Planning Board

TOWN OF BRUNSWICK
336 Town Office Road
Troy, New York 12180

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD February 6, 2014

PRESENT were RUSSELL OSTER, CHAIRMAN, MICHAEL CZORNYJ, FRANK ESSER, TIMOTHY CASEY, KEVIN MAINELLO and VINCE WETMILLER.

ABSENT was DAVID TARBOX.

ALSO PRESENT were JOHN KREIGER, Code Enforcement Officer, and WAYNE BONESTEEL, P.E., Review Engineer to the Planning Board.

Chairman Oster first reviewed the tentative agenda for the February 6, 2014 meeting, noting that the Parsons/TWC, Inc. site plan had been removed from the agenda at the request of the Applicant. Chairman Oster noted that the Applicant will advise the Planning Board when it is ready to submit further information and proceed with the application.

The Planning Board members reviewed the draft minutes of the January 16, 2014 meeting. Upon motion of Member Czornyj, seconded by Member Wetmiller, the minutes of the January 16, 2014 meeting were unanimously approved without amendment.

The only item of business on the agenda was the site plan application submitted by Monarch Design Group on behalf of Ace Hardware for property located at 831 Hoosick Road, the current Feathers Furniture location. Edward Esposito of Monarch Design Group was present on the application. Mr. Esposito explained that his understanding of the Board's request from the January 16, 2014 meeting was that the Applicant submit revised plans showing the project in two phases, with Phase I consisting of the renovation to the existing Feathers Furniture building along with all aspects of the project on the east side of the project site, including the demolition

of the residential home to the east, any grading for parking, and stormwater improvements. Mr. Esposito provided a color copy of the site plan showing Phase I on 11”x17” paper to the Planning Board members. Mr. Bonesteel noted that Mr. Esposito had provided one set of the full size plans showing Phase I directly to him. Mr. Esposito then generally reviewed the aspects of Phase I including providing explanation on the structural canopies that are proposed to be installed, the stormwater management system for Phase I, and the retaining wall proposed for the eastern edge of the project site. Mr. Esposito explained that although the site plan proposes construction of a retaining wall on the eastern edge of the project site, the owners and the broker are attempting to obtain a grading easement, or in the alternative, to buy the adjoining property outright, so that the area can be graded and rip-rap installed to eliminate the need for a retaining wall. Mr. Esposito clarified that the application currently seeks to construct the retaining wall, and that any changes in that respect would be presented to the Town through a site plan amendment. Mr. Esposito also explained that much of the stormwater flow would be collected and directed to the rear of the site and was designed to infiltrate into the soil, rather than simply flowing naturally to the front of the site. Mr. Esposito also explained that the intent of the plan for Phase I is to collect the stormwater from the roof of the building and to unify it with the stormwater collected from the parking lot and to direct it along the rear of the site by means of a stormwater channel with four drywells. Upon completion of Phase II, the stormwater management system for the entire site will be unified. Mr. Esposito explained that he incorporated into the revised plan an extended walkway to the rear area of the parking lot which is intended for employee parking. Mr. Esposito also explained that the dock area on the west side of the existing building would be included in Phase I. Mr. Oster confirmed that the Planning Board’s discussion at the January 16, 2014 meeting resulted in the Board’s request that

the Applicant consolidate the project components on the eastern side of the site and the renovation of the existing building into one phase for purposes of developing a project phase that could stand on its own. Mr. Bonesteel noted that he had received full size plans, including Phase I, which he had preliminarily reviewed. Mr. Bonesteel had some questions on parking, which he discussed generally with the Applicant. Chairman Oster asked whether the 11 parking spots planned for the eastern side of the property near the propane tank would be designated for employee parking. The Applicant explained that those parking spots were intended to be used by customers seeking propane refills, but that employees might park there as well. Member Mainello asked questions concerning the paving that would occur for Phase I. Currently the rear of the site is gravel. The Applicant explained that the currently existing pavement in the front would continue to be used during Phase I and that the gravel area in the rear would be paved during Phase I. The Applicant also explained that after Phase II, a new wearing course over the entire parking lot of the entire site and new line striping would be completed. Mr. Bonesteel asked questions concerning the depth of the pavement, to which the Applicant explained that the pavement would be 5" deep for truck traffic areas, and 4" deep for the remainder. Member Wetmiller asked whether any percolation testing had been done to confirm the suitability of the site for infiltration. The Applicant generally explained that the stormwater channels and drywells should be sufficient to store stormwater for a period of time to allow it to infiltrate at the site, but that if all the drywells and stormwater channels planned for Phase I filled to capacity due to heavy stormwater accumulation, the stormwater could brim over and run by gravity along the current drainage pattern. The Applicant explained that in performing the stormwater calculations, he selected the data appropriate for a 100 year storm. The Applicant further generally explained the volume of stormwater that would be stored in the two swales, the

channel located at the rear of the site, and the four drywells. Member Czornyj asked the Applicant to review the changes in the total greenspace at the site. The Applicant explained that currently, the amount of greenspace on the site is approximately 9%; after Phase I is completed, the greenspace will be approximately 16.29%; after completion of Phase II, the total greenspace would approximate 20%. The Planning Board asked questions concerning the retaining wall, particularly with respect to whether it would be constructed along the entire eastern boundary of the project site, to which the Applicant replied that the retaining wall was proposed for the entire eastern boundary of the site. The Planning Board noted that it was difficult to discern the precise location of the retaining wall because they had not received a full set of plans and instead only received the 11”x17” color coded sheet. Mr. Bonesteel explained that it would not be practical to build a retaining wall directly on the property line, and the Applicant explained that the retaining wall would be located slightly off of the property line. Member Czornyj noted that relocating the retaining wall from the property line would impact the setback distance between the edge of the pavement on the eastern end of this site and the edge of the retaining wall. Member Czornyj also asked questions concerning the size of the blocks planned for the retaining wall. The Applicant responded that the blocks generally were approximately 18” x 18” x 36”. Mr. Bonesteel commented that the contours on the full size plans he received and reviewed were too small and that the notes are too difficult to read on the full size plans. Mr. Bonesteel requested that the Applicant provide a full set of plans with larger text and notes. Member Mainello asked why the driving lane on the east side of the project was proposed to be a one way exit lane, in light of the fact that the proposal calls for parking of 8 cars on the east side of the building. Member Mainello explained that under that proposal, cars would enter the site and if they complied with the one way direction they would have to drive all the way around the back

of the building in order to park in those 8 spots. The Applicant responded that the one way direction was planned for Phase I because after completion of Phase II, the overall traffic pattern would appropriately call for a one way exit on that side of the building given the internal truck traffic circular pattern. Chairman Oster asked whether the Applicant could extend the two way traffic lane so as to allow cars to drive directly into the area of the 8 parking spaces as they enter the parking lot. There was general discussion that currently customers of the existing dance studio in the existing building park their vehicles along the eastern side of the building where the 8 parking spaces are intended as well as along the front of the current Feathers Furniture building. Member Mainello asked the Applicant to confirm that the dance studio would no longer be located in the building. The Applicant explained that the dance studio currently has approximately one year left on their lease and for that period of time, the dance studio would remain in the building. Member Mainello said he was under the impression that the dance studio was not part of the site plan application, but if it was going to remain in the building, the site plan application should reflect as much because it may affect their consideration of truck traffic patterns, internal circulation, and sidewalk requirements, among other things. The Planning Board engaged in lengthy discussion concerning the square footage of the Ace Hardware retail space, the square footage of the existing dance studio, and the square footage of the storage area, as well as the impact of the dance studio on the site plan review. The Planning Board discussed that Ace Hardware would need to obtain a site plan amendment if the site plan ultimately approved included the dance studio, but later Ace Hardware sought to occupy the dance studio space. The Board generally discussed that if the site plan is approved with a notation of a dance studio on the plan, the dance studio would be a permitted part of the project site for beyond the one-year remaining term of the current lease, and the owner could continue to lease that portion

of the building to a dance studio. The Planning Board also discussed that, if the site plan is approved without a notation of a dance studio, that the project would be in violation of the site plan approval if thereafter the existing dance studio continued to remain for the remainder of the lease term. The Planning Board asked the Applicant to provide clarification as to whether the site plan application would include the dance studio as part of the plan. The Applicant explained that the plan was to include the dance studio as part of the site plan, and when the lease ended, the Applicant would obtain site plan amendment to either take over the dance studio square footage or to offer to rent the space to another tenant. The Planning Board also inquired whether the Applicant intended to offer heavy equipment rentals at the site. The Applicant responded that he would consult with the owners and would provide an answer to that question to the Planning Board. Member Mainello explained to the Applicant that the existence of the dance studio at the site was an important consideration for the Planning Board because currently the Feathers Furniture store is open until 5:00 p.m., whereas the dance studio is open at night. Under the current proposal, the Ace Hardware store is proposed to be open until 9:00 p.m., which would result in customers of Ace Hardware being at the site at the same time that the customers of the dance studio would be at the site. Member Mainello explained that for purposes of determining whether the layout is appropriate for the two uses given that they will be coexisting during some times of the day, the Planning Board needs some additional data concerning the use of the dance studio portion of the site. The Planning Board also asked the Applicant to provide clear detail concerning the width of the sidewalk in the front of the existing building, to show that it is 10’ wide given the Applicant’s proposal to display products on pallets in that area. The Applicant stated that they had calculated the number of parking spots based on the industry standard of one parking space per 200 square feet of retail floor area. Mr. Kreiger explained that

the Brunswick Site Plan Review Act called for one space for every 600 square foot of retail floor area. Member Czornyj explained that he has observed that parking by customers of the dance studio at night fills up the east side of the parking area and also a large portion of parking area in the front of the existing building. Chairman Oster stated that if the Code provides for a certain number of parking spots based on the retail square footage of the building, he does not believe that the Planning Board can require more spots based on the fact that there are two different retail uses within the same building. Member Mainello commented that the Board's consideration of traffic flow, internal circulation, and layout of parking, as well as pedestrian circulation, would be affected by whether or not the dance studio was part of the site plan. The Board discussed the various options available for dealing with the pedestrian, vehicle traffic, and parking concerns associated with the dance studio, including consideration of crosswalks and confirming adequate sidewalks around the building. The Applicant explained that he would provide the Planning Board with information relating to the dance studio lease including the lease term, and would also provide clarification on the hours of operation of both the Ace Hardware and the dance studio. The Applicant further explained that to the extent the Planning Board has concerns relating to delivery truck traffic impacting the dance studio customers, the proposal is that delivery trucks and garbage trucks would visit the site either early during the day or at night, with delivery trucks typically making deliveries between 4:00 a.m. and 7:00 a.m. The Applicant also stated that the site plan provides for stop signs near the area of the building where the trucks would be driving past the dance studio. The Applicant agreed to provide to the Planning Board an estimate of the number of anticipated cars when the dance studio and Ace Hardware would be both open. The Applicant also agreed that it would consider extending the two way driving lane as suggested to allow cars to park in the 8 parking spaces proposed near the

dance studio as they enter the parking lot. The Applicant also agreed that he would clarify the width of the sidewalk at the front of the store. Member Esser asked additional questions concerning the retaining wall. Chairman Oster suggested that the site plan may designate that a portion of the building is occupied by a tenant rather than occupied by a dance studio, which would alleviate some of the concerns that approving the site plan with a dance studio might limit the future use of that space. Member Mainello responded that he would like to know what specific type of tenant is proposed because it would affect his consideration of various aspects of the site plan particularly relating to safety. Mr. Bonesteel suggested that the Board might consider allowing for segregated parking, with designated spots for the dance studio while it was open. Members of the Planning Board discussed the various advantages and disadvantages of segregating parking. Member Mainello requested that the Applicant provide additional information concerning the dance studio. Member Czornyj asked whether there will be an outdoor display on the front west corner of the project site, and noted in particular, that if the Applicant proposed to display heavy rental equipment there, the site plan should show it. Member Casey asked questions concerning the shed located in the eastern corner of the site. The Applicant explained that the proposal is to keep the shed, although it will be lowered in elevation due to grading that will occur. The Applicant also explained that the plan was to update the shed as necessary to accommodate storage of propane tanks. The Planning Board and the Applicant discussed the further submissions that would be made. The Applicant will provide a large set of plans to the Planning Board members which will include larger text and clearer detail; a full site plan; a plan showing Phase I; a plan showing Phase II; details for the various aspects of the plans; and the lighting and landscaping plan. The Applicant agreed that the submission would also include a designation of that portion of the existing building that will be used by the dance

studio as well as that which will be used by Ace Hardware for storage in the rear of the building. Chairman Oster noted that the matter would be placed on the agenda for the February 20, 2014 meeting.

There was one item of new business, being the proposed redevelopment project of property located at 1163 Hoosick Road submitted by Alta East, Inc. Mr. Kreiger provided copies of the application materials to each of the Planning Board members, to the Planning Board attorney, and to Mr. Bonesteel. Mr. Kreiger explained that the application would require an area variance and special use permit, and that the matter would therefore be on the agenda of the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Kreiger explained that the Planning Board can expect the Zoning Board of Appeals to request a recommendation from the Planning Board, and therefore the application materials have been provided to the Planning Board at this juncture. The Planning Board generally discussed issues relating to the site including whether the site had a sufficient area for installation of a properly functioning septic system, the lighting proposed for the site, and the location of the NYSDOT right of way. It was explained that the application would be presented to the Planning Board at the next meeting, on February 20, 2014. Mr. Kreiger explained that the Zoning Board of Appeals may request at the Zoning Board of Appeals' February 24, 2014 meeting that the Planning Board provide a recommendation on the applications pending before the Zoning Board of Appeals. The 1163 Hoosick Road redevelopment project was placed on the agenda for the February 20, 2014 Planning Board meeting.

The index for the February 6, 2014 meeting is as follows:

1. Monarch Design Group – site plan – 2/20/2014.
2. Alta East, Inc. – site plan/ZBA recommendation – 2/20/2014.

The proposed agenda for the February 20, 2014 meeting currently is as follows:

1. Monarch Design Group – site plan.

2. Alta East, Inc. – site plan/ZBA recommendation.