

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

PLANNING BOARD COUNTY OF ALBANY

TOWN OF COLONIE

\*\*\*\*\*

LESH SUBDIVISION  
241 SAND CREEK ROAD  
SKETCH PLAN REVIEW

\*\*\*\*\*

THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled matter  
by NANCY L. STRANG, a Shorthand Reporter Commencing  
on September 12, 2017 at 7:44 p.m. at The Public  
Operations Center, 347 Old Niskayuna Road, Latham,  
New York

BOARD MEMBERS:  
PETER STUTO, CHAIRMAN  
BRIAN AUSTIN  
CRAIG SHAMLIAN  
STEVEN HEIDER  
KATHLEEN DALTON  
SUSAN MILSTEIN

ALSO PRESENT:  
  
Kathleen Marinelli, Esq. Counsel to the Planning  
Board  
Joseph LaCivita, Director, PEDD  
Nick Costa, PE, Advance Engineering  
Charles Voss, PE, Barton and Loguidice

1                   CHAIRMAN STUTO: Next item on the agenda Lesh  
2                   Subdivision, 241 Sand Creek Road, sketch plan review, seven  
3                   lot residential subdivision.

4                   Joe LaCivita, do you have anything to say about  
5                   this one?

6                   MR. LACIVITA: The only thing that I want to put  
7                   on the record at this time is that it has been before our  
8                   Development Coordination Committee meeting known as the DCC  
9                   on June 14, 2017.

10                  Nick will take it from here.

11                  MR. COSTA: This is a parcel that is located up  
12                  on Sand Creek Road. It does have an existing home located  
13                  right here (Indicating). It encompasses this area right  
14                  here. It has frontage along Sand Creek here. The big  
15                  benchmark of where this is located is the National Grid  
16                  parcel that is adjacent to it. It's almost 3 1/2 acres in  
17                  size. There is existing sanitary sewer on Sand Creek.  
18                  There's also existing water on Sand Creek. We are proposing  
19                  to connect to them to provide those utilities to those new  
20                  lots.

21                  The site is located in a single-family  
22                  residential zone. The lots are substandard to the  
23                  single-family residential zone. There are seven lots  
24                  proposed. The single-family residential requires 18,000  
25                  square feet and 90 feet of frontage minimum and a 40 foot

1 setback. What we are proposing here is less than the  
2 18,000. They range anywhere from 10,800 to 17,375 square  
3 feet. We are proposing a 30 foot setback instead of a 40  
4 foot setback. There is one lot that doesn't meet the  
5 minimum width which is this lot right here. It is 70 feet  
6 instead of 80 feet frontage along the road.

7 The proposal is to extend the road from Sand  
8 Creek Road over to a cul-de-sac and bring in the utilities  
9 along that new road and serve the proposed lots. Again,  
10 the existing home would remain on this lot. New homes  
11 would be constructed on the remaining lots. The topography  
12 of the site is such that everything is towards the  
13 National Grid parcel so we are proposing a storm water  
14 management area to pick up all the runoff to the proposed  
15 drainage system that's out on Sand Creek Road.

16 CHAIRMAN STUTO: How are you proposing to get to  
17 those smaller lots? What provision of the Town Code? I mean,  
18 going to the ZBA?

19 MR. COSTA: Yes, our next step is to go to the  
20 Zoning Board of Appeals to get area variances for lot width  
21 and lot area and set back.

22 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I don't know if I should make an  
23 editorial comments or not. If I were on that Board, I'm not  
24 sure how I would look at that.

25 Chuck, you are our Town Designated Engineer.

1 Chuck is with Barton and Loguidice.

2 I know you haven't done a formal review of this  
3 yet, but I'm wondering if you have any preliminary  
4 comments.

5 MR. VOSS: Yes, we were at the DCC meeting when  
6 this was first brought. We have been out to the site. The  
7 site is really kind of one of those that we were describing  
8 earlier in the evening. It's a long linear left over parcel  
9 tucked back in this area. This area grew up organically and  
10 just kind of filled it naturally. I think this is like one  
11 of the last two or three pieces of land back there. So,  
12 certainly the use is compatible. The smaller lot sizes - if  
13 you can get them, great. If not, you might have to adjust  
14 your plan. The access onto Sand Creek - you certainly have  
15 it. As you noted, one of the things that kind of struck me  
16 as I looked at this when you first came in was just the  
17 change in elevation.

18 If you're up around Pfeil Avenue and come down  
19 - those residents up above are a good 10 to 12 feet higher  
20 than I think you would be based on the final grading.

21 MR. COSTA: That's right.

22 MR. VOSS: From a visual impact to those  
23 neighbors to the northwest, they're not really going to see  
24 a whole lot. Most of those houses are close to the road.  
25 Even back on Griswold Avenue, you have some grade changes in

1 there that would kind of present looking down into the site.  
2 Those impacts will necessarily concern me. The National Grid  
3 parcel is what it is. It is a power line parcel which is  
4 pretty wide open. That is several hundred feet.

5 I know early on in the DCC there was some  
6 comments about maybe trying to realign this new street  
7 with Berkley Drive.

8 I don't know if you have made any new roads  
9 there. One of your concerns is the existing house that  
10 kind of presents that. You don't necessarily want to take  
11 that house down.

12 MR. COSTA: There are a couple things. The  
13 existing house is one of the reasons. The other reason is we  
14 still have to come through here to get to the sewer because  
15 that's the only place to get to the sewer the water. So, we  
16 would not only have the street here but we were also have  
17 the utility easement through there. As far as efficient use  
18 of the parcel, it made sense for us to follow utilities.

19 MR. VOSS: Other than that, Peter, everything  
20 else is pretty much there.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm looking at the Town  
22 comments. Do they talk about that these are substandard  
23 lots? I am not finding it.

24 MR. LACIVITA: The Building Department may have  
25 been through this as well through the DCC.

1                   CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay. For myself, I think it's  
2 premature to have to much comment on behalf of myself. I  
3 don't know about anybody else. I don't favor this kind of  
4 density.

5                   MR. SHAMLIAN: If you're looking for guidance  
6 from the Board to get a variance and then come back -  
7 variance aside, I am not in favor of this level of density  
8 for those size lots.

9                   MR. COSTA: The density is in conformance. It's 3  
10 1/2 acres; two units per acre. I understand.

11                  MR. SHAMLIAN: I may have used the wrong term.  
12 The lot sizes are just too small.

13                  MR. COSTA: Were not saying that they are not.

14                  CHAIRMAN STUTO: Anybody have anything else to  
15 say.

16                  MS. DALTON: I agree.

17                  MR. COSTA: Okay, thank you for the comments.

18                  CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.

19                  Whereas the above entitled proceeding was  
20 concluded at 7:54 p.m.)

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.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

NANCY L. STRANG  
LEGAL TRANSCRIPTION  
2420 TROY SCHENECTADY RD.  
NISKAYUNA, NY 12309

