

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

THE SUMMIT AT FORTS FERRY
33 & 45 FORTS FERRY ROAD
SKETCH PLAN REVIEW

THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled matter
by NANCY L. STRANG, a Shorthand Reporter Commencing
on October 3, 2017 at 7:35 p.m. at The Public
Operations Center, 347 Old Niskayuna Road, Latham,
New York

BOARD MEMBERS:
PETER STUTO, CHAIRMAN
CRAIG SHAMLIAN
LOU MION
STEVEN HEIDER
KATHLEEN DALTON

ALSO PRESENT:

Kathleen Marinelli, Esq. Counsel to the Planning
Board
Joseph LaCivita, Director, PEDD
Michael Tucker, PE, VHB
Wendy Holzberger, PE, VHB
Mary Elizabeth Slevin, Esq.
Adam DeSantis
Frank Nigro

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I apologize to Ramic
2 Redevelopment because we should have had you third.
3 You are on for 7:40 and we cannot call that up early.
4 We will see how it goes. This other presentation
5 will be a little bit longer.

6 The next project on the agenda is Summit at
7 Forts Ferry, 33 and 45 Forts Ferry Road, sketch
8 plan review, three-story 62 apartment building in
9 three-story 47,000 square foot office building.

10 Joe LaCivita, do you have any introductory
11 remarks?

12 MR. LACIVITA: Nothing at this time. We
13 will turn it right over to Mike Tucker.

14 MR. TUCKER: Good evening. My name is
15 Michael Tucker I am here from VHB. I'm here this
16 evening to present this sketch plan for the Summit at
17 Forts Ferry.

18 As was read by the Chairman, this is Forts
19 Ferry Road on the left-hand side of this sheet.
20 This is a 13.06-acre project site comprised of two
21 parcels; 33 and 45 Forts Ferry Road. The project
22 is in the office/residential zone - the OR zone.

23 What we are proposing is a zoning compliant
24 plan that has a 62-unit three-story senior
25 apartment building and a 47,000 square foot

1 three-story office building. Both buildings are
2 facing Forts Ferry Road as required by the design
3 guidelines in the OR district.

4 The OR district allows 18,000 square feet of
5 commercial density per acre on the site. You are
6 allowed to convert 80% of that to residential use
7 using a factor of 3,000 square feet per unit. So,
8 I won't bore you with the math but that is in your
9 packet, I believe. That's where we came up with
10 the program here.

11 The 62 unit apartments and the 47,000 square
12 feet of office space is compliant with the OR
13 zone.

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Joe, have you reviewed
15 that map?

16 MR. GRASSO: Yes.

17 MR. TUCKER: So, we are proposing access
18 roads out onto Forts Ferry Road, similar to a project
19 that you saw previously, looping the site. There will
20 be office parking to the rear of the office building.
21 The apartment building is separated by green space in
22 the storm water management feature. There are
23 separate parking garages for the senior apartment
24 building that is located towards the rear.

25 Utilities will be coordinated with the Latham

1 Water District and Pure waters. As proposed, we
2 are proposing to tie into an existing water main
3 on Forts Ferry and loop the site and loop it back
4 through to Catalina Court. Again, that was based
5 on our discussions with John Fraser and Latham
6 Water. The sewer will split the site - the
7 residential piece will go to the North toward
8 Catalina Court, the office building will tie into
9 the sewer and Forts Ferry Road. Again, that is
10 still to be determined as we work through the
11 process with both the Latham Water District and
12 Pure Waters.

13 The storm water management design will be
14 done and will be completely compliant with the New
15 York State DEC guidelines and the Town of Colonie
16 guidelines. Based on our initial look at it, the
17 project can certainly meet those guidelines.

18 We have understood from previous discussions
19 with neighbors that we are going to avoid dumping
20 any additional storm water towards the rear of the
21 site and we will do everything we can to make that
22 situation better toward the rear by redirecting
23 some of the back flow that goes there today.

24 That's really the site, in a nutshell for a
25 sketch plan.

1 Wendy is here to talk about the traffic.

2 MS. HOLZBERGER: Good evening. I'm Wendy
3 Holzberger, also from VHB.

4 We completed a traffic evaluation on this
5 updated plan. I just want to review it quickly.

6 The focus for this type of land-use is on the
7 a.m. and p.m. peak hours and based on the
8 Institute of Transportation Engineers trip
9 generation, the site is estimated to generate
10 about 85 trips in the a.m. peak hour and about 87
11 trips in the afternoon. That magnitude of traffic
12 is less than the New York State Department of
13 Transportation and the Institute of Transportation
14 Engineers trip volume thresholds to really require
15 a lot of off-site analysis. So, our analysis
16 really focuses on the site access points.

17 So, we distributed those trips that I spoke
18 about - both the a.m. and p.m. peak hour onto
19 those. Actually, instead of the two site driveways
20 to provide a worst-case analysis, we distributed
21 them onto one site driveway assuming if all the
22 traffic came in and out of one of the driveways.
23 Based on our analysis, at one intersection both
24 peak hours operate at good levels of service which
25 indicates about 15 seconds or less of maximum

1 delay for any movement at that intersection during
2 those peak periods.

3 Another thing that we looked at was there
4 were some concerns or questions expressed about
5 the need for a left turn lane on Forts Ferry Road.
6 We did review the ASHTO requirements or guidelines
7 for left turn lanes and found that those
8 guidelines are not met during either of those peak
9 hours. So, there is not a recommendation or need
10 for a left turn lane at the site access.

11 That's really the quick review.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: No, that is fine for now.

13 Is that the end of the presentation are now?

14 MS. SLEVIN: My name is Mary Beth Slevin.

15 Good evening.

16 We know that the Planning Board received some
17 correspondence from the Neighborhood Association.
18 We did meet with the neighbors back in May to
19 review the plan. A discussion was had with the
20 neighbors about some potential modifications of
21 the site. Those were explored, but were unable to
22 be implemented, both with respect to compliance
23 with the Zoning Code and just with site
24 constraints. It is unfortunate that the neighbors
25 felt that we misrepresented the discussion that we

1 had with the Town Board. That was not the case. We
2 really simply reported back to the Town that there
3 was a meeting that was held, the project was
4 reviewed, the type of comments that we received
5 from the neighbors - and that we looked forward to
6 continuing review of the project.

7 So, I just wanted to be clear that was the
8 nature of the conversation and the nature of our
9 perception of the meeting that we had. We continue
10 to look forward to reviewing the project both with
11 the Board and with the public.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.

13 This project is being reviewed by our Town
14 Designated Engineer, CHA.

15 Joe Grasso, I know you have not completed a
16 thorough review yet or generated a letter, but
17 could you give us your thoughts so far on this
18 project?

19 MR. GRASSO: Sure. I've tried to write
20 down some notes. I'm just going to go through some of
21 our initial comments. Like you said, there is nothing
22 in your packet because we didn't issue a letter yet.
23 We don't do that until concept review, but we did get
24 a chance to look at the sketch plan application.

25 We also did attend a DCC meeting that was

1 held on that application where the Town
2 Departments got a chance to raise some comments.

3 So, from a zoning in density standpoint we do
4 agree with what Mike had said - that the zoning is
5 compliant both from a land use stand point as well
6 as a density standpoint. In the OR zone it does
7 allow commercial/office space. It does allow
8 multi-family residential units, whether it is
9 senior or not. Both of those are allowed in the OR
10 zone.

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: That said, do you agree
12 with the scale of this project in the context that it
13 is in?

14 MR. GRASSO: I will bring up some comments
15 that talk about the scale and the site design.

16 MS. DALTON: Can I ask a question? In one
17 of the letters there was a discrepancy between the
18 reports here of the site being over 13 acres. There
19 is an allegation essentially in the letter that is
20 actually only 11.1 acres, which includes 3.5 acres of
21 433 Forts Ferry and 7.6 acres for 45 Forts Ferry. Did
22 you get a chance to look at that?

23 MR. GRASSO: I don't think I have that
24 letter.

25 MS. DALTON: I will make sure the proper

1 version is referenced.

2 MR. GRASSO: Before we keep going, because
3 I am going to talk about the density - Mike, can you
4 just speak to that?

5 MR. TUCKER: The letter is correct. The
6 online tax parcel viewer does state that. It's not
7 that unusual for tax maps to be a little bit
8 different than actual field surveys and deeds. In
9 this case, the area is based on deed research and
10 actual field surveying of the property.

11 MR. GRASSO: In terms of the density, the
12 comments that we make are really based on the project
13 site and size as it has been surveyed. From a density
14 standpoint, if it was strictly commercial/office
15 which would be allowed on this parcel, it could be
16 developed with 235,000 square feet of development.
17 Like Mike said, you are able to convert some of the
18 density to residential. So, if you do that fully you
19 are allowed 62 residential units and approximately
20 47,000 square feet of office.

21 So, that's what the project is proposed as;
22 62 units and 47,000 square feet of office.

23 CHAIRMAN STUTO: What is the total square
24 footage?

25 MR. GRASSO: The total square footage is

1 136,607 square feet.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, it is 100,000 less
3 than it could have been.

4 MR. GRASSO: Although you have to remember
5 that much of that square footage is actually the
6 apartment square footage. It should be looked at
7 differently than commercial and not strictly square
8 footage.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: But, if they went all
10 office, that would double the size.

11 MR. GRASSO: So, any more questions about
12 the land use or the density?

13 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Well, what is your
14 opinion on the scale?

15 MR. GRASSO: I'm going to get there. Just
16 the density by law and the zoning - we agree with
17 that.

18 So, the plan generally meets the Colonie
19 design standards. In terms of the scale and the
20 location, obviously the character of Forts Ferry
21 Road changes and as you get past Wade Road, you
22 have the commercial piece but past that you have
23 more predominantly a residential area. There is a
24 different scale of the road and a different scale
25 of development. The land use that we are looking

1 at here could be conceived as being consistent
2 with the planned uses that are currently out
3 there. I think that it is important to drill down
4 deeper and see how the site is laid out with a
5 three-story commercial office building 20 feet off
6 of Forts Ferry Road which is very inconsistent
7 with the character of the Forts Ferry Road
8 corridor.

9 The Health Park building is set back
10 appreciably from Forts Ferry Road and then, like I
11 said, residential on the other side - on the north
12 side of Forts Ferry. From that perspective, we
13 think that the scale of the project as it appears
14 from Forts Ferry Road is consistent.

15 The other thing is regarding the scale of the
16 senior housing. It is a large building and not
17 very inconsistent with what you see across the
18 street of the Capital Region Health Park. I think
19 that it is important to understand how that
20 building is going to be seen or whether or not it
21 is going to be seen from the road because
22 obviously if it is highly visible from Forts Ferry
23 Road, there could be some aesthetic impacts as it
24 starts to change the character of Forts Ferry from
25 an undeveloped state to a developed state.

1 One the things that we think should be
2 considered with the plan is to actually shift the
3 commercial office building back into the site so
4 that it provides a greater separation from Forts
5 Ferry Road and reduces its visibility. That may
6 start to mitigate those impacts that I have
7 identified. They've got a pretty significant space
8 area that they are using for storm water
9 management in between the two buildings. So, it
10 looks like that area could be occupied by the
11 commercial office building.

12 The other thing that I think it's really
13 important about the plan is that they are
14 basically maintaining that 100-foot buffer to the
15 rear. Obviously we've got a large senior housing
16 building in close proximity to the buffer. You may
17 be able to see through the buffer at certain times
18 of the year to that residential area. Another
19 option be to possibly shift the senior housing
20 building away from the SFR zone and increase that
21 vegetative buffer to the north and east sides of
22 the project site. So, I think there are a couple
23 of other layouts that should at least be
24 investigated for the project before it gets into a
25 defined site plan.

1 In terms of the interior parking, that is
2 something that can change the character or the
3 feel of a building from basically an undeveloped
4 site to a commercial/office type of development.
5 We would want to see that interior parking island
6 calculation done as it relates to the
7 commercial/office building. If you break it down,
8 I think for sure that interior landscaped island
9 requirement does relate to the commercial/office
10 building. I think that is something that we should
11 take a close look at as we continue to review the
12 project.

13 In terms of the potential impact on bus and
14 transit and pedestrians, we are talking about a
15 pretty significantly sized commercial/office
16 building, senior housing project both of which we
17 would expect would create a demand for transit
18 service and for additional pedestrian activity
19 around the site and around the Forts Ferry Road
20 corridor.

21 There is no bus stop along Forts Ferry Road.
22 The closest bus stops are down on Wade Road. As
23 part of the project, they are proposing to build a
24 sidewalk along their frontage, but only from
25 across their frontage. They are not looking to

1 extend it all the way down to Wade Road and they
2 are not looking to extend it north to the school.
3 We are not supportive of sidewalks without a
4 logical termini and we think that it is important
5 that because of the transit demands and pedestrian
6 demand, that this project should include a
7 sidewalk along Forts Ferry Road all the way down
8 to Wade Road or Wade Road Extension and then
9 westerly all the way up to the elementary school.
10 I think the sidewalk picks up at Omega Terrace.
11 So, at least going up that far, and then we would
12 have a continuous sidewalk along the side of Forts
13 Ferry Road. So, that is something that we should
14 continue to review as the project moves forward.

15 In terms of the access arrangement, they are
16 proposing two access points. Two access points can
17 improve emergency accessibility, but we are not
18 sure if two access points are actually required
19 for this scale of development. We think that they
20 should consider a single point of access which
21 would provide some access management along Forts
22 Ferry Road and could reduce the change in
23 character as you go from an undeveloped state to a
24 developed state.

25 I think that access of the Capital Region

1 Health Park which I think is a rights out full
2 access in - there may be merits to lining up the
3 access to this site across from that site access.
4 Again, that would improve access management along
5 this corridor of Forts Ferry Road.

6 In terms of the senior housing, it's got the
7 separate garages around the perimeter of the site.
8 They are to the east side of the site and the
9 south side of the site. To the north into the east
10 we've got that 100-foot buffer up against the
11 residential district boundary.

12 It may be beneficial to move the garages that
13 are on the south side of the site up to the north
14 side of the site because those garages provide
15 increased buffering. It also knocks out the
16 headlights, knocks down sound and it keeps it more
17 internal to the site. Again, just to solidify that
18 100-foot buffer around the perimeter. That is
19 something that we think should be considered.

20 They talked about the reduced clearing along
21 Forts Ferry Road by shifting the office building
22 back.

23 They did note in their traffic study that
24 they would need to do some clearing along their
25 frontage to improve site distance to meet the site

1 distance requirements. That is something that we
2 would like some more information on to make sure
3 that all the clearing actually could be done
4 within the frontage. We would want to be able to
5 evaluate where that clearing was across the front
6 especially if we can start to shift the building
7 to the back and save some of that vegetation along
8 the Forts Ferry Corridor.

9 In terms of the parking, they are proposing -

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you have anything else
11 to say about the traffic study?

12 MR. GRASSO: Yes. I did not get to traffic
13 yet.

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: You did reference the
15 traffic study.

16 MR. GRASSO: Sorry. I will get there.

17 In terms of the parking - I'm just going by
18 my notes. They are proposing 350 parking spaces
19 which includes parking the office building by
20 Code, but also parking the senior housing
21 apartment building at two spaces per unit which is
22 the Town's requirement for multi-family. When you
23 actually look at the parking demands by this type
24 of adult housing, it is typically around one space
25 per unit. We think that they should consider a

1 reduction of the parking and maybe some land
2 banked parking. Obviously, they have about 60%
3 green space, so there is adequate green space on
4 the site. Still, we want to not over-park the
5 site. Obviously, the more parking that you build,
6 the more clearing you need to do and the more
7 storm water management you need to provide. So, we
8 think that they should consider a reduction in the
9 parking and I think that it is something that the
10 Board should consider being supportive of a
11 waiver.

12 In terms of the traffic, I did take a look at
13 the traffic study that they provided. It has not
14 been reviewed by our traffic engineers yet. It is
15 something that we typically do when the project
16 gets submitted for formal concept review. I'm just
17 going to point to some of the data. I know that
18 Wendy touched on some of this.

19 The project will generate 85 new trips during
20 the a.m. peak hour and 87 new trips during the
21 p.m. peak hour. Wendy had mentioned that is lower
22 than the DOT threshold of 100 trips where they
23 start to look at the impacts of those trips on
24 certain intersections. I don't want to just jump
25 to DOT standards. We are talking about a local

1 road and I think the character of Forts Ferry Road
2 is different than many of the other commercial or
3 heavily traveled corridors of the Town. Just
4 because it is less than 100 trips during a peak
5 hour, it doesn't mean that it doesn't warrant a
6 more in-depth level of traffic review. I think
7 that is something that we want to work with them
8 to get really solid traffic information so that
9 really we can understand the impacts on not only
10 the intersections, but also the character of Forts
11 Ferry Road.

12 When you do the math and you look at the
13 volumes on Forts Ferry Road this project is going
14 to raise the level of traffic by 18% during the
15 a.m. peak hour and 13% during the p.m. peak hour.
16 So, even though it may not cause significant delay
17 at intersections or safety hazards, that level of
18 increase could be considered significant in terms
19 of the volume on Forts Ferry Road and the
20 character of that road. I think we want to get a
21 better understanding of that level of increased
22 traffic and how it's going to start to change the
23 character of Forts Ferry Road.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Joe LaCivita and I spoke
25 this afternoon.

1 Joe, do you have anything to add to that --
2 about traffic, specifically.

3 MR. LACIVITA: No, I think Joe brings up
4 valid points.

5 During the course of this, we were going to
6 try to look at it a little bit more. I think that
7 we have that neighborhood characteristic that we
8 are trying to preserve during the course of this
9 review.

10 I know that one of the things that we will be
11 doing is meeting with the applicant during the
12 course of this process.

13 MS. DALTON: I live over in that area and
14 I just want to encourage you that when you look at
15 the traffic, not just look at the Forts Ferry Road
16 which I understand what you're saying about the
17 character of that road. Wade Road Extension and Route
18 7 - the intersection right by the office park there
19 is completely backed up for probably an hour and a
20 half every afternoon between 3:30 and 5:00 -
21 sometimes more. I know that those of us who know how
22 to get around that traffic frequently already cross
23 through some of those neighborhoods and go over to
24 Forts Ferry Road so we can get to Target and Price
25 Chopper. I just encourage you to look at this more

1 comprehensively because just looking at that Forts
2 Ferry/Wade Road intersection - that's not the whole
3 story, especially in the p.m.

4 MR. LACIVITA: One of the things that I
5 was going to mention -- I know Joe spoke about
6 traffic one of the things, Peter, was typically run
7 models like this through our Capital District
8 Transportation Committee when they look at it when
9 they are specifically inside the GEIS. I talked to
10 Joe a little bit about this earlier and maybe we
11 could run that model to see if there are impacts,
12 like you're saying, somewhere else within the
13 corridor.

14 I know that Joe has a number of other things
15 to talk about on the traffic. I think that is one
16 of the other options that we have here.

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can I ask another
18 question about traffic?

19 MR. GRASSO: Yes, I'm not done with
20 traffic yet.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, I will throw it out
22 there. It is sort of relevant to the subcategory
23 within traffic.

24 In the context of the Airport GEIS we
25 discussed traffic a.m. peak and p.m. peak hours,

1 but there is also traffic all day long. For
2 example, I said well, when is the next time that
3 there is impact and I was told that it was lunch
4 time from the traffic engineers as to the impact
5 to traffic. It is also sometimes more than just an
6 hour - an hour in the morning and an hour in the
7 afternoon. Is there anything you could say to
8 that, in terms of educating us about what is
9 relevant and not just viewing a.m. and p.m. peak
10 hours that other impacts?

11 MR. GRASSO: In terms of the Airport Area
12 GEIS the peak hour that we focus on in terms of the
13 improvements that we have built to mitigate the
14 traffic impacts is the p.m. peak hour. This traffic
15 study actually looks at the a.m. peak hour also
16 because it is important to understand both of those
17 peak hours.

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm trying to go even
19 beyond that.

20 MR. GRASSO: Understood. With this type of
21 land use generally once you get into office type
22 development you're talking about peaks during the
23 a.m. peak and the p.m. peak. Yes, it is something
24 that we would look at.

25 CHAIRMAN STUTO: And there are 62

1 residential units.

2 MR. GRASSO: There are some. When you
3 drill down into the traffic study - I forget what the
4 number of trips are from the seniors.

5 MS. HOLZBERGER: The seniors are like 12
6 and 17 of those trips.

7 MR. GRASSO: Substantially that is less
8 than a commercial/office component. Obviously we can
9 look at it through the course of the day - how many
10 total trips is coming from the site compared to the
11 existing volumes on Forts Ferry Road. It is something
12 that we can definitely look at.

13 CHAIRMAN STUTO: It is relevant to look
14 beyond the a.m. and p.m. peak.

15 MS. DALTON: What I think is relative is
16 that it's right down the road from Forts Ferry
17 School.

18 I would say that the school bus exit is also
19 important. I think the entry time is probably
20 consistent with the peak hour. The exit time is
21 not.

22 The other thing that I just wanted to point
23 out is having been somebody who had my child in an
24 after school program, that dismissal time is not
25 the only time you have issues because you have

1 parents coming back and forth from there as well
2 because it's right down the block from school. So,
3 I would just encourage you to kind of start
4 looking at whatever time they get out - like, 3:00
5 or so. You are also going to have kids walking.

6 MR. GRASSO: So, those are all things that
7 could be looked at in a traffic study.

8 I did a cursory review of the data and their
9 evaluation of the turn lane, I agree that it is
10 highly unlikely that the level of traffic that
11 this project is going to generate is going to
12 require a left-hand turn lane into the site. There
13 were some questions about that early on, but we
14 don't expect that to be a trigger for a necessary
15 improvement.

16 I think it's really important to understand
17 from a traffic standpoint that this project is
18 outside of the boundary of the Airport Area GIS.
19 The boundary of that study is actually for that
20 very road. So, it's just across the street from
21 the boundary which means that this project's
22 development was never taken into consideration in
23 a GEIS study area, nor are the impacts of the
24 project being mitigated when looked at
25 cumulatively. So, this project is not paying its

1 fair share of traffic mitigation, like a project
2 across the street would be doing. This project is
3 going to impact areas within the study area. It's
4 going to benefit from improvements that have been
5 built with mitigation fees by projects that have
6 developed within the study area. I think that it
7 is important that this project does evaluate its
8 impacts on those facilities and see if those sites
9 are going to be impacted in any way to any degree
10 and see if this project should require some formal
11 mitigation for its traffic impacts. That includes
12 the Wade Road/Forts Ferry Road intersection, the
13 Wade Road/Route 7 intersection and the Forts Ferry
14 Road/Sparrowbush Road intersection. We do
15 recommend that the traffic study does look at
16 those three intersections and calculates those
17 impacts so we can start to understand its impacts
18 on those capital improvements that have been
19 built.

20 MS. DALTON: So, consistent with that, you
21 had mentioned before about the sidewalks. I want to
22 go back to that because I wanted to ask you what was
23 the possibility of mitigation fees here because I do
24 think that the sidewalk should go to the school - to
25 the corner. This is not only because of the issues

1 with kids coming down and there being more traffic,
2 but also because those seniors will benefit from
3 being located in that area. There is a Stewart's
4 right on the corner. There is the Target across the
5 way. There is a chiropractor's office right across
6 the street. Of course, there is the medical building.
7 So, extending a sidewalk to the corner and putting a
8 crosswalk in there, I think, creates a safety
9 situation for everybody. I absolutely would support
10 asking for mitigation fees and using it for the
11 sidewalks.

12 MR. GRASSO: It is important to understand
13 that this project is outside the study area so
14 mitigation fees don't automatically apply to mitigate
15 those impacts. Nonetheless, I agree that this project
16 does require some detailed level of review, more so
17 than a project that is in the study area. So, from a
18 SEQR standpoint I think it's important for us to
19 delve down into those details. Let's not confuse with
20 the typical traffic mitigation fee with just
21 pedestrian improvements because sometimes pedestrian
22 improvements are not included within those traffic
23 mitigation fees. We may be talking about two separate
24 things. It could be another form of mitigation. I
25 think Joe is right, though, when he said that CDTC

1 does have a model that does cover this area and we
2 could route the traffic from this project site in
3 that model and see what the mitigation fees would be
4 if it were in the study area and what type of reserve
5 capacity we are going to use out of those
6 improvements.

7 From a SEQR standpoint, because it is outside
8 the Airport Area GIS, we would recommend a full
9 EAF be provided. It does provide an additional
10 level of review.

11 Regarding the architecture of the building,
12 it is highly likely that at least one if not both
13 of the buildings are going to be visible from the
14 Forts Ferry corridor. I think it is important to
15 look at the architecture of the buildings to see
16 how they are going to fit in with the character of
17 the area.

18 Lastly, in terms of the storm water, some of
19 the storm water on this site drains to an isolated
20 wetland to the east side of the site. I'm not sure
21 if the water level ever builds up and then flows
22 further into the residents to the east. It is an
23 isolated wetlands because it doesn't continue
24 off-site. It is not contiguous with another area
25 which is significant because it is therefore not

1 jurisdictional by the Corps of Engineers but it
2 could be significant from a storm water management
3 standpoint. Basically, that low area that exists
4 on the site is capturing that run-off in detaining
5 it. So, we want to make sure that when the site
6 gets developed that storage that is currently
7 being provided is appropriately mitigated for.
8 That is something that we will take a close look
9 at. Mike did speak to that in his initial
10 presentation. So, I know that he is aware of it.

11 We raised a concern last time the project was
12 proposed for development so it's something that we
13 will take a close look at and make sure that we
14 are not filling up that isolated wetland and
15 discouraging any more water off-site than it
16 currently receives.

17 That's basically where we are at with our
18 review.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I think it is fair to let
20 the applicant respond to your comments. They were
21 significant and good comments.

22 Do you want to do that now, or do you want
23 the Board to ask questions first? I mean, Joe
24 raised at least 10 issues, I think.

25 MR. TUCKER: I think I scratched down as

1 many of them as I could.

2 Regarding the building placement - the design
3 guidelines for the OR actually set a maximum
4 setback off of the road there. So, there is a 20
5 foot maximum setback -

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: We routinely waive that.

7 MR. TUCKER: Like I said, we were setting
8 this up to be a zoning compliance plan. That's what
9 we went with - what the zoning is there.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Would you consider
11 alternatives?

12 MR. TUCKER: I would have to talk to the
13 client about it. We will talk about it.

14 Interior green space - we calculated it for
15 the entire site since it is a single lot. We can
16 certainly look at that, though, to calculate it to
17 show the internal green space requirements for
18 each of the two developments.

19 To access points - again, it's more from an
20 emergency access standpoint. We can certainly talk
21 to the emergency department and see what their
22 requirements are.

23 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Sometimes we have just an
24 emergency one - a principle access and then an
25 emergency one.

1 MR. TUCKER: Our whole point of having two
2 was to not provide any sort of connection to the
3 neighborhood and any of the residences around there.
4 We can also show the limits of clearing there on the
5 plan. I don't think that's an issue. I think a
6 couple of the site layout things kind of fall into
7 something that we can try to take a look at and maybe
8 we can shift things around a little bit or maybe we
9 could make garages there. Again, I don't think those
10 are major changes to the site plan.

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Banked parking - do you
12 have any opinion on that?

13 MR. TUCKER: To spaces is probably --
14 based on all their other facilities that they have,
15 it sounds like they need to spaces per unit.

16 MR. GRASSO: I want to talk about this,
17 then.

18 The parking is based on really what the
19 demand would be for a multi-family residential.
20 Your traffic study is using the Land Use Code for
21 adult senior living which has a greater reduced
22 level of trip generations. You have to make sure
23 that you are not pulling from two different areas
24 to support your arguments.

25 MR. NIGRO: The only reason that we needed

1 it is for those few times when we have special
2 things, then we need the parking for it. When we
3 have open houses or things going on in the community
4 where family members would come in -- we would need
5 that parking. We would not be able to have those
6 things.

7 MR. MION: Would it be a possibility to
8 use that other parking lot for the building, if it is
9 not a special event type thing?

10 MR. NIGRO: Most of those events take
11 place during the day.

12 MR. MION: During the week, or on the
13 weekend?

14 MR. NIGRO: During the week, during the
15 day.

16 CHAIRMAN STUTO: How many times a year do
17 you have those?

18 MR. DESANTIS: Probably monthly.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can you continue to look
20 at that, Joe?

21 MR. GRASSO: Yes.

22 MR. TUCKER: I think that's all I have
23 from a site standpoint. I will keep looking through
24 my notes.

25 MR. GRASSO: One other thing - I know that

1 you had mentioned running the water and sewer
2 connections to Catalina. I know that is the 100-foot
3 buffer area. Would you go in subsurface with those?

4 MR. TUCKER: There was a couple of
5 options. Again, we haven't talked it's all the way
6 through yet. One was to provide a zigzag through
7 there so that when you are looking down Catalina, you
8 can't see straight into the site. So, there would be
9 trees there. Again, that's something that we need to
10 work through the potential direction it would go.

11 MS. HOLZBERGER: Just a couple notes to
12 clarify that the 100 vehicle trip threshold that is
13 set up is really kind of a guideline. It is based on
14 statistics from the Department of Transportation that
15 says if you don't eat those numbers, the likelihood
16 of actually needing mitigation or having an impact is
17 really low. That is kind of used as a guideline for
18 that. So, when we talk about the 85 and the 87 trips,
19 actually that guideline is 100 vehicle trips on any
20 intersection approach. So, that 85 or 87 - they are
21 total trips. If you break that down and go back to
22 Wade Road, you are talking less than 50 trips on any
23 intersection approach.

24 I heard your concerns and I definitely think
25 we need to sit down and really look at what makes

1 sense. Wade Road Extension is not that old. It
2 was built to a standard of a prior year, so we
3 really need to look at what makes sense to look at
4 it - the CDTC model and everything. I just want
5 to be careful not to over-extend the study too far
6 beyond what it really needs to be, regardless if
7 it is in the GEIS. The study that we did does
8 follow standard protocol and engineering and based
9 on the driveway and analysis, the operation is
10 really going to be pretty good.

11 The comment about extending the peak hours -
12 understanding that especially if you are near a
13 school, that afternoon peak can be extended but it
14 is typically -- we have done counts to kind of
15 show that variation. So, if your school gets out
16 at 2:00 in the afternoon, your office is not going
17 to let out at 2:00 in the afternoon. So, you are
18 going to have such a minimal impact and that's
19 really why we end up focusing on those a.m. and
20 p.m. peak hours. I understand your concerns and
21 you are correct that there probably is an
22 elevation in the afternoon, but to associate it
23 with this site and impact mitigation - that would
24 be hard to connect.

25 The data that the IT presents doesn't really

1 take it down. It is really for the peak of those
2 facilities. I have been doing this a long time and
3 we don't really do -- I can count on one hand if
4 we ever did like a mid-day/week day unless it's
5 like a really odd land use or something like some
6 special type of event or something like that - or
7 if we are looking at a school, then we would do
8 those potential peaks. We can certainly sit down
9 and talk with CHA further to define the scope.

10 MS. DALTON: Again, since I live in the
11 neighborhood I can kind of speak to that a little
12 bit. I think that in addition to the school being
13 there, there is the State Police building that is
14 there on the other side. I believe their hours go
15 7:00 to 3:00 as one of their shifts. That dumps a lot
16 of people out into that same neighborhood at the same
17 time.

18 Also, the New York State United Teachers
19 building is right behind that. I am pretty sure
20 that they have flex hours so that again -- those
21 hours start earlier.

22 So, I would just say that I completely
23 understand what you are saying about the standards
24 and the engineering and not having a benchmark to
25 look at some of those things. Again, that is a

1 rather unique situation and the neighborhood. So,
2 even just going out and doing a traffic study in
3 conjunction with Joe -- doesn't it meet national
4 standard of some sort?

5 MS. HOLZBERGER: I understand and we do
6 have some data - like, 24 hour data that we can
7 review that shows that fluctuation right on Forts
8 Ferry that you're talking about and look at DOT data
9 as well.

10 MS. DALTON: Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm looking at the Forts
12 Ferry Neighborhood Association letter and I think we
13 touched on many of the issues that they raised in
14 their letter.

15 There is one that was not, which is
16 archaeological. There is some mention of
17 Weathermac Cemetery. Have we come across that?

18 MR. LACIVITA: I did see the comments at
19 number four - the archaeological sites?

20 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Yes, has the applicant
21 come across that? Where are we on archaeological?

22 MR. TUCKER: Hartgen completed an
23 archaeological study.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can you talk about that a
25 little bit?

1 MR. TUCKER: There is an archaeological
2 area of concern on-site. They submitted it to SHPO.
3 SHPO is okay with that. We just need to come up with
4 an avoidance plan for it and the way that the site is
5 designed, we are avoiding it right now. We just have
6 not gone back to SHPO at this point for that until we
7 really get through the -

8 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can you tell us about it?
9 You're talking about the cemetery or no?

10 MR. TUCKER: No. The cemetery is not on
11 the site.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can you tell us what it
13 is?

14 MR. TUCKER: It is an old foundation
15 located there from the previous -

16 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Off your disturbance
17 area?

18 MR. TUCKER: Yes. Again, like I said, we
19 will get that disturbance plan into SHPO once we get
20 to the sketch plan and we know that the site is not
21 going to -

22 MR. LACIVITA: Has our Town Historian
23 reached out to you at all? I know that he had said
24 that he had a couple of things to submit to you.

25 MR. TUCKER: Not that I have seen, no. I

1 will check with Hartgen. Maybe he went directly to
2 Hartgen on that. I will find out.

3 MR. SHAMLIAN: Those are the renderings
4 down on the floor, Mike?

5 MR. TUCKER: It is. So, this is an aerial
6 view of the office building in front and the
7 apartment building towards the rear. This is just a
8 closer look of the apartments. Again, this is
9 basically the same architecture of previous
10 facilities that our client has built. The office
11 building at this point - the architecture has not
12 been designed yet. This is more just to show a mass
13 of it on the site.

14 MR. SHAMLIAN: Can somebody talk about the
15 trees and other vegetation that are on the site and
16 give us a little size and species? I don't know if
17 you have looked at that.

18 MR. TUCKER: I can talk in general terms.
19 I can get something more detailed from our landscape
20 architect, if you want. The 100-foot buffer that has
21 been previously said - all the way around is going to
22 remain undisturbed. It is relatively open on that
23 northwest corner of the site. It gets thicker as you
24 work your way back around where the residents are.
25 The area in the middle is a mix of pines, scrub some

1 mature trees.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: You have any comment?
3 Should we be looking at the significance of trees?

4 MR. GRASSO: Yes, I think we should,
5 especially if the Board is suggesting that things get
6 shifted back from Forts Ferry Road. I think that it
7 is important to understand the level of vegetation
8 that could be preserved by looking at that option.
9 If the Board is not supportive of pushing the
10 building back there are the open areas between the
11 two sites that is primarily for storm water
12 management, but there could be some significant
13 trees. As you know, saving even a few significant
14 sized trees can dramatically change the character of
15 the site plan.

16 I appreciate that they provided the
17 rendering. Obviously, when you drive the Forts
18 Ferry Road corridor, right now the site feels
19 heavily vegetated and basically no use into the
20 site.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: It is a radical change.

22 MR. GRASSO: It is a radical change. I
23 don't want to say that this is representative, but at
24 least you can start to understand the significance of
25 the change when you start to lose the vegetation. I

1 think that it is important that if you feel this is a
2 significant change, that it warrants the next level
3 of review regarding -- the vegetation that is there -
4 is it significant? Can it provide some buffering into
5 the site? Can the site plan be modified in such a way
6 that some of those trees can be saved?

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I am in agreement with
8 those statements supportive of the concept. I don't
9 know how the rest of the Board feels. At first
10 blush, it looks like the building should be shifted
11 around. I think that needs to be explored.

12 MR. MION: If you move the garages from
13 the south side to the north side, and if you shifted
14 the apartments east from the south - you could use
15 the garages for an additional buffer to the
16 residential on the other side.

17 MR. TUCKER: We can certainly look at
18 that. One thing that we try to do is make sure there
19 is parking provided all the way around on the site.
20 So, there are doors on this side (Indicating). We are
21 trying to make sure there is surface spaces on that
22 side of the building.

23 MR. MION: If you move them, you would
24 just be doing the same thing.

25 MR. TUCKER: Understood. So, if you slide

1 it down, these garages would move on to that side.

2 MR. MION: That's right.

3 MR. TUCKER: We can take a look at that.
4 We are trying to make sure that we are not even close
5 to that buffer with any disturbance. So, we will have
6 to see how that works in separating that out.

7 MR. MION: If you take that office
8 building and you move it back some - from previous
9 projects that we have seen, if you put it 20 feet
10 from the road it looks like a wall. That is not what
11 you want. You don't want to come up Forts Ferry and
12 see that.

13 MR. TUCKER: I think that's what the COR
14 zone was going for when it was written.

15 MR. MION: I would like to see that moved
16 back, also.

17 MR. TUCKER: We will look at that.

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Other comments from the
19 Board?

20 MR. SHAMLIAN: I agree with Lou. Quite
21 frankly, I am not supportive of it even on the other
22 roads of the Town and I'm certainly not supportive of
23 it on Forts Ferry Road. I am not certain that a
24 three-story office building is appropriate there. I
25 understand that the zone calls for transition, but

1 I'm not sure a three-story office building is
2 transition. That is just a big massive building.
3 That's just my thought at the moment. Just because
4 the zoning allows it, doesn't mean that it is right.

5 CHAIRMAN STUTO: And that we can mitigate
6 against the impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods.

7 MR. MION: Also the road. I think you only
8 need one way in and out. If you want to have the
9 other one, use it for emergency vehicles only. That
10 way, your safety factors taken care of also.

11 MR. TUCKER: We will take a look at it.

12 MR. SHAMLIAN: Just to be clear, I don't
13 necessarily have an issue with a three-story
14 residence. It is the three-story office building that
15 I have an issue with.

16 MS. DALTON: I feel like we have given you
17 a lot of feedback.

18 I do just want to go on the record as saying
19 that Lou and I went to see your other facility up
20 in Saratoga. We thought it was fabulous. We both
21 wanted to move there. It really was very nicely
22 done. I know that we need this kind of senior
23 housing in our community. People have been asking
24 me when we are going to be developing more. So, I
25 just want to make sure that you understand.

1 I will speak for the Board and myself. We
2 want to make sure that this is done as well as
3 possible. I am certainly in favor of bringing your
4 facility and the services that you're going to be
5 providing to our citizens here to Colonie.

6 MR. TUCKER: Thank you.

7 MR. HEIDER: I have just one comment. I
8 have never been -- since it was incorporated -- this
9 20 foot wall - to me, it's absolutely ridiculous on
10 most streets. Even on the main roads when you see
11 some of the buildings that are built 20 feet from the
12 sidewalk, it is just beyond belief that is what we
13 are doing in the Town. I would love to see if you
14 could mitigate that by pushing it back.

15 The building in the back is beautiful. We
16 certainly could handle housing like that for
17 seniors.

18 I live very close to an apartment complex
19 over on Wolf Road that are catering to that
20 population that have no problem renting for an
21 awful lot more then you are right here. I just
22 want to echo those comments about the location in
23 the front of the building.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, this is only sketch
25 plan. It is a first look and it is just for the

1 purpose of getting a lot of feedback and hopefully
2 positive criticism.

3 I think Joe Grasso has made up a lot of
4 excellent points and I hope that you will consider
5 all of those and work with Joe, including the
6 scale and the shifting of the building and taking
7 a more in-depth look at traffic and have the
8 people at Joe's firm in the traffic department
9 look at it and all the other issues that we have
10 raised. We look forward to seeing you come back
11 again.

12 That's it, from our perspective. Thank you.

13 MR. TUCKER: Thank you.

14

15 (Whereas the above entitled proceeding was concluded
16 at 8:25 p.m.)

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.

Dated: _____

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

