

WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES
TOWN OF LLOYD PLANNING BOARD

Thursday, September 19, 2024

CALL TO ORDER TIME: 5:30pm

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ANNOUNCEMENTS: GENERAL, NO SMOKING, LOCATION OF FIRE EXITS, ROOM CAPACITY IS 49, PURSUANT TO NYS FIRE SAFETY REGULATIONS. PLEASE TURN OFF ALL CELL PHONES.

OFFICIALLY OPEN THE MEETING

Attendance: Board members: Scott McCarthy (came in at 5:45pm), Carl DiLorenzo, Gerry Marion, Bill Meltzer, Lambros Violaris, Evan Pendleton, Lenny Auchmoody (Town Board); Board Staff: Dave Barton, Paul Van Cott (via Zoom), Christian Moore, and Sarah Van Nostrand

Absent: Board Members: Charly Long, Franco Zani, and Fred Pizzuto

Minutes to Approve at the September 26, 2024, meeting
August 15, 2024 & August 22, 2024

New Business:

Highland Estates: Subdivision: Route 9W: SBL #96.9-1-35.210

Applicant is seeking a 2-lot subdivision.

Review Status: Application and plan circulated to the board.

Chris (Applicant's Agent) said that the applicant is seeking a two-lot subdivision down on 9W. The applicant wants to subdivide the property for sale at a later point. There is no new proposed development at this time. There is easement work that needs to be done with the sewer.

Bill asked if this is the matter that they received via email.

Dave said yes about the easements. Patti (Applicant's Agent) responded, so that will be baked into a future submission. Right now, there is a hydrant further south on the property on lot 2 and he was hoping that there would be an easement across it like there is on the property where Walgreens sits now. There are already two easements on the property, one is a water line out there on 9W, the other is for stormwater that runs east-west across the property into a level spreader, that discharges out the back. He understands that this is just to split the property among members.

Christian said his comments are basically concerning the easements, there are notes on the plans regarding Collins Ave and Vandervoort St he is not sure if they proposing to bring any easements over those at the south end of the property. It appears those two pathways do encroach on the proposed lot 2. The note mentions that there is access, but he isn't sure if they plan on formalizing it or not.

Chris said you would like a formal easement around that.

Dave said it would be wise. He is not sure if Vandervoort St exists or not, he knows Collins is there as it is a drive to a house.

Christian said it is indicated on the map as a gravel path, so it be something that has overgrown over the years.

Dave said it looks like the property line splits it, so there is probably a right-of-way across it and should be memorialized somehow.

Christian said regarding the other easements notes 10 states that there was a water and sewer easement granted to the Town of Lloyd that encompasses the entire site. Would that be something that needs to be modified if it covers the whole parcel. The same for note 11 it mentions a stormwater easement that covers the entire parcel.

Chris said that he will look into it.

Christian said based upon the utility mark out it sort of looks like the water line is connected to the sewer line in one spot. It may be just a stub that someone installed there when they were installing the main for future use, but it looks like it's connected to the sewer line which he doesn't know if it is.

Chris said he will get that cleared up.

Christian said that they noted that the EAF indicated the possibility of archaeological site, he doesn't know if the site has been scoped.

Chris said that he believes it has for Rite Aid.

Dave said he will have to pull that file.

Christian said if SHIPO was already reviewed and was given a no comment, then a copy should be included in this application.

Dave said that he thinks there were cross easements, when the Rite Aid was put in that there were cross easements, is there a note on that.

Chris said he believes there is.

Dave said it might be helpful to the board to note it.

Chris said he will make sure that it gets noted.

Dave said on the Walgreens parcel the exit that comes in off of 9W exists now, that is the way in and out of Walgreens, he is assuming that there are easements across the properties now.

Chris said that he will look into it and get it noted.

Paul said that this will be subject to SEQRA as it is an unlisted action. He agrees with CPL that they need something from SHIPO. He asked if a conceptual layout of the property could be provided, so the board can consider the potential impacts of future development.

Chris said that they will look into that.

Paul said that they can discuss that. In terms of SEQRA just to make sure that the board is looking at the full SEQRA impacts of the action including conceptual development.

Christian said regarding the bulk requirements, just draw all the offset envelopes for the new parcels.

Chris asked you want the offsets drawn on all three.

Christian said yes, even though you are going to have to follow them when a new development application comes in, it might be useful to memorialize it here.

Old Business:

Jacobs, John & Mary: Subdivision 111 South St: SBL #87.3-5-2.314

Applicant is seeking a 4-lot subdivision.

Review Status: Updated plans circulated to the board.

Chris (Applicant's Agent) said that the applicant is looking for a subdivision for feasibility to sell the lots. They are looking to create 4-lots. The lots in the rear will have a common driveway, an easement will be granted for that. They also have the New York State wetland crossing that they will need. In the front it is a common access point and then splits off to their respective lots. He asked if the plans were circulated to the fire department and if it was if there were any comments.

Dave said there was, he received the comments today from the chief and he has no problems with these driveways as they are laid out. Said he thinks the board was waiting

for septic, and if it has been received yet.

Chris said they do not have sewer yet.

Christian asked if they have done any deep tests yet, it will be a part of the health department approval. The question was are the soils good in the rear because it is on the ridge back there. They are still going to have to provide profiles for the driveways.

Chris said he will check with the engineer to see where they are with that.

Christian asked if they have spoken with DEC yet.

Chris replied that he doesn't believe that they have submitted the application yet, they are still working on some final grading, but he believes it will be very soon.

Christian said as they commented last month the location that they are proposing to cross, the DEC wetland would be the minimum area of disturbance to get from the front to the back, but in the end it is going to be the DEC's determination on how they get through if they have to put drainage or culverts to prevent that new driveway, which they are going to assume is going to be in a fill section to prevent it from damming water on that upper piece.

Paul said that this is a SEQRA unlisted action, so the board has to look at the potential impacts of the buildout. The board should know the area of disturbance as there are wetlands on the property. The EAF identified the Northern Cricket Frog was flagged for the property, which is a protected species, the board should know where the DEC stands in regards to that. Then overall the board needs to look at a conceptual layout, so they can make a SEQRA determination.

Evan said assuming that it is going to be over 1-acre of disturbance, areas for stormwater management should be shown.

Chris said that the engineer is working on that right now.

Christian said that was one of their comments it looks like it going to exceed 1-acre, if it is under 5-acres then they only have to provide erosion control, they wouldn't need to do permanent stormwater control practices and that is as per DEC. It depends on how much they are going to disturb getting that one driveway to the back. They have to go through the design process and then between the houses, driveways and septic systems, they have to come up with a number.

Paul said that and the septic systems would all be relevant to the SEQRA review.

Dave said that they are going to want to get this done ASAP before January 1, as the DEC may be adopting new setbacks for wetlands, which would not make this subdivision possible without relief from them.

Carl said it seems that the septic system both the primary and reserve is in the 100-foot buffer.

Dave said the gray area on the map is actually the 100-foot buffer area.

Public Hearings:

Marion, Thomas & Eric: Lot Line Revision: 213 & 215 Vineyard Ave: SBL #87.4-5-21 & 87.4-5-22.100

Review Status: Public hearing scheduled for September 26, 2024.

Continued Public Hearings:

Ohioville Solar: Special Use Permit and Site Plan: Crow Hill Rd

Applicant is seeking a special use permit and site plan approval for a solar array.

Review Status: Public hearing opened August 22, 2024

Nick (Applicant's Agent, Carson Power) said that the fire department approved the fire hydrant easement, it is technically in Plattekill, but it affects the project. The public hearing in Plattekill has been opened and will continue next Tuesday. The same letter was submitted, and they showed up in person and asked the same questions. They submitted a response letter addressing the comments in both letters. There was another neighbor who just submitted written comment yesterday and those have been addressed and can provide that to the board. Plattekill is ready to make a SEQRA and SUP determination after they close the public hearing next Tuesday.

Scott said so they have made no determination as of yet.

Nick replied not yet. One of his questions is assuming they do make a determination Tuesday, what would the board need, would be something in writing submitted to the board before the meeting Thursday to make a decision or is that even possible. He knows that it is a quick turnaround, if they can provide something in writing before the meeting is that sufficient or is there something else that you would need.

Paul said that he reached out to Plattekill's attorney and engineer, and his understanding is as Ohioville has suggested they are hoping to make a SEQRA determination and their zoning determination next Tuesday. He asked them if it was possible if they do make their SEQRA determination to provide that immediately because the board needs that from them in order for Lloyd's Planning Board to move forward with any kind of decision next week. He thinks the board asked him last month to get a resolution ready in case they made their SEQRA determination, he is working on that, and it will be

ready. It really all depends on Plattekill whether they make their determination and whether they get it to us in a timely fashion.

Nick said that the stormwater maintenance agreement was submitted, is that something that is resolved with Paul or with CPL.

Dave said it was sent to Paul and CPL and they are looking it.

Paul said that it was sent over and it should be fine.

Nick said that the changes were not really substantial, they were just addressing the two different project companies, the leases for each and making sure that's it is covered by the agreement. He asked if decom bonds were something that was approved with the project or is it done at a later date.

Dave said we haven't done that yet.

Nick said that they submitted a number that was based off of NYSERDA.

Christian said he doesn't think that they have weighed into the bond, he thinks that was Plattekill because the original number that was proposed seemed pretty low from what he remembers. In this case does the bond have to be split between the towns.

Owen (Carson Power) said that is what they proposed, a full bond proposed with Plattekill, they upped the amount because they had a few lines that they were under on. For the Town of Lloyd they submitted the same decommissioning plan, however there was a reduced bond because they only have 1.5 MW and have no infrastructure in Lloyd, just panels. It was a little less than \$100,000, they are good working through whatever it needs to be.

Christian said he doesn't recall seeing it, he could have missed it.

Owen said it was in a large submission packet, either way they will have a bond.

Nick said they will resubmit it.

Owen said there is one outstanding comment and that is the freeboard on the detention basins. Their engineers looked at it, 25-year storm has 12-inches of freeboard, 100-year storm does not have 12-inches, but it is not over the top, so their intention there is to make sure they get conditional approval because the feature is in Plattekill then circle back with CPL and hopefully it is not something that would hold up site plan approval but would be a condition that they could work through.

Christian asked if the design was modified, or if the calculations were modified.

Owen said not since they have reviewed. What they did was they went back and double

checked it, 25-year storm or the 100-year storm are they over the top and if they are over the top, it would go over the road and into the pond. They know it is an outstanding comment, they feel that it is not a huge comment, but they are willing to address it as a condition of approval.

Christian said if they can submit something in writing for the rationale and they will take a look at it.

New Short-Term Rentals:

Naranjo, Cesar: 269 Pancake Hollow Rd.

Review Status: Application and supporting documents circulated to the board.

SEQRA Status: Type II

Potential Action: Open public hearing.

Cesar (Applicant) said that he purchased the property in 2022 and made some improvements to the house. He wants to use it as a short-term rental and for his personal use.

Scott asked how many bedrooms are there.

Bill said it looks like it is 6 but was 11 at one point.

Cesar said it was a large property and in bad shape when he purchased it. The previous owner appears to have been doing work on it, but they made some improvements to it. They currently have 6 bedrooms.

Scott said it has 6 bedrooms and was an inspection done on it and is there anything that needs to be done.

Matthew (Works with the applicant) said that he attended the inspection, he works with Cesar with other properties that he owns. He has been involved with the application and speaking with the Town of Lloyd offices to make sure everything is correct. The postings are up, they have done the fire safety inspection, and at this time it is their understanding that they have met all the requirements.

Scott asked how far does he live from the property.

Matthew said he lives about an hour away, but he has team members that are closer to the property that work for and are able to respond if needed.

Bill asked are they going to be the emergency contact or are you.

Matthew said they have a central office, and that phone number is provided, and they

dispatch the team members based on the nature of the call. They do have a presence in the area within 5 miles of the property.

Dave said that he is aware of 81 Hawley's Corners, the problem with calling Liberty is, he knows that there is a 24 hour number, but it would be much more effective if they had a local number called, because if he is standing in bad weather at 2am because of a fire call to this location, he cannot tell you how frustrating it will be if he called Liberty to have someone there call Hawley's Corners and then hope that contact was made and will respond to the scene of an incident. He would like to have, but it is up to the board, but he would like to have a local number. You say there is a 24-hour number, but is it staffed by your staff or a calling service.

Matthew said it is a combination of having an answering service and his team as well. They use this for a number of properties throughout the Catskills. They have deployed this strategy for guest concerns and emergency concerns for over 4 years now and they have found it to be very effective.

Scott said it may work for your company, but it won't work for the town. The board would rather have a local phone number.

Matthew said that he can give the board his direct number, then they just deal with him.

Bill said in the code it says 30 minutes from the town hall.

Scott said that is for the person who is going to maintain that property. The person who is going to be responsible for to be able to let the building department do what they need to do and to answer to. If you have someone who is very close by it wouldn't hurt to give that phone number to the town, so they have that number to contact.

Matthew said that person is a team member, yes, they are on call and yes, they have the ability to work on, but should it be their day off or their time not being here, they have someone else stepping in and providing coverage for that.

Scott said that is the part that won't work.

Matthew said he has someone in the area, he is not saying that they are going to be coming from an hour away.

Scott said it has to be within 30 miles.

Matthew said he has another office in Ellenville, they are within the ability to meet the town's code. Can he tie it to one person's response he doesn't think that is right.

Scott said it is not your responsibility to do that, it is the applicant's responsibility to make sure that he has someone here within 30 minutes to that property.

Cesar said he has a person who lives in Gardiner, and he is the one who does the landscaping and is his handyman. He can ask him to do this, and the relationship that he has with him he thinks it is going to work out.

Scott said all the board is looking for is that 30-minute guy. With all the calling something could go wrong, and the inspector is going to be waiting, no one wants to deal with that.

Cesar said that Randy from 66 Landscaping would probably be willing to do this for him.

Scott said the personal phone number is for the town itself, the board will see the number, but they have nothing to do with it once it's approved.

Cesar said as soon as he has the persons okay, where should he send it.

Scott said send it to the building department.

Cesar said that he would send it.

Scott asked if the property was marked out, so they don't have people wandering around.

Cesar said that it was submitted to the town.

Scott asked if it was posted in the property also.

Cesar said yes.

Bill asked if there is a posted address on the street.

Cesar said that the mailbox says 269.

Bill said if they have 6 bedrooms, do they need 6 parking spots because when he looks at their parking, it's not 6 parking spots to him, they block each other in.

Dave said that the fire chief did review this today and he is not the biggest fan, he is concerned with 6 vehicles, one of the house rules is no parking on the lawn, you can fit 6 cars in there, but you wouldn't be able to fit another vehicle like an emergency response. That was a concern of his, they just had an accident not long ago and they had the emergency response vehicles parked in the driveway. He was concerned about the parking and access for emergency vehicles.

Bill asked what is the requirement for 6 bedrooms.

Dave said there isn't anything in the STR code. It is up to the board's discretion.

Scott said this is one property with 6 parking spaces.

Dave said it is two properties and the septic is on the other one. The septic is across the street. In the Town of Lloyd roads bisect parcels, it was one parcel once, the county took this road and did its dedication years ago, when the road was incorporated it created two parcels. As far as he can tell there is a pipe running from the house under the road to the other side. They have a paid bill saying that the leach field was replaced, it is strange that the septic is on the other side.

Scott said it is one STR, he guesses you could have 6 people with 6 different cars, so parking is still a concern.

Matthew said three of the bedrooms are only twin beds, which would limit the number of adults.

Scott said it is still the number of bedrooms.

Gerry asked is there any way that they can change the driveway to accommodate more cars. He asked if there was a way to remove the grassy area and extend the driveway somehow.

Cesar said that grassy area used to be a tree, but he removed it.

Carl said that it looked like it would work on paper, but you have to take into account the fire chief's comments if they have to get emergency vehicles in there.

Gerry said that they could possibly make the driveway wider if the applicant is set on having that many cars, he doesn't know if that is feasible.

Carl said he can minimize the number of spaces.

Scott said that the board is not going to come up with the plan, you will have to figure out how to mitigate the parking issue on your own.

Carl said in the past didn't they have some kind of sketch plan or site plan for STRs.

Dave said only an aerial plot plan is required per code.

Carl said maybe that can be done so the board has some idea of the dimensions of the parking area.

Scott said it seems that the board would like to see some mitigation for the parking or to reduce the number.

Cesar said that they can change the number, but it would affect the application.

Scott said you would just change the number of cars you will allow for the rental. Let's say your application goes down to 4 cars or 3 since it seems 3 fits there perfectly, and the neighbors sees 6 cars there, they are going to complain, they are going to say something to the town and then you will be in violation of the special use permit. If you are in violation the next time you apply, it might not be happening. That is what you have to consider, if you are saying there is going to be 4 cars or 3 cars, that's what it has to be as the board doesn't want the neighbors to complain.

Carl said it is not the board making the decision, when this goes before the fire department that usually may have a little more precedent in the application because of the safety issue.

Dave said the occupancy can stay the same. If there are 6 cars there as the chair suggests and the neighbors don't complain then you get lucky.

Scott asked for a motion to open the public hearing.
Motion made by Bill, 2nd by Lambros.
All ayes, motion passed to open the public hearing.

No public comment

Public to remain open until the requested information is received.

Bill said you mentioned that you are going to use the house yourself sometimes, are you going to use it when there are guests or when they are not there.

Cesar said not when guests are there.

Kandiar, Goutham: 10 Eisgruber Park Ln.

Review Status: Application and supporting documents circulated to the board.
SEQRA Status: Type II
Potential Action: Open public hearing.

Goutham (Applicant) said that he has owned the property for about 3 years now. All the violations on the property have been corrected. He is working with a company called Alluvion, the contact is Dino, and they are out of Poughkeepsie.

Scott asked how many bedrooms?

Goutham replied 4.

Scott said so you are looking for 8 people.

Goutham said correct 8.

Scott asked how many parking spaces.

Goutham said that he is only asking for 4 parking spaces but could fit more.

Scott asked if the boundary of the property was marked.

Goutham said that there is a fence around the property.

Bill asked if there is an address marker at the end of the driveway, so people know where they are going as it is a long driveway.

Goutham replied yes.

Gerry asked if everything was good.

Dave said yes, his office has been out there.

Bill said this reminds him of the Tina Drive one the board had.

Dave said that the access for this is through the Eisgruber Trailer Park, it is not just a long driveway, but it also passes through another zone with multiple homes on it to get to this one.

Scott asked if there was an easement or something that allows them to access this property.

Dave said he would assume.

Scott said that there is a little bit of concern there.

Carl said that it is a mobile home park, they are usually private independently owned.

Dave said these were a part of the Eisgruber family.

Scott said it is pre-existing.

Dave replied long time, pre-existing.

Scott said he doesn't really think that would be a concern. If they lived in the house, they would have family, friends and other people visiting. There were some letters of concern that were received by the board.

Scott asked for a motion to open the public hearing.

Motion made by Bill, 2nd by Lambros.

All ayes, motion passed to open the public hearing.

Beth (5 Eisgruber Park Lane) said that she is concerned with driving through the private driveway, there are 8 different houses and they have children. It is a safety issue with having different strangers going through every day. They have kids getting on and off the bus and playing outside.

Scott asked how far the house is from this area.

Beth said it is right there, they have to drive through the driveway past all these homes to get to it.

Scott said they are all individual houses there.

Beth said yes.

Scott said he is looking at a picture and seeing all the different houses. When other houses come through the property how is that any different from him having an STR.

Beth said that there is not a lot of traffic, it is a very quiet neighborhood and that the families feel comfortable walking and feel safe in the neighborhood. There is not a lot of noise and they look out for each other, they know who is coming and with this is not going to be the case.

Goutham said that they are valid concerns. He has been renting it out for a few weekends each month, a few times it has been a weeklong rental. He has a strict no events and a no party rule. As far as the overall traffic he doesn't think it will be more than if he lived there permanently, as well as the garbage generating aspect. Nothing he is going to is going to disrupt the community aspect. He has spoken with the Eisgruber's and they don't have an objection to this.

Scott asked is this a private road or a town road.

Beth said the cars that come through they are comfortable with, but that is not going to be the case. It is very concerning to the safety of the neighborhood.

Gerry asked if there are any restrictions on the deed.

Beth said there are 6 other families involved in this, as there are 8 houses that you have to go past to get to this house.

Bill said you mentioned that you have already been renting this out as a short-term rental.

Goutham said yes, when he was unaware of the regulations, but they shut it down once they found out about the regulations.

Dave said that is the case more often than not.

Carl said can research be done to see if there are any covenants or easements at the time that the Eisgruber family did this development.

Dave said that he doesn't know that it would be any different because the way the law reads and the way the law has been interpreted in New York State is that the residential use is not stopping, if there is access to the house now that doesn't stop because of this new residential use. They will check.

Carl asked who maintains the road.

Beth said her husband, Eric. When they purchased the house, it was believed that it was going to be a single-family home and that is why it was put through that way. It never would have been okay for a short-term rental.

Scott said now that the law is written the way it is, it is a residential home that has the ability to become a rental.

Dave said it doesn't change the use.

Scott said that the use isn't change it's still residential people living in a residential home.

Beth said it will increase the traffic.

Scott said it has been going on that way since the house was built back there. No matter who was back there, traffic would be going through on that road back to that house.

Beth said that house was her father-in-law's house and that was totally different.

Dave said that we are never the last person to own our homes, so things change.

Gerry said it was a short-term rental.

Scott said it was short-term rental for a while before the law went into effect, they had the short-term rental use going on there.

Dave said he will do some research on the easements; he cannot see it not being okay.

Catherine Pine (7 Eisgruber) said that she sent in the letter (see attached).

Johnathan Pine (7 Eisgruber) said that a big selling point of the property for them was the quietness and seclusion of the property.

Scott said the public hearing will be open next week, and that he appreciates their concerns. Just remember that if you would like to look at the STR law that the Town of

Lloyd has, you can see that a lot of the concerns that you have are addressed in it. If an STR was to not abide by the rules listed in the code and if there are any complaints against them, that would definitely keep them from getting reinstated as an STR.

Dave said or it can be revoked.

Motion to Adjourn.

Sarah Van Nostrand

From: Catherine Pine <catherinepine88@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2024 2:25 PM
To: Sarah Van Nostrand
Subject: [EXTERNAL]: Response for Public Hearing 9/19/24

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Catherine and Johnathan Pine
7 Eisgruber Park Lane
Highland, NY 12528
catherinepine88@gmail.com
225-939-8851

September 19, 2024

Town of Lloyd Planning Board
12 Church Street
Highland, NY 12528

Dear Members of the Town of Lloyd Planning Board,

We, the undersigned residents of Eisgruber Park Lane, are writing to formally object to the application to operate a short-term rental (Airbnb) within our neighborhood. Our community is a small, close-knit enclave, and many of us have serious concerns regarding the potential impact such an operation would have on the safety, privacy, and cohesion of our neighborhood.

Our concerns are as follows:

1. Safety Concerns for Children

We purchased our home at 7 Eisgruber Park in September of 2023. What drew us to this property was the immense privacy and safe feeling of the small neighborhood. We have two young children who frequently play outside throughout the day, often on or near the private road. Now that school is in session, our children play outside during the afternoon and early evening hours. The influx of unfamiliar visitors, who may not be aware of the children at play, poses a safety risk. This is a quiet area where children can run freely without concern for heavy or unpredictable traffic. A revolving door of new and unfamiliar individuals raises the possibility of accidents or simply discomfort for parents and neighbors alike.

2. Privacy and Security

We live in a tight-knit, private community where neighbors know each other and feel secure in their environment. Having a transient rental property introduces the uncertainty of unknown people frequently coming and going, which could lead to a loss of the sense of safety and trust we have cultivated. Many neighbors have voiced discomfort with strangers being regularly introduced into our shared spaces. The nature of short-term rentals means that the neighborhood atmosphere could change drastically, with different groups coming in for brief periods and possibly disrupting the peace.

3. Shared Road, Driveway, and Dumpster

Our neighborhood shares essential infrastructure, including the road, driveway, and waste disposal facilities. With an Airbnb property, the increased traffic could cause wear and tear on the road that the community would

ultimately bear the cost to repair. Additionally, having frequent, short-term guests using the shared dumpster could lead to issues with garbage overflow, improper disposal, and unsanitary conditions. These shared resources were designed for the residents of the community, not for commercial or rental use.

4. Preserving the Character of the Community

Our neighborhood is not just a collection of homes—it is a private, residential community where we enjoy a quiet, peaceful environment. Allowing an Airbnb or other short-term rental disrupts this dynamic by introducing a commercial element into an area that is zoned for residential use. Many of us have made significant investments in this community because of the privacy and tranquility it offers, and we worry that allowing transient rentals will fundamentally change the character of our neighborhood.

5. Potential for Increased Noise and Disruption

Short-term rentals often attract visitors who are here for vacations, celebrations, or gatherings, which can sometimes lead to increased noise levels, especially during evenings and weekends. This is particularly concerning in a family-oriented community where quiet evenings and respect for neighbors are highly valued.

In light of these concerns, we respectfully urge the Planning Board to reject the application for the Airbnb operation. Our goal is to maintain the integrity, safety, and harmony of our community. We are confident that you will give careful consideration to the legitimate concerns of the residents and protect the character of our neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter. We look forward to your thoughtful response and are happy to provide any additional information if necessary.

Sincerely,

Catherine, Johnathan, Cooper (aged 9), and John-Luke (aged 7) Pine

Catherine Pine
225-939-8851

Sarah Van Nostrand

From: beth1028@optonline.net
Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2024 10:13 AM
To: Sarah Van Nostrand
Subject: [EXTERNAL]: Planning Board Meeting 9/29& 9/26

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Reference : 10 Eisgruber Park Lane

I tried calling earlier, left message.

Question, if I can not make tomorrow's meeting, will this be re-addressed on 9/26 ?

My name is Beth Eisgruber, and I reside at 5 Eisgruber Park Lane (for 32 years) . I oppose the application submitted by Goutham Kandiar for the proposal of short term rentals at his 10 Eisgruber Park Lane Highland NY 12528 address.

The unreasonable amount of traffic this will create, driving through our private property with children, pets, and neighboring pedestrians is a safety risk, and unwelcomed. This property was sold (by my father in law) to be a single family home, not a rental property.

Please let me know what I personally need to do to move forward with this opposition.

Thank You

Beth Eisgruber

845-256-7019 H

