

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 AUTO GLASS
327 OLD NISKAYUNA ROAD
APPLICATION FOR CONCEPT ACCEPTANCE

THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled matter
by NANCY L. STRANG, a Shorthand Reporter commencing
on May 8, 2018 at 7:22 p.m. at The Public Operations
Center, 347 Old Niskayuna Road, Latham, New York

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

ALSO PRESENT:

Michael C. Magguilli, Esq., Town Attorney
Michael Tengeler, Planning and Economic Development
Department
Daniel Hershberg, PE, Hershberg and Hershberg
Joseph Grasso, PE, CHA

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Next item on the agenda is
2 Safelite Auto Glass, 327 Old Niskayuna Road, application
3 for concept acceptance, one-story, 40,500 square foot
4 building, 30 parking spaces and eight banked spaces.

5 MR. LACIVITA: Again, this is an action on
6 concept. The project was before our Development
7 Coordination Committee meeting on November 1, 2017. It
8 was before this Board on February 13, 2018. It is in the
9 airport area GEIS area and it is zoned in the COR
10 business district.

11 Once again, Dan Hershberg will take us
12 through the project.

13 MR. HERSHBERG: I'm Daniel Hershberg from the
14 firm of Hershberg and Hershberg. I'm here today with
15 Peter Campito as the applicant. Sitting right next to
16 Peter is Bill Mafrici, who is responsible for preparing
17 some of these very nice pictures that I put up. I don't
18 do any CAD work or coloring work, accepted with crayons.

19 The site limit is pretty much at this
20 intersection (Indicating). When we first started the
21 project, Safelite reversed into the other direction
22 so that the driveway was closer to the intersection.
23 We put it on this side here and the circulation
24 pattern seems to work out better. A truck can pull
25 into here, backup and can turn out and get out again.

1 The loading docks are back in this corner here
2 (Indicating). Employees are here.

3 Again, I don't operate a Safelite facility,
4 but I understand that this company primarily uses --
5 if you follow their ads on television, when you get a
6 broken windshield and you're out at the playground,
7 they send their people out with their equipment and
8 trucks, so they have to have trucks there and
9 vehicles parked there and they will be out in the
10 field or doing work there and also some employee
11 parking. Therefore, we have provided parking on the
12 side for employees or trucks.

13 We do show some banked parking here and some
14 banked parking in front. We don't think we are going
15 to need it for this particular site. We think our
16 computation is pretty much correct. We have 16
17 employees; one and a half per employee is 24; one
18 space per 225 square feet. We have 3,100 square feet
19 of office space. So, we think that requires 14. So,
20 there is a total of 30 parking spots. We intend to
21 build 30 and bank eight. We think that's going to be
22 enough because the employees will swap out for their
23 cars into trucks when they come in the morning to go
24 out in the field. I think the only time it will be
25 busy is if Safelite doesn't have any business and

1 their trucks are there all day and employees are
2 there all day.

3 The only thing they do here is assemble the
4 windshields and shields and stuff like that. There is
5 nothing really produced here. The wind shields get
6 shipped with the right size for each car and they may
7 have to put seals on them or other things to adhere
8 them to your car, but it's not really an industrial
9 process. This is primarily a warehouse and workspace
10 for the employees.

11 Storm water management is here (Indicating).
12 We believe we are okay for porous pavement. We think
13 that essentially we can channel this roof area and
14 disperse that. We have prepared a SWPPP and submitted
15 it as part of our analysis. We think it works well.

16 We do have wetlands to contend with right
17 here (Indicating) and we do propose to do a sewer
18 connection across the wetlands to the existing pump
19 station which is over here (Indicating). We would
20 tend to bore that underneath the wetlands so we don't
21 have to do a wetland disturbance for that. We don't
22 intend to disturb any wetlands. Our goal is not to
23 apply for a nationwide permit at all.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, we are going to ask our
25 Town Designated Engineer, CHA represented by Joe Grasso

1 to give his comments on this. This is a voting item so
2 if members of the public want to speak, I would ask that
3 they sign up on the sign-up sheet.

4 Joe?

5 MR. GRASSO: So, we do have a comment letter in
6 your packet dated April 27. I will list my comments,
7 probably in the order of significance and try to pick up
8 some of the comments from the Planning Department and
9 the CAC.

10 One of the things that was discussed when the
11 project was in front of the Board for sketch plan
12 review a couple months ago was the impact on existing
13 vegetation. There is some substantial vegetation
14 along the north property line which separates the
15 site from some residential lots to the north. There
16 is also a significant maple tree right in the corner
17 of Old Niskayuna Road. The plan doesn't depict that
18 vegetation.

19 Dan, do you know what this project impact is
20 going to have and can you just describe for the Board
21 what is going to occur to that vegetation?

22 MR. HERSHBERG: You mean whether we are going
23 to be able to save that maple tree?

24 MR. GRASSO: Well, if you will be able to say
25 that maple tree and then there is a row of pines or

1 spruces along the north side.

2 MR. HERSHBERG: We have moved it away from
3 there. I don't know if it shows on your plans.

4 MR. GRASSO: So, this plan will not result in
5 the loss of any of the trees?

6 MR. HERSHBERG: Again, whenever you're digging
7 close to them, you have to be careful. We think because
8 the spruce trees primarily have longer tap roots rather
9 than larger roots like deciduous trees do, we think we
10 can build this. We are 15 feet off of it doing an
11 excavation for the building. We think that we can
12 maintain those spruces.

13 MR. GRASSO: You are 15 feet off the trees?

14 MR. HERSHBERG: Yes.

15 MR. GRASSO: If you can just confirm that when
16 you advance the plans and show those trees. The survey
17 should really extend 50 feet into the residential lots.
18 You really just surveyed up to the property line. It's
19 just something that we need some assurance.

20 MS. DALTON: I just didn't hear what it was; 15
21 or 50?

22 CHAIRMAN STUTO: It's 15.

23 MR. HERSHBERG: Our contours really stopped at
24 about here which is 15 feet off the property.

25 MR. GRASSO: When we looked at the aerial

1 photo, it just look like everything was going to have to
2 shift to the south. Again, it's just something we would
3 like confirmation on, as the applicant moves forward.

4 You did a good job discussing the proposed
5 land banked parking which we are supportive of. It
6 seems like you've got good justification for it. It
7 is something that would be a waiver item by the
8 Planning Board. So, that is something that the Board
9 should consider.

10 During the initial DCC review and sketch
11 plan, the need for pedestrian accommodations was
12 talked about. If you could just review that. I know
13 there's a propose sidewalk note on the plan, but it
14 doesn't really clarify exactly what is going to be
15 proposed or built as part of the project.

16 MR. HERSHBERG: This has been an issue with us
17 regarding how much pedestrian accessibility we have to
18 provide with this particular site. You may recall that
19 when we did another project on Wade Road, we ended up
20 doing a significant amount of - set aside for the cost
21 of pedestrian improvements. Our goal here would be to
22 provide something that the Town sees as a benefit, which
23 doesn't cause too much pain to Peter Campito.

24 So, the quantity of sidewalks we would have
25 to build here is subject to actually being built or

1 doing in escrow for - that is the subject that we
2 want to be able to discuss and talk out. I was sick,
3 given our choices we allowed for maybe the width of
4 the building. We don't think it's reasonable for my
5 client to pay the full cost of the entire roadway all
6 the way down to the Nexium sign at the other end of
7 the site. It's a significant run of pavement. When
8 other projects come along, we think that they are to
9 participate too. Again, if the plan here is to
10 require my client to participate for pedestrian
11 accommodations by building some or escrowing for some
12 - I think the whole question is the quantity.
13 Obviously, Peter's willing to discuss that and we can
14 act in his stead and try to keep the pain down for
15 him.

16 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you have any reaction to
17 that, or just take that as a sufficient reply?

18 MR. GRASSO: It is something that the Board
19 should weigh. I think the initial request from the
20 Planning Department was that the property is unique in
21 that it's got frontage on both Wade Road and Old
22 Niskayuna Road. So, there was a request to construct or
23 escrow the cost of the sidewalks along both roads.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: What's the lineal feet for
25 that - the maximum?

1 MR. HERSHBERG: We would have about 1,030 feet
2 if we used the frontage along Wade Road as well as Old
3 Niskayuna Road. That sounds like a lot for this building
4 though.

5 MR. GRASSO: It is and it is important to
6 understand that the frontage of Wade Road is actually
7 built out already. Obviously, there is no sidewalk
8 there. Where this building is going is really in another
9 part of the site. In our view, the focus should be on
10 establishing a sidewalk along the Old Niskayuna Road
11 corridor. The frontage is broken up as we see on the
12 coloring on the map. If there is a certain segment there
13 that could be built now or contributed to -

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Yes, it strikes me that it
15 should be a fair proportion in relation to the site of
16 the building.

17 Does the Board have any feelings on that?

18 (There was no response.)

19 Okay, we will continue that discussion.

20 MR. GRASSO: Most of the other comments that
21 were raised during the DCC process and sketch plan have
22 been addressed on the plans. It is in an area of
23 archaeological significance, so a cultural resources
24 report is going to be required. That will be a sign-off
25 from SHPPPO. It is an unlisted action pursuant to SEQR.

1 We have a minor comment regarding the completion of the
2 form. The Board will be expected to make a SEQR
3 determination when it comes back for final review.

4 Dan, Fire Services has raised a concern at
5 DCC about the parking spaces on the south side of the
6 building. It may have to be relocated to meet fire
7 accessibility requirements. To know what the code
8 issue was?

9 MR. HERSHBERG: Yes, we moved them away from
10 the building. I think we have addressed that issue.

11 Peter has ordered an archaeological study, so
12 that is underway.

13 MR. GRASSO: The last thing that I want to
14 bring the Board's attention to in our letter was - Dan
15 spoke about proposing porous pavement. In general, we
16 think porous pavement is a great storm water management
17 approach when the conditions are right. There are a
18 couple of concerns that we raised regarding use of
19 porous pavement on the site. One is obviously that the
20 site is subject to heavy truck traffic, which normally
21 doesn't go very well with porous pavement. Then, there
22 is some indication that there were some previous fills
23 on the site and porous pavement is generally restricted
24 from those areas.

25 MS. DALTON: I actually have a question. Can

1 you explain what kind of fill you're talking about? What
2 is the issue there?

3 MR. HERSHBERG: When we looked at the
4 geotechnical out here, there was evidence of fill. It
5 says essentially that they found remnants of concrete
6 three feet down. That was an indication that there was
7 some fill put in there. Quite honestly with most of the
8 pavement sections, we think when we excavate that and in
9 working with the original soil, fill is a problem
10 because 12-002 and the New York State Storm Water
11 Management Design Manual says that fill should not be
12 used in infiltration areas. We have to find that out and
13 figure out whether or not there are areas that we may
14 have to leave out for the porous pavement. We think
15 basically it is suitable for it. The main question is
16 always in areas like this with the separation of
17 groundwater being so close to a wetland - we have to
18 manage that. We have to keep it clear of the groundwater
19 by 4 feet because we are in a primary aquifer area with
20 the bottom of our pavement section. Yet, we need to keep
21 it so that we don't put everything on fill. It is a
22 balancing act. We think we can do it here.

23 Quite honestly, a lot of people are concerned
24 about porous pavement and how it holds up. We got a
25 heavy duty porous payment which essentially is just

1 more of the same mix of asphalt. We find as long as
2 we keep that section above 4 inches worth of asphalt
3 - it's a typical section. We don't want to do it with
4 2 1/2 or 3 inches, but 4 inches worth of asphalt
5 works very well for truck traffic. We have used it on
6 a number of sites that had similar truck traffic.
7 Everybody is concerned about porous pavement and
8 maintaining it, but I'm not.

9 MR. GRASSO: So, basically we just want to
10 alert the applicant to the fact that the digital testing
11 is going to be required and provided with the final
12 plans so that we can have support for.

13 CHAIRMAN STUTO: It doesn't look like any
14 members of the public signed up to speak on this.

15 We will turn it over to the Board.

16 Kathy?

17 MS. DALTON: I had a question, but it was
18 answered.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Lou?

20 MR. MION: Nothing.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Susan?

22 MS. MILSTEIN: No.

23 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Craig?

24 MR. SHAMLIAN: No.

25 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chief Heider?

1 MR. HEIDER: No.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I don't have any comments
3 either, except that the ones that were already
4 expressed.

5 So, do we have a motion for concept
6 acceptance?

7 MS. DALTON: I'll make that motion.

8 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Second?

9 MR. MION: I'll second.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Any discussion?

11 (There was no response.)

12 All those in favor, say aye.

13 (Ayes recited.)

14 All those opposed, say nay.

15 (There were none opposed.)

16 The ayes have it.

17 MR. HERSHBERG: Thank you

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: You're welcome.

19

20 (Whereas the above entitled proceeding was
21 concluded at 7:35 p.m.)

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

