

**VILLAGE OF MONROE
PLANNING BOARD
WORKSHOP/MEETING**

**TUESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2021
7:00 P.M.**

MINUTES

Pledge of Allegiance

Present: Chairman Boucher, Member Allen, DeAngelis, Hafenecker, Karlich, Kelly, Attorney Cassidy, Engineer O'Rourke, Planner Fink,

Chairman Boucher opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag. Chairman Boucher stated that in conformance with the Senate Bill S50001 from the Governor we are permitted to hold virtual meetings.

Public Hearing

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

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

Chairman Boucher stated that this is a continuation of The Q's public hearing which was held open. Chairman Boucher stated that if the planning board is not satisfied with The Q's response memo to public comments the board will request additional information from the applicant. The planning board will review the response memo provided to ensure that all questions or concerns provided during the public hearing are addressed. When available the response memo will also be uploaded to the Village of Monroe website. Engineer Esposito provided an overview of the project for the public. The project site consists of three tax parcels, around 10 acres in total. The project site is zoned URM, which is multi-family, and is consistent with the Village's comprehensive plan. A constraints analysis was conducted, and the results showed that the applicant was permitted to have up to 122 units. The application proposes 72 two-bedroom units which are open market rentals. 133 parking spaces are proposed; the code only requires 88. Approximately 42% of the space is being preserved as open space, and the requirement is 15%. 13,000 sq. ft of active recreation is proposed, which includes amenities such as a picnic pavilion and a play area. The intended demographic for these apartments are seniors and also bookends, which are young professionals. Engineer Esposito also noted that the applicant has worked with the board regarding the redevelopment and improvements for Steven Lane. Stephen Lane is proposed to be improved with a paved surface, and will be 26 ft. wide minimum. Concrete curbing, storm water management, street lights, and a pedestrian connection to the existing sidewalk on Still Avenue. Attorney Cassidy asked if an affidavit of publication had been received regarding the notice published in the Times Herald Record to denote the change of meeting custom to be held virtually via Zoom. Secretary Doherty

confirmed that an affidavit of publication had been received. Chairman Boucher opened up the public hearing for public comment.

Justin Foley provided the following comments:

A lot of Village residents are concerned about the “end-game” of the increasing amount of development in Monroe. How are the current roads, which are small, going to handle the volume generated by development. Is there a proper assessment of development in Monroe. Where will all this construction lead Monroe 20 years down the line, specifically with traffic and how cars are currently backed up on Spring Street. Residents are sitting in traffic for 45 minutes to go one mile down the road. Our small country roads can’t handle what’s being built. Residents are in the dark regarding community planning, and there is no long-term goal. It’s important that there is a visual plan or assessment of how the future of Monroe will look. Monroe has a country farmer aesthetic; a lot of the new construction doesn’t match that look. Monroe looks like a hodgepodge of modern and old and it doesn’t look appealing.

Tim Mitts provided the following comments:

Mr. Mitts drove by the site half an hour ago and the back of the project site and wetlands were really flooded. Mr. Mitts stated that he was informed that the land was converted to URM to hold a maximum of 40 units during the Village Comprehensive Plan. Only four acres are developable out of the whole ten acres. Mr. Mitts stated that he was also informed that to access the rear entrance on Stephen Lane one would have to cross through wetlands, which the applicant isn’t allowed to touch. Mr. Mitts stated that at the September 13, 2021 portion of the public hearing from the applicant’s presentation he had been under the impression that there were going to be 72 units and 103 parking spaces, but during this continued public hearing it was stated that there was 122 units with 133 parking spaces. What about handicapped parking. Engineer Woodruff clarified that 72 units and 133 parking space, 16 of which are handicapped, are proposed. These numbers have not changed since the last portion of the public hearing.

Attorney Cassidy suggested that a 10-day written comment period be provided. Mr. Foley asked if there was a drawing so that the public can see what the proposed project will look like. Chairman Boucher stated that renderings are available on the Village of Monroe’s website. Member Hafenecker wanted to make sure that when The Q’s response memo is available that the public can access it. Chairman Boucher explained the process of how The Q’s response memo will be received and reviewed by the planning board. When the planning board finds that the response memo addresses all questions and concerns brought forth the response memo will be uploaded to the Village of Monroe website. Member DeAngelis stated that a 10-day written comment period is too short and a 30-day written comment period would be better. Chairman Boucher stated that the board can extend the written comment period to 14 days if that time frame is a better fit. Member Karlich asked if closing the public hearing starts the 62-day clock for approval. Attorney Cassidy confirmed that closing the public hearing starts the 62-day period but the applicant can waive that deadline. Member Karlich and DeAngelis expressed concern that the board will not be able to finalize approval within 62 days. Attorney Cassidy stated that in most circumstances if the timeframe runs out before the board is able to approve the project then the board will take action on a resolution to deny the application. To avoid a

denial most applicants will grant additional time. The board discussed the process of how the board will review The Q's public comment response memo. Chairman Boucher stated that planning board agendas are posted ahead of the meeting. Planning board meetings and workshops are open to for the public to attend and listen.

On a motion made by Member Kelly, seconded by Member Allen, it was unanimously **Resolved to close the Public Hearing for The Q and allow for a 14-day written comment period.**

Workshop/Regular Meeting

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

Present: John Till, Architect; Keith Woodruff, PE;

Engineer O'Rourke stated that his office has some technical comments on the revised SWPPP submitted by the applicant but will not have the memo ready until the next planning board meeting. Planner Fink stated that the next step in the process, following the close of the public hearing and when all public comments are received, is to evaluate how this application will be affected by SEQR. The SWPPP review also needs to be completed for the SEQR portion of the project to be evaluated so that a positive or negative declaration can be issued. Member Hafenecker stated that while driving down Route 17M he noticed a sizable amount of flooding across the street from 548 Route 17M. If the flooding in this area is bad, with what impervious surface is in the vicinity, how much worse will the flooding be at The Q's project site. Engineer O'Rourke stated that whatever the peak flow running off the site is currently has to remain the peak flow. The applicant cannot exceed whatever flow is currently happening on the site. Engineer O'Rourke provided an overview of how stormwater management works for the board. Member DeAngelis asked if the applicant will be on the November Agenda. Engineer O'Rourke confirmed that the applicant will be on the November agenda.

2. **548 Rt 17M – Site Plan - (220-4-8)**

Present: Larry Torro, PE Civil Tech Engineering;

Chairman Boucher stated that a 239 review was received with only comments advisory in nature provided. The most significant comment on the 239 was regarding the dark sky lighting standard. Engineer O'Rourke stated that the applicant had be directed to show the carport on the site plans during the last meeting and had resubmitted the revised plans. The carport shown meets all regulations. There are some tree and flood plain impacts, so the applicant will have to obtain a flood plain permit from the building department after the planning board approves the project. The applicant is currently working on clearing soil which was stored in an inappropriate spot. Attorney Cassidy is working with the applicant's attorney to finalize the cross easements. Engineer O'Rourke's office is generally satisfied with the plans. The applicant will add a note to the plan about the maintenance of landscaping in perpetuity. The applicant has accommodated the board's request for minor landscaping along the portion of the property with Route 17M frontage. Attorney Cassidy stated that she has reviewed the draft easements and she has included in the draft approval resolution that the applicant is to cause those easements after approval to be recorded. The recording information is also to be found on the site plan.

Regarding the 239 comment where Orange County requests to have SHPO review the application, Attorney Cassidy has interpreted that as a request for the applicant to submit to CRIS. The proposed applications are just improvements to an existing site, so the impact is likely to be minimal. Planner Fink stated that what likely triggered the County's SHPO comment is the nearby cemetery which is individually listed on the national register. The 548 project site is already existing and extensively disturbed already, so there doesn't seem to be any historic significance. The possibility that there would be an adverse impact on historic resources is remote. Engineer O'Rourke noted that the 548 project site doesn't actually abut the cemetery, so there is likely no impact. Planner Fink stated that the 548 property is within an area that is identified as an important habitat for a New York state and federally threatened species. A note prohibiting tree cutting for trees over five inches in diameter at breast height during November 1 and March 31 should be added to the site plans. Engineer O'Rourke noted that there are no trees on the site as part of this application to be cut. Planner Fink read the Negative Declaration into the record. The board discussed the materials which are proposed to be stored in the flood plain area of the project. Attorney Cassidy read the approval resolution and special use permit into the record. The board discussed the approval resolution and special use resolution and some modifications were made. "Planning Board Attorneys" in the Approval Resolution was modified to "Planning Board Attorney". "November 1 through March 1" in the Approval Resolution was revised to read "November 1 through March 31". In the Special Use Permit, the language of the second condition was revised to "2. Property owner shall not stockpile any material in the floodway as delineated on the final site plan."

Agency Use Only [If applicable]	
Project:	548 Route 17M
Date:	October 25, 2021

Short Environmental Assessment Form
Part 2 - Impact Assessment

Part 2 is to be completed by the Lead Agency.

Answer all of the following questions in Part 2 using the information contained in Part 1 and other materials submitted by the project sponsor or otherwise available to the reviewer. When answering the questions the reviewer should be guided by the concept "Have my responses been reasonable considering the scale and context of the proposed action?"

	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Will the proposed action impact existing: a. public / private water supplies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. public / private wastewater treatment utilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Agency Use Only [If applicable]	
Project:	548 Route 17M
Date:	October 25, 2021

Short Environmental Assessment Form

Part 3 Determination of Significance


For every question in Part 2 that was answered "moderate to large impact may occur", or if there is a need to explain why a particular element of the proposed action may or will not result in a significant adverse environmental impact, please complete Part 3. Part 3 should, in sufficient detail, identify the impact, including any measures or design elements that have been included by the project sponsor to avoid or reduce impacts. Part 3 should also explain how the lead agency determined that the impact may or will not be significant. Each potential impact should be assessed, considering its setting, probability of occurring, duration, irreversibility, geographic scope and magnitude. Also consider the potential for short-term, long-term and cumulative impacts.

The site is located within an area identified by NY State as important habitat for the Northern Long-eared bat, a "Threatened" species on both federal and State lists. The site plans will contain notes alerting the owners and operators of the site that any trees over 5" DBH will only be removed between the period from November 1 and March 31.

The site is located within an area identified as sensitive for historic resources due to its proximity to the Monroe Village Historic District including the Monroe Cemetery, which is individually listed on the State/National Registers of Historic Places. In this case, the site has been extensively disturbed by the current structures and paved surfaces by a company providing paving, earthwork, land clearing, and demolition services. No new disturbances of previously undisturbed areas are expected as a result of the proposed warehouse and open shed.

The site is located in close proximity to the Ramapo River and its floodplain. No development is proposed within the floodplain but the applicant has proposed to store building materials in the floodplain. No new structures are proposed within the floodplain. In addition, the applicant has prepared and the Village Engineer has reviewed a Drainage and Utility Plan as well as an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan to avoid erosion and sedimentation of the Ramapo.

The Planning Board has given due consideration to the action as defined in 6 NYCRR 617.2(b) and 617.3(g). The Planning Board has also concluded that environmental effects of the proposed action will not exceed any of the criteria for determining significance found in 6 NYCRR 617.7(c).

<input type="checkbox"/>	Check this box if you have determined, based on the information and analysis above, and any supporting documentation, that the proposed action may result in one or more potentially large or significant adverse impacts and an environmental impact statement is required.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check this box if you have determined, based on the information and analysis above, and any supporting documentation, that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.
Village of Monroe Planning Board	October 26, 2021
_____ Name of Lead Agency	_____ Date
Jeff Boucher	Chairman
_____ Print or Type Name of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency	_____ Title of Responsible Officer
	J. Theodore Fink, AICP
_____ Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency	 Signature of Preparer (if different from Responsible Officer)

PRINT FORM

VILLAGE OF MONROE
PLANNING
RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE SITE PLAN AND SPECIAL USE APPLICATION OF
548 ROUTE 17M LLC
SBL 220-4-8

WHEREAS, the Village of Monroe Planning Board has received the site plan and special permit application of Roger W. Braley on behalf of 548 Route 17M LLC for the construction of a 60' by 70' warehouse and attached open shed for an existing material storage and sales facility.

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

1. Application dated January 20, 2021
2. Short Form Environmental Assessment Form dated January 25, 2021, revised April 29, 2021
3. Site Plan prepared by Civil Tec Engineering & Surveying PC, dated April 29, 2021 last revised October 11, 2021 consisting of 1 sheet:
4. Comments by John O'Rourke, Planning Board Engineer; Jim Cocks, Building Inspector; Ted Fink, Village Planner; and Elizabeth Cassidy, Planning Board Attorney.
5. Orange County Department of Planning letter r pursuant to GML 239, dated September 30, 2021

WHEREAS, the Planning Board declared itself to be lead agency on June 22, 2021 and has determined that this is Unlisted action pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQR"); and

WHEREAS a duly noticed public hearing was held on July 27, 2021, August 24, 2021, and September 13, 2021. The public hearing was closed on September 13, 2021;

WHEREAS after consideration of all of the materials and comment before it, the Planning Board declared that this action will not have an adverse environmental impact for the reasons set forth in the written Negative Declaration dated October 26, 2021 incorporated herein as if set forth at length.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Planning Board hereby grants site plan approval and special use permit subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. The terms of the special permit shall be incorporated as if fully set forth herein at length.
2. The Planning Board Chairman is hereby authorized to sign the site plan after the following have occurred:
 - a. Applicant to pay all fees
 - b. Applicant to cause cross easements and declaration as approved by the Village Board of Trustees and the Village Planning Board to be recorded in the Orange County Clerk's office. The recording information shall be included as a map note on the final site plan.
 - c. Confirmation by the Village Engineer and Planning Board Attorney that the final site plan conforms to the terms of this approval resolution.
3. Applicant to obtain all permits including but not limited to: building permits and flood permit.
4. Applicant to remove dirt pile currently located in flood zone as per plans prior to the issuance of a building permit.
5. Applicant to remedy violation issued by New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (April 23, 2021) by removing fill material from the flood way prior to the issuance of a building permit.
4. Applicant to commence construction within one (1) year pursuant to § 200-72 (F) of the Village of Monroe Village Code. Applicant may request an extension.
5. All landscaping as shown on the landscaping plan shall be maintained in perpetuity.
6. The improvements shall conform to the plan as submitted by the applicant.
7. Tree cutting, if any, of trees in excess of 5 dbh shall be limited to November 1 through March 31.

Motion by Member Hafenecker, Second by Member Kelly

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

Filed in the Office of the Planning Board Clerk on this _____ day of October, 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.

VILLAGE OF MONROE

PLANNING BOARD

SPECIAL PERMIT

This special permit is issued to 548 Route 17M LLC for the construction of a 60' by 70' warehouse and attached open shed for an existing material storage and sales facility pursuant to § 200-48 of the Village of Monroe Village Code subject to the Planning Board's special permit procedures and regulations as set forth in the Village of Monroe Code Article XII § 200-48, et seq.

FINDINGS

The board determines, after review of all the application materials, consultant comments and public comments, that the applicant/owner has satisfied the findings required by the Village Code § 200-48.2, in particular:

1. The location and size of the use, the nature and intensity of the operations and traffic involved in or conducted in connection with it, the size of the site in relation to it and the location of the site with respect to streets giving access to it are such that it will be in harmony with the appropriate and orderly development of the district in which it is located.
2. The location, nature and height of buildings, walls and fences and the nature and extent of the landscaping on the site are such that the use will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of adjacent land and buildings.
3. Operations in connection with any special use will not be more objectionable to nearby properties by reason of noise, fumes, vibration or other characteristics than would be the operations of any permitted use not requiring a special use permit.

4. Parking areas will be of adequate size for the particular use, properly located and suitably screened from adjoining residential uses, and the entrance and exit drives shall be laid out so as to achieve maximum safety.
5. Existing municipal facilities are adequate for the proposed use.
6. The property will be suitably landscaped to protect the neighborhood and adjacent property in perpetuity.

Based upon these findings, the Planning Board approves the Special Permit subject to the following conditions:

1. All landscaping as shown on the landscaping plan shall be maintained in perpetuity.
2. Property owner shall not stockpile any material in the floodway as delineated on the final site plan.
3. This special use permit shall expire within one year of issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy pursuant to §200-48.4 of the Village of Monroe Code.

Dated: _____

VILLAGE OF MONROE PLANNING BOARD

BY: _____

Jeff Boucher, Chairman

On a motion made by Member Kelly, seconded by Member Hafenecker, it was unanimously **Resolved to approve the negative declaration for the 548 Route 17M project.**

On a motion made by Member Hafenecker, seconded by Member Kelly, it was unanimously **Resolved to accept the 548 Route 17M approval resolution and special use permit as amended.**

3. **310 Stage Road Multifamily – Field Change – (213-1-31)**
Present: Paul Edwards, Owner;

Engineer O'Rourke provided an overview of the project and his comments for the board. During the September 13, 2021 meeting, the planning board approved some field changes for the applicant. During that meeting, the applicant was also looking for approval for two additional field changes. One field change related to a shifted retaining wall and the other field change was the elimination of a sidewalk affected by the shifted retaining wall. Clarification concerning the retaining wall was provided the other day, but was submitted after the submission deadline and therefore could not be accepted for this meeting. Engineer O'Rourke's office did review the late retaining wall information and had no objection to the field change. The board has the option to approve that field change based on Engineer O'Rourke's review or wait on the decision until next month. The applicant's architect and Building Inspector Cock's confirmed that the sidewalk is not required as per ADA requirements. Engineer O'Rourke stated that the board typically requires a sidewalk, and people will be walking there, so the board should discuss the sidewalk. The applicant has a canopy in the front that's covered, which is more of a front porch for those apartments, and the sidewalk could potentially be viable. Another option is that although the 26-foot-wide road width cannot be reduced the applicant can stripe it for pedestrians. Fire vehicles would still be able to drive on the road. Engineer O'Rourke notes that if the board does not grant the applicant this field change they would have to rip out the wall, redesign, and rebuild the wall, and put in the sidewalk as originally approved. This would be expensive for the applicant. Chairman Boucher asked why the applicant moved the wall four and ½ feet closer to the building. Mr. Edwards provided an overview of the project's situation to the board. When excavation began for the retaining wall the applicant encountered tree roots from the adjacent property. The trees are historic and over 100 years old. The applicant stopped excavating to avoid compromising the root system. Museum Mason Lodge is very sensitive to the trees and was their main concern when the applicant's project was originally proposed. The applicant thought they had enough room to excavate but were confused by the shading on the plan and were ultimately 4 feet off of the measurements. Chairman Boucher asked why the applicant did not approach the planning board ahead of time for a field change. Mr. Edwards stated that he did not realize the error until it was made. The excavator, the mason, and Mr. Edwards all misread the plan because they were confused by the shading. Building Inspector Cocks was the one who brought it to their attention a month and a half ago. The applicant and their contractors reviewed the plan and were looking at one sidewalk but didn't realize that there was a second sidewalk because the building was shaded over the second sidewalk which wasn't delineated on the plan. Mr. Chairman asked if the applicant thought that the shaded portico portion of the building was the sidewalk, and the applicant confirmed that this is what happened. Member DeAngelis stated that the project should have stopped as soon as the error was discovered and brought before the planning board. Mr. Edwards stated that they did. Engineer O'Rourke stated that the applicant still moved the wall. Member DeAngelis asked if the applicant brought in an arborist to review the damage on the trees. Mr. Edwards stated that no tree roots were cut and since March 2021 the roots have been growing and looked healthy. Member Hafenecker stated that it looks like the applicant knew the wall had been moved 4 ½ feet closer because the trees could have been hurt. Engineer Morgante stated that when measuring the wall the applicant and their contractors had misread the plans and did not realize the second sidewalk was an exterior sidewalk and not an interior sidewalk. The measurements taken between the retaining wall and building measured 26 ft. , which probably added to their confusion about misreading the sidewalk exterior to the portico. Engineer Morgante is under the impression that the applicant and the contractors didn't think they were doing anything wrong as the dimensions worked out. Member DeAngelis expressed concern about cars entering and exiting the property. Engineer Morgante stated that he visited the site recently and had no issues turning into the garage. Engineer Morgante stated that he believes that what the applicant did was a genuine mistake and that Mr. Edwards has been a good and transparent applicant with the board. Engineer Morgante stated that he shaded the overhangs so that those reading the site plan understand

where the edge of the structure is. Mr. Edwards stated that the building over the driveways, the storage room section, and the outside wall are shaded as well which added to his confusion. Morgante displayed a picture of the site plan for the board and further explained the exterior sidewalk situation. The only purpose of the exterior sidewalk was to maintain ADA compliance as maintaining ADA compliance inside of a portico area is more difficult. Engineer O'Rourke also stated that the exterior sidewalk can also be used by pedestrians in the Village to enter the unit. Engineer Morgante continued to explain the shading around the building to the board. Engineer Morgante stated that the site plan submitted to the board contains all the field changes that were made to the site after their initial approval. Engineer Morgante stated that the trees appear to be fine, because of the distance the applicant moved the wall back, and the distance to the root canopy is pretty solid. There's a good chance of the trees surviving the next year or two and then they will be stable. The board and Engineer Morgante continued to discuss the mistake made with the exterior and interior sidewalks. Member Allen asked what the width of the exterior sidewalk was supposed to be. Engineer Morgante stated that the exterior sidewalk was supposed to be 5 ft. Member Allen stated that with the wall change drivers now have less room to do a five-point-turn to exit the premises. Engineer Morgante stated that there is a sidewalk on either side of the garage regardless, so a driver can't start their turn until they clear the sidewalk. Engineer Morgante stated that the turning diagram showed that turning on a 26-foot-wide path was possible, and that a firetruck turn and car turn was showed. Engineer O'Rourke asked about the area of the upper right of the handicapped spot, which was moved. The applicant should show that there was a 5 ½ foot change on the parking spot. Engineer O'Rourke asked if a resident can move from one apartment to the next without treading on the roadway. Engineer Morgante stated that yes, a resident can move from any unit the way it's shown. Member DeAngelis noted that a resident would have to walk through someone else's porch. Mr. Edwards stated that the walkway is ADA compliant. Engineer Morgante noted that the portico area does not impede on where the door is. Chairman Boucher asked if the EMS were contacted about the proposed field changes. Building Inspector Cocks stated that EMS coordination lies with the planning board. Chairman Boucher stated that for due diligence purposes it would be great to have confirmation from the Fire Chief stating that he is satisfied with the fire hydrant position and turning radius. Member Allen asked if there was ever a measurement taken regarding the distance possible from the trees to the retaining wall. Mr. Edwards stated that the retaining wall needs to be designed by a professional engineer certified by the State of New York. The concern of the tree roots was considered, but the retaining wall engineer might not have known some of the history behind the project with the trees and roots. Engineer Morgante and the board discussed the striping of the walkway. Engineer Morgante stated that a traditional fire lane sign, with yellow painting, and cross hatching along the front of the building could be striped. Engineer O'Rourke had no objection. Building Inspector Cocks stated that there wouldn't be any issue with that striping as long as the area was delineated as "no parking" on the site plan so the area is kept clear. Member DeAngelis asked if that meant the area could be kept as both a walkway and a fire-lane, which Building Inspector Cocks confirmed. Member Allen suggested that a small symbol, like a man or bicycle, be added to the walkway. Engineer Morgante stated that it would be a good idea to add a pedestrian symbol on the walkway. Engineer O'Rourke stated Secretary Doherty should forward this project to EMS for their comment. Then the applicant can look for potential approval at the next workshop/meeting in two weeks. Member Hafenecker asked how far from wall the posts holding up the posts holding up the doors near the garage are. Mr. Edwards stated that the posts are approximately 2 feet from the wall, and the posts mainly serve an aesthetic purpose. Chairman Boucher asked when the applicant will have the revised site plan drawings available for the board, to which Engineer Morgante responded within two weeks of this current meeting.

4. 856 Route 17M – Amended Site Plan – (201-3-17)

Present: Joel Jeramias, Applicant;

Mr. Jeramias provided an overview of his application for the board. The building is a two-story building. The first floor is currently where cabinets and other related items are worked on. The second floor is currently an office. The applicant's project proposes to utilize the first floor for office space, changing the use. There is enough parking, and nothing outside the building is being modified, aside from landscaping and pavement. Engineer O'Rourke provided an overview of the history of this building for the board. This building used to be known as the Zuckerman Building. The building is very small and is also located on a very tiny lot. The plans submitted do not state who created them, as no engineer or architect is listed. The plans more resemble internal building department plans than site plans. The site plan is completely lacking. This building is also has no sewer connection; there is currently an on-site septic system. In the past there were opportunities for the owner to connect to sewer and water during the Crystal Run site plan and the Smith Farm site plan, but the owner at the time declined to do either connection. Sewer and water is an issue. There are drainage issues with the property. There is a drainage easement that goes across the front with two small pipes, which causes back up and flooding. Currently the plans show two separate entrances that would have to be modified. There are also two separate parking lots where inter-driving is not permitted. One of the parking lots is located on top of the septic system. From an engineering point of view there is a lot of work that needs to be done. Although this application is listed as an amended site plan, the project should be described as a site plan. Engineer O'Rourke could not find any records of the project site. Building Inspector could not find any site plans for the project site in his records – whatever site plans were found were approved by the building department in the distant past. The previous owner had gotten a variance for the building, and currently the building is non-conforming. Member DeAngelis asked if this building was once the Orange County Health Department building, which Building Inspector Cocks confirmed. Engineer O'Rourke stated that there is the DOT road, the adjacent Heritage Trail, the Orange and Rockland Lakes, and existing utilities issues on the property. This is a tough site. Building Inspector Cocks stated that there is no dumpster enclosure shown on the site plan, which needs to be added. Mr. Jeramias stated that he approached the planning board to determined what requirements are needed for this site plan. Engineer O'Rourke stated that all requirements for the site plan are listed in the Village of Monroe code, but the applicant should hire a professional architect or engineer to draw up a plan that the board can review. Member Kelly stated that the owner's endorsement does not have a proper address or recitation of ownership on the affidavit. Attorney Cassidy stated that the applicant will have to button up the paperwork. Mr. Jeramias stated that he has no relationship with the owner. The owner wants to sell the building, Mr. Jeramias is working for the buyer. The buyer doesn't want to buy before knowing that the building will be approved to be an office building on the first floor. Attorney Cassidy stated that the property owner has to provide the planning board with full authorizations for the board's file. Engineer O'Rourke stated that his office cannot provide comments for the proposed site plan at this time because there is no information on who prepared the map. The applicant needs to hire a professional engineer to go through village code and submit a real site plan, then a board review can be done. Chairman Boucher stated that the applicant is encouraged to resubmit to the board once a professional site plan is created. Mr. Jeramias asked for more information regarding the septic issue on the property. Engineer O'Rourke stated that this property is not tied into the sanitary sewer treatment plan. The on-site septic system is probably 50 years old by now. The applicant will have to hire a professional to determine if the on-site septic system is still functioning, and that the proposed parking is not on top of the septic system. The applicant could also run a pump station and a forced main to the nearest sewer system, but that will require an easement to cross the neighboring property. Building Inspector Cocks stated that he has no records of the

Ice Cream Shop being connected to sewer. Mr. Jeramias stated that at the offices there would be no showers or dishwashing. Engineer O'Rourke stated that there is set criteria for an office, which factors space and number of employees. The septic system, which may potentially have parking on top of it, still has to be documented for how much flow can be handled. Attorney Cassidy asked if Engineer O'Rourke needs the plans to be sealed by a licensed professional, which Engineer O'Rourke confirmed.

5. **236 High Street – Field Change + SUP Review – (206-5-4.12)**

Present: Tim Mitts, Applicant;

Engineer O'Rourke provided an overview of the application to the board. This project had already been approved, and as part of the approval there was a generator designed and shown on the site plan. Due to the existing building and window manufacturer recommendation the generator has to be five feet from the building, and not the window. The applicant is proposing to move the generator to the rear of the building, from its current position at side of the building. Engineer O'Rourke's office has no objections. The application is currently before the board because the generator move is categorized as a field change. Building Inspector Cocks also has no objections with the generator move as well. Mr. Mitts stated that originally he believed the generator was supposed to be three feet from the window. Attorney Cassidy stated that this field change is a Type Two action under SEQR. Mr. Mitts stated that the expiration of the Special Use Permit approval is coming up soon and he requests a one-year extension from the board. Although the applicant is making good progress from the state, due to the fire in Spring Valley the state has tightened up their calls. Generators are also on a 22-week delay of delivery. Regarding the extension Mr. Mitts stated that there was confusion about what the permit renewal date was as there are two dates, the one which the Special Use Permit was approved and the date where the Chairman signed the approved site plans. Attorney Cassidy stated that special permit renewal extensions are capped at 6 months, or 180 days in 200-48.4 of the Village Code. Attorney Cassidy stated that the 6 month extension will start from October 19, 2021.

On a motion made by Member Kelly, seconded by Member Hafenecker, it was unanimously **Resolved to accept proposed generator move from the side to the rear of the building for the 236 High Street Project.**

On a motion made by Member Hafenecker, seconded by Member Allen, it was unanimously **Resolved to extend the Special Use Permit for 236 High Street 180 days from October 19, 2021.**

Approval of Minutes

1. September 13, 2021

On a motion made by Member Kelly, seconded by Member Allen, it was unanimously **Resolved to approve the September 13, 2021 Minutes.**

Adjournment

On a motion made by Member Kelly, seconded by Member Hafenecker, it was unanimously **Resolved that there being no further business, the Meeting be adjourned.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:27 PM.