

1 STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF ALBANY

2 TOWN OF COLONIE

3 *****

4 OFFICE/WAREHOUSE BUILDING

5 2 LEAR JET LANE

6 *****

7 THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled

8 matter by NANCY L. STRANG, a Shorthand Reporter

9 commencing on August 25, 2020 at 7:53 PM at

10 Memorial Town Hall 534 New Loudon Road, Latham,

11 New York.

12

13 BOARD MEMBERS:

14 PETER STUTO, CHAIRMAN

15 CRAIG SHAMLIAN, RECUSED

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

25 OF PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

ZACHERY HARRISON, PLANNING AND ECONOMIC

1 DEVELOPMENT
2 NICHOLAS COSTA, PE, ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND
3 SURVEYING
4 JOSEPH GRASSO, RLA, CHA

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 item on the agenda-
2 2 Learjet Lane sketch plan review for the
3 proposed construction of three
4 one-story office buildings with dedicated
5 space for warehousing/distribution, a total
6 building area of 54,000 square feet. The
7 site is zoned COR;
8 commercial/office/residential.

9 Sean, do you have any comments before
10 the applicant mixer presentation?

11 MR. MAGUIRE: Not here, no.

12 MR. COSTA: Good evening, Nick Costa from
13 Advance Engineering and Surveying. We're here
14 tonight with Barry Feinman who is the
15 applicant.

16 This is a site that we have presented
17 to the Board previously that is located at 2
18 Learjet Lane, which is just a little bit
19 south of the Route 2/Wade Road intersection.

20 What Barry is proposing to build here
21 is 54,000 square feet of office and
22 warehouse space into buildings. The site is
23 zoned for COR office residential and Learjet
24 is off of Wade Road. A portion of Learjet
25 has already existing buildings on it. This

1 is the southwest corner or quadrant of the
2 site and it is shown on the site plan to be
3 developed with three buildings. One building
4 would be right off of the Learjet entrance
5 and then the two other buildings would be
6 towards the more westerly side of the site.
7 The site topography is fairly flat where the
8 development is being proposed.

9 It drops toward the back towards the
10 wetlands. They are New York State DEC
11 wetlands that are located on the site.

12 Those are shown in that hatched area.

13 The parcel size is about 10 acres. In
14 between the buildings there are pink areas
15 that would encompass maneuvering for the
16 trucks that would be utilizing the dock
17 areas on the larger building.

18 The number of parking spaces required
19 is 118 and we have shown 118 spaces.

20 The sanitary sewer is located along
21 Wade Road and will provide gravity service
22 to the proposed building. Water is located
23 along Lear Jet and we can connect to that.

24 The stormwater will be handled - we
25 think we can handle it with some subsurface

1 detention and possibly recharge into the
2 soils. There is some sandy soil. We have
3 done some drilling - testing at the site.
4 So, we may be able to recharge some of it
5 and put the stormwater into the soils. There
6 is also plans to discharge toward the
7 wetlands if that need arises, once we do all
8 the calculations of the stormwater design.

9 The plan is quite different from the
10 last time of what we presented to the Board.
11 At that time the site arrangement was a lot
12 different than is shown right now.

13 There is a sanitary sewer trunk line
14 that runs through the rear of the site, but
15 that runs pretty much along the wetlands.
16 There is an area that is outside of the
17 wetlands that we could possibly get into for
18 our sanitary sewer for the first building.
19 That's what we have shown.

20 There are dumpster areas that are shown
21 also on the plan for serving each building.

22 I think that's pretty much what we have
23 done so far.

24 This would be the larger building
25 (Indicating). This would be the office area

1 and this would be the rear and sides. So,
2 you can see the front office area where
3 there is more windows and the parking is
4 shown for vehicles and then the rear
5 elevation and elevation - where it shows
6 truck access.

7 This is the smaller building
8 elevations. So, that's the front elevation,
9 the side elevations and rear elevation. The
10 front elevation of the smaller building - we
11 have truck access so trucks will be able to
12 drive in there. Also, the office will be to
13 the sides.

14 If there any questions, I would be more
15 than happy to answer them.

16 CHAIRMAN STUTO: As with the other
17 projects we have seen tonight, this will be
18 reviewed by our Town Designated Engineer. In
19 this case, CHA.

20 Joe Grasso, I know that you have not
21 completed a formal review, but could you
22 tell us your thoughts about what you see
23 before us today?

24 MR. GRASSO: Sure. This is a site that we
25 have reviewed various development proposals for

1 through the years.

2 Just starting with a relatively high
3 level regarding the zoning, this site is
4 zoned COR which is for
5 commercial/office/residential. We all know
6 the Wade Road corridor and there are no
7 residential uses that I know along this
8 section of Wade and we commend the applicant
9 for sticking to what is already established
10 in the neighborhood and that is just
11 commercial uses. So, we are supportive of
12 the uses as proposed. This plan really
13 addresses many of the concerns that we have
14 brought up during previous site plans
15 previously proposed for this site. I will go
16 through some of those that I made notes on.
17 One is: respecting the wetlands as well as
18 the 100-foot wetland adjacent area.

19 So, this site basically shoehorned into
20 the development but it respects the
21 regulated adjacent area, which we commend
22 the applicant for doing. We are also very
23 supportive of the access arrangement.
24 They've got one access proposed off of
25 Learjet Lane and I think it's the first time

1 we have looked the site plan with only one
2 access proposed. You may recall in previous
3 proposals that there was a proposal for a
4 curb- cut onto Wade Road which we were never
5 supportive of because of some site distance
6 concerns. They have eliminated that and just
7 have the one access on Learjet Lane. So, we
8 are supportive of that.

9 All the truck traffic that accesses the
10 larger building is really internal to the
11 site. So, we don't expect large trucks to be
12 visible from the Wade Road corridor which we
13 think is a desirable feature of the plan. We
14 also think that the setback of the building
15 from Wade Road is consistent with other
16 buildings that we see along the Wade Road
17 corridor as more of a suburban office style
18 development. So, we think this plan fits in
19 with that. Although not shown on the plan,
20 we had previously commented and the Planning
21 Department had commented on the need for
22 pedestrian facilities along the Wade Road
23 corridor such that this site could get
24 pedestrians up Wade Road through a separate
25 corridor. This applicant has committed to

1 making those improvements along Wade Road
2 even though they would be off-site. That's a
3 very, very desirable feature of the plan.

4 A couple of the comments are things to
5 consider for both the Planning Board and
6 Nick's office, assuming that the project
7 moves forward. One is in the southwest
8 corner of the site, the parking king of
9 makes an acute angle with a drive aisle. The
10 ability for large emergency apparatus to
11 circumvent around the site, I think, is
12 important especially for that larger
13 building. It's not a very efficient layout
14 there. There are three parking spaces and we
15 just think by losing some parking or
16 reorienting the parking in that corner, you
17 can make a more efficient parking layout and
18 not have to impact or build off of that
19 slope that tails down into the wetland
20 buffer. So, some tweaks there. With the
21 buildings located the way they are, there is
22 a very large area of undefined asphalt areas
23 right in the center of the space. It's
24 questionable whether or not that area can be
25 defined either through some kind of island

1 treatment or some other kind of treatment so
2 there's a little bit more vehicular
3 circulation control or maybe some way to
4 break up that large sea of asphalt right in
5 the center of the site. It may make some
6 improvements to the look of the site plan
7 and how it operates from a circulation
8 standpoint.

9 That's basically where we are with our
10 review.

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, we will turn over
12 to the Board.

13 Susan?

14 MS. MILSTEIN: Architecturally, I am not
15 pleased with it. I think it needs work.

16 Also, if the parking can't work with a
17 30,000 square-foot building, maybe it needs
18 to be a little bit smaller. Those are my
19 only comments.

20 MR. GRASSO: I didn't hear that second
21 comment.

22 MS. MILSTEIN: If the parking can't be
23 accommodated with a really large building,
24 maybe it needs to be scaled down a little bit.

25 MR. GRASSO: Thanks

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Paul?

2 MR. ROSANO: No, I'm all set, Peter.

3 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chip?

4 MR. ASHWORTH: I have nothing at this
5 time.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Lou?

7 MR. MION: Are the fire apparatus supposed
8 to be able to get around the building on all
9 sides?

10 MR. GRASSO: I think it was only the large
11 building that they wanted to be able to get
12 around.

13 Do you remember at the DCC?

14 MR. COSTA: That's right.

15 MR. GRASSO: I think they were okay with
16 smaller buildings - being able to get into the
17 fronts of those. I think they wanted to be able
18 to circulate around the larger building.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chief?

20 MR. HEIDER: Will there be sidewalks
21 around that for pedestrians?

22 MR. COSTA: Yes.

23 MR. HEIDER: In their proposal I didn't
24 see it.

25 MR. GRASSO: I think it was in the

1 narrative.

2 MR. COSTA: In the narrative here the
3 sidewalks are supposed to be built all the way
4 up to here (Indicating).

5 MR. GRASSO: They did mention it in the
6 narrative that was part of the project.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I agree with the comments
8 made so far. This is only sketch plan and
9 presumably you can make the building look a
10 little bit better but not expensively, or
11 whatever. We would like to know what the
12 materials are and the comments are well taken
13 by the Town Designated Engineer.

14 MR. COSTA: We will work with everyone
15 moving forward. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.

17 (Whereas the above entitled proceeding
18 was concluded at 8:05 PM)

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

