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PRESENT: Aaron Cioppa Chairman, Jay Erickson Vice Chairman, Gregory Bernard, Steven Jobe, Mark Friedman, Dr. Thomas Bloom and Jennifer Coleman.

ALSO PRESENT: Mike Liquori Esq. and Brendan Liberati Esq. from the firm of Hogan, Rossi and Liquori LLP, Ronald J. Gainer P.E. and Chris Robbins from SLR Planning firm.

CONTENTS: Starkdale Park farms Inc. Site Plan, Dylan and Regina Pignatelli Environmental Permit Minutes and New Business.

Chairman Cioppa opened the meeting at 7:00p.m. and then led the salute to the flag.

STARKDALE FARMS INC. Further Discussion/ Site Plan

*Starkdale Park*

West Dover Road

Pawling, NY 12564

Grid Number: 134089-6958-00-673657

 134089-7058-00-022710

 134089-6958-00-827687

 Mr. Nicholas Baron from Hart Howerton, Ms. Sarah Yacket from Buckhurst Fish & Jacquemart, Mrs. Jennifer Gray from Keane and Beane Law Firm, Mr. Adam Thyberg from Insite Engineering, Mr. Michael McCormack from Liscum McCormack VanVoohis Architects, Mr. Moish Ziv landowner were present.

 Chairman Cioppa began by introducing Mr. Chris Robbins from SLR Planning Consulting firm. He made an announcement that that tonight’s Starkdale Farms Inc. meeting is not a public hearing, therefore, the Board will not be taking comments. Nonetheless, he encourages constitutes and organization to submit written letters to the Board and to include JoAnne Daley to ensure all letters are added to the Board files/records.

 Mr. Baron said since they last appeared before the Board on September 03, 2024, they wanted to begin by providing updates to the Board. They continue to refine the project details in terms of layout, programming and other design elements along West Dover Road by offering a diverse array of housing opportunities. These options would include single families and older individuals seeking to downsize. The property primarily includes residential housing components, recreational and outdoor accessible facilities, amenities and programs for the overall project. The East Ridge and Cascade neighborhoods proposed require internal roadways to connect from the Dover side of the project to the Pawling side.

 Mrs. Gray Esq. said they are before the Board to discuss the zoning petition. In addition to the plan design, they understand the requirement to appear before the Town Board for a zoning petition. They are here seeking a referral from the Planning Board to the Town Board on the zoning petition. We understand the Town Board is the authoritative Board for the zoning petition. As part of tonight’s discussion they wanted to explain their zoning approach to rezone the Town of Pawling’s three (3) parcels from Residential-R2 to a Planned Development District (PDD). They believe the Planned Development District (PDD) is a good fit for this overall project, especially when taking into consideration the mixed uses. A commercial component that expands into the Town of Dover market square area. The Planned Development District (PDD) they are proposing offers dimensionally required amendments that they are seeking as far as density, access and setbacks. These slight tweaks suggested for Planned Development District (PDD) written changes are for access to and from NYS Route 22. The change sought would be access off of West Dover Road. The next two additional tweaks proposed are to specifically add Agricultural practices as a permitted “use”. The entire area around “The Crescent” is dedicated to agricultural along with specific setbacks

 Mr. Bernard said the applicants are seeking an amendment to the building height. Their proposal is for 50 to 60 foot building heights.

 Mrs. Gray responded, yes that is correct. The Planning Board has been provided the zoning petition. They’re looking to get in front of the Town Board to discuss the zoning petition.

 Mr. Freidman asked if this Planned Development District (PDD) is only effective in Pawling or site wide?

 Mrs. Gray responded the zoning petition to amend the Planned Development District (PDD) is only for the Town of Pawling. The Town of Pawling cannot change zoning for the Town of Dover. They submitted a similar Planned Unit Development (PUD) zoning petition to the Town of Dover.

 Mr. Freidman asked what the uses are proposed in the Pawling Planned Development District (PDD) for the Pawling parcels?

 Mrs. Gray responded primarily uses are a variety of residential housing types for the Town of Pawling.

 Mr. Friedman said in the Town of Pawling’s Planned Development District (PDD) there is a component for a variety of residential housing, and commercial and industrial.

 Mrs. Gray responded the way they are viewing the Planned Development District (PDD) is the project spans throughout both the Town of Pawling and the Town of Dover. When you look at the project as a whole, the project includes a market square area (north end of the site) hotel, conference and event centers in the Town of Dover. These different features of the project create mixed uses.

 Mr. Freidman said the Code of the Town of Pawling only governs Town of Pawling lands, not the Town of Dover.

 Mrs. Gray said that is correct. They are viewing the site as a whole, which includes mixed uses. They specifically do not want to compete directly with the Village of Pawling commercial district.

 Mr. Freidman asked why the applicant believes the Planned Development District (PDD) is most appropriate use of zoning, versus another type of rezoning or variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals. The current Planned Development District (PDD) along NYS Route 22 has a much different development intent as opposed to how it relates to the West Dover Road Residential-R2 Pawling parcels.

 Mrs. Gray responded this all depends upon how the Board looks at the Planning Development District (PDD). It matters if you’re specifically looking at only the Pawling portion of the project or the totality of the 600 plus acres in both Pawling and Dover.

 Mr. Freidman said the Pawling Planning Board is looking at the project strictly based on the Code of the Town of Pawling. He reiterated, why does the applicant believe that the Planned Development District (PDD) is most appropriate zoning request by the applicant, versus another type of rezoning or variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals. The Pawling Planned Development District (PDD) requires residential, commercial and industrial components

 Mrs. Gray said as explained they are looking at the project a whole. That’s why they proposed the Planned Development District (PDD). If there is a discussion on an alternate type of zoning proposal, they are open to those discussions with the Board. It is not their intention to procedurally apply for area variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

 Chairman Cioppa asked why the applicant wouldn’t create their own Planned Development District (PDD) that suits the Pawling parcels? Currently you are speaking about the overall project which encompasses both Pawling and Dover. There is a bit of confusion here, because this Board is addressing only the Pawling parcels zoning. He does not understand this approach of including Dover as far as these zoning amendments.

 Mrs. Gray said there is an option to create a “Planned Development District (PDD) 2.0”. This would be another approach to zoning. Normally, when a developer enters into a community, the developer tries to work closely within the existing zoning code framework. They don’t try to create an entirely new zoning district.

 Chairman Cioppa said one item the applicant is requesting are building heights of 55 to 60 feet. The Town Planning Board spent years on the current Planned Development District (PDD) code. The Town did not want 55 to 60 foot building heights. If the Town changes the current Planned Development District (PDD) code provisions, then the building heights along the NYS Route 22 corridor also changes. It is important for everyone to understand if the Town changes the Planned Development District (PDD) code then those zoning changes occur within the established NYS Route 22 district. The Town researched and spent many hours to refine the Code of the Town of Pawling Planned Development District (PDD). He asked why not create your own Planned Development District (PDD) zoning that suits the West Dover Road site.

 Mrs. Gray responded this could be another option they are willing to consider.

 Vice Chairman Erickson said the instinct to work with what is already within our code clearly is developer’s intent. What I am hearing from the members of the Board is that what is being presented, so far, is not a best fit for the West Dover Road parcels. He was on the Board during the time period that the Town refined and revised the Planned Development District (PDD) specifically for NYS Route 22. What your proposing is not the intent of the NYS Route 22 corridor Planned Development District (PDD), which included components of residential, commercial and industrial. What the applicant has articulated is that the Pawling portion of the project is strictly residential. The commercial components are to be located within the Town of Dover. He asked if that is correct for a synopsis on the Pawling side of the proposed project?

 Mr. Baron said the small restaurants are to be located within in Dover. The main market square area clearly will be located in Dover. There are some small pieces of the site that remain to be worked out.

 Vice Chairman Erickson asked - is it correct that the applicant is only proposing residential housing for the Town of Pawling?

 Dr. Bloom asked what is the percentage of the approved commercials square footage that can be built within the current Planned Development District (PDD) local law.

 Mr. Freidman said forty 40 % of the Planned Development District (PDD) is to be built out as commercial.

 Ms. Coleman said that 30% also has to be dedicated to open space, to remain as preserved land.

 Vice Chairman Erickson said the plans submitted only illustrate residential housing development in Pawling. Why would the applicant be asking for commercial and or industrial components of a proposed Planned Development District (PPD) when they are only proposing residential housing?

 Mrs. Gray said as they mentioned at the start, they are only looking at the project as a whole. We understand the Board is looking at this proposal for Pawling only.

 Vice Chairman Erickson said the proposed zoning code petition is for Pawling only. The Board is discussing a planning procedural perspective for the proposed zone changes located in Pawling. He explained that the applicant is proposing “A“ zoning changes for Dover and “B” zoning changes for Pawling. There are two separate asks, “A” asks for Dover and “B’ asks for Pawling. It’s not the same for both Towns. The asking for “B” is specifically for Pawling only. The applicant is asking for more than what has been presented on the site plans in “use” alone. This is a bit confusing. The Board has to consider - are you thinking this Planned Development District (PDD) is good as written, so let’s just go ahead with residential housing, ignoring the other commercial and industrial components?

 Mrs. Gray said it is what they thought was the best fit. This is a back and forth discussion. Tonight is the first time they are hearing the Board’s thoughts to the contrary of the Planned Development District (PDD). It might not be the best fit. We are happy to consider alternative zoning, including a brand-new district.

 Vice Chairman Erickson said, lets go through a thought experiment. Currently the zoning is a Residential-R2 and you are possible seeking a “Planned Development District 2.0”. What can you not do in a “Planned Development District-R” compared to what you currently can do in a “Residential-R2 Zoning district, the current zoning?

 Mrs. Gray said it is mostly dimensional, along with some of the non-conformities with respect to the Residential-R2 Zoning district.

 Vice Chairman Erickson clarified for the record, which this means not in terms of Residential-R2 density or size of the dwellings?

 Mrs. Gray responded the “dimensional” means the proposed increase in density for the single family and multi-unit housing. She then referred the question to Mr. Thyberg to answer.

 Mr. Thyberg said where we depart from the Residential-R2 Zoning regulations is in the proposed build out areas of the “The Crescent”, and the West Ridge as multifamily housing and the East Ridge is single family. That’s where we depart from the Residential-R2 density.

 Vice Chairman Erickson said the Code of the Town of Pawling allows for cluster multifamily housing.

 Mrs. Gray said the way she read the Code of the Town of Pawling, the multifamily housing allows for 3 or more residential houses.

 Vice Chairman Erickson said in terms of the proposed development, what is the type of multifamily housing the applicant is requesting?

 Mr. Thyberg said in “The Crescent” portion of the development, they are proposing 22 units in the individual buildings. It is a basic apartment housing. The West Ridge is also multifamily. Nonetheless, he does not remember the actual number of units. In total they are proposing several hundred units.

 Ms. Coleman said “The Crescent” is comprised of twelve (12) buildings with a total of 264 units/apartments. She then asked for Mr. Thyberg to clarify the number of units and building sizes proposed in “The West Ridge” buildings.

 Mr. Thyberg said 264 multifamily units for The Crescent” and the “West Ridge” is very slightly under 100 multifamily units.

 Mr. Freidman clarified that is over 350 units for “The Crescent” and “West Ridge proposed areas of development. Nonetheless, these numbers of close to 364 multifamily units do not include other proposed development within Pawling. He asked how many acres are located in the Town of Pawling?

 Mr. Thyberg responded Town of Pawling (3 parcels), 134089-7058-00-022710 141.42± acres, 1348089-6958-00-827687, 2.138 ±acres, 134089-6958-00-673657 72.5± acres. He said approximately 220 acres.

 Chairman Cioppa asked what the mix of housing units is. Will the units be bought and sold, rentals or will some of the units be for staff housing?

 Mrs. Gray said presently they have no defined level of detail for the usage of proposed housing. The housing proposed is a mixed use.

 Chairman Cioppa asked several questions. If lodging is proposed within the Town of Pawling, how is the workers/staff housing rental percentage packages going to be worked out? Would that include the staff/workers’ breakdown of paying a portion of the rent and working off the balance?

 Vice Chairman Erickson explained that according to the Code of the Town of Pawling for a subdivision, lot count uses simple math. The parcel is estimated at 220± acres. For a Residential-R2 Zoning district, the total number of allowable lots is therefore approximately a maximum 110 units. The current proposal presented for a mixed development of multifamily and single family is a minimum of 360. These numbers far exceed the maximum allowable build-out.

He went on to say, let’s take out the commercial aspiration of the plans for discussion purposes. It is clear that the density is above the allowable units. He asked what is the applicant’s intention for the West Ridge multifamily housing, which is being proposed on steep slopes? The Code of the Town of Pawling has strict environmental ordinances not to allow building on steep slopes. These ordinances were adopted for the Town’s protection of our ridge lines, steep slopes and viewshed. What is the applicant’s intention, to request both a large density increase along with potential build out on steep slopes?

 Mr. Thyberg responded that it is true, the proposed area to build out the West Ridge is located on steep slopes. Their plans are to request waivers from the Town to build out these areas.

 Vice Chairman Erickson asked if this request has been added to the drafted petition for zoning changes?

 Mrs. Gray said as far as a steep slope build out, as they move through the planning process, they will request waivers for these environmental permits required by the Town. Presently, the steep slopes build out is not part of their petition to rezone.

 Vice Chairman Erickson said the Code of the Town of Pawling would not allow build out on the steep slopes. As with many people from the Town of Pawling, he knows that mountain well. The topography is steep. He is trying to simplify the project relating to important points, such as the viewshed, build-out on steep slopes. The Town is a dedicated Appalachian Trail community.

 Ms. Coleman said since the Board is discussing housing units, in her opinion the applicant has not provided the number of units for “The East Ridge”.

 Mr. Baron responded “The East Ridge” proposal is for 27 single family lots.

 Ms. Coleman said the applicant suggested additional usage for the Planned Development District PDD. What types of additional uses is proposed?

 Mr. Baron said from a design perspective, an agricultural portion/use would be farming, and farm stands. Currently some agricultural farming is ongoing at the site.

 Vice Chairman Erickson said agricultural uses are presently allowed in a Residential-R2 Zoning district.

 Mr. Baron said their objective is to reach the density required for this project.

 Ms. Coleman said it appears that the elephant in the room, is to have an opening for an evolution to grow in the future. I am reading between the lines here. The Board is trying to identify what that is. If the applicant is not only coming before the Board to reach their density housing numbers, what is the other evolutions of uses for this parcel? What are the other current and future visions?

 Mr. Baron said it is primarily housing density. The planning and design presented is the current proposal before the Board.

 Ms. Coleman said there is a discrepancy in the total parcel acreage. The applicant states the parcel is estimated at 220± acres. The actual acreage is 216± acres. It is important to correct this information in all documents submitted to the Board.

 Mr. Freidman summarized what is being presented. The applicant is seeking a Planned Development District (PDD), using the current Code of the Town of Pawling with revisions. The proposal is not really a Planned Development District PDD, it is enhanced housing density zoning. The issue before the Board is that this currently is Residential-R2 Zoning, which is allowable at an estimated 110 housing units. The Board is looking at a minimum of 380 housing (single family and multifamily) units. The proposed housing density is extremely high for what is currently a rural area. There are significant steep slope and viewshed issues that have not been addressed by the applicant. As shown on the site map, the Appalachian Trail is visible from this site. The AT is going to look right down on this development. He has hiked up to the Cat Rocks, and understand that the “Crescent” build-out will be very prominent. It is quite clear the proposed project density consists of too many units. He asked if the “East Ridge” could be viewed from Cat Rocks and or the surrounding viewshed?

 Mr. Baron said under the full SEQRA Environmental Impact Statement they will complete a full detail viewshed analysis (photos and a 3-d model). There is wetland, wetland buffers and greenspace between the “Crescent” and “East Ridge” that create a natural buffer.

 Mr. Freidman said the point of a Town rezoning a Planned Development District (PDD) or an alternate type of zoning for enhanced density is that there are tradeoffs with commercial and industrial development and other aspects of development beneficial to the community. With the majority of this project located in the Town of Dover, it is not entirely clear how it benefits Pawling for the enhanced density requested. He understands the pretty pictures, and all the recreation proposed. His recommendation to the Town Board is that the benefits to Pawling be spelled out clear, concise with extreme details on any type of enhanced housing density before any consideration for a rezone.

 Mrs. Gray said one unique portion of the project is that the Pawling Central School District is wholly located within the Town of Dover. The School District tax revenues from the market square area will go to PCSD. The developer’s opinion is that this is a significant benefit to Pawling Central School District.

 Dr. Bloom said the density might outweigh the school budget revenues. It all depends upon who will occupy the housing units, and how many additional children will attend Pawling schools. At one point, will increased school children trigger the need to construct a new school, which then burdens the remaining landowners throughout the entire Town and Village of Pawling? He asked how Dover tax revenue can be given to Pawling. This is incomprehensible that Pawling can receive tax revenue from another Town.

 Mrs. Gray said they will perform a fiscal analysis in detail on the tax revenues relating to what would be the tax burden for the Town of Pawling.

 Vice Chairman Erickson said it’s important to get ahead of that economic analysis. It will help set the conversation around the direction for a petition to rezone request. It is important to note that a Town Board does not have any obligation to entertain a zoning request. It’s a really big deal for Pawling. We are a rural community that wants to protect our bucolic nature and we are running out of those very bucolic open spaces. The applicant must provide backup data and analysis sooner rather than later. If you take out the commercial component, the economic equation has to balance. He also recommended the applicant figure out what number of units make economic sense, basically a comparison of the desired higher density and what is allowable per the current Code of the Town of Pawling. Presently, the applicant would not have to go through a petition to rezone for a build-out of 110± units. The current housing density requested is a huge “ask” to the Town.

He asked if the applicants have contacted National Parks Services and/or the Appalachian Trail relating to the viewshed, environmental concerns etc. It is important to begin conversations with these entities before moving forward. They are major stakeholders. The Appalachian Trail, and Town viewshed are unique and worth protecting.

 Mr. Baron responded that they have not contacted either entity.

 Mrs. Gray said this is one of several important issue to tackle. They are anxious to get a referral from the Planning Board to the Town Board on the rezoning petition amendments. In their opinion it is necessary to get a referral from the Planning Board to the Town Board.

 Vice Chairman Erickson said that, according to the Code of the Town of Pawling, there is no obligation for a referral from the Planning Board for the applicant to approach the Town Board. It makes sense for the Planning Board to be in communication with the Town Board throughout the process. The Planning Board has set up a Starkdale Park subcommittee, and we started having meetings with the Town of Dover Planning Board Starkdale subcommittee.

 Mr. Gainer said the primary issue that the applicant wanted to discuss with the Planning Board for tonight’s meeting is the petition to rezone.

 Mr. Liquori said tonight the Planning Board has provided feedback to the rezoning of the Planned Development District (PDD). The Planning team consultants will remain the same for both Boards. His office will be involved with the development of this project.

 Dr. Bloom said the density is a major issue. The applicant has to be realistic to the locations that could or could not be built upon (i.e. steep slopes). He wants the applicant to consider what Vice Chairman Erickson said this evening to evaluate the project as to what point the density makes sense compared to a lesser project build-out. The density presented is a large ask for this Town. Fiscal analysis reports, feasibility studies and components of the project need to be submitted and clarified before wasting everyone’s time and money.

 Ms. Coleman asked for clarification on the lodging component of the site plan. Is there lodging being proposed for the Pawling side of the project?

 Mr. Baron said they are proposing twelve 12 lodging cabins as part of the hospitality component of the resort. They are proposing lodging cabins in both Pawling and Dover. These cabins are located in the Town of Pawling.

 Ms. Coleman asked if the lodging cabins would be rental units within Pawling? These additional cabins increases the density between 380 or 390 housing units, whether it is dwellings sold, staff housing or rental units.

 Vice Chairman Erickson said the lodging or camping portion of a proposed plan should be reviewed as to whether they are permitted uses as to what currently is allowed pursuant to the Code of the Town for Pawling.

 Dr. Bloom asked if a phasing plan would be proposed? He would think that the Town of Dover would want to have the commercial component of the plan built out initially, and then the housing. What will a phasing plan look like between both Towns?

 Mr. Baron said during the later phases of the project, a phasing plan would be developed.

 Mrs. Gray said this evening dialog with the Planning Board has been productive. Chairman Cioppa said thanked the applicant for coming this evening.

DYLAN & REGINA PIGNATELLI Further Discussion/Environmental Permit

Old Route 22

Pawling, NY 12564

Grid Number: 134089-7057-00-352685

 Mr. Michael Gillespie from the firm of M. Gillespie & Associates, Jim, and Dylan Pignatelli landowners were present.

 Chairman Cioppa said the property is located at Old Route 22, consisting of 13.95± acres in an R-1 Zoning District. The applicant intends to construct a single-family residence. They have completed Dutchess County Board of Health approvals for a sanitary sewer disposal system and on-site well. The environmental permit application was referred to the Planning Board by Everett White, CEO/SMO and Walter Artus, Environmental Director. Due to the environmental constraints the project is under review by Mr. Ron Gainer.

 Mr. Gainer said the application before the Planning Board is for an Environmental Permit. Due to the extent of potential environmental impacts, the proposed design plans were referred to his office. The entire site is wooded, with many significant, mature trees within the proposed area of disturbance. A site inspection was conducted on Friday, December 13, 2024 with Mr. Pignatelli. The initial plans illustrate a very significant volume of materials to be excavated, possibly between 10,000 and 20,000 cubic yards. It is also noted that per code section 171-20 (“Permit Standards”) paragraph (B), “alteration of grade or disturbance to the natural vegetative cover on slopes greater than 30% shall be avoided”. The driveway is proposed to be constructed at grades of 15% over most of its length. The intent of the project creates such significant disturbance that the Board will likely want to perform a site inspection. Based upon the re-grading shown on the profile sheet, cuts of 15 feet or greater, up to as much as 28 feet, will be required over more than 350 feet of the driveway’s overall 1,050 foot length.

 Mr. Gillespie said no doubt this is not an easy piece of property to develop. We are trying to maintain driveway grade of 15%, in excess of the 10% permitted. There are a few ways to soften getting into the site. The site is comprised of steep grades, with large boulders. In terms of terracing we can excavate cuts for retaining walls using onsite materials. This information will be provided in their next site plan submission.

 Dr. Bloom and Mr. Gillespie had a conversation on acquiring a 911 number for an Old Route 22 residence.

 Vice Chairman Erickson asked if the landowner could acquire access from the Pawling Central School District or off of Prospect Road?

M. Pignatelli said that when they first were looking at this property, they spoke with Tom Basile, Code Enforcement Office. He stated no deeds were available for Prospect Street. The potential driveway access from Prospect Street consists of an 18 feet wide area. This area appears like it is owned by the Town.

 Mr. Pignatelli said they are willing to work out the potential use of this entrance. He is willing to construct a driveway around Mr. Talbot’s rose of sharon bushes.

 Vice Chairman Erickson said the paper road comes off of Prospect Street, opening up a possible option for potential access.

 Mr. Pignatelli said Tom Basile Code Enforcement Officer stated they could not use this Prospect Street access.

 Vice Chairman Erickson said as of right, you could not build a driveway, nonetheless, he is thinking practically. The applicant would be responsible to obtain legal approvals from the Town of Pawling.

 Mr. Pignatelli said going up this hill will consist of moving a lot of material. There are so many areas of depression that he believes, with boulders, they can set them to use as retaining walls with planting of pachysandra or myrtle, naturalizing the property and slowing the stormwater runoff down. This parcel is loaded with dead trees. He has someone coming to mark the trees to identify what are specimen trees that could be salvageable. His goal for the property is to construct a dwelling for his family (Jim and Regina Pignatelli) and then, at a later date, subdivide the property for his sons to build a home. He explained that was the main reason they bought this property, to construct a 1600 square foot ranch home and then in the near future his sons could build. They originally had the idea of a subdivision idea for the property. The property can be split several different ways as it’s located in a Residential 1, R1 zoning district.

 Mr. Erickson said the major concern is the significance of the steep slopes, driveway gradient and site disturbance to obtain what you are looking for as to access. The proposal is a hugh amount of land disturbance and expense. The Board also takes into consideration when these large rain events occur, what happens down slope. It is a concern of possible road washing out.

 Mr. Pignatelli said on both sides of the driveway they will have 2-foot shoulders, along with 6 or 7 ¾-inch gravel surface pull offs approved by the Fire Marshal. This is based upon the largest Pawling Fire trucks and emergency vehicles response. At the end of the driveway they are proposing 30 inch stormwater infiltrators in the pull-offs to collect stormwater. This way any stormwater runoff will go into the 2 to 4 feet shoulders and then stormwater water will run into the parking areas to the infiltrators.

 Mr. Bernard said that is all fine and good. The major problem is stabilizing the slopes. There are many mature large trees that have to be removed, resulting in bare unstable slopes. It does not matter if the driveway has proper stormwater runoff /stabilization. It is the bare slopes that have to be stabilized. The driveway cuts have to be extended way up the hill and it’s going to be very hard to maintain it such that the slopes don’t erode. Myrtle and pachysandra will not prevent the stormwater runoff coming downhill at a high velocity of speed during a major rain event. This is easily ununderstood based on the amount of steep slope disturbance, going uphill.

 Mr. Pignatelli responded that he wanted to include construction of tree wells.

 Mr. Bernard said the Board does not want to argue with you. The biggest problem is the major land disturbance to develop a driveway going up steep slopes.

 Mr. Erickson said the Board can go back and forth on the engineering aspect of the project. First they should consider alternative access.

 Mr. Freidman asked if there are plans to pave the driveway?

 Mr. Gillespie said based on the steep slopes, the driveway would be required to be paved.

 Mr. Freidman said 1,050 feet of paved driveway estimated cost with excavation site work to obtain access into one lot with the potential for a future subdivision is one million dollars.

 Mr. Gillespie said that is correct rough estimate for the site work and paving based upon the steep slopes and driveway gradient. Those numbers would be based upon work performed by an outside contractor. Mr. Pignatelli plans on performing the site excavation work himself, thus reducing the overall project cost.

 Mr. Freidman said the potential reduced cost could still be $500,000 to $700,00. It’s still labor and material. He asked if the cost to develop this driveway is even feasible?

 Mr. Gainer said that, given the significance of the construction required, it is important for the Board to understand what the applicant is proposing. The applicant and I walked the entire site, including Prospect Street. He explained to the applicant the very significant engineering that has to be done to access the property from Old Route 22. Mr. Pignatelli felt it would be difficult to acquire access from Prospect Street. He explained that the Board should not perform a site inspection until a better understanding of access is obtained. He agrees with the Board that the cost of access into this parcel is very significant and with the driveway extensive re-grading it doesn’t seem feasible to obtain access.

 Mr. Bernard said the proposed driveway side slopes appear to be designed as a 2:1 slope, which are very significant and will require stabilization to prevent erosion.

 Mr. Gainer said the entire driveway length involved, which will require formal, engineered retaining walls and then with 2:1 side slopes graded back to existing grades, this will require that they be armored in some way.

 Mr. Freidman asked what the driveway grades is?

 Mr. Gainer said that existing grades along the route of the proposed driveway are in excess of 30% to 35%. The site excavation for this site will a remarkable amount of design to get the access up this hill.

 Mr. Liquori said the applicant’s attorney or engineer should complete a title search for both parcel numbers, 134089-7057-10-380599 and 134089-7057-10346603 to examine their deeds, as well as a title search of the subdivision. There is a need to establish ownership. The applicant would have to follow Town law procedure for a 280a with the Town of Pawling to access the property from Prospect Street. As long as its more than 15 feet, they can use Prospect Street for an access.

 Vice Chairman Erickson suggested the applicant hire a land use attorney to understand the ownership rights/deeds and the Town’s 280a procedure.

 Mr. Gillespie said that coming in off of Prospect Street also has a level of details that require engineering (i.e. stream crossing /ravine area).

 Mr. Freidman suggested the applicant’s engineer submit a slope analysis and constraints map.

MINUTES:

 Motion by Ms. Coleman to approve the minutes of December 16, 2024 as read.

 Second by Mr. Freidman. Chairman Cioppa asked for discussion.

 All were in favor and the Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

 Chairman Cioppa said JoAnne Daley re-appointment letter was read into the records by Vice Chairman Jay Erickson.

 Motion by Vice Chairman Erickson to forward the re-appointment letter as read to the Town Board.

 Second by Dr. Bloom. Chairman Cioppa asked for discussion.

All were in favor and the Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

 On a Motion by Dr. Bloom and seconded by Ms. Coleman to adjourn the meeting at 8:45p.m. All were in favor and the Motion carried.

 Respectfully submitted,

****

 JoAnne Daley

 Recording Secretary

non-approved minutes