

**VILLAGE OF MONROE
PLANNING BOARD
WORKSHOP MINUTES**

**MONDAY JUNE 14, 2021
7:00 P.M.**

PRESENT: Chairman Boucher, Members Allen, DeAngelis, Hafenecker, Karlich, Kelly, and Parise; Attorney Cassidy, Engineer Higgins, Planner Fink.

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.

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

Present: Steve Esposito, PE; John Till, Architect;

Chairman Boucher stated that the planning board will review the new elevations provided by the applicant, which were revised per board comments. It did not appear to Chairman Boucher that the buildings were changed in the sense of materials or look, but the colors changed. Architect Till reviewed the revised elevations with the board. The color of the buildings were revised to have more of an earth tone. The siding colors were revised to have a natural clay color. The vertical siding will have a herringbone color. The horizontal clapboard siding will have a natural clay color. The exterior materials were revised; the stucco finish was removed. There are two primary colors and two primary materials for the siding. The roofline was softened, and previously the building had a taller, tower effect. The fascia board was streamlined to have a softer feel to the elevation. Member Parise feels that these new buildings are much better, the look is clean and looks modern, and appreciates that the applicant removed the stucco. Member DeAngelis does not like that the doors appear to be a mustard color, but is in favor of the lighter gray building, which looks more cheerful and comforting. Member DeAngelis asked what other colors could be used for the doors. Architect Till states that how the file is displayed on a digital screen can be deceiving as the doors are more of a brown color. The color of the doors is going to be painted so the options are more flexible. Member Parise suggested perhaps using a taupe color. Architect Till stated that the door can be a taupe color if the board requests. Member Hafenecker is in favor of the new design. Member Hafenecker asked what room of the building would be where the two small horizontal windows directly over the two doors are. Architect Till stated that the room where the windows are directly over the doorways there will be a stairwell. The side with a small horizontal window on each floor are going to be bathrooms. There are sidewalks outside, and the small higher window keeps the room private. Architect Till clarified that since this document is an elevation the building shown is what will be seen on either side of the building, from both the parking lot and the neighboring golf course. Architect Till stated that the windows are a combination of casement windows and awning windows. The lower windows are awning, the upper windows are awning, and the center windows are casement windows. Member Karlich stated that the design is the same but the colors are different. Member Karlich expected that the board was going to receive a rendering of an altered design. The colors are better, but Member Karlich is not in favor of the look. Member Karlich asked which windows go

with what unit. Architect Till explained the layout of the building to the board. The general concept is that these are flat two-bedroom apartments. One door enters into the grade level apartment and the next door goes upstairs to a unit directly above. Each unit will have its own private entrance. There are no shared corridors or hallways. Architect Till described how each door connects to each unit. There are 18 units in each building, 9 units on each side. The units mirror each other. There's a walkway that goes all around the building, some units will face the parking lot and others will face the golf course. Chairman Boucher requested that the applicant provide the board with the floor plans for the buildings. Member DeAngelis and Member Karlich stated that they are not satisfied with the design and layout. It had appeared to them that the applicant would return to the board with a different design but that didn't happen; only the colors were revised. Chairman Boucher stated that the applicant had said they would first change the colors before changing the design. Member Kelly feels that the new colors are better but is not satisfied with the current design. Chairman Boucher is not satisfied with the modern look of the buildings and doesn't believe the design fits the character of the neighborhood. Chairman Boucher stated that after reviewing the site during the June 11th site visit he does not believe the project site is as hidden as was originally believed. Everything can be seen from the golf course. Only the lower third of the project site will be concealed with trees. The neighboring homes are only around 60 feet away from the project site. Chairman Boucher stated that what designs look modern now won't look modern in 15 years, but is in favor of the current colors for the buildings. Member Parise is in favor of the revised roof, where the large vertical portion was removed. Member Parise stated that whatever is built today will be outdated in the future anyway. The applicant knows the marketing end of this project and the kind of demographic he is targeting. The applicant wants to draw in the younger generation. The applicant has built apartments similar or close in design and has no problems renting to younger people. Chairman Boucher stated that every community is different. It's not just about the rental, it's about the project fitting into the surrounding area. Chairman Boucher stated that the revised elevations were received over the weekend and the board hasn't had that much time to review the changes. The applicant will be on the agenda for the June 22, 2021 regular meeting and by then the board will have reviewed the changes. Chairman Boucher is in favor with the applicant's decision to remove the stucco from the design. Member Parise stated that the public can provide their comments during a public hearing. Both versions of the elevations can be presented to the public. The planning board doesn't live in the area, let the neighbors give their feedback on the design. Chairman Boucher stated that most likely the public hearing will be set for this application during the upcoming June 22 2021 regular meeting.

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

Present: Larry Torro, PE, Civil Tech Engineering; Rodger Braley, Architect, Rodger W. Braley Architects;

Engineer O'Rourke could not attend tonight's workshop so Engineer Higgins provided comments on his behalf. The applicant will provide cross easements to the planning board attorney for review and continue to maintain two separate lots. The Lanc & Tully office has no objection to this approach. Based on feedback from the fire department, the mulch storage is to be relocated to maintain 20 feet between bins and other permanent structures. New locations should be shown on the plans and care should be taken to avoid storage of mulch over or directly adjacent to the catch basin. This was labeled on the plan, but his office would like to see that graphically the structure relocated as needed. The applicant's narrative states no additional

lighting or landscaping is proposed, planning board should discuss if this is adequate, some minor landscaping in the rear of the site in coordination with the proposed signage could help to better delineate the floodway to deter future encroachment. If no additional lighting is proposed it should be noted on the plan. It appears no drainage structures or facilities are proposed. If this is the case architectural plans should be provided to demonstrate how drainage will be handled for the three new buildings, and site plan notes should be provided that reference these plans. We want to make sure that runoff is being addressed; even if there are new structures they should be handling drainage away from the building into the flood area. Engineer Higgins lost Zoom connection due to disruption from inclement weather. Secretary Doherty displayed the site plan for the board. Chairman Boucher stated that he would like to see landscaping on the edge of the property on the floodway line which would serve as a reminder for employees on the property not to encroach into the floodway. A hedgerow, or similar element, should be added along Route 17M. Planner Fink provided his comments. Landscaping would be appropriate on 17M and the rear of the site to prevent any sort of further encroachments into the floodplain and floodway. The landscaping plan does not need to be fancy but it should keep trucks from backing up and depositing material into the floodway. Fencing could be used but a row of trees would be a better option. Trees stabilize the soil and provide wildlife habitat along the creek. Chairman Boucher stated that it would be nice to have a hedgerow where the guiderail is located along Route 17M. Planner Fink stated that the guiderail area would be the most appropriate place to provide screening for vehicle parking and storage area. Member Parise stated that trees along the floodway line would be good but could the trees potentially uproot and become muddy in that area. Member Parise is concerned that a fence or trees in the area could potentially encroach onto the floodplain. Member DeAngelis stated that there are wet plants which can withstand a wet area. Member Parise stated that he is concerned of trucks backing into trees and destroying them. Member Parise suggested that an inexpensive barrier placed to protect the trees. Engineer Torro believes that just a row of trees would be sufficient for the area. Engineer Higgins reconnected to the workshop. Chairman Boucher requested that the applicant provide a plan which would include the requested screening, such as a hedgerow, on Route 17M and the requested landscaping which would delineate the floodplain on the rear of the property. Engineer Higgins provided the rest of his comments. His office defers to the building department regarding "general storage" in the floodplain and what, if any, requirements may be had concerning this material. Any and all utilities to serve the proposed buildings should be shown and detailed on the plans. The applicant may wish to consider signage or striping to prohibit parking outside of the two parking spaces proposed immediately adjacent to the proposed frame building. The note on the site plan stating "stock piled material in the floodway/floodplain is to be removed" should be expanded to add "prior to any building permit". The application requires referral to the County Department of Planning for GML review. Chairman Boucher read a portion of text from a letter from the NYS DEC dated April 23.

"On April 1, 2021, the above referenced site was inspected by department staff. DEC staff observed fill material including soil, concrete blocks, and rock placed adjacent to the banks of Ramapo River, Class B. In some locations, the soil was overtopping the concrete blocks and silt fencing causing it to migrate towards the river. On the Eastern side of the property, large stockpiles were being stored without any erosion and sediment controls separating them from the stream bank. Since the river is Class B it is regulated by DEC Under the Protection of Waters Law, Environmental Conservation Law Article 15, and the implementing regulations 6NYCRR Part 608.

During a rain event, these stockpiles could contribute to a water quality violation in the receiving water. Proper erosion and sediment controls must be installed immediately and maintained in

accordance with New York State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control in order to prevent a contravention of water quality standards.

Inadequate erosion and sediment control practices may result in the contravention of the New York State Water Quality Standards (6 NYCRR Chapter X, Part 703.2) in the receiving water. Contravention of Water Quality Standards is a violation of Article 17-0501 of the Environmental Conservation Law and subject to penalties of up to \$37,500 per day, per violation. Proper Erosion and sediment control measures must be installed at the site immediately. “

Chairman Boucher asked if this information received from the DEC affects this applications' readiness for a GML 239 referral. Engineer Higgins stated that he did not review this with Engineer O'Rourke yet. Engineer Higgins stated that the erosion control issues are something that need to be addressed. Attorney Cassidy stated that the DEC and the 239 are independent processes and the planning board can move this application forward. Attorney Cassidy is in favor of comment 9 of Engineer O'Rourke's June 6, 2021 Memo which states that "We recommend the note "stock piled material in the floodway/floodplain is to be removed" should be expanded to add "prior to any building permit"." Moving forward with the project won't hinder the effort to remedy the outstanding violation. Attorney Cassidy stated that her preference would be for the two lots to be merged, as there are walls that encroach onto the other property. Merging the lots solves many problems. If the applicant chooses to pursue keeping the lots separate using cross easements the applicant needs to recognize that these cross easements limit the utilization of the lots. If someone were to sell the property the applicant would have to show that lot 214-1-56.1 can be independently operated from lot 220-4-8. The applicant is relying on lot 220-4-8 space for circulation and other things in relation to this application. Attorney Cassidy recognizes that the applicant wants to keep their doors open but the lots may not be as useful with cross easements. There should be a note that any other use of the lot 214-1-56.1 is going to require amended site plan approval for both lots. Engineer Torro stated that a note on the site plan stating that any other use of lot 214-1-56.1 would require amended site plan approval from the planning board can be added. Engineer Torro stated that the applicant's attorney will contact Attorney Cassidy so that the cross easement declaration process can be started. Attorney Cassidy stated that the cross easements declaration will be one of the last steps done on the 548 Route 17M application, after the site plan is largely set. Chairman Boucher stated that he believes this application is ready to be sent out for a GML 239 referral and potentially even have a public hearing date set. Attorney Cassidy stated that she will prepare a draft resolution to send for a 239 Referral and to set the public hearing. Member Parise asked if any turning radii will be put on the site for fire trucks. Engineer Torro stated that the applicant had met with the fire department. The only issue was that the Fire Department need a 20 foot clear aisle from the storage bins, which was also a comment contained in Engineer O'Rourke's June 6th memo. Member Parise asked if the roadway will be all gravel, which Engineer Torro confirmed. The planning board requested that the applicant have the Fire Department provide their comments in writing. Member Parise requested that the letter include confirmation from the Fire Department that the department had reviewed the plans with the applicant and building department. Member Parise stated that historically the planning board sends a copy of the plans to all emergency services for review. Chairman Boucher stated that Secretary Doherty will forward the site plan for review to the Police Department, Fire Department, and the Ambulance Corps. Member Hafenecker asked if the parking lot near the two-story frame building will be paved eventually. Member Hafenecker also noted that in this past week the air quality in the area was negatively affected and there was a lot of tracking of dirt and dust coming onto Route 17M. Will these issues be rectified, and will the parking lot be paved after the buildings are framed out and built. Engineer Torro stated that he will get those answers to the planning board. The roadway in the rear of the property will be gravel, and Engineer Torro will find out from the

applicant what will happen to the front of the property. Member Karlich asked where the mulch bins will be moved to and will the bins be shown on the plan. Engineer Torro stated that where the mulch bins will be relocated to will be shown on the plan.

3. **251 High Street - 206-1-2**

Present: Larry Torro, PE, Civil Tech Engineering;

Engineer Torro provided an overview of the project for the board. This is an application for a four-lot subdivision on approximately two acres. The project site is located off of High Street. The units proposed are single family residences which meet the bulk requirements the four lots propose. The units will be serviced by municipal water and sewer. What was submitted to the planning board was a concept plan showing the layout, the subdivision map. The second sheet submitted shows the layout map showing dwelling sites and setbacks. Engineer Torro isn't sure who came up with the cul-de-sac concept which in his opinion appears excessive. Engineer Torro isn't sure if there is a way around having a cul-de-sac, and he was hoping the Village had some sort of provision potentially for a private road to avoid this cul-de-sac. The applicant isn't thrilled with the size of this cul-de-sac but these are the requirements under the code. The houses are shaped how they are to maximize footprint while keeping the structures within the building envelopes, which the goal of having a 1,500 sq. ft. footprint. Chairman Boucher asked Attorney Cassidy about the possibility of having a driveway and private road servicing the houses to get rid of the cul-de-sac. Attorney Cassidy stated that given the width of the lot she had initially thought that one of the parcels could be accessed with a driveway off of High Street and the other three parcels have a common driveway. Attorney Cassidy stated she will review the Village Code to see what can be done. As there is a cul-de-sac this four-lot subdivision will be treated as a major subdivision under Village Code. Chairman Boucher is in favor of having a driveway off of High Street service one unit and a shared driveway servicing the other three units. Member Parise stated that something similar was done off of Pine Tree Road. The Village and the Highway Department do not want cul-de-sacs. The whole design should be changed. If changes were made then potentially the project would be just a minor subdivision. Chairman Boucher stated that the houses proposed are right on the setback line. Attorney Cassidy told Engineer Torro that the **FAARD local law** is now in place. Engineer Higgins provided his comments. Engineer O'Rourke had spoken with Engineer Torro regarding the concerns for the subdivision. The majority of the 14 comments have to do with the utilities, trees to be cleared, driveway location, sidewalks, grading, and other items. The applicants have to work with the options available pending Attorney Cassidy's review of the code. Engineer Higgins provided his comments. There is a comment regarding the short EAF which reads "Item 2 on the short EAF should identify the Village Board as a permitting agency for acceptance of dedication of the road, Village DPW for disturbance within High Street and Orange County Sewer District #1". A Orange County GML review is required as the property is within 500 ft. of the Town of Monroe. Engineer Torro requested that Attorney Cassidy provide any preliminary information she is able to find in the Village Code. Attorney Cassidy stated that she will provide the information that she finds.

Other Business

1. **Local law #5** – **Introductory Local Law modifying the definition of lot coverage contained in Chapter 200 of the Village Code, “Zoning”** *Planning Board to review local law #5 and offer recommendations.*

Attorney Cassidy provided an overview for the board. This local law is a zoning amendment. The planning board's job is to comment and provide recommendations back to the Village Board. This proposed law stemmed from a discussion Attorney Cassidy had with Attorney Terhune as an applicant proposed to have a lot be entirely paved with blacktop. Typically, lot coverage excludes blacktop as open space but the Village Code currently does not. Attorney Terhune then suggested that the coverage definition in the code be updated to include paved areas, and so the Local Law #5 draft was the result. Attorney Cassidy reviewed the Local Law #5 draft to see how existing projects would be impacted. The planning board should be careful of potential unintended consequences. From Attorney Cassidy's and Planner Fink's perspective the board should make sure that blacktop is counted as part of coverage for stormwater and runoff is overall a good idea, but the board needs to remain thoughtful of implementation. The existing 208 Business Center project is definitely going to be an issue with coverage if the Local Law #5 definition were to apply. Some of the Village's coverage ratios are low but that may be because the coverage definition only reflects structures. The planning board may need to take a more comprehensive approach and not just look at the definition but also address the corresponding ratios in the various zoning districts for what is deemed acceptable coverage. Coverage will be close to 100% in the Village's center as the buildings are tightly knit. Residential zones will have a lower coverage. There may be a misunderstanding that the Local Law #5 came from the planning board, but this is not true as the Local Law #5 was drafted after a discussion between Attorney Cassidy and Attorney Terhune. The recommendations the planning board provides tonight will be included in a letter which the planning board can sign off on at the regular meeting. Planner Fink provided his comments. Planner Fink agrees that Local Law #5 draft is a good attempt to come up with a better definition for lot coverage. After reviewing the bulk requirements and the different zoning districts Planner Fink believes that some additional work needs to occur that would be more reflective of the full scope of lot coverage and the different zoning districts. The next step is to inform the Village Board that a change in the coverage definition could have unintended consequences unless the changes were paired with an analysis of the bulk requirements for the zoning districts just to see how projects will be affected. Chairman Boucher requested that Planner Fink provide a comment memo regarding Local Law #5 to the planning board for review. Planner Fink stated that a comment memo regarding Local Law #5 can be provided. Member Parise stated that the planning board has 45 days to react and offer comment to Local Law #5. Member Parise stated that the planning board needs to micromanage this law. Member Parise asked what else does Local Law #5 affect in the code. What about parking calculations and gravel driveways. There are a lot of factors that need to be considered and Member Parise does not believe that a complete evaluation can be completed by the next regular meeting. Attorney Cassidy stated that the planning board can list the issue of having adequate time for review as a comment. The planning board can also include the need for a comprehensive approach of Local Law #5 as a comment as well. Attorney Cassidy stated that the sentiment that coverage should address blacktop coverage is a good one, as how the code stands now theoretically if an applicant were to have the right sized building an entire lot can be paved with blacktop. If blacktop will be included as part of Village's coverage calculation then the coverage number should also be determined. Attorney Cassidy requested that Planner Fink forward her the comment

memo so the memo can be incorporated into a letter and circulated to the planning board for the next regular meeting.

2. Draft Fee Schedule

Attorney Cassidy displayed a copy of the draft fee schedule. Member Parise asked if a copy of the current fee schedule can be included for the board's reference. Attorney Cassidy stated that she will distribute a copy of the existing fee schedule to the board. Attorney Cassidy stated that the last time the fee schedule was updated was in 2014. Attorney Cassidy provided her comments on the Draft Fee Schedule. The only section that was added in terms of code is the Escrow Deposit for Consultant Review section. Every other item on the draft fee schedule is from the current fee schedule and no alterations were made yet. Attorney Cassidy recommends that Subdivision section be altered to include fees for sketch, preliminary, and final approval. Planner Fink provided his comments on the Draft Fee Schedule. The short EAF is only 5 pages long and the long EAF is 25 pages, plus attachments such as traffic studies. The Long EAF form on the escrow deposit should be bumped up from \$800 to an amount that would take into consideration the time necessary to review the long EAF. To account for the variable times needed to review the long EAF and attachments some municipalities have instituted a per page fee. Planner Fink stated that in his experience if the municipality doesn't have an adequate escrow account set up for the SEQR reviews then the municipality will be in a position where the applicant will continually require funds to be replenished. Charging a larger sum upfront and returning any unspent funds is better. Attorney Cassidy stated that Engineer O'Rourke emailed her and said that the fees on the Draft Fee Schedule were in line with other municipalities. Chairman Boucher is in favor with the current revisions to the fee schedule and in is favor of requiring an escrow upfront. Any unused portion will be returned to the applicant. If the escrow falls below a threshold the applicant won't appear on the agenda until the account is refilled. Attorney Cassidy stated that at the bottom of the Draft Fee Schedule the threshold for escrow replenishment is stated, which reads "When the required escrow deposit amount falls below 40% of the initial deposit, the applicant shall replenish the deposited amount to the full initial value prior to any further review of the application". Attorney Cassidy stated that the Draft Fee Schedule includes points of flexibility where the consultants decide what amounts are appropriate so that larger and smaller projects are accommodated. Attorney Cassidy stated that she will send the board a version of the Draft Fee Schedule with the proposed changes highlighted.

3. Planning Board Public Notice Local Law

Attorney Cassidy stated that she had circulated a draft of the Public Notice law which is a local law that will amend the zoning code of the Village of Monroe code to provide additional Public notice for Planning and Zoning applications. Attorney Cassidy stated that Member DeAngelis had sent her an email suggesting the addition of a section referencing the subdivision code to have this same noticing procedure for site plan, special permit, and subdivision applications. Member Karlich stated that Section 2. Part (b) ii. it is stated that "The applicant shall cause notice of public hearing to be published in the official newspaper of the Village" The public notice is published in the newspaper by the planning board secretary. The newspaper also provides an affidavit of publication back to the planning board secretary. Attorney Cassidy stated that if the planning board wished to have the planning board secretary continue to publish the

public notices to the paper that is fine. Many municipalities now are starting to put the burden of publication on the applicants. If there is a mistake then it's not the municipality's fault, it's the applicants'. The planning board prepares and sends the public notice to the applicant and the applicant is responsible for the mailings and also publishing the notice in the newspaper. The goal of holding the applicant responsible for publishing the public notice is to reduce the steps the municipality is required to take. The applicant would also provide the affidavit of publication to the planning board prior to the public hearing. Member Karlich stated that the applicant isn't as familiar with the publication of the legal notice as the planning board secretary is. Member Karlich isn't in favor of requiring the applicant to publish the public notice in the newspaper. Member Parise asked Attorney Cassidy if in her experience if applicants have been able to consistently and successfully have the public notice published in the newspaper 10 days before the public hearing and provide the affidavit of publication. Attorney Cassidy stated that she can provide the planning board with a list of municipalities that require the applicant to publish the public notice in the newspaper. Attorney Cassidy stated that for municipalities that require the applicant to publish the notice she will include the legal time frame. The planning board can also send the applicants an instruction sheet to follow so that the public notice is posted properly. Member Parise asked that if the planning board implements these changes requiring the applicant to post the public notice to the paper should the Village of Monroe ZBA and Village Board also revise their public notice procedures similarly. There should be consistency among the boards. Attorney Cassidy stated that she can circulate the draft public notice law to the ZBA attorney and Chairperson. Attorney Cassidy stated that she had revised draft public notice law Section 2 (b) item iv. from "serviceable material" to "sturdy material such as plastic that withstand inclement weather". Member Parise asked if there will be any changes to sign code. Attorney Cassidy stated that in the draft public notice law Section 3 item G which reads "Temporary signs required in connection with public notice of a land use application to the Village of Monroe Planning Board or Zoning Board of Appeals shall not require a permit of the Code Enforcement Officer." had been included. Member Parise stated that he wants to make sure the temporary signs are not left up indefinitely and are taken down. Attorney Cassidy stated that in the draft public notice Section 2 (b) item iv. it is stated that "The applicant shall remove the sign within 7 days of the close of the public hearing.". If the signs aren't removed within 7 days the building department can issue the applicant a violation of the zoning code. Attorney Cassidy stated that she will circulate a copy of the draft public notice law to the ZBA and will include the reference to the subdivision notice which is that the public noticing procedure for site plan, special permit, and subdivision applications will be the same.

4. Resuming In-person Planning Board Workshops and Meetings

Chairman Boucher stated that most municipalities are resuming in-person board meetings. How does the board feel about resuming in-person meetings starting from the July workshop. Member Parise asked if there is enough room to safely have an in-person board meeting. Chairman Boucher stated that the days the planning board holds workshops and meetings the Village courtroom is available. Chairman Boucher spoke with Mayor Dwyer briefly and Mayor Dwyer believes there may be enough room. Chairman Boucher believes that during the COVID-19 Pandemic there was a limit of 14 occupants for the court room. Attorney Cassidy stated that she will check the occupancy limit for the courtroom. Member Allen asked that if people are vaccinated do they have to wear a mask. Chairman Boucher stated that he will verify that information for the board. Attorney Cassidy stated that she will review the Village's COVID-19 protocols for the

board. Last time Attorney Cassidy checked the Village Court rules everyone had to wear a mask, but those were rules for the New York State Court System. Member Hafenecker asked if it would be possible for the planning board to use the Town of Monroe's Town Hall to hold meetings. That room is big. Member Parise stated that he has participated in other in-person meetings for other municipalities. Member Parise stated that if the planning board wishes to use the Town Hall for meetings the Village should speak with Town Supervisor Cardonne and get clearance. Member DeAngelis is in favor of using the larger Town Hall, and added that a larger room is better for public hearings. Chairman Boucher that currently the Village Board holds meetings both through Zoom and in person. Member Parise believes that the Village Board meetings are only in person and are not hosted on zoom. Member Allen asked if meetings will continue to be broadcast through zoom as well as held in person. Attorney Cassidy stated that the Zoom technology used during meetings is an exception from the open meetings law due to the ongoing Governor ordered state of emergency. Once the state of emergency ends the planning board will no longer be able to use Zoom technology during public meetings. Attorney Cassidy stated that from her experience hosting a meeting both in person and through Zoom is difficult. The flow of the meeting is split between Zoom and the in-person gathering and not everyone will see the same things. Some municipalities have technologies that let them broadcast the in-person meeting live over Facebook, but virtual participants are limited to leaving comments on the Facebook livestream. Member Parise believes that the Village Board, specifically Mayor Dwyer, should contact Supervisor Cardone regarding the use of the Town of Monroe Town Hall for workshops and meetings.

Adjournment

On a Motion made by Member Parise and seconded by Member Kelly, it was unanimously: **Resolved that there being no further business, the Meeting be adjourned.** The meeting was adjourned at 8:48PM.