

1 PLANNING BOARD COUNTY OF ALBANY

2 TOWN OF COLONIE

3 \*\*\*\*\*

4 RIDGEVIEW MEADOWS SUBDIVISION  
1126 LOUDON ROAD, SKETCH PLAN REVIEW

5 \*\*\*\*\*

6 THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled matter  
7 by NANCY L. STRANG, a Shorthand Reporter commencing on  
October 30, 2018 at 8:17 p.m. at The Public Operations  
Center, 347 Old Niskayuna Road, Latham, New York

8 BOARD MEMBERS:  
9 PETER STUTO, CHAIRMAN  
10 CRAIG SHAMLIAN  
11 BRIAN AUSTIN  
12 KATHLEEN DALTON  
13 SUSAN MILSTEIN  
14 LOU MION  
15 STEVEN HEIDER

16 ALSO PRESENT:

17 Michael C. Magguilli, Esq., Town Attorney  
18 Joseph LaCivita, Director, Planning and Economic  
19 Mahassti Donadio  
20 Jeff Connery  
21 Terresa Bakner, Esq. Whiteman Osterman & Hanna  
22 Roger Keating, PE, Chazen Companies  
23 Charles Voss, PE, Barton and Loguidice

24  
25

1                   CHAIRMAN STUTO: The next item on the agenda is  
2 Ridgeview Meadows subdivision, 1126 Loudon Road, sketch  
3 plan review, 23-lot subdivision.

4                   Joe LaCivita, anything to say?

5                   MR. LACIVITA: Peter, this is here for sketch  
6 plan review. I know there has been a lot of conversation  
7 on this project with abutting uses.

8                   Roger is going to skip to the 1126 New Loudon  
9 and will talk a little bit about how it connects to  
10 the greater parcels.

11                  MS. BAKNER: Terresa Bakner from Whiteman,  
12 Osterman and Hanna. I'm here tonight on behalf of  
13 Ridgeview Meadows at North Colonie. We are here tonight  
14 for sketch plan review. It has been submitted to the  
15 Building Department for zoning verification.

16                  With me tonight is Roger Keating from the  
17 Chazen Companies, who you all know as well as Ben  
18 Avery from Black Rock Construction.

19                  This project was in front of the Board in a  
20 different existence as part of a PDD proposal back in  
21 July 2017. It has been a while since we've been in.

22                  At that time, there was some very specific  
23 suggestions made to the property owner with respect to  
24 how to design this project. The emphasis was on having  
25 it be single-family residential with lots that are

1 consistent in size with houses that are consistent in  
2 size and quality to the surrounding area.

3 So, we went back and looked at the minutes  
4 from those meetings. What we tried to do was address  
5 each and every issue that had been raised by the  
6 Planning Board in terms of dissatisfaction with the  
7 previous design. So, each lot is more than 18,000  
8 square feet. Many of them are much more than 18,000  
9 square feet. We have five houses going in the  
10 Nottingham Way direction and we have 16 houses going  
11 in the other direction. We have only 21 houses all  
12 over. It does say 23 lots but that's of course for the  
13 stormwater and other infrastructure. The goal here was  
14 to meet all the requirements of the Zoning Code and to  
15 not require any variances of any type. There are no  
16 area variances. Each lot meets the table requirement  
17 that is set forth for single-family residences.

18 We also have delineated all the wetlands on  
19 the site. You will see that they are predominantly in  
20 the center of the site. There is a jurisdictional  
21 determination that was issued by the Army Corps of  
22 Engineers and the project has been designed so that we  
23 affect less than 1/10 of an acre and only for roadway  
24 crossing. So, we are clearly covered under the  
25 Nationwide Permit 29.

1                   We still have some work to do. This is just  
2 sketch plan. What we don't have is testing for the  
3 stormwater basins. We still need to do some  
4 archaeological work as well. What we wanted to do was  
5 come in front of you and we have been at the DCC and  
6 got their comments, but we wanted to come in front of  
7 the Board and make sure that now that we have put the  
8 conservation subdivision behind us, that we meet the  
9 requirements of the Board for SFR.

10                   The property alongside Route 9 is in a  
11 separate parcel. That is going to remain as it is.  
12 That is zoned COR. We are not proposing any zone  
13 change or anything along those lines. It is purely and  
14 simply a single-family residential development. I will  
15 turn it over to Roger.

16                   MR. KEATING: My name is Roger Keating from the  
17 Chazen companies.

18                   We are looking at providing water service  
19 connections off of the end of Weatherby Court. As we  
20 went through the DCC review, it was desired to have  
21 that water main looped. So, we have taken the water  
22 line and looped it through the development so that it  
23 also connects out to Nottingham Way.

24                   Public sewer is available along both  
25 Nottingham Way and at the end of Weatherby Court. We

1 simply would be doing a sanitary sewer line extension  
2 along both of those roadways to bring the service to  
3 those lots.

4 We have identified several areas on the  
5 project site for on-site stormwater management - two  
6 rather large areas in the center portion and a few  
7 smaller areas along the Weatherby Court extension that  
8 we are proposing.

9 You mentioned briefly the access points. We  
10 do not have any access point to Bergen Woods Drive  
11 here. There is the potential for an emergency access  
12 there - there is no road connections or anything along  
13 those lines. Then, we do have a dead-end connection  
14 that would go towards the adjoining property to the  
15 south, which would be a temporary cul-de-sac that  
16 would be in place there.

17 I think I hit the points with respect to the  
18 utilities. So, I will turn it back over to the  
19 Chairman and the Board.

20 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, this is going to be  
21 reviewed, if the application continues, by our Town  
22 Designated Engineer. Again, it is Chuck Voss, for the  
23 record of Barton and Loguidice.

24 Chuck, do you have any preliminary comments  
25 on this?

1                   MR. VOSS: Just briefly - there has been no  
2 formal application for us to review at this point.

3                   I would just like to make the Board aware and  
4 they certainly know that we have been involved with  
5 this project when it was a PDD application many months  
6 ago and went through all those discussions and  
7 comments and attended several of the public  
8 information meetings that were associated with that  
9 overall project. We are very familiar with some of the  
10 issues out there, the concerns of the residents and  
11 certainly the concerns of the Board with that prior  
12 discussion.

13                   I think we will be paying particular  
14 attention just to the interconnect issues that  
15 certainly are going to be prevalent with this.

16                   The utilities, we don't think are an issue.  
17 Certainly the wetland complex out there and the  
18 avoidance of that will be something that we will be  
19 interested in making sure that we look at as we go  
20 forward.

21                   At this point, there's really nothing further  
22 for us to comment on, Peter, in terms of looking and  
23 reviewing at something formally.

24                   CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, we normally don't take  
25 public comment. There isn't even an application in. I

1 see that some of the residents did come out. So, we are  
2 not going to get into a big back and forth, but if you  
3 want your opinions to be heard at this point, we will  
4 call you up.

5 Ms. Donadio.

6 MS. DONADIO: My house is here (Indicating).  
7 The only things I'm concerned about are the deer. Where  
8 the deer going to go? Is it going to be this place for  
9 them? I am not thinking about the road next to my house.  
10 I'm not thinking about this houses behind my house. The  
11 deer - I have been seeing them for 17 years. They is in  
12 my backyard. I'm just thinking - were they going to go?

13 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.

14 We will consider that as this project moves  
15 forward.

16 Jeff Connery,

17 MR. CONNERY: I live at 15 Weatherby, which  
18 puts me right here (Indicating).

19 I have to say that I'm kind of impressed with  
20 the fact that I never thought that the builder was  
21 listening to what we wanted and it seems like they  
22 kind of are, but there are a couple of issues and I  
23 think it was mentioned. They did a nice job with  
24 getting the lots in there. A lot of our neighbors were  
25 not against a nice development going in. The only

1 thing that everybody in our neighborhood seemed to be  
2 against was making a road connection.

3 I know that Mr. Jones on this part  
4 (Indicating) had submitted plans which showed a  
5 connection to this also. Now, Mr. Jones, on his last  
6 submittal, was told to leave access up off of his  
7 Boght road project that he's doing currently. So, that  
8 would give this project access from Boght Road. The  
9 only thing is: The Town would have to provide an  
10 easement of this process, if this project isn't ready  
11 to go yet. So, I'm a little concerned about the fact  
12 that there is possible segmentation that's going on  
13 with this.

14 Unless, Mr. Magguilli, you can explain it to  
15 me -

16 CHAIRMAN STUTO: We're not answering questions.  
17 Were going to take your comments. There's not even an  
18 application. The issues will percolate.

19 MR. CONNERY: Over on the side right here  
20 (Indicating) - a lot of what we were concerned about was  
21 not having all the trees taken away because there's a  
22 cul-de-sac here for Bergen Woods and there is a  
23 cul-de-sac here for Weatherby. We were concerned about  
24 all these trees being knocked out and they go and stick  
25 one house right here in the corner against this

1 (Indicating), which is going to take all the trees down  
2 plus the sewer line utility easement for the Jones'  
3 property at some point. That's going to take everything  
4 out of there and change both situations at the end of  
5 both streets.

6 I took this paperwork and I did some math on  
7 this and there is 72,000 square feet of usable space  
8 here for houses. This house can actually be moved over  
9 here (Indicating) and this can all be fit in. When you  
10 break down the 72,900 square feet, it works out to  
11 18,263 square feet. So, there is a usable 18,000  
12 square feet lot over here (Indicating). So, this house  
13 could be moved. You wouldn't have to do this and you  
14 wouldn't have to take all the trees out of here. You  
15 could run this sewer line easement straight across  
16 like this and leave the majority of the mature trees  
17 in our neighborhood. That's really what we talked to  
18 Mrs. Mahan about - that we didn't want everything  
19 leveled. That's what's going to happen if you let them  
20 do this right here - in the bottom corner.

21 Other than that, I really didn't think they  
22 were listening. That is my issue - is the connection  
23 here. The connection can be made through the Jones  
24 property. Jones is property already has the stub to  
25 show that's going to connect to this.

1                   We are very concerned not about price point  
2 but we are concerned about square footage - that it  
3 will be similar in square footage to our homes.

4                   CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.

5                   Chief, we will start on your side. You have  
6 any comments or questions?

7                   MR. HEIDER: I am more concerned with Weatherby  
8 and about emergency access. I don't remember where we  
9 left it off with the Jones' property, but that's nowhere  
10 near in the future, as far as I know. I can't imagine  
11 the Fire Department liking this with no access to the  
12 back of the project at all.

13                   MR. CONNERY: We are not against the walkway or  
14 the road through their. We don't want a road going  
15 through there. We don't mind if there's like a bike path  
16 that goes through that neighborhood.

17                   MR. HEIDER: That's a road.

18                   MR. CONNERY: I know, but what they are  
19 proposing is a road. We kind of wanted a cul-de-sac for  
20 their project there and then just have a bike path going  
21 through that has a knockdown balaster so a fire truck  
22 could get through.

23                   CHAIRMAN STUTO: Let's try not to have a back  
24 and forth.

25                   Do you have any response to what the Chief

1 was saying - the applicant?

2 MR. KEATING: well, we are looking at the area  
3 as well for pedestrian/fire access is needed at the end  
4 of Bergen would strive right in that area. If there is a  
5 secondary means of ingress/egress that is needed, they  
6 could very easily be a walkway or something that goes  
7 from that location to tie into the Weatherby extension.

8 MR. HEIDER: The only question I had for you:  
9 That first house on the right - that first lot on the  
10 right that he's talking about - - is it because of the  
11 layout of the land that has to be shown where it is? It  
12 is a big lot.

13 MR. KEATING: Again, it is sketch plan. I'm  
14 sure that we could look at moving the house around as  
15 part of the plan.

16 MR. HEIDER: That easement to the Town - that  
17 will be clear.

18 MR. KEATING: For utilities there, yes.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Craig?

20 MR. SHAMLIAN: So, just to clarify: The stub  
21 it's going down into the Jones' property - we did not  
22 approve anything on the other side of that - - this is  
23 more of a comment. So, that is a stub to nowhere right  
24 now.

25 MR. KEATING: That is a stub to nowhere,

1 correct.

2 MR. SHAMLIAN: I agree with the Chief. I think  
3 you should look at Lot 16 and see what you could do with  
4 that in terms of either moving the lot completely or  
5 certainly shifting the house and being able to maintain  
6 some green space. Otherwise, I don't have a lot of issue  
7 with this. I have no issue with the connectivity. It was  
8 always contemplated. It was always laid out that way.  
9 When the bigger project was a PDD, the issue was  
10 connectivity all the way out to Route 9. This has  
11 eliminated all possibility of that. So, I think you're  
12 headed in the right direction and that's my opinion.

13 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Susan?

14 MS. MILSTEIN: I don't have anything to ask.

15 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Brian?

16 MR. AUSTIN: I agree. I'm quite impressed from  
17 where was in the beginning stages with the PDD and all  
18 the buildings and aspects that were going in to now  
19 which is a residential. I agree with Craig that  
20 Weatherby Court was originally intended to be extended  
21 kind of the way that it was going out originally. That  
22 one house in the corner - we agree that that really  
23 looks out of place and it's a stub to nowhere. You can't  
24 really make it a paper street because I know you want to  
25 make one house in there as well. That one project, we

1 have not approved that or I'm not sure where we are with  
2 that. I think neighbors have expressed that they are  
3 pleased with it too. Good job.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Lou?

5 MR. MION: I just echo what everyone else has  
6 just said. I agree with them. You did a real good job,  
7 considering everything that you were working with.

8 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Kathy?

9 MS. DALTON: Me too.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I think you have heard a lot  
11 of good comments from the neighbors. That's something to  
12 go back with. Thank you.

13 MR. KEATING: Thank you.

14 (Where is the above entitled proceeding was  
15 concluded at 8:30 p.m.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

CERTIFICATION

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

