

**VILLAGE OF MONROE
PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES**

**MONDAY AUGUST 9, 2021
7:00 P.M.**

PRESENT: Chairman Boucher, Members Allen, DeAngelis, Hafenecker, and Karlich; Attorney Cassidy, Engineer Higgins, Traffic Engineer Canning, Building Inspector Cocks.

Chairman Boucher opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag. An announcement was made regarding the location of fire exits.

Workshop

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

Present: Steve Esposito, PE; John Till, Architect; John Coladonato; Aaron Goldklang, Owner;

Chairman Boucher stated that the applicant did not submit some documents on time but has decided to accept the revised renderings and elevations for the board to review. Architect Till presented the rendering to the board. Stone was added to tie in the earth-toned colors of the buildings. Earth-toned colors were brought into the siding. Other residential style detailing and cornices were added to the buildings as well. The board was in favor of the revised design and the landscaping. Chairman Boucher stated that the applicant will have to provide physical samples of the materials that will be used. Member DeAngelis was concerned that the building was a little dark, but overall the revisions were much better. The board discussed the colors of the building materials with Architect Till. Architect Till specified that the darker color of the stucco siding Member DeAngelis was referring to was listed as “DIC 503” on the materials list. Architect Till stated that the renderer matched the colors shown on the rendering to the elevations. The landscaping depicted on the rendering also matches the submitted landscape plan. Chairman Boucher stated that the public hearing to be held on August 24, 2021 will take place at the Town of Monroe Town Hall. Chairman Boucher stated that he will check that the Town of Monroe Town Hall has equipment so that the applicant can provide a digital presentation for the August 24 public hearing. Chairman Boucher recommended that the applicant bring a physical display as well. Chairman Boucher provided an overview of the public hearing procedure for the applicant.

2. 548 Rt 17M - 220-4-8

Present: Larry Torro, PE, Civil Tech Engineering;

Engineer Torro stated that the public hearing was kept open since no public comment was received. Chairman Boucher stated that no comment had been received from Orange County Planning Department. Attorney Cassidy stated that she had provided the applicant with sample language that they could use when creating their cross easement. Engineer Torro stated that the applicant is in the process of removing the outstanding pile of material on the property. Chairman Boucher stated that Planner Fink was in favor of the proposed sycamore trees and would like to see some sort of tree protection, such as snow fencing, to protect against possible truck collisions while the saplings grow. Engineer Higgins provided an overview of the L&T August 6th comment memo for the applicant. The applicant is required to invert elevations and the slope of the drainage pipe should be shown with a detail for the roof leader connections. The total area of disturbance should be checked and confirmed on the plan. The board should discuss the additional landscaping that was added. The applicant will require a Floodplain Development Permit. The board discussed the additional landscaping was in favor of what was proposed. Member Hafenecker noted that currently there is a lot of dirt tracking which will hopefully not be as aggressive in the future. Member Hafenecker asked if the landscaping will contain mulch or river rocks. River rocks often go unmaintained and weeds can grow unchecked, so mulch would be preferable. Chairman Boucher noted that the applicant will have to remove the offending material pile onsite before a building permit or site plan approval is granted. Attorney Cassidy stated that easement language needs to be provided by the applicant.

3. 251 High Street - 206-1-2

Present: Larry Torro, PE, Civil Tech Engineering;

Engineer Higgins provided an overview of the L&T August 3 comment memo. The subdivision plan submitted requires four variances. Engineer Torro stated that the rest of the comments are technical in nature. This revised design was submitted to the board for their feedback and direction. The board and applicant agreed that the cul-de-sac submitted previously was not ideal. The board discussed the current submission. The design submitted to the board has four lots approximately 58 feet wide; this is not ideal. Flag lots would be better in this case, but the Village of Monroe no longer permits flag lots. Chairman Boucher stated that a three-house subdivision would be much better than the current four house subdivision proposed. Engineer Torro agreed that the previous cul-de-sac design permitted was not ideal. With the current four-lot submission the 58 ft. lot width is not unusual; a 50 ft width is not uncommon. Engineer Torro stated that he will speak with the applicant on possibly reducing the four-lot subdivision down to three lots instead. Chairman Boucher noted that that

what the applicant proposes currently can potentially become very expensive. Engineer Higgins provided an overview of factors which can contribute to the cost. The cost of the construction of the roads will contribute. Currently there could be an excess of 1 acre of disturbance. There will be requirements for stormwater management, the design of a SWPPP. On the layout with the cul-de-sac Engineer Higgins isn't sure if there is enough room for detention facilities above grade, and subsurface detention may be a possibility as well. The cul-de-sac is irregular and hard to work with. As a 100 ft. width is required by code there is currently enough room for two lots on frontage, and three lots would require a variance. The currently proposed 4 lots will require a variance and could be considered significant. On this four-lot subdivision how will vehicles and vehicle turns be accommodated so as not to back out into the road. Chairman Boucher stated that Planner Fink had provided verbal comments regarding the potential impact of the neighborhood around the project. The project may potentially require more analysis in parts 2 and 3 of the EAF. The board discussed the potential of having the four-lot subdivision reduced to three lots. Attorney Cassidy stated that if the cul-de-sac is so problematic then possibly the Planning Board can contact the Board of Trustees regarding potential changes in zoning. This project has identified some weak spots in Village Code that may come up in future projects. The board discussed the code and other requirements relating to the cul-de-sac, such as cul-de-sac size. Attorney Cassidy stated that she can reach out to the mayor regarding the code. Attorney Cassidy and Chairman Boucher discussed the code and how a conversation can be started with the Village Board for potentially some revisions regarding cul-de-sacs. Secretary Doherty displayed an image of the current property via Google Maps. The board continued to discuss the proposed subdivisions and potential changes in the code. Chairman Boucher stated that he will contact Mayor Dwyer. Chairman Boucher stated that he will set up a meeting with Mayor Dwyer to discuss the situation of potential changes in the code regarding cul-de-sacs. Chairman Boucher noted that the applicant is very accommodating so far regarding changes to the layout of the proposed subdivisions.

4. 445 Route 17M - 222-2-2.1

Present: Larry Torro, PE, Civil Tech Engineering;

Chairman Boucher stated that lead agency was declared during May 2021. The SEQR action is unlisted. Engineer Higgins provided an overview of the L&T August 5th comment memo. An infiltration testing plan is required. The SWPPP should explain how stormwater will be pre-treated before entering the underground storage chambers. Orange County Planning 239 referral is required and has not been done yet. Traffic Engineer Canning provided an overview of the Kimley Horn July 2nd comment memo. There are a couple of issues as it relates to site plan parking. The site plan and the traffic study are good from an office use perspective but not from a medical office

building perspective. The driveway will require a permit from New York State DOT because the driveway is on a state highway. The driveway design does not comply with state standards. This is a commercial property and the applicant is required to file a PERM 33. This is a three phase process. Traffic Engineer Canning explained the first phase of the three phase process. NYS DOT has been requiring that new developments provide left turn mains on the main line. The applicant has proposed to provide sidewalks along the front edge of the property. There is an existing sidewalk on the south side of Route 17M which extends into the project site. This sidewalk should extend into the property so that pedestrians can walk from the sidewalk into the parking area. Sidewalk is provided along the front of the property but stops at the Stop & Shop plaza. If the sidewalk were to be completed then people could walk from the project site to the Stop & Shop plaza. Discussion regarding traffic continued. Attorney Cassidy recommended that a note on the site plan be added stating that Village code classifies office and medical as the same use, but there are different parking generations for each use. Any future tenant that generates greater intensity use would have to appear before the planning board again. The planning board should also add a note to prevent future tenants from having large vehicles do heavy unloading on site. Discussion regarding traffic continued. Chairman Boucher stated that the applicant will do a clear cut on the site and will cut down 150 trees. Chairman Boucher stated that Planner Fink had stated to him that on one part of the site plan a 250-year-old oak tree will be cut down to create one of the proposed parking spaces. Chairman Boucher stated that Planner Fink recommends that the applicant create an overlay of the tree plan, site plan, and underground plan with the grading. This grid would help the planning board better evaluate the project site. Chairman Boucher stated that as there is also a lot of old growth on the property the planning board may want to conduct a site visit. Discussion regarding the existing trees on the project site and potential site visit continued. Traffic Engineer Canning discussed PERM 33 and other traffic matters with the board. The board was in favor of conducting a site visit. Secretary Doherty displayed an image of the project site via Google Maps. Discussion regarding the location of the project site ensued. The planning board discussed when a site visit would be conducted. Chairman Boucher stated that the date of the site visit will be confirmed at a later date.

Adjournment

On a Motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Hafenecker, it was unanimously: **Resolved that the August 9, 2021 workshop be Adjourned at 8:21PM.**