

1 PLANNING BOARD COUNTY OF ALBANY

2 TOWN OF COLONIE

3 *****

VILLAGE OF NEW LOUDON

624 NEW LOUDON ROAD

BOARD UPDATE TO APARTMENT/SITE PLAN AMENDMENT

5 *****

6 THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled
7 matter by NANCY L. STRANG, a Shorthand Reporter,
8 commencing on November 1, 2016 at 7:47 p.m. at The
Public Operations Center, 347 Old Niskayuna Road,
Latham, New York.

9

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

17 ALSO PRESENT:

18 Kathleen Marinelli, Esq. Counsel to the Planning Board
19 Joseph LaCivita, Planning and Economic Development
20 Department
21 Michael Tengeler, Planning and Economic Development
22 Department
23 Charles Voss, PE, Barton and Loguidice
24 Paul Goldman
25 Nick Costa, PE, Advance Engineering
Amy McCain
Marcia Codling
Richard Oppedisano
Paul Rosano, Town Board

21
22
23
24
25

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I will just call up the next
2 project to try to get things moving along.

3 Village of New Loudon, 624 New Loudon Road,
4 board update to apartment/site plan amendments.

5 We will let the applicant get set up.

6 Joe LaCivita, to have any introductory remarks
7 for this project?

8 MR. LACIVITA: Sure. Tonight we have Paul
9 Goldman and Justin Marini here.

10 The Village of New Loudon has been before us a
11 number of times as it has worked through the process.
12 It is truly one of the true projects that has really
13 designed itself to the zoning district that we have to
14 with the mixed zone.

15 Tonight we have the final phase of the project
16 which are the two remaining buildings identified for
17 apartments.

18 We will turn it over to Paul Goldman to go over
19 it.

20 MR. GOLDMAN: Good evening. My name is Paul
21 Goldman, for the applicant. I have Nick Costa with me
22 and Justin Marini.

23 We just want to go over briefly what the
24 changes are from the approved site plan. We are
25 dealing with an improved site plan.

1 The first change is that the access is proposed
2 before the guard shack so it has a separate access the
3 lines up with the smaller building. We're going to
4 call this Building B and Buildings C, rather than the
5 prior access that is through on Cambridge and came
6 back out. We believe that this is better for the
7 community because it keeps the access separate from
8 the apartment community and the townhome community.
9 So, that's the first change.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Does everybody understand
11 that? I'm not sure that I fully understand.

12 MR. GOLDMAN: So, were showing of access here
13 onto Winter Creek before the guard shack. So, it lines
14 up with the access for the other parking rather than
15 the old site plan that provided access down from
16 Cambridge, down through to the gates and back through.
17 We think that works better because it keeps the
18 separation of the two projects. I think that's an
19 improvement that we have made.

20 In terms of Building B, this building's
21 footprint is exactly situated on the site plan. So,
22 all that is really going on there is we have removed
23 or reduce the height. Remember, there was a cupola
24 there with 50 feet. It's been reduced down from the
25 prior limitation.

1 I will show you the elevation.

2 MR. LANE: So, the cupola was eliminated?

3 MR. GOLDMAN: Yes.

4 This is Building B. What you see is an
5 attractive mixed-use building. It's a fairly larger
6 building. It's a 47 unit building. So, all we are
7 doing - this is the comment that we have from the
8 chairman - is doing some internal reconfiguration. It
9 was approved for all two bedroom units. There is a
10 lot of housing stock in the apartment business of
11 two-bedroom units. They are your traditional garden
12 style apartments. We are having an offering of
13 studios, one bedrooms and two bedrooms. The point
14 being is that any mixed-use community - remember the
15 goal of the project in a mixed-use community is to
16 have interaction the between the retail in the from
17 and the people so people can have a place to live and
18 work and commune without getting in their car. That
19 was the goal of the project. We think this is an
20 attractive mixed-use building.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: That's going to be all
22 residential, right?

23 MR. GOLDMAN: All apartment buildings.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, it's not mixed-use.

25 MR. GOLDMAN: I'm talking about the whole

1 project.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: You keep saying a mixed-use
3 building. It is not a mixed-use building.

4 MR. GOLDMAN: It's all residential - - thank
5 you for that clarification.

6 In terms of Building B, the smaller building,
7 it was an office building. This is the smaller
8 building on the other side of the street (Indicating).
9 This is Building C.

10 This building was previously approved as a
11 three-story building with office on the first floor
12 and two stories of residential. It is now being
13 proposed as a two-story all residential building. We
14 don't believe in the location behind in the rear -
15 that there is a market for office structures. So, we
16 have reduced down the size of the building by
17 approximately 4,500 square feet.

18 In addition, when we came before you, we were
19 proposing to eliminate that park behind this building
20 and that's remaining.

21 So, those are the only changes, in terms of the
22 structure. We think that what we are proposing is
23 consistent with the approval for the entire project
24 and we think that the buildings that we are proposing
25 are attractive. There is a shortage of one edge room

1 and studio units for young singles.

2 In terms of the parking, we think we are over
3 parked on an overall basis. Even with the smaller
4 units - the more typical apartment ratio is two to one
5 where is this building with a mix of studios and one
6 bedrooms, it should be 1 to 1. But, even using the to
7 do one ratio traditional for apartments, were over
8 parked.

9 MR. LANE: What is the effect on parking with
10 the eliminating the commercial on the lower level?
11 Does that reduce your requirement?

12 MR. GOLDMAN: It does. We have taken that into
13 configuration. We have 537 provided versus 515 that is
14 required.

15 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, we can talk more about
16 parking.

17 MR. GOLDMAN: The other piece that we put into
18 place is that we have a shared parking arrangement
19 relative to this parking field in front of Building A.

20 CHAIRMAN STUTO: What is in that building?
21 Remind us, please.

22 MR. GOLDMAN: This is the office building of
23 the retail - Jimmy John's and Dunkin' Donuts. This
24 parking field is now dedicated for the use of this
25 building and this building (Indicating) for overflow

1 parking. We think that works well. When you go back
2 there, there is a lot of parking available in this
3 area. If there's overflow parking over here
4 (Indicating) they can be used to service the bigger
5 building. The timing will work well.

6 That's all I have.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: What happens to green space?
8 Let's get that out on the table.

9 MR. GOLDMAN: I think the green space stays the
10 same. It's all on the approved site plan. We're not
11 doing anything -- what was proposed at the last
12 meeting with the elimination of the subtle pocket Park
13 - the but the green space stays the same. This
14 building is exactly on the footprint of the approved
15 site plan so, there is no impact.

16 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can you go over again how the
17 architecture has changed? You've given us a broad
18 brush on everything and we appreciate it.

19 MR. GOLDMAN: What we are proposing for the
20 architecture - what we are proposing is this building
21 here for the bigger building. It sits exactly on the
22 footprint of the approved site plan. We think that the
23 architecture is attractive.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: How did the old building look?

25 MR. LACIVITA: Actually, from the old building,

1 Peter, if you remember these porches and outside
2 spaces - the peaks that you see here - the rooftops,
3 this was all more square. When you're talking about
4 the cupola -- you may remember that it was all square
5 in nature. You don't have these peaks and valleys. It
6 brought more of a homestyle living versus more of the
7 mixed-use office and residential. This is much more
8 attractive and more in line with the design standards.

9 MR. LACIVITA: Actually, if you look in your
10 packet you will see that this building is completely
11 square and nature. Right where this pulls in, where
12 you see the porches and everything else, you will see
13 how it's more defined as a residential pocket.

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Does the smaller building have
15 a similar look?

16 MR. GOLDMAN: It does. The rendering is not
17 colored.

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: It's the same everything?

19 MR. GOLDMAN: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN STUTO: The parking spots stay exactly
21 the same, is that what you're saying?

22 MR. GOLDMAN: Exactly the same.

23 CHAIRMAN STUTO: It's probably appropriate now
24 to turn it over to the Town Designated Engineer for
25 his analysis. We want to make sure that it works. You

1 know that we have a couple letters from the attorneys
2 from Berkshire Bank, right?

3 MR. GOLDMAN: I can address that, if you want.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Give me your impression of how
5 the parking does not work now. It is my understanding
6 that it does not work. This was sold to us as the
7 parking is not perfect - for lack of a better phrase.
8 This is going to improve the situation. Explain that
9 to me, please.

10 MR. GOLDMAN: In terms of Berkshire Bank - we
11 have 537 provided. We are only required to have 515.
12 Even if you pull them out on the table, they had 11
13 spaces there. Even if you agree with everything they
14 say, we don't need them.

15 So, what we are doing - I have a copy of the
16 final easement that is recorded -

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: This is in litigation, right?

18 MR. GOLDMAN: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: What you are saying is that
20 you cannot go on their property for shared parking. Is
21 that a fair statement of what their position is?

22 MR. GOLDMAN: What they are doing, we think, is
23 in violation of the approval. I think that's really
24 relevant for today. I'm just trying to say to you that
25 it works out there for the people that want to

1 participate. We have a confirmed arrangement now that
2 is reported relative to this parking field for the
3 benefit of Building B and C. This works well. I have
4 a copy that I can give to the Board. It is recorded
5 and it is of record as of last week. That's so we can
6 use this parking field for the benefit of these two
7 (Indicating). That resolves a lot of the problems
8 that we had.

9 The bank over here - if you look at the
10 approved table, it only had 11 spots. We don't need
11 those 11 spots. I think were fine. I really think
12 that's kind of a sideshow. At the end of the day we
13 have a recorded easement that I talked about which is
14 of record.

15 CHAIRMAN STUTO: You can give that to our
16 attorney.

17 MR. GOLDMAN: That solves a lot of the problems
18 that is the basis of litigation.

19 The other part that was problematic - because
20 again, we want to make the project work for the
21 benefit of the community. That separation between the
22 town homes and the balance of the project has been
23 taking care of because we are taking the intermingling
24 of the townhome community and apartments by having the
25 direction out to Winter Creek, which we think is a

1 real benefit for the community.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, let's turn it over to
3 our Town Designated Engineer, Chuck Voss, again from
4 Barton and Loguidice.

5 Chuck, you have reviewed this project.

6 MR. VOSS: Thank you. We were brought in to
7 take a quick look at this. We received some
8 information from the applicant about a week ago. I
9 looked back through the record and to the comments and
10 specifically the last time the applicant was here was
11 in July kind of addressing some of the same questions.
12 I reviewed the record and really extracted out what I
13 thought were kind of the five main points that the
14 board was asking for clarification on. I have
15 generated a memo and you shall have a copy. Let me
16 just walk you through that quickly and it goes to some
17 of those points.

18 They stay in your meeting on the 26th, the five
19 points that really kind of stand out for me and when I
20 focused on were parking, density in terms of new
21 residential units, green space, office retail uses
22 versus the residential uses in the traffic signal
23 warrant issue. Go through each one quickly here.

24 In terms of parking, the applicant provided a
25 very detailed analysis in their July submission that

1 really outlined and compared the multiple different
2 levels of parking that you saw from this project from
3 its ODA approval through a modified plan to the
4 concept that we see now.

5 Essentially, you can read through my comments
6 but the key point is that the ODA specific approval
7 was mandated and predicated upon the fact that you
8 would have shared parking across the entire site. The
9 applicant achieves that originally in their proposal
10 we feel. Even under this new configuration we see
11 shared parking still is a very strong factor for
12 making the project work. When you start to look up the
13 various components that they are proposing and you
14 look at the interconnections they are proposing like
15 that new curb cut to the southern parking lot by
16 Building B we see some efficiencies there are that
17 make a lot of sense. So, we certainly concur with the
18 fact that creating the new curb cut to the
19 northwestern parking lot makes a lot of sense. We
20 certainly support that.

21 The other prior alternative was to go through
22 the guard shack, through the town home development and
23 then back into that parking lot. It just didn't make
24 sense from an efficiency standpoint in terms of the
25 access and that parking lot. So, we like that idea.

1 In terms of overall parking, excluding the bank
2 question which we looked at in some detail, the
3 applicant can demonstrate that they have provided
4 sufficient parking to the current standards. If you
5 look back at the original approval, the amount of
6 parking provided was 537 in under this current
7 proposal it stays at 537.

8 One of the driving factors is to see in terms
9 of whether or not the parking is sufficient - is the
10 density question, which kind of leads me to my next
11 point.

12 What we did is we looked at the proposal of the
13 two buildings. Originally Building B was a large
14 three-story building that had complete retail uses on
15 the first floor. We all know retail uses generate
16 typically on the order of a magnitude of two times
17 more parking requirements and residential uses during
18 the normal business hours. Sometimes that increases,
19 depending upon the tenants. So, we see the net
20 reduction in parking demand by eliminating the retail
21 uses as being a benefit - a credit, if you will for
22 the site. Then, we start to look at the configuration
23 of the new units - the new residential units up there
24 and you can draw some conclusions as well. By reducing
25 the number of two-bedroom units you in theory are

1 reducing the number of potential vehicles that might
2 be associated with those units. You can make
3 generalizations about those units, but in general
4 two-bedroom unit will have potentially two people
5 associated with it. That's how the calculations go.
6 Sometimes, there are three. You might have two adults
7 using one bedroom in the other bedroom being used as a
8 second bedroom. You could have a potential of free
9 vehicles associated with those two bedroom units. So,
10 by reducing the number of two bedroom units down to
11 one bedroom and studios, it's somewhat tough to
12 quantify but in essence it kind of creating a net
13 reduction in the amount of potential parking spaces
14 you might feasibly need to serve those residential
15 units.

16 So, for Building B we don't see a conflict, per
17 se, with parking demands by changing the use and the
18 density of that building to a kind of mixed-use -
19 retail on the first floor with residential above, to
20 all residential use.

21 Building C is almost the same theory. In
22 essence, you are reducing the whole floor of retail
23 use, reducing the overall density and size of the
24 building. So, the scale is coming back down. Again,
25 you're kind of changing the complexion of those units

1 within that building that may necessitate slightly
2 less parking than could be anticipated on the original
3 proposal.

4 The other factor that I wanted to touch base on
5 terms of density was the overall complexion of the
6 site itself. This ODA in this mixed-use development,
7 as your attorney mentioned, really envisions several
8 different things. It envisions relatively dense heavy
9 commercial uses up front. That was fronting on Loudon
10 Road. Behind that it was envisioned as almost kind of
11 a slight transition to back into the less dense
12 residential uses of the town houses in the back. With
13 a mixed use development, this is the kind of
14 progression you would want to see. You would want to
15 see the more intense uses up front, a slight reduction
16 in the amount and intensity abuses in the middle and
17 then a much less density use toward the back. That is
18 strictly to accommodate those residential uses. So, we
19 see this change in potential uses as being consistent,
20 again, with that kind of ODA original concept of
21 mixed-use. We are applying the mixed-use here a
22 little bit more broadly across the entire site which I
23 think is pertinent versus the actual focus on the
24 mixed-use of each individual structure itself. I still
25 think that the site from that standpoint works very

1 well.

2 I'm green space, we touched on that. Peter, I
3 think you mentioned that the applicant in the original
4 proposal was looking to 10 spaces behind Building C
5 and that open area of that little park area. It is my
6 understanding that is off the table.

7 Finally, the office retail uses versus
8 residential uses - it's a market condition. Ideally,
9 would we like to see all the buildings be mixed-use?
10 Potentially, under the original scheme. I think market
11 conditions warrant and lead toward a more sustainable
12 type of mixed-use here. It's very difficult, as we all
13 know, and retail developers can tell us and commercial
14 developers can tell us is it is tough to put
15 commercial uses hidden back behind other commercial
16 uses a relatively small site. Most business owners one
17 exposure. Loudon Road is a heavily trafficked road.
18 Most of those retail businesses rely on pass by
19 traffic customers. It's difficult, at best, to hide
20 commercial uses behind - like a wall of commercial.
21 We've all been out there and we've seen the formation
22 of that.

23 I think that, in and of itself, is pretty
24 self-explanatory.

25 Certainly, last but not least is the traffic

1 warrant. We concur with the applicant's traffic
2 consultant where they basically say -- I can go over
3 this real quickly -- existing traffic volume
4 conditions to satisfy traffic volume criteria for the
5 installation of a traffic signal. We feel, given this
6 proposed use build-out status of the project now, a
7 traffic signal is certainly warranted.

8 CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, that is going to become
9 current with this.

10 MR. VOSS: It is my understanding that DOT will
11 be asked for those permissions to go forward with
12 that. It is a DOT road. It is a state road. One of the
13 key mitigation measures the original approval from
14 this Board and the Town Board is that new traffic
15 signal would go in.

16 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Board members?

17 (There was no response.)

18 Okay, this is just an update for us.

19 MR. LACIVITA: This is the Board update with a
20 site plan amendment application. It has been placarded
21 for approval, so it does have the capability to be
22 acted on. The applicant successfully addressed all the
23 questions, comments and concerns of the Board from the
24 last time.

25 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, then we are taking

1 public comments.

2 MS. MCCAIN: My name is Amy McCain. I just
3 wanted know what these were (Indicating).

4 MR. GOLDMAN: Those are easements.

5 MS. MCCAIN: I saw my question was. They were
6 big dark lines on the things that you downloaded off
7 the site. It just wasn't clear what they were. So
8 those are easements for drainage?

9 MR. VOSS: They are cross access easements.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Is there anyone else in the
11 sign in sheet? It looks like you are from the other
12 neighborhoods.

13 MS. CODLING: I just had a comments about the
14 existing parking lot in the front with the retail
15 stores. There is not enough handicapped parking. It is
16 very adequate. Can that be changed?

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Now is the time to address it.
18 Are saying in the front - where?

19 MS. CODLING: Burger 21 - those stores. there
20 is just not enough handicapped parking close to the
21 store.

22 MR. LANE: They are pretty busy places.

23 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm just giving Chuck and the
24 applicant a chance to look at the existing conditions.

25 MR. VOSS: Nick can address it. It looks like

1 there are two spaces there, Nick?

2 MR. COSTA: There are two here. And here there
3 are two more (Indicating).

4 MR. LACIVITA: Are you asking more toward the
5 Jimmy John's side or the other side?

6 MS. CODLING: No, toward the Burger 21 side.

7 MR. LACIVITA: I think the one of the things
8 that we can do is look at what the requirements are in
9 the square footages. Then, if we have to add
10 additional or even change out some additional - we can
11 even add that on or may be relocate -

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: If there are only two spots on
13 the other side, I agree. That's not enough. I think
14 it's just a matter of changing it from open to
15 handicapped.

16 MR. GOLDMAN: That is Mr. Fazzone's building,
17 but I think there are sufficient parking there. I
18 think you can reconfigure it. I will go to him and ask
19 him. I think there's sufficient parking in them
20 parking field. That's why we think the shared parking
21 arrangement that we have works well.

22 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Sufficient for what?
23 Sufficient to make the change that's being proposed?

24 MR. GOLDMAN: I believe there is.

25 MR. MION: I think that the way it is now, the

1 handicapped is mostly way down at the other end. My
2 wife makes the same comment.

3 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, before they come back,
4 will address that.

5 Richard Oppedisano.

6 MR. OPPEDISANO: I'm Richard Oppedisano and I
7 have one quick question. With all the units are going
8 to begin here and all of this traffic flowing onto
9 Route 9, which is basically parking lot now, we have
10 four red lights between Maxwell Road and 155. Now,
11 we're talking about adding a fifth red light within
12 that period of less than a mile.

13 That's my only question.

14 MR. VOSS: I can address that, Peter. It is a
15 requirement from DOT.

16 MR. OPPEDISANO: What I am saying is that you
17 are just going to be backing up traffic, after
18 traffic, after traffic.

19 MR. VOSS: That was taken into consideration
20 during the environmental review of the project. DOT
21 mandated that new light there. Is there roadway.

22 MR. OPPEDISANO: They're never going to get out
23 of that project if they don't have a light there.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you have any other general
25 comment on that? Does the applicant?

1 Will there be coordinated lights?

2 MR. VOSS: It is my understanding that there is
3 an access management plan in place for Route 9 where
4 the lights will be synchronized. Presumably it may
5 actually help the flow through there.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can we get answers to that for
7 the next time on this project?

8 MR. VOSS: Sure.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Anybody else?

10 (There was no response.)

11 Okay, so what is being proposed here, Joe?

12 MR. LACIVITA: Before us tonight is the site
13 plan amendment which allows for the event - the unit
14 count that we have, the parking space that we have,
15 the new elevation - everything has already been
16 approved from infrastructure and everything on the
17 original plan. Right now, it's the use of 11 units
18 parking space. The change is from a three-story
19 building to the two-story. Also, the access.

20 Am I missing anything?

21 MR. GOLDMAN: Access, the elimination of the
22 cupola, elimination of one floor and basically it's
23 just the internal reconfiguration.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I didn't realize we were
25 taking a vote tonight. It is not concept. It is an

1 amendment, but in a sense it will be final. We need to
2 hear back on the handicap parking and I would like to
3 have a presentation on the lights as well. I don't
4 know if we can give a tentative approval. I don't know
5 how that works for you.

6 MR. GOLDMAN: Mr. Chairman, we were looking for
7 final approval. You can condition it. It is a DOT
8 road.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: That we would like an
10 explanation.

11 MR. GOLDMAN: Whatever DOT requires on the road
12 is going to have to be done.

13 In terms of the handicap parking, were just
14 going to have to do it if you mandate it. It is just
15 that simple. So, if you want to add for parking spots
16 - handicap spots - I will go back to him and tell him
17 that's what he has to do.

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay. Then, let's get specific
19 about it. So, we are making a decision tonight on
20 handicap parking. Let's get the maps out and take a
21 look.

22 Yes, Paul.

23 MR. ROSANO: This is going to be an amended
24 ODA. This is going to have to go to the Town Board for
25 final approval.

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I hear what you are saying.

2 MR. LACIVITA: There is no amendment to the
3 ODA, Paul. The ODA was specific to being able to
4 construct in the back there was no access. So, we put
5 it ODA on the entire parcel in order for them to get
6 the building permits.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, this is the site plan
8 aspect.

9 MR. VOSS: Peter, why don't I suggest this: If
10 the board is amenable, why don't I work with Nick
11 Costa on locating for new handicap spots?

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you think for will be
13 enough, ma'am?

14 MS. CODLING: Those curbs are very high, also.

15 MR. VOSS: I can work with their engineer to
16 determine where those should be.

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay.

18 MR. GOLDMAN: We are fine with that. Again, if
19 you took the two in the back and move them in the
20 front, I think it works. again, we have no problem
21 with working with Mr. Voss and Mr. Costa. It has to
22 work. That is the point.

23 MR. MION: Spread them out a little bit.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, so a minimum of four new
25 handicap spots.

1 MR. MION: Wouldn't you agree that it would be
2 best to spread them out instead of locate them in one
3 area?

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Joe, are you going to be on
5 that as well?

6 MR. LACIVITA: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do we have to do anything with
8 SEQR? I should at least talk about that.

9 MR. VOSS: No. SEQR is satisfied.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: The environmental review does
11 not have to be revised because there are not
12 substantial changes to the project, right?

13 MR. VOSS: Right.

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: The buildings are staying the
15 same size.

16 MR. VOSS: They are actually reducing the scale
17 and size.

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do we have a motion for site
19 plan amendment as proposed tonight with the conditions
20 that were discussed, including but not limited to a
21 minimum of four extra handicapped parking spaces.

22 MR. LANE: I'll make that motion.

23 MR. MION: I will second it.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do we have any discussion?

25 (There was no response.)

1 All those in favor say aye.

2 (Ayes were recited.)

3 All those opposed, nay.

4 (There were none opposed.)

5 The ayes have it.

6 MR. GOLDMAN: Thank you, very much.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.

8

9 (Whereas the above entitled proceeding was

10 concluded at 8:15 p.m.)

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 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 _____

