

**In The Matter Of:**  
*CITY OF ALBANY INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY*  
*PUBLIC HEARING*

---

*RE: 363 ONTARIO STREET LLC*  
*February 7, 2018*

---

COVERING ALL UPSTATE NEW YORK

»«  
**M-F Reporting, Inc.**  
»«

MFReportingNY.com

Office: 518-478-7220  
Fax: 518-371-8517

Mail to: 5 Southside Dr., Suite 11  
Clifton Park, NY 12065

*Min-U-Script® with Word Index*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

-----

CITY OF ALBANY INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

PUBLIC HEARING

RE: 363 ONTARIO STREET LLC

-----

21 Lodge Street

Albany, New York 12207

February 7, 2018

12:14 p.m. - 12:52 p.m.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING  
ON PROPOSED PROJECT  
AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE  
RELATING THERETO

Notice is hereby given that a public hearing pursuant to Section 859-a(2) of the General Municipal Law of the State of New York (the “Act”) will be held by City of Albany Industrial Development Agency (the “Agency”) on the 7<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2018 at 12:00 o’clock p.m., local time, at the offices of the Agency located at 21 Lodge Street in the City of Albany, Albany County, New York in connection with the following matters:

363 Ontario St LLC, a New York limited liability company (the “Company”), has submitted an application (the “Application”) to the Agency, a copy of which Application is on file at the office of the Agency, requesting that the Agency consider undertaking a project (the “Project”) for the benefit of the Company, said Project consisting of the following: (A) (1) the acquisition of an interest in an approximately 1.8 acre parcel of land with an address of 363 Ontario Street (tax map no.: 64.76-4-47) in the City of Albany, Albany County, New York (the “Land”), together with the existing improvements containing in the aggregate approximately 140,000 square feet of space located thereon (the “Existing Facility”), (2) the demolition of the Existing Facility, (3) the construction on the Land of three (3) buildings to contain in the aggregate approximately 175,500 square feet of space (collectively, the “Facility”) and (4) the acquisition and installation therein and thereon of related fixtures, machinery, equipment and other tangible personal property (the “Equipment”) (the Land, the Existing Facility, the Facility, and the Equipment being collectively referred to as the “Project Facility”), all of the foregoing to constitute a residential apartment building containing approximately 109 units, with approximately 99 underground and approximately 44 surface parking spaces and first floor retail space to be owned and operated by the Company, and any other directly and indirectly related activities; (B) the granting of certain “financial assistance” (within the meaning of Section 854(14) of the Act) with respect to the foregoing, including potential exemptions from certain sales and use taxes, real property taxes, real estate transfer taxes and mortgage recording taxes (collectively, the “Financial Assistance”); and (C) the lease (with an obligation to purchase) or sale of the Project Facility to the Company or such other person as may be designated by the Company and agreed upon by the Agency.

The Agency is considering whether (A) to undertake the Project, and (B) to provide certain exemptions from taxation with respect to the Project, including (1) exemption from mortgage recording taxes with respect to any documents, if any, recorded by the Agency with respect to the Project in the office of the County Clerk of Albany County, New York or elsewhere, (2) exemption from deed transfer taxes on any real estate transfers, if any, with respect to the Project, (3) exemption from sales taxes relating to the acquisition, construction, renovation and installation of the Project Facility, and (4) in the event that the Project Facility would be subject to real property taxation if owned by the Company but shall be deemed exempt from real property taxation due to the involvement of the Agency therewith, exemption from real property taxes (but not including special assessments and special ad valorem levies), if any, with respect to the Project Facility, subject to the obligation of the Company to make payments in lieu of taxes with respect to the Project Facility. If any portion of the Financial Assistance to be granted by the Agency with respect to the Project is not consistent with the Agency’s uniform tax exemption policy, the Agency will follow the procedures for deviation from such policy set forth in Section 874(4) of the Act prior to granting such portion of the Financial Assistance.

If the Agency determines to proceed with the Project, the Project Facility will be acquired, constructed, reconstructed and installed by the Agency and will be leased (with an obligation to purchase) or sold by the Agency to the Company or its designee pursuant to a project agreement (the “Agreement”) requiring that the Company or its designee make certain payments to the Agency.

The Agency has not yet made a determination pursuant to Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law (the “SEQR Act”) regarding the potential environmental impact of the Project.

The Agency will at said time and place hear all persons with views on either the location and nature of the proposed Project, or the Financial Assistance being contemplated by the Agency in connection with the proposed Project. A copy of the Application filed by the Company with the Agency with respect to the Project, including an analysis of the costs and benefits of the Project, is available for public inspection during business hours at the offices of the Agency. A transcript or summary report of the hearing will be made available to the members of the Agency.

Additional information can be obtained from, and written comments may be addressed to: Sarah Reginelli, Chief Executive Officer, City of Albany Industrial Development Agency, 21 Lodge Street, Albany, New York 12207; Telephone: 518-434-2532.

Dated: January 23, 2018

CITY OF ALBANY INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT  
AGENCY

BY: /s/ Sarah Reginelli  
Sarah Reginelli, Chief Executive Officer

1 APPEARANCES:

2  
3 IDA BOARD MEMBERS:

4 TRACY METZGER - Chair

5 DARIUS SHAHINFAR - Treasurer

6 LEE ECK - Assistant Secretary

7 DOMINICK CALSOLARO - Member

8  
9 IDA STAFF:

10 SARAH REGINELLI, Chief Executive Officer

11 MARK OPALKA - Chief Financial Officer

12 JOSEPH LANDY - Senior Economic Developer II

13 ANDREW CORCIONE - Economic Developer

14 Capitalize Albany Corporation

15 CHANTEL BURNASH - Executive Assistant

16 Capitalize Albany Corporation

17 ASHLEY MOHL - Senior Economic Developer II

18 MICHAEL BOHNE - Communications & Marketing Assistant

1 APPEARANCES (CONTINUED):

2  
3 ALSO PRESENT:

4 NADENE ZEIGLER, ESQ.,  
Hodgson Russ

5 A. JOSEPH SCOTT, III, ESQ.,  
6 Hodgson Russ

7 WILLIAM KELLY, ESQ.,  
8 Agency Counsel

1	I N D E X     T O     S P E A K E R S	
2		
3		PAGE
4	David PHAFF.....	7
5	BOB PHANEUF.....	19
6	BETSY WRIGHT.....	23
7	JOSEPH ALTERI.....	28
8	STEVEN VADNEY.....	30
9	GENE SOLAN.....	31
10	BRENDAN NOONAN.....	35
11	ROB MALKUS.....	38
12	JUDY DOESSCHATE.....	40
13	DEBORAH LAMBEK.....	46
14	MICHAEL HIPPI.....	48
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		

1 MS. METZGER: Thank you for getting  
2 here through this weather. We appreciate it  
3 very much because we definitely want to hear  
4 what everyone has to say.

5 So good afternoon. My name is Tracy  
6 Metzger, and I am the Chair of the City of  
7 Albany Industrial Development Agency in  
8 connection with a project which is the  
9 subject of this public hearing.

10 Today we are holding this public  
11 hearing to allow citizens to make a statement  
12 for the record relating to the involvement of  
13 the Agency with a project for the benefit of  
14 363 Ontario Street, LLC, a New York State  
15 limited liability corporation.

16 I will now ask Sarah Reginelli, the  
17 Chief Executive Officer of the Agency, to  
18 make certain preliminary remarks with respect  
19 to the Project and then start the public  
20 hearing.

21 Sarah.

22 MS. REGINELLI: Thank you, Tracy.

23 Good afternoon, everyone.



1           The proposed project consists of the  
2           acquisition of an approximately 1.8-acre  
3           parcel of land, construction on the land of  
4           three 58,500 square foot buildings containing  
5           approximately 109 residential apartment units  
6           with tenant amenities, with approximately 143  
7           on-site parking spaces and 4,000 to 6,000  
8           square feet of retail space.

9           Now, unless there is objection, I'm  
10          going to suggest waiving the full reading of  
11          the notice of this public hearing, and  
12          instead request that the full text of the  
13          notice be inserted into the record.

14          I will also note that the general  
15          information on the Agency's general authority  
16          and public purpose are contained in a  
17          separate statement and it will be entered  
18          into the record.

19          Before we start the public hearing, I  
20          would first like to introduce the project  
21          applicant and ask them to make a brief  
22          presentation with respect to the proposed  
23          project.

1           The stenographer is at the end of the  
2           table, so unless you are as loud as I am,  
3           please direct your comments to her.

4           MR. PHAFF: My name is David Phaff.  
5           I'm a real estate broker with Howard Phaff  
6           Realty Services as well as David Phaff &  
7           Associates. I'm representing Ryan Jankow and  
8           Jankow Companies with regard to this  
9           application.

10          Basically -- you said brief?

11          MS. METZGER: Yes.

12          MR. PHAFF: I will do the best I can.

13          So first of all, we appreciate you  
14          meeting with us today. The evolution of this  
15          project is based on one important factor, the  
16          need for quality housing in uptown Albany  
17          balanced with making a positive impact on the  
18          neighborhood.

19          The current plans address concerns and  
20          suggestions by the Planning Board, the Board  
21          of Zoning Appeals, the city officials, the  
22          Pine Hills Neighborhood Association, and  
23          neighbors over the past nine months. The

1 result is a design that meets the needs of  
2 the neighborhood and community at large and  
3 provides a new spirit to an aging  
4 neighborhood.

5 Basically, our concept creates a social  
6 and economic focal point and encourages a  
7 walkable neighborhood by virtue of its  
8 design, commercial and public spaces. It is  
9 the unifying piece in an area with a variety  
10 of building designs where the condition of  
11 the properties range from derelict to superb.  
12 It replaces blacktop with five-foot wide  
13 sidewalks on all three sides of the property  
14 and adds substantial shrubbery on and off the  
15 property. Our residents are more apt to be  
16 active, walking to businesses, nearby parks  
17 and riding their bicycles whenever possible.

18 There is a concern regarding the  
19 development's impact on street parking. We  
20 have allowed for 40 percent more spaces than  
21 are required by zoning. We expect that there  
22 will be as many as 20 surface spaces left  
23 unclaimed by tenants to be used by guests,

1 customers and employee of the laundromat and  
2 cafe. We also expect to see more curbside  
3 parking availability by reducing substantial  
4 curb cuts. This may result in a conservative  
5 increase in on-street parking by eight or  
6 more spaces. In short, there is ample  
7 parking for everyone.

8 Early on, there was justifiable concern  
9 about traffic, utilities, and most  
10 importantly, the historic flooding that has  
11 plagued the intersection of Warren and  
12 Ontario Streets.

13 The City of Albany Traffic Engineering  
14 Department has signed off on the project  
15 indicating that at peak hours, the apartments  
16 do not generate a significant level of  
17 traffic on the immediate streets. The  
18 developer is assuming the cost for  
19 appropriate ramping at corners and other  
20 measures requested.

21 The Water and Sewer Department has been  
22 satisfied knowing the peak usage of the  
23 building relative to the current capacity of

1 the systems is sufficient. The developer has  
2 agreed to make specific improvements to  
3 balance the flow.

4 National Grid has seen no issue with  
5 providing adequate service to the buildings  
6 with the existing infrastructure. In fact,  
7 electric and gas usage is projected to be  
8 very low with the exclusive use of LED  
9 lighting, energy efficient appliances and  
10 heating systems in a well-insulated  
11 environment where conservation is encouraged.

12 Our water runoff studies have shown  
13 that the proposed development will reduce the  
14 runoff by approximately 60 percent from the  
15 existing conditions with the utilization of  
16 porous pavement, underground retention  
17 systems and other conservation measures that  
18 will substantially impact the frequency and  
19 extent of flooding. These studies and plans  
20 have all been approved by the city.

21 In addressing the massing of the  
22 Ontario Street building, the developer has  
23 made every attempt to remedy the situation in

1 a number of ways. The original concept was a  
2 four-story box design, which was replaced by  
3 a mansard styled roof with three-and-a-half  
4 stories at the suggestion of the Planning  
5 Department and encouraged by the Pine Hills  
6 Neighborhood Association.

7 Its footprint was similar to what we  
8 now show. However, issues with the  
9 mansard-style roof resulted with another look  
10 at a more conventional four-story design when  
11 it became apparent that we could not  
12 accommodate the neighborhood association's  
13 wish to include commercial and public spaces.

14 The design that we now have is a direct  
15 result of the input from the ZBA, the  
16 Planning Board, and the Department of  
17 Planning and Development with some direction  
18 from the Pine Hills Neighborhood Association.

19 Several roof designs and modifications  
20 were evaluated. The current flat-roof design  
21 of four stories represents a reduction in  
22 overall height from the original mansard  
23 design by approximately 4 feet. After

1 extensive discussions, our application for a  
2 height variance has been approved by the  
3 Board of Zoning Appeals.

4 Rather than build to the property line  
5 or any nominal setbacks, the developer has  
6 moved the building back from Ontario, Park  
7 and Warren Streets to create more green space  
8 and minimize the perception of height.

9 The fourth floor of the Ontario  
10 building was set back on the south side to  
11 further reduce the visual impact.

12 We did attempt to push both the third  
13 and fourth stories back to afford a stepped  
14 profile. Unfortunately, a change of that  
15 magnitude would necessitate structural  
16 changes which further cut down on the number  
17 of viable apartments. It also created a  
18 significant obstacle with bearing columns  
19 penetrating the apartments and the  
20 underground garage.

21 Our plans call for more trees and  
22 landscaping to break visual sight lines and  
23 soften the appearance of the building. The

1 developer is going so far as to improve the  
2 city right-of-way along Warren Street by  
3 planting additional trees along its south  
4 side. You'll also note that on the Ontario  
5 building, there are now awning-like overhangs  
6 over the first floor and window openings that  
7 shield the glass from sunlight in the summer  
8 and better define the first floor commercial  
9 and community spaces from the rest of the  
10 building. We've also maximized the height of  
11 the windows and on the fourth floor, south  
12 facing terrace, added large planters with  
13 arborvitae.

14 To encourage a walkable neighborhood  
15 and to provide desirable amenities, we have  
16 included space for a cafe and store as well  
17 as a service-oriented laundromat. The cafe  
18 and store will feature both outdoor and  
19 indoor seating areas and is expected to be  
20 frequented by tenants and neighbors alike.

21 It was imperative to retain the green  
22 space and outdoor cafe element in the design  
23 which further complicated any thought of



1       expanding the building to the north. Another  
2       suggestion that was made. We also recognize  
3       that most of the customers will be walking to  
4       the stores as opposed to driving which  
5       lessens the impact on parking.

6               There have been concerns expressed  
7       regarding the number of jobs this project  
8       will eliminate. According to the owner's  
9       representative, there are two full-time and a  
10      few part-time positions at Playdium as of  
11      this time. The laundromat has three  
12      part-time employees, and it's believed that  
13      the convenience store has no more than three  
14      employees, two full-time and one part-time.  
15      This is a total of four full-time and seven  
16      part-time jobs.

17             The proposed employment figures for 363  
18      Ontario reflect two full-time building  
19      superintendents and two part-time maintenance  
20      personnel. The new laundromat is expected to  
21      have one full-time and four part-time  
22      employees. And the proposed cafe would have  
23      four full-time and four part-time employees.

1       The total number of projected employees by  
2       the three different employers is seven  
3       full-time and ten part-time employees. A  
4       total gain of six employees.

5               Finally, our projected rents are  
6       appropriate relative to the cost of  
7       construction in meeting the requirements by  
8       the city, addressing the issues this site  
9       presents, and attracting desirable tenants  
10      who will appreciate the buildings' features  
11      and high quality appointments. This will  
12      enable us to fill the buildings without  
13      significant delay. The financials presented  
14      to the Board of Zoning Appeals and the IDA  
15      are honest approximations of what we expect  
16      to encounter.

17              There has also been a claim that we did  
18      not allow for public input through this  
19      process. Actually that's an insult to the  
20      City of Albany's agencies and departments,  
21      all of whom had worked diligently to ensure  
22      that we come up with a viable plan that truly  
23      benefits the city and especially the

1 neighborhood.

2 Since last spring, when we first  
3 initiated a dialogue with the neighborhood  
4 association common council members, there  
5 have been no fewer than nine public hearings  
6 at which the public could witness the  
7 evolution of the project. These included a  
8 public meeting, Planning Board and Board of  
9 Zoning Appeals' meetings and workshops.

10 We have made every effort to arrive at  
11 a design that serves the City of Albany and  
12 its residents well. Our data has evolved in  
13 the same way as our design, reflecting the  
14 necessary changes to satisfy the majority of  
15 stakeholders. What we have presented is  
16 accurate.

17 We want to thank you for your diligence  
18 and your attention to detail and ask that you  
19 vote in favor of our application this  
20 afternoon to enable us to continue with the  
21 project.

22 Thank you.

23 MS. METZGER: We'll now open this

1 public hearing at 12:14 p.m. I would like to  
2 start by acknowledging that the notice of  
3 this public hearing indicated that written  
4 comments could be addressed to the Agency.  
5 To date, nine written comments have been  
6 received by the Agency prior to this public  
7 hearing. Each of those comments submitted  
8 will be submitted to the record as well as  
9 you also have copies -- the Board members  
10 will have copies of them in front of you.

11 With regard to Mr. Bermingham's  
12 submission, there has been a clarification to  
13 point number 1. The original proposal  
14 included three buildings with 3.5 stories,  
15 again received from Mr. Bermingham, that was  
16 proposed and met with the community on  
17 9/17/17. Since then, the proposal changed to  
18 four-story buildings with a different roof  
19 design and no further community meetings have  
20 been held. That's quoting from Mr.  
21 Bermingham's update to his submission.

22 We have received an additional ten  
23 correspondence, however, that correspondence

1 did not refer to this project at all within  
2 that email, and so we will be reviewing that  
3 with counsel to determine whether that will  
4 be submitted into the public record for this  
5 public hearing, or if it is to be distributed  
6 to the group as general correspondence to the  
7 Agency.

8 So now on to the public comment. By  
9 way of operating rules, if you wish to make a  
10 public comment, please sign in on the  
11 appropriate sign-in sheet that's right here.  
12 I will then call on the individuals listed on  
13 this sheet in order. Please wait to be  
14 recognized, then stand and state your name,  
15 address and affiliation.

16 Please also remember again, the  
17 stenographer is located at the east end of  
18 the table here, so be sure to direct your  
19 comments very clearly in her direction.

20 Please keep your comments to five  
21 minutes so that all present may have a chance  
22 to comment for the record.

23 A record of this public hearing will be

1 prepared and reviewed by the members of the  
2 Agency in connection with consideration of  
3 the proposed project. A copy of the record  
4 of this public hearing will be presented to  
5 the Mayor of the City of Albany as well.

6 Again, the purpose of this public  
7 hearing is not to field questions, but rather  
8 to solicit public comments.

9 Please be reminded that this embodiment  
10 is not the City of Albany Planning Board or  
11 for the zoning appeals. Those agencies have  
12 their own process and take their own public  
13 comment during public-comment periods on  
14 project properties that are under their  
15 jurisdiction.

16 I will now refer to the sign-in sheet  
17 to identify those who wish to comment on  
18 either the nature and location of the project  
19 facility or the proposed financial assistance  
20 being contemplated.

21 The first name on the list is Bob  
22 Phaneuf.

23 MR. PHANEUF: Thank you all for being

1 here and being concerned. My name is Bob  
2 Phaneuf. I'm a rental property owner in the  
3 Park South, Pine Hills and New Scotland  
4 Woodlawn area.

5 I'm opposed to the proposed Playdium  
6 project. I believe it has negative impacts  
7 to the surrounding neighborhood and its  
8 people, the stakeholders, the residents, and  
9 the businesses.

10 It's difficult to realize the impact  
11 this project will have without a project  
12 summary that includes the concerns and needs  
13 of this struggling neighborhood. A PILOT  
14 analysis by the IDA should not put the  
15 interest of the developer over that of the  
16 tax paying residents and businesses  
17 surrounding this project.

18 A cost benefit analysis might consider  
19 a \$7 million or more tax break for this  
20 apartment rental business good for the  
21 developer and good for Albany's future tax  
22 base. However, the short-term and long-term  
23 cost to the neighborhood residents and

1 businesses should be of greatest concern.

2 For property owners, taxes will  
3 continue to increase, and this new apartment  
4 complex will reap many financial benefits.

5 The PILOT exemption for this project  
6 include school tax and library taxes, city  
7 and county taxes, sales taxes at 8 percent,  
8 use taxes, mortgage tax, mortgage transfer  
9 tax, and probably some other ones. I was  
10 unable to get the full information about the  
11 benefits of this PILOT program, but those are  
12 some of them for a term of 10 to 20 years,  
13 not knowing which has been decided yet.

14 To my knowledge, none of the residents  
15 in this community have ever received tax  
16 breaks over the last 100 years. There are  
17 few benefits to this neighborhood project for  
18 the neighbors. The project does not enjoy  
19 the support of the neighborhood and neighbors  
20 I have spoken to.

21 This project is too tall, too dense,  
22 too close to the street, too many apartments  
23 for the acreage. This project will create



1 more parking and traffic safety problems.  
2 This project may adversely affect area family  
3 and rental values. This project will  
4 eliminate five local tax-contributing  
5 businesses and what I counted is 18 jobs.

6 This project requires more city  
7 services and will pay a disproportionately  
8 lesser amount of tax. This project will  
9 stress sewer water and road infrastructure  
10 creating more flooding problems -- possibly  
11 creating more flooding problems. This  
12 project does not provide ample parking to  
13 support the commercial aspects of the  
14 project.

15 This project does not fit the  
16 architectural character of the neighborhood.  
17 This project destroys the historic building  
18 and community treasure that has served the  
19 residents and families of Albany since 1940,  
20 and still does.

21 This project will have a negative  
22 impact. Let's not lose this community  
23 treasure to another tax-privileged apartment

1 complex. I hope the IDA can find another  
2 project to support with our tax dollars, one  
3 that can provide as much fun and joy and  
4 service that the Playdium complex has for 78  
5 years.

6 Thank you for listening.

7 MS. METZGER: Thank you.

8 The next speaker will be Betsy Wright.

9 MS. WRIGHT: Hi, everybody. I'm  
10 unfamiliar with this process, and to tell you  
11 the truth, frankly, extremely nervous. So  
12 please forgive me and correct me if I stray  
13 from your rules.

14 You know what? I've lived in Albany  
15 for 35 years. I came to this city; I loved  
16 it. I loved the neighborhoods. I loved the  
17 housing. I loved the wrought iron. I loved  
18 the poor working areas. I loved the mansion  
19 area. I love it. I am fortunate, I live in  
20 the Melrose Neighborhood Association, but I  
21 own a house at 313 Partridge. The Playdium  
22 is on the west side of that block. 363 is on  
23 the west side of the block, I'm on the east

1 side of the block, so I'm very affected by  
2 what occurs.

3 And believe me, I'm not opposed to  
4 demolishing the Playdium and doing something  
5 else. You know, this may be the time to do  
6 it, but I am opposed to the size of this  
7 development. I don't know how many of you  
8 have gone and just driven around, but it is a  
9 great neighborhood. We've had ten years of  
10 rough economy for everybody, and it shows in  
11 this neighborhood, but it's a great  
12 neighborhood.

13 The application indicates that it's a  
14 university and college area, but I would bet  
15 that it's 50 percent private homes and  
16 50 percent rental property, maybe owned by  
17 the people who live there. But we've got --  
18 we've got -- on Woodlawn, we've got that  
19 great Little League park. We've got  
20 Ridgfield Park. We've got these nice houses  
21 around Ridgfield Park. We have my house  
22 right across from the park.

23 I've already had three offers to buy

1       that house as a result of this development.  
2       It's going to increase my property value I'll  
3       bet. But you know what? I don't want it for  
4       property value. I want it for family value.

5               I don't live there, but I bought the  
6       house for my daughter who has a handicap who  
7       lives there. My grandchildren live there.  
8       We love the house. This is a house that was  
9       built by Italian immigrants maybe 80, 90  
10      years ago. They loved the house. They used  
11      to have the lot on the corner as well.

12             You know, this house is so well built  
13      that the beams -- the structural beams,  
14      they're not 15 inches apart. They're 10 or  
15      12 inches apart. It was a working class  
16      family, but they loved it and I love it.

17             This development will substantially  
18      change this neighborhood. I have testified  
19      to the Zoning Board of Appeals and they asked  
20      me to submit -- they offered me an  
21      opportunity to submit a written statement. I  
22      prepared a letter, and I have that now within  
23      your package, and it tells you my objection

1 to the development.

2 One, it is too big. You drive there,  
3 you know, it's two-story family houses all  
4 over the place and like there's the Warren  
5 Street Apartments. These are individual  
6 units separated by a drive or property. They  
7 may have been as much as eight to ten  
8 apartments in those buildings. That would be  
9 a great use for this property. This is going  
10 to have 110 apartment buildings.

11 Attorney Phaff gave a really excellent  
12 presentation but, you know, he's guessing  
13 about things too. He doesn't really know  
14 who's going to live there. He said  
15 millennials. Well, millennials turn into  
16 family members. They have children.  
17 Millennials may have a good job. There are  
18 109 apartments so that's at least 109 cars,  
19 maybe more. At least 200 people.

20 If you look at my letter, you'll say, I  
21 guess that this property is extremely dense  
22 for the neighborhood. I guess that it will  
23 have on one quarter of our block as many

1 people who live in any of the other blocks.  
2 "Guess" is probably a bad word. It would  
3 have sounded better if I had said "my  
4 estimate is." And it sounds great, this  
5 development sounds great, but not for that  
6 area.

7 Let it be the Tobin Frank -- First  
8 Frank -- whatever it is -- Place that we've  
9 been trying to develop for so many years.  
10 That's an excellent place for this.

11 Ontario is one way. Partridge is one  
12 way. There are reasons why those streets are  
13 one way, because they are narrow. This is  
14 going -- the traffic is going to severely  
15 affect the neighborhood.

16 I was there just today. People are  
17 parking on both sides of Partridge, and  
18 there's only room for one car to go down  
19 Partridge. Now, let's add 109 cars going up  
20 Park and around the corner to Partridge. It  
21 is not -- there are going to be financial  
22 consequences for the city.

23 MS. METZGER: You've had five minutes.

1 MS. WRIGHT: Thank you.

2 I just want to say, they are requesting  
3 \$7.9 million. Mayor Sheehan is only asking  
4 12.5 from Governor Cuomo to balance the  
5 budget. I oppose the amount and I oppose  
6 this development just because it's too big.

7 Thank you.

8 MS. METZGER: Thank you.

9 Joseph Alteri.

10 MR. ALTERI: Good morning. I represent  
11 I think what our last speaking was speaking  
12 about a little bit. I'm an older millennial.  
13 I'm a teacher at Albany High, and I plan on  
14 staying here for quite a while and having a  
15 20- or 30-year career there.

16 A lot of my co-workers that are around  
17 my age, we -- a lot of them don't live around  
18 here. It's probably because of the lack of  
19 places that they can call home. I personally  
20 love it here.

21 I live uptown a little bit, but I would  
22 not consider -- before a project like this, I  
23 would not consider that particular

1 neighborhood, as would many of my colleagues  
2 who -- again, we work and we make exceptional  
3 money and we can contribute to any local  
4 neighborhood that we would choose to settle  
5 in.

6 So I would like this committee to not  
7 only consider people like us but the tax  
8 revenue we're going to bringing in terms  
9 of -- if I were to live in a place like this,  
10 I would be going out to eat a lot in the  
11 local neighborhood and favoring other  
12 businesses really close by.

13 So I feel like there hasn't been a lot  
14 of attention paid to that trickle down effect  
15 of money coming into the community. And I  
16 think it would be people like us that -- and  
17 colleagues of mine that are sick of coming  
18 down the Northway every day to work in  
19 Albany.

20 If you wanted to work in Albany, I  
21 would assume you would want to work in Albany  
22 as well. So that is kind of my advocacy for  
23 this project and projects like this.



1 Thank you.

2 MS. METZGER: The next speaker is  
3 Steven Vadney.

4 MR. VADNEY: Good afternoon everybody.  
5 Thank you for the floor. My name is Steven  
6 Vadney. I'm a business owner within the City  
7 of Albany. I currently reside in  
8 Schenectady, New York. I grew up in the Pine  
9 Hills neighborhood and lived there up until  
10 probably a decade after college and moved  
11 away because there wasn't new construction  
12 and modernization.

13 So I would welcome a project like this.  
14 And it would even bring me back to the  
15 neighborhood. The walkability and the  
16 accessibility is something that I seek and I  
17 think, as Mr. Alteri said, those of us in our  
18 age group kind of seek as well. It would be  
19 great to live and work within in the city  
20 that I've always called home.

21 As someone who has frequented the  
22 Playdium, I can tell you that it probably  
23 hasn't been the historic treasure that it may

1       have once was 75 years, and I am definitely  
2       in favor of this proposal.

3               Thank you.

4               MS. METZGER:   Gene Solan.

5               MR. SOLAN:   My name is Gene Solan.   I  
6       live at 16 Prospect and I am a 40-year  
7       resident of the City of Albany.   I was active  
8       in the revitalization of our libraries, the  
9       branch library, and worked on the planning  
10      committee for that in the 1990s.

11              More recently, I was a board member of  
12      Local 2030 working on and getting a  
13      neighborhood and community input into the  
14      planning process for the comprehensive plan  
15      that emerged.   So I've seen a lot of efforts  
16      to revitalize our community, and I want to  
17      thank the IDA for being part of the public  
18      hearing process.

19              Neighbors, residents want to contribute  
20      to the process.   They want to understand  
21      projects there are brought forth or are  
22      proposed and they want to understand the  
23      scope, et cetera.

1           And the public hearing process, and  
2           typically the meetings that the developing  
3           team present to the neighborhoods, okay,  
4           before neighborhood residents is a very  
5           important process, and it's a very important  
6           opportunity.

7           Realistically, at those meetings, and I  
8           have been at several meetings of that nature,  
9           both relating to this particular project and  
10          also the proposed project up on New Scotland  
11          Avenue and right off South Allen Street  
12          across from St. Peter's Hospital, and the  
13          amount of information that's presented at  
14          that meeting, both about the scale of the  
15          building, the design of the building;  
16          certainly the rents that are proposed for  
17          these particular projects, basically in the  
18          area of about \$1,500 a month, and they're  
19          going up from there, depending upon the  
20          location and the project; and they're dealing  
21          with the issue of the stormwater, which is a  
22          major problem in Albany, in the City of  
23          Albany, and parking, et cetera. Some of the

1 other speakers have raised those particular  
2 concerns.

3 So one -- an area that's very important  
4 is the responsibility of the IDA board to  
5 make sure that the representations that are  
6 made in the applications for these projects  
7 are realistic. And to make sure that going  
8 forward -- because these projects will  
9 benefit from tax PILOTS, tax exemptions -- to  
10 make sure that the job creation numbers,  
11 okay, are realized. Not just projections but  
12 are realized to make sure that the other  
13 financing is in place and the commitments  
14 that are made by the developers to the  
15 community are realized.

16 A number of these projects have  
17 commitments to provide a certain number of  
18 apartments for -- they're really not  
19 low-income folks, because I think the  
20 standard is 100 percent of the area median,  
21 something like that -- but to make sure that  
22 those apartments are delivered as promised.  
23 And it does apply I know to a project of this

1 particular size.

2 So this entire process is very  
3 important, and neighborhoods all over the  
4 city are faced with the prospect and the  
5 potential of having more projects coming into  
6 their neighborhoods.

7 Some projects are proposing five, six,  
8 seven stories. I mean, that is egregious.  
9 Okay. That's totally out of scale with the  
10 residential -- with the residential character  
11 of our neighborhoods.

12 Fortunately, the project that's being  
13 discussed today and is being considered is  
14 not of that height. But I know they worked  
15 very hard to get -- to bring the height down,  
16 but they did require a variance in order to  
17 move the project forward.

18 So I want to just, on behalf of the  
19 neighborhoods, thank everyone here on the  
20 board working for that, and I would like to  
21 personally thank Dominick Calsolaro who came  
22 to the council of Albany Neighborhood  
23 Association monthly meeting last month, and

1 he said the IDA wants to hear from the  
2 neighborhoods. And he wants to suggest  
3 that -- we never see anybody from the  
4 neighborhoods at the IDA meeting.

5 So I'm glad the invitation was  
6 extended, and I hope that the neighborhoods  
7 continue to be involved in the public hearing  
8 portions of your meetings.

9 Thank you.

10 MS. METZGER: Thank you.

11 Brendan Noonan.

12 MR. NOONAN: Good afternoon, everybody.  
13 My name is Brendan Noonan. I grew up two  
14 blocks from the Playdium on Ryckman Avenue.  
15 My parents still live there. I played  
16 basketball at Woodlawn. I played baseball  
17 Central Babe Ruth. I hung out at Ridgefield  
18 Park. I bowled at the Playdium most of my  
19 life, save for four years of college.

20 I am here to strongly be for the  
21 apartment complexes to be built for many  
22 reasons.

23 Number 1, it's quite an eyesore, it has

1       become quite an eyesore for our neighborhood.  
2       As a few other people said, people my age and  
3       younger cannot afford houses right now. We  
4       need apartments. We need places to live. I  
5       have spoken to many people of different ages  
6       across Pine Hills. When Park Row Apartments  
7       were built, when Adams Park were built,  
8       people said there goes the neighborhood. The  
9       apartment is -- the neighborhood is still  
10      great. It's still what it is. People still  
11      want to live there.

12             I used to own a two-family on Park  
13      Avenue about two blocks away. I sold it last  
14      year, but I had no problem, even after Saint  
15      Rose built their dorms, renting my apartment,  
16      year after year. If people want to live in  
17      Albany and work in Albany, they need places  
18      like this.

19             I hear the number of apartments is a  
20      problem. I hear the height is an issue. A  
21      hundred and nine or however many apartments  
22      there are, there are not going to be 109 cars  
23      in this apartment complex.

1           People 30, 35 and younger cannot really  
2           afford cars. They can't afford to buy  
3           houses. We want places like this to live.

4           The height thing, again, I've been  
5           there a million times. The apartment across  
6           the street on Park Avenue, I think it's going  
7           to be even with the top of the apartments.  
8           Ridgefield Park is also pretty -- has some  
9           altitude to it. The apartment building on  
10          the corner of South Main and Myrtle is I  
11          believe six or eight stories high. It's part  
12          of the neighborhood. I'm sure there was some  
13          pushback when that was built however many  
14          years ago.

15          We live in a city. People need places  
16          to live. I do understand both sides, but I  
17          strongly feel this apartment needs to be  
18          built for many reasons, and I hope the  
19          reasoning against this not being built is  
20          just fear of change, because that happens a  
21          lot in this city, as we know.

22                 Thank you.

23                 MS. METZGER: Rob Malkus.



1           MR. MALKUS: My name is Rob Malkus. I  
2           own a two-family building, 221 Myrtle Avenue,  
3           and I'm speaking in support of this project  
4           for a few reasons.

5           So the Playdium Bowling Alley, as the  
6           previous speaker said, it's had a great run,  
7           but the site is in need of development. We  
8           have a project coming forward that is  
9           designed to bring a benefit to the area.

10          Looking at and talking about the amount  
11          of jobs in the area, whether the number is  
12          between 20 jobs and 10 jobs, what about the  
13          jobs that are going to come from the  
14          businesses that are going to be attracted to  
15          an area that has an extra 100 brand new  
16          apartments with a client base and with a base  
17          that wants to be walking to these areas where  
18          there is vacant storefronts that we are  
19          populating. What about those jobs? And the  
20          benefit to the area that this can spark. I  
21          think it's something that needs  
22          consideration.

23          It addresses parking and the issue of

1 traffic and stormwater. Stormwater is an  
2 issue across Albany. Does that mean we just  
3 stop with progress on everything because the  
4 stormwater is done? I think that's not a  
5 case.

6 Issues as far as this project has been  
7 addressed for stormwater management  
8 mitigation. Power issues. It's going to  
9 bring people to the area. It's going to  
10 bring a client base.

11 Even as an apartment renter in the  
12 area, I'm not worried about renting my  
13 apartments. I'm priced below what this price  
14 range is, so I think there's still -- it's an  
15 area where you can get a different tenant  
16 base coming in, and I can still capitalize on  
17 that. And my tenants are going to benefit  
18 from the parks and everything that these  
19 people would benefit from just the same.

20 So in conclusion, I support the  
21 project. I don't care about the height. I'm  
22 a block away. I think getting rid of the  
23 Playdium and putting up a new project is only

1 going to help the area.

2 Thank you.

3 MS. METZGER: Council Member Judy  
4 Doesschate.

5 MS. DOESSCHATE: First, I want to note  
6 that a few constituents asked me to provide  
7 some materials, and I don't know who I gave  
8 that to. And I'm also providing there an  
9 attachment to my letter that was sent in, and  
10 I hope that everybody reads my complete  
11 review with the details regarding this  
12 particular project and how I reached the  
13 conclusion that I reached.

14 One of the handouts that I'm providing  
15 is apartment comparables, and I did provide I  
16 think like eight copies of that -- I did not  
17 know how many people might need -- that the  
18 developer prepared at some point and provided  
19 to me and I think others in the planning  
20 department. It actually reflects an  
21 intention to rent these apartments at a  
22 higher rate than was used in the proforma  
23 analysis. And I think that that is very

1 significant when they're applying for  
2 financial assistance and you're trying to  
3 figure out whether or not this is financially  
4 viable without your support.

5 I want to note that when I initially  
6 heard about this project, I did raise  
7 concerns about the height of it, and the  
8 planning department did recommend that they  
9 reduce it to three-and-a-half stories. That  
10 is what was presented in the community  
11 meeting.

12 And at that community meeting, I kind  
13 of really felt it was important to get the  
14 word out. I distributed over 350 flyers  
15 personally in the immediate vicinity because  
16 a lot of people don't receive notices of the  
17 Planning Board meetings or the ZBA meetings.  
18 They're not members of the neighborhood  
19 association but their opinions still really  
20 matter.

21 So over 70 people came to that  
22 community meeting. They saw a diagram of a  
23 project that's significantly different than

1           what you are being asked to approve now.

2           I understand that it has been presented  
3           at these other public meetings, but a lot of  
4           people are now finding out through Helena  
5           Brown, and she's letting people know about  
6           this, and they are opposed to the height as I  
7           had feared the people would be opposed.

8           You have to understand that this entire  
9           neighborhood has the Park Row Apartments that  
10          are two-and-a-half stories tall. And  
11          otherwise -- and it has a high burning wall  
12          which is like one-story tall. And otherwise,  
13          there's a lot of single-family, one-story  
14          buildings in the area.

15          This is a dramatically different kind  
16          of appearance from that, which is one of the  
17          reasons why I have encouraged the developers  
18          to think about doing a three-story  
19          development.

20          A three-story development would allow a  
21          lot of people to come in and live in our  
22          neighborhood in high-end apartments. And if  
23          you look at the facts in my letter, and if

1       you look at the rents that these people could  
2       be charging, and more than likely will be  
3       charging for these particular apartments, a  
4       three-story building would be financially  
5       viable with your support. A four-story  
6       building is financially viable without your  
7       support.

8               And basically it's over \$600,000 profit  
9       per year if they charge rents that appear in  
10      the comparables for similar kinds of  
11      apartments.

12             The Aspen is charging over \$1,300,  
13      1,350 for an apartment, one-bedroom, that is  
14      300 square feet, smaller than the one-bedroom  
15      apartments planned here. And then they  
16      charge another \$50 for the covered parking.  
17      So clearly, the rents that this developer  
18      could be charging is much higher than what's  
19      been reflected in the proforma use. And even  
20      in their proforma use, it's even less than  
21      what they have included in those documents  
22      regarding the comparable apartments.

23             I also want to note that I notice that

1 the minutes say that the developer has said  
2 that they met with the Pine Hills  
3 Neighborhood Association. I've gotten  
4 verification they have not. They have not  
5 attended any meetings. The Pine Hills  
6 Neighborhood Association has not met with the  
7 Board.

8 They did -- there was one conversation  
9 that occurred at a ZBA meeting with one board  
10 member and the president of the board. So I  
11 don't know why that is appearing in your  
12 minutes. I don't know that if that is a  
13 misrepresentation of what was said, et  
14 cetera, but I think it's really important  
15 that people understand that.

16 It's also important to understand that  
17 when the Pine Hills Neighborhood Association  
18 met with the board members alone, they were  
19 provided with a diagram of the new -- the  
20 changes, they wound up thinking, and  
21 expressed qualified support for that.

22 MS. METZGER: Five minutes.

23 MS. DOESSCHATE: It's five minutes

1           already.

2                   And the qualified support basically  
3           says if they supported -- if it is really  
4           necessary, to do it at that level. And I  
5           suggest, with your support, that you easily  
6           develop this at three stories.

7                   I also want to just comment in terms of  
8           the numbers changing on the -- that we're now  
9           hearing about the job development. I don't  
10          think I heard anything said about the eight  
11          positions at the Albany Clothing & Promotions  
12          that occupies space at this particular  
13          facility, and that information comes to me  
14          directly from the owner.

15                  And also, I was told by the manager of  
16          the Playdium that there are 11 people  
17          employed at that particular location. My  
18          calculations is that there is a net loss of  
19          14 people.

20                  I want you also to really pay attention  
21          to what I have said about the midtown plan.  
22          This does not fit within the midtown plan.  
23          It is not anything like the midtown plan, and



1           therefore, the points awarded to that for  
2           catalyst and neighborhood plan should come  
3           out of your criteria. My contention is that  
4           this does not meet your criteria for funding  
5           for a number of reasons. And please, again,  
6           look at my letter.

7           Thank you.

8           MS. METZGER: We have next Ryan Jankow  
9           or Deborah Lambek.

10          MS. LAMBEK: Good afternoon. My name  
11          is Deborah Lambek. I am the attorney for the  
12          applicant. I just wanted to say a couple of  
13          words for the project.

14          The first thing is, the project, the  
15          Playdium, we submitted a letter from a  
16          relative of the owner of the existing  
17          Playdium basically giving a history saying  
18          that the Playdium has gone downhill over the  
19          past number of years. And they've had it on  
20          the market for a lot of years, have not had a  
21          buyer.

22          Now they have a buyer for it, but if  
23          this deal does not go through, the chances

1 are that the Playdium is going to be going  
2 out of business. The current owner is ill  
3 and will not be operating it for very much  
4 longer. So the building will become vacant  
5 and will become even more of an eyesore for  
6 the property.

7 The second thing is that we submitted a  
8 letter from the Pine Hills Neighborhood  
9 Association giving its unconditional support  
10 for the project.

11 And then the project is going to be  
12 creating new jobs, but in addition to the new  
13 jobs, we're going to be creating -- we are  
14 also going to be creating a lot of  
15 construction jobs during the construction of  
16 the project, which is also a positive.

17 And then the other thing is, with  
18 respect to the PILOT agreement, we have  
19 requested a PILOT for a certain number of  
20 years. But the PILOT payments start at a  
21 place that the property taxes are at now, so  
22 the city is never going to be getting less  
23 than it's already getting.

1           And in fact, when the property comes  
2           online in a year or so after the construction  
3           is completed, the property tax payments are  
4           going to jump to double from what they are  
5           right now.

6           So the city will be benefiting, and the  
7           school district will be benefiting, and the  
8           payments will be ramping up over time.

9           Thank you.

10          MS. METZGER: Next is Michael Hipp.

11          MR. HIPPI: Good afternoon, everyone.  
12          My name is Michael Hipp, and I just want to  
13          give a perspective of someone who lives in  
14          the neighborhood currently.

15          I'm 27 years old. I went to SUNY  
16          Albany. I graduated in 2012 and I  
17          immediately moved to the New Scotland  
18          neighborhood. I lived at 517 New Scotland  
19          Avenue for three years. I really enjoyed the  
20          neighborhood. At one point, I had a roommate  
21          that left so we looked for somewhere else and  
22          I moved up to Latham. I was there for two  
23          years and I've recently moved back into the

1 neighborhood.

2 I work in Albany as an underwriter for  
3 an insurance company and I really like the  
4 Pine Hills neighborhood. I had an extremely  
5 difficult time finding an apartment that I  
6 wanted to live in when I just moved to the  
7 neighborhood. I'm currently at 58 Norwood  
8 Avenue.

9 A lot of the apartments that I looked  
10 at in the area, while they're okay, they're  
11 not nicer, they're not modern. They haven't  
12 been updated. The amenities aren't really  
13 what someone I feel in my age group and my  
14 income level is really looking for and wants  
15 to have in an apartment. That's lacking in  
16 that neighborhood.

17 I think a project such as this takes  
18 care of an eyesore in the neighborhood. It  
19 brings more middle-20s to early-30s aged  
20 people to the neighborhood that are making  
21 decent amounts of money. Not making a  
22 tremendous amount, but making enough to add a  
23 positive economic value to the neighborhood

1           that's currently not there.

2                   I don't know that there's really a  
3           comparable place. I think if you go down a  
4           little bit further on New Scotland, you have  
5           the new apartments that were built down  
6           there. Those are pretty expensive.

7                   There's a lot of doctors and attorneys  
8           that live in there. It's not really  
9           affordable for someone my age in my type of  
10          role. But again, the amenities in the houses  
11          that are affordable right now in that area  
12          aren't what people like me are looking for.  
13          They're moving to apartment complexes in  
14          other areas instead of living in this area.

15                  As far as millennials being able to  
16          afford homes, that varies. But I think a lot  
17          of us are choosing not to because we like the  
18          walkability of neighborhoods, we like the  
19          ability to change where we live if we so  
20          choose. And this puts a place in that  
21          neighborhood that provides that opportunity  
22          to others like myself and others.

23                  So with that being said, I'm in support

1 of this project. I've lived in the  
2 neighborhood off and on since 2012, and I  
3 plan on staying there, but only if things  
4 like this happen in that neighborhood.  
5 Otherwise, I'll be looking for an apartment  
6 complex with more amenities in the future.

7 Thank you.

8 MS. METZGER: Is there anyone else  
9 present who wishes to speak on the record?

10 So there are no further comments, and I  
11 will now close this public hearing at  
12 12:52 p.m.

13 Thank you for your time.

14 (Whereupon, the above-titled matter  
15 concluded at 12:52 p.m.)  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, KATHERINE D. NICHOLS, RPR, do hereby  
certify that I recorded stenographically the  
foregoing testimony taken at the time and  
place herein stated and the preceding  
testimony is a true and accurate transcript  
hereof to the best of my knowledge and  
belief.

*Katherine D. Nichols, RPR*

---

KATHERINE D. NICHOLS, RPR

My name is Helene Brown, and I live at 562 Park Ave., just 1 ½ blocks down the street from the proposed apartment complex development at 363 Ontario street.

First, please know that I am opposed to this project being incentivized by your board granting any tax abatements since the project at the size planned will not be an asset to the neighborhood and only an asset to the developer, which I address in the talking points of my statement and arguments below.

Also, I can only hope my statement and arguments are relevant as I was unable to ascertain from your notice of Public Hearing exactly what it is the Board is considering when reviewing this developer's application.

Along with my statement opposing the development are petition pages signed by about 40 property owners within 3 – 4 blocks of the site. There are also about the same number of renters who have signed on separate pages. These pages will be submitted along with my statement and arguments by Judy Doesschate on my behalf as I cannot be at the hearing today.

My statement and arguments address, from my point of view, some of the criteria from the application the developer must submit to the Board, (which I saw on your website) which contains criteria similar to Albany's 2030 plan as I knew of nothing else to reference. I do not believe the developer's application meets one of the IDA's "Baseline Eligibility Requirements", which is that it must comply with the 2030 Plan. I assert that in a great many instances it does not comply; therefore, under the Board's own policies it should not be eligible for support from the IDA.

My reasoning is as follows:

It does not create diverse housing stock: In front of the Planning Board the developer's representative stated, (to dismiss my concern that granting a height variance to them would encourage other developers looking to build in this neighborhood to do the same), that there really are no other lots to be developed in the manner of this project in this neighborhood. Therefore, I can only conclude that their project won't promote diverse housing stock. It will be one of a kind and out of place in a neighborhood consisting of mainly 1 – 2/1 story structures.

It does not encourage mixed income & intergenerational housing options: Since this project will be one of a kind for the neighborhood it will not encourage mixed income housing around it. It is out of the income ranges of most living around it paying about \$875 for a 1 br. and \$1000 or so for a two br. unit. With no other lots available to develop it will not encourage more units in the same price range within the neighborhood. As far as encouraging intergenerational housing, generally speaking older folks do not seek out housing that mainly attracts millennials as I suspect this complex will with rents set at \$1200 for a 1 br. and \$1400 for a 2 br.



It will not promote neighborhood integration: At one of the hearings either before the Planning or Zoning Board, (I can't recall which), to counter my statement that their project would negatively impact the rental "pool" for the surrounding neighborhood, the developer's representative suggested that their project's apartment dwellers are a different type of person(s) from those who live in our neighborhood's houses and would not have an interest in living in them and so his development would not draw tenants from our rental "pool". Subsequently one must conclude that those living in our houses around this project would not have an interest in occupying their units. So it can be concluded, that integration is not an expected outcome here. Also, as the developer believes their apartment dwelling tenants (as mentioned above) are a different type of person from those living in our houses, I would not expect them to buy one and become permanent residents of the neighborhood. As a long time 30 year resident of the neighborhood I can say with certainty and great pride that the housing in my neighborhood (as well as those nearby) is integrated with older folks living in homes within the blocks with those younger and folks of diverse income brackets and ethnicity intermingled throughout the same neighborhood and living on the same block(s) with each other. There is no housing like the project proposed where only one type of person resides in density, (as the developer's representative stated). In these respects then, there is no benefit from this type of housing to further integrate the surrounding neighborhood.

It does not promote affordable housing: The average cost of a 1 br. in the surrounding area is running about \$875/mo. and 2 bedrooms are about \$1000/mo., which in my opinion, is affordable housing. In context with the neighborhood and average incomes of people I have screened when my rental unit has been available, and those I have spoken to when canvassing with my petition, this project does not promote affordable housing at the rates the developer is setting. It is out of alignment with the community around it.

It will not create low impact development design: It is too unlike the 1 - 2 1/2 story structures that border it and are on the blocks around it. It is too tall and too densely packed into too small of a space. It will tower over them. Its design would stand out like a sore thumb and appears as more of a compound that is not only separate from the neighborhood but also overtakes the neighborhood it is to be situated in and is not complimentary to it. Its size and design is not low impact to the area.

It will not enhance or promote neighborhood commercial centers: The number of parking spaces, which I understand to be only six, allotted to the commercial spaces as designed will do nothing to support patronage from the neighborhood community surrounding it, many of whom stop at the store there now for light grocery and shopping or lottery needs etc., in transit (by car) from work to home and/or from shopping elsewhere to home. Also, the laundromat there now, which is of a good size, attracts a brisk business and there are over six vehicles parked in that lot at almost all times, especially peak commuting times, patronizing both the laundromat and mini-mart. If you go by there on Saturday and Sunday the laundromat is packed and the store has a steady flow of patrons. The residents of the surrounding neighborhoods will see little benefit, if any at all from those businesses proposed by the developer due to the lack of parking and size. Additionally the commercial space as designed

will not draw more businesses to the neighborhood or make it a destination as there are no other lots available to develop. Also, I have heard no mention of a min-mart, only a café and what will certainly be a much smaller laundromat. This commercial space will not draw patrons as it does <sup>now</sup> from inside or encourage others from outside the area to come to it as the Playdium presently does.

It will not improve balance between owners and renters: We are in a heavily tenanted neighborhood. When I moved here in 1983 there was a great balance. Over the years that has changed and this project will do nothing to create any kind of balance or draw owner occupants. If anything it may result in driving some long time owners away which could result in the creation of even more rental properties. Part of the petition pages I present to this Board and have presented to the Planning Board consists of homeowners and owner occupants living within 3 - 4 blocks from the site, all opposing this development. Also, as the developer believes their tenants (as mentioned above under neighborhood integration) are a different type of person from those living in our houses; based on this, I would not expect them to buy one of our homes and become permanent residents of the neighborhood. The project will not improve the balance between owners and renters.

It will negatively impact on street parking: with 109 apartments made up of one and two bedroom units one can conclude there will easily be 200 residents, the great majority of whom who will have cars as will their visitors. With one parking space (for free) assigned to each unit (of 143 available leaving 34 available for a fee), there will certainly be overflow to the surrounding streets. We have a parking shortage now and are saturated in this respect. Any overflow will have a negative impact to the residents here now. Most of our homes do not have driveways or garages and most residents park on street. It is hard to find a space now and on alternate side of the street parking days (or snow emergencies) it is especially challenging

It will negatively impact traffic: I assert that we will experience significantly increased traffic to our side streets where neighborhood children play in warm weather, riding bicycles, tossing balls and frisbees, skateboarding and more as many of the homes are short on yard space. The residents of this complex will certainly use our side streets between New Scotland Ave. and Morris Street to come and go from this project to circumvent traveling on Madison and New Scotland Avenues. Those of us living here and "in the know" do this now. We saw a significant increase in traffic from the Albany Med. expansion and housing units built once their new employees and residents discovered them. There is no reason to believe that this project will not add heavily to them as its dense population of residents also uses them to commute back and forth from work to home and to and from other destinations every day. There still is a sort of quiet suburban feel to these blocks that should not be further compromised by any additional increase in traffic to keep them attractive to homebuyers and renters with families.

While the developer may have you believe that because mass transit is close by their residents will use it to commute, in my experience personal vehicles are still the preferred mode of transportation for those that own them in my area. I can say with assurance that everyone on my block of Park Ave. that owns a car drives to work, school and other destinations. I see them

as I drive to work and again in the evening (especially in the warm weather when I am out enjoying my porch). If you drive around the blocks close to Albany Med. and the Psychiatric Center during the day you will see many parked cars, but as we residents leave our spaces are taken by their employees and visitors. The same goes for the blocks close to New Scotland Ave., which in addition are utilized for parking by the students of the colleges that border our area. During the weekdays on Partridge St. and Ontario Street parking is available, but not so at night. That is because those folks drive to work and other destinations also. The point is that many people are driving through our neighborhoods now and more so since development near them, and I assert that there is no reason to believe that the residents of this development would behave differently. To increase traffic in the amount this project will, (in my opinion), add will most definitely negatively impact the neighborhood it is to be located in and those around it.

This project is not in need of tax abatement: I assert that this project would be profitable at the rental rates that came from the developer's submission for the proposed assessment. It was alluded to at the neighborhood meeting held at the Hibernian Center last year that this developer would own this complex for many, many years and I have not experienced rental rates in Albany remaining stagnant in my 30 years here. Based on that information I come away with the sense that granting this project a tax abatement is unnecessary as it will be a profitable endeavor without one. Granting this project tax abatement is not in our city's best interest and only serves to benefit the developer

In conclusion I respectfully request the Board reject the developer's request for a tax abatement for this project. Incentivizing it is not in the best interest of the city and most definitely not in the best interest of the neighborhood or neighborhoods surrounding it and it does not align with much of Albany's 2030 Plan for the future.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Respectfully,



Helene Brown

518-526-6446

# PETITION IN OPPOSITION OF BUILDING MIXED USE BUILDINGS AT 363 ONTARIO STREET

The undersigned residents of the surrounding neighborhoods oppose the construction of the mixed use project proposed for the above site and request the Planning Department reject the developer's application. This metropolitan style apartment complex's design does not fit with that of the surrounding area and the project itself is too large and tall. It will create overly burdensome traffic to side and through streets and add to already existing parking shortages on street. It does not belong in my residential neighborhood. I am over 18.

NAME	# of street only ADDRESS	Renting #yrs.	PHONE #
James Edick	29 Glenwood St	1	518-992-8592
Melissa A. Davis	199 New Scotland Ave	10+	518 233-2585
Jennifer Davis	603 Warren St	5	518-650-8826
Catalina Domingo	685 Park Ave	1	518-612-9489
Bishnu K Wagle	483 Yates Street	07	518/2565627
JOE B.			
Tom Feil	275 New Scotland Ave		518 339-2804
Charissa Blakemore	635 PARK AVE		518-525-3607
KING B. McLAUGHLIN	300 Elm St	AK	518 459-2428
Bruce Edmonds	685 Park Ave	2	518 986-2728
Mina Azubi	808 Madison Ave	1	(518) 362-4325
Terrille Simmons	664 Myrtle Ave	2	518-428-3147
Ignette Robinson	362 Partridge St	OWN	518-466-0696
Kenneth Stephens	544 Park Ave	1	518-308-7338
Ingrid M. S.	17 Winthrop Ave	2	518-360-7849
Juan M. S.	17 Winthrop Ave	2	518 330-0805
H. H. Cipello	751 Myrtle	20	458-8584
Tom Rivers	772 Myrtle	20	—
Sarah P. Moulton	716 Myrtle Av	61	518 937-0147
E. G. L. W. L.	603 Winthrop St		518 501 7228

# PETITION IN OPPOSITION OF BUILDING MIXED USE BUILDINGS AT 363 ONTARIO STREET

The undersigned residents of the surrounding neighborhoods oppose the construction of the mixed use project proposed for the above site and request the Planning Department reject the developer's application. This metropolitan style apartment complex's design does not fit with that of the surrounding area and the project itself is too large and tall. It will create overly burdensome traffic to side and through streets and add to already existing parking shortages on street. It does not belong in my residential neighborhood. I am over 18.

NAME	ADDRESS	# Renting	PHONE #
Joseph Deyoung	677 Park Ave	1/24	845-863-3037
Derek Dorn	677 Park Ave	1	845-867-8790
Ginger Berlin	311 Partridge St	2	518-764-9543
Dandra Everett	615 Warren St	12	518-376-625
Chad Harn	348 Quail St	4	518-364-2749
John F Jackson	381 Mercer St	9	(518) 364-0348
Gavin Nelson	603 Warren St	5	845-430-1536
Katera Darden	629 Park Ave	5 1/2	518-860-8853
McGonzalez Co.	296 Grand	5	518-432-4161
Kristine Secore	875 Park Ave	8	518-438-0131
Freida Hawthorne	20 Moore St	20	518-430-8691
Helen Watson	638 Park Ave	owner	518-48987
Erin McCarthy	618 Mercer St.	4	518-331-3517
Lisa Hawth	618 Mercer St.	20	518-331-3517
Robert Babstock	618 Mercer St.	4	318-331-3517
OL	696 Myrtle Ave	20	
Eunice Dufalte	610 Warren St	6	518 4277501
Wendy Black	638 Park Ave	2	518 6691574
John Tavi	311 Partridge St	8	201 874-7878

# PETITION IN OPPOSITION OF BUILDING MIXED USE BUILDINGS AT 363 ONTARIO STREET

The undersigned residents of the surrounding neighborhoods oppose the construction of the mixed use project proposed for the above site and request the Planning Department reject the developer's application. This metropolitan style apartment complex's design does not fit with that of the surrounding area and the project itself is too large and tall. It will create overly burdensome traffic to side and through streets and add to already existing parking shortages on street. It does not belong in my residential neighborhood. I am over 18.

[illegible]


# PETITION IN OPPOSITION OF BUILDING MIXED USE BUILDINGS AT 363 ONTARIO STREET

The undersigned residents of the surrounding neighborhoods oppose the construction of the mixed use project proposed for the above site and request the Planning Department reject the developer's application. This metropolitan style apartment complex's design does not fit with that of the surrounding area and the project itself is too large and tall. It will create overly burdensome traffic to side and through streets and add to already existing parking shortages on street. It does not belong in my residential neighborhood.

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE #
Print & Sign	(Homeowners)	
Carol Soranno Clarno	570 PARK AVE	518 482-5117
Ng Maure	618 Park Ave	518-458-8960
Jeannette L. Jones	620 PARK AVE	518-854-2734
Timika Y. Jones	620 Park Ave	518-506-0233
Kronna Rodriguez	677 Providence St	518 853-806
Jeff Thompson	604 Providence St	518-221-6838
Nicholas Clark	664 Providence St	518 542-4115
Sandra Kitarai	674 Providence St	518 701-3446
Elaine Savage	370 Hartford	
Paul Bust	641 Providence St	518 461-3467
Cassandra Farina	637 Providence St	518-429-7607
James Doyle James W. Doyle	139 Woodlawn Ave	518-366-7193
Lily Corrigan	141 WOODLAWN AVE.	518-694-6063
THADDOE Joanne Fiegel	149 Woodlawn Ave	518-320-0530
Eric Lehtinen	377 Quail St. Albany	518 220 8233
Helene Brown HB	562 Park Ave.	518-506-6446

# PETITION IN OPPOSITION OF BUILDING MIXED USE BUILDINGS AT 363 ONTARIO STREET

The undersigned residents of the surrounding neighborhoods oppose the construction of the mixed use project proposed for the above site and request the Planning Department reject the developer's application. This metropolitan style apartment complex's design does not fit with that of the surrounding area and the project itself is too large and tall. It will create overly burdensome traffic to side and through streets and add to already existing parking shortages on street. It does not belong in my residential neighborhood.

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE #
 Robert Rector	564 PARK AVE ALB NY 12208	619-241-2345
Elaine M. Kohut	577 Park Ave 12208	518 526-5420
Mark Lananan	121 S. Lake Ave	518-526-1894
Allison Capra	605 Park Ave. Albany 12208	860-455-3486
Dennis Everett	313 Quail St Alb 12208	518-729-3931
Saleh Nauri	640 Park Ave Albany NY 12208	518-275-254
Jose Lopez	646 Mercer St Albany NY 12208	518-542-7930
Nick Washington	348 Quail St Albany NY 12208	518-375-9781
Michael Zampi	522 Warren St Albany NY 12208	508 212-5640
Edin Sasic	525 Warren St Albany NY	518-530-0720
Thaddaus Andrus	319 Quail St, Albany, NY	518-965-6340
DONALD MURDOCK	541 WARREN ST ALBANY, NY	518-626-5000
David Campbell	593 Warren St, Albany, NY	518-969-7884
Sharna Smith	603 Warren St Albany (518)	362-9440
Steven Faulk	611 Warren St. Albany	347 640-9495
Ahmad Ali	619 Warren St Albany	845-665 9179
Robert A. B.	690 Park Ave	518-237-2055
Wishanna Lee	702 Park Ave 12208	518-506-5421
Bibi Eshak	698 Park Ave 12208	518 292 825



## PETITION IN OPPOSITION OF BUILDING MIXED USE BUILDINGS AT 363 ONTARIO STREET

The undersigned residents of the surrounding neighborhoods oppose the construction of the mixed use project proposed for the above site and request the Planning Department reject the developer's application. This metropolitan style apartment complex's design does not fit with that of the surrounding area and the project itself is too large and tall. It will create overly burdensome traffic to side and through streets and add to already existing parking shortages on street. It does not belong in my residential neighborhood.

[illegible]



The Playdium redevelopment project. Development Plan Review / Demolition / Area Variance for construction of a three, 4-story multifamily structures with approx. 3,000-sqft of ground level commercial space, a total of 110-units. An existing, approx. 41,200-sqft commercial structure will be demolished in order to accommodate the proposed construction.

