

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

SAFELITE WAREHOUSE
MANUFACTURING BUILDING
327 OLD NISKAYUNA ROAD
SKETCH PLANN REVIEW

THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled
matter by NANCY L. STRANG, a Shorthand Reporter,
commencing on February 13, 2017 at 7:46 p.m. at The
Public Operations Center, 347 Old Niskayuna Road,
Latham, New York.

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

ALSO PRESENT:

Michael Tengeler, Planning and Economic Development
Department
Daniel Hershberg, PE, Hershberg and Hershberg
Joseph Grasso, PE, CHA
Peter Campito

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Next project is Safelite
2 Warehouse Manufacturing Building, 327 Old Niskayuna
3 Road, sketch plan review, construct a new one-story
4 39,500 square foot manufacturing warehouse facility.

5 Mike, any preliminary comments before we turn
6 it over?

7 MR. TENGELER: No, let's hear what they have to
8 say.

9 MR. HERSHBERG: My name is Dan Hershberg with
10 the firm of Hershberg and Hershberg. With me as Peter
11 Campito, property owner and Bill Mafrici is the guy
12 who draws all the drawings so I can show them off.

13 We think this is a misnomer here. It's a
14 warehouse, but what they do there is not manufacturer.

15 All they do is assemble things. None of the
16 glass is manufactured there. None of the parts are
17 manufactured here. A piece of glass is already cut to
18 size because it fits a certain window and they put
19 seals on it to get it ready to install in a car. They
20 put it on the car and goes out for service to the car
21 on-site.

22 I don't know why it was called a manufacturing
23 site. It's really just a warehouse. The only thing
24 they do is light assembly.

25 I don't know if it makes any difference, but I

1 just wanted to clarify what the building is used for.

2 The plan you see here is not the same plan that
3 is in your packet. We apologize for that. The
4 driveway, we have here determined, worked much better
5 with the circulation pattern to move it over here
6 (Indicating).

7 The building foot print stayed pretty much the
8 same, but the access to it and the driveway was on the
9 other side. A lot of the other issues stayed pretty
10 much the same.

11 We had some infiltration tests done. The site
12 is suitable for porous pavement. We used porous
13 pavement other places in the Campito project site.
14 This worked well there and we intend to use porous
15 pavement. We do need some additional place for
16 infiltration to take place.

17 The main question we had with separation of the
18 groundwater -- we are in the Schenectady/Niskayuna
19 aquifer area. So, we need four foot clearance from the
20 groundwater - any place where it is. That may mean
21 essentially that we may have to relocate what is shown
22 back here by the wetlands.

23 One thing that we can do is put a recharge
24 gallery subsurface underneath the pavement to take
25 care of the roof drainage. So, those are just

1 therefore sort of placeholders until we do our storm
2 water design.

3 At the next stage here, we will be doing a
4 feasibility study for storm water and at that point we
5 should be able to make a decision.

6 There were a number of comments at the DCC
7 meeting. Most of them are technical and we are used to
8 dealing with them.

9 The Latham Water District recommends that we
10 tap off this hydrant to get our water in there.

11 There is another comment from the Fire
12 Department. The Fire Department wants a new hydrant in
13 there. We have to work out how to get that done on the
14 site. The Fire Department thinks that we need a
15 hydrant on-site so the hose pulled to the back of the
16 building -- even though there is a hydrant here at
17 this corner, it is very close to the 600 feet and they
18 would prefer to have a hydrant on site someplace where
19 they can reach it easier. We will consider that and
20 work with Latham Water to get both that lead off the
21 hydrant.

22 But maybe what we could do is extend that
23 hydrant lead back here and have a second hydrant and
24 do it that way (Indicating). The hydrant lead is only
25 a 6-inch lead and were going to need an 8-inch pipe

1 when we do public water extensions. So, we are a
2 little betwixt and between the two department
3 comments, but we will work that out.

4 We show loading docks at the facility. They
5 probably won't all be busy at the same time. The
6 trucks come in and they unload material and probably
7 stay a little while and leave again. The employee
8 parking is placed on the side and the customer parking
9 is in the front. We think that's enough parking for
10 the employee parking. What it will be is company
11 trucks to be staged back here (Indicating).

12 Safelite is one of the companies that allows
13 employees to drive a truck called and then drive it
14 back in the morning. Some plumbing outfits do that. We
15 are not really certain what they will do there.

16 In any event, there is plenty of space here to
17 have the service trucks that are out in the field and
18 put your windshield it when you break it and all those
19 wonderful commercials that you see on television all
20 the time.

21 I'm lucky that my windshield hasn't broken and
22 I have not had to call them yet.

23 It's a relatively simple process.

24 This site, you may be aware, we were in about 2
25 1/2 years ago to put a marijuana processing plant on

1 the site. They are processing something, but it's not
2 marijuana. It is another material.

3 We think that the site plan works well. There
4 is some parking in the front, but it's an area here
5 where we don't think that attracts very much. We can
6 certainly landscape that area.

7 The one issue here is the same issue that we
8 had what we were doing the parking expansion on the
9 other site.

10 The critical area with the Town is the extent
11 of the sidewalk which we will be required to do with
12 this project.

13 In addition to some sidewalks, Peter Campito
14 put up an escrow account - a contribution to the
15 escrow account to pay for pedestrian improvements.
16 Otherwise, we are just building a portion of where we
17 need sidewalks and the theory was that at some point
18 they would be enough to come all the way down Wade
19 Road to Niskayuna and across Niskayuna.

20 The comment which I think was Mike Lyons' is
21 that we should put in a new sidewalk all the way down
22 Old Niskayuna here and Nexus Drive which is the name
23 of this access driveway (Indicating). Then, use the
24 escrow account to put sidewalks on Wade Road down to
25 Livingston Avenue.

1 His logic was, and we don't disagree with that,
2 is an awful lot of employees do walk. The New York
3 State Department of Taxation and Finance has a lot of
4 employees in that building and they do tend to walk at
5 lunchtime, like the people in this building here. If
6 you come out here around lunch time, there is an awful
7 lot of employees coming back after a walk here
8 (Indicating). They are primarily walking, I think, in
9 the parking lot and down towards old Niskayuna Road
10 and may be around the other Town facility next door.
11 There isn't an awful lot of places to walk here on
12 sidewalks. We will try to work that out to the best of
13 our capability to figure out how best to address that
14 issue and get some walks installed.

15 The existing wood line just about follows the
16 wetlands line or it so, we are not going to be
17 clearing any of that.

18 We don't intend to impact any of the Army Corps
19 of Engineer wetlands at the site. They intend to jack
20 a directional boring pipe across the wetlands to a
21 sanitary sewer up here (Indicating). That would come
22 from a pump and go all the way back there. That line
23 would be bored underneath the wetland so we don't have
24 any wetland disturbance. There is no buffer required
25 from the Army Corps of Engineers.

1 We show this building 50 feet off to the side.
2 We see how close that it comes to the wetland there.
3 We may, between now and the time we come back for
4 concept, slide that building about 30 feet off the
5 property line so that we can have this corner of the
6 pavement a little further up to the wetlands so we can
7 do some grading at that point. That would be change
8 that we might consider and any other changes with the
9 Board we want to consider.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you. That's a nice
11 presentation.

12 Joe Grasso, to have any comments?

13 MR. GRASSO: Sure. Overall, we think that
14 they've done a really good job from a site plan
15 perspective.

16 A lot of the elements that we would like to see
17 regarding the layout of the site are there. The trucks
18 are out back, smaller parking lot, single access point
19 are all good things that they have already built into
20 the plan.

21 I have to apologize that I don't have a copy of
22 that plan. I'll try to tailor my comments to what I
23 see up there. So, we support the access management -
24 the trucks in the back and the overall layout.

25 There are some maple trees along the site

1 frontage and also toward the south side.

2 MR. HERSHBERG: There are four or five down
3 here (Indicating).

4 MR. GRASSO: I think that there is actually a
5 really big one here (Indicating). It looks like
6 you're going to be able to avoid them. Let's make sure
7 that we know those. If you start to shift the building
8 towards it, you have to make sure you're not impacting
9 those. There are some really nice maples closer to the
10 front that would be important to save.

11 You gave a great dialogue about the sidewalks
12 but did not get into any specifics about what is being
13 done as part of this proposal. It's just an issue that
14 we have to make the Planning Board aware of.

15 Obviously, I don't think it's appropriate for
16 this scale of development to build a half-mile
17 sidewalk but to add to a pedestrian plan that serves
18 the overall area -

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: But you are proposing to link
20 that access street - is that we said?

21 MR. HERSHBERG: No, our goal here is to work
22 with the Town to figure out if they are ready for us
23 to make an additional contribution to pedestrian
24 mitigation and use that now to do something - we will
25 do it now. In fact, if they prefer to accumulate more

1 funds so they can get a more global solution to the
2 pedestrian problem, we will do that to. I think that's
3 an issue that we worked out. What's the reasonable
4 amount for this developer to contribute? Obviously to
5 build the entire sidewalk structure at this time would
6 not make sense for the size of this development.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I agree with that.

8 Do we have a lot of escrow money? How does that
9 work? I know you contributed from one of your other
10 projects in the vicinity. How does that work -- the
11 escrow money?

12 MR. TENGELER: I assume that there is an escrow
13 setup for pedestrian amenities and that's been
14 accumulating. I do know what the amount of that is
15 right now.

16 MR. GRASSO: So, in terms of the right of way,
17 it looks like there is a conveyance strip across the
18 frontage.

19 MR. HERSHBERG: Essentially what we are talking
20 about doing is not necessarily conveying but not
21 putting anything in that area that would encumber it
22 so that it could not be conveyed as part of a
23 right-of-way. We think it is an appropriate
24 right-of-way to give -

25 MR. GRASSO: To accommodate a future sidewalk

1 which obviously we would support.

2 The last thing that we had -- has there been
3 any kind of recent jurisdictional determination on the
4 wetlands to confirm that DEC is not looking to take
5 jurisdiction on it? It is a sizable complex.

6 MR. CAMPITO: We did that when we did 150 Wade
7 Road.

8 MR. HERSHBERG: We got a jurisdictional letter
9 issued by the Army Corps, but I don't know whether or
10 not there was a consults on the New York State -

11 MR. GRASSO: We would recommend that. It is a
12 large complex and I would hate to see them come in
13 late and say hey, were taking jurisdiction because of
14 its size based on new delineations. Therefore, you get
15 that 100-foot buffer requirement.

16 MR. HERSHBERG: We did check the map. Quite
17 honestly, in the past when a project starts in an New
18 York State jurisdictional wetland -- we honor their
19 maps at that point. They are hard-pressed to come in
20 and claim after the fact that they want to take
21 jurisdiction. It's not that DEC can't do those things
22 to protect the wetlands, but this point here it would
23 be unusual for them to come in and change it in the
24 middle of a project and say now we want jurisdiction.
25 We will verify with the Army Corps and DEC.

1 MR. GRASSO: That would be great.

2 That's it.

3 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Good comments. I don't have
4 anything to add.

5 Okay, thank you.

6

7 (Was the above entitled proceeding was concluded at
8 8:05 p.m.)

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.

NANCY L. STRANG

Dated _____

