

**VILLAGE OF MONROE PLANNING BOARD  
WORKSHOP MEETING  
JULY 6, 2016  
MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** Chairman Parise, Members Cocks, DeAngelis, Karlich, Graziano, Engineer Queenan, Attorney Levinson, Building Inspector Cocks

Chairman Parise opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag. An announcement was made regarding the location of fire exits.

**1. Shop Rite Plaza – Conditional Use Renewal – (203-2-5)**

**Present:** Ronald Kossar, Esq.; Peter Calabrese, Brixmor Property Group

Attorney Kossar informed the Board that the Post Office has been approached regarding the parking issue and they are working to accommodate the Board's requests. Mr. Calabrese added that striping and "no parking" markings have been added. Attorney Kossar added that the truck traffic has been rerouted as best as they can. Attorney Levinson noted that he still sees trucks enter through the front. Chairman Parise commented that the applicant should keep on top of the truck issue. Chairman Parise further commented that he and Member DeAngelis made a site visit in May with Mr. Calabrese and they were both very satisfied with the plantings and improvements made to the site. Mr. Calabrese stated he put together a 3 year plan for site improvements in order to balance out the costs. The landscaping will be watered and maintained and there is still one more asphalt project scheduled for this year. The next two years will bring some more improvements. Member Cocks commented the site looks great and is much improved. Member Graziano agrees he sees a lot of improvement.

**2. Threetel Holdings – Conditional Use/Site Plan – (203-3-3.2)**

**Present:** Joe Haller, PE, Civil Tech Engineering

Engineer Haller informed the Board that the tenant with the Uhauls has been served with a notice to vacate but does not know the status of the issue. The Landlord is pursuing the matter through legal venues. Chairman Parise discussed the 6-30-16 letter received from NYS DOT, specifically their request that the parking in front of the building along Route 208 be removed. Engineer Haller stated Engineer Torro is working with DOT on the parking issue. The Board agreed that the parking issue as requested by DOT needs to be addressed and new parking spaces incorporated into the site plan before the Board can go any further on this application.

**3. Monroe Florist – Amended Site Plan – (201-1-9.4)**

**Present:** Mark Edsall, PE; Margaret Barry, Owner

Chairman Parise noted that the last time this application was before the board it was left that there was supposed to be a meeting with the applicant, her engineer, the Village engineer and Village building inspector and evaluate what was not completed per the original approved site plan. Building Inspector Cocks stated that meeting was held and the items agreed on which Engineer Edsall included in the amended site plan. Engineer Edsall described the application to the Board. The property is located in the GB zone and has an existing retail florist shop in the main building on the first floor, and the applicant is now proposing to convert the use of the second floor of the main building as an owner's apartment, which requires a conditional use permit. The second building shown on the plan was originally approved by this board to be removed but was never removed, and has since been renovated and is proposed for approval as a business office. Other items which were discussed in the field include reorientation of some of the parking spaces; the addition of handicapped parking spaces meeting current standards; two sheds were supposed to be removed but remain on the property and are used for light storage; the dumpster location from the original approved plan has shifted and the enclosure is not what today's Village code requires; the walk in refrigerator remains on site; a small grass area which was going to be eliminated remains on site; and the greenhouses were also supposed to be removed but remain on site. The property is the subject of variances therefore the applicant is before the board to not only amend the site plan but to also abide by the variance regulations specifically if any use on the site changes the property owner must return to the Planning Board for review. The property owner would like to keep the green house areas and clean them up and use them as planting beds. The framing will be removed and the area cleaned up. Ms. Barry added that if she lived on the property it would be easier to focus on maintenance of the property. The Board was not opposed to allowing the green house area to be used as long as it was cleaned up. The Board also agreed that the dumpster enclosure has to meet village code. Building Inspector Cocks added that the enclosure there now is wood stockade and would not hold up.

Architect Chabon, representing Chabad of Orange County, informed the Board that their Engineer was running late and requested to be moved to the end of the agenda.

**4. Lenza – Amended Site Plan – (223-1-4)**

**Present:** Steve Brown, Hudson Valley Realty

Chairman Parise noted there are some differences in the construction from what the site plan called for. Mr. Brown admitted there were some changes done without the Board's approval and was looking to remedy the changes. Chairman Parise noted the drive through menu kiosk is not in the correct spot and is concerned there could be an issue with the stacking of the cars. Mr. Brown responded that the menu board was moved approximately 20 feet due to a door on the building. Dunkin Donuts feels that having 5 cars stacked between the window and the order board is sufficient due to the speed in which they process the orders. This site provides for an additional 3 cars, for a total of 8

cars to the entry of the drive through lane. Chairman Parise commented that it is upsetting that site plan review is given and then not followed. It gives the impression that an applicant can do whatever it wants, regardless of what the Planning Board approves, and that is unacceptable. If Dunkin Donuts wanted to change something that was approved they should have stopped working and contacted either the building inspector or village engineer, or even returned to the planning board. Submitting an as built site plan after the fact is not acceptable. Changes can always be considered along the way. The Board agreed this is unacceptable and agreed that the order sign should be where it was originally agreed to be placed. Chairman Parise added that the ingress and egress is problematic and feels the direction should be limited to one way in and around the building to exit. Mr. Brown agrees with the traffic flow problem and agrees to have the engineer redraw plans with a one way around the building. Building Inspector Cocks suggested angling the parking spaces to make it harder to park if the one way is not followed. Since the final blacktop coat has not been done yet this can easily be modified. Mr. Brown noted he submitted a new lighting plan due to the shorter light poles which were installed. Chairman Parise noted that the lighting plan needed to be reviewed and compared to the original lighting plan for any discrepancies, and added that a full size paper copy needs to be submitted. Engineer Queenan summarized that there are two issues, one being the changes that were made deviating from the approved site plan (i.e. the moved order kiosk, the altered light pole size), and the other is the changes that they are proposing to make (additional signs including free standing pylon sign, new ingress/egress pattern, new striping pattern). The Board would like to see an overlay with the proposed amendments and changes compared to the original site plan. The plans need to be updated with the new traffic flow and striping around the site along with the new proposed signs. Attorney Levinson added that the general notes on the amended site plan should reflect all of the general notes from the original site plan. Member Karlich asked about details on the free standing sign and stated that a variance would be needed, and once they variance was obtained the plan would have to be amended again to reflect the final position of the sign. Chairman Parise added that the U-Haul trucks are still all over the site despite being addressed with the site plan. Two parking spaces were put aside for the U-Haul's yet they've been parked everywhere. Mr. Brown assured the board that the U-Haul issue has been resolved and they are limited to the two spots or behind their own building.

**5. Chabad of Orange County – Site Plan – (206-6-1.2)**

**Present:** John Petroccione, P.E.; Arthur Chabon, Architect

Chairman Parise stated that due to the size of the submission our engineer was unable to complete his review. Chairman Parise stated that without a complete engineer review the board cannot proceed. Engineer Petroccione stated that the new plans address all engineering comments from the last review along with some modifications such as an adjustment to the positioning of the building, turning areas and roadway adjustments as requested by the Fire Department. Engineer Queenan stated that Engineer O'Rourke was almost finished and could be ready for Monday, and added that Engineer O'Rourke felt the traffic study submitted by the applicant should be referred to

the Village's traffic consultant for review. Chairman Parise suggested that since Engineer O'Rourke would be done with his review by Monday, discussion could be held on Monday night after the board has an opportunity to read the review. Chairman Parise polled the board and they unanimously agreed to discuss the matter at the Regular meeting on 7/11/16. Chairman Parise noted that this matter was scheduled for the AARB meeting on 7/11/16 and asked the applicant why they would be going before the AARB at such an early stage in the review process. Architect Chabon replied they wanted to get a jump start on the process. Attorney Levinson informed the applicant that if anything changes during the planning board review process they would have to return to the AARB. Member Karlich requested renderings of the building.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

On a motion made by Member Cocks and seconded by Member Graziano it was unanimously **Resolved that there being no further business, the Meeting be adjourned.** The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.