

1 PLANNING BOARD COUNTY OF ALBANY

2 TOWN OF COLONIE

3 \*\*\*\*\*  
4 SUMMIT SENIOR LIVING  
45 FORTS FERRY ROAD  
5 SKETCH PLAN REVIEW  
\*\*\*\*\*

6 THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled  
7 matter by NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART, a Shorthand  
8 Reporter, commencing on July 14, 2015 at 7:21 p.m.  
at The Public Operations Center, 347 Old Niskayuna  
9 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 Joseph Grasso, PE, CHA  
21 Mary Elizabeth Slevin, Esq., Stockli Slevin & Peters  
22 Mike Tucker, VHP  
23  
24  
25

1           CHAIRMAN STUTO: Summit Senior Living, 45 Forts  
2 Ferry Road. This is a sketch plan review. This is a  
3 request for a three-story 110 unit senior housing  
4 facility.

5           Joe LaCivita, do you want to give an  
6 introduction on this?

7           MR. LACIVITA: Absolutely. This 45 Forts Ferry  
8 Road has been before the DCC which is the Development  
9 Coordination Committee on May 27, 2015. The applicant  
10 has requested a rezoning which was acted upon in the  
11 Resolution by the Town Board. We have that before us  
12 today to look to consider the rezoning to a PDD and is  
13 here tonight for sketch plan review to get the Board  
14 acclimated with the project.

15          CHAIRMAN STUTO: We will turn it over to the  
16 applicant, if you can identify yourself?

17          MS. SLEVIN: Good evening. My name is Mary Beth  
18 Slevin and I'm here on behalf of the applicant. Here  
19 with me this evening is Mike Tucker with PHP and also  
20 Adam DeSantis who is one of the partners in the project.  
21 We appreciate the Board's time to review this project  
22 this evening. It's a rather exciting project. This is  
23 a little different than some other senior housing that  
24 you may have looked at. It is designed to be for  
25 seniors who are independent who want to have the luxury

1 of having someone else take care of the lawns and  
2 snowplowing and also have the ability to remain active  
3 and to remain part of their community.

4 Our client has constructed several other  
5 projects of this nature in North Greenbush,  
6 Glenville and we're starting construction of a similar  
7 one in Wilton.

8 The concept is really different. The idea is  
9 to make sure that the seniors who are living in  
10 these particular projects remain active so there is  
11 a very advanced program of amenities, including aqua  
12 aerobics and different kinds of games, bocce ball,  
13 courts outside and walking areas for the seniors.

14 They are also provided with transportation to  
15 wherever they may want to go; whether it's doctor's  
16 appointments, shopping and all those kinds of things  
17 so that they have the ability to remain part of the  
18 community and remain active in all of the things  
19 that they want to do, so that they will age with the  
20 kind of grace that we would all want to do.

21 Because this is a PDD, it's required to look at  
22 the PDD criteria for a project. Some of the things  
23 that we would ask the Board to consider as you  
24 review the recommendation to the Town Board is the  
25 location of the facility on the site. There is a

1 100-foot buffer around several sides of the site  
2 which have been preserved over and above that buffer  
3 area. There is additional greenspace that has been  
4 preserved between the actual building and the nearby  
5 residential areas; all with the kind of maintaining  
6 open space, but also maintaining that existing  
7 buffer between the neighborhood. Even though this is  
8 residential in its own right, it is a larger  
9 building than the nearby residences. We believe  
10 that this way it provides an opportunity to really  
11 be a transition from what some higher commercial  
12 uses across Forts Ferry to where this project is  
13 then to the residential neighborhood. So, it  
14 provides that gradual transition.

15 I'm going to ask Mike Tucker to walk through  
16 the site plan for the Board and then we are  
17 available to answer any questions you have.

18 MR. TUCKER: Good evening. I'm Mike Tucker from  
19 VHP.

20 As Mary Beth said, the property here is  
21 essentially two parcels; it's number 45 and 33 Forts  
22 Ferry Road. It totals about just over 13 acres. We  
23 are proposing a single building, three stories with  
24 110 apartment units in it, two access points off of  
25 Forts Ferry Road with no access through to the

1 abutting residential properties to the North.

2 We have maintained that 100 foot no disturb  
3 buffer that is built into the zoning along this side  
4 of the property (Indicating). There will be  
5 approximately 170 parking spaces, 58 or 60 of them  
6 will be garage spaces, which are these buildings  
7 around the perimeter. We are maintaining over 60%  
8 open greenspace on the site and the further studies  
9 are ongoing now. We did delineate a federal wetland  
10 on the property. That report has gone into the Army  
11 Corp and we are awaiting their jurisdictional  
12 determination site visit any day now. That is  
13 located in the back of the property and it has  
14 allowed us to keep the building toward the front  
15 which is what we wanted it along the street frontage  
16 there.

17 All the utilities are located within Forts  
18 Ferry Road. We have discussed those with Pure  
19 Waters and the Latham Water District as we have gone  
20 through the DCC process. Stormwater will all be  
21 controlled on-site and discharged to that existing  
22 wetland as it does today, meeting the stormwater  
23 guidelines for DEC.

24 That's pretty much it and we can answer any  
25 questions.

1           CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, we have a Town Designated  
2 Engineer who has not formally reviewed it, but I know  
3 that he has taken a look at it and that's Joe Grasso  
4 with CHA.

5           Joe, do you want to give some comments?

6           MR. GRASSO: Yes, some preliminary thoughts for the  
7 Board to consider as they start their review of the  
8 project.

9           It's a zone change from the office residential  
10 zone to a PDD. So, one of the things that the  
11 Planning Board typically looks at is the change in  
12 density. You look at what would be allowed based on  
13 the underlying zoning as opposed to what is  
14 currently proposed. This project is 110 residential  
15 units and so it's strictly a residential project.  
16 The underlying zone provides a mathematical  
17 calculation that you can go through that establishes  
18 the maximum density based on either a strictly  
19 commercial use or a combination of commercial and  
20 residential. The OR zone does not allow strictly a  
21 strictly residential project. So, if it was  
22 strictly commercial, mathematically, it would allow  
23 a maximum of 235,000 square feet of commercial  
24 office space. It would allow three three-story  
25 office buildings on the site.

1           If it was a mixture between commercial and the  
2           maximum amount of residential, you could have 47,000  
3           square feet of commercial and 62 units residential.  
4           So, again, we're looking at a strictly residential  
5           project of 110 units. So, you can kind of get a  
6           sense as to how the density is being changed by the  
7           project.

8           The two triggers that require the project to be  
9           a PDD based on this development program of 110  
10          residential units - one is that it's strictly  
11          residential and the second is that the maximum  
12          building footprint size allowed in the OR zone is  
13          30,000 square feet. They are proposing a building  
14          of a footprint of 55,000 square feet.

15          CHAIRMAN STUTO: You could do multiple buildings;  
16          yes. What is the logic behind that?

17          MR. GRASSO: It's to try to reduce the amount of  
18          big box retail that you're going to see or large scale  
19          office buildings, because the OR zone is typically in a  
20          transitional zone between a strictly commercial area and  
21          a strictly residential area which is exactly the context  
22          of this site. So, it's something important for the  
23          Planning Board to consider. Forts Ferry Road changes  
24          the context drastically from the Wade Road side down to  
25          the Forts Ferry School side and Omega Terrace.

1           MR. SHAMLIAN: Well, with the existing zoning, do  
2 they still need to maintain the 100-foot buffer?

3           MR. GRASSO: They do, yes. That's an overlay that  
4 would apply. I'm not saying that mathematical density  
5 could be effectuated on the plan. We haven't asked for  
6 a plan. This is the first time that we're seeing it and  
7 I'm not sure if that's something that may help you  
8 analyze the density. That's one of the things that when  
9 we are looking at a single family residentially zoned  
10 property and we look for a layout to see how many lots  
11 you can get so that you can get a good comparison. The  
12 mathematical calculation isn't always a good reflection  
13 as to what can go up on the site. The underlying zone,  
14 though, does allow three-story buildings and that's what  
15 they are proposing here.

16           In terms of mitigation of impacts, most of the  
17 areas of the Town are covered by a GIS study area.  
18 This site is not. So, there is not going to be any  
19 mitigation fees required to mitigate the impacts.  
20 That will require us to do a more in-depth analysis  
21 of the environmental impacts on all of the typical  
22 issues; traffic, water, sewer, open spacing and  
23 things of that nature.

24           There is a wetland area that has been  
25 identified on the project site. Right now it

1 appears to be non-jurisdictional, so no jurisdiction  
2 by the Corp of Engineers. This is something that  
3 should be confirmed by the applicant as they work  
4 through the process. The wetland isn't probably  
5 important from a stormwater management perspective  
6 and it probably acts as an infiltration area so  
7 that's something that we want to make sure gets  
8 addressed as part of the stormwater management  
9 approach for the project site. We don't have any  
10 drainage impacts.

11 It is in an archeological sensitive area so an  
12 archeological investigation or sign-off from SHPPO  
13 will be required.

14 In terms of the parking, they are proposing  
15 1.53 spaces per unit. Based on the proposed use  
16 being senior housing, that's above what the industry  
17 standards are. The site could theoretically be  
18 considered to be over-parked. It's something that  
19 we'll take a look at to see if there is rationale  
20 for the parking, but it could be something that we  
21 look at either a reduction of the parking or  
22 possibly land-banking some of the spaces and only  
23 building them if they are needed at some point in  
24 the future.

25 The site plan lacks any pedestrian facilities.

1 Forts Ferry Road doesn't have any sidewalks across  
2 the frontage of the site. There are sidewalks down  
3 obviously, Wade Road and on Forts Ferry, I think,  
4 beginning at Omega Terrace and then extending down  
5 to the school and I think that it's on the north  
6 side of Forts Ferry Road. It would be logical for  
7 this project to extend pedestrian facilities that  
8 would extend from Omega Terrace to the Wade Road  
9 corridor.

10 That kind of dovetails in with my last comment.

11 PDDs are required to provide a public benefit.  
12 Obviously, the type of housing that it being  
13 provided could be considered as a public benefit.

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I don't buy that, and I'll just  
15 say that for the record.

16 MR. GRASSO: It's something that we might hear from  
17 the applicant, but it's time to start thinking about  
18 other public benefits that may be required to support  
19 the project and pedestrian accommodations not only in  
20 front of the project site, but down Forts Ferry Road is  
21 something that should be considered.

22 I'm just going to touch on a couple of comments  
23 that were brought up by the Planning Department  
24 during the DCC review.

25 One is the public amenities should be

1 identified as part of the concept application. The  
2 second is the need for sidewalks along the public  
3 right of way along Forts Ferry Road. Another  
4 comment is that they suggested that the parking that  
5 is proposed in the front yard of the building be  
6 relocated to either the side or the rear of the site  
7 and possibly shifting the building back from Forts  
8 Ferry Road.

9 That's about it. Those are the only comments  
10 that we have at this time.

11 The only other thing is because it's a PDD,  
12 it's a Type I action so a full EAF is required and  
13 we'll look for that as part of the concept submittal  
14 package, and we'll need to make a determination as  
15 to whether or not the Planning Board or the Town  
16 Board will be lead agent. Typically, in the recent  
17 past, the Planning Board has been lead agency for  
18 PDD applications. SEQRA needs to be done before the  
19 Town Board takes action on the PDD, not necessarily  
20 at the same time the Planning Board takes action on  
21 the PDD recommendation.

22 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, I'm sure that the Board has  
23 comments and questions.

24 Lou?

25 MR. MION: Let me ask you this: How do you feel

1 about maybe taking the front half of it and moving the  
2 whole thing back and have kind of like a boulevard going  
3 into it, since it is for active seniors and a lot of  
4 people will be driving and kind of make it like a  
5 residential roadway or street going in?

6 MR. TUCKER: When we laid this out, we actually  
7 originally had the building closer to the rear. When we  
8 determined that there is that potential wetland on the  
9 site, we pushed it up so that we could limit the impacts  
10 of that. If it does turn out that it is a  
11 non-jurisdictional wetland, I think that does allow us  
12 the opportunity to potentially shove the building back  
13 onto the site a little bit.

14 There is just a question that I was going to  
15 talk to Joe about. There is a drainage structure at  
16 this end of the wetland (Indicating) that runs back  
17 toward the residential neighborhood. If that does  
18 provide a connection through to somewhere, that's  
19 something that we need to discuss with the Corp.

20 MR. LACIVITA: The resident was actually into my  
21 office talking about that, as well. He has an  
22 understanding of the flow and everything so as we get to  
23 that part of the design, we'll get him with us.

24 MR. TUCKER: I need to speak with DPW as well. At  
25 the DCC meeting we talked about getting those drainage

1 plans in so that we can track that for that land.

2 To answer your question, if it does turn out  
3 that that's not jurisdictional, we'll certainly look  
4 at potentially pushing the building back.

5 MR. MION: I think that would really look nice.  
6 Then you could come off of the road, off Forts Ferry and  
7 drive back in the street a little bit and then you have  
8 your apartments. There may be a way of figure it  
9 without interfering with the wetlands also.

10 MR. LANE: Is the design of the building already  
11 basically set, or do you still have leeway to do some  
12 changes?

13 MR. TUCKER: There is some flexibility in it with  
14 the pods of apartment units. The general shape needs to  
15 stay the same because all of the community uses and the  
16 pool and exercise rooms are all kind of in the center.  
17 We are trying to keep a relatively equal distance from  
18 all of the other areas.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you have any other elevations  
20 to show us?

21 MR. TUCKER: I have elevations from a different  
22 project. They haven't done them for this specific one.

23 MR. SHAMLIAN: How tall is this building?

24 MR. TUCKER: It's three stories. It's about 45 to  
25 the peak of the roof.

1           MR. AUSTIN: How far back from the road are you  
2 sitting?

3           MR. TUCKER: We are probably about 75 feet to the  
4 road to the building.

5           CHAIRMAN STUTO: But you have parking right there  
6 also.

7           MR. AUSTIN: I like Joe's comment about the parking  
8 being moved from the one side. I think that we can do  
9 something with the facade on the Forts Ferry Side.

10          MR. TUCKER: That is a rendering of the project in  
11 Glenville which has recently been constructed and is  
12 open and we are planning on taking some actual photos of  
13 that soon that we can show the Board.

14          MR. GRASSO: Is that Hudson Meadows? What project  
15 in Glenville is that?

16          MR. TUCKER: Glenwick Manor. It's on Dutch Meadows  
17 Lane near the Walmart.

18          MR. AUSTIN: Is there any way to rotate the  
19 building?

20          MR. TUCKER: We have tried a bunch of different  
21 ways to turn it, but that 100-foot buffer there - that  
22 overlay district is really limiting the width,  
23 especially here.

24          MR. AUSTIN: If the wetlands come back as not being  
25 an issue, can you move it back and rotate it?

1           MR. TUCKER: We can move it back, but we can't  
2 fully rotate it.

3           MR. AUSTIN: My only concern is really going to be  
4 for the first of all for the residents. It's going to  
5 be a big impact on them seeing a three-story -- I  
6 understand that there will be the buffer and there will  
7 be some additional buffer that you are creating, too,  
8 which is good.

9           The Forts Ferry impact too - seeing a large  
10 structure that close -- I see some elevations here,  
11 but I will be interested in seeing the actual  
12 elevations, as we get further in the process. I  
13 think that it is, like Joe said, a good transition  
14 from the Target piece that we have to the Omega  
15 Terrace residential and it works because that's the  
16 rezoning. I would like to see some tweaking with  
17 the design for sure.

18           MR. LACIVITA: Can that roof-line be brought down  
19 in any way, shape or form, Mike, and have some type of  
20 proximity to the neighbors? Can you do some balloon  
21 tests to see what kind of a height -- we did that for  
22 the Elks project that is going to be coming up next.

23           MR. TUCKER: If that is something that the Board  
24 would like, we can certainly do that.

25           MR. LACIVITA: At least you can kind of get a

1 perspective.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Or at least talk about it  
3 intelligently with the elevations.

4 MR. SHAMLIAN: We're obviously making a transition  
5 change there. I'm concerned about 45 feet with the  
6 neighbors.

7 MR. LANE: You are definitely going to need to some  
8 outreach.

9 MR. TUCKER: Mary Beth can speak to that, also.

10 MR. LACIVITA: They tried several times to try to  
11 find -- we were told of a person who was kind of like  
12 the one that was in that neighborhood to get a hold of  
13 and we never had an opportunity to meet with him to get  
14 some talks going, but we will have more meetings coming  
15 up.

16 MS. SLEVIN: We did spend several months trying to  
17 reach out to the neighborhood group to set up an  
18 informational meeting back in February and March and we  
19 just weren't successful. As we start this project  
20 process we are certainly more than happy to continue  
21 with those efforts.

22 MR. SHAMLIAN: Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I have a couple of questions and  
24 comments.

25 This is a PDD which we have a number of

1 applications and we have had some approvals on the  
2 PDDs, which basically is a rezone, by definition in  
3 some fashion. The first things that I look at is  
4 density. As I understand this, Joe Grasso explained  
5 the density analysis of what you could build if he  
6 did the commercial office mix or just the office.  
7 This bears a reasonable relationship. It's a lower  
8 density in terms of square footage, at least, right?

9 MR. GRASSO: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: That's easy to say. Residential,  
11 if it was the mix that was permitted, it would be 62  
12 units but there would also be a substantial commercial  
13 office with this. So, this density seems to bear at  
14 least a reasonable relationship to what could be built.  
15 I'm going to look at that a little closer but some of  
16 the other applications - the density is pushed a little  
17 further than I think perhaps it should be.

18 The other thing is the benefit to the  
19 community. That's a shorthand word that I'm not  
20 even sure that it's in the PDD legislation.

21 One of the key things that I look at and try to  
22 remind the applicant is -- I'll just say it for the  
23 record - Section 190-66 of the Land Use Law says  
24 "Objectives: In order to carry out the intent of  
25 this article, all approved PDDs shall provide an

1           adequate and integrated system of open space and  
2           recreational areas designed to tie the PDD together  
3           internally and link it to the larger community." So  
4           far, I don't see that here. I think that is  
5           something that I'm trying to keep an eye on for all  
6           the PDDs that come through. Is there a park that is  
7           shared with the community? You can go over that  
8           sentence, but it means that it should be tied in,  
9           internally, a recreational area -- I'll read it  
10          again. "provide an adequate and integrated system of  
11          open space and recreation areas designed to tie the  
12          PDD together internally and link it to the larger  
13          community." To me, there should be some shared  
14          space in trail systems or pedestrian access that  
15          links it to the rest of the community that everybody  
16          can enjoy and use. So, if you could think hard  
17          about that one?

18                 MS. SLEVIN: Just to respond to that, we are very  
19                 aware of those requirements including the requirement  
20                 for public amenity and there are things that we have had  
21                 conversations with the Town for many months. We are  
22                 more than happy to make sure that we address those  
23                 issues. We have looked at concepts for trails on the  
24                 property.

25                 One of the limitations is that we looked at it

1 within the 100-foot buffer and that is within a no  
2 disturb area, so we aren't sure if that's a place  
3 that it could be. That would really be a logical  
4 place because it really is the place where it is  
5 connected to the rest of the community.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Explain to me why that's no  
7 disturbing. It's a buffer, but is it an absolute  
8 requirement?

9 MS. SLEVIN: It's a Town overlay and we have to  
10 take a harder look at it and what the intent was for the  
11 Town overlay.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Joe or Joe, do you have any  
13 comments?

14 MR. GRASSO: I'd have to look at it. I don't know  
15 if that's strictly a no-building construction, or no  
16 cut.

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can that be waived, if it's done  
18 intelligently?

19 MR. GRASSO: No.

20 MR. LACIVITA: Over at Cap Com there was a similar  
21 buffer there. I think that they preserved it to the  
22 best that they could over there. We would have to take  
23 it through the Town Attorney's office.

24 MR. GRASSO: We will look at it. By the time that  
25 it comes back for concept, we'll know the answer.

1 MS. SLEVIN: Those are certainly concepts that we  
2 are more than happy to look at and to work with the  
3 Board for those kinds of ideas and others.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you have any now? You come  
5 here for sketch plan and you don't have anything?

6 MS. SLEVIN: We have talked about the walking  
7 trails. We have talked about sidewalks along Forts  
8 Ferry Road. Those were all things that we are willing  
9 to do. We haven't had any real direction from the Town  
10 as to whether those are things that would be -

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Well, we are the Planning Board  
12 and we are the ones that make that recommendation to the  
13 Town.

14 MS. SLEVIN: And we are looking for the Planning  
15 Board's guidance on whether they think that those kinds  
16 of concepts are appropriate and in-line with what your  
17 expectations are.

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I say, yes.

19 MR. SHAMLIAN: The sidewalks - no. Sidewalks are  
20 required on a lot of projects today, essentially whether  
21 it's a rezone or not. I personally don't view that as a  
22 public amenity above and beyond. There is a certain  
23 hurdle that they need to meet, and I don't think that  
24 sidewalks in and of themselves meet that.

25 MS. SLEVIN: And we're looking at sidewalks beyond

1 just the project property. I agree with you. On the  
2 project property itself, sidewalks would be part of the  
3 project. Going beyond the project that is not normally  
4 a requirement of that particular project - we look at  
5 that as part of the public benefit that would go toward  
6 the amenity requirement.

7 MR. AUSTIN: So, linking the projects on Wade Road  
8 and then linking the project to Omega -- because there  
9 is some space there between your project and those  
10 certain areas because there is a sidewalk to nowhere at  
11 Stewarts. So, you would link to that one.

12 MS. SLEVIN: Correct.

13 MR. GRASSO: And at concept we'll look at the  
14 length of the frontage of the project site versus the  
15 length of the sidewalk from Omega to Wade Road. I think  
16 that it's about 500 feet of frontage and about 1,500  
17 foot distance from point to point, but we'll confirm  
18 those numbers.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.

20 The other point that I wanted to make was a  
21 follow-up on these two gentlemen to my right which  
22 is -- obviously, we are worried about the impact on  
23 the residential areas and this is a transition area  
24 and Omega -- the residents there are right next  
25 door. I would envision better screening from the

1 front. I personally would rather see a driveway  
2 that runs through a little bit and have more of the  
3 building in the back and not just have parking lot  
4 and building as you drive by. I'd like you to try  
5 to be a little more creative with that or at least  
6 look at that.

7 Like Lou said, lop off the front of the  
8 building and put it in the back and still respect  
9 the screening with the neighbors. I would rather see  
10 a winding driveway where you're not sure what is  
11 back there to mitigate the visual impact from the  
12 road - to keep woods there or to keep vegetation  
13 there. That's my other main comment.

14 Obviously, we're going to want to know what the  
15 traffic impact is going to be and whether the road  
16 and surrounding area can handle it. That is the end  
17 of my comments.

18 MR. LANE: I agree with Peter. You need to look at  
19 how this is going to be viewed from a public road,  
20 especially for the neighbors in the area.

21 MS. SLEVIN: We are trying to be sensitive to the  
22 neighbors.

23 CHAIRMAN STUTO: We normally don't take comment on  
24 sketch plan. Are you a representative of the  
25 neighborhood?

1 FROM THE FLOOR: No, sir. Actually, I live over on  
2 Starlight Road and I have a question. How tall is the  
3 hotel that is around the corner from this?

4 MR. LACIVITA: That's the COR zone and I thin that  
5 ti's 60 feet. It's under the 75 max.

6 FROM THE FLOOR: So, that's three stories or four  
7 stories?

8 MR. LACIVITA: No, I think that it's actually five  
9 stories.

10 FROM THE FLOOR: I was just curious; thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: But it's not right adjacent to the  
12 residents.

13 MR. LACIVITA: Correct. It's across Wade Road and  
14 over into the COR development where Target is.

15 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Any other comments or questions?

16 MR. SHAMLIAN: When you come back, I'd like to see  
17 a little bit of an analysis from the density and not  
18 just theoretical, but what can actually be placed there,  
19 given the overlay district and the potential wetlands  
20 and whatnot.

21 MS. SLEVIN: And we had done that work. We can  
22 certain provide that to the Board.

23 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you. See you next time.

24 MS. SLEVIN: Thank you, very much.

25

1                   (Whereas the above referenced proceeding was  
2                   concluded at 7:43 p.m.)  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
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 August 23, 2014

