

**VILLAGE OF MONROE PLANNING BOARD  
WORKSHOP MEETING  
JANUARY 26, 2021  
MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** Chairman Boucher, Member Allen, Hafenecker, Karlich, Parise, Engineer O'Rourke, Attorney Cassidy, Building Inspector Cocks, Planner Fink

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.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**1. 745 Route 17M – Amended Site Plan (206-2-1.1)**

**Present:** Joel Mann, Brach & Mann; Charles J. Gottlieb, Whiteman Osterman Hanna;

Secretary Doherty read the public hearing notice into the record. Secretary Doherty acknowledged the certificates of mailing were received. Chairman Boucher called on the public to provide their comments. Mary Tosi provided her comments. She emailed the Planning Board Secretary with a picture depicting a spotlight in the back of the building and a sound file which played the noise that can be heard outside her window. This spotlight shines directly into the window of her house, and she lives a couple hundred feet away, on Orchard Street. The sound file contains noise that can be heard from the building, which is particularly noticeable in the summer when her windows are open. It sounds like an air conditioner. After the ZBA meeting in August the building manager John Stramiello called her and stated these issues would be taken care of, and he would get back to her soon, but never followed up. Mr. Mann provided his response. He confirmed that Mrs. Tosi had raised these concerns at the ZBA meeting. He met with the managers and they confirmed that the light on the property is an issue; a cover from one of the lights is missing. He will follow up with building managers and make sure this is dealt with. They are not sure where the noise is coming from but speculates that an electric cabinet at the corner of the buildings is generating the sound. An electrician was called to inspect this, but Mr. Mann did not follow up on the results of that. Chairman Boucher stated that the board can speak to the applicant about this and add these issues as a condition in the resolution so they are fixed. Member Parise asked if the applicant could provide a brief presentation of their project so that the public understand what the applicant is trying to do. Mr. Mann presented the project. The address of the proposed project is 745 Route 17M. They applied for a ZBA variance to utilize existing space within the building on the attic level. This is a neighborhood shopping center and there is a limitation of 30,000 square feet. The variance was granted, which allows for the additional 5,700 square feet of attic space to be used within the building. The proposal is to extend existing uses within the building. A traffic report commissioned demonstrated no major impacts on the traffic. At this point they aim to have the project approved. Changes were also made to the site plan to make the area more pedestrian friendly and increase safety. Member Parise asked if the public hearing should be kept open until the issues raised by the neighbors are addressed. Chairman Boucher stated that the board could do that or add that as an

approval condition. The light can be fixed immediately, but the neighbor would not be able to gauge the humming noise until she is able to open her windows in the warmer months. Member Allen asked if she would be able to stand outside of the window and be able to review the noise that way. Chairman Boucher stated that it is not known the source of this noise. Maybe this is an air conditioner that only comes on in warmer months and would not be switched on in the winter. Mr. Mann added his comments. He was under the impression that this was resolved, but he will now ensure that it is dealt with. If this note can be added as a condition on the approval resolution then this issue will be taken care of as soon as possible. Member Allen speculated that the noise could be from a backup generator, that only turns on once a week. Mrs. Tosi stated that whatever the source of the noise is, she has to keep her windows closed in the summer. Member Allen asked if this is a backup generator for the whole house. Mr. Mann stated that he is not sure about what is on the property as he is not a manager of the property. Chairman Boucher stated that although Mrs. Tosi submitted a sound file, he was not sure if the noise that plays accurately captures what she hears from her windows. The noise cannot be identified, and it should be made a condition so it is taken care of. Mrs. Tosi stated that she will be satisfied with whatever is decided on as long as the issue is solved when it can be. Attorney Gottlieb added his comments. One of the other conditions to be added concerns the landscaping, which is also an issue present in the spring-summer months. When the weather becomes warmer Building Inspector Cocks may be able to inspect both the landscaping and this noise issue so that everything is addressed. Mrs. Tosi stated that she did not have a chance to see where the additional sidewalks are going to be built, and if there will be lights on them. Mr. Mann stated that the sidewalks will not be built in a new area but on site. They will be at the front of the property at the driveway entrance. No additional lighting is proposed. The board reviewed the sound file sent. Member Allen stated that crickets and ambient noise can be heard but it is difficult to identify specifically what the sound is. Member Parise stated that the board should each review this sound. Mrs. Tosi was concerned that since the files she sent were being uploaded to the One Drive which contains the board's meeting materials her email address would be made public. Attorney Cassidy stated that if there is ever a situation where her submitted files were ever shared for public record her email would be redacted.

On a Motion made by Member Allen and seconded by Member Boucher it was **Resolved, that the Public Hearing for 745 Route 17M for Amended Site Plan be closed.**

Member Allen:	Yes
Member Boucher:	Yes
Member DeAngelis:	Absent
Member Hafenecker:	Yes
Member Karlich:	Yes
Member Parise:	Yes

**2. 85 Gilbert St. – 2 Lot Subdivision & Site Plan – (203-6-39)**

**Present:** Joel Mann, Brach & Mann; Caleb Pawelski, Pietrzak & Pfau;

Secretary Doherty read the public hearing notice into the record. Secretary Doherty acknowledged the certificates of mailing were received. Mr. Mann provided a presentation of the project. The property is located at 85 Gilbert Street. The proposed action is for a two-lot subdivision for two duplex dwellings. The new entrance to the site will be from Smith Farm Road. There is no entrance from Gilbert Street. This is to prevent any costs to the new improvements on the road. All the utilities will go through Smith Farm Road. All or most engineering comments have been addressed. Renderings have been provided for both

buildings depicting all side views. A list of colors and material selections have been given as well. The applicant's goal now is to have this project approved by the planning board. Chairman Boucher called for any public present to provide their comments. There were no members of the public present who provided comments for this project.

On a Motion made by Member Parise and seconded by Member Karlich it was **Resolved, that the Public Hearing for 85 Gilbert Street Two Lot Subdivision be closed.**

Member Allen:	Yes
Member Boucher:	Yes
Member DeAngelis:	Absent
Member Hafenecker:	Yes
Member Karlich:	Yes
Member Parise:	Yes

**3. 683 Route 17M – Site Plan (212-2-6)**

**Present:** Jay Stone, Owner;

Secretary Doherty read the public hearing notice into the record. Secretary Doherty acknowledged the certificates of mailing were received. Mr. Stone gave a presentation of the project. The second floor of 683 Route 17M has been used as a residence for the last 15 years. Through trying to sell the building, old records showed that the second floor was zoned as commercial. He aims to convert the second floor to residential so the existing apartment there can be legal. From the changes discussed in the previous meeting, he agrees to take down the existing garage to make room for seven accessible parking spaces. These changes are shown on the site plan that was submitted to the board. Chairman Boucher called for the public to provide their comments. No members from the public provided comments for this project. He recommends that the board continue the public hearing for the application since the new site plan was submitted yesterday and there has not been enough time for the board to review. Member Allen said he is fine with that. Member Parise asked why the public hearing has to be continued, as there has been no public comment and the site plan has been revised. Chairman Boucher stated that the site plan has not been reviewed by Engineer O'Rourke. Member Parise stated that if the public was here and had comments which could not be addressed due to a lack of review then it would be different. Chairman Boucher stated that the public has a level of trust that the materials submitted to the board are reviewed sufficiently. Once the public hearing is closed the public cannot add comments. Member Parise asked Engineer O'Rourke if he reviewed the plan and are there any technical issues with it. Engineer O'Rourke stated that the plan came in yesterday and he has briefly reviewed it. He has not completed the review but will have comments. Attorney Cassidy stated that the board should be aware of the sixty-two days limit to act, and it is the board's decision if they want to keep the public hearing open or closed. She has not had a chance to review the submitted site plan in depth. Mrs. Tosi, a member of the public present, provided her comments. If the materials submitted will be given a review with comments then the public hearing should stay open so that the public has a chance to provide their input. Member Hafenecker provided his comments. He likes the changes that have been made and are in line with what the board requested. He agrees with Mrs. Tosi that the public should also be able to have a chance to evaluate the reviews on the site plan when they are complete. Member Allen and Member Karlich agree to keep the public hearing open.

On a Motion made by Member Allen and seconded by Member Parise so that the site plan submitted can be fully reviewed with comments it was **Resolved, that the Public Hearing for 683 Route 17M be resumed February 23, 2021.**

Member Allen:	Yes
Member Boucher:	Yes
Member DeAngelis:	Absent
Member Hafenecker:	Yes
Member Karlich:	Yes
Member Parise:	Yes

## REGULAR MEETING

### 1. 745 Route 17M- Amended Site Plan (206-2-1.1)

**Present:** Joel Mann, Brach & Mann; Charles J. Gottlieb, Whiteman Osterman Hanna;

Engineer O'Rourke provided his comments. There are no further engineering issues. Planner Fink provided his comments. He displayed the landscaping plan for the board to see. He indicated to an island on the plan located by the bank and drive-thru. There are two landscaping labels for the island on the plan. One is an octagon shaped label marked "TC – 1" representing a Little Leaf Linden tree. The other is an octagon shaped label marked "AS – 1" representing a Sugar Maple tree. The two labels both point to one tree icon. Are there two trees proposed in this area or just one. There are also no labels for the three shrubs on the island. He reviewed this because there are two new cross walks proposed in the area. Would there be any blockage to the site distance. He does not believe there would be an issue, but it would be good to know what shrubs were proposed at this location. They may grow to a height which obscures the driver's view of a pedestrian using the proposed cross walks when the driver makes that turn around the island to exit the site. Mr. Mann provided his comments. He visited the site to review what plantings are there and if any are missing. Mr. Mann agreed with Planner Fink's comment, stating that he observed the same thing regarding the labels. On the site he saw one tree and three shrubs but does not know what kind of shrubs they are. He noticed that some trees on the site were missing. Behind the building there are twenty-eight evergreen trees, two different types of evergreen. A couple of them were missing. Some of the trees in the front of the site are missing as well. The building manager explained to Mr. Mann that due to the rock in the area some of the plantings died. Once the warmer season arrives he will have the landscaper visit the site and review the plan so they can replace all the missing landscaping. Since there is only one tree by the island, the tree depicted on the plan is probably mislabeled, and it should only be a Little Leaf Linden or Sugar Maple tree. Chairman Boucher noted that directly opposite of the island there is one tree and three shrubs depicted, and those are labeled correctly. Mr. Mann agrees and assumed that the island was planted in the same way, so both sides are the same. Engineer O'Rourke stated that the area Chairman Boucher and Mr. Mann are referencing does have a tree marked as "TS – 1" and the shrubs as "Ea – 3". So there is just an extra label and a missing label on the other island, but the plantings are the same. Chairman Boucher asked if this meant that these corrections should be made on the landscaping plan. Engineer O'Rourke said that it is just a matter of noting these details in the resolution or adding them as a CO. He states that Building Inspector Cocks will check the landscaping in the spring. Chairman Boucher stated that lead agency was declared for this project on December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2020. It was declared as an unlisted action under SEQR. A 239 was received back from the county with a

determination of no impact. The board needs a determination of negative declaration approved by the board, and a resolution passed. He states that Planner Fink has created a draft resolution and it is available on the cloud. Member Parise asked Engineer O'Rourke if "in perpetuity" should be noted on the site plan. Attorney Cassidy stated that the "in perpetuity" language was noted in the draft resolution. Member Parise stated that this should be noted on the landscaping plan as well. Attorney Cassidy stated that they are incorporating the existing landscaping plan by reference. Engineer O'Rourke agreed and noted that the applicant did not submit the landscaping plan so noting it by reference in the resolution is fine. Member Parise stated that it should be noted on the landscaping site plan as well, like the board normally does. Chairman Boucher stated that if the "in perpetuity" language is noted on the resolution is just as binding. Attorney Cassidy asked if the board would like this noted on the proposed amended site plan. Member Parise clarified that he was referring to the landscaping plan. Engineer O'Rourke stated that the applicant did not submit a new landscaping plan for this project and the existing one is being used. He believes that what Attorney Cassidy is suggesting is to note the "in perpetuity" statement, which will reference the previous approved landscaping plan, on the proposed amended site plan since that is what the applicant is submitting. If the board wishes to have that note added to the existing approved landscaping plan then the different projects will be mixed, as the board is adding a new note to an already existing plan. For the applicant to have this note added they would have to do a whole new submission and relabel all the plans, which the board can request be done if they wish. Member Parise would rather see the note added on the proposed amended site plan if the board does not want to update the existing landscaping plan. Attorney Cassidy stated that she will add language to note that "in perpetuity" be added to the proposed amended site plan. Member Allen asked if the board were waiting for the spring when Building Inspector Cocks would inspect the landscaping on the site. Chairman Boucher stated that Building Inspector Cocks would inspect the site in the spring as the winter will not show the full state of the vegetation. Since the existing landscaping will be noted on the resolution and on the amended site plan to have a note for maintenance in perpetuity the applicant will be held to that standard anyway. Member Parise asked Mr. Mann about the landscaping plan. He asks if Mr. Mann has replaced anything on the landscaping plan or is what shown on the plan identical to what is on the site currently. Mr. Mann stated that there are some plantings missing, but no replacements have been made. When the weather is suitable a landscaper will come out and replant what is missing. Based on that Building Inspector Cocks will be able to review the site afterwards to check for compliance with the original landscaping plan. He also believes that this is one of the approval conditions. Planner Fink provided the board with some background before reading the neg dec resolution into the record by displaying the Part 2 and Part 3 Environmental Assessment Forms. In preparing the neg dec, he prepared the Part 2 EAF. This is an assessment of the impacts of the proposed project. For all eleven questions asked about the types of potential impacts that could occur, he found that there would be no or small impact occurring in each category. The Part 3 EAF is the determination of significance. This is where each of these impact categories, should there be any concerns, would be explained further. He added a note in the Part 3 EAF to indicate the presence of a continuation sheet that describes the potential environmental affects in a couple of areas. He also prepared the continuation sheet titled "Commons on the Lake Neighborhood Shopping Center SEQR Part 3 Environmental Assessment Form Continuation" that also discussed the description of this action. There are three areas addressed in the Part 3 EAF. Planner Fink read the Part 3 EAF continuation sheet into the record. He also notes that the Part 2 and Part 3 EAF also act as a negative declaration for the action. If everyone is in agreement, then the next step would be to consider adoption of the negative declaration by resolution, which should be available for the board to review. Member Karlich asked where this regrading or potential regrading is and about the removal of trees. Planner Fink noted that was a question he had too, and he was not sure if there would be any modifications made to the rear of the site that would

affect any of the existing trees back there. The landscape plan indicates that there is some maintenance which occurs within that area. Engineer O'Rourke stated that there is no regrading proposed or shown on the site plan. It's just an installation of sidewalks in the front and some striping. No trees are proposed for removal. Planner Fink read the Neg Dec Resolution into the record. Attorney provided her comments before reading the approval resolution into the record. This is a resolution to approve the application. A draft resolution has been prepared that has some blank spaces pending the close of the public hearing and adoption of the neg dec dates. In light of the discussion tonight changes have been made to the draft resolution. The conditions "2. Applicant to address the light fixture at rear building to prevent light from entering adjoining homes", "3. Applicant to address noise pollution." were added. A foot note was added stating that "The landscaping plan identifies two tree labels on the traffic island, the Board and the Applicant recognize that one tree shall be maintained in the traffic island.". Attorney Cassidy read the approval resolution into the record.

### **Part 3 EAF Continuation Sheet:**

## **Commons on the Lake Neighborhood Shopping Center SEQR Part 3 Environmental Assessment Form Continuation**

Commons on the Lake is an existing neighborhood shopping center originally approved in 2006. The proposed project includes conversion of approximately 5,700 sq. ft. of existing vacant space on the third floor of the existing commercial building to medical/office space use. This use of an existing building required an area variance for the additional leasable floor area in a Neighborhood Shopping Center beyond the maximum area limitation of 30,000 sq. ft. The Village of Monroe Zoning Board of Appeals granted the required area variances on November 10, 2020. Site Plan amendments proposed for the project include pedestrian safety improvements and minor parking area modifications including additional landscaping.

### **2.2 Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?**

The proposed project consists of an amendment to the approved Site Plan for an existing neighborhood shopping center. The project will not result in building modifications that enlarge the existing building footprint. Rather, the project consists of converting vacant space in the building into new medical/office uses. This project, therefore, is consistent with the Village Comprehensive Plan's Objective 9, which states: "Respect the scale and character of downtown buildings by promoting appropriate building heights at the entrance to downtown from the ponds;" Increasing the intensity of use in an existing building however, has the potential to impact traffic. This issue is discussed below under Item 2.5. No other adverse impacts on land use are expected as a result of the proposed action.

### **2.5 Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walking?**

The proposed action will result in a greater use of an existing building by converting vacant space to medical/office uses. A Traffic Impact Study was prepared by Maser Consulting to assess the potential impacts of the increased use of the building. The Traffic Study, detailed in a letter from Maser Consulting to the Village of Monroe dated August 28, 2020, found that the renovation and use of the 5,700 square foot space, which will be used for multiple uses: "Is expected to be very moderate in the order of 20 total additional vehicle trips during peak one hour periods. Therefore, it is not expected that the use of this 5,700 square feet of space will result in any significant traffic impact." The Maser Traffic Study was reviewed by the Village Planning Board's engineers, Lanc & Tully Engineering and Surveying, P.C. in a letter to the Village dated October 8, 2020. Lanc & Tully concluded and advised the Village of Monroe that "Our office is generally satisfied with the information as provided by Maser and we would concur that we would anticipate little to no major impacts to traffic movement along Route 17M due to an additional 5,700 sq foot medical office component to the existing neighborhood shopping center. Commons on the Lake of 1 2 SEQR Part 3 EAF Both Maser Consulting and Land & Tully's comments on the proposed project make reference to internal modifications to the parking lot and on-site traffic flows that: "Would appear to

greatly enhance the health and safety of pedestrians in and around the site as well as provide additional signage and traffic movement for those occupants and potential patrons utilizing the bank and the offices/retail neighborhood shopping center.” No other adverse impacts on traffic are expected as a result of the action.

**2.9 Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources?**

No federal or State wetlands are found on the Commons on the Lake site. One potential federal wetland can be found across the street (State Route 17M) within Crane Park. This potential federal wetland is known as Mill Pond and no modifications to the Mill Pond are proposed. Indirect impacts to the Mill Pond are already accommodated by the project site’s existing stormwater management system. No modifications to the on-site stormwater management system are proposed.

According to the records of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, the Northern Long-eared Bat and Indiana Bat are found within the area where the project is located. The Northern long-eared bat is Threatened in New York State while the Indiana Bat is Endangered in New York State. The site is almost entirely developed with an existing commercial building and asphalt paving for parking and traffic flow. No undeveloped areas of the site are expected to be substantially modified. A small strip of woods buffers the site from existing residential uses to the west. This existing wooded strip will be maintained as it exists now. Some regrading will occur on the portion of the site facing northwest. This area is expected to result in maintenance of mature trees and installation of new landscaping. If any trees over five inches in diameter at breast height are to be removed based upon field conditions at the time of construction, then tree removal will be limited to the period from November 1 through March 31 of the year to be consistent with the advice of New York State for protection of bat species of conservation concern.

**Neg Dec Resolution:**

617.12(b)

State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR)

**Resolution Authorizing Filing of Negative Declaration**

**Name of Action:** 745 Route 17M (Commons on the Lake) Site Plan Amendments

**Whereas**, the Village of Monroe Planning Board is the SEQR Lead Agency for conducting the environmental review of a proposed Site Plan amendment for an existing neighborhood shopping center, Village of Monroe, Orange County, New York, and

**Whereas**, there are other involved agencies pursuant to SEQR, and

**Whereas**, the Planning Board has reviewed the Short Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) for the action, including the Part 1 EAF dated 5/5/20 and the Part 2 and Part 3 EAF dated 1/26/21, the probable environmental effects of the action against the Criteria For Determining Significance, and has considered such impacts as disclosed in the EAF.

Now **Therefore Be It Resolved**, that the Planning Board adopts the findings and conclusions relating to probable environmental effects contained within the attached EAF and

Negative Declaration and authorizes the Chairman to execute the EAF and file the Negative Declaration in accordance with the applicable provisions of law, and

**Be It Further Resolved**, that the Planning Board authorizes the Chairman to take such further steps as might be necessary to discharge the Lead Agency's responsibilities on this action.

On a motion by **Member Allen**, seconded by **Member Hafenecker**, and a vote of **Member Boucher, Member Karlich, Member Parise** for, and **0** against, and **Member DeAngelis** absent, this resolution was adopted on **January 26, 2021**.

**Approval Resolution:**

VILLAGE OF MONROE  
PLANNING BOARD

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION OF COMMONS ON THE LAKE, LLC  
FOR AMENDED SITE PLAN APPROVAL  
SBL 206-2-1.1

WHEREAS, the Village of Monroe Planning Board is considering action on a proposed amended site plan application by Commons on the Lake, LLC to permit the 5,700 square feet of existing attic space to be finished office space within the GB district located at 745 Route 17M (SBL 206-2-1.1);

WHEREAS, the site has existing site plan approval dated December 18, 2006;

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

1. Application dated November 25, 2020.
2. Environmental Assessment Form dated May 5, 2020.
3. Site Plan prepared by Pietrzak & Pfau, dated May 3, 2018, last revised November 3, 2020.
4. Interior Floor Plans prepared by Brach & Mann Associates, dated April 28, 2020.
5. Landscaping Plan, prepared by TRC Engineers, Inc, dated May 31, 2006, last revised 10-2-2007.
6. Traffic Analysis prepared by Maser Consulting as submitted to the Monroe ZBA dated August 28, 2020 and September 17, 2020
7. Decision of the Village of Monroe ZBA dated August 13, 2020
8. Supplemental Decision of the Village of Monroe ZBA, dated October 13, 2020.
9. Comments of the Planning Board Engineer, Attorney and Village Building Inspector.

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has determined that this is an Unlisted pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQR") and adopted a negative declaration on January 26, 2021 and those findings are incorporated herein by reference;



WHEREAS, the Planning Board is in receipt of a comment letter by the Orange County Department of Planning dated January 25, 2021 pursuant to General Municipal Law § 239 et seq. and said letter indicated that the matter was for local determination;

WHEREAS, the Planning Board held a duly noticed public hearing on January 26, 2021;

WHEREAS, the Public Hearing was closed on January 26, 2021;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that after consideration of the application materials, the consultant comments and public comments, the Planning Board hereby grants amended site plan subject to the following conditions:

1. Applicant to maintain all landscaping as shown on the landscaping plan approved December 18, 2006 in perpetuity.<sup>1</sup> A certificate of occupancy shall not be issued until all landscaping is properly installed. A note shall be put on the final site plan prior to signature by the chairman to that effect.
2. Applicant to address the light fixture at rear building to prevent light from entering adjoining homes.
3. Applicant to address noise pollution.
4. Applicant to submit final site plan to be signed by the chairman.
5. Applicant to pay all fees
6. Applicant to obtain all permits.
7. Applicant to commence construction within one (1) year pursuant to § 200-72 of the Village of Monroe Village Code. Applicant may request an extension.
8. Chairman shall be authorized to sign the site plan upon the advice of the Planning Board Engineer and Attorney that the final plan set conforms to the conditions of this amended site plan approval.

Motion by Member Parise, Second by Member Hafenecker – Dated January 26, 2021

Member Keith Allen	Y
Member Jeff Boucher	y
Member Geraldine DeAngelis	absent
Member Paul Hafenecker	y
Member Marilyn Karlich	y
Member Gary Parise	y

Filed in the Office of the Planning Board Clerk on this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2021.

---

<sup>1</sup> The landscaping plan identifies two tree labels on the traffic island, the Board and the Applicant recognize that one tree shall be maintained in the traffic island.

**2. 85 Gilbert St. – 2 Lot Subdivision & Site Plan – (203-6-39)**

**Present:** Joel Mann, Brach & Mann; Caleb Pawelski, Pietrzak & Pfau;

Chairman Boucher stated that a 239 Referral was received back from the County with no further comments. Engineer O'Rourke has no further engineering comments for this project. Chairman Boucher asked Attorney Cassidy about the situation concerning parkland fees and/or parkland space. Attorney Cassidy stated that she along with Planner Fink reviewed this and determined that parkland fees are required. Member Parise asked if this was stated in 175-19 Sub-Section D, and that the applicant has no way to put parkland on the property. Attorney Cassidy confirmed that this was true. This would be included in the approval resolution of finding that installing recreational/parkland areas, given the size of the subdivision, is not worth it. The Village of Monroe will accept parkland fees in lieu. Member Parise asked if those fees would go into the Village of Monroe's Parkland escrow account. Chairman Boucher mentioned a comment Planner Fink had brought up in a previous meeting. A note should be added on the plan stating that no trees are to be cut between April and October, so that it compliant with the DEC. Planner Fink added his comments. After reviewing the proposed subdivision plans it appears that some trees will be cut down. This area can be habitat for the Long-Eared Bat and the Indiana Bat. Any trees that are considered mature are potential habitat. Even though these trees are not technically protected as habitat for endangered and threatened species if there is an application that is subject to SEQR this needs to be addressed. Typically this is handled by including a note regarding the tree cuttings on the subdivision plans. In the case of a site plan it would also be noted there too. This note advises owners that all cutting of trees would be restricted to November 1<sup>st</sup> – March 31<sup>st</sup> to avoid the roosting times when the bats are using the trees as habitat. He has incorporated that into the SEQR documentation. A Part 2 and Part 3 EAF has been prepared as well. This document also operates as a negative declaration for the project, assuming the board is in agreement over the language used and adopts the document. Chairman Boucher asked Engineer O'Rourke for his thoughts on the note regarding tree cuttings. Engineer O'Rourke stated that he will leave this decision to the board. He visited the site and there were only a couple of trees, none of them were bat habitat. He was not worried about it and most of the trees used were already taken down. Member Parise added his comments. Back in August 2015 the board approved the subdivision for Smith Farm. The Escrow account was opened for a traffic light on the corner of Gilbert Street 17M. Since this application is a subdivision, should it also contribute to this escrow account for the traffic signal. There were about \$130,000-\$178,000 put towards that traffic light. In the resolution that passed it stated that every two years the village engineer and traffic consultant should review the current situation and see if the funds should be changed for the added traffic signal. Member Parise concludes by asking what the status is of this traffic light fund. Attorney Cassidy added her comments. She spoke with Attorney Terhune recently about this matter because Smith Farm filed a Phase 3 and Phase 4 with the county clerk. She confirmed that the money is still in escrow with the Village for those traffic improvements. It is not clear whether the review scheduled to be done every 2 years was completed. Attorney Terhune is aware of it. It is possible that a review is upcoming in light of the new work to be done on Smith Farm. Building Inspector Cocks may know more about this. Member Parise asked if any other money should be put towards this application since it is a subdivision in the same area. Engineer O'Rourke stated that this is only a two-lot subdivision, with an existing house already there. When the money for the escrow account for traffic improvements was first put into motion by Smith Farm, Smith Farm was paying for all the improvements. Crystal Run and maybe the YMCA also contributed. Supposedly, the money there is already sufficient for the improvements. Since the money for traffic improvements has already been posted and bonded and is already somewhat designed, there is no need to charge this applicant. If the board wishes to charge applicants who have work done in this area then they would have to charge all projects working along this corridor,

and there is no transportation district set up, so it is not appropriate to charge this applicant. Member Parise asked who was doing the traffic review. Engineer O'Rourke stated that the village hired an outside consultant to do this review. He believes Creighton Manning was who the village chose. He believes that discussion about this was had, and maybe an analysis and update was done. He is not specifically sure about the status of that though. DOT changed the design from what they originally approved. He believes this issue is being handled by the Village Board. Member Parise stated that in the resolution approved previously a review every two years is supposed to be done by the village engineer and traffic consultant. Engineer O'Rourke stated that the Village Board had decided not to have the village engineer do the review but instead hire a traffic consultant to act as village engineer for traffic. Member Parise requests that an update on the status of this situation be given to the planning board. What is going on with the traffic signal. Even though this applicant will not be contributing to the funds, the light is still on Gilbert Street, and the intersection of 17M and Gilbert Street will be used. Attorney Cassidy stated that she will contact the Village Board and Town Planning Board for an update. Planner Fink gave his comments regarding the Neg Dec. He reviewed all questions on the Part 2 EAF and believes that all potential impacts will be classified as with none or small impacts. He has Prepared a Part 3 EAF. The Part 3 EAF discusses if does the use or intensity of use of the land change from one single family dwelling to two family dwellings for a total of four dwellings on the site. It also discusses the potential increase in traffic and that the traffic will be directed from the subdivision onto Smith Farm Road. The number of vehicles that are using that, based on the ITE Generation Manual are expected to be minimus and do not reach any of the thresholds that NYS DOT has established for requiring any sort of traffic impact analysis. Regarding adverse changes in natural resources, there is no state or federal wetlands on the site. The site does adjoin a floodplain which does appear on the proposed subdivision plan but will not be altered as a result of the proposed action. It runs along Gilbert Street. Concerning the Indiana Bats and Northern Long Eared Bat, if the board feels that there is no potential for impact on the site that discussion can be removed. He advises keeping it in because the Part 1 EAF does indicate that these bats are in the area but will make that discussion more pertinent to the fact that the field visit indicated that no trees that would provide habitat would be removed from the site. Planner Fink read the Neg Dec Resolution into the record. Attorney Cassidy read the Approval Resolution into the record. Member Parise asked if Lot 2's address is on Gilbert Street, and if Lot 1 was on Smith Farm Road. Building Inspector Cocks, also 911 Coordinator, stated that lot one would have to be off of Smith Farm Road. He also asked if it was ever determined what the front of the house was going to be, since it is on a corner lot. He can determine it to just be Gilbert Street, but there isn't a problem either way, since there are two fronts anyway.

**Part 3 EAF Continuation Sheet:**

**85 Gilbert Street Subdivision  
SEQR Part 3 Environmental Assessment Form Continuation**

The proposed action consists of a subdivision of an existing 0.9. acre parcel into two lots for the purpose of constructing two, two-family dwellings. An existing single family dwelling and other outbuildings and assorted features, that occupies the existing 0.9. acre site, will be removed. Driveways and parking areas for the two-family dwellings will be constructed. Water will be supplied by the Village of Monroe's central water supply system while sewage will be disposed of via Orange County Sewer District No. 1's central sewer system. The site lies within the Village of Monroe's UR-M Zoning District.

## **2.2 Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?**

The proposed project consists of replacement of a single family home with two new two-family dwellings for an increase in density of three dwelling units. In the UR-M Zoning District, a two-family dwelling may be permitted subject to issuance of a special use permit in accordance with Section 200-49.1 of the Village Zoning Law. A lot area of 15,000 square feet is required for each two-family dwelling building. The 0.90 acre site (39,204 square feet) has sufficient acreage to accommodate the subdivision and development of the two, two-family dwellings. No adverse impacts on land use or density are expected as a result of the proposed action.

## **2.5 Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walking?**

The proposed action will result in a greater use of Smith Farm Road and other local streets by the future occupants of the two, two-family dwellings. The scale of the proposed development is small and does not come close to triggering any State Department of Transportation thresholds for requiring a traffic impact study. Traffic increases are expected to be *de minimus*. Sidewalks are available in the neighborhood, allowing for pedestrian movements within the Village's urban environment as an alternative to auto use. This arrangement is consistent with the Village Plan's focus on reducing traffic congestion in the Village generally.

## **2.9 Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources?**

No federal or State wetlands are found on the 85 Gilbert Street site. A floodplain is found adjoining the 0.9 acre site along Gilbert Street. This floodplain will not be altered as a result of the proposed action. According to the records of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, the Northern Long-eared Bat and Indiana Bat are found within the area where the project is located. The Northern long-eared bat is Threatened in New York State while the Indiana Bat is Endangered in New York State. The site 85 Gilbert Street Subdivision of 1 2 SEQR Part 3 EAF is currently developed with an existing single-family dwelling, outbuildings and asphalt paving for parking. Undeveloped areas of the site are expected to be modified to accommodate a more intensive use of the property. Existing trees will be removed and some regrading will occur. Landscaping has been proposed to mitigate the loss of existing trees and other vegetation. A note on the Subdivision plans commits the owner(s) to maintenance of the landscaping in perpetuity. In order to avoid impacts to the two bat species of conservation concern, subdivision plan notes will be placed onto the plat. Such notes will restrict the owner(s) to cutting of any trees over five inches in diameter at breast height to the period from November 1 through March 31 of the year. Such trees provide potential habitat during the growing season for bat species and the advice of New York State for protection of bat species of conservation concern is to avoid cutting of trees during the growing and bat-roosting season.

**Neg Dec Resolution:**

617.12(b)

**State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR)**  
Resolution Authorizing Filing of Negative Declaration

**Name of Action:** 85 Gilbert Subdivision and Special Use Permit

**Whereas**, the Village of Monroe Planning Board is the SEQR Lead Agency for conducting the environmental review of a proposed two lot subdivision at 85 Gilbert Street, Village of Monroe, Orange County, New York, and

**Whereas**, there are other involved agencies pursuant to SEQR, and

**Whereas**, the Planning Board has reviewed the Short Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) for the action, including the Part 1 dated 9/29/20 and the Part 2 and Part 3 EAF dated 1/26/21, the probable environmental effects of the action against the Criteria For Determining Significance, and has considered such impacts as disclosed in the EAF.

**Now Therefore Be It Resolved**, that the Planning Board adopts the findings and conclusions relating to probable environmental effects contained within the attached EAF and Negative Declaration and authorizes the Chairman to execute the EAF and file the Negative Declaration in accordance with the applicable provisions of law, and

**Be It Further Resolved**, that the Planning Board authorizes the Chairman to take such further steps as might be necessary to discharge the Lead Agency's responsibilities on this action.

On a motion by **Member Parise**, seconded by **Member Allen**, and a vote of **Member Boucher**, **Member Hafenecker**, **Member Karlich** for, and 0 against, and **Member DeAngelis** absent, this resolution was adopted on **January 26, 2021**.

**Approval Resolution:**

VILLAGE OF MONROE  
PLANNING BOARD

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE APPLICATION OF 85 GILBERT HOLDINGS LLC FOR 2 LOT  
MINOR SUBDIVISION AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL

WHEREAS, the Village of Monroe Planning Board is in receipt of an application for a two-lot subdivision by Joel Mann on behalf of 85 Gilbert Holdings LLC, located at 85 Gilbert Street in the Village of Monroe;

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

10. Application

11. Environmental Assessment Form dated June 22, 2020, revised September 29, 2020

12. Subdivision plat and site plan prepared by Pietrzak & Pfau, dated June 24, 2020, last revised November 3, 2020 containing 6 Sheets
13. Architectural renderings
14. Comments of the Planning Board Engineer, Attorney and Village Building Inspector

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has determined that this is an Unlisted pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQR”) and adopted a negative declaration on January 26, 2021 and those findings are incorporated herein by reference.

WHEREAS, the Planning Board is in receipt of a comment letter by the Orange County Department of Planning dated December 8, 2020 pursuant to General Municipal Law § 239 et seq. and said letter indicated that the matter was for local determination;

WHEREAS, the Planning Board held a duly noticed public hearing on January 26, 2021

WHEREAS, the Public Hearing was closed on January 26, 2021;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that after consideration of the application materials, the consultant comments and public comments, the Planning Board hereby makes the following findings:

The Planning Board finds that, due to the size, topography or location of the subdivision, land for park, playground or other recreation purpose cannot be properly located therein and that a fee in lieu of parkland is warranted.

Smith Farm Road is designed and improved in accordance with the Village’s code and is acceptable to serve as access to the subdivision.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Planning Board grants conditional final subdivision approval subject to the following conditions:

9. Professional land surveyor to locate and install corner monuments.
10. Applicant to submit final subdivision plat/site plan to be signed by the Chairman.
11. Applicant to record cross easement for the maintenance of stormwater infrastructure and any other shared utilities as approved by the Planning Board Attorney.
12. Applicant to pay all fees including fee in lieu of parkland as required by Village of Monroe Code § 175-19 (D).
13. Applicant to obtain all permits.
14. Chairman shall be authorized to sign the site plan upon the advice of the Planning Board Engineer and Attorney that the final plan set conforms to the conditions of this approval.

Motion by Member Hafenecker, Second by Member Parise – Dated January 26, 2021

Member Keith Allen	Y
Member Jeff Boucher	Y
Member Geraldine DeAngelis	Absent
Member Paul Hafenecker	Y
Member Marilyn Karlich	Y
Member Gary Parise	Y

Filed in the Office of the Planning Board Clerk on this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2021.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Fiona Doherty  
Planning Board Clerk

I, Ann-Margret Baxter, Clerk of the Village of Monroe, does hereby certified that the foregoing resolution was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on \_\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ann-Margret Baxter, Clerk  
Village of Monroe.

**3. 43 Freeland Street- Amended Site Plan (214-1-62)**

**Present:** Joel Mann, Brach & Mann;

Chairman Boucher stated that the 239 was received with no further comments. The SEQR is a Type 2 with no action required. Note 13 was added to the site plan with the roofing and building materials listed. Engineer O'Rourke had no further engineering comments. Chairman Boucher asked if there were any notes put on the landscaping plan stating maintenance in perpetuity. Engineer O'Rourke stated that note was listed on the previous approved site plan. Attorney Cassidy read the Approval Resolution and Special Use Permit into the record.

VILLAGE OF MONROE  
PLANNING BOARD

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION OF MEIR TESSLER FOR AMENDED  
SITE PLAN AND SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPROVAL

SBL 214-1-62

WHEREAS, the Village of Monroe Planning Board is considering action on a proposed amended site plan/special use permit application by Meir Tessler for the addition of an accessory apartment to an existing single family home within the SR 10 district located at 43 Freeland Street (SBL 214-1-62)

WHEREAS, the site has existing site plan approval;

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

15. Application, dated July 23, 2020
16. Environmental Assessment Form dated, July 23, 2020
17. Site Plan prepared by Civil Tec Engineering dated July 29, 2020, last revised January 16, 2021.
18. Interior Floor Plans prepared by Brach & Mann, dated August 26, 2020.

19. Landscaping & Lighting Plan, prepared by Civil Tec Engineering, dated July 29, 2020.
20. Architectural renderings.
21. Comments of the Planning Board Engineer, attorney and Village Building Inspector
22. Comments of the Village departments including but not limited to Police Department, Fire Department and DPW.

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, the Planning Board is in receipt of a comment letter by the Orange County Department of Planning dated November 5, 2020 pursuant to General Municipal Law § 239 et seq. and said letter indicated that the matter was for local determination;

WHEREAS, the Planning Board held a duly noticed public hearing on October 19, 2020 and continued on December 14, 2020;

WHEREAS, the Public Hearing was closed on December 14, 2020;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that after consideration of the application materials, the consultant comments and public comments, the Planning Board hereby grants amended site plan and special permit subject to the following conditions:

15. The findings and conditions of the Planning Board as set forth in the special permit annexed hereto and made a part hereof are adopted as if set forth at length.
16. Applicant to submit final site plan to be signed by the chairman.
17. Applicant to pay all fees
18. Applicant to obtain all permits.
19. Applicant to commence construction within one (1) year pursuant to § 200-48.4 and 200-72 of the Village of Monroe Village Code. Applicant may request an extension.
20. Any special use permit issued hereunder shall be to the applicant and shall be terminated upon the sale, expiration of a leasehold interest of the applicant, a change to a permitted use that does not require a special permit, or abandonment of the site, unless otherwise authorized by the Planning Board. If there is noncompliance with the conditions of the resolution of special use permit, the certificate of occupancy shall be revoked.
21. The terms and conditions of existing Site Plan approval is incorporated herein by reference.

Motion by Member Allen, Second by Member Hafenecker – Dated January 26, 2021

Member Keith Allen	Y
Member Jeff Boucher	Y
Member Geraldine DeAngelis	Absent
Member Paul Hafenecker	Y
Member Marilyn Karlich	Y
Member Gary Parise	Y



Filed in the Office of the Planning Board Clerk on this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2021.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Fiona Doherty  
Planning Board Clerk

I, Ann-Margret Baxter, Clerk of the Village of Monroe, does hereby certified that the foregoing resolution was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on \_\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ann-Margret Baxter, Clerk  
Village of Monroe.

VILLAGE OF MONROE  
PLANNING BOARD

SPECIAL PERMIT

This special permit is issued to Meir Tessler, owner of property located at 43 Freeland Street, Village of Monroe, New York for the addition of an accessory apartment pursuant to § 200-49 of the Village of Monroe Village Code subject to the Planning Board’s special permit procedures and regulations as set forth in the Village of Monroe Code Article XII § 200-48, et seq.

FINDINGS

The board determines, after review of all the application materials, consultant comments and public comments, that the applicant/owner has satisfied the findings required by the Village Code § 200-48, in particular:

1. The location and size of the use, the nature and intensity of the operations and traffic involved in or conducted in connection with it, the size of the site in relation to it and the location of the site with respect to streets giving access to it are such that it will be in harmony with the appropriate and orderly development of the district in which it is located.
2. The location, nature and height of buildings, walls and fences and the nature and extent of the landscaping on the site are such that the use will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of adjacent land and buildings.
3. Operations in connection with any special use will not be more objectionable to nearby properties by reason of noise, fumes, vibration or other characteristics than would be the operations of any permitted use not requiring a special use permit.

4. Parking areas will be of adequate size for the particular use, properly located and suitably screened from adjoining residential uses, and the entrance and exit drives shall be laid out so as to achieve maximum safety.
5. Existing municipal facilities are adequate for the proposed use.
6. The property will be suitably landscaped to protect the neighborhood and adjacent property in perpetuity.

Based upon these findings, the Planning Board approves the Special Permit subject to the following conditions:

1. The basement (517 square feet) shall remain unfinished and may not be occupied as habitable space in conformance with zoning.
2. Applicant must comply with all requirements of § 200-49
3. The Applicant has represented to the Planning Board that the accessory apartment is to be occupied by a family member and may not be occupied by a rental tenant until such time as the applicant complies with § 200-49 including but not limited to:
  - a. The owner must file a covenant at the County Clerk's office and with the local assessor stating that the right to rent an accessory apartment ceases upon transfer of title. A copy of said covenant shall be provided to the Planning Board and Building Department. Upon a transfer of title, the local assessor shall notify the Building Department, who will then take the appropriate steps to ensure compliance with these provisions. Applicant to provide draft covenant to Planning Board attorney for review and approval prior to filing.
  - b. Purchasers of homes that have special use authorization for accessory apartments who want to continue renting those apartments must reapply for special use authorization.
  - c. Full compliance with Chapter 158, Rental Property shall be completed prior to occupancy of the new accessory apartment as a rental.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

VILLAGE OF MONROE PLANNING BOARD

BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
Jeff Boucher, Chairman

**4. 683 Route 17M – Site Plan (212-2-6)**

**Present:** Jay Stone, Owner;

Chairman Boucher stated that the site plan the applicant submitted to this meeting came in yesterday, and there was not enough time to provide a full review with comments. On the plan received, the applicant has proposed to remove the existing garage to make room for the parking spaces the board requested. A 239 referral was received and there was no significant impact. He asked Mr. Stone if the square footage and the garbage disposal details were added to the plan. Mr. Stone confirmed that this was the case. Chairman Boucher asked Mr. Stone if the owner's name was listed correctly on the plan. Mr. Stone confirmed this was done. Chairman Boucher stated that the driveway is going to need to be cleaned up and repaired, does Mr. Stone have plans to do that. Mr. Stone stated that after the garage is taken down the space will need to be leveled. Currently there is asphalt. If it needs total repaving or patching that can be done. Either way, the entire place will have asphalt and parking lines. Engineer O'Rourke provided his comments. A lot of what the board had asked for was done, but the site plan needs to be cleaned up. Striping and Parking is shown over an area marked "Lawn". That area needs to be marked as paved. The paving is up against an adjacent garage. Usually there is some protection to stop a car from driving directly into that, such as a bollard, small fence, or curbing. He will have a complete review done soon. Mr. Stone says he will have a small fence added, and notes that any area where people will park will be paved. Building Inspector Cocks stated that all the details need to be on the plan so that he can verify that everything is installed correctly. Mr. Stone asked if he was on the agenda for next month. Engineer O'Rourke stated that he was since the public hearing for this project is continued. Attorney Cassidy stated that the board will treat the submission for this month as the submission for the February meetings.

**5. Spring Hill Apartments – Site Plan Approval (207-4-11.1 &15)**

**Present:** Joseph Nyitray, Brooker Engineering; Mike Abuladze, Owner

Engineer O'Rourke gave his comments. At the last workshop the board reviewed the construction cost estimate and the recommendation that this be forwarded to the village board for acceptance. Before that workshop his office provided the applicant with comments on the SWPPP. Once those issues are addressed, he believes they should be set. A letter was provided by Attorney Emanuel with concerns of the board accepting comments from a resident after the public hearing. It's water under the bridge at this point, as those comments have already been addressed, so he doesn't see any impact on that. At this point the board stands to recommend to the village board the construction cost estimate and wait for a resubmission of the SWPPP. Chairman Boucher noted that the board had received a letter from the applicant granting the extension of the 62-day timeline to the February 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting regular meeting. A resolution to accept the construction cost estimate and cross easements has been drafted. The Planning Board will need to send a recommendation to the Village Board. Attorney Cassidy states that the referral of the construction costs as well as the cross easements has been put into one resolution. Attorney Cassidy read the Resolution into the record. In the cover letter that will be sent to the Village Board, a portion of it would pertain to the street sign issue. Traffic Consultant Connell had reviewed this issue and told the board that "No Parking" signs were not needed on Spring Street since legally people could park there for a moment. The board's concern was that people would stop on the road to run something into the building. So "No

Stopping” or “No Standing” signs would be required. This recommendation would be passed along through the cover letter to the Village Board. Member Parise stated that the whole Spring Street has no parking permitted on it at all, as can be seen in the code. There is a sign across the street that says “No Parking from Here to Corner” also. Maybe on the other side of the street something needs to be added as well. There are no “No Parking” signs anywhere on that street and yet parking is prohibited, so the public needs to know that. Chairman Boucher stated that he will include that in the letter to the Village Board. Engineer O’Rourke stated that the water report had been received after the deadline from their engineer. He has forwarded it to the water superintendent for his comment. Generally it looks ok, but the Village has previously had issues with quantity of the water. That is not this applicant’s concern, and he believes there is enough water to address them. When the Water Superintendent’s response comes back his office will review that as well. Member Parise asked if the board did a resolution to grant them the 62-day period waiver. The applicant sent in a letter January 11<sup>th</sup> to waive the 62-day period. Typically the board makes a motion to accept that waiver. Member Parise made the motion and was seconded by Member Hafenecker. Chairman Boucher roll called the board. Engineer Nyitray provided his comments. They are addressing Engineer O’Rourke’s comments and should have their response soon.

On a Motion made by Member Parise and seconded by Member Hafenecker it was **Resolved, that the board approve the January 11<sup>th</sup> 2021 letter requesting a 62-day waiver**

Member Allen:	Yes
Member Boucher:	Yes
Member DeAngelis:	Absent
Member Hafenecker:	Yes
Member Karlich:	Yes
Member Parise:	Yes

VILLAGE OF MONROE  
PLANNING BOARD

RESOLUTION TO REFER PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION COSTS AND DRAFT  
EASEMENT TO THE VILLAGE OF MONROE VILLAGE BOARD

WHEREAS, the Village of Monroe Planning Board is considering the application of Spring Hill Apartments, LLC to construct 34 multifamily units within 2 buildings located at the intersection of Spring Street and Franklin Avenue in the Village of Monroe; and

WHEREAS, as part of that application, it is necessary to refer the proposed construction cost estimates to the Village of Monroe Village Board in order for the applicant to post the requisite performance bonds; and

WHEREAS, Planning Board Engineer, John O’Rourke has reviewed such construction cost estimates and finds them to be acceptable; and

WHEREAS, the site requires cross easements for the proper functioning of the overall site; and

WHEREAS the Planning Board’s attorney, Elizabeth Cassidy has reviewed the “Declaration: Access, parking, storm water management, and utilities cross-easement” and after comment and revision, finds such document to be acceptable;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Village of Monroe Planning Board hereby recommends to the Village Board that it accept such construction cost estimates and cross easements.

Motion by Member Karlich, Second by Member Parise – Dated January 26, 2021

Member Keith Allen	y
Member Jeff Boucher	y
Member Geraldine DeAngelis	Absent
Member Paul Hafenecker	y
Member Marilyn Karlich	y
Member Gary Parise	y

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

#### **December 9, 2020**

On a Motion made by Member Parise and seconded by Member Allen it was **Resolved, that the board approve the December 9, 2020 Workshop Minutes.**

Member Allen:	Yes
Member Boucher:	Yes
Member DeAngelis:	Absent
Member Hafenecker:	Yes
Member Karlich:	Yes
Member Parise:	Yes

#### **December 14, 2020**

On a Motion made by Member Parise and seconded by Member Allen it was **Resolved, that the board approve the December 14, 2020 Workshop Minutes.**

Member Allen:	Yes
Member Boucher:	Yes
Member DeAngelis:	Absent
Member Hafenecker:	Yes

Member Karlich: Yes  
Member Parise: Yes

### **January 11, 2021**

On a Motion made by Member Karlich and seconded by Member Parise it was **Resolved, that the board approve the December 14, 2020 Workshop Minutes.**

Member Allen: Yes  
Member Boucher: Yes  
Member DeAngelis: Absent  
Member Hafenecker: Yes  
Member Karlich: Yes  
Member Parise: Yes

### **Adjournment**

On a Motion made by Member Parise and seconded by Member Hafenecker it was **Resolved that there being no further business, the Meeting be adjourned.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:04 p.m.

Member Allen: Yes  
Member Boucher: Yes  
Member DeAngelis: Absent  
Member Hafenecker: Yes  
Member Karlich: Yes  
Member Parise: Yes