

**VILLAGE OF MONROE PLANNING BOARD  
WORKSHOP MEETING  
JANUARY 8, 2020  
MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** Chairman Parise, Members Cocks, DeAngelis, Karlich, Boucher, Allen, Engineer Russo, Attorney Reineke, Building Inspector Cocks

Chairman Parise 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.

**1. Chabad of Orange County – Architectural Review – (206-6-1.2)**  
**Present:** Arthur Chabon, Architect

Architect Chabon informed the board that the building has been reduced in size since receiving planning board approval. Minor changes to the location of the footprint are shown on the plan to adjust so the building fits on the land, and a terrace originally shown on the north side of the building has been moved to the south side. Architect Chabon indicated the building has been reduced from two story to one story, and from 11,000 sq. ft. to just under 9,000 sq. ft. Architect Chabon showed the board renderings of the architectural style and colors proposed. The walls are still to be stucco, the roof will be architectural shingles, and the trim will be painted wood. Samples were provided for the board to review. The applicant is hoping to trim the base of the building with stone, but if funds prohibit stone, then a parged concrete base will be done. The concrete would be tinted to blend in with the building. Member Boucher asked how the concrete is tinted. Architect Chabon described the process of how dye is integrated into the concrete. The proposal is also to include a pergola over the patio, but if it is too cost intrusive the pergola would be built at a later date. Engineer Russo stated that the minor adjustments to the size of the building will require an amended site plan to be submitted to show the changes and ensure that all is in conformance with the prior approved site plan. Engineer Russo stated that Engineer O'Rourke spoke with Engineer Petroccione and he will be providing an amended site plan for Engineer O'Rourke's review. SEQR has already been done and there are no other engineering issues. Architect Chabon requested that the board approve the stone and the pergola along with the other materials, and also approve the parged concrete in case the stone can't be done. The board discussed options for approval and if it would be necessary to bring the applicant back to the board if they had to install the concrete instead of the stone. The board felt that it wouldn't be necessary to make the applicant return to the board and could accommodate an approval with options. Chairman Parise requested the applicant outline the specific materials and colors in a list. Chairman Parise advised the applicant that before any approval could be given an amended site plan would have to be submitted to Engineer O'Rourke and reviewed and accepted.

2. **310 Stage - Multifamily Housing – Site Plan – (213-1-31)**

**Present:** Michael Morgante, PE, Arden Consulting Engineers; Paul Edwards, Owner

Chairman Parise noted that updates to the site plan, landscaping plan, lighting plan, and elevations and renderings of the building and stone wall have been provided. Engineer Russo discussed engineering review comments. Engineer Russo stated that Engineer O'Rourke is still in the process of reviewing all documents submitted. Easement documents were submitted for the force main and should be reviewed by the Village Attorney. The applicant has coordinated with SHPO and appears to be implementing their recommendations. The application was sent to Orange County Planning for 239 review and comments were received back stating Local Determination. Engineer Russo stated if the board is satisfied then a public hearing could be scheduled. Building Inspector Cocks reviewed the fire access road as proposed and stated as the building is under 30 feet aerial access is not required. The access road as proposed is acceptable. Attorney Reineke reviewed the declarations submitted and felt they would be better if they were combined into a single declaration. It should be set up so that it is an affirmative obligation so that in the event of a failure to meet the obligations the property owner will understand that if the Village has to do work it will be charged back against the property owner. Engineer Morgante confirmed that Orange County Sewer has given conceptual approval of the plan. Chairman Parise noted that the plans were sent to emergency services and the only response received was from Monroe Volunteer Ambulance who had no issue. Mr. Edwards presented samples of the roofing and siding material to be used. The roof will be a gray architectural shingle. The siding is proposed to be all blue using high density cellular siding. The board was not fond of the blue color. Discussion was held regarding possible siding colors and Mr. Edwards was open to suggestions. The board agreed on more gray earth tones. Mr. Edwards would provide a list of materials and colors. Chairman Parise asked if there was going to be any landscaping around the rock wall and commented that it shouldn't be covered up too much. Engineer Morgante stated some landscaping grasses were proposed but would not block the wall. Member Boucher asked the applicant how they would address the stormwater concern raised by the County. Engineer Morgante stated that normally if more than 1 acre is being disturbed on a site that would trigger a stormwater prevention plan. This project is disturbing less than 1 acre and will not be generating runoff or flows that would be cause for stormwater capture.

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

**Present:** Steve Esposito, PE; Aaron Goldklang, Owner

Engineer Russo described the project as the proposed merger of three tax lots for a 68 unit multi family development on a 10.1 acre property located on Stephen Lane and in the URM zone where multi family development is permitted by special permit and subject to the requirements of 210-49.2. A narrative should be provided. Currently Village Code only allows the merger of lots for commercial purposes. The applicant is

requesting a waiver from the planning board as to the lot merger pursuant to 175-21. The number of permitted units in a multi family development is to be calculated based on the formula provided in 200-49.2C which requires subtracting lands in easements, streets, wetlands and areas containing slopes of 20% or greater from the gross lot area. This calculation should be provided to confirm accuracy. NYS DEC wetland MO-9 encroaches onto the property. Delineation information should be noted on the plan. The current plan shows disturbance within the 100 foot buffer which will require an Article 15 wetland permit. Once the merger issue is resolved a full site plan should be submitted. Dumpster locations should be provided on the plan and an EAF should be submitted. Attorney Reineke explained that this is a site specific issue. In looking at the map and in speaking with the building department, it is Attorney Reineke's understanding that in the absence of a merger of these lots, the buildable lot areas on the 2 large existing lots are so severely constricted that you really can't build multi family housing or any other allowable use in the zoning district on these lots. If the board determines that this particular site is so constrained by the physical conditions, the planning board can waive the requirement, but the board would have to make the finding that there are issues with the site; that it is in the public interest to support the waiver; and the merger constraint would be a burden to the applicant. Absent the waiver these lots are virtually undevelopable for the zoned use. In the alternative the applicant could apply to the Village Board for the waiver but they would be looking at the same issues. Engineer Esposito added that the site is extremely inhibited for development because of the wetlands on site. The site is zoned for multi family and is in conformity with the Village's recently adopted Comprehensive Plan. By developing this site the private, unimproved road of Stephen Lane would be improved benefitting the Village. Engineer Esposito continued that multi family is recognized as commercial property by the Town of Monroe Tax Assessors office, the Village Water Dept., Orange County Real Property Tax Department and the State of NY. Commercial properties are permitted to be merged. Engineer Esposito noted that the Orange County Comprehensive Plan and the recently adopted Village of Monroe Comprehensive Plan, both of which clearly document a need for varied housing types such as multi family housing. The plan meets or exceeds the Village code requirements for multi family housing. The site has street frontage, its near shopping, its set back in a quiet setting good for residential use, with a golf course on one side, a few single family homes on another and the rest surrounded by wetlands. Based on these facts this project meets the criteria for a waiver. Mr. Goldklang addressed the board and stated he owns several other properties in the County and plans to develop this site to market to anyone who would be interested in living there. He takes pride in his property and he is invested in building a project the Village would be proud to have. Engineer Esposito added the applicant is prepared to file a deed restriction with this property to provide that it remains multi family rental, and commercial property. Chairman Parise noted that people have been trying to develop this property for years but nothing ever came through. Member Cocks stated that Stephen Lane would have to be improved and Member Karlich noted Stephen Lane was a private road. Building Inspector Cocks noted that Stephen Lane is owned by this applicant and is part of the flag lot.

**4. Ramapo Street – Proposed Senior Housing (220-1-4)**

**Present:** David Niemotko, Architect

Engineer Russo stated the project is for a two story structure for senior housing on a 3.72 acre property with frontage on Ramapo Street. Section 200-49.3 requires a narrative outlining both the proposed project and the applicant's criteria for its determination of the need for the project. This has not been provided. The market analysis provided is generic in nature and not specially related to senior housing providing census data relative to the County and Town of Monroe but not any findings specific to the Village need. The analysis also does not provide any detailed information such as targeted ages of residents, proposed rents, affordability restrictions or proposed services. The report is not an acceptable demonstration of need for senior housing. Once the applicant provides a narrative and documented need for the project satisfactory to the planning board, then the application has to be referred to the Village Board for their review. At this time the planning board should focus on if they have enough information to refer the application to the Village Board. Chairman Parise stated he was not satisfied with the market analysis as he found the information confusing and not about a need for senior housing. The board discussed the market analysis and the confusing data and the lack of a narrative or summarized need for senior housing. Architect Niemotko will have a narrative prepared and a summary of the analysis submitted. Attorney Reineke explained the senior housing law as a floating zone which could be attached to any zone. In order to do that the applicant has to come to the planning board with documentation supporting the need for the floating zone. The planning board then forwards the application to the Village Board for review either without comment, with recommendation in favor or against. If the Village Board approves the application then they determine the density and send the application back to the planning board for a complete site plan review. Member DeAngelis asked if this was for all senior housing or just subsidized senior housing. Attorney Reineke responded its for all senior housing. Building Inspector Cocks asked what bulk requirements were being used as there are no bulk requirements for senior housing, and multifamily housing is not permitted in GB. Architect Niemotko responded that some of the bulk requirements came simply from the nature and location of where they could build given the wetland limitations on the site. Attorney Reineke stated that in the code the planning board ultimately determines the bulk requirements for senior housing. The Village Board will provide the density for the number of units which will dictate the size of the building. Then the planning board will have the ability to decide if the proposed setbacks are satisfactory. Architect Niemotko added that the building will be sprinklered which will address the fire access requirements. Architect Niemotko was asked if this project was going to be privately funded or publicly subsidized. Architect Niemotko stated his client was not looking for public funding so this will be open market housing for seniors. The board suggested the applicant refine the market analysis to accurately reflect the Village of Monroe, provide a summary of the analysis, and provide a narrative.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

On a motion made by Member DeAngelis and seconded by Member Allen it was unanimously **Resolved that there being no further business, the Meeting be adjourned.** The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.