

1 STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF ALBANY

2 TOWN OF COLONIE

3 *****

4 34 DENISON ROAD

5 RIDGEWOOD SUBDIVISION

6 *****

7 THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled
8 matter by NANCY L. STRANG, a Shorthand Reporter
9 commencing on August 11, 2020 at 7:13 p.m. at
10 Memorial Town Hall 534 New Loudon Road, Latham,
11 New York.

12

13 BOARD MEMBERS:

14 PETER STUTO, CHAIRMAN

15 CRAIG SHAMLIAN

16 PAUL ROSANO

17 SUSAN MILSTEIN

18 STEVEN HEIDER, RECUSED

19 LOUIS MION

20 FREDERICK ASHWORTH

21

22 ALSO PRESENT:

23 KATHLEEN MARINELLI, ESQ. COUNSEL TO THE BOARD

24 SEAN MAGUIRE, AICP, CEcD, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT
OF PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
25 ZACHERY HARRISON, PLANNING AND ECONOMIC

1 DEVELOPMENT
2 DOMINICK ERRICO, PE, CT MALE
3 JOSEPH GRASSO, RLA, CHA

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Next and final item on
2 the agenda, 34 Denison Road, Ridgewood
3 Subdivision. Sketch plan update to subdivide
4 102.79 acre site; 40.15 acres as open space,
5 develop 62.64 acres with 76 residential units,
6 52.86 acres for stormwater management and
7 preserved open space.

8 We will turn it over to the applicant.

9 MR. ERRICO: Good evening. Dominick Errico
10 with CT Male Associates, here with the
11 applicant Charlew Builders. The reason that we
12 are in front of you again tonight is to give
13 you an update from our last meeting which was a
14 virtual meeting. We had some additional open
15 space we created. We juggled a couple of lots
16 but basically the plan that you see up there is
17 what we have resubmitted as a visual.

18 I do have an aerial map that shows the
19 proximity of the neighborhood. We did have a
20 meeting -- I'm not sure, but we did have a
21 meeting right before we had the last meeting
22 - with a Neighborhood Association- we had a
23 virtual meeting, which went very well. I'm
24 thinking it went about an hour and one-half
25 or an hour and 45 minutes. Sean actually had

1 a chance to join and so he answered some
2 questions for the Town. The Neighborhood
3 Association - I have forgotten their name.
4 That went well. I don't know if there has
5 been any other further comments from the
6 Neighborhood Association. One of the factors
7 at the last meeting that we had were - we
8 created a little more open space in here.
9 Basically it is a continuous open space all
10 around. This is accessible here (Indicating.
11 This map does not show it. It shows on your
12 aerial and as a suggestion from Joe Grasso-
13 in this area over here there is a 20-foot
14 access easement. That is if there was a path
15 that would create an access through here
16 allowable to cross the area to get from the
17 rear of the property back out to the park.
18 This area and here, again, is the area that
19 we are considering to be the parklands
20 (Indicating). All the green area that you
21 see is conservation. That number has
22 increased a little bit. I believe it's about
23 52 acres of preserved land which is well
24 above our requirement. I think that it was
25 49. I did print it up, but only part of it

1 came out. I think 49 was what we were
2 required.

3 MR. GRASSO: Yes, you are required 49.09
4 acres and you are preserving 51.6.

5 MR. ERRICO: Those calculations have been
6 confirmed. That does appear in the top left
7 corner of the map that you have. We still have
8 76 lots. Water and sewer and everything is
9 still connected. The stormwater management
10 areas are still in the same location. The
11 purple area indicates our steep grade areas
12 that are greater than 20%. The wetlands are the
13 other shaded areas. This area done here is the
14 archaeological area and that green area is
15 basically the access road and parking area if
16 there was to be one for the park here.

17 In the update we believe we had
18 addressed the concerns that the Board had
19 the last time we were in front of them. The
20 update is to allow us at this point go into
21 the concept design and submittal stage.

22 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you for your
23 presentation and for the revised drawings. I
24 personally had Zoom calls with Sean and Zach
25 and staff and our Town Designated Engineer. The

1 key point that we were really talking about -
2 because it is called for in the Comprehensive
3 Plan - is the park issue. We have asked Joe as
4 the Town Designated Engineer to articulate
5 those thoughts and put his design skills to
6 that effect. That seemed to be a very big issue
7 at least from where I'm sitting.

8 We're going to turn it over to our Town
9 Designated Engineer. It is CHA; Joe Grasso.

10 I assume that is one of the topics you
11 are going to highlight.

12 MR. GRASSO: Yes there's not a formal
13 letter that we issued because this is just a
14 Board update, but I would just like to go
15 through some notes that I made.

16 Dom did a good job touching on most of
17 them, but there were a couple of things that
18 we needed to clarify. There may be some
19 repetition here.

20 We noted that there was a reduction in
21 the number of lots that are proposed from 80
22 from the last meeting down to 76 -
23 single-family homes. That amount of open
24 space proposed, absent of the stormwater
25 management areas, has gone up from 38 acres

1 to 40 acres. The total amount of lands to be
2 preserved includes a stormwater management
3 area and that is allowed per the zoning
4 which is a total of 52.86 acres which
5 exceeds the amount required by the density
6 calculation which is 49.09 acres. In
7 addition, the 76 lots that you are proposing
8 are far less than the maximum allowable
9 density based on the zoning which is 183
10 single-family homes on the property. Through
11 the work they have done, they have
12 identified various lands throughout the
13 project site that are worthy of conservation
14 and as you can see on the map that's on the
15 screen, you can see how these areas have
16 tried to be avoided to the greatest extent
17 possible and that includes steep slope areas
18 over 25%. Although you will see that there
19 are some steeply sloped lots. The wetland
20 areas throughout the site have been avoided.
21 They have created buffer areas around the
22 perimeter of the site which provides a
23 separation between the development and
24 nearby landowners. They have avoided any
25 impacts to the archaeological area by

1 including that within the open space area.

2 A significant item they have done since
3 the last meeting is they did a comprehensive
4 tree study throughout the areas of the site
5 to be developed and they have identified the
6 trees over 36 inches in diameter. Actually,
7 I think they're over 24 inches in diameter
8 and there are a lot of them. So much that
9 you have to start - I talked about at the
10 last meeting - what is the threshold of
11 trees that are worthy of protection. After
12 looking at the number of trees over 24
13 inches in diameter, we are thinking the ones
14 that are over 36 inches in diameter are
15 trees that are worthy of preservation by
16 either moving driveways, or homesites or lot
17 lines around. They have provided those maps
18 to our office for review and I don't know if
19 they have been included in this packet to
20 the Planning Board Members. We would expect
21 that information to be included within a
22 formal concept submission. They didn't do
23 what we had asked at the last Planning Board
24 meeting.

25 We have reviewed the access arrangement

1 and we continue to be in favor of the two
2 points of access, as proposed. They have
3 also increased the open space lot along
4 Denison Road to be over 5 acres. Like Don
5 mentioned, there is a significant
6 interconnectivity of the open spaces
7 throughout the site. Some comments that we
8 continue to have that should be of
9 consideration by the Planning Board is the
10 open space or the ownership of the various
11 open space areas. What's been talked about
12 is the possibility of deed restrictions
13 which was not in favor of the Planning Board
14 at the last meeting.

15 Another consideration is ownership by a
16 homeowners association and the applicant had
17 expressed some concerns not wanting to do
18 that. The Planning Board, I think, was split
19 whether the HOA was the appropriate
20 mechanism to only open space lands. There
21 was talk about the Town owning the open
22 space lands and I think there was a mixed
23 recommendation from the Planning Board
24 regarding whether or not the Town should
25 take over the open space land. I think some

1 of the Planning Board Members were in favor
2 of that and I think that's one of the action
3 items we're trying to get feedback from the
4 Town administration about. I think Sean
5 would be the best one to speak about that.
6 There was some talk about a pocket park in
7 the five-acre area that basically satisfies
8 the open space area along Denison Road -
9 satisfies that five-acre size of a pocket
10 park.

11 When I went through the minutes from
12 the last meeting, it wasn't something that
13 the Planning Board said had to be a
14 component of the plan. I do know that this
15 current open space layout has an area
16 between the archaeologically restricted area
17 and the first lot that could accommodate a
18 small pocket park as well as a small
19 pull-off parking area for people to park
20 there and not have to access that open space
21 from Denison Road. There was no consensus on
22 the need for a pocket park. There was a lot
23 of consensus regarding trails throughout the
24 open space areas and that is not something
25 they have yet identified in the plan, but we

1 think that is something that would make the
2 development much more appealing and like Don
3 said, they did provide some - I think you
4 have shown on the rendering that you handed
5 out today - an easement between some of the
6 lots that will allow a trail to get from the
7 open space areas to the subdivision roads.
8 That is something where we would prefer to
9 see a larger strip of open space area that a
10 trail would go through and not just a thin
11 easement just to provide better separation
12 between trail users and residential
13 homesites. That is something that the
14 Planning Board can weigh in on.

15 For the open space areas for when you
16 come back for concept, Dom, it would be good
17 if we had the acreage for each of the open
18 space areas as well as the stormwater
19 management areas identified so we know the
20 sizes of those.

21 For that pocket park, if there wasn't a
22 pocket park built there, we know there is an
23 area that could accommodate one.

24 The project site is in the airport area
25 GIS study area, so mitigation fees for

1 recreation will be provided by the
2 applicant. So, the Town will be accruing
3 some funds that could be used for possible
4 recreation facilities either on the site or
5 any place in the Town and that is something
6 that the Planning Board may want to weigh-in
7 on.

8 If there is a trail network throughout
9 the open space, which was supported by the
10 Board at the last meeting - if this open
11 space is going to be made available to the
12 public and not just the residents within the
13 development, then you may want to consider a
14 small pull-off parking area. Like I said,
15 the logical place for that would be next to
16 the archaeologically sensitive area and the
17 green open space parcel. When you first come
18 into the development it would be on the
19 left.

20 I'm not sure how the Town handles
21 mailbox corrals for new developments, but if
22 a mailbox corral is required or warranted,
23 that pull-off area could also serve as an
24 accessible spot for the mailbox corrals.

25 So, that's really it with our comments

1 on this plan.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm going to direct this
3 a little bit. Do you want to comment on whether
4 the Town has any interest in owning the open
5 space and how they feel about the pocket park?

6 MR. MAGUIRE: I think that generally
7 speaking, the Town is not interested in
8 acquiring additional property to maintain. I
9 think it's been more recent practice that these
10 open spaces are going along with an HOA to
11 maintain them over the long term. I think that
12 remains to be the preference here.

13 CHAIRMAN STUTO: How about paying for a
14 pocket park? I know we talked about in our Zoom
15 meetings - I just want to flush it out because
16 I think what we discussed was - it impinges on
17 some of the lots in particular.

18 Joe maybe you can get more specific on
19 this.

20 Lot 76, you suggested, be made smaller.
21 I forgot what other things we discussed - if
22 that they impinged on the lots or called for
23 rearrangement of some of the lots. The basic
24 concept was pull-off the main road, take a
25 left and have a parking area - reserve space

1 for a future pocket park, but the financing
2 may not be there today and then have a trail
3 system circumnavigating essentially the
4 entire development.

5 MR. MAGUIRE: Right, in the GIS for this
6 area, it does identify a park in this general
7 vicinity and I think that the thought here is
8 that this subdivision would be the location for
9 it because I think we're quite frankly running
10 out of opportunities to place that park. How we
11 construct that - whether or not the Town Board
12 will work with the HOA to make the improvements
13 using the GIS funds or however we pull that
14 off, I think we still have to work those finer
15 details out.

16 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you want to add more
17 detail to that? I want the Board to fully
18 appreciate the concepts.

19 MR. GRASSO: Yes, in terms of the
20 location, we provided some informal comments on
21 this plan to the applicant's team for
22 consideration. Those changes for the most part
23 have not been reflected on this plan, but I'm
24 just going to go over to the screen to show the
25 area that we thought would be suitable for a

1 pocket park.

2 I also failed to touch on one of the
3 comments from the Planning Board at the last
4 meeting about the lots in close proximity to
5 Denison. So, I'm just going to go up to the
6 screen for a moment.

7 So, what we were thinking in terms of
8 an area for the pocket park would be in this
9 area so that would be outside of the
10 archaeologically sensitive area, but
11 contiguous to this open space parcel. In
12 order to accommodate that, some of these lot
13 lines could get shifted over so the closest
14 lot line would be basically where my pen is,
15 providing this area to accommodate a pocket
16 park.

17 Going back to some of the comments of
18 the Planning Board was that not having lots
19 in close proximity to Denison Road and we
20 had thought this lot may need to be
21 eliminated in order to provide more open
22 space off Denison Road (Indicating). I think
23 the applicant is pretty firm that they would
24 like to be able to develop that lot in that
25 location.

1 So, that is something the Planning
2 Board may want to consider, as well.

3 MR. MION: Lot number 76, Joe - did you
4 say square that lot off?

5 MR. GRASSO: Yes. So, what we were saying
6 is shift these lot lines over so that this lot
7 line here gets shifted over to a location here
8 to free up more area where you could do a
9 pull-off parking area along the road and then
10 have an area for a future pocket park
11 (Indicating).

12 MR. MION: When you say shifted over -

13 MR. GRASSO: Not lose the lot, but just
14 shift these lot lines over so all these
15 homesites would get shifted over to the west.

16 MR. MION: What would happen if you just
17 shifted - squared 76 off? Maybe so it's about
18 the same size as the rest of them.

19 MR. GRASSO: I think that is something we
20 can look at.

21 MR. ERRICO: The frontage is probably 100,
22 maybe. The smaller lots are 90 feet wide and go
23 up to 110 and most of them are 110 to 120. I
24 think that one lot is 110. One of the reasons
25 we left that out that way was to keep a buffer

1 if this was an accessible area for a park and
2 we were looking at the pocket park to be inside
3 a little bit more in this area (Indicating). We
4 can definitely square that off, but we wanted
5 to keep more of a buffer and not have the park
6 so close to the property so there was a buffer
7 between the residential and the pocket park
8 which is primarily just swing sets and
9 playground. It's not much more than that. I
10 don't know how much more area we're looking to
11 say that we need for that park, but our
12 impression was that this is 80 feet wide so
13 that we can get parking in there and get a
14 pretty decent size pocket park and not using
15 the green space we have. We can expand it out a
16 little bit. I like the idea of maybe just
17 holding this corner and bring that line back a
18 little bit and make it a little wider. That
19 would definitely work, but we wanted to keep a
20 buffer between the park and the residential lot
21 as well - that was our intent.

22 MR. MION: You can still keep that buffer?

23 MR. ERRICO: Yes, I think that we can.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Did you point to the that's
25 trail system?

1 MR. ERRICO: It is not shown on here.

2 MR. GRASSO: So, basically what we thought
3 is if you had a pull-off parking area here,
4 what you would try to do is get a trail loop in
5 as much around the perimeter of the site as
6 possible. We thought about coming through the
7 open space areas. We are talking about a small
8 informal footpath that's maybe five or six feet
9 wide. We're not looking at a multiuse path or
10 trail that's used for rollerblading because of
11 the grades that we have within these open space
12 areas. What we were looking at is a possible
13 footpath through this open space area coming
14 down and coming up to the subdivision to make
15 it accessible for these lots - coming through,
16 we were looking someplace in here (Indicating).

17 MR. ERRICO: We were actually looking more
18 here because it is a wider lot and we can get
19 more space in.

20 MR. GRASSO: So, take the trail up through
21 here into this open space area and meander
22 through the woods and come all the way through
23 this large open space area, loop around and
24 come all the way down to the road here and
25 close to the intersection with Denison Road

1 (Indicating). So, basically it's a continuous
2 loop so if there was a pull-off parking area
3 here, somebody could park and they could do a
4 whole loop through and end up where you
5 started.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I think this is a big
7 issue. I will give my personal opinion and then
8 asked the Board if they can give their
9 thoughts.

10 I would like to reserve some area for a
11 pocket park. I like the trail idea. I think
12 we could encroach on that larger triangular
13 lot a little bit. I'm confident that Joe
14 could work with the developer to do that. I
15 personally would let them keep that other
16 lot on the right as you're coming in because
17 he's given up a lot of lots already and I
18 think it would be a fair compromise and he
19 can have screening there. That's my opinion.

20 I would ask the Board for their
21 comments and their thoughts on those issues.

22 MR. ERRICO: Can I just address the path
23 one? I want to make sure that it's understood
24 where we are coming from - from that path.
25 Having the path - the developer is okay because

1 he would do a fee simple HOA, which is pretty
2 typical for open space. The issue comes to
3 where if the HOA - if there's a public path and
4 it's open to the public, it's going to be a
5 difficult thing for an HOA to own and maintain.
6 The liability behind it - there's no way of
7 policing the public and doing all that. It's
8 actually a very difficult thing for an HOA to
9 own. Not to say that there could not still be a
10 path, but it would be for the community of that
11 neighborhood and not the public. The park would
12 not have access to that path. They can have
13 access here and walk around the road
14 (Indicating) because that's a public
15 right-of-way, but to get them to the whole path
16 would be kind of encroaching because the HOA
17 and the property and that. He's not against
18 doing the path, but he would rather do the path
19 and turn the whole thing over to the Town and
20 have the Town wholly maintain the area.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I understand the issues.
22 Let's leave that issue as a discussion point
23 for now. We'll just talk particular ownership
24 and whether that public has access. I think
25 Sean said that the Town would rather have the

1 HOA. I'm not sure what you're saying is
2 correct, but I believe it's said in good faith
3 that if the HOA owns it, it causes
4 extraordinary difficulties with the general
5 public there.

6 We'll just open up to the Board as to
7 how everybody feels about what we're talking
8 about.

9 Paul, it looks like you want to say
10 something.

11 MR. ROSANO: Not to get off that subject,
12 but on my aerial behind lots 10 and 11 - behind
13 lot 13 there's a redline and if that's accurate
14 - I am seeing three swimming pools on your
15 property. Could that be just a fluke?

16 MR. ERRICO: Is that the aerial?

17 MR. ROSANO: Yes, that's the aerial.

18 MR. ERRICO: The aerial is not an accurate
19 survey. It's just an indication of where the
20 property is. There are no encroachments on the
21 property.

22 MR. ROSANO: Okay, so we are clear on
23 that.

24 MR. ERRICO: Nobody has any fencing, or
25 sheds or pools on the property.

1 MR. ROSANO: I have no other comments.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Susan?

3 MS. MILSTEIN: I don't have any comments.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chief?

5 MR. HEIDER: I hate to be a one-trick pony
6 here, but I still think lot number one has to
7 go. This is a conservation area and I don't see
8 why it has to be seen from Denison Road,
9 especially if you're talking about a park on
10 the corner, I don't think the house needs to
11 overlook the park. There would be a perfect
12 spot for a trailhead to meander through that
13 backside.

14 I asked before at some point in the
15 process for us to see a layout - I don't
16 care what it's made out of, but what the
17 pocket park would look like in this area.
18 The constrained areas here are almost
19 cliffs. They're not little hills and I just
20 can't see a whole lot of where a pocket park
21 can go there. Even though the Town may not
22 want one, I think it's part of the plan and
23 I think we should at least see a facsimile
24 of what it would look like in the event that
25 it would capture it.

1 In my prior profession, paths between
2 two or three \$500 to \$1 million houses don't
3 work. If you trying to do a pass system and
4 all the sudden you've got a 10 foot
5 right-of-way between two houses -- the
6 houses across the street are going for
7 one-half million or more. I just can't see
8 that being very neighborly. I see problems
9 down the road. Do a path however you can,
10 but I don't think it should come through
11 between two houses on one side of the road
12 and across the road and through two houses
13 on the other side. It's a pathway to
14 problems. I'm sure that the developer really
15 doesn't want to do that.

16 MR. GRASSO: So, can we just speak to that
17 issue? If there was a minimum width of the open
18 space, would that address the concern, or is it
19 not even - because then we get away from the
20 continuous loop of a path around and
21 accessibility to the path where we are going to
22 create a dead end - which is fine as long as
23 that's what the Planning Board would like to
24 see -

25 MR. HEIDER: And I get what you're saying.

1 Nobody wants anyone walking through their
2 backyard. When you put a path down the side
3 yard, you have people walking through your
4 backyard in the middle of the summer. What that
5 causes a lot of time is people put a big old
6 ugly fence up that takes away from the
7 character that you're trying to achieve. I
8 understand that it's difficult. I would love to
9 see a path through this, but I just don't know
10 if it's smart thinking to put a path between
11 four houses in this development. I just don't
12 think that would work.

13 MS. MILSTEIN: I don't have a problem with
14 it because anyone who is buying these four lots
15 is going to know there's a path that's going to
16 go alongside their lots.

17 MR. GRASSO: What we had suggested - to be
18 candid with the Board - was to create a gap
19 between the lots and the trail would go through
20 an 80-foot swath. Obviously, there would have
21 to be some substantial shifting of lot lines to
22 accommodate that. Because this is the
23 conservation density subdivision, you have the
24 flexibility to reduce lot sizes and lot
25 frontages and I think we could still maintain

1 the same lot count by shifting lot lines
2 around. That's what we we're thinking was the
3 80-foot swap between lots to address any of the
4 concerns.

5 MR. HEIDER: But who would maintain that
6 80 feet?

7 MR. GRASSO: It would all be part of the
8 same open space.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: The HOA.

10 MR. HEIDER: That would actually be better
11 than 10 feet.

12 MR. GRASSO: I agree. I have done trails
13 that are 30 feet and I don't think it's a very
14 comfortable environment for both the residents
15 as well as the trail users.

16 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Lou?

17 MR. MION: I've nothing to add.

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chip?

19 MR. ASHWORTH: I think that should be made
20 wider than 20 or 30 feet. If the Town doesn't
21 want to take responsibility for the back, then
22 it should be strictly for the use of the people
23 in the subdivision. I think the path is a good
24 idea. The HOA is going to have to maintain it.

25 MR. ERRICO: It's not just these people.

1 It's all these neighbors too - that the path
2 will abut these too. That will be closer to
3 this neighborhood than that one (Indicating).
4 There are a lot of trees and there's not a lot
5 of density to them. There's a lot of trunks and
6 a lot of pines and a lot of trunk styles.
7 There's a lot of growth is at the top, but this
8 is more of a hill up here, so this is more the
9 lower part where it flattens out.

10 MR. GRASSO: There may be able to be a
11 distinction if a pocket park is ever
12 established here - that would be for the
13 public. I think that's what the GIS had
14 envisioned. Whereas if there is a trail system,
15 maybe that would only be reserved for the
16 residents of the community.

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Is the Board in agreement
18 on that?

19 MR. MION: The only concern I would have
20 is right now you have people from the other
21 areas across the street that may be walking the
22 dogs in that and now you're going to put this
23 in there and you can have trails that these
24 people have been accustomed to using and all
25 the sudden you're going to say it's not for

1 their use anymore. How are you going to keep
2 them out? That is the question.

3 MR. ERRICO: Technically, it's not for
4 their use now. They just use it. I understand
5 what you're saying.

6 MR. MION: Are there existing trails in
7 there now?

8 MR. ERRICO: No, just what you see in the
9 aerial map. That's what a lot of people do use
10 as far as walking because it's open for when
11 they put the water line in. But there's nothing
12 else on the property. There are some guys that
13 drive some four-wheelers there, but there's no
14 so-called trail. They just cut through the
15 woods, basically. That's mostly this
16 neighborhood over here, from what we can tell
17 (Indicating). If we did do the trail and have
18 it available for the community, it would not be
19 as high-end if it was for the public. It would
20 be a little lower. We would just follow terrain
21 as much as we could because it is basically for
22 the 76 lots. If it was for the public, there's
23 a little more detail that has to be put into
24 it. We have to make sure there's not real steep
25 areas and there's got to be a wide enough path

1 for passerby's and things like that. Definitely
2 a different type of path if it's going to
3 become public.

4 MR. MION: It's just a thought because
5 people that have been here before walk their
6 dogs there. You're right there's no trail, but
7 the just walking in through there -

8 MR. ERRICO: If it's not posted, there's
9 no reason why they can't do it, basically.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, I don't know if we
11 have a consensus or not. I guess I'm having a
12 hard time reconciling having a restricted trail
13 but having a parking area that the public can
14 go to. Because if they go and park and there is
15 a future pocket park that's not there yet, why
16 is there parking lot there?

17 MR. GRASSO: I think if the Board is
18 comfortable with a trail system and the pocket
19 park is only just an area that's reserved for a
20 possible future park and if there's no need for
21 a mailbox corral and there's no need to have
22 pull-off parking because everybody within the
23 development is going to walk down there and get
24 on to the trailhead, then there wouldn't need
25 to be a trailhead with parking for kiosk or

1 anything else.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: It's up to the board.

3 MR. ROSANO: There are multiple pocket
4 parks in this Town that don't have parking lots
5 like Anson Park. You can go but -

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: You have to cross a major
7 street if you don't live in the neighborhood
8 there.

9 MR. ROSANO: Well, you could walk down the
10 street to get there. I don't think we need
11 parking lots if we're going to do a pocket park
12 that I don't think we need to do parking lots.
13 The place to walk to. Like I say, you've got
14 Anson and all over Town there's pocket parks.

15 CHAIRMAN STUTO: You have to cross a major
16 street to get to them.

17 MR. ROSANO: Yes, in a way you do. Over
18 from where I come from the Anson Park - there
19 is no parking area. You have to park in the
20 school parking lot and you have to cross either
21 Lockrow - you're crossing streets that are
22 cut-through streets; especially Frederick. So,
23 I don't see a need for a parking lot if it's
24 going to be - people are walking there now with
25 their dogs. There are people all over the place

1 up there. Anytime you go up there, you're
2 seeing everybody in the woods walking their
3 dogs.

4 I do see the need for a kiosk. That's a
5 different story because I can't see the mail
6 service delivering the 76 houses. I just
7 don't see that happening.

8 MR. HEIDER: I have one more minor thing.
9 You've heard of Stratford Drive. It's actually
10 Newport - the connecting road to the east. You
11 have Stratford Drive on there and it's actually
12 Newport. In your narrative you have Newport.
13 That's the old street name.

14 As far as what Paul was saying, he's
15 right. The pocket parks were not meant to be
16 driven to. My main concern is I don't think
17 you need a big parking lot. If you going to
18 do a pocket park, how's it going to be
19 designed on the topography of this land?

20 CHAIRMAN STUTO: How about this: Are we in
21 agreement that this will be a private trail
22 system used only for the homeowners that are in
23 there and that we'll reserve a certain area and
24 the Town can decide in the future how they want
25 - whether they want to put a parking lot there

1 or just playground equipment. Does that work?
2 It will be the Town's decision at some future
3 time.

4 MR. HEIDER: It works as long as the trail
5 doesn't go through the pocket park. Because you
6 can have a sign that the pocket park that says
7 limited for residents only. It's not going to
8 work

9 MR. MION: As it sits there now, is there
10 room for parking?

11 MR. ERRICO: Yes, depending upon how many
12 cars you want to have there.

13 MR. GRASSO: It's three parking spots
14 right now.

15 MR. ERRICO: That's 30 x 50 or 60 feet -
16 three parking spots. It's not a lot of space.
17 We figured we could get a dozen in there, if it
18 was a big enough park.

19 MR. MION: The reason I bring up is it is
20 a preserved land - I can square up 76, or leave
21 it alone.

22 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I would say squared-off,
23 but I don't know. Joe has looked at it a lot
24 closer than I have.

25 MR. GRASSO: That would be my

1 recommendation.

2 MR. MION: Squared-off.

3 MR. GRASSO: Yes, square it off and shift
4 lot lines to create more area.

5 MR. ERRICO: Can I make a suggestion? If
6 Joe or maybe Sean would give me an area - how
7 much pocket park you need. It's an acre or two
8 acres, than I can take this area and even if we
9 did it ahead of time - grade out in an area
10 that would be level enough for park -- it's not
11 that steep in this area here, but there's a
12 little grade. We could probably grade it out
13 and make enough area for a natural part for the
14 future. We can replant it so it grows green and
15 if the Town never wants to go there, they can
16 take the trees out. That could be a solution
17 that you can get what you are looking for and
18 make sure you get the park that you're looking
19 for -

20 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I am okay with that idea,
21 but to get Chief's concept in which is not to
22 let the pocket park users see the trail. You
23 would have to have a pocket park buffer and the
24 trail system would have to start - something
25 else would have to happen on the other side of

1 the buffer. It's going to be dead-ended there
2 so maybe it would be an open area on the other
3 side. I don't know. We need a landscape
4 architect here.

5 MR. MAGUIRE: If you're looking at the
6 slopes here, the one thing that came to mind -
7 it's different because it is an HOA pocket
8 park, but Boght Meadows there was some slope
9 challenges there and you can see how they dealt
10 with that to put a small pocket park in the
11 neighborhood.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: You're going to come in
13 with concept, right? Why don't you and Sean and
14 Joe talk about it and address the concerns that
15 the Board has raised tonight? I think we gave
16 you a fair amount of information.

17 MR. ERRICO: So, the next time we submit,
18 it will be for concept detailed plans.

19 MR. GRASSO: It will be a formal concept
20 submission.

21 MR. ERRICO: Understood.

22 MR. MAGUIRE: Can I just add - is there a
23 consensus on a trail or no trail?

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Yes, trail.

25 CHAIRMAN STUTO: And it will be only for

1 the HOA - homeowners.

2 MR. MAGUIRE: A private trail and there
3 will be no trailhead at the park because the
4 intention is this would be a neighborhood park
5 for everybody and we really want to keep the
6 trail limited to just this HOA - this
7 development - for their purpose.

8 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Correct, that is what the
9 Board is saying.

10 MR. GRASSO: I would like to flush out
11 that issue only because the way the open spaces
12 set up - trails that connect to the subdivision
13 streets make them accessible to everybody and
14 that's very important. Loop trails are very
15 important. I would not recommend dead-end
16 trails, but the pocket park is not going to be
17 developed as part of the initial subdivision.
18 We may still be advocates for a trail going
19 through that area understanding that if a
20 pocket park is developed, some kind of
21 combination that restricts people on the trail
22 would have to be part of the park plans through
23 signage, or fencing or a rerouted trail at that
24 point. I think that's a natural area to have a
25 trailhead. It's for the residents of the

1 development to use.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm fine with that.

3 MS. MILSTEIN: I'm fine with that.

4 MR. MAGUIRE: I guess the other
5 alternative, too, is that find somebody else to
6 manage the open space - the Land Conservancy,
7 or something like that. This may not be a large
8 enough piece of property.

9 MR. ERRICO: That has been the responses
10 that we have had when we've inquired. They want
11 hundreds of acres.

12 MR. HEIDER: Can I just ask one question?
13 Does a trail work - go back to lot number one
14 for a minute. Even if you left lot number one
15 there - because I know you're really
16 considering taking it out - you have a certain
17 amount of green around that. But to go along
18 with Joe's point about not wanting to have a
19 dead-end trail, can you take a trail behind lot
20 one up around the hill all the way around the
21 top and then at some point make a loop and have
22 it crisscross and come back? That would be a
23 long trail and it would be the same trail. You
24 guys are the designers.

25 MR. ERRICO: I mean, if you're trying to

1 get back to the park I guess that would be -

2 MR. HEIDER: Just trying to keep them out
3 of the park -

4 MR. ERRICO: Obviously, you could come
5 through here and then out to this right-of-way
6 (Indicating). But going up and around - I think
7 Joe would probably say he doesn't like to loop
8 the trails back on themselves.

9 MR. GRASSO: He obviously can do that, but
10 I think the intent is to get the trail system
11 as accessible to as many to the lots so you not
12 having to walk a long ways down a subdivision
13 Street. So, once you start to loop it back on
14 itself -

15 MR. HEIDER: You could loop the back on
16 the road where there is constrained areas on
17 top.

18 MR. ERRICO: If there is a pocket park
19 here, you can do it. You're saying come down
20 here and loop back around, but then this whole
21 area could be basically the parkland.

22 MR. HEIDER: I guess I'm talking about
23 lots number between lots 18 and 19. That's at
24 the very top. That would give you access. It's
25 just an idea.

1 MR. ERRICO: It's going to be real hard
2 for me to change Lot 1 because that I've got
3 every number everything because that's the
4 first lot.

5 MR. HEIDER: I'll come over and help you.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, you have your
7 work cut out for you. We'll see you at concept.

8 MR. ERRICO: Okay, thank you very much.

9 (Whereas the above entitled proceeding
10 was concluded at 7:45 PM)

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 CERTIFIES 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.

Date: _____

Nancy L. Strang
Legal Transcription
2420 Troy Schenectady Road
Niskayuna, NY 12309

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

