

 NY OFFICE

 74 Lafayette Avenue, Suite 501
 845.357.4411 Tel

 Suffern, NY 10901
 845.357.1896 Fax

NJ OFFICE 22 Paris Avenue, Suite 105 Rockleigh, NJ 07647

201.750.3527 Tel

June 1, 2022

Orangetown Town Board 26 Orangeburg Road Orangeburg, NY 10962

Attn: Orangetown Supervisor Kenny and Members of the Orangetown Town Board

Re: Gatto Lane Site Plan, Section 68.07, Block 2, Lot 1 Response to public comments from the May 24, 2022 Town Board meeting BE #20267

Dear Supervisor Kenny and Members of the Town Board:

We have the following responses to the public comments received at the May 24, 2022 Orangetown Town Board public hearing for the Gatto Lane zone change and PAC petition. Please note the names and comments were transcribed from notes taken at the meeting and not from a stenographer's report:

#### Carlos Real, 171 Gatto Lane

- Comment: 86% of forested area is coming down.
   Response: Comment noted; the current plan includes approximately three acres of lands in the buffer (30% of the site) to remain undisturbed.
- Comment: Increase in sewage and runoff, 38% increase in impervious surfaces.
   Response: Comment noted; there will be an increase in impervious surfaces. The PAC zone requires 40% minimum green space and the application proposes approximately 59.9% of green space.
- **Comment**: Retention pond.

**Response**: A retention pond will be part of the ultimate stormwater mitigation plan, which may be at grade or below ground. This will be determined during the Planning Board Site Plan review process.

• **Comment**: Guarantee of runoff.

**Response**: Stormwater detention will be designed in accordance with standard engineering practices to achieve no net increase in peak runoff rates and will be reviewed by the appropriate Town staff during the Site Plan approval process.

Comment: Checked yes that stormwater runoff will flow onto adjacent properties on the EAF.
 Response: Stormwater runoff flows onto adjacent properties under existing conditions. Each individual lot does not store all the stormwater runoff generated by rainfall events. The application will include at the Site Plan level detailed design to provide stormwater mitigation to provide "no net increase in peak runoff rates."

### Vanessa Lappens, Blauvelt Coupon

Comment: Prefer a park/partner with town.
 Response: Comment noted; a public park is not a suitable alternative at this time.

- *Comment*: Wants to purchase Pfizer property.
   **Response**: Not applicable to the current application.
- **Comment**: Wants exact building plans.
- Response: Comment noted; exact building floor plans will be provided for the Site Plan approval process. We note the applicant has agreed to reduce the number of units by 5% and eliminate three bedroom units, which are allowed by right as per the PAC zone bulk requirements.
- Comment: Build a less dense set of plans.
   Response: Comment noted; the current plans are less dense than the previous plans. Unit count has been reduced from 40 units to 38 units.
- **Comment:** Concerns regarding power, water, and emergency services.
  - **Response**: Potential significant impacts with respect to power, water and emergency services will be provided during the Site Plan approval process by the Planning Board. We note the project proposes to widen Gatto Lane and will provide separate emergency access through the site to Grotke Road. Access for emergency services was discussed in detail with the Town of Orangetown and will be addressed to the satisfaction of all appropriate agencies.
- **Comment:** Brooker Engineering has a conflict of interest.

**Response**: Brooker Engineering performs drainage reviews for the Town of Orangetown Planning Board. In the rare instances when Brooker Engineering has an application before the Planning Board or another conflict of interest, another engineering firm will perform the drainage review on the behalf of the Planning Board. The design engineer does not perform the reviews on behalf of the land use board.

• **Comment:** Look into tiny homes.

**Response**: Tiny homes are not practical for this site. This would result in longer roads and more sprawl throughout the site by introducing setbacks between many smaller buildings. The current design is more compact and centrally located.

### Unnamed man

• Comment: Likes woods.

**Response**: Comment noted; the application maintains the 50 feet buffers along the property lines as directed by the PAC code. These will remain wooded and supplemented with additional screening.

• **Comment:** Lack of recreation no clubhouse.

**Response**: Passive recreation consisting of community gathering spaces and walking paths have been added to the Site Plan, which exceeds the requirements directed by the code. The project is not of a sufficiently large scale to bear the cost of construction and future maintenance of a clubhouse building.

Comment: Not within walking distance of shopping.

**Response**: Walking distance to shopping is not a requirement for senior housing. The PAC code specifically has an allowable use of "other" for sites that are not within hamlets, i.e., not within walking distances to shopping.

### Comment: Gatto Lane is too small.

**Response**: Gatto is proposed to be widened to Town road standards as part of this application.

Comment: Concerns regarding wildlife.
 Response: Comment noted. The application includes buffer zones of no disturbance and will result in less clearing than what would result from a single family application development.

## <u>John Liltizen</u>

- Comment: What's the price?
   Response: The price will be determined by what the market will bear.
- **Comment**: Overdevelopment.

**Response**: We respectfully disagree with the categorization of the project as overdevelopment. The request for a zone change to R-15 is entirely compatible with the 16 acres of abutting zoned R-15 development to the east. The development of the site as per PAC density requirements would allow 40 units, with another potential 10 units per the bonus development clause in the zone, for a total of 50 units. The original application of 40 units has been reduced to 38 units, 24% less than what would be allowed if the bonus units were included.

Comment: Widening the road will cheapen the neighborhood.
 Response: Comment noted; the overwhelming sentiment from the public and Town is that Gatto Lane should be widened, regardless if this development occurs.

• **Comment:** Concerns regarding quality of life.

**Response**: Comment noted; the project represents a development of a wooded area. This will result in loss of trees and a change in the aesthetic of the neighborhood. By implementing the buffers, clustering the development in the center of the site, adding the age restriction for the future owners, and providing additional landscaping, the new development will result in a community that will not impact the quality of life any different from any other development of this site.

### Rose Cohill

Comment: Questioned legality of having one exit.
 Response: An emergency access road to Grotke Road is included in the Concept Site Plan.

### Joy Johnson 26 Gatto Lane

- Comment: Truss construction is common by Toll.
   Response: Comment noted; all building construction will meet all applicable state and local building codes. This may or may not include truss construction.
- **Comment:** Problems with fire trucks.

**Response**: Emergency access will be improved as a result of this project. This will be designed to the satisfaction of the Town Highway Department, fire inspector, and engineering department.

# • **Comment**: Road was flooded.

**Response**: We will coordinate with the Town to incorporate any historical flood observations into the design of the improved road.

# • **Comment:** Rezoned for eight houses.

**Response**: Comment noted; the current R-40 zoning would allow nine dwellings. As discussed elsewhere, the applicant is seeking a zone change in accordance with the adject 16 acres of R-15 zoning.

• **Comment:** Doesn't think there is a need for it.

**Response**: Comment noted; Toll Brothers is a nationwide developer with particular expertise in market analysis. This is a modest project by their standards and they confirmed through their own internal due diligence there is a need for this PAC style housing stock.

Comment: Worried about senior housing on the other five acres that Pfizer owns.
 Response: Comment noted, but not relevant to this application. The applicant does not own the Pfizer land on the south side of Gatto Lane. If this land is developed in the future, that application will be subject to land use approvals from the relevant land use boards.

## Randolf F. Johnson, Gatto Lane

• **Comment:** R-15 is too dense.

**Response**: The abutting properties to the east comprise 16 acres of R-15 development. The proposed zone change consistent with the character for the neighborhood.

• **Comment:** No need for it.

**Response**: There is a demonstrated demand for senior housing in the Town of Orangetown. While we acknowledge several senior housing and PAC zones projects have been constructed in recent years, that was the result of a significant demand and shortage of this housing stock. Change in zoning code to adopt PAC style zoning reflects this trend, which is supported by the public need.

### Jen Falzone, Gatto Lane

- Comment: Toll hasn't performed public outreach.
   Response: Toll held a public information outreach session in February 2021. Appearances before the Town Board and Planning Board are open to the public for public comment.
- **Comment:** Brooker Engineering has a conflict of interest.

**Response**: Brooker Engineering performs drainage reviews for the Town of Orangetown Planning Board. In the rare instances when Brooker Engineering has an application before the Planning Board or another conflict of interest, another engineering firm will perform the drainage review on the behalf of the Planning Board. The design engineer does not also perform the reviews on behalf of the land use board.

- Comment: Gatto is cramped.
   Response: Gatto is proposed to be widened to Town road standards as part of this application.
- **Comment:** Not enough parking.

**Response**: The required parking by code is two spaces per unit, which is 2x38 = 76 spaces. The application exceeds this requirement by providing one garage space and one driveway space per unit, with ten additional overflow parking spaces on the north side of the site, which is 86 total spaces.

• **Comment:** Strengthen zoning laws to protect overdevelopment.

**Response**: Comment noted; this is not relevant to the current application. The Town of Orangetown has the ability to change the zoning at their discretion. We are working with the current zoning and land use practices in place at the time of this application.

### Tom Gavigan, Laurel Road

Comment: "Doesn't want change"
 Response: This is the personal preference of the speaker; however, the property owner has the right to develop the property subject to the approval of the local Town Board and land use boards.

50 year resident of Palisades

- Comment: Concerns about high density zoning in New Jersey.
   Response: Comment noted, but not relevant to this application.
- **Comment:** No consideration for abutting neighbors.

**Response**: We disagree with this assertion. The theory behind the PAC zone concept is that there will be higher density housing in existing residential neighborhoods, which is the reason buffer zones and larger setbacks are required for this style of development. This is done in consideration of the neighboring properties.

Comment: Wants a more conservative approach to zoning.
 Response: Comment noted; this is not relevant to the current application. The Town of Orangetown has the ability to change the zoning at their discretion. We are working with the current zoning and land use practices in place at the time of this application.

Very truly yours,

ennett Plennent

**BROOKER ENGINEERING, P.L.L.C.** Kenneth DeGennaro, P.E. NY License No. 07621