

1 PLANNING BOARD COUNTY OF ALBANY

2 TOWN OF COLONIE

3 *****

CAMPITO PARKING EXPANSION

150 WADE ROAD

APPLICATION FOR CONCEPT ACCEPTANCE

5 *****

6 THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled
7 matter by NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART, a Shorthand
8 Reporter, commencing on December 1, 2015 at 7:20 p.m.
at The Public Operations Center, 347 Old Niskayuna
Road, Latham, New York

9

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

14

15

16

17 ALSO PRESENT:

18 Michael Tengeler, Planning and Economic Development

19 Kathleen Marinelli, Esq. Counsel to the Planning Board

20 Dan Hershberg, PE, Hershberg and Hershberg

21 Daniel O'Brien

22 Ryan B. Weitz, PE, Barton and Logudice

23

24

25

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: The final item on the agenda
2 is Campito Parking Expansion 150 Wade Road. This is an
3 application for concept acceptance. This is a 200-car
4 parking expansion.

5 Mike Tengeler, do you have any introductory
6 comments?

7 MR. TENGELER: Yes, briefly. They went for
8 concept acceptance. This is right up the road at 150
9 Wade Road. This was in for a sketch plan review not
10 too long ago.

11 Peter Campito, the applicant is in the audience
12 and Dan Hershberg is presenting.

13 I'll turn it over to Dan.

14 MR. HERSHBERG: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I'm
15 Daniel Hershberg from the firm of Hershberg and
16 Hershberg.

17 We were here before for sketch plan approval.
18 We have received some comments that might impact us
19 and one was the CDTA. CDTA has bus service on Wade
20 Road and they do stop here. So, our proposal would be
21 to add a pad at this area here (Indicating) for a bus
22 stop for CDTA and this island right here, although
23 it's green, you can't plant on it. It's got a water
24 main on it, so we can't plant on it anyway. So, we
25 may opt to put a sidewalk into the building there so

1 that the pedestrian connectivity to the building is
2 good.

3 We're also adding connectivity from the rear.
4 We're adding sidewalks from the rear to get people
5 from the rear parking lot to the front entrance. It's
6 a plan where we are using porous pavement. There is
7 an existing detention basin here which we have talked
8 to the stormwater office and essentially they're
9 concerned that maybe some of the piping may need to be
10 restored in that, but other than that, from a
11 stormwater standpoint, we did an infiltration test.
12 It was a little shallow to ground water, but we
13 figured out a grading method to keep the clearance
14 from the groundwater clear so that we're okay with
15 regard to the easement and porous pavement and we
16 think that essentially that we actually went beyond
17 the feasibility study. We actually prepared the
18 stormwater management report according to the Town
19 standards that we submitted previously. We think that
20 the stormwater issue goes away.

21 We did talk previously before about beefing up
22 the landscaping in the front when we come back to
23 final. My goal would be to have some landscaping
24 there. We do have some landscaping there. Here is the
25 existing landscaping here (Indicating). We have tried

1 to repeat it here, but we can beef it up a little bit.
2 It sort of matches this piece here (Indicating), but
3 the capability of planting this island isn't there so
4 I think that we would owe you some additional
5 landscaping in the front.

6 MR. LANE: Dan, within the comments that we
7 received, the Conservation Committee had asked that
8 the trees behind the building be maintained.

9 MR. HERSHBERG: The trees behind here - we
10 don't intend to touch them at all. The only thing is
11 that we are adding a sidewalk right along the edge of
12 the pavement. We won't have to cut down any trees
13 there. We may have to trim a couple of limbs while
14 we're working on it, but we do not think that we'll
15 lose any trees with regard to building this new access
16 in the rear. It's right on the edge of the pavement.

17 Up here, there are very few existing trees in
18 here that are impacted. This is used as a ball field.
19 You don't normally plant trees in the middle of a ball
20 field. We're going to plant some trees on the site
21 here on the islands and this detention basin is going
22 to remain. It does require little tender loving care
23 and we'll take care of it.

24 I think that CDTA's comments - we accept a
25 portion of them and we think that we can build a pad

1 there meeting their needs. We might have to grant
2 them an easement because essentially there is very
3 little space on the roadway here. The right of way
4 line and the edge of the pavement are very close
5 together. There is only about six feet from the edge
6 of the pavement to the right of way one. There is not
7 a lot of space in there. We would talk to them about
8 moving the enclosure back in on Peter's property and
9 grant them an easement for CDTA.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Are there any members of the
11 public that are seeking to speak on this project?

12 MR. O'BRIEN: I'm Daniel O'Brien and I'm the
13 neighbor next door and I'm in favor of the project.
14 I've seen it and I've sent a letter. I'm not sure if
15 the letter we received.

16 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I don't know if it's in our
17 packet.

18 Is there anything in particular in the letter
19 or do you want that noted?

20 MR. O'BRIEN: No, it just that I understand
21 what's going on there next door near the big project
22 and I'm all in favor of it. Mr. Campito has been just
23 great neighbor. That's it.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, thank you.

25 Anybody else from the public want to speak?

1 (There was no response.)

2 Okay, it's not a complicated one.

3 The Town Designated Engineer - do you want to
4 give us your comments?

5 MR. WEITZ: My name is Ryan Weitz and I'm with
6 Barton and Loguidice.

7 We issued a concept level review on November
8 20th and I'd like to just review a couple of
9 highlights from that letter that's in the packet.

10 Of course we're very happy to hear that some of
11 the recommendations from CDTA are being considered.
12 That was something that was reflected in our comment
13 letter.

14 Also, that moving forward with first
15 preliminary submittal that any encroachment easement
16 agreements be submitted at that time.

17 We noted during a site visit that there is an
18 existing manhole frame and cover in the proposed area
19 disturbance that's become detached from the structure
20 itself and we just wanted to point that out hoping
21 that would be remedied through the project.

22 We note that in the proposed grading plan it
23 appears that they required four feet clearance between
24 a sole source aquifer, ground water table and the
25 porous pavements upgrade is met. So, we just to be

1 mindful of that moving forward because there is high
2 groundwater. Ultimately, the porous pavement at this
3 level is conservatively sized. There is some good
4 infiltration on the site and it was modeled at about
5 9% of the lowest stabilized infiltration. So, it
6 seems like a good practice to use on-site and those
7 were the primary comments that we had at this level.

8 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can someone talk briefly about
9 the SEQRA? We're not going to vote on SEQRA today,
10 but I think that it's appropriate to get some of that
11 on the record and get us thinking about it.

12 MR. TENGELER: It looks like it's an unlisted
13 action. The short Environmental Assessment Form will
14 be reviewed for this project. There were a couple of
15 comments that I see here on the Barton and Loguidice
16 letter and the comments from the Town, as well. There
17 is nothing major and I'm sure that Dan can comment on
18 that and revise the answer to question 1 on the short
19 Environmental Assessment Form indicating that the
20 proposed action will not only involve the legislative
21 adopted plan level of administration rule -- it's
22 checklist stuff. A brief explanation to question 10.
23 There are a couple of little fill in the blank things
24 that Dan will work on between now and concept.

25 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you have anything to add to

1 that?

2 MR. HERSHBERG: No. We appreciate the letters,
3 but there was nothing that was earth shattering. The
4 only substance was CDTA's comments.

5 The comments about the separation of
6 groundwater was a concern to us originally because we
7 were concerned about that, but we find out that we
8 have enough space by raising the finished grade using
9 the porous pavement to reach the grade. I appreciate
10 the fact that Barton and Loguidice knows that we use a
11 very conservative level of infiltration. That's why
12 the systems work. We try to be as conservative as we
13 can.

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, thank you.

15 Any comments or questions from the Board?

16 (There was no response.)

17 Do we have a motion for concept acceptance?

18 MR. LANE: I'll make a motion.

19 MR. MION: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Any discussion?

21 (There was no response.)

22 All those in favor say aye.

23 (Ayes were recited.)

24 All those opposed say nay.

25 (There were none opposed.)

1 The ayes have it.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. HERSHBERG: Thank you.

4

5 (Whereas the above proceeding was concluded at

6 7:29 p.m.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATION

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

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 _____

