guests. We
20 know a lot of the guests and the type of people who are
21 coming to Town to visit those major anchors plus the
22 general business in Town. That's really what we are
23 trying to do. We've been around the country looking at
24 newer prototypes for different brands.

25 Jack McCabe from our office is actually in

1 charge of hotel brand aspect for us and he's been
2 everywhere from North Carolina, Texas and New York
3 City looking at all the different brands and trying
4 to select what we feel would be the best product for
5 this piece here. They can't award us a brand until
6 we get closer to knowing when we will be able to get
7 the project going. If we did get positive on the
8 concept and SEQRA tonight I think that we would go
9 right to work to try to secure that for the next
10 meeting and tell you exactly what we want to do and
11 refine these architectures.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Questions or comments from the
13 Board?

14 (There was no response.)

15 Chuck you want to talk to us about the
16 environmental review?

17 MR. VOSS: Yes, as we noted the last time that they
18 are required to go before SEAMAB for the variance for
19 the 100 foot buffer in the back. In order to do that
20 the Board has to basically take action on SEQRA to allow
21 SEAMAB to move forward. What we have prepared for the
22 Board tonight, we had Rebekah look at and approve and
23 Kathy also looked at it.

24 We have a SEQRA recommendation which is in your
25 packet. It's a couple of pages in from Rebekah's

1 office. She is basically just confirming that this
2 is a SEQRA Type I and that the action will not have
3 a significant effect on the environment, as
4 proposed. Following that is Part I of the full
5 Environmental Assessment which basically goes
6 through the questions.

7 We have also prepared the necessary SEQRA
8 Resolution for the Board which will adopt the
9 negative declaration and I have that and we can go
10 through that.

11 Then there is certainly Part III which
12 basically is the extensive analysis of no mitigative
13 impacts. If you like, I can read to you that
14 Resolution and the Board can move forward.

15 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'll give everyone a minute to
16 look through that. We've had it in our packet and I'm
17 sure that everybody has reviewed it.

18 I will note that we normally don't do the
19 Environmental Review until around final. It is my
20 understanding that in order to get an action from
21 them, we needed to do the Environmental Review now.
22 I think that we spent enough time and we've done
23 enough of a review that we're poised to do that.

24 Why don't you walk us through the Resolution
25 and then if there is any more comment or question we

1 can get to that.

2 MR. VOSS: Okay, before you is the Resolution
3 adopting and issuing a negative declaration, notice of
4 determination of non significance under SEQRA for the
5 227 Wolf Road office and hotel project.

6 Whereas the Town of Colonie Planning Board, the
7 Board, has received an application from First
8 Columbia including an Environmental Assessment Form
9 with supporting documentation packets proposing to
10 construct a new office building and multi-story
11 hotel on an 8.92 acre parcel near the intersection
12 of Wolf Road and Albany Shaker Road in the Town of
13 Colonie, Albany County, New York which is the
14 project, and

15 Whereas pursuant to Article 8 of the
16 Environmental Conservation Law as amended, the New
17 York State Environmental Quality Review Act, SEQRA,
18 is implementing regulations at 6 NYCRR part 617
19 which is the regulations, the Board desires to
20 comply with SEQRA and the regulations with respect
21 to the project, and

22 Whereas the Board caused a letter and Part I of
23 the short EAF to be sent to other potentially
24 involved agencies and interested agencies as these
25 quoted terms are defined in the regulations

1 indicating the Town of Colonie Planning Board's
2 desire to serve as lead agency as is defined in the
3 regulations with a coordinated review under SEQRA of
4 the project, and

5 Whereas each of the involved agencies are
6 potentially involved agencies as agreed to or raised
7 no objections to the Town of Colonie Planning Board
8 serving as lead agency for a coordinated review
9 under SEQRA of the project, and

10 Whereas the Board established itself as lead
11 agency for the project at a public meeting held in
12 the municipal building on April 22, 2014, and

13 Whereas the lead agency thereafter continued to
14 coordinate with its advisors and consultants to
15 review the project and its intended environmental
16 effects and further reviewed for its studies
17 reports, maps, documentation and data and negative
18 record, and

19 Whereas the lead agency has now heretofore
20 completed Parts II and III of the long EAF and has
21 considered the negative declaration under SEQRA
22 which has been distributed to all Board Members for
23 review, and

24 Whereas the members of the Planning Board as
25 lead agency that have read the annexed negative

1 declaration, know the concepts thereof and decide to
2 adopt and issue said document as lead agency under
3 SEQRA.

4 Now therefore be it resolved that pursuant to 6
5 NYCRR part 617.7, 617.20 and 617.21 of the
6 regulations of Article 8 of the Environmental
7 Conservation Law of New York State, the Town of
8 Colonie Planning Board as lead agency hereby adopts
9 the annexed negative declaration, notice of
10 determination of non significance under SEQRA upon
11 the vote thereupon and the signature of the Chairman
12 herewith, and

13 Be it further resolved that the Town of Colonie
14 Planning Board as lead agency hereby issues the
15 annexed negative declaration notice of determination
16 of non significance under SEQRA upon the vote
17 thereon and the signature of the Chairman herewith,
18 and

19 Be it further resolved that this Resolution
20 shall take effect immediately.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.

22 Does anybody have any comments or questions?

23 (There was no response.)

24 MR. LANE: I'll make the motion.

25 MR. MION: I'll second it.

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: All those in favor say aye.

2 (Ayes were recited.)

3 All those opposed say nay.

4 (There were none opposed.)

5 The ayes have it.

6 There are no waivers on this project, right?

7 MR. VOSS: There is actually three waivers on the
8 project.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: We're not going to vote on those.
10 Why don't you just mention those, but we're not going to
11 vote on those.

12 MR. VOSS: You don't need to vote on those this
13 evening.

14 MR. BETTE: Parking for the mixed-use is one.
15 There was a three foot difference in the setback here
16 and the 80 percent frontage.

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, well we don't have to vote
18 on those, but they're on the record..

19 With respect to the main question which is
20 concept acceptance and that's not a final approval
21 or even really an approval - I think that you've
22 heard our comments. I think that we're saying
23 right-in and right-out and also left-in on the area
24 that you were pointing to there on the northeast
25 section of the property and I think that we're going

1 to take under advisement the connection to the
2 Hampton. We want to study that a little further.

3 Anything else that you want to point out?

4 (There was no response.)

5 MR. MION: I'll make the motion.

6 MS. DALTON: I'll second.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Any discussion?

8 (There was no response.)

9 All those in favor say aye.

10 (Ayes were recited.)

11 All those in favor say nay.

12 (There were none opposed.)

13 The ayes have it.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. BETTE: Thank you.

16

17

18 (Whereas the above entitled proceedings were
19 concluded at 7:55 p.m.)

20

21

22

23

24

25

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 January 15, 2015

