

**VILLAGE OF MONROE PLANNING BOARD**  
**WORKSHOP MEETING**  
**FEBRUARY 8, 2021**  
**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** Chairman Boucher, Member Allen, DeAngelis, Hafenecker, Karlich, Kelly, Parise, Engineer O'Rourke, Attorney Cassidy, Planner Fink, Traffic Consultant Andrea Connell

Chairman Boucher opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag. Chairman Boucher stated that in conformance with the Executive Order 202.10 from the Governor we are permitted to hold virtual meetings.

**1. 208 Business Center Site Plan – (201-3-3, 4, 7, 8)**

**Present:** Kirk Rother, PE; Ken Wersted, PE, Creighton Manning

Chairman Boucher stated that this project is a Type 1 under SEQR. The board recirculated to be lead agency. Engineer Rother provided an overview of the project. 208 Business Center is an application for a commercial building on the corner of Gilbert Street and Route 208. Behind the site is the YMCA and to the north is the Town of Monroe Town Park. This project has been in front of the board for around two years. Primary topic of discussion has been traffic. Engineer Wersted has taken the lead on the traffic for this project. There had been numerous meetings with the DOT and Traffic Consultant Connell. DOT wanted to know how far into the SEQR process this project was, and DOT had not heard anything back from the Village. At that time, Planner Fink had been brought on board and brought to the applicant's and board's attention that since the site is located adjacent to a park, the threshold is lowered to twenty five percent of the typical threshold. This changes the SEQR classification from unlisted to Type 1, so it was required that a recirculation for lead agency take place. The circulation has been done, and the board has received responses from the agencies that received these documents so now the project can continue to the next step of the SEQR process. Planner Fink had previously discussed issuing a positive declaration, and in anticipation of that the applicant has submitted a draft scoping document for the board to consider. Planner Fink offered his comments. Engineer Rother has taken the first step in the process of trying to develop an environmental impact statement. It seemed to be the consensus of the board, from this project was previously on the agenda, that the board was looking to issue a positive declaration requiring an EIS and then move forward with that procedure. The next step for the planning board is to adopt a positive declaration. A positive declaration is a SEQR form. It is a determination that the project may result in one or more significant impacts and therefore an EIS must be prepared. He has prepared a draft form for the board to review. A draft resolution to adopt the positive declaration has also been provided for the board. The board would consider this at its next meeting later in the month. Once that is done, SEQR regulations require that the public be involved in the scoping of the draft EIS. Scoping is like developing an annotated table of contents listing what is in the EIS. What sort of studies need to be conducted in a preliminary way, what are the impacts

that could result from the project, what kinds of mitigation would be appropriate for minimizing or avoiding those environmental impacts identified in the EIS. The next step for the planning board is to go through the scoping process once the pos. dec. has been adopted. Even though SEQR regulations do not require a public meeting, he recommends that a public scoping session be held. That would be an opportunity for the public and any involved agencies to comment on the sufficiency of the submitted draft scoping document. The draft scoping document gets distributed, and in the interest of time he recommends that the positive declaration is distributed. All of the agencies that are involved on the project must receive copies of the positive declaration. The agencies have to know what the board is doing as lead agency since the planning board is the only one conducting the environmental review of 208 Business Center. The agencies have a right to involve themselves and comment on the scoping process. Down the line, the agencies would be involved in providing comments and questions on the draft EIS that will be prepared. At this point, the board only has to adopt the positive declaration and circulate the draft scoping document to all of the involved agencies, and to get the draft scoping document to the public. He recommends that a scoping notice be published in the paper and posted on the village website, and to schedule a public scoping session. There is a time element of 60 days from when the applicant submits the draft scoping document. Planner Fink asks Attorney Cassidy for clarification when the 60-day timer starts. Does it begin when the pos. dec is adopted by the board. Attorney Cassidy states that the most conservative date is when the Planning Board became lead agency, which would be 30 days after circulation, which she believes would be February 4<sup>th</sup>, 2020. The date statutes are not clear in this regard, but the board cannot declare pos. dec until the February 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting, so she would say the 60-day timer starts then. We can start working on that, hence the recommendation to declare or set the scoping session at the next meeting. Planner Fink says that the 60-time period will be difficult to meet. If the scoping session happens in March, there will need to be time for the planning board. The next step in the process after the applicant submits the draft scoping document is for the planning board to adopt a final scoping document. The final scoping document will consist of the draft scoping document and any comments made by other agencies, the village board, and members of the public. That would be tough to accomplish in 60 days. As he understands it, the time frames under SEQR are directory, not mandatory. But there is a provision in SEQR regulations that if the board or lead agency fails to adopt the final scoping document within 60 days of submission, then the applicant can move forward and prepare the EIS based on the submitted draft scoping document, and not the planning board's final scoping document. The board will be working to have their process done as soon as possible, but it would be good if the board had consent that should a few more weeks be needed the applicant would grant that extension to the board. Chairman Boucher stated that the board would seek an extension probably until the April meeting. The board would need that consent in writing as well. Attorney Cassidy provided her comments. Building Inspector Cocks has brought to the board's attention that there is a violation on the property. Engineer Rother stated that he will notify the applicant of this so it is taken care of. Chairman Boucher stated that the board will probably want to look at those documents and at the February 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting declare a positive declaration under SEQR and to formally adopt a resolution to have the public scoping meeting on March 23<sup>rd</sup>. Revisions to the draft scoping document may be needed, and that will have to happen prior to the April 27<sup>th</sup> meeting, and the board will be about 21 days short of the 60-day clock, so an extension will be needed. Engineer Wersted provided his comments on the traffic study. Two comments from the Ambulance Corps and the Village Police were received. The applicant had taken those comments, the DOT's comments, and Traffic Consultant Connell's comment letter and responded to them in one package. A couple of the comments from the ambulance and the police department focused on traffic and access throughout the area. From the tone of the comments it did not appear to him that the DOT had seen the applicant's concept improvement plan. The applicant included those concept improvement drawings in their response, which have

also been forwarded to those agencies. DOT had comments about where the crosswalks would go throughout the triangle intersection area. DOT had also asked them to look at Oreco Terrace and the intersection of Orange and Rockland where it ties into Route 208. Site distances for those locations were reviewed, and the applicant has provided more detail on where the realignment of Orange and Rockland Road might take place in terms of teeing into Route 208 at more of a 90 Degrees versus the angled direction it is now. The applicant had gone back to a previous concept of the triangle reconfiguration visited in the summer of 2020, which showed how the configuration connected into North Main Street and Route 208. The 424 and 432 projects across the street had also been included. There is a concept to consolidate some of those properties and create an office building there. The previous comments provided by other projects such as Threetel, YMCA, and Clove Wood to take those volumes and incorporate them into this previous concept have also been addressed. That information was given back to DOT and Traffic Consultant Connell. Traffic Consultant Connell has also issued another comment letter, and the applicant has spoken with DOT over the last couple of days. DOT is currently reviewing Traffic Consultant Connell's comments and the applicant's latest responses and are working on their finalization. Traffic Consultant Connell provided her comments. The latest plan had been reviewed. DOT came up with their preferred plan, which is the one from Summer 2020, which DOT is reviewing carefully. One of the key items remaining in terms of DOT sign off is the left turn access into and out of 424 and 434, and DOT are working that out. The other item is Orange and Rockland Road, the alignment, and how that will tie in and operate. Another minor item is the Oreco Terrace. There was some minor site distance in one direction, which was not up to standards, related to some of the embankment and vegetation. Some of the turning movements, like if a driver attempted a right turn out of there, is a sharp angle. This is difficult to do without going into the opposing lane of traffic. The DOT can determine that though, and the residents there know how to approach that intersection. So it's just waiting on DOT feedback as to the entire triangle redesign plan. Member Parise asked about the intersection where the Gilbert Street extension is and the Route 208 coming into the Village. Where is that traffic light, was the queuing of the traffic there reviewed. The biggest problem right now is at the current intersection above that. The traffic backs up to Route 17M. How does the new traffic signal improve this situation. Engineer Wersted said that the new traffic signal will improve the traffic in this area. Today, traffic comes up Schunnemunk and continues in that direction or turns left because that is the only way it can go North on Route 208. The current traffic signal in place operates one approach, so only one direction goes at a time. Conventional signals have at least two approaches go at the same time, such as East and West or North and South. With the realignment of 208 Northbound structured so that traffic does not have to go through that intersection anymore, traffic will stay on this "ramp" as it continues north, and that will reduce the volume at this old signal. Hopefully, once the volume is reduced, the old traffic signal can be allowed to operate more like a traditional signal where more than one approach goes at a time. That will help relieve a lot of that queueing issue traveling northbound. Traffic Consultant Connell agrees that the older signal at the four way intersection causes a lot of backups. Traffic queueing will be relieved when it is moved to the new slip ramp. DOT is considering changing the signal there so that at North and South directions run at the same time, so the signal would be more efficient. Member Parise asked if the synchronization of these traffic signals would reduce the back up. Traffic Consultant Connell confirmed that was true. Engineer Wersted stated that he provided these traffic models to Traffic Consultant Connell and the DOT so the applicant is reviewing how those intersections would operate, and all of these signals would be coordinated with each other, with the goal to reduce the amount of stops taken by vehicles in those intersections. Member Parise asks if the reviews on traffic will also account for volumes generated from other projects such as Threetel. Engineer Wersted stated that in the September review the applicant accounted for the Threetel project, the 424 and 434 project, the Clove Wood development, Blooming Grove, as some of that volume comes down here as well. An

additional 5% increase in traffic has been included on pretty much all movements as a catch-all. Chairman Boucher asked if the traffic generated from Lego Land was considered. Especially in the summer, people are coming through the village during weekend traffic going back and forth. Engineer Wersted stated that Lego Land traffic was not accounted for directly as the applicant did not think that traffic would go through this intersection specifically, but the 5% increase in traffic the applicant accounted for would handle this. Travelling to and from Lego land will partially depend on where the driver coming from. For the most part, this intersection is focused on the local projects within a couple of miles of the area. The planned expansion of a warehouse on the corner, as well as the extension on Gilbert Street which will turn into a realty office with a mortgage company, was accounted for. There were some homes proposed on Schunnemunk that were accounted for. Member Hafenecker asked if someone was travelling off on Route 208, wanted to come back into the village and wanted to use the Schunnemunk Street, would drivers have to use that second traffic light. Engineer Wersted indicated on the Triangle Redesign concept the two left turns that would be taken, one from the second traffic light on Route 208 and the next left at the existing light which would bring the driver to Schunnemunk St. Attorney Cassidy asked if the 5% accounts for the proposed subdivision on Schunnemunk Street in the Town of Monroe. She stated that she would get information regarding that project to Engineer Wersted so he is aware of it. Engineer Wersted stated that he will consult his notes to see if that site was accounted for in their analysis. He stated that he has 210 Schunnemunk included, which are the 21 dwelling units of single family detached housing with access to Schunnemunk Street. Member Parise asked Engineer Wersted if DOT is still looking at 17M still, specifically the intersection with the traffic light in the mobile station, Wally's Ice Cream, and Wayback Burger's area. Even if a fix will be put the situation at the 208 intersection, this area is still a problem as well. Engineer Wersted stated that the study area included that portion as well. Member Parise stated that DOT should also look at the traffic signal on Gilbert Street and 17M. He had brought that up when the planning board was reviewing the two-family house on Gilbert Street. Engineer Wersted stated that Smith Farm was putting up a traffic signal there. The light got hung up because DOT did not want to allow the traffic signal to go in unless a northbound left turn lane was also constructed. Without the northbound left turn lane, through traffic would start using the shoulder on the road. The traffic light improvement was tabled until either funding was gathered or a mechanism was found to create that northbound left turn lane. Member Parise said that specific traffic signal needed three warrants, and it only met two. Traffic today is also using the shoulder as a through lane, which is dangerous. Member Allen asked if there was room to put a left turn lane there. Engineer Wersted stated that the shoulders from either side would have to be removed to create center turtling. If DOT puts in a shoulder, and it needs to be repurposed, the same shoulder would eventually need to go back. That would mean pushing the curbs out in either direction, perhaps redoing the drainage. The shoulder of the road often has a different bank angle than the travel way of the road. The road may be 2-3% to let the water sheet off, but it can be 4-6% for a shoulder. Chairman Boucher stated that at the regular meeting the board will look to declare a positive declaration under SEQR and also formally adopt a resolution to have the public scoping meeting take place at the regular Meeting in March.

**2. Spring Hill Apartments – Multi Family Housing Site Plan (207-4-11.1 & 15)**

**Present:** Kevin Brodie, Architect; Joseph Nyitray, Brooker Engineering; Brian Brooker, Brooker Engineering;

Chairman Boucher stated that the cost estimates were sent to the Village Board with a recommendation from the planning board to approve. The action was determined to be listed as

a Type 1 Action under SEQR. Engineer O'Rourke provided his comments. In the previous submission, the applicant had addressed all engineering issues. His office is reviewing some minor SWPPP comments. The water report that had been submitted was also passed to the Village Water Superintendent who had some comments and concerns. From an engineering perspective, he had no issue with the water report submitted. The black aluminum fence had been noted on the latest plans. He did not see the plaque for Mape's Family Plot. The board has closed the public hearing. From an engineering view his office is satisfied with the layout. There was heavy discussion on the traffic and the flow, the entranceways, and he believes these concerns had been satisfied. Once the minor SWPPP issues are resolved and the Village Water Superintendent gets back to him the board will be in a position to act on this project. Chairman Boucher asked if the Mape's Family Plot plaque detail was noted on the plan or was that missed. Engineer Brooker stated that Architect Brodie will add that detail to the plan. It will be attached to the fence at the entrance gate. Are there any details that the board wants the plaque to have. Member Parise stated that maybe gold lettering can be used, something to make it stand out. Architect Brodie stated that he was planning on having the plaque be bronze. He asks also if the board knows who is in that grave. Member Parise stated that he went to Tom Sullivan, from Smith Seaman & Quackenbush funeral home, and although he has a lot of history on the area he has no records for that. Member DeAngelis spoke to the Village Historian and she has no records either. Chairman Boucher stated that the board will probably look to have a neg dec declared by the April meeting. A SEQR resolution will need to be approved by the March meeting. Planner Fink stated that as long as the water issues brought up by the Village Water Superintendent are resolved then that can be done. Engineer Brooker asked why the applicant would have to wait for that and not be able to have the resolutions and declarations done in the February meeting. Engineer O'Rourke stated that the Village Water Superintendent will not have his review done by then. There were concerns about the overall water usage in the Village, so those must be resolved first. Chairman Boucher asked Attorney Cassidy if once that is resolved, all that is left is the easement declaration. Attorney Cassidy stated that the easements have been approved as to form, and sent to the Village Board for further review. She anticipates that when it is time to do the neg dec then the approval resolution will follow. The condition would be that those easements were recorded and provided recording information. Engineer O'Rourke stated that if all works out then the neg dec and resolution would be done at the March meeting. Chairman Boucher stated that the applicant would need to grant an extension of 62 days to the March meeting. Member Parise asked if Chairman Boucher and Attorney Cassidy would put together a checklist to ensure that none of these steps in the process are missed. The water situation, the easements, the SWPPP comments, the cost estimates to be accepted by the Village board. Engineer O'Rourke stated that perhaps these can be listed by Attorney Cassidy in the draft resolution.

**3. 310 Stage Rd – Multi Family Housing – Retaining Wall Redesign  
(213-1-31)**

**Present:** Paul Edwards, Owner;

Mr. Edwards provided context for the project. In the original project a segmented wall was proposed. There are some retaining walls that can be seen when you drive into the main entrance and the segmented wall faces the front of all the 6 units and it is pretty large. There was a segmented wall for all original submissions. The Engineer on the project was not well versed in wall design and noted on the plan that a wall design would be a later submission done by a design engineer for walls. There were doubts about the structural integrity of the segmented wall and at the last submission it was changed to a poured wall. This change from a

segmented wall to a poured wall was discovered when Mr. Edwards had submitted a wall design to Building Inspector Cocks. He had intended the wall to be segmented, as it looks a lot nicer and less commercial than a poured wall. Building Inspector Cocks had brought it to his attention that the wall plan does not have a provision to change the wall, it just says poured wall. Mr. Edwards had later submitted to Building Inspector Cocks an engineer design for a segmented wall plan, and a brochure depicting the design. This project proposes a segmented wall, as it is more aesthetically pleasing, which is important since it will be the first thing seen when you enter the site. Chairman Boucher stated that he had spoken to Building Inspector Cocks about this. The board can review the photos that were provided by the applicant. What would be required is planning board approval for a field change. Engineer O'Rourke confirmed that the Village Code does not allow for the Village Engineer or Building Inspector to make field changes, those have to go back before the planning board. He states that the Building Inspector's concern is the look of the wall, as that was discussed with the board often during this project since the wall is visible from Stage Road and from Route 17M. His office reviewed the technical issues and found no objections engineering wise. The wall should be fine, the design looks OK. The board should review the specific look of the wall itself, and if the board is satisfied then could approve this as a field change. Member Hafenecker asked if the design and structures depicted in the Terra-Crete brochure represented the proposed retaining wall. Chairman Boucher confirmed that was the case. Mr. Edwards stated that the wall is a brick style segmented wall. The face dimensions of the block are two feet high by four feet wide. Member Parise asked if the photos provided show the color and style of the wall. Mr. Edwards confirmed that was the case. Member Parise asked if the blue buildings depicted will be the color of the units on site. Member Allen stated that the board had changed the color from blue to gray. Mr. Edwards stated that the houses will be a very dark gray. Engineer O'Rourke stated that the picture with the blue townhouse has a wall which the proposed wall will resemble. Member Parise noted that the picture below the blue townhouses had a light gray/beige color and was interested to see how the color of the wall would look with the townhouses. Member Karlich stated that in previous discussions the board had discussed using the existing stone on the property for some of the retaining wall, and this proposed retaining wall does not use that stone. Mr. Edwards stated that the existing stone on the property will be used for the front sign on the property. The applicant will put a façade wall in the front and using the reclaimed stone for that. Engineer O'Rourke confirmed that there will be no changes to that sign. Member Parise asked if the board had to approve this as a field change, and Chairman Boucher confirmed that this was the case. Attorney Cassidy stated that she will have something drafted for the board's regular session later in the month. Engineer O'Rourke stated that only the design of the wall has changed, not the grading or height. Member Hafenecker asked if the parking spots are on the back end of the unit. Are there six or seven spots. Engineer O'Rourke confirmed this and said that there are a couple of handicapped parking in the front. Member Hafenecker asked if there are 6 units total. Chairman Boucher confirmed that there are 6 units. Engineer O'Rourke stated that some clearing and grading has already been done on the site and the board could drive by to review the work done. Chairman Boucher stated that there was a picture available of the reclaimed stone wall with the sign available for the board to view. Chairman Boucher stated that the board will review this and take action on the next regular meeting.

**4. 445 Route 17M – Site Plan – (222-2-2.1)**

**Present:** Larry Torro, PE, Civil Tech Engineering;

Engineer Torro provided an overview of the project. The footprint of the building is the same. The issue to be resolved before proceeding further with the plans was that of the lower level being considered a basement. The height was originally at 14 feet and has now been reduced

to 10 feet as per code 4-4 A grading plan has been provided, so a determination could be made that it was more than 50% below grade. There were some modifications to the parking on one side because of the easterly back corner. The applicant moved the 10 feet off the property line because there is residential in the back. One of the comments left by Engineer O'Rourke was regarding the support columns, with a concern that the columns would interfere with parking spaces or circulation. It was coordinated with the Engineer and Architect to place the column with some islands around them for parking spaces so the applicant could accommodate the lower-level parking. The applicant aimed to resolve the issue that the building was considered two stories and the lower level was considered a basement. That basement is going to be accessory use storage strictly for the tenants. In a previous submission Mini storage was discussed, but that is not the situation here. The applicant would like the board to feel satisfied with the changes so the applicant can proceed further into the plans and create the drainage, stormwater, utilities, walls, lighting, and landscaping portion of the plan. Engineer O'Rourke provided his comments to the board. This is a glorified concept plan. He has reviewed the basement elevation with Building Inspector Cocks and it has been determined that it meets code, so it would be considered a two story building, so it meets zoning. It is too early other than for the board to provide a general sentiment of approval so the applicant can proceed. A 239 Referral will not work at this time because the County will have too many comments. He asks the board to be cognizant of fire access vs. fire apparatus access road for the turnaround, as depending on the height of this building it could be a building code issue. There is quite a bit of grading; it is a tough place to access. It is on the bend of the road. The site is much higher than the adjoining shopping center. The applicant may be able to do an interconnect in the rear, but he does not believe that can be done for the front. Planner Fink provided his comments. He reviewed the Village's Comprehensive Plan. The site has an extensive row of parking adjoining existing parking. There is an objective, listed in the traffic section E.2.3.2, which states to "Promote traffic flow between adjacent parking facilities in separate ownership. Additionally, wherever possible, any new development along the Route 17M corridor should provide cross easements to adjacent properties to allow the interconnection of parking facilities. This will in turn allow the Village to reduce the number of necessary curb cuts and improve traffic flow." Has this been discussed by the planning board. Has the applicant considered any kind of interconnection to the adjoining parking area. Engineer O'Rourke had mentioned the grading differences, so would that connection even be possible. Engineer Torro stated that he had spoken with the adjoining plaza since the applicant was looking to possible grade down on the adjoining plaza's property so that everything was at a more uniform level, and also spoke on the issue of access. The adjoining plaza was very reluctant to do anything on their property, the adjoining plaza would consider minor grading if necessary. The adjoining plaza had issues with an interconnection, which the adjoining plaza did not expand on, but Engineer Torro stated that he may be able to get something in writing if the board requests. Planner Fink stated that maybe it would be possible to talk about shared parking, and potentially reduce some of the parking on this property. If the adjoining parking is not at maximum capacity maybe it could be possible to share some of the parking if there was an interconnection. People could park once and walk over to the other development, which would help relieve traffic. Engineer O'Rourke stated that at the back of the shopping center the grading goes down. There's kind of a pull off there in the rear so that could potentially be extended, emergency services may help as well. The grade changes between the two properties, especially in the front below 17M are significant, but you may get access through the rear. Member Parise stated that it would be nice to have a walkway from this office to the shopping center. People driving out and going to lunch could use the walkway in nice weather. Also, where would all the snow be put. Will the snow be put in the proposed storm water pond. This will have to be plowed. The shopping plazas have 72 hours to remove snow from the parking lots so it doesn't take up the spaces. That was a problem years ago, such as with the Shoprite Plaza, which was resolved in the special use permit. Also, if

there was pedestrian interconnect between the two properties that would be good. If there was interconnect of traffic, an ingress and egress would also be good. With the elevation situation it is difficult to see if that could be accomplished. Chairman Boucher asked Engineer O'Rourke what his thoughts on the grading and interconnected parking in the comprehensive plan. Engineer O'Rourke stated that Engineer Torro is aware of that now. The applicant will have to review that again when the applicant comes back with a more complete design. The applicant could either get an interconnect agreement with the next-door property owner or have a written document stating that it could not work because of grading or because the adjoining plaza does not want an interconnect. Hopefully, the applicant can get a grading agreement and potentially some type of stairway down or other interconnect, as Member Parise had brought up the possibility of a walkway. Attorney Cassidy requested that on the next submission the application is slightly different from the property card. There are two owners shown on the property card. Could it be matched or explain the difference.

**5. Northeast Community Bank – Amended Site Plan – (214-1-53.2)  
Present: Larry Torro, PE, Civil Tech Engineering;**

Engineer Torro provided an overview of the project. On the easterly property line, there was a small retaining wall that somewhat starts on the rear of this property and goes on to the neighboring property. The wall should have been removed during construction of the bank, but it was not removed. This was an oversight. The neighbor had contacted the village about the wall. Essentially, the applicant is looking to remove the existing wall and replace it with a new block wall along that line. As this not being a field change, this project had to come before the board as an amended site plan. There was a vinyl fence in that area that was constructed, it is now existing, and the applicant aims to make this part of the site plan. The access so the wall can be taken down would be through the neighbor's property, and the contractor for the bank has had some preliminary conversations with the neighbor. He would work with the property owner to restore whatever disturbance is created during construction. Engineer O'Rourke provided his comments. He took some photographs of the site which were uploaded for the board to view. The last photo shows the vinyl fence that was put on top of an existing wall. There are issues with the existing wall so it will be taken down and a new wall and fence will replace that. There is no room for landscaping in the area. The fence was not on the original site plan. He assumes that the neighbor is happy with the fence there, just the condition of the wall itself was the issue. Member Parise asked if the new wall and new fence will be the same type as what is there now. Engineer Torro confirmed that this was the case. Engineer O'Rourke stated that the applicant submitted a short EAF, his office is generally satisfied, although it's a Type 2 Action under SEQR. The site is near Route 17M so a 239 Referral may be required. Attorney Cassidy said that technically the site does require a 239 referral. Secretary Doherty can send out the 239 Referral this week to shorten the time frame. The board will do the lead agency, Type 2 Action, and ratification of the referral, and then have the project on for the March meeting so that the 30 days requirement is satisfied. If the board waits for that motion, then there will be delays into April. There technically does not need to be a formal resolution to send out the 239 Referral. Chairman Boucher stated that Secretary Doherty can send out the 239 Referral, then the board can declare lead agency at the regular meeting. Engineer Torro asked if the applicant would be on the February 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting for lead agency. Chairman confirmed this and stated also that the 239 response will probably not be received until March. Attorney Cassidy stated that at the regular meeting the referral resolution will be ratified.



**6. Threetel/Oak St. – Site Plan – (203-3-3.2)**  
**Present:** Larry Torro, PE, Civil Tech Engineering;

Engineer Torro provided an overview of the project. This project was before the board about a year ago. The footprint of the proposed office building has been reduced. The client and property owner, who utilize the on-site warehouse, have had their business expand so the applicant needs to keep the portion of warehouse which was originally slated for removal. The site plan has been changed so the warehouse remains. Some proposed parking on the side has been eliminated. There was some access circulation around the building which was taken out because it would have brought the access out to Oak Street, which originally brought them out to the joint access between the two properties. Basically, this is the same concept as far as the office and warehouse, two uses, on the same lot but with a reduced footprint. There were questions raised about the area around the office building, but as plans proceed, there would be something that would allow for some additional landscaping, grass area. There is less than required parking provided on the property. There is joint access for the parking on the adjoining lot and the applicant would look to utilize that. There would be some bank parking on the other lot if it is required by the board. At this point, this is more so the concept of the office building. Chairman Boucher stated that in April 2020 the planning board declared intent for lead agency and to coordinate a SEQR review. At that time it was classified as an unlisted action under SEQR, but this may not be correct. Planner Fink provided his comments regarding SEQR. He reviewed the Type 1 thresholds and SEQR regulations. This project meets the Type 1 Threshold. Two things are needed. The only EAF that was submitted was a short EAF. For Type 1 Actions, a long EAF is required. That needs to be submitted because there is another agency involved, which is the Village of Monroe ZBA. The board will be required to circulate lead agency for that, but the long EAF is required first. Engineer O'Rourke asked that when the Neg. Dec. and lead agency notice was done, was the applicant able to get to the ZBA. Engineer Torro responded that the applicant has not yet appeared before the ZBA due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the changes made to the office footprint. The applicant wanted to resolve the office footprint before the applicant went to the ZBA. Engineer O'Rourke stated that for all intents and purposes the applicant is starting the project from scratch. The applicant is now in a position to submit a long EAF, have the planning board declare lead agency, and go to the ZBA. The applicant should also check that the height of the buildings for fire access and fire apparatus access meet the code before the applicant go to the ZBA. Attorney Cassidy provided her comments. Any cross easements for parking should be provided for review and comment. The board should review the adequacy of the parking and whether a waiver of the parking requirements is needed. There was some discussion of using parking from other sites. The parking calculations for those sites should be provided so that the board can ensure there is enough parking for both sides. There are two variances required, for front yard and coverage. Engineer O'Rourke asked that Engineer Torro resubmit the parking easements that were created in the past. That lower parking lot is not used much at all, but to use that the applicant would have to get access. There is a potential sidewalk shown. It will be important to get those people from the parking lot to the office building, or wherever the public needs to go. Chairman Boucher stated that Building Inspector Cocks had commented that ADA parking and access details need to be noted on the plans. A dumpster enclosure location detail is required as well. Waterline and sewer details need to be noted as well. Applicant should identify if a sprinkler system is proposed. Fire access is required to the existing rear warehouse and in the rear of the new building. Dead end access is permitted, but not to exceed 150 feet in length. Utilizing the

side of the building adjacent to the county may suffice to meet this requirement. Secretary Doherty will send Building Inspector Cocks' comments to Engineer Torro. If the applicant is able to get variances then some of those comments may change. Member Karlich asked if the applicant will need a variance for the lot coverage. Engineer O'Rourke confirmed that this is correct. There is a requirement in the code that a building can only have so much coverage in an area. In the GB zone you're allowed to have 25% lot coverage. What is proposed is 45% lot coverage. This is an existing warehouse that could use a lot of work. The old office building is kind of "hatched" in that whole area. The applicant needs the variance because the applicant wants more coverage than what the area would permit. Member Karlich asked what the lot coverage was on the Route 17M 445 project. Engineer O'Rourke stated that the lot coverage there was 22%.

**7. 683 Route 17M – Site Plan (212-2-6)**  
**Present:** Jay Stone, Owner;

Chairman Boucher stated that there is a continuance of the public hearing that will go next on February 23<sup>rd</sup>. If all goes accordingly, the applicant will make a resubmission for approval in March. The board is looking to do a Special Use Permit and Site Plan Approval. Mr. Stone asked if the date of the March Regular Meeting was March 23<sup>rd</sup>. Chairman Boucher confirmed that this is correct. Chairman Boucher provided an overview of the project. The applicant is looking to convert a second-floor existing apartment to residential use and keep the first-floor commercial use. Engineer O'Rourke provided his comments. The applicant submitted plans after the submission date. His office reviewed the plans and the comments were sent to the applicant's designer, but there was not enough time for the resubmission. The comments his office provided are still there, and the changes still must be made. Mr. Stone stated that he told his engineer that the entire parking lot will be repaved. A barrier will be put up, as per Engineer O'Rourke's comments. Engineer O'Rourke stated that a split rail fence may be a lot cheaper than putting up concrete blocks. The fact that the applicant is repaving the driveway and taking down the garage is great, it just needs to be shown on the plan. Mr. Stone stated that he is concerned about Engineer O'Rourke's #9 Comment, which reads "Planning Board should review existing site conditions to determine if additional landscaping, repaving or lighting is required." In the previous meeting, the board did not have time to review the plans submitted. Member Parise asked if anyone is renting the upstairs floor now, and if the renters do rent that upstairs floor how do the renters leave and enter the area since it is currently filled with snow. Mr. Stone stated that the upstairs is being rented but he is not sure how the renters leave and enter. Member Parise said that he is concerned about that, since there has been a lot of snow recently. Where is the snow being stored. Mr. Stone stated that the neighboring owner may be letting the occupant use their spaces, since the area is occupied by construction trucks and the big dumpster. Member Parise said he is concerned about the snow, and the snow should be removed so that the tenants can park because right now it is very tight. The board should be concerned about that, so the tenants are happy and the area is presentable. Mr. Stone agrees with his concerns and states that if the new owner is interested in maintaining his tenants, he will have to keep conditions satisfactory. The owner will have to use a snowblower as there is no place to plow it. Chairman Boucher asked Mr. Stone what his concern was with Comment #9. Mr. Stone stated that at the time Engineer O'Rourke submitted his comments the planning board had not been able to review the plans, so he just wants to confirm that the board has no other comments. Member Parise asked if the board was satisfied with the landscaping as shown on the plan. Member Allen said that on the plan it looks like there is a gas meter on the house near left side of the driveway, will a bollard be installed in front of that. Mr. Stone stated that there is about three feet of grass between the driveway and the meter. Member Allen

stated that the bollard would be there to prevent accidents, and that no one ever plans on running into a gas meter. Chairman Boucher asked if the black house is for drainage. Mr. Stone said that was a sump pump. Member Allen suggested that maybe the sump pump be moved underground so that the new driveway to be installed is not affected by the water. Chairman Boucher stated that the public meeting will be continued February 23<sup>rd</sup>. Engineer O'Rourke said that a bollard in front of the gas meter would not be a bad idea and will offer protection.

**8. 548 Rt. 17M – Site Plan – (220-4-8)**

**Present:** Rodger Braley, Architect, Rodger W. Braley Architects;

Engineer O'Rourke provided a brief overview of the project. He attached an aerial of the site. This site is next to the Mombasha Firehouse, down by Freeland Road, McDonald's, and Built Well Fence. This is the applicant's first appearance before the board. It looks like the applicant is trying to clean up the site. The applicant are proposing an accessory warehouse, and an open-walled shed to cover some of the equipment and facilities. There is no existing site plan for this site, but the area appears to have grown over the years. This is in a flood zone so the flood map line will have to be shown on the plan. Some topography and additional survey work need to be done. The Site Plan's special use for office is permitted, but warehousing requires a special use permit. A short EAF was submitted but it did not seem to match DEC standard form, nor were the answers consistent with the DEC standard form. He asks that the applicant resubmit the EAF using the DEC's website so that the answers are correct for endangered species, flood zones, and wetlands on the site. Planner Fink stated that the correct one is a form available on the DEC's website. The applicant probably used an older copy of the EAF forms available years ago before the state transitioned to an online format. Based on what he has seen now, the action appears to be unlisted so a short EAF would be sufficient. This plan is more of a concept plan, and there is a whole section in the Village Code for both site plan and special use that the plan will have to be updated for. A topographic survey, landscaping, lighting, drainage, erosion, and architectural renderings will be required for the Architectural Review Board, which the planning board is now also. It looks like either one person owns multiple properties in this area or there's cross easements, so that will also need to be shown for circulation. Architect Braley provided an overview of the project. The applicant seeks to construct a facility that will house all of their equipment and move it out of the site, and also have a place to put their new office. Right now the applicant are inhouse and have outgrown the space, so the applicant is asking for 500 sq/ft and a mezzanine in what is primarily a metal building. Behind that 500 sq/ft and mezzanine is an existing shed and an existing area that is made from built-up railroad ties where the applicant stores material. The applicant wants to take all of that and put it into one structure, which is the structure on the second sheet of the plan. On the right side of that sheet, on a rendering he made, that building is the one with the columns and concrete backing. Materials like sand and gravel will be stored there. The applicant owns the property next door, and he also owns all the property behind the Mombasha Fire Station. Those two lots are used for storing materials. Should that be noted on the site plan, should there be a combination of the two lots. The lots are (220 – 4 – 8) and (214 – 1 - 56.1). Attorney Cassidy stated that her preference would be that, since there is not an existing site plan and the area has changed over time and is used as one lot, that a site plan covering both lots be made. Potentially, the lots can also be merged. Architect Braley stated that right hand side, the one which ends in 56.1, is all outside storage, there are no buildings on it. Engineer O'Rourke asked if the building on that property is carved out in the front and the rear property. Attorney Cassidy said that there is a carve out and the building is in a little niche. Engineer O'Rourke stated that the two lots should be one comprehensive site plan if the owner owns both, and to avoid any

cross easements. Architect Braley asked if the owner should join both lots. Engineer O'Rourke stated that yes, he should, unless he cannot do it for tax purposes. Even then it can still be a joint site plan. The lots could be merged or cross easements established. This is so the board can approve everything and make it legal. Whether the owner wants to have two parcels or a cross easement that is up to him. Chairman Boucher asked Attorney Cassidy if there is an issue with merging lots. Spring Street had an issue with that. Engineer O'Rourke clarified that the issue on Spring Street related to a recent local law the Village had with combining lots to create a bigger use. This site has already existing use, although he is not sure if it is for the zone, he does not believe there is an issue. Attorney Cassidy said that for Spring Street, it was in a residential area and there was a residential component, but she will check that. But regardless, the site plan for this project needs to show all the items listed in the Village Code. Engineer O'Rourke's comments got most of those, and these comments should be addressed. Member Parise asked if a whole new site plan could be done so that the board can see what is proposed and what is existing. Chairman Boucher says that he is under the impression that the applicant is just looking for a nod of approval from the board for conceptual approval. Then the applicant will go from that and create a full-size site plan. Architect Braley stated that this the case. Chairman Boucher stated that he believes these proposed changes will help clean up the lot. Secretary Doherty will also send a copy of the meeting calendar so he can reference the submission deadlines. Architect Braley stated that the owner will not be back until next week, and the issue of combining the lots will take more time than anything else. Engineer O'Rourke said that it can be shown on the plan, as one of the notes, that the lots would be merged. As the applicant go through the process then the applicant could work on that, without having that issue causing delays. Attorney Cassidy stated that the corporate disclosure only disclosed 51%. Unless the remaining ownerships are less than 2%, all other ownerships should be disclosed. Architect Braley also said that the owner might have to have a portion of the site plan with the flood plain resurveyed again, which might delay submission. Member Hafenecker stated that there are some things on the site plan which appear to be very close to that flood plain. The Ramapo Stream is near the back of the property. Architect Braley said that he added a 100 ft. buffer, and most states that he is licensed in require at least 100 ft. buffer. Engineer O'Rourke stated that from when the last survey on the property was done it appears that there has been some expansion on the property. The owner has also cleared close to the Ramapo Stream. Once the short EAF is resubmitted it may reveal that the area is a state wetland, as the old racetrack that was nearby was a state wetland. If the area is part of a state wetland, that would have to be mapped on the plan as well. Member Parise asked if the area must be delineated by the DEC. Engineer O'Rourke stated that once the short EAF is revised, the area's status as state wetland will be determined, the applicant can have a wetland delineator mark it and the DEC confirm if it is a state wetland. Member Hafenecker noted that when the Ramapo Stream can run aggressively. Also, going to the back of the site plan by the 100 ft. buffer on the Ramapo Stream, there is a lot of debris right up to that creak, and work might be needed to clean that up.

## **Adjournment**

On a Motion made by Member Parise and seconded by Member Kelly it **was Resolved that there being no further business, the Meeting be adjourned.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:11 p.m.