

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

\*\*\*\*\*

CRISAFULLI WAREHOUSE  
348 OLD NISKAYUNA ROAD  
APPLICATION FOR CONCEPT ACCEPTANCE

\*\*\*\*\*

THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled matter by NANCY L. STRANG, a Shorthand Reporter, commencing on February 27, 2018 at 7:37 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  
SUSAN MILSTEIN

ALSO PRESENT:

Joseph LaCivita, Planning and Economic Development Department  
Michael Tengeler, Planning and Economic Development Department  
Joseph Grasso, PE, CHA  
Luigi Palleshi, PE, ABD Engineers  
Michael Crisafulli, Jr.  
Gloria Hubbard

1                   CHAIRMAN STUTO: The next item on the agenda is  
2                   Crisafulli Warehouse, 348 Old Niskayuna Road,  
3                   Application for concept acceptance, 63,357 square foot  
4                   warehouse.

5                   Joe LaCivita, do you have any preliminary  
6                   comments on this one?

7                   MR. LACIVITA: We'll give these guys a second  
8                   to get set up.

9                   The only dates that I want to get on the record  
10                  is the project was before the Departmental  
11                  Coordination Committee on September 13, 2017. We saw  
12                  this on November 28, 2017 for sketch. It is in the  
13                  Airport Area GEIS, so mitigation fees will apply and  
14                  it is in the airport district.

15                  Luigi Palleshi is here before us tonight from  
16                  ABD to take us through the project. That, again, is  
17                  for concept acceptance.

18                  MR. PALLESHI: Good evening. I'm Luigi Palleshi  
19                  here tonight for ABD Engineers. We are here tonight on  
20                  behalf of Crisafulli Associates. Michael Crisafulli is  
21                  here with me tonight.

22                  The project as you mentioned is located at 348  
23                  Old Niskayuna Road, directly across the road from the  
24                  building that we are sitting in right now.

25                  The property is 5.5 acres. It's adjoining the

1 Albany county Airport lands and also zoned commercial  
2 airport business.

3 What we are proposing to do is an entrance off  
4 of Old Niskayuna Road which would serve a 63,752  
5 square foot office warehouse building. It would be  
6 one-story in height, approximately 30 feet in height  
7 with parking along the southerly side of the building.

8 On the northerly side we are proposing dock  
9 doors. The landscaping on the property - we are  
10 proposing mixed pines along both the adjoining  
11 properties as well as sporadic throughout the site,  
12 especially around the dumpster area and around the  
13 building. There will be foundation shrubs low-lying  
14 near the building.

15 We are proposing 35.2% greenspace on the site.  
16 There are existing water utilities located on Old  
17 Niskayuna Road. There is a water main that we will be  
18 connecting to. As part of the DCC, one of the comments  
19 from Latham Water was to extend the water main into  
20 the site. We had proposed an eight-inch water main  
21 extending into the site with a hydrant and our fire  
22 service line would come off of that.

23 Septic is proposed on the project. We are  
24 anticipating with the office warehouse usage - it's  
25 very low use. It's similar to what we have done in the

1 areas here on a low-type use. We had proposed a septic  
2 system mainly because the sanitary sewer system is  
3 more than 1,000 or 1,500 feet away. There is a pump  
4 station in this direction and there is also one that  
5 heads underneath the airport.

6 Lighting is proposed. It will be all down-type  
7 lighting - LED. The pole lights would be 18 feet in  
8 height, all down-type lighting and the building  
9 mounted lights, again, would be all down-type  
10 lighting.

11 The stormwater is proposed to utilize  
12 infiltration on the site. It will be in conformance to  
13 the Town standards and Dec stormwater regulations.

14 Right now we have this set up for possibly four  
15 tenants. It could very well be one. We are trying to  
16 set it up and there is no set tenant yet for this  
17 facility. We also provide the building rendering. This  
18 is just preliminary right now as far as colors and  
19 looks, but we just wanted to give you an idea of what  
20 the project would look like.

21 I believe that we addressed all the DCC concept  
22 approval and at this time if any of the Board Members  
23 have any questions, I'll be happy to answer them.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, this has been reviewed  
25 by our Town Designated Engineer, CHA.

1 Joe Grasso, could you give us your comments on  
2 this project?

3 MR. GRASSO: Sure. So, there is a letter from  
4 CHA in your packets dated February 16, 2018. We don't  
5 have a lot of significant comments on the plan. It is  
6 a zoning compliant project. It's gone through the DCC  
7 and the departmental reviews. This plan reflects  
8 addressing any of the comments that were previously  
9 raised.

10 The project site is located within the Airport  
11 Area GEIS study area, so mitigation of cumulative  
12 impacts are going to be required according to what the  
13 findings statement of that document.

14 Regarding the building architecture - we think  
15 that it is attractive for this site as a warehouse and  
16 distribution facility.

17 Luigi had a board up showing a rendering of it.

18 Given the size and scale of the building and  
19 the proximity to the adjacent single family  
20 residences, we do recommend that material samples and  
21 a color board be provided to the Planning Board for  
22 review.

23 We assume the second-story clear windows showed  
24 on the rendering were mezzanine - can you just point  
25 those out? They are not counted toward the useful

1 building square footage. So, we are looking for  
2 confirmation of that.

3 Is that the case?

4 MR. PALLESHI: Again, that's conceptual right  
5 now. I think that it's more that this is the warehouse  
6 and more to shed some light internally into the  
7 warehouse. There would be a mezzanine over the top.

8 MR. GRASSO: So, it's not designated as a  
9 two-story building.

10 MR. PALLESHI: That is correct.

11 MR. GRASSO: That was really our question.

12 The concept plans depict building mounted  
13 lights and we always caution at the use of wall-pack.  
14 Certain fixtures are restricted in the Town and we  
15 recommend that cut-sheets be provided early on with  
16 the review process to ensure appropriate fixtures are  
17 used and won't create glare to off-site areas.

18 We had some comments regarding the stormwater  
19 feasibility testing that was done. It does appear that  
20 infiltration will be an appropriate treatment  
21 mechanism. We did raise some questions regarding where  
22 the seasonal high groundwater should be measured to,  
23 based on some of the test results provided.

24 The proposed access drive is bordered on the  
25 north and south with existing single family

1 residential homes. The plan depicts clearing and  
2 grading right up to those property lines with very  
3 limited proposed landscaping. So, our suggestion would  
4 be that additional landscaping buffering be provided  
5 to provide almost complete visual separation between  
6 the access drive and the adjacent residences just  
7 based on the non-compatibility of the proposed use.

8 As Luigi mentioned, the soils are supportive of  
9 an on-site waste septic system, so that is adequate.

10 In terms of the vegetation, the response letter  
11 indicated that a site walk was performed by a  
12 qualified biologist. It is noted in the report that  
13 the site consists mostly poplar tree and invasive  
14 species that are not worthy of saving. We agree with  
15 that assessment.

16 The concept plan does depict the limit of  
17 grading.

18 Lastly just in terms of the SEQR review, it's  
19 an unlisted action pursuant to SEQR. The applicant has  
20 provided a Part I completed. The only involved agency  
21 appears to be the Planning Board and we believe that a  
22 short EAF adequately describes the environmental  
23 setting and the proposed project. So, based on the  
24 limited impacts, we don't believe significant  
25 environmental impacts are expected to occur and we

1 recommend that the Planning Board withhold making a  
2 determination until we get more final plans for  
3 review.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you take exception to  
5 anything stated by the Town Designated Engineer?

6 MR. CRISAFULLI: They are all agreeable.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Are there members of the  
8 public looking to speak on this one?

9 (There was no response.)

10 Okay, we'll open it up to the Planning Board.

11 MS. MILSTEIN: I have a question. You don't  
12 have the tenants identified yet, do you?

13 MR. PALLESHI: No.

14 MS. MILLSTEIN: Do you know what type of  
15 tenants you're looking for or what type of materials  
16 or items are going to be stored there?

17 MR. CRISAFULLI: No, we don't. This is typical  
18 of any building like this that you would find in the  
19 Town - usually in a light industrial distribution type  
20 tenants, service related businesses. It could be any  
21 number of uses. Usually it's typically a small office  
22 component, warehouse space, docks, drive-in doors.  
23 It's tough to really say. So, no, I don't know exactly  
24 what materials.

25 MS. MILSTEIN: Would they be storing like

1 hazardous materials? Is that a possibility?

2 MR. CRISAFULLI: It's a possibility. We'd have  
3 to comply with all the zoning or the building codes,  
4 if that were the case. We would have to run that  
5 through the departments but it's a possibility, yes.  
6 Everything can be hazardous if it's stacked. But yes,  
7 it's possible. I don't want to say no and be  
8 disingenuous.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Any other comments or  
10 questions?

11 MS. HUBBARD: My name is Gloria Hubbard. I own  
12 the property across the street on both sides of the  
13 proposed warehouse here.

14 I have a question in regard to the water table.  
15 In the spring everything over here floods  
16 (Indicating). I was wondering how they were going to  
17 be taking care of that with so much blacktop, concrete  
18 and everything. We're not going to have any place  
19 where the water will run off from the airport into  
20 this 5.5 acres.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, do you have any other  
22 questions?

23 MS. HUBBARD: No.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, if you could have a seat  
25 we'll have a response by the applicant and our Town

1 Designated Engineer.

2 We will turn it over to the applicant.

3 Can you respond about the stormwater management  
4 and ground water?

5 MR. PALLESHI: So, back in August of last year,  
6 2017, we did test pits out there with both the Town  
7 stormwater department as well as the Albany County  
8 Department of Health for the septic system. We did go  
9 down about five feet and it was brown sand as you  
10 would typically find. We hit modeling around three  
11 feet in the ground. All of the stormwater run-off from  
12 the rooftop and the pavement will be distributed  
13 throughout the site in several different infiltration  
14 basins. They will be designed so that we can handle  
15 100-year storage volume within each of those basins.  
16 With the TDE and the Town overlooking our stormwater  
17 calculations that will ensure that we meet the  
18 compliance with both the Town regulations for  
19 stormwater as well as New York State DEC.

20 As far as the drainage from the county airport.  
21 They have their own - from what it appears from the  
22 aerial - their own several drainage ditches and  
23 stormwater drainage areas that a don't go through this  
24 site. The southern portion of the site sits higher and  
25 it's all rolling towards the airport area. We are

1 utilizing the existing grades and we can't discharge  
2 any more off the site after we develop the site than  
3 what you see today.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: How would you characterize the  
5 impact on this woman's residential properties?

6 MR. PALLESHI: We feel that it won't have any  
7 impact to these residential properties because  
8 everything is along the rear of their properties.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Did that address groundwater,  
10 as well?

11 MR. PALLESHI: So, the modeling was encountered  
12 around three feet from the surface.

13 CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, what does that mean?

14 MR. PALLESHI: What that means is when we dig  
15 these infiltration basins down, we need separation  
16 distances between that seasonal high ground water  
17 table to the proposed rate of our basin. These will  
18 normally remain dry. They are infiltration basins and  
19 the idea for those is that you don't have any standing  
20 water.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can you respond to that?

22 MR. GRASSO: Obviously, we agree with what  
23 Luigi just said.

24 So, when we talk about modeling, you dig a test  
25 pit five feet down and no ground water comes in. Very

1 often that is the case because you may not be doing  
2 that at the point of the year where groundwater is  
3 highest. One of the things that we looked for is  
4 modeling which is a discoloration within the soil  
5 profile. That's an indicator and when we start to see  
6 modeling we pick that as the seasonal high ground  
7 water level. So, all their designs are based on that  
8 highest elevation and we make sure that we are not  
9 designing a system that is going to be effected by  
10 groundwater any time during the year.

11 So, all the run-off from the site will be  
12 contained within the property line and treated both  
13 from a flood control standpoint and a stormwater  
14 quality standpoint. Flood control means that the  
15 regulations require that you can't discharge any more  
16 run-off off the site than exists today in a completely  
17 undeveloped state. That is something that - they will  
18 go through the engineering analysis as the plans  
19 advance. Basically what we want to do now is make sure  
20 that the concept and the stormwater management  
21 approaches acceptable and we think that the plan is  
22 going to advance without significant changes to the  
23 layout based on the regulations. We do the final  
24 review of all the those things as part of our review.

25 CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, you agree that it's not

1 going to negatively impact the residential homes  
2 there.

3 MR. GRASSO: That's correct.

4 MR. PALLESHI: The other thing that I'd like to  
5 add is that all soils - as we do testing for  
6 percolation of that soil - every soil has a different  
7 percability and when we do our analysis and our  
8 design, the Town's Stormwater Department actually has  
9 a factor safety of 2 for a storm infiltration on-site.  
10 We took this above and beyond the concept level and  
11 actually looked at these areas and designed the  
12 stormwater already, even though it's not required at  
13 this conceptual level.

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Does that answer your  
15 question, ma'am?

16 MS. HUBBARD: Sort of.

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you have a follow-up  
18 question?

19 MS. HUBBARD: I want to see it in April around  
20 that side of the property (Indicating). Right across  
21 the street there are ducks that swim in the  
22 groundwater across the street.

23 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I think that what they are  
24 saying is they're going to design it to current  
25 engineering standards which say it's not supposed to

1 impact your property. It's supposed to keep the water  
2 on the property and not release it any quicker. That  
3 the stormwater part. They are also supposed to not  
4 impact low enough to impact the groundwater.

5 MS. HUBBARD: The water level on this road is  
6 very high.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Right and they think that they  
8 know where it is from the test pits that they did and  
9 they'll bring in fill if they have to in order to not  
10 impact that. So, that's what I understand them to say.  
11 We'll be back again for final.

12 Any questions or comments from the Board?

13 MS. MILSTEIN: So, could this project actually  
14 help with the water that is existing?

15 MR. PALLESHI: I think that it will help  
16 alleviate some of the water that sits where I believe  
17 she is talking about. As we get in there and clear it  
18 and regrade with drainage swales and so forth, yes.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Anybody else?

20 (There was no response.)

21 Okay, we have an application for concept  
22 acceptance, subject to all Town departments and  
23 comments of the Town Designated Engineer and Planning  
24 Board comments. Do we have a motion?

25 MR. AUSTIN: I'll make that motion.

1 MR. MION: second.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Any discussion?

3 (There was no response.)

4 All those in favor, say aye.

5 (Ayes were recited.)

6 All those opposed, say nay.

7 (There were none opposed.)

8 The ayes have it.

9 Thank you.

10 MR. PALLESHI: Thank you.

11

12 (Whereas the above entitled proceeding was concluded  
13 at 7:55 p.m.)

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 \_\_\_\_\_

