

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 AND 45 FORTS FERRY ROAD
BOARD REVIEW AND UPDATE

THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled matter
by NANCY L. STRANG, a Shorthand Reporter commencing
on December 19, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. at The Public
Operations Center, 347 Old Niskayuna Road, Latham,
New York

BOARD MEMBERS:

- PETER STUTO, CHAIRMAN
- KATHLEEN DALTON
- BRIAN AUSTIN
- LOU MION
- CRAIG SHAMLIAN
- STEVEN HEIDER
- SUSAN MILSTEIN

ALSO PRESENT:

- Joseph LaCivita, Director, Planning and Economic
Development Department
- Michael Tengeler, Planning and Economic Development
Department
- Michael C. Magguilli, Esq. Town Attorney
- Michael Tucker, PE, VHB
- Mary Elizabeth Slevin, Esq.
- Wendy Holsberger, PE, VHB
- Joseph Grasso, PE, CHA
- Erich Smith
- Lisa Drake

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: The clock on the wall says
2 7:00. Welcome to the Town of Colonie Planning Board.
3 Before we get started on the first item on the agenda,
4 we did have a request to do an overhead projector thing
5 here. We passed that on to the applicant. It is the
6 applicant's application and presentation. However, the
7 Comprehensive Plan Committee is recommending better
8 audiovisuals or at least they are discussing that.
9 Joe, why don't you give me your perspective? If we do
10 the overhead now we either have to get another person,
11 or you have to operate in which case you can't do your
12 job.

13 MR. LACIVITA: Wi-Fi capabilities are set up in
14 that area.

15 We have been talking to MIS over the past year
16 about the ways to do this. We are looking at screening
17 and things like that. There wasn't any money in my
18 capital budget for the 2017 fiscal year which we are
19 in now. We do have monies in the upcoming year for
20 some of the things that we are targeting. Again, we
21 have been addressing it over the past year and we are
22 limping along with the Comprehensive Plan. That's why
23 we are all sitting down there when we have all of
24 those functions and wires scrawled across the floor.
25 So, we want something that is safe and a non-tripping

1 hazard. We have been working towards it. We expect to
2 have it done early part of 2018.

3 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Does anybody else on the Board
4 have any comment or suggestions on that?

5 (There was no response.)

6 Joe Grasso, do you? You know the system.

7 MR. GRASSO: No.

8 CHAIRMAN STUTO: We are definitely going to
9 focus on that, right?

10 MR. LACIVITA: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.

12 Do you have any other business comments before we call
13 up the first item?

14 MR. LACIVITA: I just want to remind members of
15 the Comprehensive Plan Committee and the residents as
16 well that tomorrow is a Comprehensive Plan meeting at
17 6:00 right here. That will be the last one for this
18 fiscal year. Hopefully, we will get toward wrapping up
19 the Comprehensive Plan where a recommendation can be
20 made in early 2018.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you. In regard to not
22 doing the overhead projector, we did print out the
23 materials which are online which are a narrative and
24 then the three alternatives. So, they are right there on
25 that table for the public to help themselves to.

1 The first item on the agenda is the Summit at Forts
2 Ferry, 33 and 45 Forts Ferry Road, Board review and
3 update, alternatives to review office and apartment.
4 I will turn it over to the applicant.

5 MR. TUCKER: My name is Michael Tucker from
6 VHB. We had a site engineers for the project. We were in
7 front of the Planning Board on October 3rd with a fully
8 compliant plan that showed 62 senior apartments and
9 47,000 square feet of office space.

10 At that meeting we got some feedback from the
11 public and from the Board regarding the look of the
12 office and its location.

13 Subsequently after that, within the next week
14 or so, we had a meeting with staff in the TDE and
15 talked about coming up with options on plans which is
16 what we have submitted to you. So, there are three
17 different options in front of you. We are just looking
18 for some feedback and direction from the Board on
19 which option we should pursue and get in for concept
20 review.

21 At that meeting there were four big points
22 that came up. One was rotating the building so the
23 long face was not along Forts Ferry. It was thought
24 that that long face on Forts Ferry wasn't in keeping
25 with the nature of Forts Ferry Road.

1 Also, the zoning has a maximum setback from
2 the roadway frontage. We talked about the Planning
3 Board's ability to waive that at that meeting.
4 So, the options that you have in front of you have
5 that rotated and pushed back from the road. Also,
6 based on the input at that meeting, we have eliminated
7 one of the driveways. So, we are showing a single
8 point of access with a potential second means of
9 access that would be gated for emergency access only
10 if it is felt that is required.

11 The fourth thing that was changed on the plans
12 was this bank of garages that was on this side of the
13 site (Indicating). It was felt by the Board at the
14 time that moving them to the other side would provide
15 some additional screening of the building from the
16 residences. So, we have shown that. Again, that is one
17 of those things that could go either way with the site
18 plan - which ever way the Board wants to do it.
19 The three options that you have in front of you are
20 this option which shows the 62 units of apartment
21 buildings in the back and a 30,000 square feet office
22 building which is a two-story office building with a
23 total square footage of 30,000 square feet.
24 The second alternative which is labeled C2 - same
25 apartment building with the same garage layout and

1 same general site layout, but this is a three-story
2 47,000 square feet building which again is compliant
3 with the zoning.

4 The third option is that same square footage -
5 the 62-unit apartment building, 47,000 square feet --
6 but into stories. So, the footprint gets a little
7 bigger. It forces us to push it a little closer to the
8 road than the other two alternatives. The other two
9 alternatives had that setback 100 feet of the
10 right-of-way. This has it at 67 feet. So, just that
11 additional square footage - that footprint forced us
12 to push that a little bit closer.

13 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I am reminded by counsel that
14 we can't pick a favorite.

15 MR. TUCKER: We are just looking for some
16 input.

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Don't interpret any of this as
18 an approval or anything like that, but we may be able to
19 get some comments that might shed some light.

20 MR. MAGGUILLI: Does the developer have a
21 version that it would like to see move forward over the
22 others?

23 MR. TUCKER: I will let Mary Beth answer that
24 question.

25 MS. SLEVIN: Mary Beth Slevin, counsel to the

1 applicant.

2 We believe that the two options that make the
3 most sense - the three-story 47,000-square foot office
4 or the 30,000. It's really a function of -

5 CHAIRMAN STUTO: The 30,000 is two stories,
6 correct?

7 MS. SLEVIN: That's correct. So, it would
8 either be the three-story or the two-story. We heard
9 from the Board the last time that we were here that the
10 preference was for a two-story building. That was really
11 what drove the options that we have before you. The
12 applicant would prefer to have the 47,000 because it
13 provides for a better utilization of the site.

14 By the same token, we appreciate the comments
15 from the Planning Board that we're trying to minimize
16 the impact - the visual impact of that building and
17 also to make sure that it fits in with the character
18 of the neighborhood. We're looking for some guidance
19 this evening in terms of the impressions of the Board.

20 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.
21 Are you done with your presentation?

22 MR. TUCKER: I am.

23 Wendy is here.

24 At those subsequent meetings we had with staff and
25 with the TDE there were some additional traffic

1 analysis that was requested. So, Wendy is here to go
2 through that. She can either go through that after we
3 talk about the plan, or she can go through that now.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm going go to our Town
5 Designated Engineer, Joe Grasso.

6 Do you want to speak first, Joe?

7 MR. GRASSO: I would rather have Wendy go
8 through the traffic. I will touch on the traffic, but I
9 think that it would be good for her to go through some
10 of the results of the analysis. Some detailed analysis
11 has been completed and provided to our office.

12 MS. HOLSBERGER: Good evening. Wendy Holsberger
13 - also with VHB.

14 As was stated in the previous meetings, we had
15 done an original traffic evaluation with that 47,000
16 -square foot office and the 62 unit senior. That
17 really was a trip generation evaluation. We looked at
18 left-turn lane guidance. We did some distribution
19 percentages, but did not do any detailed analysis
20 based on some of the industry guideline thresholds.
21 At that subsequent meeting we did agree to do some
22 detailed analysis. We have completed that on the Wade
23 Road/Route 7 intersection, the Forts Ferry
24 intersection and also the Sparrowbush Road
25 intersection.

1 So, just to give a brief synopsis of those
2 results. In the original analysis, we provided a memo
3 to the Town and that was based on that 47,000-square
4 foot and the 62 units of senior housing. What we
5 looked for in that analysis is any drops in levels of
6 service and also any increases in the delay. Based on
7 that - we did all of our projections for future
8 analysis and distributed those trips which were 85
9 trips in the morning and 87 in the afternoon on all
10 three of those intersections.

11 The results show that at the Route 7
12 intersection with Wade Road during the morning peak
13 hour, the existing at no-build condition is a level of
14 service D and that D is maintained in the future with
15 that additional traffic.

16 The level of service in the p.m. is an F at
17 that intersection. We all know that gets congested in
18 the p.m. and it stays at a level of service F.

19 In the morning there is no change in the
20 overall average vehicle delay at that intersection. In
21 the afternoon when that level of service is F, the
22 increase is only a two second increase in delay. We
23 are representing less than .3% of the traffic in the
24 morning and .56% in the afternoon. So, we are a very
25 low percentage of volume, as represented at that

1 intersection.

2 Moving to the Wade Road/Forts Ferry
3 intersection, in both the existing conditions they are
4 the level of service B and during both peak hours
5 those Bs are maintained and the delays are a two
6 second increase in the morning and it remains the same
7 in the afternoon. We're at a more of a 4% to 4.8%
8 increase in the volume at that intersection.

9 The Wade Road/Sparrowbush Road is overall
10 level of service B and that's maintained and there is
11 really no change in the average vehicle delays - the
12 overall at that intersection and we are about 1% to
13 1.3% increase in volume with the project there.

14 So, based on that, it kind of confirms those
15 thresholds that we talked about as to why we didn't do
16 intersection analysis because we're really not seeing
17 any large increases in delay and drops of levels of
18 services. Based on that assessment, we are saying that
19 there is no off-site mitigation required.

20 We did run the numbers again for that 30,000 square
21 foot building and the results are very similar. You
22 might have a second or two difference but they didn't
23 go up any. They are either where we were at with the
24 47,000 or below that.

25 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you want to comment on

1 Traffic?

2 MR. GRASSO: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you have that data?

4 MR. GRASSO: We have and we have reviewed it.
5 We can concur with the summary that Wendy has provided
6 as to the project in either form. We're looking at two
7 alternatives. One is obviously the 62 senior apartments
8 that stays the same. It's whether or not the office
9 component would be looked at as 47,000 square feet or
10 30,000 square feet.

11 Traffic data was provided for both of those.
12 Within either development scenario, we're not seeing a
13 significant increase in traffic or significant impact
14 on the way that the intersections and the roadways
15 operate today.

16 Whether or not, even though there is going to
17 be some level of increase - because obviously
18 development results in increase traffic - we look at
19 whether or not there would be any triggering the
20 thresholds that would warrant mitigation in the form
21 of building additional turn lanes, signalization
22 changes. There is nothing out there that this project
23 would be referred to do to make any mitigated traffic
24 impacts.

25 One thing that I will say is this project is

1 uniquely situated in that it's just across the street
2 from the boundary of the Airport Area GIS. So,
3 projects within that study area boundary pay
4 mitigation fees to fund transportation improvements
5 that this project is going to route its traffic
6 through. So, although this project isn't going to
7 result in a significant impact to traffic and there is
8 no mitigation in terms of needing the building
9 infrastructure to support it, as the project goes
10 through the approval process, we would like to see
11 what the value of that reserve capacity is that this
12 project is using up out of those improvements that
13 have been paid for by mitigation fees. Mitigation
14 fees are not applicable to the project, but we would
15 like to know what that value is so that the Planning
16 Board can understand it.

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Who is going to calculate
18 that?

19 MR. GRASSO: The model for this region is run
20 by the Capital District Transpiration Committee. So, we
21 can provide them the application materials to see the
22 size of the project and its location and then they can
23 run the analysis based on today's current mitigation
24 fees and figure out what the value of the project would
25 be if it was within the study area. I think that is

1 useful information for us to know the scale of that.
2 I'm just going to transfer over to the layout, just to
3 comment on the things that Mike has mentioned during
4 his presentation regarding a comparison of the plans.
5 We are looking at plans where all three options are
6 zoning compliant. They are relatively consistent with
7 what we saw last time except there were specific
8 comments that we had made from our office and then
9 comments that we had heard from the Planning Board. I
10 think that the revised plans do a good job trying to
11 be responsive to all of those comments. Some of the
12 things that we have seen is - obviously taking the
13 scale of the office building down from a three-story
14 building to a two-story building is something that we
15 think is better in keeping with the character of the
16 Forts Ferry Road corridor. So, we think that's
17 advisable. Any time you reduce the size of the office
18 building component, you're going to reduce not only
19 the scale of the building but its impact on traffic.
20 So, by reducing the scale from 47,000-square feet down
21 to 30,000 it results in basically a 30% reduction in
22 traffic. The data that Wendy was presenting regarding
23 a maximum of a two second increase in delay, obviously
24 gets cut down by one-third. It's almost a negligible
25 increase in traffic. Obviously, we are more supportive

1 of a two-story 30,000-square foot office building
2 versus the two or three story 47,000-square foot
3 office building.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can we talk about scale a
5 little bit particularly in height because we had a chat
6 with one of the Board Members about that.

7 What is the height of the building if it's on
8 the smaller scale - the two story?

9 MR. TUCKER: Probably 28 feet - maybe a little
10 less.

11 MR. GRASSO: So, 14 feet per floor. So, if we
12 go to a three-story building, we're looking at a
13 building of about 42 feet high.

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: And we're down to 28. What is
15 the height of a four-bedroom colonial with a peaked
16 roof?

17 MR. GRASSO: About 25 to 30 feet.

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, it's in the same range.

19 MR. GRASSO: Yes. The big difference here is
20 that the building is a flat roof building. So, you
21 should keep in mind that when you're looking at the
22 height of the building and its proximity to Forts Ferry
23 Road obviously the closer that the building is to the
24 road, the greater the impact of the scale of the
25 building and the height of the building is going to have

1 along the roadway character.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, you support pushing the
3 building back.

4 MR. GRASSO: The option of C1 has the
5 30,000-square foot building. One hundred feet away from
6 the road is a significant improvement from the plan that
7 we previously saw. It would require a waiver from the
8 Planning Board because the design guidelines would like
9 those buildings in the OR zone up along the road to
10 create more of an urban feel. I think that based on the
11 concerns that we've heard from the Planning Board and
12 our review of the context of the site, it would be
13 better to keep the building further away from the road.
14 So, I think that's advisable.

15 They have relocated those garages - some of
16 the garages from the east side of the site to the west
17 side of the site. We think that those garages are
18 better located over there. They can provide more of a
19 physical barrier up against the buffer and block
20 headlights and sound emanating from the site. I know
21 that we don't expect that the site is going to be a
22 significant noise generator and result in any noise
23 impacts.

24 Also, in terms of the parking lot layout, the
25 smaller office building obviously requires a smaller

1 parking lot and it's easier for them to accommodate
2 the interior landscaped island requirement from the
3 design standards. They have done that well within the
4 parking lot for not only the office building but they
5 have accomplished that within the parking lot for the
6 senior apartments, as well.

7 The other notable change to the plan is they
8 have taken it from two proposed access points on Forts
9 Ferry Road down to one primary access point for
10 vehicles with a secondary emergency access connection.
11 That would something that would need to be agreed to
12 by the Fire Services Department, but we do think that
13 the single point of access with an emergency access is
14 an improvement over the previous plan.

15 The other thing that I just want to mention on
16 the plan is that they are proposing sidewalks across
17 the road frontage. One of the things that we had
18 raised as a concern at the last meeting was the desire
19 to have a continuous pedestrian connection from Wade
20 Road Extension up to Omega Terrace which is where the
21 sidewalk picks up on the north side of Forts Ferry
22 Road. Whether or not the sidewalk is on the north side
23 where the project site is, or on the other side, I
24 think that is something that could be viewed in closer
25 detail when the engineering plans get advanced for the

1 project.

2 The project is going to result in a need for
3 greater pedestrian accommodations. It could create the
4 need for people who would like to use bus service.
5 There are no bus stops along Forts Ferry Road. The
6 closest bus stop is down Wade Road Extension. We think
7 that a continuous sidewalk connection down to Wade
8 Road Extension and all the way up to Omega Terrace is
9 an important part now. This project only controls a
10 certain amount of frontage along that route.

11 Obviously, there needs to be a willingness of
12 the landowners along one side of the road or the other
13 to accommodate the sidewalk if it cannot be fit within
14 the right of way. It's a pretty narrow right-of-way
15 along Forts Ferry Road. So, that's something that we
16 would look for the applicant to investigate further
17 and work with the Town's Department of Public Works as
18 to where the best place for a sidewalk is and whether
19 or not it would be accommodated based on the concerns
20 of the adjoining neighbors along that route.

21 Lastly, I just wanted to touch on the parking.
22 The plan is showing parking consistent with what the
23 Town's Code requires. The parking ratio for apartments
24 is two spaces per unit and that's what they are
25 showing. Because the apartments are going to be geared

1 toward seniors, they typically result in a lower
2 parking demand ratio - closer to one space per unit.
3 So, as the plans advance, we would recommend the Board
4 consider possibly land banking some of that parking.
5 You can maybe design that storm water management
6 system for it, but not have to build it at this time
7 and only build it if it's being required based on the
8 occupancy of the site and parking needs.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Does the applicant have a
10 reaction to that particular comment?

11 MR. TUCKER: I think that at the last meeting
12 that comment was raised, also. I think the applicant was
13 more comfortable keeping it at the two per-unit for the
14 time being just given some of the types of open house
15 events that they have there. That is certainly something
16 that we could talk to you about.

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay.

18 MR. GRASSO: Lastly, regarding the drainage, it
19 is early in the process to get into a lot of details
20 regarding how the drainage will be addressed. The site
21 will need to comply with the state's storm water
22 regulations, which are extremely stringent. There will
23 be no additional run-off from the site after it is
24 developed and exists today. Any low areas of the site
25 that provide storm water attenuation will need to be

1 mitigated and addressed into the plan. So, we think that
2 storm water will not result in any impacts to any
3 off-site areas. All of the storm water management will
4 be contained within the site and they have allocated
5 areas to do that.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you. Those were good
7 comments.

8 We will open it up to the Board.
9 Chief, do you have anything to say

10 MR. HEIDER: Just a couple of things.

11 My compliments to the applicant for making the
12 changes that they did.

13 I would prefer the smaller building. Smaller
14 is better for a number of reasons. First, it provides
15 a buffer to the south where the parking would end up
16 going.

17 The only thing that I think would help the
18 project is the architectural aspects of that is that
19 the building is in line with the architectural aspects
20 of the apartment building.

21 I have seen his apartment buildings and other
22 locations and they are very pretty buildings.
23 Also, even though we asked to have the garages moved
24 up to that other end, from the neighbors standpoint --
25 I was up around the area today -- even though you are

1 leaving 100 feet, you can still see right through it.
2 There is almost no evergreen growth at all in that
3 100-foot buffer. You're looking at almost 500 feet of
4 garages. I personally would like to see some evergreen
5 buffer up towards the garages. It doesn't have to be
6 continuous, but something that will complement the
7 back of the garages. In time, it would actually grow
8 over the garages which would complement the look of
9 the building at that point. Currently, there are no
10 evergreen's up there at all. I think that would just
11 up the project a little bit more.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: You took a lot of my comments.
13 Craig?

14 MR. SHAMLIAN: I know that it is early, but can
15 you talk a little bit about what you foresee for
16 clearing limits and what you are not going to disturb
17 out of the gate?

18 MR. TUCKER: It's probably tough to see. This
19 100-foot buffer that is shaded here (Indicating) along
20 this whole property line along the back has to remain
21 undisturbed. I think we talked a little bit about this
22 last time - was the utility connection point. They were
23 still working with Latham Water. That will all remain
24 undisturbed. We are going to try to maintain some
25 undisturbed area in the front. Obviously, some of the

1 trees that are in there are not very attractive trees
2 anyways. We will try to keep some of that undisturbed.
3 The rest of the site, basically in order to make the
4 storm water work, will end up being disturbed. The
5 majority of it will be undisturbed because of that
6 100-foot buffer.

7 MR. SHAMLIAN: Again, I know that it is early,
8 but where are you contemplating the storm water
9 management?

10 MR. TUCKER: There is going to be a basin and
11 this area (Indicating) in the middle. If you have seen
12 on the other sites, they typically line them and/or have
13 an infiltration system with a fountain and it so that it
14 is actually a feature of the site. There will be some
15 smaller areas in the front. In the open areas behind the
16 apartment building between the building and the garages
17 and the area - like a long type of swale like features
18 along the back of the garages just to capture anything
19 that comes off the back of the garages.

20 MR. SHAMLIAN: Again, I would echo the Chief. I
21 certainly like the smaller office building better than
22 the larger.

23 I would strongly be in favor of banking some
24 parking.

25 That's about it

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Susan?

2 MS. MILSTEIN: I really don't have much to add
3 in terms of what was previously said.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Brian or Lou?

5 MR. MION: I would like to compliment you on
6 the work that you have done. I agree with everything
7 that has been previously said by the other Members of
8 the Board and I, myself, would like to see the smaller
9 one - the smaller building. I am in favor of banking
10 some of those parking spaces, also.

11 MR. AUSTIN: I agree.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I agree with everything. I
13 can't think of anything that the other Board Members
14 have said that I disagree with. I think that the
15 aesthetics are going to be particularly important. That
16 includes the plantings, screenings, the architecture,
17 the outlooks from Forts Ferry I think is going to be
18 very important. I would reiterate that and emphasize
19 that.

20 This is a non-voting item, but I know the
21 president of the Association is here from the
22 neighborhood. Is there one person that might want to
23 give comment that you think would summarize the
24 sediments?

25 MR. SMITH: My name is Erich Smith. I live at

1 19 Omega Terrace.

2 We are concerned about the height of the
3 senior citizen building. We are not against it. We
4 would love to have it. They would be perfect
5 neighbors. It's just that the height is going to be
6 one of the major projects and everybody is concerned
7 about the water.

8 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Good drainage.

9 MR. SMITH: Good drainage. The traffic that may
10 appear on Omega Terrace and right past our houses - that
11 is concern. Those are our main concerns.

12 The office building is in compliance. We are
13 not happy because it's going to create a lot of
14 traffic on Forts Ferry.

15 The other night in order to go to the Town
16 Board meeting, which I go to at 6:00 - from my house,
17 I had to leave at quarter after five because of the
18 traffic. It is backed up. It is really backed up.
19 We are very concerned about what that office building
20 is going to create in traffic for us.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.

22 We are studying traffic.

23 Joe, you're probably the best person to
24 comment on those issues -- and the height of the
25 building, too. We didn't really talk about the height

1 of the senior housing.

2 MR. GRASSO: I think that those are both
3 important considerations and things that we are really
4 taking a close look at. I think the scale of the
5 apartment building - it is a large building. It is three
6 stories high, so it's probably going to be 35 feet, I
7 would say. The scale of it is going to be different than
8 the scale of the other buildings in the area, other than
9 across the street - the Capital Region Health Park. I
10 think that the buffering that is provided and being
11 retained around the perimeter of the site - the 100-foot
12 buffer - even though there are no evergreens, there is
13 some significantly sized vegetation. That vegetation is
14 a lot taller than that building is going to be, yet the
15 buffer is not going to completely screen views from the
16 Omega Terrace neighborhood. It is going to be a
17 substantially filtered view during the summer. I would
18 think that it would almost be completely screened.
19 It is sufficiently set back from Forts Ferry Road.
20 It's probably about 400 feet back from Forts Ferry
21 Road to that building. So, I don't think that it's
22 going to be out of scale or out of character or
23 unattractive looking for where it will be viewed from.
24 In terms of the traffic, like I said, any new
25 development that happens in the Town creates

1 additional traffic. It is about us understanding the
2 level of change and whether or not those changes are
3 going to be significant and cause a significant
4 increase in delay for people that are already on these
5 roads. Based on the scale of this project, it's not.
6 We always keep in mind that, as we said, under the
7 current zoning this project could be developed easily
8 with over 200,000 square feet of office space. The
9 level of traffic would be much more significant. I am
10 not confident that even 200,000 square feet of office
11 space would trigger the need for additional traffic
12 improvements out there. We have a pretty robust
13 transportation network that surrounds the site. We do
14 not think that there is going to be a large increase
15 in the number of trips that go west on Forts Ferry
16 Road or through the Omega Terrace neighborhood. So,
17 we just don't think this project is going to result in
18 significant impacts to the traffic.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Ma'am, do you live in the
20 neighborhood? If you could keep it brief and please
21 remember that there will be other opportunities.

22 MS. DRAKE: I'm Lisa Drake and I live at 4
23 Catalina Drive. So, the garages will be right next to
24 where I live.

25 I would like to thank the Board. I have been

1 to several meetings and I would like to thank the
2 Board tonight. I heard all of you say that you would
3 like to see the minimum of what has been proposed.
4 That's what I hear and I appreciate that.

5 I also want to share with you and challenge
6 you -- we live in a world right now - a society where
7 we are always trying to jam 50 pounds into a 25-pound
8 bag - always, everything we do. If you walk around
9 this world, whether it is the holidays or whether we
10 are just trying to get across Town we are trying to
11 jam 50 pounds into a 25-pound bag, always.

12 I would like to challenge you to consider that even if
13 we go with the two-story office, I think we are still
14 trying to jam may be 42 pounds into a 25-pound bag. I
15 just ask you to really think about that. I hear what
16 you are saying about no impact, no impact, no impact,
17 but you live in the Town, don't you? It is hard to get
18 around. It is hard to do things. We are fooling
19 ourselves if we don't think that there is going to be
20 more traffic on Omega Terrace and there is going to be
21 more and more. There is going to be more.

22 So, I just challenge you. Are we putting too much and
23 that 25-pound bag? Someday it's going to break whether
24 it's this development and this project or another one
25 around Town. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Joe, you and I discussed the
2 zoning and the OR district which is a mixed zone. It is
3 office/residential. You came across a portion of the
4 Zoning Law which said it cannot be exclusively
5 residential.

6 MR. GRASSO: That is correct. It could be
7 exclusively commercial or exclusively office, but it
8 can't be 100% residential. So, there has to be some
9 level of office development on this site to make it
10 zoning compliant.

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: As I was reading through that
12 section -- I assume that you have read through this
13 section.

14 MR. TUCKER: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN STUTO: It talks about the mix of the
16 two uses - office and residential. It does say that
17 there should be meeting places. I assume those are
18 parklike settings.

19 Do you know the language that I am referring
20 to?

21 MR. TUCKER: Yes

22 CHAIRMAN STUTO: What have you done to address
23 that?

24 MR. TUCKER: At the sketch level we haven't
25 shown anything.

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you have some ideas?

2 MR. TUCKER: Like I said, this area where the
3 storm water is going to be - we probably have some
4 benches there. There are other facilities that have some
5 kind of look-out over that. Before the apartment
6 building, there are some recreational uses like pickle
7 ball and bocce courts in the rear. Specifically, that's
8 for the residents just at this point.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: How about pedestrian movement
10 on the whole site? Have you thought about that much?

11 MR. TUCKER: There is a plan to put sidewalks
12 out in front of our frontage. There will be sidewalks
13 coming into the site. We, early on, had explored a
14 potential walking trail through the buffer. We are not
15 going to do that now, but there may be some sort of
16 trail around the site at some point.

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Joe, do you have any thoughts
18 on that?

19 MR. GRASSO: No.

20 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Any other comments from the
21 Board?

22 (There was no response.)

23 Okay, thank you.

24 MR. TUCKER: Thank you. We appreciate it.

25

1 (Whereas the above entitled proceeding was concluded
2 at 7:29 p.m.)
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
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.

Dated: _____

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

