

**VILLAGE OF MONROE PLANNING BOARD
WORKSHOP MEETING
JUNE 14, 2017
MINUTES**

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

ABSENT: Member 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. Lenza – Amended Site Plan (Granite Store) – (223-1-4)

Present: Steve Brown, Hudson Valley Realty

Chairman Parise informed Mr. Brown that when he visits the Dunkin Donuts on the property on Saturdays he has noticed lots of cars parked in the parking lot, but the therapist's office is closed and there are very few customers in Dunkin Donuts. Mr. Brown was unaware of others using the parking lot and would look into the matter. Mr. Brown discussed the engineering comments made. As far as delivery trucks the applicant would be using a 36' flat bed, and submitted a turning radius drawing as requested by Lanc & Tully. In addition, Mr. Brown submitted a revised site plan addressing many of the comments in Lanc & Tully's review. Engineer Higgins stated he would have these plans reviewed. Mr. Brown noted that the new plans include notes regarding turning radius, truck delivery type, ADA parking, fencing details for outdoor storage, removal of the propane tank. The existing dumpster will be used for business waste and in addition a stone waste roll off container will be added inside the fenced in storage area. Engineer Higgins noted that a revised EAF was received and found acceptable. Landscaping and lighting should be discussed. Member DeAngelis requested a landscaping plan. Mr. Brown explained to the board that a site plan for this site was recently approved by this board, and that plan included landscaping for the entire site. Landscaping has been maximized on the site. Mr. Brown pointed out to the board the areas where landscaping has been added, but reiterated that the prior application considered the site as a whole with regard to landscaping. Engineer Higgins noted that the Planning Board Attorney should review the proposed new use to determine if this use is allowed per the neighborhood shopping center classification. Attorney Levinson felt the retail use was allowed. Engineer Higgins added that due to the proximity to Route 17M, a 239 referral will be needed as well as to NYS DOT regarding the entrance and exit from the site. Emergency service referral should also be made for their input. Mr. Brown stated that there is absolutely no change proposed to the site at all. This is a tenant moving into an existing building with no changes to the existing site at all. Amendments to the site plan are mainly notes and removal of the propane tank. Engineer Higgins stated the main concern was the truck deliveries and storage area. Member DeAngelis added that all of the points were important. Building Inspector Cocks asked where cutting and fabrication operations would be. Mr. Brown stated all operations would be inside the building. Mr. Brown stated the granite is delivered to the site and then on site they cut the granite and polish it. Dust and water debris results from the fabrication. Settlement tanks will be installed to catch the waste which will collect the water and silt. The waste material will be placed in a

container and removed from the site. Building Inspector Cocks added that the inside operation will be governed under the building permit. Chairman Parise asked what type of sign the granite store would need. Mr. Brown felt they would only have a building mounted sign. Building Inspector Cocks reminded Mr. Brown that there can only be one pylon sign for the entire site. Engineer Higgins added that all existing lighting should be shown on the plans. Chairman Parise felt that lighting should be reviewed to ensure adequacy, especially if customers would be brought into the storage area to select slabs. Chairman Parise asked if there was a delivery schedule and would it be coordinated with the Dunkin Donuts deliveries. Mr. Brown would look into the matter.

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

Present: John Petroccione, P.E.

Engineer Petroccione explained that preliminary soil tests were done and the results were misleading. Ground water was very shallow which made the area more conducive to a permanent standing body of water, or detention pond. An area behind the proposed building proved to be a better location. In addition discussion was held with Lanc & Tully about the exact location of the sidewalk. The new plans show the new location of the detention pond and sidewalk location. There was some confusion with the engineering review and not all pages were received by Lanc & Tully. Due to some of the pages not being reviewed, Lanc & Tully will review the full set and discussion will be held at the Monday meeting. Chairman Parise noted for the record that a traffic study was conducted on 10/28/06 with counts done 6/2005 and 7/2006, and another traffic study done 11/18/16 with counts done 10/28 and 10/29/2016.

3. Copy Center – Amended Site Plan – (202-1-3)

Present: David Niemotko, Architect

Architect Niemotko explained that the applicant put up the free standing sign without building permits or site plan approval. The ZBA granted a variance for the setback. NYS DOT also approved the location of the sign with regard to the right of way. The applicant is now looking for site plan approval as to location of the sign and to be able to obtain building permits. Member DeAngelis asked if the AARB reviewed the sign. Architect Niemotko responded the AARB had not yet reviewed the sign. Building Inspector Cocks indicated that since there was no building permit applied for, no referral was made. Architect Niemotko was uncertain what the engineering comment regarding an incorrect EAF meant. Engineer Higgins was uncertain and would consult with Engineer O'Rourke, but could see the form was signed by the owner and should be signed by a design professional. Engineer Higgins noted that the original approved site plan maps should be referenced in the General Notes, and a copy of the complete originally approved site plan map should also be provided. The zoning variance obtained should be noted on the plans. A copy of the ZBA variance should be provided to review any requirements or restrictions which may have been imposed. Documentation should be provided and certified by a licensed surveyor as to the exact location of the sign, and in reference to the actual property line. Due to the sign being taller than 10 feet, certification by a professional engineer or architect indicating the sign was constructed to withstand winds of 100 miles per hour is required. Design details of the sign including lighting and electrical connection/extensions should be provided for review. Design calculations along with footing details prepared by a licensed professional familiar with structural design should be provided. The planning board should review the lighting of the sign and whether additional landscaping should be required. Any lighting proposed should be identified on the plan and a foot candle diagram provided. Referral to NYS DOT should be made due to proximity to the ROW. Because the project is within 500 feet of a state road referral to Orange County for 239 review should be made.

4. **Bridges at Lake Parc – Site Plan – (211-1-1)**

Present: Joseph Haspell, Esq., Alan Lipman, Esq.; Liz Mello, Brian Brooker, Brooker Engineering; Mr. Frank, Applicant

Engineer Brooker summarized that a DEC dam permit and a stream disturbance permit is required but cannot be applied for until the plan is found acceptable to the planning board. Since the last appearance before the board a number of changes have been made to the plans in response to engineering review, such as road widths, retaining walls, type of grading around the houses, headwalls, etc. Remaining issues included the traffic report and the need for the traffic light therefore an updated traffic study was submitted. If there still remains a need for a traffic light, the applicant agrees to contribute the \$60,000 towards that light, a number which was agreed upon in the resolution of preliminary approval, and the village would contribute the remainder of the cost. Engineer Brooker is looking for confirmation as to whether or not a traffic light will be required. Chairman Parise stated the traffic study has been sent on to the Village's traffic consultant but we have not received his review yet. Chairman Parise noted that a traffic study was done 1/7/10 with counts done in November 2009, and has been updated again on 4/17/17 with counts done in March 2017. Chairman Parise noted for the record that the studies and counts were not done during the summer. Engineer Higgins noted that Lanc & Tully is still reviewing the SWPPs. Chairman Parise asked the board if they had any additional questions or comments. The board had no comments. Chairman Parise asked if the applicant has had any response from the Village Board regarding the existing house and property. Attorney Haspell responded that the issue has gone silent. Attorney Haspell stated the applicant will offer the property for dedication and the Village will either accept dedication or it won't. Regardless, it will not interfere with this approval as that portion of the property is being left open. Attorney Haspell summarized that the applicant received numerous phone calls months and months ago, and then things went silent. The applicant is giving the Village the opportunity to do what they want with the house, and if they don't, it will not delay the project. Chairman Parise noted that neither the planning board, nor the applicant or their consultants, have heard anything from the Village Board or any of its members regarding any change in the status of the house and related property. Attorney Haspell stated the last communication received was prior to December 2016 and that was from Mr. Dwyer. Since that communication, which has been over 6 months, there has been no communication, it has been silent. Attorney Levinson confirmed with the applicant that there has been no discussion with Mr. Dwyer or any other representative of the Village Board in over 6 months. Attorney Haspell agreed.

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion made by Member DeAngelis 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.