

VILLAGE OF MONROE
PLANNING BOARD
WORKSHOP AGENDA
MONDAY, MARCH 8, 2021
7:00 P.M.

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

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

Workshop

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

Present: Brian Brooker, Brooker Engineering; Ira Emanuel, Esq; Kevin Brodie, Architect; Michael Abuladze, Owner;

Engineer O'Rourke stated that all engineering comments were addressed. Traffic Consultant Connell provided her comments. The right-turn entrance only driveway on Spring Street require "No Left Turn" signs. The applicant has a couple of "One Way" proposed at the entrance of the driveway on Spring Street which are not required. A "One Way" sign at the west side of the driveway entrance into the parking lot should be added instead. The crosswalks proposed at the Franklin St. and Spring St. intersection end on grass area and should be extended to meet the existing sidewalks on the south side of Spring St. and west side of Franklin Ave. Engineer Brooker stated that the Kimley-Horn memo was received and those modifications have been made. Planner Fink stated that the next step in the SEQR process is for the Planning Board to make a determination of significance. A draft Negative Declaration will be created unless there are concerns from the Planning Board. Attorney Cassidy stated that the Village Board of Trustees has adopted the Cross Easement Declaration for the Spring Hill Apartments project. A draft Approval Resolution has been prepared and sent to the applicant. No Special Use Permit is required. Member Parise requested that a note stating that the gravesite be maintained in perpetuity be added to the Draft Approval Resolution. Member DeAngelis asked how large the fencing on the gravesite is. Engineer Brooker stated that those measurements are shown on Drawing 1 and Drawing 2 of the site plans. Member DeAngelis requested that the specific dimensions of the fence be noted on Drawing 1 and Drawing 2. Member DeAngelis asked if the Planning Board will have a Project Manager for this project. Engineer O'Rourke stated that his office will oversee and coordinate this project with the Building Department to ensure that everything is completed on the site plan before Building Inspector Cocks issues a close out on

the Site Plan Permit. Member DeAngelis requested that the colored renderings of the buildings be added to the Planning Board's File. Member DeAngelis asked if there was a checklist for this project. Attorney Cassidy stated that the Draft Approval Resolution contains a list of all the documents necessary, applicable conditions, and references to Code provisions. Once Traffic Consultant Connell's comments are addressed, the Planning Board will be looking to act on the Draft Approval Resolution at the Regular March meeting. Engineer O'Rourke stated that the applicant will have to add the graveyard dimensions and add a note which requires the maintenance of the graveyard in perpetuity. Engineer Brooker stated that the two notes and dimension changes will be added to the plans. Attorney Cassidy stated that the Planning Board requested the recording information to include a map note. Attorney Emanuel stated that his preference would be that the map note not be added until the site plan is approved. Chairman Boucher asked if the Planning Board needed to refer to the Village Board about codifying the signage. Attorney Cassidy stated that this would be done outside of the approval. Member Parise requested the Planning Board confirm with the Village Board that the proposed signs on Spring Street are put up, as well as the "No Stopping or Standing" signs.

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

Present: Jay Stone, Owner;

Engineer O'Rourke provided his comments. The applicant's latest plan has not yet been submitted to the Planning Board, but the applicant's engineer sent it to Engineer O'Rourke to review. The applicant has addressed all engineering comments. Engineer O'Rourke noted that the light fixture proposed is not a typical light fixture. The proposed light fixture is a small back area with motion detectors. The Planning Board may want to have a note added on the plan to state that the lights are supposed to point downward. If the Planning Board is satisfied with everything the applicant has done, then this project will be ready for action. Chairman Boucher stated that Attorney Cassidy will draft an Approval Resolution. Member DeAngelis asked Engineer O'Rourke about Comment #1 on his February 26, 2021 Memo which reads, in pertinent part, "While still not meeting current code (for pavement width for travel lane) it does bring the site into more compliance". Does the applicant need an area variance for pavement width for travel lane since there are compliance issues. Engineer O'Rourke stated that the applicant does not need a variance because these conditions are preexisting. Building Inspector Cocks stated that since this project is a conversion from commercial to residential the Special Use Permit needs to be taken care of. Member Parise asked what conditions will be noted in the Special Use Permit. Will items such as adequate parking and snow removal be included. Building Inspector Cocks stated that historically, the Planning Board does a condition and then a year after the CO was issued the Planning Board reviews the Special Use Permit again. If everything is going well, the Planning Board can extend that CO indefinitely or conduct a review every five years. The certificate is issued for one year after CO. Chairman Boucher stated that action will be taken on this item at the March 23 Meeting.

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

Present: Larry Torro, PE, Civil Tech Engineering;

Engineer O'Rourke provided his comments. The applicant submitted revised plans documenting the length and height of the proposed wall. A short EAF was provided, which Engineer O'Rourke's office finds to be acceptable. The Planning Board waived the Public Hearing for this project back in February 2021. A 239 Referral was submitted to Orange County Planning for this project. As soon as the 239 Referral is received or the 30-day limit is expired the Planning Board can act on this project. Secretary Doherty stated that the 239 Referral for this project was sent February 9, 2021. Chairman Boucher stated that Attorney Cassidy will draft an Approval Resolution for this project. Member Parise stated that when he visited the site in 2017 there were bushes on the perimeter of the site, near where the front of the Mr. Cone ice cream shop had previously been. The Planning Board wanted those bushes to be preserved. Member DeAngelis stated that she also remembered this discussion from the 2017 site visit and that it was stated that the Planning Board wished for the bushes to be preserved and planted elsewhere around the perimeter. Engineer Torro stated that he remembered the previous discussion about the bushes but does not recall if it was discussed about planting them along the perimeter. There was an attempt to preserve the bushes, but during the time that lapsed the bushes did not survive. Member DeAngelis stated that the minutes reflect that the bushes would be planted around the perimeter. Attorney Cassidy stated that the other pages of the site plan will be incorporated by reference for the existing approval. The prior approval, landscape plan, lighting plan, and other pages, will be incorporated so that those pages will remain unchanged. Chairman Boucher stated that action will be taken on the March 23, 2021 meeting.

4. Threetel/Oak St. – Site Plan – (203-3-3.2)

Present: Larry Torro, PE, Civil Tech Engineering;

Engineer O'Rourke provided his comments. The parking area adjacent to the office building has been removed which reduces the overall amount of parking and handicap accessibility. As a result of these parking modifications, the applicant may no longer meet ADA Requirements. The applicant should review ADA Requirements. The Planning Board will have to grant a waiver for the parking requirements. The applicant also has a cross easement with the adjoining property. This adjoining property has more than sufficient parking in the lower area. The applicant will have to bring this project to the ZBA for variances for the front yard and total development coverage for the office building. The loading area should be shown on the plans. There are other comments, but those can begin to be resolved after the applicant appears before the ZBA. This project is being reclassified as a Type 1 Action under SEQRA; previously it was classified as Unlisted. The Planning Board will have to take Lead Agency. A Negative Declaration must be done as well. The ZBA cannot look at this project until the Type 1 Action, Negative Declaration, and Lead Agency are done by the Planning Board. Chairman Boucher requested that Engineer Torro provide a written document to the Planning Board requesting a parking waiver and also providing reasons for the request. Engineer Torro provided an overview of the project. The cross easements for this project site do exist with the parcel across the street. The area around the office building may be developed into a green area for seating, which would make the environment around the office more pleasant. Building Inspector Cocks asked Engineer Torro about the Fire Department Access, especially for the warehouse section which is parallel to the Heritage Trail. Engineer Torro stated that there is 33 ft. for Fire Department access. Building Inspector Cocks stated that area near the warehouse parallel to the Heritage Trail should be made a Fire Department Alley so that there is access to that rear of the building and warehouse.

Currently there is no access to those areas. Building Inspector Cocks stated that the height of the building should be determined as this height will affect the apparatus access. Engineer O'Rourke stated that "No Parking" and "No Standing" marks be striped in the area where the Fire Department Access will be. Planner Fink Provided his comments. This is a Type 1 Action under SEQRA. At the Regular March Meeting the Planning Board can declare its intent to be Lead Agency and to circulate a letter to the ZBA asking for consent for the Planning Board to be Lead Agency. Planner Fink stated that he can have that Lead Agency document prepared for that meeting. Attorney Cassidy stated that regardless of how the Planning Board chooses to proceed, the Negative Declaration must be adopted first.

5. 296 Schunnemunk Subdivision - 202 - 6 -1.1, -1.2

Present: Joel Mann, Brach & Mann; Mark Siemers, Pietrzak & Pfau;

Engineer O'Rourke provided his comments. This is the most recent edition of this proposed subdivision presented to the Planning Board. There have been other attempts over the years. This project is basically a glorified flag lot. A new road is proposed to service the back portion. The Village Code was revised years prior to prohibit allowed flag lots. The biggest issue to resolve is the note on the original subdivision site plan stating that no further subdivisions would be allowed. After that note is resolved here are traffic issues with the multiple driveways in that area. The applicant will have to resolve the grading and entire layout of the site. Mr. Mann provided an overview of the project. The only information that has been found so far is that note on the site plan. Mr. Mann does not believe that there are any filed restrictions anywhere. Mr. Mann and Attorney Siemers are investigating the power of the note. Chairman Boucher stated that the applicant is bound to the notes on the plan after the plan is approved. Attorney Cassidy provided her comments. Most times, the research comes under the guide of Open Space Restrictions shown on filed maps which state that an area is to be left open. If the applicant can provide legal authority to the Planning Board, the Planning Board attorney can evaluate whether the restriction can be lifted. Secretary Doherty should retrieve the minutes from the prior approval from the previous subdivision approved on this area that was approved by the Planning Board. Attorney Cassidy also requestd Mr. Mann provide an explanation as to why the proposed road was treated as a separate lot. Engineer O'Rourke stated that when the previous subdivision on this area was done, a flag lot was created. That project is where the note stating that no further subdivisions be done was placed. At the time, the Planning Board was concerned that there would be attempts to create another flag lot between the front lot and rear flag lot. Attorney Cassidy stated that typically she sees a note barring additional subdivisions when no health department approval is received. This note on the original site plan for the previously approved subdivision in this area appeared to be an unequivocal "No". Mr. Mann provided context for the proposed 296 Schunnemunk Subdivision. When the owner had originally purchased the property, the intention was to do a three lot subdivision, one front lot and two flag lots. The Village went into moratorium, and after the new zoning laws were adopted the owner was unable to have all of the proposed subdivisions done. The owner instead settled to take what they could get and obtained a permit for the duplex in the front. Mr. Mann tried different routes to help the owner get what they paid for, as this lot was purchased on the assumption that more than a single duplex worth of value out of the area. The proposed Lot One is not a lot, it is a proposed private road. Originally when Mr. Mann had done this just as a proposed road his assumption was that the cul de sac could be an easement and the setbacks would be from the right-of-way line. Building Inspector Cocks had informed him that Mr. Mann would also need

the setbacks from the cul de sac. Mr. Mann stated that If all of the issues were settled the shape of the road would take in the cul de sac. With the proposal of this road, which can be extended all through until the end of the property, then that road would put Lot 2 into compliance as Lot 2 would no longer be a flag lot. Mr. Mann had reached out to the owner to see if the owner would be willing to join and close the driveway but has not received a response yet. Chairman Boucher stated that the previous minutes will be retrieved for the Planning Board to review.

6. Ramapo Street Mixed Use – Site Plan - 220-1-4

Present: David Niemotko, Architect

Architect Niemotko provided an overview of the project. The previously proposed Adult Care Facility was not approved by the Village Board so a different type of building has been proposed. The owner would like to put retail on the first floor and offices on the second floor. The building decreased in size. Now the building is 770 square feet per floor. Building Inspector Cocks stated that on the Land Use Determination form completed for this project the use of this building was determined to be a neighborhood shopping center. This neighborhood shopping centers requires a special use permit. Engineer O'Rourke provided his comments. There are wetlands, floor zones, floor plains, and retaining walls. There are also Army Corps of Engineer permit requirements and DOT requirements for access. The big issue now is the access around the building, which does not even come close to meeting Code requirements. That access needs to be resolved and coordinated with the Army Corps of Engineers. The plans submitted do not match up to the original plan submitted to the Army Corps. The proposed parking, which is expanded, would potentially expand the disturbance area. Engineer O'Rourke cited the wetland delineation map as reference. The other issue is fire access. If the building is over 30 feet in height aerial access is required, which will mean that a road of at least 26 feet is required. Planner Fink provided his comments. A full EAF is required to evaluate if the SEQRA action on this project is a Type 1 or Unlisted action. Engineer O'Rourke stated that this site is adjacent to a historical district in the Village of Monroe. Attorney Cassidy stated that this property backs up to the Heritage Trail. Engineer O'Rourke stated that because of the proximity to the Stage Road Intersection, the curve of the road, as well as DOT involvement, the Planning Board may need a Traffic Consultant to review this project. Architect Niemotko provided his comments. The building is less than 30 feet in height. Emergency access is only needed for the front of the building. Any access that goes around the building will be vehicular in nature. Given the nature of the parking and that the parking is at a 45 degree angle, access would increase all around. When the Adult Care Facility was approved by the Army Corps of Engineers the building was originally 1000 feet larger than what is currently being proposed. The impact on this current proposed building will be less. A national work permit from the Army Corps was received. This national work permit will be packaged with the next submission. Member Parise stated that the Planning Board should wait until the next submission to review the Army Corps of Engineers national work permit. Chairman Boucher stated that the Planning Board will see the applicant when the next submission is received.

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

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

Engineer O'Rourke rescused himself as his office has a conflict of interest. Planner Fink provided a review of the process for the Public Scoping Session that will be conducted for the 208 Business Center's Draft Scope document. Following the March 23, 2021 meeting and after the public comment period ends on April 2, 2021, the Planning Board will adopt a final scoping document which will be provide to the applicant. The applicant will then prepare a Draft EIS. The Planning Board conducts two levels of review on this Draft EIS. The first is a completeness review. If the Planning Board believes that the provided Draft EIS passes the completeness review, then the Planning Board would accept that Draft EIS as complete for purposes of public review, set a public comment period, and set a date for a public hearing on the EIS. If the draft EIS does not pass the completeness review then the Draft EIS will be taken back to the drawing board and receive modifications. This March 8, 2021 Workshop is a good opportunity for Planning Board members to provide their comments on the Draft Scoping Document. One item the Planning Board has already discussed regarding the Draft Scope is the need for additional discussion about emergency services. Traffic Consultant Connell provided her comments regarding the traffic study submitted in January 2021. The applicant was working with DOT on the preferred traffic plan. DOT had selected the triangle redesign plan for the area. Engineer Wersted provided his comments. He had recently spoken with DOT regarding the direction the Planning Board was going in for the scoping document. Engineer Barber provided her comments. For the scale of the scoping document, typically a red line version is done to highlight all the comments added and the changes made. If the Planning Board is in favor, Engineer Rother could have this red line version of the Draft Scope prepared for the Planning Board. If a high level of public participation is expected it may be helpful to have a stenographer present to clearly record all the comments made. The transcription of the public scoping session would also be distributed to the applicant quickly so all comments can be addressed. Engineer Barber's office will prepare a formal comment letter for the March 23rd, 2021 meeting. Engineer Barber stated that on the draft scope there should be a section on noise, as that was an issue identified in the Positive Declaration. There should also be a section in the draft scope on community facilities. The applicant's consideration on ESO's as well as solid waste handling procedure were noted. Under Section 3 Subtopic B the currently listed "Water Resources" as an area of study is appropriate. "Water Resources" could be bifurcated to discuss wetlands and surface water separate from stormwater management. The wetlands and surface water would include the jurisdictional information classification, size, the impacts to the buffers, flood plains, and tributaries to the onsite features. The separate section on stormwater management would include a discussion on the overall drainage basin, as well as a pre and post development conditions. Runoff and proposed mitigations would be included as well. In Section 3 Subsection F Transportation or under Section 5 Alternatives of the draft scope the applicant should discuss the proposition by the Village of Kiryas Joel on the connector road which would alleviate the traffic on Schunnemunk. The Section Seven on energy could be a subtopic of section three. A formal comment letter with more details on these comments will be issued for the next meeting. Chairman Boucher is in favor of having a red line version of the draft scope be created. Chairman Boucher is also in favor of having a stenographer present. Member Parise offered his comments. On the Draft Scoping Document, the Site Plan, and the Positive Declaration, the listed square footage of the buildings are different on each document. The vehicle counts for parking also different on each document. The Army Corps of Engineers is listed as an interested agency in the draft scope document. Does the Army Corps of Engineers need to be involved. Planner Fink stated that he does not believe that there are wetland impacts on this property that are at a level which require the involvement of the Army Corps of Engineers. Engineer Rother stated that there are no core wetlands on the project site. The Orange and Rockland Lake with a drainage pipe which is discharging towards the lake may by considered a core wetland.

Engineer Barber stated that on previous memos by the H2M office the DEC recommended that the Army Corps be contacted for a wetland determination. If a wetland determination has not been received yet that determination should be conducted soon. Chairman Boucher asked Engineer Rother if the wetland determination was done on the site. Engineer Rother stated that a biologist had done a wetland delineation and a rare threatened endangered species study. The rare threatened endangered species found was the Indiana bat and the Northern long-eared bat. The wetland delineation and the rare threatened endangered species study has not been submitted to the Army Corps yet. Engineer Rother stated that due to the backlog of work and the COVID 19 pandemic it is unlikely that the applicant will receive a JD letter from the Army Corps. Member Parise stated that in the Draft Scope under Section 3 Subsection B. Water Resources the agencies FEMA, USGA, were listed. In Section 3 Subsection C Vegetation and Wildlife the U.S Fish and Wildlife agency was listed. FEMA, USGS, and U.S Fish and Wildlife should be added as interested agencies. Member Parise asked if a final survey was done on the property. Could that final survey be submitted to the Planning Board. Engineer Rother stated that a final survey was done and the results of the final survey are shown on the existing conditions map. This Final Survey will be included in the EIS. Member Parise stated that the Village of Monroe Police Department should be added as an involved agency. The Village of Monroe Police Department will have to maintain traffic control around the project site when the construction begins. Engineer Barber stated that in the recommended section on Community Facilities, the applicant should address all impacts on the ESO including the Village of Monroe Police Department. Member Parise stated that for a project of this scale a project manager would be an important person to coordinate the construction so that traffic moves freely. This project manager note could be added to the Draft Scope under Section 2 Subsection I Construction. Member Parise stated that under Section 3 Subsection A for the item "Proposed Mitigation Measures" the last bullet point states "Discussion of Best Management Practices". These best management practices should be elaborated on. Engineer Rother stated that for the topics Section 3 Subsection A. Soils and Geology as well as Subsection B. Water Resources there are documents published by the DEC which discuss best management practices. Member Parise stated that an escrow account for the 208 Business Center Project should be discussed. Attorney Cassidy stated that after speaking with the Planning Board's consultants, there was a recommendation to set up a replenishing escrow fund. A resolution will be adopted at the March 23, 2021 meeting to set the value of this escrow account at \$25,000 to be replenished. Member Parise stated that this Scoping Session should be sent through Constant Contact. Using the Cable Channel as a media platform to reach the public is also a good idea. Building Inspector Cocks stated that the deadline for the applicant to deal with the building violations is March 22, 2021. If those violations are not resolved by that March 22 date then the 208 Business Center project will not be seen on the March 23, 2021 meeting. Attorney Cassidy stated that the Scoping Documents for the 208 Business Center Scoping Session on March 23, 2021 should be uploaded on the website. Secretary Doherty stated that the Notice of Public Scoping, Positive Declaration, Draft Scope, Site Plan, and Full EAF will be available on the website. Engineer Rother stated that a revised Draft Scope will be provided after the March 23, 2021 Meeting. A red lined version of that revised Draft Scope will be provided as well. Engineer Rother asked who will be the author of the Final Scope Document. Attorney Cassidy stated that she had no objection to Engineer Rother and his team preparing the document. Attorney Cassidy reminded the Planning Board that the comment deadline for the Draft Scope is April 2, 2021 and the submission deadline for the April meetings is March 29, 2021. The revised Draft Scope will not be finalized until April 2, 2021 when the deadline is reached. Chairman Boucher stated that the Planning Board would have to agree that in this one instance to accept a document after the submission date. Chairman Boucher stated that this decision would be made by resolution at the March 23, 2021 Meeting. Chairman Boucher asked Secretary Doherty if there was a Village of Monroe Facebook page that the Planning Board could have the 208

Business Center Scoping documents posted on. Secretary Doherty stated that the Village of Monroe's Facebook page is operated by Mayor Dwyer and postings would have to be coordinated through him. Member Hafenecker asked if the Planning Board could coordinate with the Monroe Matters Facebook page. Member DeAngelis stated that Channel 22 and Monroe Matters are used by the community. Attorney Cassidy stated that legally the only place the Planning Board has to post notice is the official paper and the Bulletin Board in Village Hall. Engineer Rother asked if the applicant could have access to the recorded zoom meetings. Attorney Cassidy stated that she had no objection to a link to the zoom meeting being emailed. Member Parise stated that if a stenographer is present at the March 23, 2021 Public Scoping Session then the Planning Board should review and approve their transcription as if they were Planning Board meeting minutes. Attorney Cassidy stated that in the event the recording of the meeting fails, the stenographer's transcription can be used as a reference. Chairman Boucher requested that Engineer Rother coordinate a stenographer to be present at the March 23, 2021 meeting.

Other Business

1. 310 Schunnemunk St. Subdivision - Street Name

Member Parise stated that after he reviewed Member DeAngelis' memo he was in favor of using either the Kronk Road or Lone Pine Road street name. Member Parise notes that the 9/11 victims are honored at the 9/11 Memorial in the Village of Monroe. The Village of Monroe can also do more to honor those victims since this year would be the 20th anniversary since the 9/11 tragedy. A blue plaque could be dedicated near where the victims used to live. Member Allen proposed that Avram be used for the new street name. The location of the street should have a Hebrew dedication. The name "Avram" is a deep Hebrew name. Member DeAngelis stated that historically the Planning Board evaluates historical significance of names for new streets. After reviewing this area with Town Historian Nelson it was learned that the Kronk family used to live in this area, but Mr. Kronk's house is dedicated in the Town of Monroe. Member DeAngelis stated that her preference for the street name would be Lone Pine Drive. The 310 Schunnemunk area for the new street historically had pine trees. The land where 310 Schunnemunk is, which at one point was owned by George Thompson, was also known as Lone Pine Farms. Member Hafenecker stated that he is in favor of the Lone Pine Road or Avram names for the new street. Member Karlich was in favor of the name Rodgers for the new street. Bill Rogers was the president of the Citizen's Bank. Bill Rogers was also a Town Supervisor. Member Parise stated that the Rogers name was used in the Town of Monroe. Chairman Boucher, Member Parise, Member Karlich, and Member DeAngelis were in favor of the Lone Pine Drive. Attorney Cassidy stated that a resolution to approve the name Lone Pine Drive will be drafted for the March 23, 2021 meeting. Member DeAngelis suggested that perhaps a document should be made which would contain the history of the names which are available for new streets. Chairman Boucher stated that this list would be good material for the Planning Board to have on file. Gaunt and Carey are names that have already been used.

Adjournment

On a Motion made by Member Parise and seconded by Member DeAngelis it **was Resolved that there being no further business, the Meeting be adjourned.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

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