

**VILLAGE OF MONROE
PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES**

**SEPTEMBER 13, 2021
7:00 P.M.**

PRESENT: Chairman Boucher, Members Allen, DeAngelis, Hafenecker, Karlich, and Kelly; Attorney Cassidy, Engineer O'Rourke, Traffic Engineer Connell, 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.

Public Hearing

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

Present: John Till, Architect; Keith Woodruff, PE, Engineering Properties; Aaron Goldklang, Owner;

Secretary Doherty read the public hearing notice into the record. Engineer Woodruff and Architect Till presented an overview of the application to the members of the public present. Chairman Boucher opened up hearing for public comment.

John Karl provided the following comments:

Rental units are needed within the village of Monroe. Will affordable housing be market driven. Will housing be set aside for volunteer first responders. Off-site improvements are required. There should be a dedicated left turn lane on Still Road for Stephen lane so that traffic doesn't become backed up, especially with school bus traffic. The box culvert on 17M, between the Mombasha Firehouse and the old mason yard needs to be addressed. This project will bring additional impervious surfaces in areas of water flow which should be addressed with the Department of Transportation. Will there be a rental office onsite for prospective renters. The civil service Fair Housing Act needs to be followed. Why are there no one-bedroom units offered. There are 133 parking spaces; will there be overflow parking. Stephen Lane, which is currently proposed to be widened to 26 ft., should be made larger to accommodate traffic and the current residents who live on Stephen Lane. The width of Stephen Lane would be a concern for emergency services.

Mark Goldstein provided the following comments:

The project site is a known flood plain which empties out onto Route 17M. Where will water drainage go. The project site is an environmentally sensitive zone.

Tim Mitts provided the following comments:

New York requires a 50 ft. buffer for wetlands. There is an issue with sewage in the Monroe area due to overbuilding. 72 units is a lot of units. Two-bedroom units are typically \$2000+; will this be affordable housing. To afford units couples will double up so there will be more cars in the parking lot. That would mean there would be less than 2 parking spaces per unit. This property borders the Monroe Golf Course. Are the units safe from airborne golf balls. The Monroe Golf and Captain's Table are historically significant to the community. How big should the units be and will the proposed 72 units disrupt the historical significance in the area?

Matthew Lynaugh provided the following comments:

Has the Planning Board contacted the school board about the transportation and cost of educating new children that would be entered into the system as a result of creating new rental units. Cost per pupil is around \$20,000. Special needs children have a higher cost per pupil. Classrooms are already overcrowded.

Carol Hawkhurst provided the following comments:

Mrs. Hawkhurst works in the school system and is concerned about the potential increase in student population. The community of Monroe should be preserved to some degree. The traffic from Monroe to Monroe Woodbury Middle School is a problem. Mrs. Hawkhurst is concerned about the wetlands and the wildlife, and traffic flow.

M. Borja provided the following comments:

Mr. Borja lives on Stephen Lane. How will Mr. Borja be able to leave and enter his property during the construction for the proposed improvements on Stephen Lane. Construction could potentially last months or years.

Wes Shea provided the following comments:

Mr. Shea asks when the concerns and comments provided by the public will be addressed by the applicant and planning board. Attorney Cassidy stated that the applicant will gather the comments presented today and will be required to provide a response to the public comment. Mr. Shea is concerned about equal opportunity housing. There has been no accountability on Gilbert Street for maintaining equal opportunity housing. Is there anything the planning board can put into place to make sure that equal opportunity housing laws are followed. **** Can there be a deed restriction? No further subdivision. ****

Jeannie Iodice provided the following comments:

The applicant states that the housing is intended for young professionals. There will not be young professionals moving into those units. There is a need for senior housing.

John D'Onofrio provided the following comments:

Mr. D'Onofrio has concerns about Phase 1 of construction (sewers and water) for The Q project 9. There will be 72 multi-family units. Will there be natural sewers or city sewers. Will there be wells or will there be city water. How will this affect the Village of Monroe water system. This is a community based on single-family residences, not multi-family residences of renters. Mr. D'Onofrio said we don't need this and it will be an eyesore. Mr. D'Onofrio has concerns about potential traffic increases on Still Road given that The Q will also be a bus route. The Q project looks like a housing project and it will not be beneficial to the community.

Mr. Kazdan provided the following comments:

Mr. Kazdan expressed concerns about wetlands issues. The County has additional issues regarding environmental policies during construction. Before we can get to that stage there is a master plan of the Town. This project obviously is a variance from that plan. Mr. Kazdan also mentioned traffic issues down the road in ten or twenty years.

Eleanor Cordisco provided the following comments:

Mrs. Cordisco said that she would like to see the back of the building as well as the front of the building. Chairman Boucher said that the building was the same in the back as it was in the front. Ms. Cordisco stated that this building reminds her of buildings she saw when she visited Russia. She did not like the dark colors and suggested that a light green might be better. Every building that is being built in the Village of Monroe is either black, grey or this color. Mrs. Cordisco asked if a portion of the land that this was on was wetlands. Chairman Boucher said that a portion of it was on wetlands but is not sure how much. Engineer O'Rourke said that the property requires a 100-foot buffer, so no impervious construction is in the wetlands. Mrs. Cordisco asked how far up Stephen Lane does the construction go. Chairman Boucher said that the first building will be approximately 60 feet back from the road. Mrs. Cordisco expressed concern that building on the wetlands will bring more water to her basement, where she already has sump pumps to help with excess water. It could also cause flooding the tennis courts. Mrs. Cordisco is not in favor of The Q project. Mrs. Cordisco stated that the traffic is very heavy now. She has trouble getting out of her driveway because of all the cars. We're going to add more traffic with this building.

Kathy Adler provided the following comments:

Ms. Adler's property abuts the Monroe Golf Course. When it rains water flows from the Monroe Golf Course to the wetlands. Where will the water flow during construction. Mrs. Adler has lived in her home for 34 years and has seen at least four golf car accidents where tow company had to retrieve the golf club cars.

John Karl addressed the Board:

Board of Trustees Member John Karl asked if the applicant had done a market analysis to see what the needs are in the community. Chairman Boucher responded that the

applicant had done an analysis. Mr. Karl referenced the Federal Fair Housing Act of 1968 and adds that this should be enforced in the community.

Tim Mitts address the Board:

Mr. Mitts had questions about the fire trucks getting in. The Building Code calls for 20 or 24 feet currently. Is there an existing road that can be used by the fire trucks. Chairman Boucher said that fire truck access has already been addressed. Mr. Mitts stated that a house on the corner just sold. Did the owner of this development buy it. This house sale will affect the survey of the project site.

No additional comments from the public were received.

Given the volume of public comments, Attorney Elizabeth recommended keeping the public hearing open for ten to fourteen days to allow for written comments from the public.

On a motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Haffenecker, it was unanimously **Resolved to keep the public hearing for the Q open and allow for 14 days for the purpose of receiving additional written comments from the public.**

Engineer O'Rourke stated that there will not be any renotification of the hearing. The public hearing will be held over to October 26th.

On a motion made by Member Kelly, seconded by Member Allen, it was unanimously **Resolved to return to the public hearing for 548 Route 17M.**

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

Present: Larry Torro, PE, Civil Tech Engineering;

Engineer Torro gave a brief overview of the project for the public. No comment has been received yet from Orange County Department of Planning.

John Karl provided the following comments:

John Karl mentioned the culvert pipe on 17M that runs parallel to the 548 Rt. 17M project site. There is a tributary that runs through The Q property down through the golf course comes across 17M to the 548 Rt. 17M project site. The culvert pipe cannot handle the water flow. The water from that tributary spills over the mattock. and flows towards the Ramapo River. That needs to be addressed. A larger culvert pipe is needed and the tributary needs to be cleaned out so that the water can flow properly. Right now the water backs up.

Tim Mittz provided the following comments:

Mr. Mitts is concerned about the proximity of the Mombasha Firehouse to the 548 Rt. 17M project site. Mr. Mitts stated that the Fire Department has used that there is

something in the code about uninterrupted usage for a certain number of years. Mr. Mitts cautioned that the applicant needs to make sure those fire trucks are removed from the premises. Mr. Mitts was told that the 548 Rt. 17M does not impact the property.

Carol Hawkhurst provided the following comments:

She began by asking what the purpose of the warehouse is and is concerned about the amount of development in the Village of Monroe. Mrs. Hawkurst that this the country, not New York City. That's why people move here. Chairman Boucher stated that the proposed warehouse will be used for storage.

On a motion made by Member Kelly, seconded by Member Allen, it was unanimously **Resolved to close to the public hearing for 548 Route 17M.**

Regular Meeting

On a motion from Member Hafenecker, seconded by Member Kelly, it was unanimously: **Resolved to open the Regular Meeting.**

1. 310 Stage Road Multifamily – Field Change – (213-1-31)

Present: Mike Morgante, P.E; Paul Edwards, Owner

Engineer O'Rourke stated that the applicant is before the planning board for some field changes. The field changes have already unbeknownst to the Building Department and Engineer O'Rourke's office, but the field changes were coordinated with the Highway Superintendent, Water Superintendent, and the Fire department. The applicant moved a hydrant and a sewer pump station. There are concerns about the overall water flow due to the size of the water line size was changed, but the applicant provided documentation from a certified engineer that the water is sufficient. Engineer Morgante explained that it seemed that the proposed field changes allowed for shallower excavation. The applicant will be able to save a small portion of the distance in the sewer portion of the construction. Engineer Morgante provided the same documents to the Orange County Department of Public Works and the Department of Environmental Facilities who took no exception to the field changes. The location of the pump station will not impact traffic or any other function on site. The location of the hydrant was reviewed as well. Originally a 6 inch line from Stage Road to the project site was added to meet fire code requirements. It was later determined to reduce the line to 2 inches. A mechanical engineer reviewed this change and deemed the resulting change to be adequate. Engineer Morgante further described the engineering components of the proposed changes. The board discussed the location of the onsite sign with the applicant. The applicant

confirmed that the existing old stone onsite was used for the sign. Chairman Boucher asked the applicant what happened with the mantle piece. The applicant stated that the mantle piece did not make it through construction as the water damage was too severe and no portion of the mantle piece could be repurposed. There was a terrible smell of mold and mildew and the applicant did not want to introduce those ailments to the new construction. There were also concerns about insect infiltration. Engineer O'Rourke confirmed that he was satisfied with the changes the applicant proposed. Attorney Cassidy stated that this is a Type 2 action under SEQR. Engineer Morgante stated that the applicant also has another field change to propose. When the retaining wall was being constructed tree roots were approaching close to the property line were encountered. The applicant had to move the retaining wall 4 feet closer in towards the building as a result. In order to rectify that 4 foot difference, the applicant had to eliminate a sidewalk that actually was never really needed. This field change was not submitted to the planning board as this field change came to Engineer Morgante's attention after the submission for this month. The applicant has photos that can be shown to the board on request. Chairman Boucher stated that all field changes have to come before the planning board. Engineer O'Rourke stated that his office has no record of the applicant modifying the retaining wall design for this specific field change. The information for the retaining wall change has to be submitted to Engineer O'Rourke's office and the Building Department. Engineer O'Rourke stated that certain field changes are permitted, but an engineer was hired to redesign the retaining wall. The applicant should have known to resubmit to the planning board before making this change. Everything in the plan is designed with a purpose. Any changes have to be reviewed by the engineer and referred to the Building Department prior to the Planning Board meeting date. Engineer O'Rourke stated that this is not the first time the applicant has conducted unauthorized field changes. The wall changes and the sidewalk removal should have come before the planning board before they were implemented. Engineer O'Rourke continued to discuss the retaining wall and sidewalk field changes with the applicant. Engineer O'Rourke stated that the applicant needs to provide information, including pictures, for the retaining wall and sidewalk field changes. Attorney Cassidy stated that the board cannot take action on retaining wall and sidewalk field changes at this time.

On a motion by Chairman Boucher, seconded by Member Allen, it was unanimously: **Resolved to approve the field changes outlined in the plan submitted by Lanc & Tully on August 18, 2021, previously reviewed and approved by the Building Department for the field changes for the water line size and the hydrant location.**

Chairman Boucher advised the applicant to resubmit the plans showing the revised location of the retaining wall and the removal of the sidewalk that was near it.

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

Present: John Till, Architect; Keith Woodruff, PE, Engineering Properties; Aaron Goldklang, Owner;

Engineer O'Rourke provided an overview of his comments for the board. The applicant has addressed all of his office's previous comments on the site plan. Engineer O'Rourke's office is still working on the storm water management system; additional comments have been provided which outline those concerns which the applicant will have to address. Engineer O'Rourke reiterated a comment brought up during the public hearing portion of the meeting regarding the phasing of construction on Stephen Lane so that residents can leave and enter their property during construction. Chairman Boucher stated that Planner Fink has brought up concerns regarding landscape delineations and excavation which the applicant will have to address. Planner Fink had discussed that a planting calendar and tree ring sizes will be required as well. The landscape plan should read "two years", currently it does not state that. Plan #3, the lighting plan, is mislabeled. No action will be taken until the storm water management system is addressed. Chairman Boucher stated that the public hearing will be opened until October 26, 2021. Attorney Cassidy stated she will coordinate the posting of documents to the Village's website with Secretary Doherty. Chairman Boucher stated that once the applicant addresses the comments made during the public hearing Secretary Doherty will have the applicant's response posted on the Village's website. Chairman Boucher stated that if the date of the public hearing is changed there will be a re-noticing of the public hearing.

3. St. Paul – Free Standing Sign (222-1-4-1)

Present: Dawn Tomasini, Applicant;

Engineer O'Rourke stated that his office has no additional comments on this application. Engineer O'Rourke and his office recommend that the application be approved at this time. application was reviewed when it was first submitted. Since then there was a modification to the location of the sign. Mr. O'Rourke said that it was his recommendation that the Board approve the application. Attorney Cassidy read the approval resolution into the record.

VILLAGE OF MONROE
PLANNING
RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDED SITE PLAN OF
ST. PAUL LUTHERAN CHURCH
21 STILL ROAD, MONROE, NY
SBL 222-4-1

WHEREAS, the Village of Monroe Planning Board is in receipt of an amended site plan application for the purpose of installing a free standing sign for the purpose of displaying changing messages to the community.

WHEREAS, the Applicant obtained a variance from the Village of Monroe Zoning Board of Appeals to allow a second sign where only one is permitted on June 8, 2021;

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has received and considered the following:

1. Application dated, June 21, 2021
2. Short Form Environmental Assessment Form dated, June 21, 2021.
3. Site Plan prepared by Barry Terach, Architect, dated February 22, 2021, last revised July 28, 2021.
4. Sign Renderings, revised 7-12-2021
5. Comments of Village Building Inspector and Village Engineer
6. Orange County Department of Planning 239 review dated July 29, 2021 indicating local determination.
7. Decision of the Zoning Board of Appeals, signed on July 13, 2021

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has determined that this is a Type II action pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQR") and no further environmental review is required; and;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Planning Board hereby grants amended site plan approval subject to the following conditions:

1. Applicant to pay all fees
2. Applicant to obtain all permits.
3. Applicant to comply with the terms and conditions of the decision of the Zoning Board of Appeals dated July 13, 2021

Motion by Member Kelly, Second by Member Hafenecker

Member Keith Allen	Aye
Member Jeff Boucher	Aye
Member Gerri DeAngelis	Aye
Member Paul Hafenecker	Aye
Member Marilyn Karlich	Aye
Member Fred Kelly	Aye

Filed in the Office of the Planning Board Clerk on this _____ day of September, 2021

Fiona Doherty

Planning Board Clerk

I, Ann-Margret Baxter, Clerk of the Village of Monroe, does hereby certified that the foregoing resolution was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on

_____.

Ann-Margret Baxter, Clerk
Village of Monroe.

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

Present: Larry Torro, PE, Civil Tech Engineering;

Engineer O'Rourke stated that the applicant had previously addressed all his office's comments. The applicant's attorney and Attorney Cassidy are working on the language for the cross-easement agreement. The applicant needs to acquire a flood development permit from the Building Department. Engineer O'Rourke stated that his understanding is that the applicant is in the process of moving that material out and that the flood development permit will not be issued until that is complete. The 548 Route 17M application was sent in for a 239 referral in June 2021 and no response was received. Engineer O'Rourke stated that Planner Fink had comments on the landscaping which were sent to the applicant. Engineer Torro stated that he did not receive any comments from Planner Fink. Chairman Boucher stated that Planner Fink had comments requesting the applicant to provide the measurements of the sycamore trees to be planted. Planner Fink also requested details on the excavation. Chairman Boucher stated that Secretary Doherty will provide the applicant with Planner Fink's Comments. Attorney Cassidy stated that she did receive a draft cross-easement agreement from the applicant's attorney. Attorney Cassidy provided comments on the draft cross-easement agreement, the applicant's attorney agreed with those comments. Upon approval of the application the cross-easement agreement will be recorded. The recording requirement will be made a condition for signing the plans. Building Inspector Cocks stated that there is a metal shed on the property which either needs to be made part of the site plan or removed. Attorney Cassidy stated that she will prepare a draft resolution in anticipation of approval for next month, October 2021. The board continues to discuss the application and the project's trajectory for approval.

5. 251 High Street - 206-1-2

Present: Larry Torro, PE, Civil Tech Engineering;

Engineer O'Rourke provided an overview of his comments for the board. This is the current iteration of the project. Previously the applicant submitted a design for a cul-de-sac, then resubmitted a design for a four-lot subdivision. This submission contains a proposal for a three-lot subdivision. Engineer O'Rourke noted that the three-lot subdivision design is much more reasonable. Engineer O'Rourke also noted that variances are required so the applicant will have to appear before the ZBA. Engineer O'Rourke recommends that the board approve a recommendation to refer this application to the ZBA. Attorney Cassidy read the resolution to declare lead agency, which includes a resolution to refer the application to the ZBA, into the record. The board discussed the recommendation to refer the 251 application to the ZBA.

VILLAGE OF MONROE
PLANNING BOARD
RESOLUTION TO DECLARE INTENT TO BE LEAD AGENCY AND REFER TO THE
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
251 High Street

WHEREAS, the Village of Monroe Planning Board is considering an application for a three lot minor subdivision located at 251 High Street in which an existing single family home is removed and replaced with three single family homes;

WHEREAS, a Short Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) dated _____ was submitted for review by the Planning Board; and

WHEREAS, after comparing the thresholds contained in 6 NYCRR 617.4 and 5, the Planning Board has determined that the proposed project is an Unlisted action; and

WHEREAS, after examining the EAF, the Planning Board has determined that the following agencies are involved or interested agencies for purposes of SEQRA: Village of Monroe Zoning Board of Appeals, Village of Monroe Department of Public Works; and Orange County Sewer District #1;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, , that the Planning Board makes the following findings:

1. The proposed action is subject to the State Environmental Quality Review Act.
2. The action may involve one or more other agencies.
3. The action is preliminarily classified as an Unlisted Action pursuant to 6 NYCRR Part 617.
4. Coordinated review of the action is appropriate.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby declares its intent to be Lead Agency for the review of this action;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Board Clerk shall cause notice of such intent to be circulated in accordance with SEQRA;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a determination of significance will be made at such time as all information has been received by the Planning board to enable it to determine whether or not the action will or will not have a significant effect on the environment.

On a motion by Member Kelly seconded by Allen and a vote 6 for and 0 against and 0 absent, this resolution was adopted on September 13, 2021.

RESOLUTION TO REFER TO THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

WHEREAS, the Village of Monroe Planning Board received an application for a four lot residential subdivision to be located at 251 High Street; and

WHEREAS, said application, although in conformity with the code, resulted in an expansive impervious cul-de-sac and irregularly shaped lots inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant has agreed to reduce the number of lots and eliminate the cul-de-sac design resulting in significantly less impervious surface and a subdivision significantly more consistent with the surrounding neighborhood; and

WHEREAS, the amended configuration requires area variances for lot width to accommodate the three proposed lots;

WHEREAS, after comparing the two subdivision layouts, the Planning Board finds the three-lot configuration to be more consistent with the community character and better for the environment;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby refers the application to the Monroe Zoning Board of Appeals for the following area variances:

Lot 1 Lot Width – Variance from 100 feet to 77.29 feet

Lot 2 Lot Width - Variance from 100 feet to 77.29 feet

Lot 3 Lot Width - Variance from 100 feet to 77.68 feet

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Chairman is authorized to transmit a letter of recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Motion by Member Kelly, Second by Member Allen

Member Keith Allen Aye
Member Jeff Boucher Aye

Member Gerri DeAngelis Aye
Member Paul Hafenecker Aye
Member Marilyn Karlich Aye
Member Fred Kelly Aye

Filed in the Office of the Planning Board Clerk on this 13 day of September, 2021

Fiona Doherty
Planning Board Clerk

I, Ann-Margret Baxter, Clerk of the Village of Monroe, does hereby certified that the foregoing resolution was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on

_____.

Ann-Margret Baxter, Clerk
Village of Monroe.

6. 445 Route 17M - 222-2-2.1

Present: Larry Torro, PE, Civil Tech Engineering;

Engineer O'Rourke provided his comments to the board. Engineer O'Rourke's biggest concern is with the storm water management system and it's distance from the retaining walls. Underground infiltration systems cannot be within 25 feet of a structure. All other comments relate to storm water management. Engineer O'Rourke's office has no issues with the application codewide. The applicant needs to provide clarification from Engineer Torro's office or the DEC confirming that the storm water management system layout works. Chairman Boucher stated that a 239 referral was sent out and comments were received. There was a comment about Tree #12, which advised that the tree be retained. Engineer Torro stated that there is a 7 ft. cut proposed which means that Tree #12 can't really be saved. Engineer O'Rourke explained the 7 ft. cut and the difficulties of saving Tree #12 to the board. Engineer O'Rourke stated that in order to save the tree the applicant would probably have to redesign the entire project around that area. The board continued to discuss the plan as it would affect the tree. Member DeAngelis asked how much landscape would be lost with the proposed design. Engineer O'Rourke stated that only Tree #12 would be lost. Engineer O'Rourke stated that the 239 referral comment regarding Tree #12 was an advisory comment so the planning board can override it if necessary. Engineer O'Rourke discussed lighting for the 445 Rt. 17M project as it relates to

the International Dark Sky Association standards to limit light pollution. Engineer O'Connell provided an overview of her comments for the board. The traffic study submitted by the applicant in July 2021 was reviewed. The revised plan showed a reduced width of 30 ft. to 26. ft. for the driveway. This revised driveway means that there is better traffic flow in the area. The driveway design does not conform to DOT driveway entrances onto state highways. The driveway does not meet the minimum 5 ft. clearance between the driveway opening limit. Engineer O'Connell stated that when the applicant applies for a Perm 33 DOT will offer their comments on what is required for the driveway. Engineer O'Connell
Engineer Torro discussed the sidewalk comments as listed in the September 8th 2021 Kimley Horn Memo. The board discussed who would be responsible for sidewalk maintenance. Chairman Boucher stated that the board will have to wait for DOT to either approve the proposed driveway or if a redesign is required. Chairman Boucher stated that a site visit will be coordinated for the 445 Rt. 17M project.

494 Route 17M – Informal Presentation - (215-1-11)

Present: Maximiliano Jedrzejczyk, Owner;

Mr. Jedrzejczyk provided an overview of his project for the board. The applicant would like to open a patio bar with a restaurant with a full menu. The view from the existing sign would be kept the same. The operating hours would be from 11am to 1am or 2am. There would be karaoke and an open mic. The applicant will own the restaurant, which will serve Caribbean cuisine. Engineer O'Rourke provided an overview of his comments for the board. The proposed 494 Rt. 17M project will be a Type 2 Action under SEQR. There will be a change of use. There doesn't appear to be any changes to the exterior. Parking requirements for this project will have to be determined. Lighting will also have to be reviewed; will there be any outdoor lighting. Will there be outdoor seating. Mr. Jedrzejczyk stated that there will be no outdoor seating. The board discussed the possibility of including outdoor seating with Mr. Jedrzejczyk. Building Inspector Cocks stated that the corraled-in area maybe be disappearing. Depending on the maximum occupancy the waterline for the sprinklers may need to be adjusted. As there is a change in use a Public Hearing would be required for this application.

Approval of Minutes

1. July 27, 2021

On a motion by Member Kelly, seconded by Member Allen, it was unanimously:
Resolved to approve the minutes of the July 27, 2021 meeting.

2. August 9, 2021

On a motion by Member Kelly, seconded by Member Hafenecker, it was: **Resolved to accept the minutes of the August 8, 2021 meeting.**

Member Keith Allen	Abstain
Member Jeff Boucher	Aye
Member Gerri DeAngelis	Aye
Member Paul Hafenecker	Aye
Member Marilyn Karlich	Aye
Member Fred Kelly	Aye

Adjournment

On a motion by Member Kelly, seconded by Member Allen, it was unanimously:
Resolved to close the meeting of the Planning Board at 9:32 pm.