

VILLAGE OF MONROE PLANNING BOARD

WORKSHOP

April 12, 2021

PRESENT: Chairman Boucher, Members Allen, DeAngelis, Hafenecker, Karlich, and Kelly; Attorney Cassidy, Engineer Queenan, Planner Fink, Building Inspector Cocks, and Traffic Consultant Carlito.

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. **The Q – Site Plan (222-1-13,14 &15)**

Present: Steve Esposito, PE;

Engineer Esposito provided an overview of the project. The project site is 10 acres in size. Federally regulated wetlands have been delineated on the site. The site is zoned as URM which, under special permit, permits multifamily homes. This project is multifamily homes. Constraint analysis yielded approximately 122 units. Currently, 72 units in four two-story buildings are proposed. The site has access off Still Road via Stephen Lane, which is a private lane, and is also a dirt road. This dirt road will be improved as part of the project. The code requires 68 parking spaces, 133 parking spaces are currently proposed. The 72 units will all be two-bedroom units. There are onsite stormwater facilities, onsite recreational facilities. There is a requirement for 65,000 feet of open space. Currently there is +/- 190,000 proposed. In that space wetlands are other environmental resources that would be put under a conservation easement for preservation in perpetuity. A walking path through the environmental resources is proposed, but the path will avoid the wetlands. The applicant proposes to improve the Stephen Lane private road to be 26 feet wide and paved. The applicant has added lighting to Stephen Lane as per the Board's request. The lighting proposed includes streetlights with sharp cutoffs which will illuminate the right of way. The sidewalk will be on one side, the northern side, of Stephen Lane. The architectural drawings were submitted for initial review. Engineer Queenan provided his comments. Currently there is a proposed 12-foot-wide emergency access road at the southern end of the site that extends out onto Still Road. The plan should clarify whether this road is going to be paved and should also be reviewed by the Building Department and Emergency Services to verify the emergency access road's adequacy. There is only one ingress and egress from Still Road, so this emergency access road is necessary to provide a second ingress and egress from the site. Regarding Stephen Lane, is the applicant proposing curbing along Stephen Lane. More detail has to be provided on the plan as to what is proposed for Stephen Lane. Engineer Queenan's office recommends that Stephen Lane has crosswalk installed on Still Road to connect to the existing sidewalk on Pope Lane. Ownership and Maintenance of Stephen Lane needs to be clarified, and whether a maintenance agreement

needs to be prepared for all the properties currently using Stephen Lane. Other comments are related to technical, water, sewer, and drainage issues. Building Inspector Cocks stated that Fire Code has a minimum of a 20-foot width for emergency access roads. Aerial Access may be needed if the buildings are over a certain height. Engineer Esposito stated that the buildings are not a total pitched roof, the roofs are going to be modified mansard roof that transition to a flat roof. The buildings will be under 35 Feet in height, two stories maximum. Building Inspector Cocks stated that an Aerial access road probably won't be needed and a 20 foot wide emergency access road would be sufficient. Engineer Esposito addressed other comments regarding a potential fire hydrant on Stephen Lane and provided by Lanc & Tully's April 7, 2021 comment memo. The applicant proposes to have a gate on the emergency access road. This gate would prevent traffic on the emergency access road. Engineer Esposito recommends that the applicant, emergency services, and Building Inspector Cocks have a meeting regarding some comments on Lanc & Tully's April 7, 2021 comment memo. Building Inspector Cocks is in favor of conducting the zoom meeting with emergency services and the applicant. Aerial access, the turning radius, and potential fire hydrants should be discussed. Chairman Boucher stated that the board has concerns about Stephen Lane, specifically the paving, curbing, and lighting of Stephen Lane. Teenagers and small children will use those roads, so safety is a concern. Chairman Boucher requests that Engineer Esposito describe the proposed lighting. Engineer Esposito stated that there are residents currently living on Stephen Lane and they are used to living on a country road. The lighting proposed with this submission are 10-foot light posts with sharp cut offs at the top, which limit how the ground is lighted. The lights illuminate one side of the road and would light just behind the post, just over the sidewalk, and will also illuminate the right of way line. The 50-foot strip that Stephen Lane is within would be illuminated. The lights will extend out to the corner of Still Road, where there is a bus stop. Engineer Esposito contacted the school districts in the area and was told that the corner of Stephen Lane is used as a bus stop and would continue to be used as a bus stop. The school districts would review the development after building is done and would consider coming onsite if the situation is deemed appropriate. Engineer Esposito displayed plan page C-103 "Stephen Lane Improvements" for the Board's reference. Engineer Esposito indicated on the shared view the top diagram of Stephen Lane which noted that the road is currently a gravel surface. What the applicant proposes for Stephen Lane is shown on the bottom diagram. The sidewalk would be on the north side of Stephen Lane. Paved width would be 26 feet wide. A drainage swale and the proposed lights are to be located on the southern side of Stephen Lane. Paving would be whatever is required by Village Code. The applicant would prefer to not put curbing on the southern side of Stephen Lane which would maintain the drainage swale at the edge of pavement. Engineer Esposito noted that Traffic Consultant Holt had recommended that the applicant install curbing on the north side of Stephen lane, which Engineer Esposito agrees would be good for safety. Traffic Consultant Holt provided a review to the Planning Board. One major comment was regarding Stephen Lane. It is unclear what the pavement cross section is going to be. On Drawing C-301 there is a note stating "On-Site Pavement section". That note should be clarified. The most critical location for curbing is on the north side to provide vertical deflection between Stephen Lane and the sidewalk provided. The applicant is providing additional parking because the 72 proposed units are all two-bedroom units. Village code has one blended rate which does not clarify between a unit mix. The applicant should provide additional justification supporting the proposed parking count as if the area does not require paving then the area should not be disturbed. Could land banking be considered for any portion of the parking. The applicant can make a determination in conjunction with the village on whether the parking is actually realizing the demand projected. Once that determination is made land bank parking spaces could be put in. Engineer Queenan provided his comments regarding curbing on the south side of Stephen Lane. Installing curbing on only the northern side keeps the area more rural and lessens the impact on existing properties. Maintenance becomes more

difficult on the non-curbed portion, as people will run on that side, and drainage in the swale is less controllable. Installing curbing on only one side of the road can leave the area with an unfinished appearance, as half the road is “unfinished”. Typically, Village standard is that curbing is on both sides to control the pavement and storm water. The answer on what will be done with curbing is dependent on the opinion of the Board. Planner Fink agrees that the area is a Village environment and that there is an expectation for curbing to be present on both sides of the road. Sidewalks aren’t necessary on both sides. What is the expected average annual daily traffic generated by this project. How many vehicle trips are expected to occur along Stephen Lane. Curbing would prevent traffic from veering off the edge of the paved road. Traffic Consultant Carlito stated he would provide an answer shortly. Chairman Boucher asked if the lighting on the south side would sufficiently illuminate the sidewalks on the north side. Engineer Queenan stated that he does not see the light locations or the foot candle calculations on the plan he was provided so it is difficult to determine. Engineer Queenan stated that if no curbing is installed on the south side and the swale remains, the light poles will have to be recessed off the road, which may compromise illumination to the northern sidewalk. Chairman Boucher stated that having curbing on only one side would not look great. Having light poles opposite of the sidewalk may also look odd. Member Hafenecker stated that it seems counter productive to have lighting on one side and sidewalk on the other. Engineer Esposito presented the lighting plan on shared screen for the Board to view. Engineer Esposito indicated on the plan to the northern part of Stephen lane where the edge of pavement, the sidewalk, and the location of the corner of Still Road on the drawing. The symbols for the six light fixtures located on the southern side of Stephen Lane were also displayed. Code requires that foot candle reads .1 at the property line. There are a couple of exceedances, but largely the sidewalk and right of way is illuminated. Most of the houses along Stephen Lane are on the right side. The houses on the southern side of Stephen lane access off the emergency access area. The light fixtures are set in a 24 inch concrete sonotube and would come 12-18 inches out of the ground. Engineer Queenan recommended that the applicant check that concrete sonotube detail for impact purposes. The light poles are in the middle of the swales and will have to be pushed back. Building Inspector Cocks stated that there are two houses on the southern side of Stephen Lane. One house has access off of the emergency access, and the other has access from Still Road. Member DeAngelis stated that there are about nine-ten houses on Stephen Lane. Chairman Boucher asked how far back the light posts would have to be so they aren’t located in the swale. Engineer Queenan stated that the light fixtures would have to be five-six feet back. Engineer Queenan asked Engineer Esposito if it would be possible to have the lights’ position changed so that they alternate from the north and south side of Stephen Lane. Engineer Esposito stated that the applicant would have to review that arrangement to see how existing driveways, sidewalks, sewer, and water would be impacted. The light shields can also be adjusted if necessary. Chairman Boucher asked what the finish would be for the concrete sonotubes. Engineer Esposito stated that the sonotubes for the light posts would have a smooth chamfered concrete edge. If requested mix can be added to the concrete so that the color changes to a dark grey or a brown beige. Chairman Boucher requested that a **rendering of the concrete** to be provided. Chairman Boucher stated that he preferred Stephen Lane to have curbing on both sides. Member Kelly and Member Karlich were in favor of curbing for both sides. Member DeAngelis was in favor of alternating the lights. Engineer Esposito stated that the ability for the applicant to alternate the lights would depend on if the Village Code could be met. The code prohibits the applicant from trespassing light. .01 foot candle outside of the property line so as not to impact adjoining properties. Building Inspector Cocks stated that the Village code does not list any specific number for foot candle, just that light cannot spill off into the property line. A .01 foot candle is probably the standard. Chairman Boucher asked about the possibility of connecting the proposed sidewalk from Stephen lane to an existing sidewalk on Pope Lane. Engineer Queenan stated that one comment his office made was to put an

extension from the Stephen Lane sidewalk and merge it with an existing sidewalk on Pope Lane. Building Inspector Cocks stated that the Stop & Shop Plaza installed new sidewalks which should be connected to Pope Lane. Engineer Esposito displayed an image from Google Maps depicting Stephen Lane, Still Road, and Pope Lane. The sidewalk on Pope Lane was indicated on the shared view. The small section of concrete seen on the exit out of the Sacred Heart Church is not a sidewalk, that portion is part of the drainage on that property. Member Karlich stated that the distance a pedestrian would have to walk from Still Road to the McDonald's in the Stop & Shop plaza is around half of a mile. The sidewalk on Pope Lane continues front of the Pine Hill Condos and connects at the Stop & Shop Plaza. The sidewalk on Pope Lane is far from Stephen Lane. Member Kelly asked if it would be even possible to have sidewalk installed on the side opposite of the Pope Lane sidewalk. That area is private land. Engineer Queenan stated that it depends on where the right of way line falls, and where the property lines are. Member Kelly asked what lay between the area of The Q's project and the Route 17M state road directly north. Engineer Esposito stated that the area is wetlands and floodplains. Chairman Boucher referenced Lanc & Tully's No. 7 Comment which states a recommendation of installing a cross walk on Still Road in addition to the applicant installing sidewalk to connect to existing sidewalk at Pope Lane for the safety and walkability of this project to the commercial area of the village. A lot of people will be walking in this area. Member Hafenecker asked if there was discussion of installing a traffic light at the corner of Stephen Lane and Still Road. Traffic Consultant Holt stated that the projected traffic volume to come out of Stephen Lane is not enough to warrant a traffic light at that corner. Traffic consultant Holt stated that the memo his office submitted also agrees with the recommendation of providing that sidewalk connection from east side Still Road to Pope Lane if feasible. Chairman Boucher requested that the applicant research the recommended sidewalk connection. Engineer Esposito stated that the sidewalk recommendation will be reviewed. The right of way will have to be researched, to see if there is enough room to have a sidewalk installed. The applicant also cannot be in a position where they are required to obtain land for the sidewalk connection. Planner Fink provided his comments on parking. The two Northernmost buildings will be surrounded on three sides by space that's being protected for the wetlands and stormwater. The two southernmost buildings will be completely surrounded by parking and access lanes with a view of the golf course. There are 40 parking spaces on the southern side. If there was a possibility of not developing all the parking until demand is evident then the southernmost access could be landscaped nicely. Further analysis to support the parking space numbers would be good to make sure Village Code is being complied with. Traffic Consultant Holt stated that the Code requirement for parking spaces is 88. Chairman Boucher is in favor of land banking the parking spaces on the southernmost buildings. Member Karlich is in favor of having all the additional parking spaces as there are 72 two-bedroom apartments. There is no parking elsewhere, so all parking has to be provided on the property. Building Inspector Cocks stated that there will be about two cars per household and renters could also have guests as well. In most of these places there is never enough parking. Planner Fink asked Traffic Consultant Holt what the ITE's parking generation says about two-bedroom apartments. Traffic Consultant Holt stated that the Village Code is based on ITE rates. ITE rates assume a mix of studio one bedroom and two bedrooms. Some municipalities may require one space per unit and another quarter space per bedroom. Engineer Esposito stated that on the southernmost buildings the nine parking spaces on the far east and west sides can be land banked and eight of the twenty parking spaces on the southern side can be land banked for additional green space. If the Village wished to implement those parking spaces on the land banked areas then the owner could be directed to do so. Attorney Cassidy provided her comments. After reviewing the SEQR process for this project a letter regarding lead agency package was not sent to the Village Board and should be sent this month. Planner Fink stated that regarding SEQR for this project the action is unlisted. Planner Fink also had comments regarding the EAF, and revisions were

made. Engineer Esposito prepared a comment letter that responded to Planner Fink's comments and questions. Chairman Boucher asked if there is a material list of the siding and a list of the colors on the renderings. Engineer Esposito confirmed that the renderings have the color, material, and a brief description of some items listed. Chairman Boucher and Member DeAngelis stated that they don't like the colors on the rendering. Member DeAngelis stated that the colors should be softer than grey or black. Engineer Esposito stated that what the board is viewing are the building elevations. Member DeAngelis stated that when this project is open for a public hearing the public will want to see a rendering. Chairman said that the board would like to see curbing on both sides of Stephen Lane. The applicant will review the possibility of alternate lighting and connecting the sidewalk to Pope Lane. The applicant will also review the possibility of adding some land banks in place of parking. Engineer Esposito asked about moving forward the SEQR process. Planner Fink stated that the next step is to prepare a Part 2 EAF and a Part 3 EAF for any thresholds that are met. Building Inspector Cocks stated that he will coordinate a zoom meeting with the Fire Chief regarding some of the comments provided by the Lanc & Tully memo.

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

Present: David Niemotko, Architect

Architect Niemotko provided an overview of the project. The applicant proposes a commercial retail two-story building on the corner of Route 17M and Ramapo Street. When the determination was made that this project is a neighborhood shopping center the parking calculations meant that four spaces per 1,000 feet were required. The layout is very different now in this submission. The applicant believes that the changes made to accomplish parking and access isles are favorable to the comment letters. Lighting and utilities were located on the site. The project site is surrounded on three sides by wetlands that cannot be impacted. The applicant took some land that was originally wetlands and made it usable by mitigating it with land that is in Harriman. There is around one acre of wetland that is being impacted. Retail space is on the first floor of the building and office space is on the second floor. Engineer Queenan provided his comments. The site location map should be cleaned up to show proximity to other properties. Currently the site map is blank with just the property boxed out. Architect Niemotko stated that there was an issue with a layer on the map transcribing onto paper and it will be taken care of. Engineer Queenan stated that on the application, cover letter, and site plan the project is listed under different project names. Only one project name should be used. Engineer Niemotko stated that he will label the project as "Ramapo Street Commercial Building". Attorney Cassidy stated that there were some instances where the SBL number was transposed. Engineer Queenan stated that the application is listed as "Amended Site Plan" when at this point it should just be "Site Plan". Engineer Queenan also brought up comment six on the April 8, 2021 L&T comment memo. The applicant received a permit from the Army Corps of Engineers for a wetland disturbance on this property which would be mitigated on a property in Harriman. The areas on sheet C-2 are consistent with the Army Corps approved plan but sheet C-5 is not. The plan that was approved by the Army Corps has a different proposed site layout than what this project currently has. Architect Niemotko replied that the 20,600 square feet on sheet C-2 is correct and consistent with C-3 and C-4. C-5 is the erosion control plan, but that was not transcribed across correctly. In the approval process for the permit, the Army Corps requested to know something about this project. What type of building it was, what was the proposed layout. That is why the applicant provided that other proposed layout. It does not

affect the area to be mitigated or being filled for use. That other layout maintains the 20,600 square feet. Once this project is at the point of lead agency and 239 referrals then the changes can be openly acknowledged to the Army Corps to see if they have any problem with that. Engineer Queenan stated that the applicant's Army Corps permit requires them to receive a water quality certificate from the DEC. Has the wetland mitigation been approved in Harriman. Architect Niemotko responded that the applicant has approval from the Army Corps, but they are still in the process of approval with Harriman and the work has not been done yet. Engineer Queenan asked Architect Niemotko if that approval process was an active application in Harriman, and where does it stand. Architect Niemotko replied that the application is active. The previous layout was met with no comments after quite a few submissions. The difference between that project and this one is that now the floodplain is being impacted. The applicant hired a sub consultant, Len Jackson Associates, who are working through the process with FEMA to get approval. When approval is received the applicant will share this with the Board. Engineer Queenan stated that his concern is that this project gets advanced approval and begins the disturbance on the project site's wetlands but the Harriman wetlands mitigation portion is never approved. There are also concerns with the floodplain and floodplain limits. The site plan needs to be updated to define the floodplain and limits of the floodplain more clearly. The floodway appears to be just the creek, but the building is very close to that, and the retaining wall appears to be almost on top of the floodway. The floodplain encompasses most of the site based on the elevations provided. A floodplain development permit will have to be processed through the Building Department. The Board will need to see the calculations on how many feet above the floodplain elevation the project is, how much fill is being brought in, what is being disturbed in that area so that flooding won't be caused at a downstream location. After briefly reviewing the elevations provided, the parking lot would be underwater in a 100 year flood elevation, and the access areas are also close. Architect Niemotko responded that the owner will hire a surveyor for the floodplain and floodway. The FEMA website will be used by the hired consultants to produce the FIRMette, and the consultants will also translate the FIRMette onto the plans. The surveyor and other subconsultants for design impact on the plans regarding the floodway, floodplain and FIRMette. Building Inspector Cocks stated that the applicant will also have to go to the DEC for a flood bank permit. Engineer Queenan stated that the floodplain permit should start now and be part of the site plan. Ramapo Creek is a Class B Stream in this location and is considered a state protected stream. The bed and the banks of that stream will have to be defined at least in the areas with the wall and the parking. The DEC has criteria on what they consider the bed and the banks to be. If the applicant does not do any survey work generally 50 feet on either side of the centerline of the stream is considered the bed and bank of the stream. Ultimately, the project site is in the floodway, in the floodplain, and will probably require a DEC permit to disturb the the bed and banks of the stream. The other issues are mainly technical issues. There are three parking aisles, but the parking isles all end on a dead end. There is no loop or turn around. The aisle width and parking spaces are correct, but there are no connection to the parking aisles. Parking at the end means that a driver has to back up through the entire aisle. The loading area for trucks seems quite small for a truck. Architect Niemotko replied that the applicant will probably move that loading area to the west where the dumpster is and relocate the dumpster. Engineer Queenan stated that the disturbance in the area will be more than one acre so a full SWPPP will be required. The access components are concerning and will have to involve DOT with entrance permitting. Possible pedestrian movements from the pond area in the center of the Village of Monroe will have to be taken account of. The applicant also needs a lighting plan, a landscaping plan, as well as further detail on any of the utility services such as water, sewer, and drainage. Engineer Queenan's office also had comments on the EAF. Chairman Boucher stated that a rendering will be needed ultimately as well. Architect Niemotko stated that he has some questions on the technical comments. Three profiles were provided. Do these profiles need to be provided in a larger

scale. Engineer Queenan stated that the stationing is off with the plan view. The spacing doesn't match the plan view. The elevations are small and difficult to read. Architect Niemotko asked about the utilities. The only utility crossing the street is sewer, water and gas are on the side of the project. Engineer Queenan stated that on the plans there was very little about inverts or nearest hydrant. Architect Niemotko stated that the nearest hydrant was located near the intersection of Ramapo Street and Route 17M and is on drawing C-1. The cut and fill analysis was done with Civil 3D shown on Plan 2 drawing C-3 which is shown in detail. Engineer Queenan stated that the Board is looking for the cut and fills map that is generated, the drawings only show the summary. Architect Niemotko stated that the map is in color and visible above the summary. Engineer Queenan noted that the Board is used to seeing a different map. The cut and fill map has the note "ACOE Approved Area of Fill" this note should be changed to "Entire Project – Limited Disturbance". Planner Fink provided his comments. The EAF needs corrections before a coordinated review can be done. Although the action is unlisted, the project does warrant a coordinated review at this point so that agency comments can be received. The EAF did not identify the DEC as an involved agency which needs to be corrected. Planner Fink will prepare a memo for the Planning Board that lists all the modifications needed on the Part 1 EAF. After the comments on the Part 1 EAF are addressed the applicant will be in a position to conduct a coordinated review. After that, the Lead Agency process can be done. Village of Harriman will need to be involved as well. Attorney Cassidy provided her comments. An EIS may be required. Traffic will need to be addressed and the Ambulance Corps building is right there. The project site is on the intersection of Route 17M and Ramapo; the angle of the turn is also steep. There are inconsistencies and corrections that need to be fixed. Once the plan is in a better place then starting SEQR and the 239 process would be appropriate. Member Hafenecker agreed that the angle of the Ramapo and Route 17M is sharp to drive out of. Member Hafenecker has also seen drivers driving along 17M who are turning left into the Sterling National Bank or driving up Ramapo Street drive their cars along the shoulder of the road. Cars turning out could be clipping by oncoming traffic. Member Hafenecker asked if there would be issues with the old cemetery that is against the parking lot. Architect Niemotko stated that the old cemetery and the headstones are hundreds of feet away from the site, although visually it appears to be up against the parking lot. When the surveyor is out there it may be a good idea to verify that distance. Member DeAngelis asked who will give the applicant authority to cross the stream. Architect Niemotko replied that the applicant will not be crossing the stream. Engineer Queenan stated that the proposed entrance is coming out from across Ramapo Street around where the Ambulance Corps building is.

Other Business

1. Administrative – Advertising

Secretary Doherty provided an overview. There was discussion about how to modernize advertising of public notices so as to better reach the community. Town of Monroe is responsible for the maintenance of Channel 22 which hosts local notices from their own and other nearby municipalities. Their equipment is being rebuilt. As a result of this upgrade there may be future costs when hosting notices, and it may not be possible to bill the applicants for these costs. There was also discussion about posting public notices on Facebook. The Village of Monroe has a Facebook page that is currently under Neil Dwyer's control. There are three ways for the Planning Board to use Facebook for notices. Neil Dwyer could post all notices himself, the Planning Board could be given access to the page to post, or the Planning Board

can create it's own page. There was also discussion about having notices share across community pages, such as Monroe Matters. Attorney Cassidy stated that whichever approach the Board chooses to incorporate must be made standard procedure for all applicants. Member DeAngelis stated that sometimes posting signs for the public notice on the property of the project sites is sometimes required. Attorney Cassidy stated that if the Board wishes for signs to be required a local law would have to be passed by the Village Board to require sign postings. This would be a change to the notice section of the local zoning law. The sign would have to be at least a certain size and of durable materials. The applicant would have to coordinate the sign and take a picture of the posted sign to and obtain a signed affidavit for the Board. Planner Fink stated that signs are posted for projects in the Town of Rhinebeck. Chairman Boucher stated that if Attorney Cassidy could provide the language to have public notice signs posted by the applicants the Planning Board would review this at the April 27, 2021 Meeting. Chairman Boucher also spoke with Mayor Dwyer who would have the Planning Board's recommendations be reviewed by the Village Board. Secretary Doherty asked if the Board would also like to have the public notices posted on the Village of Monroe's website. Chairman Boucher stated the public notices should be posted on the website as well. This would require no extra arrangements or costs from the Planning Board. Secretary Doherty asked for confirmation on how the Facebook posting for public notices from the Planning Board would be handled. Does Mayor Dwyer want to have these posted on the Village of Monroe Facebook page, or will the Planning Board have its own Facebook page. If the Planning board has its own Facebook page this would be an official media page for the Village of Monroe. Member Allen asked if there would be any legal issues to having notices posted on an invite-only group, as not everyone would have equal access to the page. Attorney Cassidy stated that she would prefer if the notices posted by the Planning Board were posted on Village sponsored social media. Typically, these pages posted on the municipalities' Facebook page are shared to other local pages by the public anyway.

2. Administrative – Fee Schedule, Escrow

Attorney Cassidy provided an overview for the Board. There are two ways municipalities can do their fees. Currently the Village of Monroe bills the work out to the applicants as invoices are received. The other way is to collect an escrow deposit upfront for all new applicants. A draft copy of the Fee Schedule from the Village of Florida has been provided for the Board to review. Within this fee schedule is a portion regarding escrow amounts, essentially setting a default escrow which is adequate for most projects. Bigger projects will require input from other consultants. The other item available for the Board to review is a draft agenda from the Town of Warwick. At the bottom of each item on that draft agenda is a line noting the status of escrow for that applicant. Currently, the Planning Board establishes escrow on Positive Declarations. Applicants have everything paid off once a project is finished as signature is not provided until the balance is paid. If projects stall or don't get approved the Village of Monroe enforces a lien on the property which is more time and effort as opposed to having an escrow up front. Member Karlich was in favor of establishing escrow upfront. Projects stall and may not appear before the board for months at a time. Attorney Cassidy stated that if the Board is in favor then a Fee Schedule could be drafted. This would also be a good time to reevaluate any application fees. The application fee isn't designed to cover costs like the part time Planning Board Secretary, running Zoom. The escrows are designed to cover the consultants. If a suggested fee schedule were drafted then the Board could adopt that by resolution. The fee schedule acts as a formula to account for most projects. If a project requires upwards adjustment that can be done at a

board meeting. Member DeAngelis stated that she doesn't know when the fee schedule was last revised. The fee schedule should be reviewed every year. Engineer Queenan stated that most municipalities he has worked with require escrow before any work can start and applicants are not allowed on the agenda if their escrow account falls below a certain threshold. Planner Fink stated that he has seen escrows in other municipalities too. If escrow falls below a level an email will be sent out to the consultants on that project to pause work until the account is sufficient again. Secretary Doherty stated that she is in favor of maintaining and escrow system going forward. Member DeAngelis requested to see a copy of the Town of Warwick's fee schedule. Attorney Cassidy stated that she could circulate this to the board. Building Inspector Cocks stated that Treasurer Murray should be informed about the escrow changes the Planning Board will put into place. If there are procedures for escrow account management those should be discussed. Chairman Boucher stated that he was in favor of having a more descriptive agenda like the Town of Warwick. Member DeAngelis stated that there was an article in the Photo News April 9-15 2021 edition regarding Spring Hill Apartments. She requested that a copy of this article be kept in the Spring Hill project file. Member Hafenecker requested that the file names of the documents on the One Drive be adjusted so that the description of the file is more prominent in its file name. Member DeAngelis agrees with Member Hafenecker. Secretary Doherty stated that she will prioritize the descriptive element of the file in its listed file name. Attorney Cassidy requested that Planner Fink and Engineer Queenan review the escrow deposits to see where they fall in line. It's recommended that the Planning Board keep the fee schedule inline with other municipalities in Orange County.

Adjournment

On a Motion made by Member Hafenecker and seconded by Member Kelly, it was unanimously:
Resolved that the April 12, 2021 Workshop be Adjourned at 9:19PM.