

1 PLANNING BOARD COUNTY OF ALBANY

2 TOWN OF COLONIE

3 *****

4 SOLDIER ON
820 ALBANY SHAKER ROAD
5 APPLICATION FOR PDD REZONING, SEQ
6 DETERMINATION, CONCEPT ACCEPTANCE AND
RECOMMENDATION TO THE TOWN BOARD
ON PDD REZONING

7 *****

8 THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled
9 Public Hearing by NANCY L. STRANG, a Shorthand
10 Reporter, commencing on May 10, 2016 at 7:02 p.m. at
The Public Operations Center, 347 Old Niskayuna Road,
Latham, New York.

11

12 BOARD MEMBERS:
13 PETER STUTO, CHAIRMAN
14 LOU MION
15 KATHLEEN DALTON
16 TIMOTHY LANE
17 SUSAN MILSTEIN
18 CRAIG SHAMLIAN

16

17 ALSO PRESENT:

18 Michael C. Magguilli, Esq. Town Attorney and Counsel to
19 the Planning Board
20 Joseph LaCivita, Planning and Economic Development
Department
21 Mary Beth Bianconi, PE, Delaware Engineering
22 Chuck Voss, PE, Barton & Loguidice
Starlyn D'Angelo, Executive Director, Shaker Historical
Society
Patrick Quinn

23 Sudhir Kulkarni, Conservation Advisory Council

24

25

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Good evening everybody. We're
2 going to try to get started here.

3 Welcome to the Town of Colonie Planning Board.
4 We have several items on the agenda; six to be exact.

5 The last meeting went to 11:30 and I'll say it
6 just for the purpose of being open and to talk to our
7 Board about it. I received a couple of
8 comments/suggestions/criticisms about the meeting in
9 terms of people who were on the last item had to wait
10 through a lot of discussion. We try to do the best
11 that we can. I think that the philosophy of the Board
12 has been to let everyone say their piece. The
13 suggestion was that some of the comments were
14 repetitive and so forth. So, we're going still let
15 everybody say what they have to say. We're going to
16 try to move along crisply but we're going to try to be
17 efficient, as well. We don't want to have time
18 restrictions. The way that we have done it in the
19 past when there was really large meetings is we
20 restrict it to three or four minutes and if you didn't
21 complete what you had to say, you had to let the next
22 person go but then you could go to the back of the
23 line and still get to say what you had to say. If we
24 have to do something like that, I guess the Board can
25 vote on that or we can talk about it. I wanted to

1 mention that and let the Board know that I did receive
2 those comments.

3 Did anyone else on the Board receive any
4 comments?

5 MS. DALTON: As long as you brought it up, the
6 one that I want to put on the record is -
7 unfortunately, there was a lot of commentary about
8 generic Planning Board issues and generic development
9 issues that were not specifically related to the
10 applicant who was in front of us. I'm not sure how to
11 guess in advance who wants to speak about the agenda
12 versus who wants to speak about the particular
13 application, but to be respectful to the applicant, we
14 really ought to keep talking about that particular
15 application and find a way to get input. We did
16 recommend that people go to the Town Board and I guess
17 that they did afterwards. This really wasn't the
18 appropriate forum for some of those comments. I think
19 that we need to be mindful of that, once we became
20 aware that was going on.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: My personal feeling is that
22 there is an appropriate forum for everything. We do
23 want to get the information and so forth. We'll do
24 the best that we can and direct the people where that
25 should be. I guess that might be enough said.

1 Does anybody else want to say anything?

2 MR. LACIVITA: Peter, if I may, I think that
3 we've heard at this Planning Board level for many
4 months now - and I know that the Supervisor and Mr.
5 Magguilli has heard as well the one resonating issue
6 and that's about the Colonie Trees. That did take a
7 lot of time at the past couple of meetings and I think
8 that it speaks to what Kathy just mentioned. I think
9 that we struggled with processes of the past and what
10 we do currently and how we have been adhering to a lot
11 of the regulations that have been addressed to us. I
12 think that part of that issue as well is both Peter,
13 you and I, Joe Grasso and Chuck Voss have been talking
14 consistently about what level of training that we
15 could bring forth to the CAC, the Conservation
16 Advisory Committee, as well as this Planning Board as
17 to the issues of the environment and how we develop
18 within that environment and how we make sustainability
19 going forward.

20 With that I know that we developed a training
21 component for Tuesday the 28th between 7:00 and 8:30.
22 It will be right here and we'll be having a meeting
23 collectively with the Conservation Advisory Council as
24 well as the Planning Board and we're going to be
25 speaking specifically to effectively incorporating

1 treed environments into the Colonie planning process.
2 So, we're going to be looking at working with both
3 Town Designated Engineers. Joe Grass, Chuck Voss and I
4 will be doing the presentation along with some
5 information from our own Planning Department as to
6 what has gone forward and we'll be getting some
7 information as well from SUNY Cobleskill - the
8 forestry department there, as well.

9 So, whoever is interested on Tuesday the 28th,
10 again, it's 7:00 to 8:30 and there will be a
11 presentation on effectively incorporating treed
12 environments into Colonie's planning process and that
13 answers the question of the concern about the Colonie
14 Trees.

15 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I think that we take the
16 issues seriously. One of the gentleman handed me
17 this; Your Brain on Nature. It was from Professor
18 Quinn. I'm going to read it. We take it seriously.
19 We may not agree on every point. We're going to go
20 through training so that we understand our roles even
21 better. We think that we understand them but we think
22 that we know everything. We're going to have training
23 and the public is welcome to listen at that meeting,
24 right, Joe?

25 MR. LACIVITA: Absolutely.

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, we'll post a formal notice
2 on that.

3 Do you have any other business before we call
4 up the agenda?

5 MR. LACIVITA: Nothing at this time, Peter. I
6 know that it is a long agenda so we can get right into
7 it.

8 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Our counsel, Kathleen
9 Marinelli, is sick so we have Mike Magguilli filling
10 in for her - the Town Attorney.

11 Thank you, Mike.

12 The first item on the agenda is Soldier On
13 planned district development, 820 Albany Shaker Road,
14 also known as 25 Meeting House Road. This is an
15 application for planned district development rezoning,
16 environmental review determination, concept acceptance
17 and recommendation to the Town Board on PDD rezoning.

18 Unless you have preliminary comments, Joe?

19 MR. LACIVITA: No. Again, we're going to get
20 right into it. I know that Mike is here as well as
21 Mary Beth, so we can get right into the presentation.

22 MS. BIANCONI: Good evening, everyone. My name
23 is Mary Beth Bianconi and I'm with Delaware
24 Engineering and we are assisting Albany County with a
25 planned development district for the Solider On site

1 which is adjacent to the former Ann Lee Nursing Home
2 over by the airport.

3 We have been here once before and we are here
4 again. In the time between, we received some comments
5 from the Board as well as from a number of other
6 interested parties and the Town Designated Engineer.
7 I'm going to make this very quick.

8 The comments were real long.

9 A number of comments had to do with things that
10 will be details during the site plan process. Right
11 now this process is a little bit sequenced because the
12 County owns the land. The County is the only one that
13 can request the zoning change. The County also needs
14 to execute a lease from Soldier On and that's a SEQR
15 action by the County. So, we've had two things that
16 have been advancing on parallel tracks. The planned
17 development district here with the Town, with the
18 applicant being Albany County and then an action that
19 the Albany County Legislature is taking to execute a
20 lease with Soldier On for the site. Once the lease is
21 executed, then Solider On will proceed with site plan
22 and all of the things that you would normally do
23 through your process.

24 There were a number of comments that had to do
25 with things that will be developed and worked on

1 during the site plan. They included things like, they
2 are in the airport area GEIS, details about flood
3 elevations, drainage, sidewalk details and connections
4 to the Ann Lee Pond which are certainly planned by
5 paths. Soundproofing, dumpster enclosures and details
6 about architectural treatments, utilities in terms of
7 how water and sewer hook-ups will be done - meets and
8 bounds and those kinds of things. SHPPO sign-off
9 which is the State Historic Preservation Office,
10 coordinated with the FAA and the Albany Airport
11 Authority, details again regarding utility
12 connections, locations of hydrants, landscaping plans,
13 pedestrian movements on the site facilitated by
14 cross-walks, setbacks, topographic surveys, additional
15 land uses, visual features and those kinds of things
16 that will all be site plan elements.

17 There were two things that were brought up in
18 all of the comments that I thought that we should
19 address this evening. One is that there was a
20 question from the Town Designated Engineer regarding
21 the historic entrance to the Shaker Site. There was a
22 comment in the narrative regarding some of the site
23 plan elements. The other one had to do with parking
24 and the number of parking spaces.

25 Very quickly, the historic entrance to the

1 site. This structure is the trustee's house. The
2 trustee's office -- this is one of the Shaker
3 structures. This is the existing meeting house. So,
4 if you've been on-site you've probably parked here and
5 come into the meeting house on the Shaker site.

6 Historically, visitors to the Shaker site would
7 have traversed this pathway of road and they would
8 have presented themselves to the trustee's office for
9 consideration for doing business or whatever their
10 business was. If you were not a member of the
11 community, you were not allowed inside the gates. The
12 gates are actually located here. They exist on the
13 site right now. There is a proposal - the Shaker
14 Historical Society Master Plan includes things like
15 signage to reestablish this historic entrance. So,
16 all we are really suggesting in the site plan is that
17 you would aid in that master planning because we need
18 to do pedestrian connections. We need parking and all
19 of those kinds of things. So, that is really the
20 comment about reestablishing a historic entrance.
21 There really isn't anything added as a site plan
22 feature. It's more about connections, pedestrian
23 connections, parking, signage and those kinds of
24 things. Again, all of those details will be covered
25 in site plan.

1 The other issue that has been brought up is
2 regarding parking on this site. Right now there are
3 approximately 122 parking spaces on the site. I say
4 approximately because a number of areas that are paved
5 - kind of paved, because they haven't been maintained
6 - were certainly used for parking historically. They
7 are not striped and they wouldn't be up to any kind of
8 standard that we would consider a modern parking
9 standard. The site plan as it's shown is concept
10 plan. The idea was essentially to reestablish parking
11 in the areas that were formally parking. Also, to
12 conduct shared parking with the Shaker site to
13 maximize that use.

14 In recognition of the fact that many of the
15 residents here don't own cars and do not drive, they
16 will get around via shuttle service -- we did not
17 propose -- the zoning for the site requires 234
18 parking spaces. We did not propose that many parking
19 spaces.

20 Shown on this concept plan is 184 parking
21 spaces. The last time that we were here we talked
22 about potentially banking some parking spaces. The
23 concept of banking is that we would plan for those
24 spaces but we wouldn't construct them initially. They
25 would be constructed if they were needed, based on the

1 demands of the site.

2 So, what we have suggested in this plan - this
3 is the same plan that you've seen before. The only
4 thing that we've done is we've added yellow to these
5 parking areas. This is very close to the airport
6 entrance which is up here where the north arrow is
7 (Indicating). We have suggested that those spaces
8 would be banked. They wouldn't be constructed
9 initially. The breakdown would be - we have 184
10 spaces on the site. We are proposing to build 128 of
11 those spaces which would be here (Indicating) and a
12 small space here. We would bank 56 which would be up
13 in this area (Indicating) and this would also retain
14 all 10 handicapped parking spaces that were shown on
15 the plan. That is certainly more spaces than would be
16 normally required under the zoning but given the land
17 use, we thought that was appropriate.

18 Something else to note - when you look through
19 your packet you see that Creighton Manning did an
20 estimate of trips for us from the site. In order to
21 do that, they worked with Solider On to develop a
22 number of vehicles that could be on the site. If
23 every vehicle was on the site all at the same time,
24 which is highly unlikely because that includes three
25 shuttles, shift workers and a whole bunch of delivery

1 people, you'd have 77 vehicles. So, if for some
2 strange reason that they were all on the site at the
3 same time and they all parked there, you'd still have
4 51 parking spaces that would not be used. So, I think
5 that there was a suggestion that the idea of banked
6 parking should be addressed. That was our suggestion
7 but we will leave it to your discussion. That is the
8 end of my presentation.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Did we get that concept plan?
10 I have a different plan.

11 MS. BIANCONI: This is the same concept plan.
12 The only thing that we did was paint this yellow and
13 add the math and I can certainly send this to you.

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay. I just wanted to
15 clarify that.

16 MS. BIANCONI: It's the same plan that you
17 have. All we did was highlight these areas so that
18 you can get the illustration so that you could see
19 where we were talking about.

20 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I remember a discussion about
21 the parking in that corner. Weren't we saying that we
22 would put the road more on the outer perimeter or add
23 a greenspace toward the main road then the banked
24 parking. I thought that's what we discussed at the
25 last meeting.

1 MS. BIANCONI: That can absolutely be done.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: What do you think is the
3 better design. I thought that's what we had
4 discussed.

5 MS. DALTON: I thought that it was with regard
6 to the line of sight and view - where you were going
7 to put the road in relation to the view of the
8 historic site.

9 MS. BIANCONI: Right now this pattern of
10 pavement follows more or less the existing developed
11 area on the site. We just mirrored it for now, since
12 this is a concept plan.

13 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I understand that but we
14 talked about it.

15 MS. BIANCONI: In terms of the visual, the
16 intersection - this is the same plan, just on our
17 fuzzy aerial. This is where the airport interchange
18 it - where the lights are. One of the concerns that
19 the Shaker Society has had is the line of site through
20 these trees, through this building which is an
21 existing garage done by Albany County and it was
22 constructed in the late 1920's or early 1930's. It's
23 a block, single story building. It's delightful. One
24 of the idea here is that there may be an opportunity
25 to actually remove that structure from the site and do

1 some work with this treed area up here. We'd still
2 keep it landscaped but to create a better line of
3 sight because as it stands today, if you were at this
4 intersection, you really can't see into the site. You
5 can't see that the Shaker buildings are there and
6 that's something that's important to them. It had
7 less to do with the parking and more to do with this
8 line of sight coming across through this building to
9 the meeting house.

10 Obviously this parking can be reconfigured.
11 The road can be reconfigured. As I said we followed
12 the existing pattern of development on the site.

13 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Right, but I think that we
14 brought it up last meeting and I thought that you
15 agreed to address that comment.

16 MS. BIANCONI: I apologize.

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Maybe I dreamed it. I don't
18 know.

19 Okay, we're going to take comment from our Town
20 Designated Engineer. We'll also take comments from
21 the public. If the public is interested in speaking
22 on this project, I would ask that they sign in on the
23 sign-in sheet to your left on that table. We're going
24 to hear from our Town Designated Engineer, Chuck Voss
25 from Barton and Loguidice.

1 Can you give us your comments?

2 MR. VOSS: Sure, Peter; thank you.

3 The Board should have in their packets our
4 letter dated May 5th which is our concept review
5 letter. It pretty much follows our typical concept
6 reviews for initial projects of this nature. I'll
7 just summarize some of the key points.

8 Mary Beth did key in on a couple of different
9 things in her presentation but I'll just touch on a
10 few others.

11 In general, the project, as you can see, is in
12 conformance with the zoning of that particular area.
13 It's located in the COR district which allows these
14 types of uses. However, the PDD is probably the
15 better way to go to allow more flexibility for the
16 site to be developed overall comprehensively which I
17 think is the way that the applicant is proposing
18 certainly.

19 Access to the site is certainly now through
20 existing entryways. They will be improved, as
21 proposed. We don't see any significant change in
22 internal or external circulation patterns here caused
23 by this concept rendering so we are comfortable with
24 this initial concept in terms of the access to the
25 site. The majority of the residents as Mary Beth

1 pointed out will be residents who do not own vehicles,
2 according to the applicant. The potential traffic
3 impacts are, for a project of this nature, we feel are
4 actually insignificant, given the density of the
5 population that will be in these buildings. Had they
6 all had their own vehicles to drive, you would have
7 expected far more vehicle trips per day going in and
8 out of the site but because of the nature of the
9 residence and the nature of how this project will be
10 operated, we don't see traffic here as a significant
11 issue. Certainly the access roads in and around the
12 site are sufficient capacity to be able to handle what
13 we are seeing.

14 The site will be obviously served by Town sewer
15 and water which will require some upgrades and some
16 improvements to connections. There will be some right
17 of ways that will need to be created. There will be
18 some additional points to make sure that we have
19 proper looping of systems and things like that.

20 Stormwater management will probably a little
21 trickier to deal with in this area. It's a very flat
22 area. Depth of ground water is very shallow. There
23 are flood zones that traverse through here. There is
24 obviously a federal wetlands or state wetlands in this
25 area. So, that will be a little tricky in configuring

1 that and working that out.

2 Some of our initial comments were looking at
3 the two new buildings; building A and building B.
4 They probably will have to be raised in elevation to
5 get up and out of some of the potential flood plain
6 areas, but we don't think that those are
7 insurmountable, given the potential to kind of create
8 some new structures in that area.

9 Overall, the site design we think is going to
10 be pretty compatible with the existing building. We
11 haven't seen a whole lot of elevational issues yet.
12 Those will certainly come further on in the planning
13 process. We're glad to see that the Shaker Heritage
14 Society is very involved obviously on this site. The
15 site will have potential impacts on their existing
16 site. So, the applicant is working with them very
17 closely and I think that's extremely positive.

18 At this point, we're not seeing any major areas
19 of concern for the concept as proposed.

20 CHAIRMAN STUTO: We have a couple of people who
21 want to comment on this.

22 Star D'Angelo, did you want to speak on this?

23 MS. D'ANGELO: I'm Starlyn D'Angelo and I'm the
24 Executive Director of the Shaker Heritage Society and
25 before I make my comments I just wanted to correct

1 you, Mary Beth. I think that you may have confused
2 the 1920's Shaker garage with the concrete garage.
3 That's what they were talking about moving; not the
4 Shaker garage.

5 MS. BIANCONI: Correct; definitely not the
6 Shaker garage.

7 MS. D'ANGELO: We're not talking about moving
8 any of the Shaker buildings on the site. We are
9 concerned about that sight line from D'Alessandro
10 Boulevard.

11 I have to commend Solider On because they have
12 used our preexisting site master plan. It was an
13 award winning master plan that we developed in 2006.
14 That has been the foundation for the preliminary
15 planning that has been done for this project. So, I
16 think that was a really good resource for this
17 project. They have carefully considered all of the
18 components of that existing plan.

19 We are very much in support of the Solider On
20 project. It may seem incompatible to have a bunch of
21 veterans living at a Shaker site, but as a friend of
22 mine who is a West Point graduate told me, nobody
23 knows the value of passivism as much as a veteran. I
24 do believe that. I do think that brining back a
25 residential use of the property is a positive thing.

1 We're very excited about programmatic opportunities to
2 work with the vets in a wide variety of ways.

3 We have some concerns about the site plan but
4 we know that we'll be able to work closely with
5 Solider On to work out any potential problems. We're
6 working with a lot of different issues from
7 environmental issues to historical. We want to make
8 sure that this is the best project that it can be and
9 that we reduce the potential impacts on the historic
10 site as much as possible. We do think that is
11 certainly possible. We have worked very closely with
12 Soldier On and we are certain in support of the PDD
13 designation for the property.

14 I think that's it.

15 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.

16 Patrick Quinn.

17 MR. QUINN: Mr. Chairman, first of all I'd like
18 to say that I know this site very well. I'm very
19 impressed by how the director and the various curators
20 have maintained it. It is beautiful. It's a tribute
21 to the area. I am also deeply impressed by the fact
22 that it's a Solider On project. This is a wonderful
23 project. The renovation of Ann Lee Home to house
24 these veterans is superb.

25 However, I would also like to ask that it be

1 written into the record a letter that I wrote today to
2 Supervisor Paula Mahan and Town Counsel Michael
3 Magguilli which is as follows:

4 Dear Mrs. Mahan and Mr. Magguilli: Almost a
5 year ago I raised the issue of clear-cutting at
6 Aviation Road and introduced the Planning Board to the
7 research of Dr. Eva Selhub and Alan Logan in the book
8 Your Brain on Nature, a copy of which I gave to you.
9 I had to find it because it's out of print for the
10 last year.

11 Mr. Stuto and other expressed both concern and
12 interest. Before the devastating clear-cut on Maxwell
13 Road, I raised the issue about that development. In
14 each case, the Board determined that it was too late
15 and that the developers had already spent a long
16 amount of time in planning, design, etcetera. In my
17 mind, this was specious to say the least. When the
18 Save our Trees group and I met with Ms. Mahan, Mr.
19 LaCivita and Mr. Magguilli, Susan Webber of the Save
20 our Trees group pointed out a Town legal provision
21 against want and destruction of trees. All agreed to
22 adhere to the law.

23 I have the satellite photos of existing site
24 conditions to be shown at the initial hearing for
25 future development proposals and it was agreed.

1 At a recent Planning Board meeting Mr. LaCivita
2 denied any memory of such a decision. Mr. Stuto and
3 Mr. Magguilli were silent about it, I regret to say.

4 Last week, for example, on Bloomingrove Road in
5 Rensselaer County I was appalled to see another case
6 of extensive clear-cutting of mature trees. It seems
7 that the reason has an epidemic of large scale
8 clear-cutting. My concern is not a question of
9 aesthetics, nor is it a concern for property values.
10 My concern began 50 years ago when I studied with Ian
11 McHarg, author of the revolutionary book, Design with
12 Nature. His were practical and environmental
13 proposals beyond Rachel Carson's The Silent Spring.
14 When I taught for 12 years at UC Berkley's College of
15 Environmental Design and noted how American concern
16 for the land and it's ecology was becoming an example
17 to the world, I was most encouraged. Since then, the
18 German and the Japanese and the Indians - they have
19 done much further research on the importance of
20 natural plant material to the physical and mental
21 health of urban and suburban communities.

22 At a recent international conference in Dublin,
23 Ireland, scientists and planners described even more
24 explicit reasons why trees are so essential to our
25 physical and mental well-being.

1 The Colonie Planning Department, however,
2 appears to have decided that ignorance is bliss. The
3 previous Town administration preserved woodlands in a
4 beautiful new park, the Crossings, whereas now the
5 Town policy appears to be the opposite, allowing the
6 destruction of adjacent woods - the woods at the
7 Cicciotti Center. When E.F. Schumacher, author of
8 Small is Beautiful addressed the New York State
9 Legislature 40 years ago, he told how devastated he
10 was at the environmental tragedy of clear-cutting
11 forests in Australia and elsewhere. Presumably he
12 thought that we New Yorkers were more practical minded
13 about such issues. He was obviously wrong. It is not
14 just our property values and the aesthetic beauty of
15 Colonie that is being sacrificed, it is community,
16 family and individual health. It is clear to me from
17 all the research that every time that we continue
18 clear cutting rather than maintaining an environmental
19 balance between building and natural context, we are
20 exponentially increasing the cost of future healthcare
21 for our children, our grandchildren and their
22 descendants for generations to come.

23 Three proposals before tonight's Planning Board
24 involve further potential tragedy. On Spring Street
25 Road a company wants to destroy an in-tact woodland

1 next to a hazardous waste dump. The most blatant of
2 tonight's new submission would remove many ancient and
3 majestic trees, some over 120 years old. I've
4 measured and some are 144 years old with diameters of
5 over four and five feet. While it's a wonderful thing
6 to conserve the Ann Lee Home through renovation for
7 the soldiers' project, it would make sense to replan
8 the proposed additions so as to avoid destroying
9 beautiful park land the Board should reject the
10 proposed additions as planned and insist on replanning
11 to ensure the retention of those majestic trees.

12 I just read today that the latest national
13 Catholic Reporter says that Pope Francis placed 30
14 trees among "an obligaty and the duty to care for
15 creation through little daily actions."

16 You are transforming deserts into forests, he
17 said, of efforts to make modern cities more fit for
18 human life.

19 In Colonie, alas, we want to turn forests into
20 urban desserts. It is time for the Town to get some
21 responsible expertise in environmental design,
22 planning and landscape architecture.

23 Sincerely yours, Patrick Quinn.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.

25 Sudhir Kulkami?

1 MR. KULKARNI: My name is Sudir Kulkarni. I am
2 a member of CAC which stands for the Conservation
3 Advisory Council. These are our comments on the
4 Solider On project.

5 Landscaping should be submitted. CAC
6 recommends leaving the trees bordering Albany Shaker
7 Road and the trees in the new southeast corner of the
8 new construction.

9 These are our comments. Thank you for giving
10 us the opportunity to speak.

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: You're welcome. Thank you for
12 coming.

13 Can we have a little discussion, Chuck, with
14 the applicant about the CAC comments and whether there
15 are significant trees worth saving in the build area?

16 MR. VOSS: Certainly. The information provided
17 by the applicant at the concept level did not include
18 a tree inventory of the site. We don't have a
19 substantial amount of information as to what is out
20 there and what is existing, what condition it's in,
21 how old it is. It's certainly something that the
22 Board can ask for and look for in a future submission.
23 It may be helpful to understand what is on the site.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Is the applicant agreeable to
25 that?

1 MS. BIANCONI: Absolutely.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, so we're asking for it.

3 MS. D'ANGELO: We have that in our site master
4 plan.

5 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, if you could share that
6 with them and they'll incorporate that into the
7 report. So, we are only at concept. We'll have time
8 to address that issue.

9 Does the Board have any questions or comments?

10 MR. LANE: Do the trees in Mr. Kulkarni's
11 submission - are they trees that maybe you have looked
12 at?

13 MS. BIANCONI: So the general conditions on the
14 site -- where the Ann Lee Home is, moving to the
15 south, there is a good distance where the grade is
16 continued and then it very slowly slopes down four to
17 eight feet - somewhere about where this road is shown
18 traversing the site. It extends a distance because it
19 was intended not to be a steep slope. There are trees
20 in this area. This area is also a flood plain. By
21 and large, there is also a wetland in the lower
22 portion of the site. So, there are some trees in this
23 area. A tree inventory was not conducted, as was
24 stated, because this was for a zoning change as
25 opposed to site planning. I believe that the trees

1 that were being discussed are perhaps in this general
2 vicinity?

3 MR. LACIVITA: No, it was D'Alessandro
4 Boulevard as well.

5 MS. BIANCONI: There was no plan to do anything
6 with that portion of the site. You can see them in
7 this drawing and unfortunately the drawing is fuzzy
8 because it's so close to the airport and they make
9 those drawings -- the photography blurry. There are
10 trees on the site. There was no intent to do anything
11 with trees here. As the Town Designated Engineer
12 pointed out that stormwater is going to be a challenge
13 on the site and it is. The regulations for something
14 like this project are going to require that stormwater
15 treatment is occurring as close to the first
16 generation as possible. So, that is going to involve
17 a lot of green infrastructure, whenever there is
18 development, whenever there is impervious - that's
19 going to aid in that. There is no intent to clear-cut
20 this site. However, developing a site that has
21 existing trees on it is challenging to preserve trees
22 in all locations. I would say that as the site plan
23 advances and as the engineer has suggested, a tree
24 inventory would be conducted working with the existing
25 inventory that is there, determine how this can work.

1 One of the ideas here is that these would be green
2 courtyards and part of the stormwater treatment but
3 also could certainly include trees without question.
4 It could include trees and raingardens and those types
5 of things. So, there is a lot of opportunity on this
6 site to preserve the mature trees that are there and
7 also to integrate new trees and new plantings.

8 MR. KULKARNI: Which one is Albany Shaker Road?
9 We are recommending also bordering Albany Shaker Road.
10 Keep the trees -

11 MS. BIANCONI: This is what I think that you
12 are thinking of is Albany Shaker Road (Indicating) and
13 this is the existing tree line and this is an existing
14 paved road. Nothing would be touched there.

15 MR. SHAMLIAN: So just to clarify, as the plan
16 exists today, you're already incorporating the CAC's
17 comments, essentially.

18 MS. BIANCONI: Yes. I just want to be very
19 honest. There are trees in this area.

20 MR. SHAMLIAN: They were specifically the
21 southeast corner.

22 MS. BIANCONI: That's right.

23 CHAIRMAN STUTO: But the central area, we'll
24 see what we can do in terms of saving -

25 MS. BIANCONI: Exactly.

1 MR. KULKARNI: And in terms of the landscaping?

2 MS. BIANCONI: Again, that's a site planning
3 detail that will certainly be incorporated in future
4 submissions without question.

5 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Any other comments or
6 questions from the Board?

7 (There was no response.)

8 Okay, the next step is to walk us through the
9 environmental review.

10 Chuck, can you help us with that?

11 MR. VOSS: Sure. The Board should have in
12 their packets Part I and Part II and Part III of the
13 long Environmental Assessment Form. We have submitted
14 all three and they were looked at and reviewed by the
15 Town Attorney's office. I can walk you through the
16 notice of determination of no significance to the
17 environment, which is the long form.

18 Part III is the negative declaration. The
19 first half basically is the cover sheet, which talks
20 about the project itself. We then go into the impacts
21 of the land on page 2. The synopsis of that is that
22 based on the above, it appears that the project will
23 not have an impact on the environment related to land
24 resources. We then looked at impact on water
25 resources and through that narrative we can say that

1 based on the above it appears that the project will
2 not have a significant impact on the environment
3 related to water resources.

4 We then looked at impact on air and again,
5 through analysis, we concluded that the project will
6 not have significant impact on the environment related
7 to air quality.

8 We then looked at impacts on transportation
9 based on what we know. Again, based on the above, it
10 appears that the project will not have a significant
11 impact on the environment related to transportation.

12 We then looked at the impact on aesthetic
13 resources. Again, through that analysis, we concluded
14 that based on the above, it appears that the project
15 will not have a significant impact on the environment
16 related to aesthetic resources.

17 We then looked at impact on archeological and
18 historical resources. Again, based on the analysis
19 and the fact that the applicant is working very
20 closely with the Shaker Heritage Society, we conclude
21 that based on the above it appears that the project
22 will not have a significant impact on the environment
23 related to archeological and historical resources.

24 We then looked at impact on plants and animals.
25 Again we concluded that based on the above that it

1 appears that the project will not have a significant
2 impact on plants and animals.

3 We then looked at impact on growth, character
4 and health of the community of the neighborhood.
5 Again, through that analysis we concluded that based
6 on the above it appears that the project will not have
7 a significant impact on the growth, character and
8 health of community of neighborhood.

9 We then looked at impacts on energy. Again,
10 based on the analysis, we concluded that based on the
11 above that it appears that the project will not have a
12 significant impact on energy.

13 Finally, we looked at impact on noise and odors
14 and again through the analysis, we concluded that
15 based on the above, it appears that the project will
16 not have a significant impact on noise and odor.

17 Therefore, the conclusion is that the Town of
18 Colonie Planning Board has completed a careful review
19 of the reasonably and anticipated areas of
20 environmental concern raised by the project. Based
21 upon that review, the criteria for determining
22 significance contained in the SEQR regulations and the
23 rule of reasonableness the Planning Board issues this
24 negative declaration concluding that the facts and the
25 circumstances of this project will not result in a

1 significant adverse environmental impact. Therefore
2 and environmental impact statement will not be
3 required.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do we have any discussion on
5 that or any questions?

6 (There was no response.)

7 Do we have a motion on that negative
8 declaration?

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

10 MS. DALTON: I'll second it.

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Any discussion?

12 (There was no response.)

13 All those in favor say aye.

14 (Ayes were recited.)

15 All those opposed say nay.

16 (The ayes have it.)

17 MR. LACIVITA: Peter, I have the recommended
18 findings.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay.

20 MR. LACIVITA: This is the recommendation of
21 the required findings that we do in the PEDD. That is
22 in the Land Use Law where the applicant has to address
23 the PEDD legislation first on intent objective and we
24 are required in 190.70 to do the findings. This
25 information had been provided to you through the

1 course of the review. I don't know if you want me to
2 go through the entire findings statement.

3 CHAIRMAN STUTO: The findings, we should
4 probably go through the findings.

5 MR. LACIVITA: They each address A through I in
6 190-70. I'll read it from the Land Use Law and
7 address how the project -

8 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Why don't you read the
9 Resolution.

10 MR. LACIVITA: We'll ask the Stenographer to
11 include the entire Resolution in the minutes.

12 Now therefore, be it resolved that The Planning
13 Board recommends that the rezoning request under
14 Resolution 399 for 2015 be approved based upon the
15 following findings of fact:

16 A. The rezoning of the parcel from CO to PDD
17 achieves of Colonie's zoning and planning documents
18 through creative planning and design. The unique
19 nature of the Soldier On project as well as
20 redevelopment opportunity at the former Ann Lee
21 Nursing Home site are appropriate for the flexible
22 approach to land use planning afforded by the
23 application of a PDD. Whereby the Soldier On PDD
24 enables a customized framework that recognizes the
25 unique environmental, physical and cultural resources

1 of the former Ann Lee Nursing Home, the context of
2 which is the Watervliet Shaker Historic District
3 within the Albany County Nature and Historic Preserve.

4 B. The Soldier On PDD is located adjacent to an
5 important cluster of historic Shaker buildings,
6 including the Shaker Meeting House, which houses a
7 museum, gift shop and event space. Renovation of the
8 Ann Lee Home will preserve and maintain the existing
9 architectural features of the structure. New
10 buildings associated with the Soldier On project are
11 intended to meet the same characteristics.

12 C. The Solider On PDD is intended to have
13 positive effects on aesthetic and historical
14 resources, agricultural, open space and recreation,
15 human health and community character while advancing
16 the objectives of the Town Comprehensive Plan. The
17 existing Ann Lee Home is underutilized and has lost
18 aesthetic appeal due to lack of active use. The
19 adaptive reuse of the structure and construction of
20 the new complimentary structures will significantly
21 improve the aesthetic appeal of the site.

22 The Soldier On PDD will provide housing and
23 support services for homeless veterans, a residential
24 population for which there are currently no
25 specialized housing opportunities in the Town

1 regardless of tenure, type of size. The Soldier On
2 PDD creates a housing option for homeless veterans
3 together with vita, customized support services which
4 are in essence the community facilities that veteran
5 residents require. In these ways, the Soldier On PDD
6 is a long-term asset to the community and enhances the
7 livability of the Town of Colonie and provides
8 economic vitality to the currently vacant Ann Lee
9 Home.

10 E. The Soldier On PDD features 55,000 square
11 feet of open space within the design and an addition
12 of 31,000 square feet of new greenspace due to removal
13 of existing asphalt areas. In addition, the Soldier
14 On PDD design enhances the pedestrian connection to
15 the Ann Lee Pond Nature and Historic Preserve by
16 increasing parking available to access the Ann Lee
17 Pond Trail, by preserving the existing footpath that
18 directs visitors from the Shaker Meeting House site to
19 the preserve trail system, and through elimination of
20 vehicular traffic from the north/south section of
21 Meeting House Road adjacent to the existing footpath,
22 creating a more pedestrian friendly environment.

23 F. The Soldier On PDD features 55,000 square
24 feet of open, 31,000 square feet of new greenspace and
25 is located within an Albany County owned property

1 covering some 39.8 acres and bordered to the west by
2 properties also owned by Albany County encompassing
3 some 55 acres of land that houses various County
4 functions including the current County Nursing Home
5 and to the south the Ann Lee Pond Historic and Nature
6 Preserve encompassing some 175 acres. Given the
7 location and surround land ownership and uses, open
8 space resources are protected.

9 G. The need for housing for homeless veterans
10 in Albany County and the region has been identified as
11 a significant need. However, the population of
12 homeless veterans represents a unique housing and
13 services challenge. Through experience, Soldier On
14 has demonstrated that the most effective means to
15 provide needed housing and customized services is
16 through operation of facilities and designed and
17 operated specifically for homeless veterans. Thus,
18 Soldier On PDD is specifically focused on meeting
19 local and area wide needs.

20 H. The Solider On PDD is specifically designed
21 to provide custom housing and support services to
22 homeless veterans. The demand for utilities from the
23 Soldier On PDD is minimal. The demand of the Soldier
24 On project for water and sewer services represents
25 less than one percent of the volumes of the Town's

1 utility systems which are more than adequate to
2 support these demands. A conservative analysis of
3 the potential trip generation for the project
4 indicated that PM peak hour trips could be 29. Given
5 that most residents of the Soldier On project will not
6 have vehicles, the majority of trips to and from the
7 site are workers. Residents will travel to and from
8 the site via shuttle vans typically outside peak
9 commuter travel periods on the adjacent roadway
10 network. Traffic generated by the Soldier On PDD will
11 not have an adverse impact on the adjoining
12 transportation system.

13 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do we have a motion on that
14 Resolution?

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

16 MR. MION: Second.

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Any discussion?

18 (There was no response.)

19 All those in favor say aye.

20 (Ayes were recited.)

21 All those opposed say nay.

22 (The ayes have it.)

23 We're also looking for concept acceptance, is
24 that right?

25 MR. LACIVITA: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: On the question of concept
2 acceptance, do we have a motion?

3 MR. LANE: Motion.

4 MS. DALTON: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Any discussion?

6 (There was no response.)

7 All those in favor say aye.

8 (Ayes were recited.)

9 All those opposed say nay.

10 (The ayes have it.)

11 Thank you.

12

13 (Whereas the above entitled proceeding was
14 concluded at 7:38 p.m.)

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 L. STRANG, 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 L. STRANG

Dated _____

