

1 PLANNING BOARD COUNTY OF ALBANY
2 TOWN OF COLONIE

3

4 *****

5 THE PROPOSED PROJECT OF
6 THE SALVATION ARMY THRIFT STORE LOCATED AT
7 2145 CENTRAL AVENUE
8 REVIEW AND ACTION ON CONCEPT ACCEPTANCE
9 *****

10

11 THE TAPED AND TRANSCRIBED MINUTES of the above
12 entitled proceeding BY NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART
13 commencing on January 25, 2011 at 8:31 p.m. at the
14 Public Operations Center 347 Old Niskayuna Road,
15 Latham, New York 12110

16

17 BOARD MEMBERS:

- 18 PETER STUTO, CHAIRMAN
- 19 MICHAEL SULLIVAN
- 20 TIMOTHY LANE
- 21 KATHLEEN DALTON
- 22 THOMAS NARDACCI
- 23 LOUIS MION
- 24 ELENA VAIDA, Esq., Attorney for the Planning Board

25

Also present:

17 Joe LaCivita, Director, Planning and Economic
18 Development

19 Chuck Voss, Barton & Loguidice, PC

20 Mark Pearson, Schopfer Architects

21 Patrick O'Gara, Captain, Salvation Army

22 Gail Biggerstaff

23

24 Amy Fox

25

26

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay before we go into
2 our next project I would like to call a public
3 hearing for February 1, 2011 for the North
4 Ridge Hollow Subdivision, 115 and
5 139 Haswell Road.

6 Our next agenda item is the Salvation
7 Army.

8 Joe, you want to give us an introduction?

9 MR. LACIVITA: Sure. This project is at
10 2145 Central Avenue. This is known as the
11 Salvation Army. It has been under the review
12 of Barton and Loguidice. The Salvation Army is
13 here this evening to review and discuss the
14 10,129 square foot addition to an existing
15 facility. The project was before us with the
16 DCC on February 13, 2008. Since that time the
17 project has been advancing through reviews.
18 There were several meetings with the TDE's,
19 DEC, the Army Corps of Engineers in the
20 neighborhood as well. The developer is here
21 again tonight to discuss and review a concept
22 proposal for this edition of the site plan.

23 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Would you like to make
24 your presentation?

25 MR. PEARSON: Sure. Good evening, my name

1 is Mark Pearson. I'm with Schopfer Architects
2 and we are the architects for the project.

3 As stated, the land we are working with
4 has wetlands on it which we have resolved with
5 the Army Corps of Engineers and the New York
6 State DEC.

7 The existing facility is a
8 12,270 square foot facility. We are proposing
9 an expansion of just under 10,000 square feet.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: You say you're at 12,000
11 now?

12 MR. PEARSON: Yes, the existing building
13 is 12,270 and were at 990-something for the
14 addition. When were done it's going to be
15 about a 22,000 square foot store.

16 We have increased the parking to
17 111 spaces. Per the DCC comments, the entire
18 building will be fully sprinklered. We have
19 met all the requirements for landscaping
20 within the parking areas. Our stormwater
21 engineer has provided the stormwater
22 feasibility study and has a concept for
23 underground stormwater retention under the
24 back parking lot.

25 The elevations of the

1 building - primarily we're going to resurface
2 the existing metal siding and will be going
3 back with mostly EIFS on the existing building
4 and changing the front from having a shallow
5 gable into a façade. There will be awnings
6 here (Indicating). The addition to the
7 building is a little bit taller. It's a little
8 over 20 feet tall.

9 I have to apologize this pinkish tone is
10 not what we intended. Were looking for a light
11 gray. We consistently have this problem with
12 the printer that comes out with the pinkish
13 hue. Were trying to resolve that.

14 Does the Board have any specific
15 questions?

16 MR. NARDACCI: It's not pink? What is the
17 color of that?

18 MR. PEARSON: Gray. We'll be more than
19 happy to provide you with actual samples of
20 the EIFS that were proposing. It's not pink.

21 MR. LANE: The only thing that I have a
22 small concern with - I think we talked about
23 this before - is where the trucks coming in
24 and the whole maneuver for them getting in and
25 out? It seems a bit awkward, at least as far

1 as what I'm looking at here.

2 MR. PEARSON: It's straight and then back
3 in and pull out.

4 MR. LANE: And they're doing that amidst
5 all of the traffic? Most loading docks are in
6 the back.

7 MR. PEARSON: Yes, and most loading docks
8 see a lot of traffic. Typically, were talking
9 about one or maybe two trucks a day, and it's
10 a 16-foot box truck.

11 MR. LANE: So, it's not a long truck.

12 MR. PEARSON: No. Typically, you'll see a
13 truck in the morning that will drop off
14 supplies and then possibly in the afternoon it
15 takes off.

16 MR. LANE: So, it's generally off-hours
17 that they will be doing this?

18 MR. O'GARA: No, primarily it will be
19 during store operation hours. I just got here
20 in September. I'm still observing patterns.
21 There might be a truck parked there receiving
22 donations. Primarily speaking, there's not
23 going to be a lot of truck traffic in and out.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chuck, you have some
25 comments?

1 MR. VOSS: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2 On January 11th we submitted our TDE
3 concept letter to the Board. We looked at
4 several different aspects of the project. The
5 fifth part of the letter clearly covers
6 initially the information that we received and
7 we have reviewed for this application. In
8 general, I think it's important just for the
9 Board to know that the site is located in the
10 COR, commercial office residential zoning
11 district, where the use is allowed. There are
12 design standards. So, we looked at those as
13 well. We have outlined those on page 2 of our
14 letter. I'll just go through some of the
15 highlights of that.

16 As we know, this is an existing building.
17 The addition is going off the back side so
18 that 80 percent of the frontage build-out is a
19 requirement. The applicants have talked about
20 putting an iron fence out there to satisfy
21 that and some additional landscaping. The
22 maximum setback for that corridor is 25 feet,
23 but again, if a pre-existing structure -- none
24 of the COR design standards, pre-existing lots
25 and so forth are necessarily required to

1 conform to that maximum setback. So, I think
2 you have some flexibility there. The building
3 sits back, I think, 55 feet from the front
4 line. That's a quick calculation, but it's
5 close. The COR design standards were created
6 obviously after this building was actually
7 built.

8 CHAIRMAN STUTO: That's been an issue in
9 the prior Board meetings that I've been at in
10 that some people think that some portion of
11 the code pushed the buildings too close to the
12 street. You think the distance fits in with
13 what's around it?

14 MR. VOSS: Yes, it does. When we went out
15 for our site visit, it's consistent with the
16 adjacent uses, as well in terms of their set
17 backs. I think it works for this section of
18 Central Avenue.

19 In the COR area on-street parking is
20 encouraged, but certainly it's not going to
21 work in this location. They are providing
22 plenty of off-street parking. The site is
23 certainly big enough and adequate to handle
24 any increase in parking required by the
25 project. They are providing some additional

1 landscaping, which will be sufficient. I think
2 the screen proposed edition is from the
3 adjacent residential uses that are relatively
4 close by. There are really no interconnections
5 possible with this site and the adjacent
6 sites. The COR design standards encourage
7 that, as well. We just don't see that as being
8 practical in this location. They can certainly
9 meet the COR design standards for greenspace.
10 The minimum greenspace for the COR was
11 35 percent. They're proposing upwards to
12 75 percent of greenspace, overall.

13 There are sidewalks on this portion of
14 Central Avenue and they will be tied into
15 those with a proposed new entryway and
16 pathway.

17 With regard to the architectural design:
18 Again, it's a pre-existing older building. It
19 wasn't designed with the COR design standards,
20 obviously. I think the applicants have made
21 some pretty significant improvements to the
22 front of that existing building with
23 relocating the front doorway, adding glass and
24 façade treatments. That will certainly help.

25 With regard to stormwater management: I

1 just want to touch on that briefly. They will
2 be providing full SWPPP stormwater management
3 details. Again, because this is really a
4 concept submission they weren't required to
5 provide super detailed stormwater management
6 designs at this point. Certainly, this is a
7 point of notice as they move forward into the
8 process. We would like to see much more detail
9 with regard to stormwater design.

10 We had some trip generations and just
11 looking at their traffic assessments, we had
12 really no concerns with that. CDTC reviewed
13 the project and commented. They had some minor
14 comments about the existing bus stop out front
15 and enhancing that perhaps with a bench.
16 Overall, we felt that they met the concept
17 level review it at the Board's discretion, but
18 we felt inclined for them to move on.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Kathy, do you have any
20 questions?

21 MS. DALTON: In my notes there was a
22 comment here that I saw the Albany County
23 Planning Board was going to make comments. I
24 didn't see that any were included here. Did we
25 receive those?

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chuck?

2 MR. VOSS: I didn't receive any official
3 copies, but I know Liz Lombardi from the
4 county was getting her reports out earlier
5 this week.

6 Joe, I don't know if she sent anything to
7 your office.

8 MR. LACIVITA: I haven't seen it as of
9 yet. Usually they meet the third Thursday of
10 the month and then we get those shortly
11 thereafter.

12 MS. DALTON: The comment is on page 4 of
13 the Barton and Loguidice letter.

14 MR. LACIVITA: I don't have them in this
15 packet, but that's not to say that they are
16 not in.

17 MR. VOSS: The lack of their comments
18 would certainly allow you to continue. You can
19 continue on with the concept review. You just
20 can't take final approval on the project until
21 you have their comments.

22 MR. LACIVITA: Kathy, a lot of times we
23 see deferred to local planning regulations
24 from the county if there is nothing of
25 significance. But without having that, I can't

1 speak as to what they saw or what they found.

2 MR. STUTO: Well, we would definitely
3 need those before final.

4 MR. LACIVITA: Yes, definitely.

5 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Anything else, Kathy?

6 MS. DALTON: No, that's it.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Lou?

8 MR. MION: Presently, you have a gate
9 that goes across the entrance when you're
10 closed. At any given time you can find all
11 kinds of things out there; furniture,
12 bicycles, beds, or whatever you want out on
13 the street. Have you done anything to make it
14 easier for people to take that out back so it
15 isn't out front?

16 MR. PEARSON: The gate is being taken
17 out. The gate is being removed, as part of
18 this.

19 MR. NARDACCI: Explain the improved
20 drop-offs that you have within the project
21 narrative.

22 MR. PEARSON: As part of the
23 reconstruction what were doing is we're
24 expanding store space by taking back house
25 operations and moving them into the addition

1 and making part of that part of the retail
2 store.

3 This portion right here (Indicating) is a
4 curbed drop-off area. It's a receiving area
5 and a process area that's going to lead to the
6 loading dock.

7 The Salvation Army tries to not encourage
8 dumping, but it does occur. It's something
9 that they do have to deal with. One of the
10 methodologies in which they deal with it is
11 that Sunday afternoon seems to be the time
12 when a lot of people are deciding to make a
13 run over to the Salvation Army. Even when the
14 store is closed, there's an area here
15 (Indicating), and there are one or two people
16 manning the drop-off to try to eliminate
17 dumping.

18 MR. MION: So, this is after hours?

19 MR. PEARSON: No, this is Sunday
20 afternoon when the store isn't open.

21 MR. MION: I live over there in that area
22 and I see a lot of that stuff. I'm just
23 wondering, are they going to be able to get
24 that off the road?

25 MR. PEARSON: Well, we're not going to be

1 eliminating individuals from accessing the
2 parking lot because the gate won't be there.
3 Again, there will be signs here (Indicating)
4 saying no dumping, and donations only during
5 operating hours. We'll have the hours posted
6 on the wall.

7 MR. NARDACCI: There are no drop-off
8 areas at the Salvation Army locations?

9 MR. PEARSON: You mean a drop-off box?

10 MR. NARDACCI: Yes.

11 MR. PEARSON: I know there are drop-off
12 boxes, but I don't think we have one.

13 MR. NARDACCI: And you guys have to admit
14 it's a serious problem, right? People
15 drop-off stuff on Central Avenue. I know the
16 location because I can see the stuff on the
17 curb. It's not your fault, but what can we do
18 to mitigate that?

19 MR. O'GARA: We have required part-time
20 drivers at these locations that are very
21 problematic. We keep them posted there. They
22 can then receive the donations there. There is
23 a cost that were saving from illegal dumping
24 that goes on there. As this unfolds and as I'm
25 hearing this, I'm sensing that this is

1 probably going to be the course of action
2 required to eliminate some of that. I can't
3 promise you that there will be no dumping at
4 all.

5 MR. NARDACCI: Do any Salvation Army
6 locations have those drop-offs?

7 MR. LACIVITA: I think that at
8 192 Troy Schenectady Road - I think you put a
9 practice into play for that one. You had
10 certain type of time restrictions. You also
11 had off-hours employees that you put into
12 practice there. There was a serious problem on
13 the Route 2 corridor where people were
14 dumping. So, if you could look at that and see
15 what it is?

16 Tom, if you remember during the course of
17 that review, we were was looking at that.

18 MR. NARDACCI: I think that it's an
19 issue. I think that several of us are echoing
20 it because it's unfortunate. It's not your
21 fault that folks are dropping off at off-hours
22 and there are stuff that they're leaving on
23 the curb of Central Avenue; and maybe isn't
24 the best stuff. They're just getting rid of it
25 and thinking well, I will give it there. I do

1 think that you need to put something into
2 place. I think that not having a gate makes it
3 more your problem on your property than it
4 does on the Town, from a visual perspective.

5 MR. O'GARA: At our Gloversville and
6 Bennington locations we have a driver that
7 goes out there -

8 MR. NARDACCI: Even with security - what
9 about security cameras? You have that?

10 MR. O'GARA: And who's going to enforce
11 that? If we can get that information to the
12 Police Department, then it would be up to
13 them.

14 MR. NARDACCI: Right. At least it's
15 deterrence. Some folks might say this location
16 has security. I think that it would be good
17 moving forward as we get to the next step to
18 first recognize that this is an issue. It's
19 such a highly visible part of so many cars
20 passing by. I think it benefits us both to
21 have it taken care.

22 MR. MION: Very often people it becomes a
23 traffic hazard because people are stopping or
24 quickly pulling over and then you have two or
25 three cars stacked up and looking. They have

1 little kids out there on there running around
2 and they're more interested in what they can
3 pick-up and drop-off than they are the
4 children. I think it's a good move of getting
5 rid of the gate. At least it keeps them off
6 the street.

7 MR. O'GARA: I think we can come up with
8 something that will work.

9 MR. NARDACCI: Thank you for addressing
10 that. That was one of my issues.

11 The front yard right now - there's a
12 level of parking spaces there now right?

13 MR. PEARSON: Yes.

14 MR. NARDACCI: There is no parking in the
15 front of the building, correct?

16 MR. PEARSON: Right.

17 MR. NARDACCI: Just walk me through this.
18 Going forward, what is the landscape plan? Is
19 that going to be increased green out front? Is
20 that what the plan is with regard to where the
21 parking was?

22 Is that screened right there
23 (Indicating)?

24 MR. PEARSON: It's on this side.

25 MR. NARDACCI: Okay.

1 MR. PEARSON: It does extend into the
2 setback. We pushed it back. The existing
3 parking lot currently wraps around here
4 (Indicating). We have widened it here. There
5 is a greater width of the property, and then
6 we narrow back to just a single stall and
7 increase parking in the rear. Why get all of
8 our handicap spaces right in this area
9 (Indicating).

10 MR. NARDACCI: What is the landscaping
11 plan for the site that you have a concept of?

12 MR. PEARSON: Small plantings here at the
13 entry drive. There will be a series of
14 plantings and all the islands. There will be a
15 variety of deciduous plants including some
16 clumping of Serbian Spruce. There will be a
17 variety of junipers at the hedgerow of
18 parking. That's basically what you're going to
19 find in all of these plantings. Actually,
20 there are two different species of Juniper;
21 one tall and one groundcover.

22 Over here (indicating) there will be a
23 series of Black Hills spruce.

24 MR. NARDACCI: I think that in moving to
25 the next step, I like to see a nice tight plan

1 for landscaping. More and more we like to see
2 what is the landscaping plan is going to be.
3 Not just deciduous, but the number of trees.
4 I'd like to see that detail at the next round
5 for the landscaping plan. Have a clearly
6 defined plan

7 MR. PEARSON: Did you read the symbols?

8 MR. NARDACCI: Okay, let me step back.
9 Let's reverse this. I ask you, what's the
10 landscaping plan? It seems to me that you're
11 struggling to tell us what the landscaping
12 plan is. I'm not trying to give you a hard
13 time. When you say well, it's a series of
14 junipers, I'd like to see a little more detail
15 in a little more depth of understanding of
16 what you're planting and where.

17 MR. VOSS: Tom, are you saying that you'd
18 like to see a separate sheet just for
19 landscaping with some color detail?

20 MR. NARDACCI: Absolutely.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chuck, you're the
22 engineer, what do you think of the landscaping
23 plan the way that it is?

24 MR. VOSS: I think that it meets the COR
25 standards. I can understand Tom wanting to see

1 that as a separate project sheet other than
2 the main plan just so that you can realize
3 what is the size of the tree caliper. I think
4 that he has that on the schedule. A separate
5 sheet showing green areas and tree plantings
6 might be beneficial.

7 MR. LACIVITA: Did you depict that on the
8 elevations too, Mark?

9 MR. PEARSON: No, we didn't depict the
10 landscaping on the elevation. We can, though.

11 MR. NARDACCI: A more detailed plan would
12 be helpful for your neighbors and your
13 residential abutters.

14 MR. PEARSON: There is a series of
15 residential properties along the north side.

16 MR. NARDACCI: And what is your screening
17 plan with the neighbors?

18 MR. PEARSON: There is currently a
19 heavily wooded area. We are cutting that back
20 to increase the parking area, but we're not
21 eliminating it.

22 MR. NARDACCI: How much is a lot? How
23 many feet are we talking about? How much are
24 you cutting back? How much will exist after
25 the parking is done?

1 MR. PEARSON: The current line of the
2 wooded area extends back into the current
3 parking lot. It's going to be cut back so that
4 there is 15 feet. This area here will continue
5 onto the neighboring properties (Indicating).

6 MR. NARDACCI: And there is continued
7 woods on the next property, right?

8 MR. PEARSON: Yes.

9 MR. NARDACCI: So, it's going to be
10 15 feet.

11 The final thing that I want to talk about
12 is architectural. I'm not promoting EIFS,
13 myself. I don't know if I've seen that here.
14 I'll do a little more research and try to see
15 what it looks like, but are there other
16 Salvation Army properties that use the same
17 materials?

18 MR. PEARSON: Yes.

19 MR. NARDACCI: So, maybe you can share
20 with us some pictures to show us what we're
21 going to be looking at? I think especially as
22 we're looking at Central Avenue, that's a main
23 corridor and thoroughfare through town. An
24 architectural review is very important. It's
25 nice that you're doing an expansion, but

1 you're also incorporating an older building,
2 too. To just have a better understanding at
3 what we're looking at. This is a grey color?

4 MR. PEARSON: Yes.

5 MR. NARDACCI: What's the front of the
6 building going to look like from Central
7 straight on?

8 MR. PEARSON: As I indicated, what you're
9 seeing is a shallow building and a very
10 shallow peak. We're building a continuous line
11 of wall so you'll have metal trim, that basic
12 light color gray with the darker gray band
13 below, and a series of accents around the
14 front windows.

15 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm going to chime in
16 and I wouldn't normally do this. I'd like to
17 underscore both things that he said. I'm new
18 to this as a Board Member and as a Chairman,
19 but I served as the Attorney for two and a
20 half years. I know that aesthetics, including
21 architectural and landscaping is very
22 important this Board.

23 This is for your benefit as well, Chuck.
24 We need for you to be our eyes.

25 I, personally, appreciate the

1 redevelopment of this property. My bias would
2 be towards enhancing it and making it look
3 really good. I'm not an architect, so I can't
4 tell. This tends to look a little bit too
5 plain.

6 Chuck, I would look for suggestions from
7 you. Even though you say it meets the COR
8 requirements, I think we're entitled to
9 suggest to the applicant things that might
10 improve it. That's where my bias is.

11 MR. VOSS: I can have our landscape
12 architects take a look at it as well to give
13 us some suggestions that they might think are
14 relevant.

15 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Also the roof - it's
16 just a flat line.

17 MR. NARDACCI: And these are things that
18 are consistent with other projects that have
19 come in, too. It's something that we're
20 looking at with these main thoroughfares. We
21 appreciate your investment, but we would like
22 to see something a little bit more attractive.

23 A lighting plan - down style lighting?

24 MR. PEARSON: We haven't generated it
25 yet.

1 MR. NARDACCI: Are there any HVAC units
2 that might be on the roof?

3 MR. PEARSON: I don't know yet.
4 Typically, we would expect to see that on the
5 back portion.

6 MR. NARDACCI: Screening the neighbors,
7 obviously, with the trees.

8 MR. PEARSON: We can certainly look at
9 screening on the roof, as well.

10 MR. NARDACCI: That's really all I have
11 right now. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Mike?

13 MR. SULLIVAN: I did have a few comments
14 comments with regard to the lighting in the
15 drop-off area. I learned that the lighting in
16 the parking lot will be turned off once the
17 last of the employees has left. There will be
18 some building security lighting?

19 MR. PEARSON: Correct.

20 MR. SULLIVAN: Is there going to be any
21 lighting in the drop-off area either on all
22 the time or motion sensors-lighting such that
23 it may discourage drop-offs the middle of the
24 night?

25 MR PEARSON: we are required by code to

1 have lighting at all the emergency exits all
2 the time. All of these doors have some form of
3 lighting. I guess what you're asking is about
4 the canopy. Will the canopy lights be on?

5 MR. SULLIVAN: Or to have motion
6 detection so that if somebody drives up it may
7 or may not discourage somebody dropping off.
8 They might come back later. I know that even
9 with the gate they drop-off anyway. I just
10 worry that with no lighting in the parking lot
11 they might wait until night time to drop-off.

12 The other question I had was: If you were
13 to put in units and you screen them, that will
14 make the roofline of the new building higher.
15 Is there some way to transition from the
16 existing? It might be something that the
17 architects could suggest. In looking at the
18 buildings, the difference between the old and
19 the new is very pronounced. I was wondering if
20 there was some way to transition that with
21 some sort of screening on the roof edges to
22 step it down. Again, I'm not an architect.
23 That's just my opinion. It sticks out to me as
24 the separation between buildings. The
25 elevation difference is kind of jagged. I'm

1 open to any suggestions that the architects or
2 you may have to maybe work on that part of the
3 building.

4 MR. LACIVITA: Mark, Mike is talking
5 about your main entryway. Typically, when you
6 go to a larger building with a focal point or
7 something like that, a landscape tree or
8 something like that would take away the eye
9 where you actually see the transition -

10 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, if you could just
11 break that up.

12 MR. LACIVITA: To Peter and Tom's point:
13 If you look at the roof examples in the COR
14 district under Section 190-4 it talks about
15 softening. It also talks about breaking up the
16 roof lines and things like that, which can
17 certainly dress up the building façade.

18 MR. SULLIVAN: That's all I had; thank
19 you.

20 MR. NARDACCI: Just with regard to the
21 architectural again, this EIFS system is what
22 you're sticking to? Is it the best design?

23 MR. PEARSON: It's really kind of the
24 stucco texture on top of an insulation system.
25 We're dealing particularly with the building

1 that is existing. Were taking off the metal
2 panels and it doesn't have a lot of insulation
3 value. So, we want to put something on there
4 that's going to be reasonably energy
5 efficient. If we were to do any sort of
6 masonry or something like that, we would only
7 get a minimal amount of insulation back into
8 that system. This is a quick way of providing
9 them with a much better insulated building.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chuck, have you seen
11 this?

12 MR. VOSS: Yes, I've seen that at other
13 locations. The only concern would be is that
14 it's not a panel sheet.

15 MR. NARDACCI: It looks like a panel
16 sheet on the plans. That's my concern.

17 MR. VOSS: Maybe that's just an
18 architectural detail.

19 MR. PEARSON: It's just a scoring
20 pattern.

21 MR. NARDACCI: The problem is with my
22 knowledge - and this is my fourth year on the
23 Board - I haven't seen this before.

24 MR. VOSS: I don't know if we seen this
25 on other locations are not.

1 MR. NARDACCI: That's what I'm struggling
2 with. We've seen a lot of commercial
3 properties improved - a lot of redevelopment
4 and I just haven't seen this. It's the first
5 time I've come across this. I'm trying to
6 understand. In looking at the plan it doesn't
7 look like stucco. It looks like square panels.

8 MR. VOSS: Tom, I think that we can have
9 them supply some photographs of some recent
10 applications and that will give you a better
11 sense of what it's like. It's almost like a
12 masonry type of the side. They can score
13 really any type of pattern.

14 I think what you have provided there is
15 just kind of the generic scoring pattern.

16 MR. PEARSON: We can change the scoring
17 pattern and the color and the depth.

18 MR. VOSS: I think that's where the Board
19 is struggling. How does that look?

20 MR. NARDACCI: Could you think of other
21 places in Town or perhaps where it's being
22 used?

23 MR. LANE: Is that typically used in this
24 region?

25 MR. PEARSON: It's used everywhere.

1 MR. VOSS: It weathers well, and it
2 stands up well, and the colors don't change or
3 fade.

4 MR. LACIVITA: On that same component
5 using that type of material and the type of
6 design - you could actually make false facades
7 using that product. You could make the
8 building stand out that way. You could put
9 peaks on this building along with your
10 landscaping design to really make it jump out.
11 You could draw focal points to the various
12 paths or entryways along the way to make it a
13 little bit more appealing.

14 MR. NARDACCI: You have this tremendously
15 historic organization with this great mission.
16 It just seems very boxy to me.

17 MR. SULLIVAN: You could also extend the
18 line at the top of the existing store to the
19 gray line that's right there such that it
20 blends more. It looks like it's two separate
21 buildings. I think that's what's killing it
22 for me.

23 MR. PEARSON: I did get a good
24 suggestion. One of the comments that I was
25 about to make is the existing store has a

1 pitched roof. We could put anything there that
2 goes above that level like that Gable. We
3 could extend lines from the existing building
4 through the new portion and it could be done
5 much more easily.

6 MR. SULLIVAN: Maybe if we could see a
7 rendering of that. That might help.

8 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Tim?

9 MR. LANE: I am all set.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Anyone from the public
11 have any questions?

12 MS. BIGGERSTAFF: My name is Gail
13 Biggerstaff. I'm one of the neighbors. I am on
14 the back of the property. I'm not sure, but I
15 do recall getting one other notice of the
16 meeting. I don't recall why I was not able to
17 attend that one. That must be when everyone
18 else came.

19 MR. NARDACCI: For this project?

20 MS. BIGGERSTAFF: Yes

21 MR. NARDACCI: I think this is the first
22 time we've looked at this, right?

23 CHAIRMAN STUTO: As far as I know.

24 Joe, is this our first time looking at
25 this?

1 MR. LACIVITA: Actually, no. The
2 Salvation Army came before the Board in 2008.

3 MR. PEARSON: Shopfer Architects got a
4 hold of all the neighbors' names and we put up
5 a presentation at the local Holiday Inn for
6 anybody that wanted to come.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: We appreciate that.

8 MR. PEARSON: That was in the summer.

9 MS. BIGGERSTAFF: So, my biggest concern
10 is the back of my property is heavily wooded.
11 I see deer in my backyard. So, my biggest
12 concern is what am I now going to look at?

13 MR. NARDACCI: So, you're going to leave
14 15 feet of woods? How many feet of words are
15 you removing to the parking lot?

16 MR. PEARSON: It's all wooded where the
17 parking lot is going.

18 MR. NARDACCI: So, how many feet of woods
19 are you removing?

20 MR. PEARSON: For pushing the line from
21 the building back, about 100 feet.

22 MR. NARDACCI: So, they're taking
23 100 feet and they're leaving 15 feet of woods
24 on your side on your property.

25 MR. PEARSON: Can you show me where your

1 house is located?

2 MS. BIGGERSTAFF: It's right here
3 (Indicating).

4 As I'm listening - I absolutely
5 understand the issue with the drop-offs. Now,
6 my concern is there is no gate. They are now
7 behind my property. I'm growing more concerned
8 as I'm listening to the fact that there's
9 going to be drop-offs at all hours of the day
10 and night when no one is around.

11 MR. NARDACCI: Have you thought about a
12 fence on your side on your property?

13 MR. PEARSON: We have not made any
14 provisions for that, but we would be willing
15 to consider a fence or an evergreen hedge.

16 MR. NARDACCI: I'm just trying to address
17 concerns about safety at night.

18 MS. BIGGERSTAFF: A fence would
19 definitely give me a lot of peace of mind.

20 MR. PEARSON: What type of fence to have
21 in mind?

22 MR. BIGGERSTAFF: Something high enough
23 so people won't come into my yard.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: What would you suggest
25 Chuck?

1 MR. VOSS: Something like a stockade
2 fence - six-foot stockade. I think that
3 15 feet is relatively minimal landscaping.

4 MS. BIGGERSTAFF: The other thing that
5 I'm thinking is that 15 feet - at first it
6 sounds good and then you start thinking well,
7 it's really not that much when you're used to
8 thick woods.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Would you be willing to
10 communicate with Ms. Biggerstaff?

11 MR. PEARSON: Sure.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Any other concerns
13 ma'am?

14 MS. BIGGERSTAFF: No, that's really it.

15 MS. DALTON: Can I ask you a question?
16 You were saying that you have dear and
17 wildlife?

18 MS. BIGGERSTAFF: Yes.

19 MS. DALTON: Have you done any evaluation
20 of what kinds of displacement there will be of
21 the animals and where they're going to go?

22 MR. PEARSON: No, we have not done
23 anything like that.

24 MS. DALTON: Are we required to?

25 MR. NARDACCI: Not on this part.

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chuck, are we required
2 to do a displacement study?

3 MR. VOSS: No, you're not required to do
4 that. Unless you're concerned about a sort of
5 species or habitat, which there's really no
6 indication of. This is a pre-existing site.
7 This area has been disturbed over the years.
8 We could certainly look and see if there's any
9 habitat, but my guess is there wouldn't be.

10 MS. DALTON: I would be really happy if
11 you did.

12 MS. BIGGERSTAFF: The deer - I've
13 actually seen on a very regular basis.

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Yes, ma'am.

15 MS. FOX: Good evening. I'm Amy Fox. I
16 just have observational thoughts as I'm
17 listening to the meeting.

18 If you're looking at any material that
19 would produce a buffer for the neighbor -- as
20 the applicant in the Board were talking about
21 where air conditioning would go - I would just
22 ask the Board to consider if any barrier is
23 actually producing an amplifying effect for
24 her for the sound.

25 Also, I would just ask the Board to look

1 at the final review to double check any
2 environmental factors that would affect
3 neighbors such as sound and lighting. There
4 are some fencing materials that could actually
5 amplify and there are fencing materials that
6 can buffer. It could be a double benefit and
7 the type of material that could be considered
8 for this application.

9 Just a comment about the deer: They are
10 the most flexible species in our area. They
11 have a very easy time with relocating because
12 of their grazing nature and they adapt. They
13 are extremely able to adapt.

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Anybody else on the
15 Board?

16 ***(There was no response.)***

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Since I'm new and I'm
18 not sure how much of the Board has been
19 involved in these types of discussions, before
20 we take a motion, I'm going to ask Elena to
21 talk about SEQRA and what the concept
22 acceptance would mean and how we should
23 suggest to make a motion.

24 Are you comfortable talking about that,
25 Elena?

1 MS. VAIDA: Yes. Actually, I was going to
2 ask Chuck because the Board Members had some
3 environmental issues raised. Are there any
4 other documents you might feel that this needs
5 before this project comes back for final?
6 Chuck has reviewed that from that viewpoint
7 and I've asked him to make some comments.

8 MR. VOSS: Just for the Board's
9 information, the applicant did submit a short
10 environmental assessment form to help us
11 classify the action under SEQRA. Initially, we
12 felt the project should be classified as an
13 unlisted action for SEQRA. I think for this
14 type of project - it's initial impact is
15 adequate and accurate. Basically, that means
16 that now we have the action classified. The
17 Board is free to ask for additional
18 information that they feel is appropriate to
19 help you make further SEQRA determination,
20 which would take place after all of the
21 information has come in for this project. At
22 this point, I think were comfortable with that
23 as a classification. Certainly, as new
24 information comes in and as you look at this
25 project through its initial review phases,

1 some new additional information may come in.
2 But I think once we have everything in place,
3 at the end you be able to make your final
4 SEQRA determination and take action.

5 MS. VAIDA: One suggestion that I have is
6 based upon the concerns of the Board Members
7 and as to the design of the issues raised by
8 the neighbor, do you think it would be
9 advisable to have them come back for another
10 review and not vote tonight since there are
11 concerns on the design standards?

12 MR. NARDACCI: That would be my
13 inclination. I think that there are a lot of
14 outstanding issues. Before we move forward,
15 I'd like to see some of the neighbor's
16 concerns addressed. I like to see more detail
17 on the landscaping. I'd like to get a final on
18 this architectural because it's hard to say
19 move forward when we really don't know what it
20 looks like. I can honestly say that I don't
21 know what it looks like. I think as things
22 move forward, I'd like to see more
23 architectural details.

24 MR. LACIVITA: I think that it's the
25 elevation and the standards that are at issue.

1 MR. NARDACCI: I have no problem with
2 anything else other than what I mentioned.
3 It's the aesthetics that are of concern. It's
4 hard because you have provided us with some
5 architectural detail, but it doesn't look
6 right. It's hard to visualize when it's
7 industrial looking this way. It sort of the
8 back side of a Rite Aid.

9 MS. VAIDA: I think it's up to the
10 applicant if you want us to vote tonight, but
11 it seems like from the comments it would be
12 better to come back with more detail and stay
13 in keeping with the concerns that have given
14 you some direction for the site plan review.
15 It's up to you.

16 MR. PEARSON: I personally would like to
17 see a vote for the concept so that we can go
18 forward. I would like to get through all the
19 stormwater, erosion, sedimentation control
20 plans and the lighting plans. But I would like
21 some commitment that this is the scheme that
22 were working with. I don't want to invest all
23 of the time and effort - I can bring you back
24 renderings - three dimensional renderings.

25 MS. VAIDA: I guess that's what I'm

1 suggesting.

2 MR. PEARSON: Can we move forward with
3 this site plan?

4 MR. NARDACCI: Personally, for myself, I
5 have a lot of concerns about the aesthetics. I
6 personally have no problem with the site plan
7 with the addition and the expansions as long
8 as we meet the aesthetics and some of the
9 buffering concerns that have been raised.

10 MS. VAIDA: Maybe we can vote on the
11 concept since this is an informal procedure -

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Elena, one which talk
13 about concepts.

14 MS. VAIDA: I think the Board understands
15 it. We're trying to make things very clear to
16 the applicants that concept doesn't entitle
17 you to anything in terms of the site plan
18 approval process. What has happened here is a
19 discussion of your design and concept that you
20 get feedback on. You can hopefully use that
21 when you put together your final site plan
22 application. I just want to make it clear that
23 you understand that concept acceptance is not
24 to be construed as approval of the project in
25 the application for site plan approval. It's

1 not complete until the final site plan is
2 actually prepared and the requirements of
3 SEQRA have been met. Obviously, we're not in a
4 position to act on that. I think everyone
5 understands that.

6 MR. NARDACCI: Before we vote on it for
7 the concept, what would you intend to come
8 back to us with in regards to the aesthetics
9 based on what you've heard from a lot of us
10 tonight?

11 MR. PEARSON: We would have to find a way
12 to integrate the existing building more into
13 the new build design. From what I'm hearing,
14 there is a building A and building B and they
15 are kind of merged together. I appreciate
16 that. I think it would have the landscaping
17 plan here. I think we should bring back a 3-D
18 rendering of that, showing trees up against
19 the buildings. The third option is, of course,
20 the buffer. What we're going to propose there
21 in terms of fencing and landscaping.

22 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can I make a comment on
23 the architectural? What about some type of
24 façade along the top along the front? Do you
25 still have the same drainage issues in the

1 back?

2 MR. PEARSON: Along the front?

3 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Yes, facing Central
4 Avenue

5 MR. PEARSON: Facing Central Avenue we
6 are proposing to put a façade in front of
7 what's currently there.

8 CHAIRMAN STUTO: To have that depicted on
9 the drawing?

10 MR. PEARSON: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: The peaks that go along
12 the top of the building - I'm thinking for
13 example with a place on Route 9. I believe
14 Fresh Market has one. Newton Plaza has one.

15 MS. DALTON: They did a really nice job
16 of making it not just a straight cut.

17 MR. PEARSON: Yes, we can create whatever
18 we want.

19 MS. DALTON: It's just not a particularly
20 attractive building. It looks very
21 institutional. I think that we're hearing here
22 is that this is an opportunity to include a
23 look of a very large piece of property along
24 Central Avenue. I think that's what we would
25 like to see.

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: All opposed?

2 ***(There were none opposed.)***

3 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Concept acceptance has
4 been approved.

5 MR. PEARSON: Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Motion to adjourn?

7 MR. MION: I make a motion.

8 MR. NARDACCI: I'll second.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: all those in favor?

10 ***(Ayes were recited.)***

11

12

13 ***(Whereas the proceeding concerning the above***
14 ***entitled matter was adjourned at 9:29 p.m.)***

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATION

1
2
3
4 **I, NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART, Approved**
5 **New York State Transcriber and Notary Public**
6 **in and for the State of New York, hereby**
7 **CERTIFY that the record taped and transcribed**
8 **by me at the time and place noted in the**
9 **heading hereof is a true and accurate**
10 **transcript of same, to the best of my ability**
11 **and belief.**

12
13
14
15 **NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART**

16
17
18 **Dated February 14, 2011**

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
Legal Transcription

Ph - 518-542-7699 Fx - 518-831-1710
www.albanylegaltranscription.com