

**VILLAGE OF MONROE PLANNING BOARD
WORKSHOP MEETING
NOVEMBER 9, 2016
MINUTES**

PRESENT: Chairman Parise, Members Cocks, DeAngelis, Graziano, Engineer O'Rourke, Attorney Levinson, Building Inspector Cocks

ABSENT: Member Karlich

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. Mavis – Conditional Use Renewal – (220-4-6.1)

Present: Daniel Krauss, Regional Director, Mavis
Mike Manes, Director of Real Estate Development, Mavis

Chairman Parise reviewed the memo from the building department. With regard to the missing landscaping Mr. Krauss stated they will be reviewing the site plan and will replace all plantings which were approved. Member DeAngelis stated that the cornflowers planted before didn't work at that site and suggested some shrubs or grasses. Mr. Krauss agreed to plant grasses. It was agreed by the board that any new plantings should be done in the spring. Mr. Krauss added that striping of the parking lot has been ordered. Regarding the outside tire storage, that was a mistake and would like to install a container on the site in order to hold the tires while they are waiting for pick up. The tires get picked up every other week. Chairman Parise stated the board needs to see what this container or structure would look like, and where exactly it would be. It should be shown on a site plan. Building Inspector Cocks stated that certain types of containers were not permitted in the Village; however there are options that can be considered. Mr. Manes asked if an expansion of the dumpster enclosure would be possible. Building Inspector Cocks added that there is an underground drainage structure near the existing structure which needs to be considered and cannot be covered when locating the new enclosure.

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

Present: Larry Torro, P.E.

Engineer Torro stated that a new 15ft curb cut was added off Route 208 as a one way entrance to allow for access to the front building. There will be no left turn into the site heading into Monroe. The parking spaces to the left of the main entry road will be eliminated. The new design has been submitted to DOT for approval but no response has been received yet. Engineer O'Rourke discussed his review. Cross easements for parking on the other lot should be considered, as the other lots parking is underutilized. Engineer O'Rourke stated that if the board is generally satisfied with the current layout then the board could declare lead agency, 239 referral and schedule a public hearing.

DOT has the final say on the egress but the plans are ready to move forward at this point to allow review to begin for outside agencies. Engineer O'Rourke added that the lane width does not meet code, however it can't as this is an existing building and DOT has restrictions. Member Cocks asked if this would be a bakery for bread only or for cakes and other items too. Engineer Torro stated he was told it was a variety of baked goods. Chairman Parise asked if there was going to be a rear entrance into the building and Engineer Torro replied there would be. Building Inspector Cocks stated that the warehouse will need to be sprinklered therefore the site plan needs to show where the water is coming in. Attorney Levinson added that Note #8 should be amended to say no charity bins and/or other collection bins. Also, Note #10 should include a definition of truck to clarify truck traffic. Chairman Parise asked what the status was with the auto tenant and if U-hauls were still blocking Oak Street. Engineer Torro stated that they were in the middle of the eviction process. Member DeAngelis commented that she still sees vehicles blocking Oak Street.

3. Cumberland Farms – Site Plan – (215-1-13)

Present: Richard Olson, Esq.; Ilana Moran, Creighton Manning

Chairman Parise discussed the 239 review from Orange County. There were some items that the County discussed which were inaccurate, therefore a letter has been drafted requesting correction to the 239 review. The issues which need correction involve the comments for underground storage tank removal, traffic and vehicle movement, and ZBA referrals. The board was unanimously in favor of sending the letter to the County to request corrections. Engineer O'Rourke discussed his comments. The number of parking spaces needs to be confirmed by the board and noted on the plan. NYS DOT will be an involved agency and a highway work permit will be required. In addition OC Environmental Facilities is also an involved agency. Attorney Olson indicated that DOT will have comments in a week or so, but would not be in time for the public hearing on 11/14/16 and requested an adjournment of the public hearing to allow for DOT comments. Attorney Olson also indicated that the applicant was not amenable to constructing a sidewalk to nowhere, since there are no other sidewalks in the area that could connect to a potential sidewalk from this site. The board wants the sidewalks installed. Engineer O'Rourke discussed the 239 review and commented that the oil tank removal was a DEC issue and would be handled at the building department; and also added that lighting has been addressed and the neighbor commented that he appreciated the extra lighting therefore lighting seems to be satisfied. Attorney Levinson added that Note #8 general construction notes should specify that the building department is to be notified.

Ilana Moran from Creighton Manning on behalf of Cumberland Farms, and Katie Craig and Bernard Kalus of WSP Parsons Brinkerhoff on behalf of the Village discussed the traffic reports. Engineer Craig reviewed the response comments from Creighton Manning and still have 3 major issues with their study. The first issue is the project study area and that it should be expanded. It is stated that the proposed project is the same use as what was originally at the site. This is not true. The prior use was a small gas station with a walk in register and minor repair service. The proposed project is

going to be a 4800 square foot convenience store in addition to the gas pumps. This is a completely different use which will attract different people. In addition the study area should be expanded to include CVS/Vista Lane to include coordination with signals as well as queuing. Based on this the analysis should be expanded to include the CVS/Vista Lane intersection. The Board agreed this intersection should be included in the study. The second issue concerns safety with regard to the left turns in and out of the site onto 17M as well as Freeland Street. Engineer Craig feels there is a high probability that DOT could restrict turns from the site therefore it would make sense to do the left turn analysis now. A similar situation occurred with the Quick Check in the Town of Monroe where DOT required no left turn onto 17M, and the Quick Check is in a much less congested area with no signalization nearby. The final issue is the pass by trips. Engineer Craig has requested Creighton Manning provide the data showing this is a relevant pass by rate they are using. The presence of this facility could change people's typical trips with having a more centrally located gas station/convenience store. Chairman Parise questioned if there would be an issue with the ingress/egress for the florist site next door as he sees potential issues there. Engineer Kalus added that there was no weekend analysis done for the site and feels that at the least a Saturday analysis should be completed. Ilana Moran from Creighton Manning responded to WSP's comments. Regarding the scope of the study, Engineer Moran felt that according to industry standards it is not necessary to add any additional adjacent intersections and the driveways will not interrupt each other because they are too close to the access point. Chairman Parise felt it was important to take the adjacent driveways into consideration. Engineer Moran felt that only one additional car would be added to the existing queues on that roadway which does not justify adding the other driveways in. Engineer Moran added that someone would not normally go from a Cumberland Farms to a CVS so it wouldn't be an issue. Engineer Moran stated collecting the additional data would cost several thousand dollars. Engineer O'Rourke questioned what could the applicant do if more studies were done, since this was an existing site. Engineer Kalus responded that coordination between the two signals could be done so that cars would not be caught at both lights. DOT would have to approve the coordination. In addition, DOT could also limit in/out and left/right turns or signal adjustment for timing for turning. DOT has received all traffic studies and comments and will be issuing their comments. Member Cocks commented that the intersection is very backed up when school lets out. Member DeAngelis added that Saturday mornings the whole intersection is backed up all the time. Chairman Parise stated that a left exit onto Freeland Street is dangerous. It was dangerous with the prior gas station which was not very busy. Chairman Parise added that the traffic accident report was done during the time when the station was closed and that is not accurate. Engineer Moran explained to the board that the evaluation shows the intersection as it is today is not problematic and is operating at an acceptable rate. Engineer Moran added that the project does not add more traffic to the area, traffic is only pass by which means people going to Cumberland Farms are already on the roadways, they wouldn't come from across town to go to the site. The board disagreed and felt that people would intentionally go to the facility to do light shopping and would bring people who wouldn't normally be travelling that intersection. Engineer Moran explained that people shopping would only do so quickly to pick up one or two things. The board felt that that

would increase the traffic flow even more with people coming and going so quickly. The board agreed that the report from DOT should be received before making any decisions.

4. The Rockfield Building – Site Plan – (202-1-1, 2 and 4)

Present: Joe Pfau, Pietrzak & Pfau; Joel Mann

Attorney Levinson reviewed the application and questioned who exactly the owners were and when the deeds were recorded, as the copies of the deeds provided were not filed. The board will require proof of ownership. Chairman Parise stated the applicant has provided a sketch plan for a proposed office building which will require variances. Before the applicant can apply to the zoning board, planning board input on the proposed layout is needed. Engineer Pfau described the project as 3 existing lots with 2 existing buildings to be razed. The 3 lots are proposed to be merged into one lot for a 2 story building with one story general office and one story of medical office with two additional stories underground for unfinished storage. With the building being entirely medical there was a deficiency of 23 parking spaces, but if the building is only one story of medical and one story of general office then they are only 7 spaces short. Building Inspector Cocks questioned if the two lower stories were going to be below grade, since there were no elevations provided on the plan. Engineer Pfau stated the two lower stories were to be below grade, the lowest floor being 100% below grade and the next floor 60% below grade, and added that elevations would be provided. Chairman Parise questioned why a four story building when they only intend to use two stories and could not understand why anyone would go through the expense and effort to build two stories below ground if they weren't going to be used. Engineer Pfau asked how the board felt about having one floor medical office and the other floor general office. Chairman Parise stated there are 4 floors proposed for this building even though Engineer Pfau is only talking about 2. Is it the intention of the applicant to never use the lower two floors? If these lower floors are going to be used they need to be addressed now, with the site plan, especially for issues like parking and traffic. Attorney Levinson does not see how the Village could monitor the non medical floors to ensure that medical isn't using them. This would adjust the parking requirements, which the applicant is short on already. Member Cocks questioned why the desire to build two below ground floors to not use them for anything. Mr. Mann stated the two lower floors are for storage only and some mechanical systems. The board felt that 20,000 square feet of storage for medical offices does not make sense and was concerned the applicant would attempt to put tenants in the basement floors at a future date, which would alter the parking and traffic for the site. Mr. Mann stated the basements would be for storage for the office tenants. Member DeAngelis asked how much storage a medical office would need. Building Inspector Cocks commented that Crystal Run just built a 77,000 square foot medical office building and they don't have any storage, so why would 10,000 square feet of medical office require 20,000 square feet of storage. Chairman Parise was concerned that much storage would potentially bring truck traffic to the site. Engineer Pfau stated trucks would offload materials. The planning board still did not understand why medical offices would require large truck deliveries for 20,000 sq. ft. of storage. Building Inspector Cocks added that although these lots are

currently zoned GB, under the comprehensive plan and the proposed new zoning code these lots are being changed to URM due to the huge traffic issues in the area. This zoning change could potentially be approved in the next month or so. Building Inspector Cocks informed Mr. Mann that if the zone does change to URM prior to him obtaining full approval, obtaining a building permit and beginning construction, there would be no vested rights due to appearing before the planning board, and delivered a letter to Mr. Mann stating this information. The Planning Board as a whole does not accept the plans as submitted, does not understand why the applicant would want to build a four story building that they would supposedly only use two stories of; is concerned the lower two floors will be used for other uses in the future and is having a hard time accepting that the lower two floors are only going to be used for storage; is not amendable to reduce the parking especially with the potential ability for the applicant to attempt to utilize the lower two stories in the future. Chairman Parise added that he feels this is an overutilization of the site. Engineer O'Rourke disclosed to the board that Lanc & Tully has done work with Mr. Mann therefore he has a conflict and an alternate engineer would be necessary if this project were to continue.

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion made by Member Cocks and seconded by Member DeAngelis it was unanimously **Resolved that there being no further business, the Meeting be adjourned.** The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.