

1 PLANNING BOARD COUNTY OF ALBANY

2 TOWN OF COLONIE

3 *****

4 NEWCOMER FUNERAL HOME
5 181 TROY SCHENECTADY ROAD
6 APPLICATION FOR CONCEPT ACCEPTANCE AND
7 ODA RECOMMENDATION TO TOWN BOARD
8 *****

9 THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled
10 matter by NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART, a Shorthand
11 Reporter, commencing on February 24, 2015 at 8:20
12 p.m. at The Public Operations Center, 347 Old
13 Niskayuna Road, Latham, New York

14 BOARD MEMBERS:
15 PETER STUTO, CHAIRMAN
16 LOU MION
17 KATHY DALTON
18 CRAIG SHAMLIAN
19 SUSAN MILSTEIN

20 ALSO PRESENT:
21 Kathleen Marinelli, Esq., Counsel to the Planning Board
22 Michael Tengeler, Planning and Economic Development
23 Joe LaCivita, Director, Planning and Economic Development
24 Aaron Baron, Sipperly and Associates
25 Brian Sipperly, Sipperly and Associates

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Next is Newcomer Funeral Home,
2 181 Troy Schenectady Road. This is an application for
3 concept acceptance and open development area
4 recommendation to Town Board.

5 Joe LaCivita, do you want to give an
6 introductory?

7 MR. LACIVITA: Sure. I think that one of the
8 things that should also go on record, Peter, as the
9 applicant themselves have been great to work with
10 because as this project has been evolving, a lot of
11 changes have come across to it and they have been very
12 willing to change the design to meet the comments that
13 were placed upon it and change the frontage access which
14 we are now going to see on 207 in the future.

15 The application tonight is for an ODA
16 recommendation and an application for concept
17 acceptance.

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, over to the applicant, if
19 you can identify yourself?

20 MR. BARON: My name is Aaron Baron and I'm the
21 project engineer with Sipperly and Associates. I'm here
22 representing Newcomer Funeral Home.

23 As Joe was just saying, we did go ahead and
24 make modifications to our concept plan according to
25 the comments that we had received at both DCC and

1 the last Planning Board meeting. The largest
2 modification, of course, was the elimination of the
3 right-in and right-out access along Route 2.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can you show us where that was?

5 MR. BARON: It's located right here. What we did
6 to eliminate that access was simply close the curb and
7 just dead end that row of parking. Vehicles will be
8 able to circulate through the canopy.

9 I think that the other major comment that we
10 had was some grading concerns. Peter, I believe
11 that you mentioned that at the last meeting. We did
12 include with our submission a concept section to the
13 site, which demonstrated that we believe that we'd
14 be able to lower the building possibly three feet.
15 I believe that the finished floor right now is about
16 249.5 and we can take that down to 246.

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can you put up the grade drawing?
18 I want to make sure that the Board understands it.

19 MR. BARON: You can see here that the existing
20 grade right here is approximately three feet higher than
21 the proposed elevation -

22 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Existing is the dashed line;
23 right?

24 MR. BARON: Correct. So, we would be lowering the
25 building approximately three feet. We would take that

1 grade to the rear of the site, flattening the grade as
2 we go.

3 CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, you're low lying toward the
4 street and your raising toward the back?

5 MR. BARON: Correct.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: So you're going from what grade to
7 what grade, overall? How would you describe that?

8 MR. BARON: Currently the parking lot has grades in
9 excess of 10 percent. We're not proposing any grades
10 over 4%, with the exception of the access drives to the
11 site.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: How steep are they?

13 MR. BARON: Under 10 and for very short distances.

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: What do you think, Craig?

15 MR. SHAMLIAN: I'm sure that's okay.

16 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay that's good on the grade.

17 Are there any other questions?

18 (There was no response.)

19 Okay, you want to talk about internal
20 circulation?

21 MR. BARON: So, again, we eliminated the right-in
22 and right-out and what we are showing are three points
23 of access. These two points of access here to the north
24 of the site will be for patrons arriving and exiting
25 from the site. The drive as shown here towards Route 2

1 (Indicating) is simply a one-way out for delivery
2 vehicles only. That access drive is only 14 feet wide
3 and will be signed accordingly.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can you show us exactly where that
5 is?

6 MR. BARON: It's right here to the east of the
7 building (Indicating). It will exit onto the access
8 drive.

9 Going back to the grading for just a moment,
10 when I was mentioning the slate ramping that we have
11 at the access drives, the most concerning one would
12 be the one to the rear and that's simply because of
13 the current elevations on the access drive there.

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: If you were attending a funeral
15 where would you probably turn in?

16 MR. BARON: I think that I would use the first
17 entrance that I came across. The rear entrance is more
18 to maintain what was there previously. There were two
19 points of access to that parking lot.

20 As far as changes go from the plan that the
21 Board has seen previously, that really summarizes
22 that there is not too much.

23 Parking was, I believe, reduced from the
24 previous plan that you guys had seen. We were
25 proposing 100 stalls at nine feet wide and the

1 applicant decided to widen the stalls to 10 feet
2 which reduced the parking to 89 spaces.

3 We relocated these drives and provided both of
4 these drives to address a comment that we received
5 from DOT regarding staffing on Route 2. They wanted
6 to make sure that we had enough room along this
7 access drive for stacking. It would also allow
8 vehicles entering the site to avoid a line of cars
9 exiting the site.

10 If the Board has any additional questions, I'd
11 be glad to answer them.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, we'll hear from our Town
13 Designated Engineer.

14 MR. VOSS: I like the improvements. If the Board
15 will remember, we first issued our initial concept
16 review letter back in October of 2014 for this project
17 and at that time the Board had some concerns with
18 grading, access, and again keep in mind that the other
19 issues before the Board tonight is the ODA designation
20 to be able to utilize the right of way that is existing
21 there for this parcel and certainly the adjacent parcel.

22 We provided you, Peter, and Joe with that
23 recommendation earlier last week about the joint
24 access way. We feel that is certainly a positive
25 recommendation that the Board consider that ODA for

1 this because again, in conformance with DOT's
2 standards and practices that we have been seeing out
3 in this area, assuming with Kevin Novaks' earlier
4 recommendation about the two curb cuts, accessing
5 this parcel, having that one main accessway disturbs
6 this parcel as well as the adjacent parcel and that
7 makes 100% sense. It's one curb cut in and one curb
8 cut out. There are certainly two parcels and the
9 ODA makes sense in this case. We certainly support
10 that end of it.

11 From a concept standpoint, we like the grading
12 that we're seeing. Granted, we haven't received a
13 formal set of plans yet. We're still at concept but
14 the initial revised concept plan that we did receive
15 showed kind of the profiles in plain view and we
16 think that it makes a lot of sense.

17 I think that if you remember the initial
18 concern in that back parking lot was during winter
19 and the icy conditions - 8%, 9% or 10% grades in a
20 parking lot will make it tough for people to walk
21 around. This proposal plan makes a lot more sense.
22 The guys did a great job at addressing the Board's
23 concerns there. We'll take a closer look,
24 certainly, at those access points in terms of grade,
25 as we get the revised plans that show that in more

1 detail. I think that from a concept standpoint
2 we're very comfortable at this point and certainly
3 will make a recommendation that the Board proceed.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm not finding an Open
5 Development Resolution. Do we have one?

6 MR. LACIVITA: I noticed the email from Chuck just
7 now and I don't see an ODA Resolution. I'm not quite
8 sure why it didn't make it into your packet, so I
9 apologize for that.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you have one electronically, or
11 no? Are you going to have to postpone that part of it?

12 MR. LACIVITA: We may have to postpone that. I can
13 bring that back very quickly so that they can go forward
14 with that.

15 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I don't think that will delay the
16 project.

17 Are there any members of the public that want
18 to speak on this project?

19 (There was no response.)

20 Okay, we are teed up to talk about concept
21 acceptance. Does anybody have any problem with
22 doing an ODA at a future date?

23 (All members agreed.)

24 Concept acceptance; do we have a motion?

25 MR. MION: I'll make that motion.

1 MS. MILSTEIN: I'll second that.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Any discussion?

3 (There was no response.)

4 All those in favor say aye.

5 (Ayes were recited.)

6 All those opposed say nay.

7 (There were none opposed.)

8 And we look forward to having a Resolution to
9 vote on for the open development area.

10 MR. LACIVITA: So, I can go ahead and draft that,
11 Peter? I'll have it all as the 'whereas' in the
12 Resolution.

13 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Yes.

14 Did you have a question?

15 MR. SIPPERLY: Yes, I do.

16 I'm Brian Sipperly from Sipperly and
17 Associates.

18 How does the process work from here?

19 MR. LACIVITA: You can go right towards your final
20 design application at this point because you had the
21 concept acceptance. The ODA - we can run that parallel
22 to the next meeting because it's simply drafting it. It
23 sounds like the members are in favor of it, based on the
24 DOT stipulations.

25 MR. SIPPERLY: We just want to be able to describe

1 it to our clients. We can describe it procedural at the
2 next Planning Board meeting?

3 MR. LACIVITA: You'll probably have your ODA prior
4 to your final approval.

5 MR. SIPPERLY: Is there a call for a public hearing
6 at the town board level first?

7 MR. LACIVITA: Yes.

8 MR. SIPPERLY: Okay, thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: As long as that happens before
10 final, that shouldn't slow you down at all.

11

12

13 (Whereas the above entitled proceeding was
14 concluded at 8:31 p.m.)

15

16

17

18

19

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 March 16, 2015

