

Village of Pawling Planning Board Minutes

Date: March 12, 2024

Present: Robert Pfister Jr., Chairman
Lou Musella, Member
Peter Pennelle, Member
Marie Liguori, Member

APPROVED BY
VILLAGE OF PAWLING
PLANNING BOARD

Also Present: Caren LoBrutto (Village Planner)
Joe Eriole (Village Attorney)
Curt Johnson (Representing Pawling Commons)
Evan Pendleton (Representing Pawling Commons)
Dave Daniels (15 Memorial Ave)
Brian & Jean Senno (28 Walnut Street)
Jared Spence (568 Route 22)
Erik Brown (568 Route 22)

On **Tuesday, March 12, 2024, at 7:00 PM**, the Planning Board met at the Village Hall. The Meeting was called to order by Robert Pfister, Chairman, and began with roll call as indicated above and The Pledge of Allegiance.

Project Name: 28 Walnut Street Major Subdivision

Owners: Brian & Jean Senno

Location: 28 Walnut Street

Parcel ID/Zoning District: 6957-20-971145/R-3

Village Attorney, Joe Eriole stated that the Applicants meet the conditions set forth on the preliminary plat approval. Mr. Senno supplied the Board with two Mylar copies of the final plats requiring the Chairman's signature.

Member Pennelle made a motion to approve the final plant for the 28 Walnut Street Subdivision. Member Musella seconded the motion. Member Liguori abstained. The motion passed with 3 of 4 members in favor.

Mr. Eriole said the applicant's consultants have to do a couple of things before Chairman Pfister signs the Mylar copies of the final plat. Once everything is completed, the Chair will sign, and the Mylars will be returned to Mr. Senno, who will then file with the County.

Project Name: Pawling Commons Amended Site Plan (Public Hearing - Expand Parking)

Owners: K.J. Rant Realty, LLC

Location: 63-71 East Main Street

Parcel ID/Zoning District: 7056-05-101917/B-1

Village of Pawling Planning Board Minutes

Curt Johnson, who represents Applicant K.J. Rant Realty, gave a brief recap of the project for the public's benefit.

Mr. Eriole explained that the applicant has not received the sign-off from DEC that would allow the Planning Board to adopt the NegDec, which would, in turn, allow the Applicant to cut down their trees before the March 31st deadline. If the Applicant is able to get the sign-off within the next couple of days, the Planning Board can consider a brief Special Meeting for the sole purpose of adopting the NegDec.

Mr. Johnson said I do want to mention that when this was approved in 2022, there was no real expansion of impervious surfaces. It was all within the existing developed area. Now, the increased impervious disturbance on the site kicks us into upgrading the stormwater management. So, what we're getting with this proposal is improved stormwater management compared to what would've been done with the 2022 approval.

Mr. Pfister mentioned that the Village has been receiving complaints that some of the drains got clogged and caused flooding next door and asked if there are curbs along the south side of the property. Mr. Johnson said there are none now, but there will be curbs.

Member Musella asked what could be done in the meantime to protect the residents on Sunset Avenue. Mr. Johnson replied that there is a temporary catch basin in the back, so we're really just keeping an eye on that and making sure it doesn't get clogged with debris.

Mr. Eriole commented that the Planning Board can also consider a condition that requires daily monitoring and maintenance during construction. Mr. Pendleton of Insite Engineering added that a maintenance agreement on the stormwater system requires regular maintenance.

Member Musella asked if there was enough water going to the property. Mr. Johnson replied as it stands right now, there is enough potable water and fire flow for Building 67. There isn't enough for fire flow for Building 71. As such, the applicant is required to install a tank in the basement of Building 71. Member Musella asked if the tanks need to be replenished and how will they be replenished. Mr. Johnson replied that the tanks would be kept full until it was called upon. Member Musella commented that in the event there's a fire, the sprinkler system would feed off of that tank. Mr. Johnson replied that there is some flow in the system that would be augmented by the flow of the water held in the tank, so a combination of the two would be brought together. Mr. Pennelle asked why the tank has to be placed in the basement versus on the roof or outside. Mr. Johnson said that part of the project hasn't been designed yet. The basement seems to make the most sense. Mr. Pennelle asked how you propose to get the water out of that tank in the basement. Mr. Johnson replied again that it hadn't been designed yet. Mr. Pennelle asked if Building 63 has a fire flow system in it. Mr. Johnson replied that the building is fully sprinklered and is fed off the main, which is going into the property now. Mr. Pennelle asked if the two new buildings are going to be fed off the same main. Mr. Johnson replied that he believed it would be fed off a separate waterline.

Village Planner Caren LoBrutto suggested that the Board open the meeting for public comments.

Village of Pawling Planning Board Minutes

Chairman Pfister made a motion to open the public comment session. Member Musella seconded the motion. The motion passed with all present members in favor.

Mr. Philip Charadini explained that his daughter and son-in-law live right next door to the project on Sunset Avenue and noted that he submitted a letter to the Planning Board (see attached letter). He explained that since the current building (IGA Market) was built 50 years ago, the properties on Sunset Avenue have started flooding, and it's still an issue. He realizes that the Applicant is trying to resolve the issue and reminds the Board that this is the last pass. He stated that whatever can be done, please do it. Just from an approach standpoint, the level spreader, and correct me if I'm wrong, is if this thing gets overcharged, say, in a 50/100-year storm, whatever the design parameter is, it is going to seep out and hit this level spreader. Then the level spreader dissipates the energy, and the water seeps where it's going to go. It's only approximately 15 feet from the bottom of this thing to their property. Unfortunately, they're probably a good 6 feet below this grade. So the bottom of these infiltrators is about 488, which is already a little bit above. Infiltrate retains the water, so it's not automatically running, and slowly, it dissipates into the ground underneath it. In the ideal world, that's a great solution. The question I have is, under this infiltration system, do we know whether there's a ledge or not, and how far down is it? Mr. Pendleton replied the ledge is 3 feet below the bottom of the infiltration system. Mr. Charadini said part of my problem with this is that it's attracting water. Even if it was a chief flow, we're building a bathtub here. There's only one spot for it to go besides the level spreader, and we had this conversation a little bit in the letters back and forth, but this dimension from the edge of the infiltrator to their property line is on a downhill slope; maybe it's 20 feet. Mr. Johnson clarified that it's 25 feet. Imagine if you had 20,000 gallons of water sitting over there with a separation of 20 feet downhill. At some point, it's going to work its way through that soil, and it's going to become groundwater because it can't go down 20 feet because it's got ledge three feet below the bottom. It's going to stop, and it's going to start spreading. I'm not pretending to know the answer to this, but I'm concerned that this isn't going to solve the problem. It's clearly going to improve it, but is there any way we can get this back to East Main Street? Discussion ensued regarding ledge and flow. Mr. Pendleton explained that we can't push everything to East Main Street because we can't cause this location to have capacity issues as well. It's existing drainage; we can't add more water to it, so we analyzed a point here and down here, and we were able to reduce runoff volume and peak flow to both points. Mr. Charadini said what you're saying is that under this infiltration system, there might be soil that can absorb this. Mr. Pendleton replied that there's at least 3 feet. Mr. Johnson demonstrated on the site plan that they dug 14 feet down and described the grade in the back corner. Mr. Charadini asked whether the ready rock retaining wall would retain water and act as a dam and prevent water from coming in. Mr. Johnson replied there's a six-inch curb that goes along with this whole thing here. Mr. Charadini asked where that goes; if it runs all the way down. Mr. Johnson replied, yes. Mr. Charadini asked if there was any way to get that curb to be about 12 inches. Mr. Pendleton replied typically they are 18 inches. Mr. Charadini said I know that's typical, but this is a very egregious property line. There's been trouble here for 50 years. If it has to be 12 inches, make it 12 inches. It's not a big deal. Mr. Johnson replied, we can look into that. Ms. LoBrutto said going back to pushing all of the flow to East Main Street, is that something you all considered at one point? Did you do the analysis and determine that it couldn't take it based on the capacity of the pipes? Mr. Pendleton replied we would be increasing the peak flow to the front. We have to show a decrease in the post-development, so

Village of Pawling Planning Board Minutes

we did look at pushing more, but if you look at our SWPPP, we're pretty much equal from pre-to post-development. Mr. Charadini asked if there is any way to put some kind of safety check or some kind of future buy-in that if this doesn't work if they're still flooded in certain storm events, there's some sort of recourse built into the approval. Mr. Eriole said, as we just mentioned, there's a monitoring requirement in any event, and I assume they're going to meet standards. Beyond that, and I can't speak entirely for what your daughter might do or what might be available to them, but if there are impacts to that property based on any kind of trespass or something of water, that could be something they could look into. Mr. Pendleton explained that if the property owner fails to perform the maintenance as required or the system doesn't perform as designed, the Village has the right to come on-site and do the maintenance and take over responsibility. Mr. Eriole said that part of the approvals is that the Village will have the right to step in. Mr. Charadini said, just to clarify, I'm here whining about a very specific issue; however, in general, I think it's a good project. It's just that since the day they bought this property, this has been a huge issue. It's greatly improved from just putting a catch basin in, or whatever it was they did temporarily, but it still occurs every now and then with larger weather events. I'm just hoping that this really resolves this issue as much as possible. Getting back to the retaining wall/curb, if we can get the curb a little higher so that if everything backs up and gets clogged up and there's eight inches of water in that lower parking lot, it's not in their yard and their basement. That would be a huge help. Mr. Johnson said, yes, we can look into it.

Sunset Avenue Resident Jessica Wood-Kelley said thank you for your email. I really appreciate that, and all my neighbors appreciate it as well. One of the things I heard you guys say about the existing pipes going out to East Main Street is when the water comes down onto Sunset, it goes into our basement, and it goes into our neighbor's basements as well, and that water then has to be pumped out and brought to the drain on Sunset. Those drains are much smaller than the ones on East Main Street, so when we're talking about old pipes and everything, you have to remember part of the water, when it comes down onto our properties, has to be pumped out. We've had to call the Fire Department twice living in our house to be helped to have the water removed from the basement; we're not complaining about just a little bit of water. That said, the drain that you guys put in has really made a big change in our lives but we still have to check on it. Currently, there's a fabric put in the drain to prevent the dirt and everything from running into the drain, and that gets clogged quite often, and when it's a big storm, the water is not draining quickly enough, so we've had over a foot of water, there since that drain has been put in. We've been flooded twice since the drain was put in, and we didn't expect it either because we got complacent, so we had to pump out our basement, and this water now is construction water. It's different, it's dirty. It's not the same kind of water, it takes longer to clean that. So I just want to kind of emphasize that, to us, this is a big deal. We've lost work; we've had to take days off to pump and clean our basement. We've bought numerous pumps. My husband had a pipe going from the back of the property all the way to the front of the property to get the water when it first came over the hill and get it to the drain on Sunset, and when that pipe freezes in the winter, he had another pipe that he would build in pieces and then scrape the ice out. So you're talking about hours and hours and days of our lives dealing with this water, and we're not the only neighbors that have dealt with this water, so I just kind of want to let you guys know that. You guys have been great; Mr. Johnson has been great in listening to our concerns, and before this gets finalized, we are really concerned about the water sitting in the dirt above our property. Mr. Johnson commented, I think a lot of it also is that drain that's in the back, although it has helped,

Village of Pawling Planning Board Minutes

was always meant to be a temporary solution until we develop that back area, so what Evan has done is basically, he's created a drainage plan now that has a permanent fix to this and meets all current standards for stormwater control so we have a permanent fix rather than just a drain in the back, which helped, and I'm sorry that you're still having problems but I think with this update and permanent structures being put in that should solve the issues.

Ms. LoBrutto said I would like to request permission for the LaBella Engineer, Sara Drury, to speak directly with Mr. Pendleton. I kind of conveyed some of her questions regarding East Main Street, but I think you could communicate what you've done as part of that analysis to her better than I can. The Planning Board, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Pendleton all agreed.

Member Musella asked what could be done in the meantime with all of this construction going on. This project is not going to be finished tomorrow. What can we do as far as maintaining that drain to make sure it's free of debris and doesn't get clogged? Mr. Johnson replied that there's an agreement with the Building Inspector, Chris Maeder from LaBella, to walk the site and check the drains before and after a storm event to make sure we don't have problems like what we have right now. Mr. Pfister asked if there was a silt fence in place now preventing some surface water. Mr. Johnson replied there's silt fencing as well as fabric in the catch basins and stuff to keep any debris from going in there. It just needs to be maintained and so we're going to just be really diligent on doing that. Mr. Charadini asked if there were hay bales behind the silt fence. Someone replied, no. Mr. Charadini said those fences get knocked over with this much water and mud. That line down there should have at least a row of hay bales with the silt fence. Member Pennelle said the hay bales are not a bad idea. With that you have a double filter. Ms. LoBrutto said I think Vivian can relay this to Chris Maeder, the Building Inspector, and he can speak with our engineer to make sure that there wouldn't be some ramifications that we're not thinking of. Mr. Pfister asked as part of the site plan review should there language for more stringent mitigation during construction for certain things. Ms. LoBrutto replied that erosion and sediment control are requirements of New York State; those are the silt fences and other things. That's why I suggested that Chris Maeder speak with Sara Drury. Perhaps there are more opportunities for better improvements there.

Sunset Avenue resident Susan Raymond asked how many units are going into that new building. Mr. Johnson replied 36. Ms. Raymond said so that gives us what, basically 51 apartments? We're on water restriction all of the time, at least two or three times a year, and you're going to put another 50 apartments in there, so how are you going to supply water to them without putting us at risk. Mr. Johnson replied, correct, I've worked in this Village for 20 years, and I know those things are in place, so the Village has sourced new water to augment what you have existing, so there is water available for this project. Ms. Raymond said I heard that before, then all of a sudden, everything goes dry again. Mr. Pennelle said, excuse me, you said there's only water for domestic; we don't have enough for fire, so don't say you have enough water. Ms. LoBrutto explained that there is adequate water capacity. It's a pressure issue for fire. It's not a capacity issue. New wells have been put in place in the last two years. It was a major Village project. Ms. Raymond asked how many of the old wells are still producing at a reasonable rate and how long do you expect them to last? Ms. LoBrutto said I do not have that information but we can report back to you.

Village of Pawling Planning Board Minutes

With no further comments from the public, Chairman Pfister suggested that based on the project's status with SEQRA, the Board should close the public hearing in case a special meeting has to be scheduled.

Mr. Musella made a motion to close the public hearing. Member Pennelle seconded the motion. The motion passed 3 to 2 with Member Marie Liguori abstaining.

Ms. LoBrutto explained that once Mr. Johnson forwards the approval from DEC to the Planning Board, a special meeting can be scheduled to close out SEQRA.

Project Name: Pawling NY Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses (Amended Site Plan)

Owners: Pawling NY Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses

Location: 568 Route 22

Parcel ID/Zoning District: 7057-17-243066/R-1

For the benefit of the public, Jared Spence presented the Board with a brief recap of the proposed project. Stating that with the growth of the congregation over the past 30 years, there has been significant attendance. Three congregations share the use of this facility, with an average attendance of 120 to 140. The Applicant is proposing to expand the use of the existing parking lot by providing 5 additional parking spaces in order to approve circulation and constraints with the current available parking on site. Additionally, they are proposing to add two residences on the lower level, as well as lighting and pathway improvements, and work in the septic field to support the additional occupancy. Lastly, the seats in the upper-level assembly room would be increased from 176 seats to 200 seats. Mr. Spence said that in our previous meeting back in February, we talked a little bit about the residences in particular, so I just thought it would be beneficial to share just a little bit about who would be living in the residences. I know that was a big point of concern as well as whether this would be an uncommon arrangement. Just to provide some insight on how we would occupy the residences, the majority of congregation members support themselves secularly; they work and attend congregation meetings and have their own ministry, but there are some who work full-time on behalf of the congregation and they do not work secularly. They receive support from the congregations, with housing, food, and other support, so they can focus on their specific assignment within the congregation. Some of those assignments are shepherding congregations and visiting and encouraging congregations. Others are lending their skills to support construction and renovation projects, etc. To be fully available for that type of assignment, there is a degree of lifestyle adjustments so they can be more involved. Often, these are single people or couples who do not have kids, so they have a little bit more time to focus on supporting congregation arrangements. So, all of those characteristics that come with family life are often not part of the lifestyle of those who are in full-time ministry. These would be the people who would occupy the residences at the Kingdom Hall. In the case of Pawling specifically, the two residences would be occupied by either two single people, a single person in each residence, or it could be two couples, one couple in each residence. Their assignment will depend on their skill set. That's basically how it would be used. It's not uncommon for this to take place. Mr. Spence explained that other Kingdom Halls have apartments within the facility with various occupancies as follows: Brewster (one couple), Hopewell Junction (single person), Ossining (single person), and White Plains (one couple). He said throughout New York, we have 40 Kingdom Halls that have attached residences to the

Village of Pawling Planning Board Minutes

facility. Throughout the United States, we have 572 residences attached to Kingdom Halls. We have even more than that are detached or not attached to Kingdom Hall, and even with those numbers, many of these have multi-dwelling units within them, so two or three dwelling units in a Kingdom Hall, and so it's not an uncommon arrangement at all. It's a very beneficial arrangement because it allows the full-time members to give more attention to their assignment and their responsibilities in a safe, quiet setting. There are a lot of other benefits that come from it as well, such as benefits to the congregation and the opportunity for the members to really focus and care for their responsibilities and, ultimately, their worship. Not being able to take full advantage of a Kingdom Hall like this really does affect our ability to accomplish some of these things because otherwise, we would have to purchase a residence or rent a residence, and then with the costs increasing in all of that, it does affect our ability to have these full-time members as part of the congregation.

Mr. Eriole said I've also done some research on this. I do not think it's uncommon; it's also not uncommon in connection to other types of denominations in terms of parish houses and things like that. Would the people who occupy the residences have some formal appointment in terms of a ministry with respect to the congregation? What I hear you say is that these members would be people who would have an official ministerial function within the church. Mr. Spence said, absolutely, yes, they are appointed to service in a particular capacity, and they are assigned to live in the residence. Member Musella asked how many times a week they meet. Mr. Spence replied that this Kingdom Hall has three congregations. Each congregation has a mid-week meeting, and then each congregation has a weekend meeting, and then there are also meetings throughout the week that are smaller in nature to organize for going out into a public ministry. Mr. Musella asked if all ministries meet mid-week. Mr. Spence replied yes, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. Monday and Friday are currently off. They have smaller meetings in the beginning part of the day. There is usually some type of activity occurring each day of the week. Mr. Musella asked about the large groups. Mr. Spence replied that large groups are held three times a week and then three times on the weekend. Specifically, on Saturday, there is a meeting of the congregation at large, so approximately 120, and then on Sunday, there are two meetings, one in the morning and one in the afternoon, approximately 120 to 140, depending on which ones. Mr. Musella mentioned the original special use permit granted in 1995, and asked Mr. Eriole if that Special Use Permit was closed and, if so, how can the Board amend something that is closed and no longer exists. Should they apply for a new Special Use Permit and not amend the original one? Ms. LoBrutto said it's essentially the same thing. It's like if you come in for an amended Site Plan approval. Mr. Eriole said the review process wouldn't be different, and the approval would be a new Special Use Permit in any event. It would update and revise the original Special Use Permit. I don't even think there's a different application. It's a good point, but I think you're okay procedurally.

Mr. Pfister asked if the application is titled an amended Special Use Permit. Ms. LoBrutto said that because they have an existing Special Use Permit until we determine that it's expired for some reason, it's an amendment. Discussion ensued, and Mr. Eriole stated that he would follow up and take a look to see if it had officially expired and said we'll make sure we get the proper nomenclature by the time you're ready to consider this.

Village of Pawling Planning Board Minutes

Member Musella moved to open the public comment session. Member Pennelle seconded the motion. Member Marie Liguori abstained. The motion passed with three of four members in favor.

There were no public comments. Village Planner Caren LoBrutto suggested keeping the Public Hearing open while waiting to hear back from the various agencies that the applicants need comments and permits from. Including the DEC on the Bog Turtles, the DOH on the public water supply permit, and DEC or DOH for any concerns about the septic system. Mr. Eriole agreed and said it's a reasonable thing to consider; there are enough open matters here to keep it open. Discussion ensued regarding procedures with respect to the continuation of public hearings. The Board confirmed that there is no need for the applicant to send out an additional mailer to surrounding neighbors.

Ms. LoBrutto asked the applicants to address the following comments:

- More details on lighting fixtures: Is there a lower Kelvin option?
- Can some or all of the lighting fixtures be put on a timer or motion detection?
- Address water demand and wastewater generation
- Hear more about expanding the septic system, which is how you have this interaction with the wetland adjacent area and again with the Bog Turtle concern.

Kingdom Hall Engineer Eric Brown replied regarding the light poles. The existing poles will be replaced with a new light bulb, which will be 3,000 kelvin. All new site pole lighting will also be a 3,000 kelvin light fixture. Wall-mounted sconces will be 4,000 kelvin, and there are just a couple of them at the rear of the building and a few under the drop-off area, but all parking area fixtures will be 3,000 kelvin.

Ms. LoBrutto commented that she is concerned the most with the rear side of the building because it is adjacent to a residential lot. Is there a house-side shield that can be applied? Mr. Brown replied that the wall sconces are the optics that basically have internal shielding that prevents it from casting a glare, and then the photometrics also show that the light levels will be reduced to zero well before where the property line goes back that way as well. Ms. LoBrutto asked if there was a way to make it either a motion detector or a timer to go off at a certain time. Because that's the entrance to the residences, right? Mr. Brown said yes, it is, and those will be on, along with all of the other site pole lighting in the parking lot areas, on a dusk to dawn timer. However, the lights facing the rear of the property will have an override switch; when the applicants are out. When they come back, they can turn the light off. Ms. LoBrutto asked if you would consider whether some smaller bollards along the walkway might provide that kind of safety feeling. It's just something to think about. Whatever we can do to minimize that effect. Mr. Brown said we'll also be sending in a specification for that so you can read a little bit more about what those are. Again, they're downward facing, internally shielded, and 4,000 kelvin.

There was one comment from the EIT on the actual calculation that was used for wastewater production so we just did want to comment on that as well. The assembly hall is listed at 5 gallons per day per seat; this is for the church. For the auditorium portion of the building, that is three gallons per day per seat, and with low flow fixtures, you are allowed a 20% reduction in the

Village of Pawling Planning Board Minutes

sewage flow that's produced, so rather than a 3.0 gallons per day per seat, it's actually 2.4 gallons per day per seat, and that's the number we used in our calculation. We'll provide our methodology.

Member Musella made a motion to declare the Planning Board Lead Agency. Member Pennelle seconded the motion. Member Marie Liguori abstained. The motion passed with three of four members in favor.

Mr. Spence commented that he would copy the Secretary on any findings and correspondence he receives from the outside agencies.

Project Name: 15 Memorial Avenue (Change of Use – Single Family Home to Hotel)

Owners: 15 Memorial Avenue LLC

Project Location: 15 Memorial Avenue

Parcel ID/Zoning District: 7057-17-051019

Chairman Pfister stated that he feels it would be best to recuse himself from presiding over this project because he's done some work for this applicant in the past. He appointed Planning Board Member Lou Musella as acting Chairperson for the 15 Memorial Avenue Change of Use Application before the Board.

Mr. Musella also disclosed that Mr. Daniels's law firm has done some work for him, which has nothing to do with land use or anything like that, just personal matters. Mr. Daniels himself did not work on it; however, one of his associates did. As such, he is capable of presiding over the matter and judging the application impartially. Before introducing the applicant, Mr. Musella informed the Board that the applicant had withdrawn his previous application for the Change of Use for One Memorial Avenue. Moving forward, the applicant has one change of use application before the Board, 15 Memorial Avenue.

Mary Langan of O'Neil Langan Architects presented the proposal for Change the Use of 15 Memorial. Currently, it's listed as a residential use, and the Applicant is proposing to change it to a hotel. It's an as-of-right use in the B1 Zoning District. The building was constructed in 1898. They are looking to make minor alterations within the existing footprint of the building and convert it into four suite-type rooms. They will be adding one full bathroom and converting one bathroom into an ADA-compliant bathroom. Currently, there is access to the property on Memorial Avenue, where there are steps up and a walkway to a covered front porch and main entrance. There is also access to the rear of the property from Smith Street. There's a shared driveway with the adjacent 4-unit residential building, and you drive into the back. There's also an existing pedestrian gate that runs along the lot behind the Village municipal building. For the exterior improvements, the Applicant is proposing to refurbish the shutters that are on the building, repair cracked glass and windows, and paint the exterior in a historic color that's in keeping with the character of the age of the building. The Applicant is proposing to make the large yard in the rear of the property an amenity for the hotel, which would include a garden with ornamental plantings and furniture seating so that the community and the hotel can enjoy that. This would include installing a picket fence to highlight the historical beauty and significance of the building, keeping it visible to the surrounding community. For Parking, the Applicant is

Village of Pawling Planning Board Minutes

proposing to re-plant the area adjacent to the neighbor and create two spaces, one being an ADA space with an 8-foot accessible aisle and also an ADA slope up to the existing rear entrance of the building, making it the ADA-accessible route into the building. On the other side, the Applicant is proposing a drive aisle, and four parking spaces. Ms. Langan mentioned there is a request and demand for hotels with rooms that can house more than two people, such as families, primarily people coming up to Pawling to take advantage of the hiking trails, food establishments within the community, and the farmers market. This will be a self-check-in hotel. Check-in is at 3:00 pm, and check-out is at 11:00 am. Management isn't on-premise, so it will be a self-check through key codes. The old stove will be removed and there will be an open space in the back that will have coffee and tea service, no cooking. This will become a common area if you check out at 11:00 and you want to go to the farmers market or a waiting area if the suite isn't available. The interior proposal includes creating a main corridor from the front door to the back. There are two stairways that go up to the second floor, and there's an existing stair that goes down to the cellar. Two pocket doors from the original building will be removed so that more privacy can be provided to the two suites on that level. Suite A is the ADA suite, so it has an accessible route with a 5-foot turning radius. We are enlarging the doors so that they will be ADA-compliant. You'll be able to come into a flexible space that could have a bed or a sitting area, and then there'll be another main room with an accessible shower, toilet, and sink. The other suite on this floor is one bedroom with a new bathroom, so this is the addition of the new bathroom. You can go up to the second floor by two stairwells. We'll be upgrading and replacing all of the bathroom fixtures. One ADA-compliant bathroom is required for up to 25 suites. Sprinklers will be added to the building and there are no plans to renovate the third floor at this time.

Adam Thyberg of Insite Engineering said as Mary mentioned at least in terms of vehicular access, the access is gained from Smith Street through an easement that's on the neighboring property. Our belief is that with the six spaces shown on the property, we more than adequately meet parking needs. This is based on historic occupancy rates at the applicant's other location and also based on the fact that these are 8 rooms but within four suites. It would be rare that we would have, even at full capacity more than one car per room. I also want to point out from the applicant's experience at the other location that a lot of the tenants are coming Appalachian Trail thru hikers that are coming through and are also people coming from the city right off the train to enjoy the amenities of the Village. We did want to point out that the easement that we do have is a long standing access easement. We do have adequate room for our drive aisles between our proposed parking spaces and have the same 12-plus feet on the existing driveway that runs through that easement. There is a location kind of right near that property line where there's two landscape walls that are closer than the required 12 width for an access aisle so we're going to seek a remedy to that through some combination of fixing the situation with the neighbor and physically opening that up and or pursuing an area variance with the Zoning Board. I think we are planning on applying for a variance for the next ZBA meeting so we can start to clear that up. In concert with that we'll also be working with the neighbor to come to the best solution. Moving on to the comments about the sewer use from single family dwelling to the hotel use, we're going to work with the sewer commission. We can point out that anecdotally the applicant does have historical data from their other location that would show that based on this change of use from the existing 4 bedroom single family use that we would have a reduction of water usage

Village of Pawling Planning Board Minutes

or something very close to what is existing. There would be negligible change and possibly a reduction based simply on the fact of occupancy rates and just the historical demand.

Member Pennelle commented that you are going from a four-bedroom house to 4 suites that are not occupied all of the time and have no regular kitchen use; it's going to be for tea and coffee. Mr. Daniels said what I just handed to the board is the Station Inns 2023 water usage report. It comes out to 36 gallons a day per suite, which equates to less than a single-family residence under the tables that were referenced in the engineer's report. Mr. Thyberg explained that a typical family residence can have 110 gallons per room, and this is clearly significantly less than that. With regard to the noise ordinance, we would like to clarify that we would like to provide access for tenants to use the outdoor amenity space, potentially to have a guest of two, but this will all certainly be done within the requirements of noise ordinances and "quiet hours" would also be a quiet hours would be observed starting at 9:00 pm. I don't think it would qualify as a "party," and again, it would be kept within the noise ordinance requirements.

Ms. LoBrutto asked about the variance the applicant would be seeking other than the variance for the entry to the parking lot. Mr. Daniels replied there is one other potential variance, which has to do with the overcrowding ordinance that was passed about 15 years ago by the Village, which has very stringent requirements to prevent many, many people from being in the same apartment. The language is a little strange, but I interpret it to mean that you cannot go from one sleeping room through another sleeping room to a bathroom. So we'll do one of two things: we'll either eliminate the sleeping in the room adjacent to the bathroom, and that will become a smaller sitting room, or we'll seek a variance for that. We think that the language of the statute provides for a variance where the intent of what the person is doing doesn't go against the intent of the statute, which is to prevent overcrowding. We feel that we're in a position to get a variance, but if we don't get it, we'll work around it so that we're in compliance with the statute.

Mr. Eriole asked Mr. Daniels to elaborate on the requirement for the minimum 12 feet in width for the drive aisle. Mr. Daniels replied we meet that everywhere, including through the easement, with the exception of where these walls come together, where there are only about nine and a half feet.

Ms. LoBrutto asked what the square footage of the third floor is and why the Applicant isn't pursuing that, and how many suites would it allow for. Mr. Daniels replied that there is very limited ceiling height, it is challenging, the ceiling goes down, and there are windows a foot above the floor. It would be a very extensive project. Ms. LoBrutto said what got my attention was the application. You said that "there is no plan for the third floor at this time," so is it potentially something you might make into some sort of common space or library nook? Mr. Daniels said I don't have any plans to do that. The space is there. It's potentially usable, but it's not practical.

Member Pennelle asked if sprinklers would be installed. Ms. Langan replied, yes.

Ms. LoBrutto said when you spoke about minor alterations to the footprint, you were just talking about the interior footprint, right? Ms. Langan replied, yes. Mr. Pennelle, replied you said you were going to close a window or door someplace, but you are not eliminating anything else on on

Village of Pawling Planning Board Minutes

the footprint. Ms. Langan replied, we're taking out partition walls and then re-doing the bathroom, and then the rest is paint and re-finishing what's there.

Ms. LoBrutto asked about how lighting would be maintained. Ms. Langan demonstrated on the site plan where lighting and signs would be installed on the property.

Ms. LoBrutto said you offered the parking demand information you have based on the Station Inn, but will you also provide the parking generation demand in the ITE manual? Mr. Thyberg replied yes. Ms. LoBrutto asked where refuse is going to be kept. Mr. Daniels said we are either going to share the dumpster behind the LaMorte building, which we already talked about with the owner, or we will put it inside the garage at the Station Inn. Mr. Thyberg commented that there isn't going to be a large amount of refuse; these are people who are going to be there for a night or two. They're going to be eating out at the restaurant in the Village and not bringing a lot in that is then going to be made into refuse. Ms. LoBrutto said it's just about managing it and making sure that it doesn't become a nuisance.

Ms. LoBrutto said you had also mentioned that you were going to provide parking in the lot adjacent to the rear of 15 Memorial if you couldn't make the parking work. Was that proposed for One Memorial Avenue in mind? Mr. Thyberg replied when the applications were combined, there was a discussion of using part of the CVS parking lot that was rented by the applicant. That is now moot because we're really just talking about 15 Memorial, and users would be parked on the site.

Ms. LoBrutto asked how often the cleaning crew comes in. Mr. Daniels replied one van of a cleaning crew would come daily unless we didn't have any guests, which occasionally happens.

Mr. Pennelle asked if there would be any management on site. Mr. Daniels said that in terms of management, someone is always around. The current manager is housed at One Memorial in an office there, and my wife does some of that as well. We've got some of my office staff who swing in, so we keep a close eye on things.

Mr. Thyberg said they will provide the remainder of the more technical information on some of the outstanding comments in Ms. LoBrutto's review letter and asked if it would be appropriate to schedule a public hearing and start getting public input on this at the next meeting.

Ms. LoBrutto said yes, the first step would be for the Board to classify the SEQRA Action. I made a recommendation that it would be classified as a "Type II Action." She explained that according to the SEQRA regulations, re-use of a residential or commercial structure or a structure containing mixed residential and commercial uses where the residential or commercial use is a permitted use under the applicable zoning law or ordinance, including permitted by special use permit and the action does not meet or exceed any of the thresholds in another part which stipulates those for Type I Action. Mr. Eriole said I agree with that, and I also agree you could schedule the public hearing.

Village of Pawling Planning Board Minutes

Acting Chair Lou Musella made a motion to classify the 15 Memorial Ave Change of Use proposal as a Type II Action under SEQRA. Member Pennelle seconded the motion. The motion passed with all present members in favor.

Acting Chair Lou Musella made a motion to schedule the Public Hearing for the 15 Memorial Ave Change of Use proposal for the April 9th, 2024 Planning Board meeting. Member Pennelle seconded the motion. The motion passed with all present members in favor.

Mr. Musella asked if the Board has to do anything about the Lead Agency. Ms. LoBrutto said it's not required for a Type II Action.

Mr. Daniels said we're not going to be cooking or serving food. We want to promote dining locally. That kind of also solves the issue of water because obviously, if we had food, there would be a much bigger demand for water usage.

Mr. Daniels and his team dismissed themselves, and Mr. Pfister resumed as Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

Minutes

Member Musella made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 24, 2024 Planning Board meeting. Member Pennelle seconded the motion. The motion passed with all present members in favor.

Other Business

Approval of the Landscaping Plan for 146 East Main Street

Owners: Main Corner Properties LLC

Location: 146 East Main Street

Parcel ID/Zoning District: 7056-09-244711

Member Pennelle said he read in the letter from Mr. Johnson that they were still looking for the clearance for the 10-foot easement into the adjacent property (140 East Main Street). Did they get their clearance or not? If not, that's got to put a stop to this because they don't have the right to the property until we have the paperwork to prove that. Mr. Eriole commented that it certainly should be part of the record. The Board can approve it subject to my review of their submission of confirmation of the final recording of the easement. Mr. Pfister asked Mr. Eriole if this would be considered a conditional approval. Mr. Eriole explained that it's technically an approval with a condition to make it enforceable. You won't have to approve this again, and the Applicant won't have to go back to the Board. Ms. LoBrutto reiterated that the Applicant won't have to come back before the Board, but they do have to submit the certified easement filed to the County Clerk. Mr. Eriole commented that at that point, he would submit a letter for the file saying that he reviewed it, and that's when they will get full approval.

Chairman Pfister made a motion to conditionally approve the landscaping plan for 146 East Main Street upon Village Attorney, Joe Eriole's review of the filed certified easement from the

Village of Pawling Planning Board Minutes

County Clerk. Member Pennelle seconded the motion. The motion passed with all members in favor.

Final Comments

Member Pennelle commented that after the Planning Board's training session with Mr. Eriole, he became concerned with the Village Master Plan and the Village's water system. The Master Plan is outdated, and with the addition of the new building, the Village is reviewing another sprinkler system to go on East Main, which will require a significant amount of water. Do we have enough water to supply all these systems that are coming online? With the new fire codes, these buildings are forced to do this stuff. I don't know how the Turk Restaurant got in there without being required to install a fire system. He might be just under the threshold that requires them to do it, but we have to start looking at this because when we had that water main break last year up here on the corner, I was out of water for over 24 hours, and that's just up the street before Pawling Commons here. Member Musella commented that he doesn't see how anyone can foresee a water main break. Mr. Pennelle said no, you can't, but what is the Village going to do to protect the rest of us. 24 hours without water that's unheard of. Now, if those two apartment buildings were occupied, that's 50 apartments without water. Mr. Musella said not that I disagree, but I think those are two different concerns you have. Member Pennelle said I understand that, but they are just adding another sprinkler system in now, and anything they do now with the new codes, you have to update all of this stuff. You keep tapping into that system. If our infrastructure is not up to it, the well may be able to pump the water to you but if you can't distribute it, you have a problem. Ms. LoBrutto suggested that the Planning Board ask Cedarwood to provide a statement of current conditions. They can address the questions about capacity; they can summarize the condition of the existing older wells and the new well; they can talk about any interaction between these new fire code requirements that you're speaking of and how that might implicate water demand issues or not. Let's get a statement for them. Mr. Eriole commented that from any individual applicant's perspective, they always have to prove their capacity and their ability to supply the water. Your issue is different, which is whether or not the infrastructure can actually deliver it. I agree with Caren's suggestion; the Board should ask for that analysis. Regarding the Comprehensive Plan process, it is a state legislative process with procedures it has to follow, and it's typically initiated by the Village Board. You can certainly ask the Village Board to start that process. I know it's something that is at least on their minds. It tends to be a long process and not an inexpensive one, but it's certainly something that any member of the public and certainly this Board can suggest to the Village Board. Member Musella said I know that the Village Board is aware of the fact that the Comprehensive Plan needs to be updated, but we have recourse. We can submit amendments to them if we feel that there's something that should be in the comprehensive plan. Mr. Eriole said the Planning Board can submit recommendations for amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. The plan is subject to SEQRA review, public comment and county review, etc. It's a fairly broad process because even though you may be only asking for a few amendments, I don't think the Village Board of Trustees, in a process like this, would want to limit it to a fairly precise set of amendments. Also, if you change the Comprehensive Plan, part of the premise for that is that it then becomes your guiding document for any amendments you make to your code in order to tend the Village toward this new comprehensive plan that you've got. That being the case, the potential impacts of the changes to the code that it might require are part of that SEQRA review, and that's one of

Village of Pawling Planning Board Minutes

the things that can lengthen that process and even sometimes lead to a GEIS (General Environmental Impact Statement.) It doesn't have to, but it can. So I just want to let you know that there's certainly nothing wrong with making that suggestion. I think it is on the Village Board's mind, and I do think they've got a little bit of money to start the process of analyzing some of the things that are of concern.

Member Pennelle commented that he's really concerned about the infrastructure and said he knows there are both federal and state grants for water. They're out there; you have to apply for them. How many hits is this mane going to take? You've only got one main coming into the Village. Mr. Eriole said (Inaudible, too many people talking at the same time). Member Pennelle said like Lou said, I don't want to see it outside. I said why not? What's wrong with a green tank outside or putting it on the roof? Ms. LoBrutto asked Mr. Pennelle what his issue is with the tank being in the basement if they have a pump. Mr. Pennelle said electrical can short out and not get the water out. That's your initial firefighting source until the fire department gets there. That's your initial water supply, and if that fails, they're building good buildings, but they will go fast. Ms. LoBrutto said I just want to distinguish that if you want to make a zoning amendment that is in line with the existing comprehensive plan, you still have to go through county review, but it doesn't have the same long process. Mr. Eriole said if you wanted to get right to the heart of the matter with a certain amendment and then just ask Caren and me, for instance, on that particular issue, to take a look at the existing comprehensive plan to make sure it's not contrary to that plan, you could do that. It would be a much faster approach to a specific solution. Mr. Pennelle said I'm afraid of us running out of water for even regular domestic water in the Village. Mr. Musella said I'm confident we have enough domestic water. You have the Umshied Wells and the Lower Baxter Green, and they're pumping good water.

Adjournment

*Member Musella motioned to adjourn until the April 9th, 2024 Planning Board meeting.
Member Pennelle seconded the Motion. The motion passed with all present in favor.*

Submitted by:



Vivian Nikolatos

Planning Board Secretary

PB Secretary

From: Curt Johnson, RA <cjohnson@jantile.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2024 12:05 PM
To: PB Secretary
Subject: Pawling Commons

Hi, Viv, The answers below (in red) are from InSite as they pertain to stormwater issues raised in the email from Sunset Avenue residents as well as the email from Philip Ceradini. I will forward my response letter to the Sunset Avenue residents to you in separate email.

Curt

Sunset Avenue
March 10, 2024

Stormwater Management and Construction Concerns:

We are currently concerned about potential storm drainage issues and the impact on our properties during construction. We have had our basements flood due to the drain being blocked during construction. We suggest exploring alternative liners or drainage solutions to address concerns about water mitigation, particularly when the current liner impedes the flow of water drainage.

We hope you've considered the importance of backup storage capacity, emergency bypass, and overflow mechanisms to the new Infiltration System. Retaining the existing storm drain in the back corner could provide an extra layer of reassurance in optimizing stormwater management.

The post-construction stormwater management practices for the project have been designed in accordance with the NYSDEC requirements which requires project to offset the increase in stormwater runoff from the proposed development. A design point (Design Point 1) on the southern property line was utilized in the project SWPPP to analyze the stormwater runoff directed towards the neighboring properties on Sunset Avenue in the current and post-development conditions. The SWPPP has been reviewed by the Town Engineering Consultant (LaBella) and all comments have been addressed to meet the local and state stormwater requirements. Therefore, there is a reduction in peak runoff flow and volume in the post-development condition at all points where stormwater runoff leaves the project site, including the neighboring properties to the south on Sunset Avenue.

The infiltration system on the west side of the site has been sized to provide a storage volume greater than the volume of runoff from the 1-year, 24-hour storm event as well as full infiltrate the stormwater runoff from the stormwater runoff from the 10-year, 24-hour storm event. There is only a very small amount of runoff which bypasses the infiltration system during the 10-year storm event and discharges to the proposed level spreader. This is a significant improvement compared to the last several decades.

My daughter, Jessica and her husband, Brian, live at 14 Sunset Ave. The rear yard of their single family home backs up to the southwest corner of the Pawling Commons project. For years this commercial parcel, now Pawling Commons, has been a major problem for all residential neighbors downhill from this site. Every public official that we have managed to get out there over the years have come to the same conclusion..."this was done all wrong, it never should have been allowed." Storm water was draining off the rear portion of the site onto the adjacent properties unimpeded. Originally built, in the 1970's I believe, ... who knows what went on then. Now here we are in 2024 worrying about the same issues. Yards and basements of these adjacent homes were regularly flooded with every moderate rain storm. And

continue today with far less regularity however. Prior to the construction of the original 70's project there was no drainage problems according to the former owners until the grocery store was constructed. While I believe that "Pawling Commons" is basically a good project for the village, I would hope they will also be a good neighbor. I think they are making a respectable attempt at responding to community concerns. I know the site engineering firm and they are one of the best.

My lingering concern is this southerly property line needs an unusual amount of focus to finally rectify this issue as much as possible....I don't think we're quite there yet. A year or two ago some mitigation was done and it seemed to help a lot...but not completely.

The plan I saw on line shows a large cul-tec farm in the lower corner of the site. I'm sure it will help control the surface drainage ...my question would be about lateral seepage during and after large rain events. Not unlike a septic system that has a clay barrier to stop lateral drift of liquids. I'm sure this can or was reviewed by the design engineers.

My next point is more of a request. Can we get a poured concrete curb...say 18" wide and 24" above finished grade for the entire length of the area of concern on that property line? It would have to be deep enough not to be undermined by erosion. It would act as a dam so NO water from this development ends up in my daughters yard or basement. Part of this request would be to completely eliminate the proposed level spreader overflow. It's creating the same potential damaging drainage issue. Couldn't this be moved to a less dangerous spot...or somehow provide a large sump to send it forward for gravity flow to the road if and when needed.

Now I'm not a site engineer...just a lowly architect...these suggestions might not all be reasonable...but I think they communicate the grave level of concern here. This is the LAST chance we have to fix this. I think every effort should be made to resolve it as close to 100% as we can get.

We appreciate the acknowledgement of the efforts put forward by the applicant to date to try and work with the neighboring residents and address their concerns with stormwater runoff from the project site. As stated in the response to the comments received by "Residents of Sunset Avenue" dated March 10, 2024, the proposed stormwater management practices onsite have been designed in accordance with the local and state stormwater requirements to mitigate stormwater impacts to the downstream areas from the proposed development. With that being said, we have designed the stormwater management facilities to also provide further resolve to the issues known on the southern neighboring properties.

As far as the requested concrete curb, unlike a septic system which is typically 12"-18" below existing grade, the bottom of the proposed infiltration system is 4.5' below the finish grade which significantly reduces the potential for lateral seepage from the system. A concrete curb in this location would be a costly improvement with little to no benefit to the downstream neighbors.

Based on the existing topography onsite, the location of the proposed level spreader can not be relocated. Based on the soil testing and finished grade in the area of the proposed infiltration system, the infiltration units can not be raised or lowered any further.

Finally, the project will make all attempts to provide a stormwater design which provides a benefit to the neighboring properties but it should be noted that during the construction of the proposed 3-story multi-family building on the east side of the site, groundwater was observed during excavation for the footings. Although the project will make every effort to control the surface runoff from the project site, the neighboring residents may still encounter drainage issues and flooding in their basements due to subsurface conditions during extreme storm events which are out of the applicants control.

Curt Johnson, RA
Architect



P: 845.493.0235

63 East Main Street • Pawling , NY, 12564

PB Secretary

From: jess32brian@verizon.net
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 1:22 PM
To: Kirk; Giada Radicchi; ANTHONY & JENNIFE PANDOLFO; Cheryl; Kevin O'Connell; PB Secretary
Subject: Re: March 12 Planning Board Letter

Thank you!!!!!!!

On Monday, March 11, 2024 at 09:11:17 AM EDT, PB Secretary <pbsecy@villageofpawling.org> wrote:

Hi Jessica,

Received... I will forward this to the Planning Board and Consultants. Thank you.

Vivian Nikolatos, Secretary

Village of Pawling

Building, Planning & Zoning Department

Office Hours: 8 am – 4 pm (Monday – Friday)

Direct: 1+ 845-855-1128

Fax: 1+ 845-855-9317

9 Memorial Avenue

Pawling, NY 12564

Email: pbsecy@villageofpawling.org

Website: www.villageofpawling.org



From: jess32brian@verizon.net [mailto:jess32brian@verizon.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2024 7:03 PM
To: PB Secretary <pbsecy@villageofpawling.org>; Kirk <kedleman@hotmail.com>; Giada Radicchi <gradicchi@gmail.com>; ANTHONY & JENNIFE PANDOLFO <pandolfos@comcast.net>; Cheryl <cheryllmoran@yahoo.com>; Kevin O'Connell <oconnellkevinj23@gmail.com>
Subject: March 12 Planning Board Letter

Sunset Avenue

March 10, 2024

Pawling Village Planning Board

Pawling, New York

Subject: Concerns Regarding Construction Project Impacting Sunset Avenue Residents

Dear Members of the Pawling Village Planning Board and Pawling Commons,

We hope this letter finds you well. As residents of Sunset Avenue, we would like to express our concerns and considerations regarding the ongoing large-scale construction project behind our properties. We appreciate the progress being made and understand the importance of the project for the community. However, we would like to bring your attention to specific issues related to landscaping, lighting, demolition, asbestos and lead paint removal, stormwater management, and construction concerns.

Landscaping and Lighting:

As the landscaping and lighting for the project are being designed, we strongly urge the inclusion of thoughtful features to address potential issues. Specifically, we recommend the incorporation of fencing, evergreen trees, and motion-sensitive lighting. These elements are crucial to mitigate concerns about privacy and continuous light intrusion into our yards. By considering these factors, the project can enhance both aesthetics and the well-being of the Sunset Avenue community.

Demolition and Asbestos Mitigation:

With the old building behind Sunset homeowners scheduled for demolition, it is imperative for residents to receive assurance regarding asbestos mitigation and the final demolition process. We request clear communication to keep homeowners informed about the asbestos mitigation plan, ensuring transparency about the safety measures being implemented. Additionally, providing advanced notice of the demolition date will allow residents to take precautions such as keeping windows shut and refraining from

planning outdoor events to minimize potential exposure to dust and debris. Open and timely communication will contribute to a safer and more informed community during the demolition process.

Stormwater Management and Construction Concerns:

We are currently concerned about potential storm drainage issues and the impact on our properties during construction. We have had our basements flood due to the drain being blocked during construction. We suggest exploring alternative liners or drainage solutions to address concerns about water mitigation, particularly when the current liner impedes the flow of water drainage.

We hope you've considered the importance of backup storage capacity, emergency bypass, and overflow mechanisms to the new Infiltration System. Retaining the existing storm drain in the back corner could provide an extra layer of reassurance in optimizing stormwater management.

We would also like to know who to contact for water concerns and/or construction in the future.

In conclusion, we hope that these concerns and recommendations are taken into account during the planning and execution of the construction project. We believe that open communication and proactive measures will contribute to a positive relationship between the project and the Sunset Avenue residents. Thank you for your attention to these matters. We look forward to continued collaboration to ensure the success of the project while maintaining the quality of life for Sunset Avenue residents.

Sincerely,

Residents of Sunset Ave

Kevin O'Connell

Kirk Edleman

Anthony Fortugno

Veronica Fortugno

Brian Kelley

Jessica Wood-Kelley

Cherly Moran

Tom Moran

AJ Pandolfo

Jenny Pandolfo

Giada Radicchi

Marc Radicchi

Cc

Robert Pfister, Jr.

Caren Lo Brutto

Dave Daniels

Chris Maeder

Jean Milord

Lou Musella

Peter Pennelle

Vivian Nikolatos

Curt Johson

PB Secretary

From: PB Secretary
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 9:26 AM
To: Robert Pfister robertpfisterjr@icloud.com; Lou Musella loumusella@gmail.com; 'snowplow26@aol.com'; Liguori, Marie
Cc: Arthur Guzzo; Building Inspector; cmaeder@labellapc.com; Drury, Sara; Ed Larkin (Elarkin@Labellapc.com); Joe Eriole; Lauri Taylor lauritaylor89@gmail.com; LoBrutto, Caren - clobritto@LaBellaPC.com; PB Secretary
Subject: FW: March 12 Planning Board Letter

Hi Everyone,

Please see below for a letter of public comments from Sunset Avenue residents regarding tomorrow's Pawling Commons public hearing. Thank you.

Vivian Nikolatos, Secretary

Village of Pawling

Building, Planning & Zoning Department

Office Hours: 8 am – 4 pm (Monday – Friday)

Direct: 1+ 845-855-1128

Fax: 1+ 845-855-9317

9 Memorial Avenue

Pawling, NY 12564

Email: pbsecy@villageofpawling.org

Website: www.villageofpawling.org



From: jess32brian@verizon.net [mailto:jess32brian@verizon.net]

Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2024 7:03 PM

To: PB Secretary <pbsecy@villageofpawling.org>; Kirk <kedleman@hotmail.com>; Giada Radicchi <gradicchi@gmail.com>; ANTHONY & JENNIFE PANDOLFO <pandolfos@comcast.net>; Cheryl <cheryllmoran@yahoo.com>; Kevin O'Connell <oconnellkevinj23@gmail.com>

Subject: March 12 Planning Board Letter

Sunset Avenue

March 10, 2024

Pawling Village Planning Board

Pawling, New York

Subject: Concerns Regarding Construction Project Impacting Sunset Avenue Residents

Dear Members of the Pawling Village Planning Board and Pawling Commons,

We hope this letter finds you well. As residents of Sunset Avenue, we would like to express our concerns and considerations regarding the ongoing large-scale construction project behind our properties. We appreciate the progress being made and understand the importance of the project for the community. However, we would like to bring your attention to specific issues related to landscaping, lighting, demolition, asbestos and lead paint removal, stormwater management, and construction concerns.

Landscaping and Lighting:

As the landscaping and lighting for the project are being designed, we strongly urge the inclusion of thoughtful features to address potential issues. Specifically, we recommend the incorporation of fencing, evergreen trees, and motion-sensitive lighting. These elements are crucial to mitigate concerns about privacy and continuous light intrusion into our yards. By considering these factors, the project can enhance both aesthetics and the well-being of the Sunset Avenue community.

Demolition and Asbestos Mitigation:

With the old building behind Sunset homeowners scheduled for demolition, it is imperative for residents to receive assurance regarding asbestos mitigation and the final demolition process. We request clear communication to keep homeowners informed about the asbestos mitigation plan, ensuring transparency about the safety measures being implemented. Additionally, providing advanced notice of the demolition date will allow residents to take precautions such as keeping windows shut and refraining from planning outdoor events to minimize potential exposure to dust and debris. Open and timely communication will contribute to a safer and more informed community during the demolition process.

Stormwater Management and Construction Concerns:

We are currently concerned about potential storm drainage issues and the impact on our properties during construction. We have had our basements flood due to the drain being blocked during construction. We suggest exploring alternative liners or drainage solutions to address concerns about water mitigation, particularly when the current liner impedes the flow of water drainage.

We hope you've considered the importance of backup storage capacity, emergency bypass, and overflow mechanisms to the new Infiltration System. Retaining the existing storm drain in the back corner could provide an extra layer of reassurance in optimizing stormwater management.

We would also like to know who to contact for water concerns and/or construction in the future.

In conclusion, we hope that these concerns and recommendations are taken into account during the planning and execution of the construction project. We believe that open communication and proactive measures will contribute to a positive relationship between the project and the Sunset Avenue residents. Thank you for your attention to these matters. We look forward to continued collaboration to ensure the success of the project while maintaining the quality of life for Sunset Avenue residents.

Sincerely,

Residents of Sunset Ave

Kevin O'Connell
Kirk Edleman
Anthony Fortugno
Veronica Fortugno
Brian Kelley
Jessica Wood-Kelley
Cherly Moran
Tom Moran
AJ Pandolfo
Jenny Pandolfo
Giada Radicchi
Marc Radicchi

Cc
Robert Pfister, Jr.
Caren Lo Brutto
Dave Daniels
Chris Maeder
Jean Milord
Lou Musella
Peter Pennelle
Vivian Nikolatos
Curt Johson



***Village of Pawling Planning Board
9 Memorial Avenue
Pawling, NY 12564***

Tel: (845) 855-1128

Fax: (845) 855-9317

Email: pbsecy@villageofpawling.org

**Robert Pfister Jr.
Chair**

AGENDA

**DATE: Tuesday, March 12th, 2024
7:00 P. M.**

- 1. Opening of Meeting, Roll Call and Pledge of Allegiance**
- 2. 28 Walnut Street (Subdivision)**
- 3. Pawling Commons (Amended Site Plan)**
- 4. Kingdom Hall of Jehovah's Witnesses (Site Plan Application)**
- 5. 15 Memorial Avenue (Change of Use)**
- 6. Approval of Minutes (January 24, 2024)**
- 7. Old Business**
- 8. Adjournment**