

1 PLANNING BOARD COUNTY OF ALBANY

2 TOWN OF COLONIE

3 *****

ROSSETTI OFFICE/COMMERCIAL SUBDIVISION
925 WATERVLIET SHAKER ROAD
SKETCH PLAN REVIEW

5 *****

6 THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled matter
by NANCY L. STRANG, a Shorthand Reporter commencing on
7 March 10, 2020 at 8:47 p.m. at Memorial Town Hall,
Loudon Road, Newtonville, New York

8 BOARD MEMBERS:
PETER STUTO, CHAIRMAN
9 CRAIG SHAMLIAN
SUSAN MILSTEIN
10 CHIP ASHWORTH
LOU MION
11 PAUL ROSANO

12

13 ALSO PRESENT:

14 Kathleen Marinelli, Esq., Counsel to the Planning
Board
15 Sean M. Maguire, AICP, CecD, Director, Planning and
Economic Development
16 Zach Harrison, Planning and Economic Development
Department
17 Daniel Hershberg, Pe, Hershberg and Hershberg
Chuck Voss, PE, Barton and Logudice

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Next item on the agenda is
2 Rossetti Office/Commercial Subdivision, 925 Watervliet
3 Shaker Road, sketch plan review, three lot subdivision
4 with the anticipated construction of two buildings for
5 Capital Region BOCES totaling 206,000 square feet with
6 475 parking spaces. That's the project.

7 We will turn it over to the esteemed Mr.
8 Hershberg.

9 MR. HERSHBERG: The next slide shows what I
10 call a master plan. Let me explain briefly why we show
11 you the master plan.

12 The same applicant owns 925 Watervliet Shaker
13 Road, so it's a single parcel ownership. Why is this
14 master plan valued under SEQRA? Because otherwise if
15 we just evaluate Boces and next year we come back to
16 evaluate one of the commercial lots and come back to
17 evaluate the third the commercial lots, we go through
18 what's called segmentation. We break it down into
19 smaller parcels and have less impact on the
20 environment. So, we're not reviewing all the impact on
21 the environment. This does not mean you grant approval
22 if we go through final site plan approval on Boces.
23 You haven't granted any approval to the balance of the
24 site. We will just say at the full build-out level,
25 this is the level of traffic, this is the level of

1 sewer that we generate, this is the level of water
2 that we need. So, it is evaluated for the master plan
3 of the site because this is actually all under the
4 same ownership. SEQRA recommends that. It's is one
5 reason you should do this sort of analysis is because
6 if it is included in a long-range plan of which the
7 action under construction is a part - - well, this is
8 a long-range plan. It may not be so long-range,
9 depending upon what the office market is. We might be
10 back next year or the year after to do a significant
11 portion of the commercial buildings on site.

12 Again, let me just explain what the master
13 plan shows.

14 This is Boces which is defined as a 206,000
15 square foot building. This actually shows 514 parking
16 spots. We were able to rearrange the parking a little
17 bit and some of the comments we got at DCC, we
18 implemented. We actually added a little more parking
19 on the site. This matches Boces' need very closely.
20 The rest of the site shows office buildings of a
21 certain size, a commercial use which is made to look
22 like a drive-in restaurant with gas facilities.

23 Of the activities that occur there, probably
24 the one with the maximum impact on traffic is the
25 drive-in lunch time. That's a big traffic generator.

1 So, we picked that as a use there.

2 The office buildings are just placeholders.
3 We don't know that anybody wants a building that size.
4 So, at some time in the future if we come along, the
5 goal is to have evaluated a plan that could meet the
6 needs of Rossetti and the long-range plan. That's
7 pretty much it.

8 Now we can go to the Boces plan. This is
9 actually the site plan that we are here for review
10 for. We made out the EAF to be the entire site because
11 in order to avoid the thought - were not segmenting
12 the project into smaller projects which would have
13 less impact. So, this is the site plan and what it
14 shows is a private road over this parcel. These are
15 the limits of the parcel. This made us not have to go
16 for an open development area. If we had left it back
17 there and just had a connect by a private driveway, it
18 doesn't make the parcel limits come down there. We
19 would then need an ODA for this building (Indicating).
20 By doing that, we provide the frontage needed here and
21 this is part of the Boces site. There will be mutual
22 easements granted.

23 First of all, we use that as a route for a
24 sewer line coming down there, for the water line
25 coming across the road and then looping it back into

1 the Shaker West project, which is currently under
2 review by the Board for final approval. We think that
3 this is the right way to do it and it makes the
4 longest loop that we need. Whether or not there will
5 be a secondary connection someplace here will largely
6 depend upon the layout of the buildings and whether or
7 not there is any need for that. So, we don't allow any
8 dead-ends. Latham Water doesn't like a dead end water
9 main, so we have circulation taking place all the time
10 and it meets Boces' needs.

11 The Boces facility itself is actually made up
12 of two buildings. One is called the Career and
13 Technical Educational Building. That's a larger
14 building. This is 165,000 square feet. Then, this is
15 the Maywood Center which is the Maywood Special
16 Education School. In my sketch plan narrative, I talk
17 about what it has there. I also talk about the kind of
18 trades and identity things that are taking place in
19 the CTE building. It currently has about 800 high
20 school students and 150 adult students. This building
21 is needed to keep up with their program.

22 This is over 40% green. Parking takes up a
23 lot of it because it has the most parking. Lot 2 and 3
24 are those that show commercial uses on them for office
25 buildings. Both of those exceed 35%. The whole green

1 site for the whole area is 45.7% green. A portion of
2 that is a wetland area that we don't want to disturb.
3 We have avoided disturbing wetlands at all for this
4 project. There is a small piece of wetland up here and
5 here and here (Indicating). We avoided disturbing it.
6 We actually took the sewer and ran up behind the
7 wetlands so we wouldn't have to disturb the wetland
8 even temporarily for utility connection. The roadway
9 misses it. We put a little bump-out in our parking
10 area so we didn't have to disturb the last piece of
11 wetlands. The goal here is, quite honestly, to keep
12 the number of involved agencies to a minimum.

13 Boces really has to have the capability of
14 getting into the ground by the end of this year. It's
15 not an unreasonable schedule. We have nine months to
16 put it together and hopefully we can meet that
17 schedule and hopefully we can get a little latitude at
18 the end.

19 We made an application to the FAA because
20 were building a building in the approach area to the
21 runway and we think if anything, they may require a
22 light on it. We don't think we will, but we will do it
23 and find out if it has to be a fully lit obstruction.
24 We don't think it is.

25 During construction - the crane here will be

1 120 foot tall crane to serve the whole site and that
2 will probably require full-time lighting by FAA.

3 Like I said, the sewer is all gravity. This
4 area here is quite a high knoll. We're grading that
5 down significantly. The material there - we haven't
6 really found a home for it yet, we may temporarily
7 store some of it on a portion of the site. We may haul
8 some of it off-site. We haven't made that grading
9 decision.

10 In this area here, very little grading is
11 required on this. That stays green. The Town has
12 talked about retaining a sewer easement, so if they
13 ever want to connect it into something at the British
14 American property behind us, they can connect into
15 sewer and the sewer and water would also be granted
16 for the sort of connections. We think it's a great
17 project. We think that the Town would be proud to
18 continue its relationship with Boces and provide for
19 the new facility.

20 We hope that we can answer any questions
21 which this Board may have a sketch plan.

22 CHAIRMAN STUTO: This is being reviewed by our
23 other Town Designated Engineer, Barton and Loguidice.

24 Chuck Voss is here.

25 I know you haven't completed any formal

1 review, but any preliminary comments would be
2 appreciated.

3 MR. VOSS: Sure, Peter, thank you.

4 We did attend the DCC meetings for this
5 project a little while ago and we had visited the
6 site. We certainly know the design team. We know the
7 other Boces project that is almost done with
8 construction. So, we are familiar with the program and
9 the layout and typically how this works - - we're also
10 familiar with the site being involved with the review
11 of the West Shaker Farm site just to the west, as well
12 as the Afirm's site just beyond that. So, the
13 utilities and infrastructure in that area - we are
14 very familiar with.

15 We just want to touch on a couple of things.
16 Dan had mentioned the SEQRA and we certainly agree
17 with looking at a site master plan conceptually, if
18 you will. In developing the SEQRA design, it looks to
19 work within that master plan. I think that's the way
20 to go on this project. Even though Phase 1, if you
21 will, is the Boces project which may take a year or
22 two or three to build out, we went wholistically and
23 looked at the site to see how it's going to be
24 developed and assess the impacts that way.

25 We have talked to the Town Attorney's office

1 preliminarily and they have classified this as a Type
2 I action, which we agree with in terms of SEQRA.

3 So, we will certainly look for, Dan, that
4 expanded EAF form that you mentioned earlier. That
5 should sort of help us assess potential impacts of the
6 site.

7 As Dan mentioned, the utilities now will be
8 further pushed toward the east on Watervliet Shaker
9 Road with the advent of the West Shaker Farm site.
10 Sewer and water are now into that site, or will be
11 after approval. Latham Water and the Pure Waters
12 Department has certainly requested that they
13 interconnect to that existing system, which we agree
14 with.

15 There was also some discussion about
16 potential easements for maybe sewer and water to the
17 British American site just to the north of this.

18 I know, Dan, you were going to look into that
19 and that was something that we potentially can advance
20 later down the road.

21 I know the applicant talked early on about
22 some potential site access - additional means of
23 ingress into the British American site. Correct me if
24 I'm wrong, but they didn't seem to be too comfortable
25 with that - British American, at this point. So, that

1 may not be a possibility. Again, it was something that
2 the applicant had looked at for mutual access points
3 to another section.

4 One thing that Dan didn't mention that is
5 also going to be a part of this is a new traffic
6 signal at the end of their access road that will be
7 going in. Certainly given the potential amount of
8 traffic entering and exiting the site, I think that's
9 an improvement that certainly the county will support,
10 as well as the project. It's right at the bottom of
11 their access road on Watervliet Shaker.

12 Other than that, certainly there will be some
13 FAA attention given where the airport's radar is
14 located which is just to the east of the site up on
15 the knoll. Potentially considering the height of the
16 new building because it might be a large building,
17 there may be a shadow effect that they make that they
18 may be concerned with. We will let them sort that out.

19 Other than that, we are going to look for
20 some pedestrian amenities; potentially a bus stop on
21 Watervliet Shaker Road. Certainly the project as
22 proposed is an approved use of that area. We will
23 certainly look more as we go.

24 The stormwater system - we want to look at
25 certainly, but given the potential designs of the

1 adjacent West Shaker site, we feel that the stormwater
2 can be handled on the site. It's mostly sandy soils
3 out there which are certainly very conducive to maybe
4 pourous pavement or something along those lines for
5 parking areas.

6 MR. HERSHBERG: We are thinking that.
7 Unfortunately, when we grade the soil out there, we did
8 some preliminary borings and at a certain point we are
9 actually penetrating through that sand layer. So, maybe
10 we could do pourous pavement on half the parking lot
11 which we might be able to have retained a layer of sand
12 on it. We may do pourous pavement with an under drain on
13 it so that the stormwater will connect to it and we will
14 do as much pourous pavement as we can in the Town. We
15 are trying to be green.

16 MR. VOSS: Other than that, we will follow the
17 plan.

18 MR. HERSHBERG: Regarding the emergency
19 ingress/egress, British American was not interested in
20 having us go in that direction. Our next-door neighbor
21 would accept us coming through that property. So, we put
22 the emergency access here (Indicating). When this gets
23 completed, we will accommodate the emergency access from
24 here and there will be an interconnection for emergency
25 purposes between the two parcels. The traffic light is

1 shown here (Indicating). We are already concerned and we
2 have already made additional contact with CDTA about
3 their service to the sites and they are interested in
4 it.

5 One element is: Why the warrant for the
6 traffic signal is higher is the number of buses
7 arriving in the morning and leaving in the afternoon.
8 The bus gets higher ranking when you do a warrant
9 analysis. It gives you a better shot at getting it
10 approved.

11 MR. ROSANO: Dan, I did have a question, or
12 actually concern. When it comes back from concept, can
13 we have a representative from Boces come to speak?

14 MR. HERSHBERG: There is a representative from
15 Boces here if you want to hear from them.

16 MR. ROSANO: I want to throw this out there
17 right now. A noise factor with the jet planes is
18 incredibly loud in that area of Colonie. Literally, the
19 jets are taking off and they are less than a mile away.
20 Is that going to have any effect on any of the students?
21 That would be my only question that I would have.

22 I know we have that with Afirm's there.
23 People were talking about the cemetery and Afirm's and
24 we did a noise test. We tried to do a noise test, but
25 they called up and said can you shut those airplanes

1 off so we can take the noise test?

2 That's my only concern at this point in time.

3 MR. HERSHBERG: We can certainly consider that.
4 Boces doesn't want the noise from the airplanes to be a
5 problem for them. We will take it up with them.

6 MR. MION: I've a question concerning the
7 light. We have one at Sand Creek right around the corner
8 at Airline Drive. We're going to put in another one -
9 talking about putting in another one. If you fully build
10 it out, you may need a full traffic light there. Have
11 you thought about putting a traffic light like they have
12 done it at Shaker El, down on Albany Shaker Road where
13 it only comes on when the buses are coming in during the
14 morning and when buses are going out in the afternoon?

15 MR. HERSHBERG: Certainly our traffic people
16 can look at that. I think the thought was that they only
17 have a significant amount of traffic on off-hours, too.
18 Not everybody is there for full days. Part of the day
19 somebody has to leave and again, it doesn't consider the
20 office mixed in there. Whenever you do an office
21 building, it always seems that there is a portion that
22 ends up being a medical office building. They generate
23 traffic all day long.

24 MR. MION: I'm just concerned because you're
25 going to have three lights and I don't even think it's

1 in a mile.

2 MR. HERSHBERG: Again, I think the interaction
3 here may be necessary. I don't know whether thoughts
4 were given to have them coordinated by time or by
5 telemetric signal to keep them coordinated. That is
6 sometimes done to make certain that they don't
7 exacerbate the situation and have adjoining lights.

8 CHAIRMAN STUTO: For myself, the traffic light
9 was the biggest thing that jumped out at me. I don't
10 know if there's any way to access one of the existing
11 traffic lights.

12 MR. HERSHBERG: We think it's necessary just
13 based upon -

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: There's no way to get to one
15 of the other traffic lights?

16 MR. HERSHBERG: No. Again, we don't think it's
17 possible. The question there is we think the signal is
18 warranted. We still have to actually go through a
19 process to be certain that it is approved. Again, we
20 think it's warranted during that time. We will vet it
21 out and find out if there's any thought about any other
22 method. We think that the only way to handle the Boces
23 traffic into the site was with the traffic signal.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I will ask our department to
25 think about that. Maybe once the other projects get

1 developed, we can have a connection. I don't know. I
2 will look to you all to figure that out.

3 MR. HERSHBERG: We have arranged our site and
4 we have left the corridor in there so if there are any
5 questions about British American that ever come about,
6 we would be amenable to working with them.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Anything else?

8 MR. SHAMLIAN: I know that we are just at
9 sketch but are you planning interior sidewalks all the
10 way down to Watervliet Shaker?

11 MR. HERSHBERG: But we thought we would do in
12 here. It's a very long stretch. We would provide
13 pedestrian capabilities in here (Indicating). As you
14 well know, there is a walking path here, too. Our goal
15 would be to collect from these office buildings when
16 they are built - a connection to the walking paths
17 there, we don't intend to put the walking path through
18 Boces. It would be consistent with their goal of
19 protecting people on-site to have public access right by
20 the building to get to that walking path. We do propose
21 to have pedestrian capabilities all the way down so if
22 somebody is getting off a bus here - - we haven't really
23 designed it yet. We are thinking essentially a sidewalk,
24 but probably an asphalt side would be better for them
25 than a concrete sidewalk in the cost of that in the long

1 run. We probably will propose that as a solution. We are
2 definitely concerned about the pedestrian
3 ingress/egress.

4 MR. SHAMLIAN: Will school buses come from both
5 buildings, or is it primarily the Maplewood facility?

6 MR. HERSHBERG: Both buildings have to have bus
7 service.

8 MR. SHAMLIAN: One of the things about these
9 projects is we spend a lot of time on busses on the
10 property and making sure the kids get off the bus and
11 across the traffic. Have you done that yet?

12 MR. HERSHBERG: It's been well thought out
13 because we've heard it before. This is a bus drop off
14 that goes all the way around and it doesn't cross any
15 traffic. They get dropped off at the front door. We are
16 not tone deaf when somebody tells us this is the way we
17 have to do things.

18 MR. SHAMLIAN: Chuck, the secondary access - is
19 there any issue that if this project is completed or
20 anything happens on the project to the west?

21 MR. VOSS: Well, the secondary means of access
22 was really a question by the Chief of Fire Safety. It's
23 not going to be a free flow access.

24 MR. SHAMLIAN: So, in theory it's kind of a
25 knockdown barrier system - is what they are originally

1 proposing. If that's just land - - we are concerned
2 about it in the subdivision where we've got 30 houses in
3 here and 1,000 people - -

4 MR. VOSS: It's kind of like the timing. The
5 West Shaker site was waiting for the Afirm's site to get
6 built. Remember that those two sites had a mutual
7 interconnection that comes out to the light there at
8 Sand Creek and Watervliet Shaker. I would certainly say
9 that you would want to hopefully advance both projects.
10 If the rest of the Shaker site ever gets developed,
11 which it may not, then you're going to be mainly looking
12 for another easement.

13 MR. HERSHBERG: I think we can work that out.
14 Luckily we have a friendly owner at the Shaker West
15 Apartments. We can work with him and try to work it out.
16 Hopefully by the time he comes to that at least they got
17 site plan approval so even if they're not ready to start
18 that end of the apartments, if that site plan approval,
19 they go forward and install the roadway to get up from
20 the end of the roadway.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Anything else?

22 (There was no response.)

23 Okay, we hope we gave you enough thank you
24 for coming.

25 MR. HERSHBERG: You're welcome.

1 (Whereas the above entitled proceeding was
2 concluded at 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

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

