

VILLAGE OF MONROE PLANNING BOARD

REGULAR MEETING

FEBRUARY 23, 2021

PRESENT: Chairman Boucher, Members Allen, DeAngelis, Hafenecker, Karlich, Kelly, and Parise; Attorney Cassidy, Engineer O'Rourke, Planner Fink, Traffic Consultant Connell, Traffic Consultant Prezioso and Engineer Barber.

Chairman Boucher opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag. Chairman Boucher stated that this meeting is being held via Zoom in conformance with Executive Order 202.10 from the Governor Cuomo.

PUBLIC HEARING:

1. 683 Route 17M – Site Plan (212-2-6)

Present: Jay Stone, Owner

This is a continuation of the public hearing on February 26, 2021. Chairman Boucher opened the meeting to public comment. No public comment was given.

On a motion made by Member Parise and seconded by Member Kelly, it was unanimously:
Resolved that the Public Hearing for 683 Route 17M be continued.

On a motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Parise, it was unanimously:
Resolved that the Public Hearing for 683 Route 17M be closed.

REGULAR HEARING

1. 683 Route 17M – Site Plan (212-2-6)

Present: Jay Stone, Owner

Engineer O'Rourke said that prior to tonight's meeting the applicant's engineer sent a draft copy of the plans to review. The plans appear to address the comments made at the previous workshop. Engineer O'Rourke said that the applicant must resubmit the plans to the Board for the March meetings. Member Parise asked Engineer O'Rourke what the applicant had put on the parking spaces for a barrier to prevent drivers from entering the adjacent property? Engineer O'Rourke stated that the plan proposes curb stops. Bollards were also added around the gas meter. The plans also show that the applicant will be ripping up and repaving the entire parking lot. Engineer O'Rourke's office will review the lighting that was proposed. Member Parise asked if, on the lower part of the proposed parking lot, will the lawn be removed? Engineer O'Rourke stated that the new

plans do show the pavement expansion. The lawn in the rear is going to be paved to expand the parking lot. Member Karlich stated that on the plans currently available to the Board there is a note for the parking which says that only the parking lot would be paved and not the driveway. Does the draft submission that Engineer O'Rourke reviewed note that the driveway will be paved as well? Engineer O'Rourke stated that repaving the entire driveway and parking lot is noted on the plan. Chairman Boucher stated that the applicant will submit new plans and the Board will review them at the March meetings.

2. 208 Business Center Site Plan – (201-3-3, 4, 7, 8)

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

Chairman Boucher stated that at the February 8th Workshop the Planning Board had discussed the two Notices of Violation on 25 Gilbert Street Extension with the applicant. These violations needed to be addressed as of Friday, February 19th, but as of this meeting the violations are still outstanding. Building Inspector Cocks stated that he had a discussion with the property owner about the violations. The property owner needed more time to resolve the outstanding issues because the snow on the property needed to be cleaned up. Building Inspector Cocks stated that he had set a deadline of March 22th, which is a day before the next March meeting. If the violations are not dealt with by then then the applicant will not be on the agenda. Engineer Barber provided her comments. She noted for the record that she is filling in for Engineer Lindsay and will be serving as a conflict engineer for this project. Engineer Barber provided an overview of the project. Intent to be Lead Agency has been circulated, and the action is classified as Type 1 under SEQR. A positive declaration and draft resolution has been provided by Planner Fink for the board to consider. The applicant has submitted a draft scoping document for the Board to review. A draft scoping document initiates a 60-day time clock for acceptance of a revised scope. It is recommended that the Board discuss with the applicant an extension to April 27, 2021 for adoption of the draft scope. This extension will allow for public participation as well as time for consultants to prepare their comments. A public scoping session can be scheduled for March 23. A notice for the Public Scoping and deadline for the submission of written comments has been prepared by Planner Fink and should be published. No revised site plans have been received, so the comments Engineer Barber's office submitted in October of last year remain relevant. Additional details on the plan are anticipated to be submitted once the issues of traffic and access are resolved. The actions on the 208 Business Center project tonight are primarily related to SEQR. Chairman Boucher stated that the Positive Declaration and draft scope are available for the Board to review. The public scoping session should be set by the Board tonight as well. Member Parise stated that the aforementioned documents were received Friday and there is a lot of material to review. Why is there such a rush to schedule a public scoping session when the Board may have other comments? More time to review these scoping materials may be needed. Chairman Boucher asked Member Parise to which documents he was referring? Member Parise stated that he was referring to the Draft Scope document. Member Parise also had a

question about the Positive Declaration. Shouldn't the Town of Palm Tree and the Village of Kyrias Joel be listed as interested agencies on the Positive Declaration? One item on the Planning Board's agenda tonight is the Forest Rd. Bridge to 208 Bridge Connector Road, which those two municipalities are involved in. Planner Fink stated that any agency that expresses an interest at any point in the SEQR process can be added as an interested agency. The interested agencies that are added will be forwarded notices and documents. The issue with delays at this point is that the SEQR regulations do include a specific time frame for the review of the draft scoping document. SEQR regulations require a 60-day period for review of the draft scope. If the Planning Board does not adopt a final scoping document within that 60-day period the applicant can use their draft scoping document to prepare their EIS. If the Board were to adopt this by April 27 as a final scoping document that would be outside of the 60-day period when the draft scoping document was submitted by the applicant. Chairman Boucher stated that the draft scoping document was available for the Board's review at the February 8th meeting. Engineer Rother stated that the applicant had submitted the draft scoping document on January 28th. Engineer Barber stated that if the Planning Board were to consider an extension, the extension would be to the April 27th meeting, which is two months from this current meeting. The applicant would have to agree to that as well. At the March 23rd meeting the public scoping session could be held and both the public's and consultant's comments could be submitted. After that, the comments provided by the public and consultants would be incorporated into a revised draft scope document, which would be considered at the April 27th meeting. Attorney Cassidy stated that the scoping session has a public portion which will be kept open for written comments for ten days. The extension would make this written comment portion available to the public. If there is a large public response the Board can reevaluate whether holding a second evening for public oral comment is necessary. Planner Fink stated that he attended a Zoom meeting for a municipality and the number of public that attended exceeded the amount of spaces available in the meeting. Members of the public would have to leave after providing their comments so that everyone could participate. Would a meeting size be an issue for the Planning Board to consider? Attorney Cassidy said that for tonight the Board should consider the Positive Declaration as it is the trigger for all the scoping documents. This project is not static and there will most likely be multiple traffic alternatives in the thesis. The scoping notice sets the public scoping process for the March 23rd meeting. Chairman Boucher asked Engineer Rother if the Planning Board could receive an extension until the April 27th meeting. Engineer Rother stated that there would be no issue providing an extension to meet that timeline. Chairman Boucher also asked Engineer Rother to work with Attorney Cassidy so that an extension in writing could be provided to the Board. Member Parise requested that the Town of Palm Tree and the Village of Kyrias Joel be added to the list of interested agencies in the Positive Declaration. Planner Fink read the Positive Declaration Resolution into the record. Attorney Cassidy requested that Engineer Rother coordinate with Secretary Doherty to have the Draft Scope, Notice of Scoping Session, and Positive Declaration posted on the Village's website. Member Parise proposed that information regarding emergency services be added to the Draft Scope. Part H of the Draft Scope reads: "Part H. Project Purpose, Need and Benefits. The public need for the proposed action,

including its economic benefits to the community, will be provided.” Can this part be elaborated upon? What are the needs, what are the benefits of this to the community?

Planner Fink stated that the needs and benefits portion of the Draft Scope is part of the EIS. When the final step of the SEQR review process and preparation of a finding statement is completed, there’s a certification on that finding statement that the Planning Board has balanced the social and economic benefits of the action with the adverse impact. That information will be provided in the EIS. Member DeAngelis requested that the Town of Monroe Planning Board be added to the list of interested agencies that receive documents regarding the 208 Business Center Project. Planner Fink stated that he would add the Town of Palm Tree, Village of Kyrias Joel, and the Town of Monroe Planning Board to the Positive Declaration. Member Karlich asked if the Village of Monroe has an escrow account with this project? Attorney Cassidy stated that she will coordinate the escrow account with the applicant and Secretary Doherty. The Village of Monroe does not automatically set up an escrow account, unlike other municipalities, so that may still have to be set up. Engineer Rother stated that he plans on attending the March workshop but will not submit anything new.

617.7

State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR)

Resolution Adopting Positive Declaration

Name of Action: 208 Business Center

Whereas, 208 Business Center, LLC (hereafter referred to as the “applicant”) submitted an application for Site Plan Review and Approval and an application for a Special Use Permit to the Village of Monroe Planning Board (hereafter referred to as the “Planning Board”), to develop a ± 5.076 acre assembly of parcels of land located on State Route 208 and North Main Street, identified as Section 201, Block 3, Lots 3, 4, 7 and 8; and

Whereas, the Planning Board, has been designated as the SEQR Lead Agency for conducting the environmental review of this Type 1 Action following a Coordinated Review with other Involved Agencies; and

Whereas, the Planning Board has reviewed the Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) for the proposed project, the Criteria For Determining Significance contained in 6 NYCRR 617.7(c), and the applicant’s proposed Preliminary Site Plan dated November 16, 2018 and as revised through September 29, 2020; and

Whereas, the Planning Board has determined that the proposed project has the potential to have a significant adverse impact on the environment and has set forth the potential impacts that may reasonably be expected to result from the proposed action in a Positive Declaration attached to this Resolution.

Now Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Planning Board hereby adopts the attached Positive Declaration; and

Be It Further Resolved, that the Planning Board hereby authorizes its Chairman to circulate the attached Positive Declaration to all other involved and interested agencies and to discharge any other SEQR responsibilities as are required by 6 NYCRR 617 in this regard.

On a motion by Member Parise, seconded by Member Hafenecker, it was: Resolved: to adopt this resolution on February 23, 2021.

Member Allen	aye
Chairman Boucher	aye
Member DeAngelis	aye
Member Karlich	aye
Member Kelly	aye

On a Motion made by Member Allen and seconded by Member Parise, it was unanimously: **Resolved that the Public Scoping Session for Route 208 Business Center be set for March 23rd, 2021 at 7PM.**

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

Present: Paul Edwards, Owner

Chairman Boucher provided an overview of the project. The board will take action on a resolution to approve the field change regarding the retaining wall design. Member Parise asked Engineer O'Rourke what specific details the Board will approve? Engineer O'Rourke stated that the Board will approve the detail of the wall change. The Building Department will handle the wall as a separate building permit. Only the visual impact of the wall is modified, the material of the wall. Chairman Boucher stated that the resolution mentions the following details: "1. Wall details; 2. Photos and specifications of the Terra Crete concrete blocks; 3. Comments of Village Building Inspector and Village Engineer." Member DeAngelis stated that the Board should attach the picture of the Terra Crete to the site plan so that there is a visual reference of what is used. Attorney Cassidy read the resolution to approve the field change into the record.

VILLAGE OF MONROE
PLANNING
RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION OF
J. SQAURED BUILDERS FOR FIELD CHANGE
SBL 213-1-31

WHEREAS, the Village of Monroe Planning Board granted conditional site plan approval on April 27, 2020 and further granted a special use permit on May 18, 2020 for the construction of a six unit townhouse development located at 310 Stage Road;

WHEREAS, the applicant has requested the Planning Board consider a field change namely changing the construction of a retaining wall from a poured concrete wall to concrete blocks;

WHEREAS, in all other aspects the site plan and special use permit remain unchanged.

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has received and considered the following:

1. Wall details
2. Photos and specifications of the Terra Crete concrete blocks
3. Comments of Village Building Inspector and Village Engineer.

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has determined that this is a Type II action pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQR”) and no further environmental review is required; and

WHEREAS, in light of the de minimis changes to the site with no impact on traffic or the environment, the Planning Board has determined that this is a field change as per the Village of Monroe Code and that no public hearing is required;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Planning Board hereby grants the requested field change subject to the following conditions:

1. Applicant to utilize blocks as shown in Terra Crete Booklet, attached hereto.
2. Applicant to pay all fees
3. Applicant to obtain all permits.
4. Applicant to commence construction within one (1) year pursuant to § 200-72 of the Village of Monroe Village Code. Applicant may request an extension.

Motion by Member Kelly, Second by Member Parise Dated February 23, 2021

Member Keith Allen	Aye
Member Jeff Boucher	Aye
Member Gerri DeAngelis	Aye
Member Paul Hafenecker	Aye
Member Marilyn Karlich	Aye
Member Fred Kelly	Aye
Member Gary Parise	Aye

TERRA-CRETE

LANDSCAPE BLOCK



Retaining Walls Made Easy



DICK'S CONCRETE Co., INC.
"THE ORIGINAL PRODUCER AND SUPPLIER
WITH OVER 10 YEARS EXPERIENCE"
(845) 374-5966





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

Present: Kevin Brodie, Architect; Joseph Nyitray, Brooker Engineering; Bria Brooker, Brooker Engineering; Ira Emanuel, Esq,

Engineer O'Rourke said that he had spoken with the Water Superintendent earlier that day. The Water Superintendent was generally satisfied with the water report as submitted and he said that there was enough water to supply this project. Engineer O'Rourke's office had no issue with the engineering part of the water report. The applicant will submit modifications on the SWPPP based on minor technical comments and the plaque for the Board to review next month. Chairman Boucher stated that the Planning Board received the Village Board's decision approving the construction cost estimates. The approval of the cross easements was not put on their agenda, and those cross easements will be reviewed by the Village Board at a later meeting. Attorney Cassidy stated that she spoke with Attorney Terhune. Attorney Terhune stated in an email she had no objections to the easements as drafted. In that email she also requested that the final plan set include a reference to those cross easements as a note. Attorney Cassidy stated that she can draft and circulate to Attorney Emanuel the approval resolution for this project. Engineer O'Rourke stated that easements are typically filed prior to the Chairman signing the map. Attorney Cassidy stated that she would make a condition to include a note with the liber page number. Chairman Boucher stated that Member Parise had requested that a checklist be prepared for this project to ensure that none of the stops in the process are missed. Attorney Cassidy and Engineer O'Rourke will put a list together before plan approval for the board. Engineer Brooker stated that the plaque and plaque details that the Board requested were submitted. Architect Brodie provided an overview of the plaque and displayed the submitted plaque rendering for the Board. Member DeAngelis asked if the plaque would be replaced if it were destroyed? Engineer O'Rourke stated that if the plaque is noted on the site plan then the owner would be required to maintain that plaque. Chairman Boucher requested that the applicant be provided an extension ~~for~~ until the March 23rd meeting. Attorney Emanuel stated that an extension would be given and a letter will be provided. Attorney Cassidy stated that she will start preparing a draft resolution before the work session and circulate that resolution to Attorney Emanuel. She will also have a checklist available to the Board before the next workshop. Planner Fink stated that he will draft the Negative Declaration. Chairman Boucher stated that the applicant will appear before the Board at the March Meetings.

5. Northeast Community Bank – Amended Site Plan – (214-1-53.2)

Present: Larry Torro, PE, Civil Tech Engineering;

Chairman Boucher stated that the Board is looking to take action on a resolution which will declare this project to be a Type 2 Action under SEQR and have a 239 referral done. Attorney Cassidy provided details on what this resolution would accomplish. A Type 2 Action under SEQR will be declared. The resolution will also note that a public hearing will be waived for this project as one is not required in this case. The 239 referral which has

been sent to OCDP will be formally ratified. Attorney Cassidy read the resolution into the record. Member Parise asked for confirmation that a public hearing will not be held and that the neighbors are aware of what will be done for this project. Engineer Torro stated that the neighbors are aware of the construction that will be done. The contractor met with the neighbors and discussed this, as the construction that will take place will happen through the neighbor's property. The neighbors are the ones who brought it to the attention of the Village. Engineer Torro asked if this application will be on the March meeting.? Chairman Boucher confirmed that this project will be seen during the March meetings.

VILLAGE OF MONROE

PLANNING BOARD

RESOLUTION TO DECLARE TYPE II ACTION AND REFER PURSUANT TO 239 –
NORTHEAST COMMUNITY BANK AMENDED SITE PLAN

SBL 214-53.2-1

WHEREAS, the Village of Monroe Planning Board is in receipt of an application by Northeast Community Bank for amended site plan approval for the construction of a modified fence;

WHEREAS, a Short Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) dated January 26, 2021, submitted for review by the Planning Board; and

WHEREAS, after comparing the thresholds contained in 6 NYCRR 617.4 and 5, the Planning Board has determined that the proposed project is Type II action and no further environmental review is required; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that given the de minimis nature of the application a public hearing shall not be required.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the application shall be referred to the Orange County Department of Planning pursuant to General Municipal Law § 239 et seq. as the project site is within 500 feet of a state highway.

Motion by Member Parise, Second by Member Hafenecker Dated: February 23, 2021

Member Keith Allen	aye
Member Jeff Boucher	aye
Member Geraldine DeAngelis	aye
Member Paul Hafenecker	aye
Member Marilyn Karlich	aye
Member Fred Kelly	aye
Member Gary Parise	aye

OTHER BUSINESS

1. 310 Schunnemunk St. Subdivision - Street Name

Chairman Boucher stated that the road from the 310 Schunnemunk St. Subdivision needs to be named, and it is the Planning Board's responsibility to name streets. He brought to the Board's attention six possible names that could be used. Morris was one name that was listed. Alynn Irene Morris was a victim of the 9/11 attack and lived in Monroe. Asher was another name listed. Michael Edward Asher was also another victim of the 9/11 attacks. Brian Charles Mulkeen was killed in a friendly fire event on September 29, 2019. The Board discussed other possible names that could be used, such as Trimble, Rogers, Barone, Dowd, Mazella. The Board discussed the history of the people whose names were mentioned. Member Parise stated that there was a committee held years prior where the members assembled the list of names to be used. The list was created in 2015. Member DeAngelis stated that maybe it was time for this list of names to be revisited and updated, and that the Board should have more time to review the naming of this street. Building Inspector Cocks stated that the Board can decide on the street name next month. Member DeAngelis requested that the street inventory be provided to the Board. Building Inspector Cocks stated that Village Clerk Baxter would have that street inventory on file. Chairman Boucher stated that he will send that street inventory to the Board for review as well.

2. Forest Rd Bridge

Attorney Cassidy said that the Board should be aware of the situation regarding Forest Road Bridge. The Supervisor of the Town of Palm Tree had emailed Mayor Dwyer regarding the Forest Rd Bridge, which Attorney Cassidy referred to as the "Schunnemunk Bypass." The Supervisor had requested that the Town of Palm Tree be included in the 208 Business Center planning. A preliminary drawing was presented. It appears that there are discussions in the Town of Palm Tree and the municipality would look to acquire the property. There will also be discussions with DOT. This information was forwarded to the 208 Business Center applicant so they are also aware of the Schunnemunk bypass. The Schunnemunk bypass will help take traffic off that difficult intersection. Building Inspector Cocks agreed that the Schunnemunk bypass will take a considerable amount of traffic away from Schunnemunk St. He did not see any negatives with the Schunnemunk Bypass. Attorney Cassidy stated that this proposed Schunnemunk Bypass essentially creates a second service road paralleling 17M. Member Parise stated that the Schunnemunk Bypass will enter Forest Avenue and that the second phase would go from Forest Avenue to connect with Larken Drive. That connection would be in line with the recommendations in the Village of Monroe's Comprehensive Plan. Town of Palm Tree must submit a plan which would show the proposed plan of the layout of the intersection on Route 208 (where the salt barn is). The route into the development and the route into Forest Road should be shown as well. Attorney Cassidy displayed the preliminary drawing for the Board and explained the proposed changes. Member Allen

asked if this project should be taken in consideration with the 208 Business Center project? Attorney Cassidy stated that the Schunneunk Bypass should be included in a discussion of an alternative or potential future impact.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. January 26, 2021

On a Motion made by Member Parise and seconded by Member Allen, it was: **Resolved that the Minutes for January 26, 2021 be approved on the condition that “Workshop” is changed to “Regular.”**

Member Allen: **Aye**
Member Hafenecker: **Aye**
Member DeAngelis: **Abstain**
Member Karlich: **Aye**
Member Kelly: **Abstain**
Member Parise: **Aye**

2. February 8, 2021

On a Motion made by Member Hafenecker and seconded by Member Parise, it was: **Unanimously Resolved that the Minutes for February 8, 2021 be approved on the condition that ambiguous language be revised for accuracy.**

ADJOURNMENT

On a Motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Parise, it was: **Resolved that there being no further business, the Meeting be adjourned.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:01 p.m.