

1 PLANNING BOARD COUNTY OF ALBANY

2 TOWN OF COLONIE

3 *****

4 CASALE EQUIPMENT *****

5 THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled
6 Public Hearing by NANCY L. STRANG, a Shorthand
7 Reporter, commencing on July 12, 2016 at 7:02 p.m. at
The Public Operations Center, 347 Old Niskayuna Road,
Latham, New York.

8

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

17 ALSO PRESENT:

18

19 Kathleen Marinelli, Esq. Counsel to the Planning Board
20 Joseph LaCivita, Planning and Economic Development
21 Department
22 Scott Lansing, PE, Lansing Engineering
23 Tony Casale
24 Joseph Grasso, PE, CHA
25

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Good evening, everyone.

2 Welcome to the Town of Colonie Planning Board.

3 If you have an agenda, you can see that there
4 are two items on it. Casale Equipment will be the
5 first item which is a sketch plan.

6 The agenda says 7:00, Planning Board and
7 Conservation Advisory Committee Education Session.
8 So, that's two Boards; our Board and the Conservation
9 Advisory Committee. My understanding is that the
10 Conservation Advisory Committee has on their schedule
11 7:30. So, depending on when this finishes, we may
12 have a couple of minutes in between. We'll proceed on
13 that basis.

14 With respect to the education session, the
15 public is welcome to attend and join in and I'm told
16 that there is going to be a question and answer
17 session for the public at the end.

18 I also heard from the instructors that there is
19 going to be surprise questions to the Planning Board
20 Members and to the CAC Members in the middle of the
21 presentation with the slides. Be prepared for that.
22 There are no wrong answers.

23 We will call up the first item on the agenda;
24 Casale Equipment Rental, 340 New Karner Road, sketch
25 plan review, one-story 8,000 square foot office

1 showroom and garage presented by Lansing Engineering.

2 I will ask Joe LaCivita if he has any
3 introductory remarks before they get started.

4 MR. LACIVITA: As typical, Peter, we bring
5 projects before the Planning Board for sketch plan
6 review which is a one-time opportunity for the
7 applicant and his engineer to meet with the Board. We
8 met on June 22nd at the Development Coordination
9 Committee meeting. Tony Casale is here tonight to
10 look at a new project in the Town.

11 I'll turn it over to Lansing Engineer.

12 MR. LANSING: Good evening. My name is Scott
13 Lansing with Lansing Engineering here tonight for the
14 Casale Rental facility. I'm also here tonight joined
15 by Mr. Tony Casale, the applicant for the project as
16 well as his entire family. This is an family-run
17 business and the family is proud to be here tonight.

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Hello Mr. Casale; welcome.
19 Welcome to the family, also.

20 MR. LANSING: As was outlined, we are here
21 tonight for a sketch plan review to take comments from
22 the Board and advance the project.

23 Just some quick background on the applicants -
24 this is a rental facility; tools, small equipment,
25 heavy equipment and everything from chainsaws to

1 excavators and everything in between. Approximately
2 90% of the business is rental and 10% of that would be
3 sales of machinery that is out of service on the
4 rental fleet or other equipment as well.

5 They currently have two locations; one is in
6 Clifton Park and the second location here in Colonie
7 located at 2005 Central Avenue. They've been in that
8 location since 2004. That facility is approximately
9 2,500 square feet. Quite frankly, they've outgrown
10 that facility and they're looking to expand and they
11 do desire to stay in the Town of Colonie.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Is the plan to leave the
13 Central Avenue site?

14 MR. LANSING: It is; correct. They want to
15 expand from that small facility to this larger
16 facility.

17 As far as existing conditions, I'll go through
18 the parcel quickly.

19 It's approximately 3.87 acres. It is located
20 at 340 New Karner Road. The parcel is currently
21 vacant. As far as wetlands, there is a DEC wetland
22 complex up toward the northwest portion of the
23 project. There is a 100-foot buffer that slightly
24 goes over the boundary of the project. That is
25 something that we will verify as we move forward in

1 the process.

2 The topography generally slopes from New Karner
3 Road down toward the wetland in the back portion of
4 the project.

5 There is a mixture of
6 industrial/retail/commercial and greenspace and open
7 space area as well. The land to the northwest is open
8 and Mabee's Self Storage is directly to the south.
9 There is a car dealership to the south and then off to
10 the east is Route 5.

11 As far as proposed conditions for the parcel:
12 the parcel is zoned industrial. What we are proposing
13 is in accordance with zoning requirements. We do meet
14 the area requirements, greenspace requirements and use
15 requirements; everything in that realm.

16 First off, there would be a subdivision of the
17 parcel. The overall parcel would be divided into two
18 lots. Lot 1 would be the lot that the Casale Rental
19 Facility would be on; approximately 1.84 acres. Lot 2
20 is for potential future development to be determined
21 at a later date. The applicant does not have plans
22 for that parcel at this time and that parcel would be
23 approximately 2.03 acres.

24 As far as the Casale rental facility, they are
25 proposing an 8,000 square foot facility. So, they are

1 going from their small 2,500 square foot facility to
2 approximately 8,000 square feet. Of that, 6,000
3 square feet would be the garage storage area where
4 they would house equipment and the front 2,000 square
5 feet would be offices and showroom for customers to
6 come in and fill out paperwork and rent the equipment.

7 As far as parking, we are proposing parking in
8 accordance with the zoning requirement.

9 As far as circulation for the site, we are
10 proposing a loop road around the parcel and that is
11 critical for the operations in that. The facility
12 does have a lot of trucks and trailers and would have
13 equipment that would have access to the facility. We
14 are proposing one way in and one way out. In my
15 earlier renditions they have full access onto both of
16 those points. In working the Albany County Department
17 of Public Works, they recommended a single point in
18 and out and that was acceptable to them and we'll
19 advance with that.

20 Vehicles would enter in. There is the ability
21 for truck and trailer to pull into the building and
22 pull back out and go around the facility.

23 Also as a part of the facility, there is an
24 outdoor display area located in the front portion. We
25 do have a hedgerow along the front of that. There was

1 a recommendation that came about during the DCC. So,
2 there would be a row in that area where they could put
3 excavators or equipment or whatever they might be
4 highlighting at that particular period of time.

5 The back portion of the yard would be fenced
6 in. There would be gates on each side so that they
7 would have a secure facility for their equipment.
8 There would be storage of equipment around the
9 perimeter of the fence and then obviously inside the
10 building as well. We're showing a dumpster in the
11 back corner of the parcel.

12 For parking in general, we have within the
13 fenced in area - we do have enough spaces for the
14 employee parking and customers have the parking on the
15 outside of the gate.

16 As far as signage, we are proposing one pylon
17 sign in the front and there would likely be the
18 signage on the building. It's something that we
19 haven't exactly developed yet but we will develop that
20 and we anticipate that will be within the Code of the
21 Town.

22 Water, storm and sewer - public water is
23 available along New Karner Road. We'll be extending
24 the service in. Sanitary sewer is available down on
25 Albany Street and we would extend public sewer down to

1 that area and the stormwater would be managed on-site.
2 We are proposing the stormwater area in the northeast
3 corner of the parcel.

4 That's essentially it for the application.
5 Again, we are here for sketch plan and we'd like to
6 advance the project. Thank you, very much.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm just going to make two
8 comments and then the other Board Members can and then
9 we'll ask Joe Grasso, our Town Designated Engineer if
10 he has comments.

11 To take the county one step further on the
12 ingress and egress -- I'll ask this as a question and
13 maybe Joe can help later -- since you control the
14 whole property now, why not have one ingress and
15 egress shared by both lots? I'll leave that as an
16 open question now. Also, it's in the Pine Bush. The
17 sensitivity of that - what needs to be saved in terms
18 of forested area. We'll keep that as an open question
19 too.

20 Any other comments at this point?

21 MR. MION: Where is the propane? Are you going
22 to have propane there? Where is it going to be? I
23 know that you currently have it.

24 MR. CASALE: I don't know that we'd have it
25 there. I don't think that we've thought that far

1 ahead, to be honest with you. We used to sell propane
2 because we were in the hardware business. I don't
3 think that there are a lot of sale down there.

4 MR. MION: If you're going to have it, I would
5 suggest putting in on the plans.

6 MR. CASALE: There were no plans to have it.
7 That's okay, we'll put it on the plan. No problem.
8 If we move forward, I don't know the answer to that.

9 MR. LANE: The dumpster - is that at the right
10 rear corner of the lot? Wouldn't it make more sense
11 to have the dumpster on the opposite corner? The
12 trucks that come in and back up to it and out. Don't
13 they back up to the dumpster?

14 MR. LANSING: If you can picture the dumpster
15 when it comes in and front loads -

16 MR. LANE: Oh, okay, it's a front load.

17 What about the drainage area?

18 MR. LANSING: We haven't gotten that far yet.
19 We are showing a stormwater basin but we would
20 obviously have to do a stormwater pollution prevention
21 plan.

22 MR. LANE: And you have plans to talk to Neil
23 Gifford from the Pine Bush?

24 MR. LANSING: Correct.

25 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, Joe Grasso is with CHA.

1 They are our Town Designated Engineer. They reviewed
2 the project on behalf of the Town.

3 Joe, I know that you haven't done a formal
4 review but if you have any comments at this stage,
5 we'd love to hear them.

6 MR. GRASSO: Yes, and you have touched on most
7 of those, but I'm just going to bring them up again
8 and add some clarity.

9 One of the issues that was raised during the
10 DCC meeting with the Town, which was also attended by
11 Albany County DPW was the access arrangement. The
12 county did express concerns over the two access
13 drives, saying that their typical configuration is one
14 and they asked for an explanation from the applicant
15 as to why it's required. I think that it's clear from
16 Scott's presentation why they do feel that it is
17 required. Although it's still important to understand
18 an access management along Karner Road is really
19 important. There are some clear advantages towards
20 truck movements, if you have a one-way circulation
21 through the site. It may be advantageous to look at
22 an alternate layout as to how the site would operate
23 with one curb cut, understanding that there is going
24 to be pros and cons both ways.

25 CHAIRMAN STUTO: What about sharing with the

1 new lot?

2 MR. GRASSO: That's the other thing. We do
3 think that the planning of this parcel is important as
4 it relates to the planning of Lot 2 which they are
5 going to subdivide because right now it's one parcel.

6 MR. LANE: Why do you think that Albany County
7 was okay with this?

8 MR. GRASSO: They didn't say that they were
9 okay. What they said in their letter is: "Generally,
10 we allow a single driveway per parcel. Please explain
11 why a single driveway could not work. A pair of
12 one-way driveways is an acceptable alternative. This
13 should improve safety and would also reduce -"

14 MR. LANSING: Joe didn't have the benefit of
15 being at the DCC meeting when Albany County was there.
16 We did have a discussion with them and they did
17 indicate that if we had broken it down into one-way in
18 and one-way out, that was something that was
19 acceptable. The letter does indicate that was
20 acceptable but at the meeting they did indicate that
21 the change in the plan would be something that would
22 be preferable to the county. So, we did make that
23 change. We originally had two full-access points and
24 that was reduced to one-way in and one-way out.

25 MR. LACIVITA: For future development and for

1 making it a better plan -- and one of those driveway
2 be shifted potentially between the two, an easement
3 might be given so that you have circulation. You may
4 still need a one-way in and allow the other parcel to
5 be developed in the future.

6 MR. LANSING: We can look at that but with
7 truck traffic in and out and thinking about the
8 movements for that if we had a development in this
9 area, people would be using that (Indicating). This
10 would be perhaps a full-access. You'd have the
11 conflict of trucks going in and cars going out the
12 other way. We can take a closer look at that. This
13 works very efficiently.

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: We don't like more curb cuts.

15 MR. LANSING: Understood.

16 MR. GRASSO: I think that what is important to
17 understand is that it's one lot right now. It was
18 always the vision that this lot would have one single
19 point of access. That maximizes the efficiency of the
20 New Karner corridor. Obviously, this layout maximizes
21 the efficiency from a site perspective. It's
22 incumbent on the Planning Board and Albany County to
23 look at things both in terms of the corridor
24 efficiency as well. What we would not want to see
25 would be another application that is going to come in

1 on Lot 2 and ask for an additional curb cut or
2 possibly two additional curb cuts. Then, we have four
3 where we thought that we would only have one. I do
4 think that to Joe's point, we should consider whether
5 or not one full-access curb cut on the north side of
6 the site adequately serves the property and also to
7 the greatest extent possible mitigates the impacts to
8 the New Karner corridor. Again, it's only sketch plan
9 review but these are the types of things -

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: That's why we are expressing a
11 strong opinion and hopefully the applicant understands
12 what we are saying.

13 MR. GRASSO: So, the other thing other than the
14 driveways was that the site is completely wooded.
15 It's densely wooded. It is zoned industrial, like
16 Scott said. This site plan meets the bulk zoning
17 requirements for an industrial zone. This site plan
18 does provide 35% greenspace but they are basically
19 clear-cutting the site in order to accommodate the
20 development plan. I think that it's important to
21 understand that the site is wooded so it's up to the
22 Planning Board to understand whether or not there are
23 features and type of vegetation that is out there that
24 provides significant purpose such that they should be
25 integrated to the site plan and preserved in some

1 cheaper fashion. Whether or not that is retaining
2 trees along the frontage or along the sidelines or
3 along the back, I think that those are the things that
4 should come out through the site plan review process.

5 The project site is not in one of the three GIS
6 study areas of the Town, so it doesn't have that
7 regional study that looks like cumulative impacts.
8 The impacts of this project need to be looked at
9 individually.

10 We did take a look at the Comprehensive Plan
11 and this parcel is on the fringe of one of the areas
12 of the Town that is identified as having high
13 conservation interest. It's on the eastern fringe
14 that begins here and extends through the Pine Bush
15 over to the Schenectady County line along the Town of
16 Rotterdam.

17 An important other point is that this site kind
18 of fits into a larger framework of open space within
19 the Town.

20 It is in the Albany Pine Bush study area, and
21 the Albany Pine Bush would provide comments during the
22 plan review process and hopefully we'll get those
23 comments. I think that Scott said that he would take
24 a proactive role and reach out to Neil Gifford and
25 discuss the project and see what comments or concerns

1 may be raised by the Albany Pine Bush Preserve
2 Commission.

3 The site doesn't have any wetlands - at least
4 we don't think that it does. Scott did mention that
5 they are going to do a detailed site investigation and
6 I think that's really important to make sure that
7 there are no wetlands. There is a wetland complex off
8 the site which is regulated by DEC, so it therefore
9 has the 100-foot buffer and it looks like that buffer
10 is going to encroach onto the project site. How far,
11 is something that we would look to the applicant to
12 figure out as they do their detailed site
13 investigation. Because it's DEC, it also involves the
14 Corp of Engineers. So, both of those agencies should
15 be involved in that review.

16 From a utility standpoint, we really don't see
17 any issues. We know that this plan has been reviewed
18 by the Town departments. There is a public sewer
19 extension proposed and the applicant is aware of that.
20 We don't see any big roadblocks regarding the utility
21 connections.

22 Stormwater management is a little bit different
23 than what we would typically see because they are
24 proposing a stormwater management area that appears to
25 have the intent to be shared with the development of

1 Lot 2. Typically with today's strict stormwater
2 regulations and the fact that these regulations are
3 always changing and evolving, we typically look for
4 each site to have its own stormwater management
5 system. Each parcel has to have its own maintenance
6 agreement now on file with the Town. It makes these
7 types of shared systems difficult to administer
8 long-term from a property ownership standpoint as well
9 as from a Town administration standpoint. So, our
10 recommendation to the applicant would be if you can
11 just look to see if development of an on-site system,
12 stand-alone from Lot 2 is appropriate and justify why
13 a shared system is beneficial. If it results in less
14 clearing of vegetation or less impact on buffer and
15 those are the types of things that we would look for
16 to justify why a shared system should be considered.

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: When you say that the Town is
18 looking for a maintenance agreement, is that a new
19 thing?

20 MR. GRASSO: It happened about five years ago
21 with one of the state's general stormwater permits.
22 The Town as a regulated MS4, has to require every
23 commercial applicant to agree and file with the Town a
24 stormwater maintenance agreement that binds the future
25 property owners for having to maintain their

1 stormwater features in perpetuity. What would happen
2 in the past is that they would be designed to meet the
3 current standards and then nobody would maintain these
4 systems. Then, their function would deteriorate and
5 the Town would have to bear the brunt of a poorly
6 functioning stormwater management system and deal with
7 it.

8 This maintenance agreement is a way to make
9 sure that the applicant is aware that they are always
10 required to maintain the systems and it gives the Town
11 the ability to enforce maintenance of these systems in
12 the future.

13 CHAIRMAN STUTO: That's commercial and not
14 residential.

15 MR. GRASSO: That's commercial only because
16 residential, if there is stormwater management -- they
17 do require a maintenance agreement. A lot of
18 residential subdivisions, because of how they are
19 designed, the infrastructure is turned over to the
20 Town so the Town takes on the responsibility of
21 maintenance of those systems. Not the commercial
22 sites. It's always on the property owner.

23 That's all that we have at this time.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.

25 Any other comments or questions?

1

(There was no response.)

2

Any other comments from the applicant?

3

MR. LANSING: No, I think that we're all set.

4

CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, thank you.

5

6

7

(Whereas the above entitled proceeding was

8

concluded at 7:24 p.m.)

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 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 _____

