

TOWN BOARD

COUNTY OF ALBANY

TOWN OF COLONIE

\*\*\*\*\*

A PUBLIC HEARING AND SUBSEQUENT VOTE IN CONNECTION WITH  
THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE LOCAL LAW NUMBER 18 OF  
2011 ESTABLISHING THE HOFFMAN SENIOR HOUSING PDD

\*\*\*\*\*

THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled  
matter by NANCY L. STRANG, a Shorthand Reporter, on  
May 23, 2019 7:41 p.m. at Memorial Town Hall 534 Loudon  
Road, Newtonville, New York 12128

BOARD MEMBERS:

- PAULA A. MAHAN, SUPERVISOR
- LINDA MURPHY, DEPUTY SUPERVISOR
- PAUL ROSANO
- DAVID GREEN
- CHRISTOPHER CAREY
- MELISSA JEFFERS-VONDOLLEN
- JENNIFER WHALEN

ALSO PRESENT:

- Timothy MacPhearson, Esq. Town Attorney's Office
- Michelle Turcotte, Deputy Town Clerk
- Luigi Palleshi, ABD Engineers
- Mary Beth Slevin, Esq., Stockli Slevin

1 MS. TURCOTTE: This public hearing is being held  
2 by order of the Town Board to hear all persons in  
3 connection with the proposed amendments to the Local  
4 Law Number 18 of 2011 establishing the Hoffman Senior  
5 Housing PDD. Notice of the public hearing has been  
6 published in the official Town newspaper which is the  
7 Spotlight and has been posted on the Town Clerk's  
8 bulletin Board. I have an affidavit for each.

9 The Town Board will now hear all persons interested  
10 in this project.

11 MR. PALLESHI: Good evening. I am Luigi Palleshi  
12 with ABD Engineers, the civil engineer on this project  
13 for the senior housing community known as the Hoffman  
14 Senior PDD. Also with me tonight is Mary Beth Slevin  
15 with Stockli Slevin. She is the attorney for the  
16 applicant.

17 We are here tonight on behalf of the applicant, Stu  
18 Hoffman. He is the owner of the land and the project.

19 Back in 2011 this Board approved a PDD as shown up  
20 here (Indicating). It was for 170-unit market rate  
21 senior assisted living as well as an assisted  
22 living/memory care for 90 beds. It has been sitting for  
23 some time, but recently we have had several discussions  
24 with both the Planning Board and some Town Board members  
25 and what we were proposing tonight is to amend the PDD.

1 It is really a simple amendment. We are going from 170  
2 units down to 140 units.

3 The reason for the different footprint as shown  
4 here - they got a little further along with the  
5 architectural from the original conceptual plan. You can  
6 see the building footprint change slightly. It is now a  
7 L-shaped building. It actually fits nicer with the  
8 topography of the land. It is still a three-story  
9 building as previously approved with a walkout basement  
10 due to the topography of the site. The access for the  
11 project would be off of Route 2. However, the address is  
12 known as 1 Alice Lane. Alice Lane is northerly here  
13 (Indicating). We do have an emergency access.

14 Everything you see here is very similar to the  
15 original approved PDD back in 2011 as far as the  
16 entryway off of Route 2 and as far as the emergency only  
17 access off of Alice Avenue.

18 The project that we have discussed several times  
19 now with the Planning Board has actually made a positive  
20 recommendation back to this Board for the 140 units.

21 We have parking situated around the entire  
22 building. We are at 1 1/2 parking spaces per unit.

23 There will be certain amenities for this project.  
24 There is an indoor pool, some walking trails as well as  
25 a scenic overlook area.

1           The project has public water and public sewer. We  
2           have a grinder pump proposed pumping up to the existing  
3           sanitary system on Alice Avenue. There is actually a  
4           water line that's owned by Latham Water that cuts  
5           through the property which we will be connecting to  
6           that.

7           Since 2011 - which kind of agrees with why we had  
8           to change the layout like we did was because of the New  
9           York State DC storm water regulations. Since 2011 until  
10          now some of those regulations have changed. So, this  
11          will incorporate all of those.

12          As far as the building design, it will be in full  
13          conformance with the Town Code for architectural  
14          features that are proposed for this building.

15          There are proposed garages - detached garages as  
16          well as outdoor parking spaces. So, as far as the  
17          amendment, as I mentioned, we are reducing it from 170  
18          to 140 and when you look at that as far as a SEQR  
19          perspective or environmental, this proposal is less than  
20          what was previously approved as far as the traffic, the  
21          uses for sewer and water and so forth. So, it is  
22          actually nice being in front of you proposing something  
23          with less density than was previously approved.

24          Some of the public benefits that I can certainly  
25          discuss tonight are very similar to what was previously

1 approved. I don't know if any of you had a chance to  
2 review some of the previous documents. It certainly will  
3 increase the real property taxes. Being that it is a  
4 senior community, there are no school-age children.

5 Other improvements would be to the existing Town  
6 water system. There is an old vault and pressure  
7 reducing valve that needs upgrading, so the developer  
8 will on his own time pay for it and replace that valve  
9 per Latham Water standards.

10 As I mentioned earlier, it does have a scenic  
11 overlook and nature walk throughout the project which is  
12 a nice benefit for the seniors. Contribution of funds  
13 towards mitigation fees specified in the Boght  
14 Road/Columbia Street GEIS to support infrastructure  
15 improvements within the study area.

16 Lastly, this is another minor change - the  
17 sidewalks. Back in 2011 the previous plan had about  
18 1,000 feet of sidewalk from our project to here where  
19 you see this building (Indicating), about 1,000 feet  
20 down the driveway entrance to Route 2. When we took a  
21 look at it, due to the topography we didn't want to  
22 encourage seniors walking down some steep slopes  
23 especially if they got to Route 2. Route 2 has some  
24 topography issues and there are no sidewalks on Route 2.  
25 To lead a sidewalk from our development to Route 2 with

1 no logical terminus point - it's not that we don't want  
2 to install the sidewalks. We would rather contribute or  
3 make a cash contribution of about \$75,000 to the Town to  
4 where the Town sees the sidewalks fit in a place where  
5 it makes more sense than trying to install or make the  
6 developer install it here where there is no logical  
7 terminus.

8 With that, we are here tonight for an approval on  
9 the PDD amendment. If there are any questions, we would  
10 be glad to answer them.

11 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: If I could just ask a question  
12 on the sidewalk - that you no longer put in the  
13 sidewalk. I thought the message from the Planning Board  
14 is that we can have different options for the cash  
15 contribution and it may not be sidewalks. It's  
16 different when you put the sidewalk in then when we do  
17 because of the steps that we go through as a  
18 government. Just the engineering alone for it - - I  
19 don't know if we can build it for \$75,000. To building  
20 another sidewalk. We can apply it to any public benefit  
21 that we determine.

22 Is that correct?

23 MS. SLEVIN: Mary Beth Slevin.

24 That is correct. The concept was to provide an  
25 amount that was equivalent to the cost of the

1 installation of the sidewalk. We reviewed with the Town  
2 on several levels what the Town would evaluate the cost  
3 of that. We got the same number confirmed with our own  
4 engineers. The number that they came up with was the  
5 \$75,000. So, how that is used is obviously at the Town's  
6 discretion. The idea was to provide a benefit that was  
7 equivalent to what was originally proposed in the PDD.

8 MR. ROSANO: Mary Beth, I have a question. Because  
9 it is going to be GEIS regulated, that money would have  
10 to fall into the scope of what was approved - - like,  
11 traffic would be one. We can't just take the money and  
12 use it for anything. The GIS is specific -

13 MS. SLEVIN: This is in addition to the GEIS.

14 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: The public benefit - because it  
15 is a PDD. Not the GEIS money which is for all of the  
16 infrastructure improvements. There are two different  
17 things.

18 MS. SLEVIN: So, the GEIS contribution will be  
19 made in addition to the sidewalk - equivalent  
20 contribution.

21 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: Thank you.

22 MR. ROSANO: I just want to say that I was on the  
23 Planning Board for the original plan and this is  
24 remarkably better. Thank you, very much.

25 MR. PALLESHI: Thank you.

1 MS. WHALEN: I have a question about senior  
2 housing. I have reviewed the record, but I can't  
3 remember - is it 55 and over? Is that what you are  
4 qualifying as senior?

5 MR. PALLESHI: Yes.

6 MS. WHALEN: That's like the standard senior  
7 number, right?

8 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: That is the state.

9 MS. WHALEN: What with the average rent be? Are  
10 they what? Are they one-bedrooms? Are they  
11 two-bedrooms?

12 MR. PALLESHI: It is a mix. That is something that  
13 I cannot answer tonight.

14 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: Is that market rate?

15 MR. PALLESHI: It is market rate.

16 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: I think that answers our  
17 question.

18 MS. WHALEN: What is the market rate, do you know?

19 MR. PALLESHI: I am just the engineer. If you want  
20 to ask questions about grading, storm water or  
21 utilities, I am here for you.

22 MR. ROSANO: It will be whatever it is the day  
23 they cut the ribbon. It could change day by day.

24 MS. WHALEN: Some kids might live there, though.  
25 If you're over 55, you could still have teenage - -

1 people are having children later. They could still have  
2 children there.

3 MR. PALLESHI: Typically facilities like this  
4 don't attract that type. We do state 55 and over.  
5 Usually you see older people -

6 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: From what we have seen, it's  
7 generally 70's through the 90's.

8 MR. PALLESHI: The memory care is like a Phase 2.

9 MS. WHALEN: Where is the memory care part?

10 MR. PALLESHI: It's on the other side of the  
11 National Grid easement. Hopefully after tonight, we can  
12 get to the Planning Board and get the site plan review  
13 on this and then shortly after when we are ready for  
14 the memory care, we will reapply to the Planning Board  
15 for the approval on the site plan review for the memory  
16 care. Right now we are focused on the Phase 1 of the  
17 project.

18 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: I think the reduction in  
19 density is great. I think it is a better project all  
20 the way around. With the topography, it was very  
21 different.

22 MR. PALLESHI: Yes, it is definitely different and  
23 that's why we are kind of taking advantage. There are  
24 some nice views out there as well.

25 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: Does the public have any

1 questions?

2 (There was no response.)

3 Any questions from the Board?

4 (There was no response.)

5 We will close the public hearing.

6 MS. TURCOTTE: We have a Resolution approving a  
7 proposed Local Law amending Local Law number 118 of  
8 2011, Hoffman Senior Housing PDD.

9 MR. ROSANO: So moved.

10 MR. GREEN: Second.

11 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: Supervisor votes aye. Clerk,  
12 call the roll.

13 (The roll was called.)

14 MS. TURCOTTE: The ayea have it, Madam Supervisor.

15 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: The Resolution is adopted.

16 (Where is the above entitled proceeding was  
17 concluded at 7:51 p.m.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATION

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

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.

\_\_\_\_\_

NANCY L. STRANG

Dated \_\_\_\_\_