

**VILLAGE OF MONROE
PLANNING BOARD
WORKSHOP MINTUES**

**TUESDAY APRIL 11, 2022
7:00 P.M.**

Present: Chairman Boucher, Members Allen, Hafenecker, Iannucci, Karlich, Kelly, Umberto, Attorney Cassidy, Engineer O'Rourke, Building Inspector Cocks

Absent: Planner Fink

Chairman Boucher opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman Boucher introduced Barbara Iannucci as a new member to the Board.

110-114 Stage

Presenting: Larry Torro Engineer for the applicant

Chairman Boucher asked Engineer Torro to give an overview of the project. Chairman Boucher stated this project was before the Board in 2019 but some of the members may not be familiar with it.

Engineer Torro explained that this is two lots with the building on one lot and a parking lot on the second lot. The existing office building that is there now would come down.

The project calls for a total of 13,200 Sq. Ft. of office space. 10,050 Sq. Ft. would be general office space and remainder would be medical office space. In 2019 when this was first presented to the Board, the Board had concerns with the architecture. The architecture style has been changed and he hopes this is more in line with what the Board would like.

Chairman Boucher asked for Board Engineer O'Rourke's comments. Engineer O'Rourke stated what they are presenting is a work in progress. There are some drainage issues that will need to be resolved. There are no setback requirements on for the property in the GB zone. The property is right on the property line so a certified survey will be required. There is a ten-foot setback requirement for the parking lots from the residence next door. The district has a residence use so the ten-foot setback needs to be there. There are engineering issues with grading. The lot length is very deep and there are some trees and a retaining wall that needs to be shown on the site plan. These items may need to be removed to do the grading of the property. Those are the main items but the last time they were before the Board there was a big concern over the look of the building. The plans are a bit deceiving as the grading is not there presently. The rendering being shown (on the big TV in the Board room) shows the front being flat and at present there are stairs in the front. Are you planning on dropping the front down? Engineer Torro stated yes, that is the plan. Board Engineer O'Rourke stated as there is an active sidewalk in front of the building and the Board would be required for a chain link fence during construction. While the Board is not ready to take any action, the Board should look at the renderings to make sure they are in line with what the Board wants.

Chairman Boucher stated this is a lot better than it was last time. Chairman Boucher asked about the grading and if they were planning on bringing it down to the sidewalk. Engineer Torro stated yes, that was the plan. Chairman Boucher asked the Board for comments. Member Kelly asked what is the existing square footage of the building? Engineer Torro stated he did not know. Currently there are two buildings on the site. One on each lot so the new structure will have less of a foot print from what is there currently. Board Engineer O'Rourke stated there was a mention of an attic in the plans but he didn't understand about the attic. The whole third floor will not be useable space, due to the limited amount of parking. He is not sure how that will be shown on the site plan.

Member Kelly asked if this building was a lot bigger than what was there currently. Engineer Torro stated yes. Chairman Boucher asked how far the alcoves over the front doors hang. Engineer Torro stated on the site plan it is about three or four feet. Chairman Boucher stated that would be on the property line. Engineer Torro stated the building was not actually on the property line it is about five feet off the property line. Engineer Torro stated it would be 27,000 Sq. Ft. of usable office space the rest would be used as storage. The total for general office space would be 10,050 Sq. Ft. and the rest of the usable office space would be medical office space which increases the need for parking.

Member Allen asked two ADA parking spaces for 43 parking spaces is correct? Board Engineer O'Rourke stated yes, it is two ADA per fifty parking spots.

Member Kelly asked what exactly are the issues with the water and the drainage? Engineer Torro explained there is no drainage on Stage Road which is a big problem. Also, when they added the addition to the property they added two big drainage ditches to the property, which is why they did not show the drainage line going to the lake and he is not sure where else to go with the drainage yet. Board Engineer O'Rourke stated if that was something they wanted to look into they would need plans for that and he could review it with the Mayor and the Town Water Supervisor. The Village maybe putting in a new water line and the Board Engineer would need to coordinate that with the applicant. Member Umberto asked if all the water and drainable was going to be collected and go down to the Village pond. Engineer Torro stated yes, that is one of the options they are looking at. Member Umberto asked if that was really a good option as the oil from cars and such would be in that drainage. Engineer Torro stated if that was the option they would need to discuss the water quality issues and any issues involved. Member Umberto stated if there are oil and water issues are you planning on having a water/oil separator system. Engineer Torro stated that is not being looked at, at this time. Member Umberto stated they need to look at that and they may need to go in another direction.

Chairman Boucher asked what the Board thought about the architectural design. The Board was able to see the design on the large TV in the Boardroom. Member Umberto stated it certainly was not country and being in an historic district it should reflect that. He does not like the design. Chairman Boucher stated he does like it. The Board discussed the colors. The sides have bump-outs. Member Hafenecker asked about the entrances. There is a front and side entrance in the design. Member Umberto stated the building needs some depth. Chairman Boucher asked how far the vertical bump-outs are, not the overhangs. Engineer Torro stated they are about three feet. Chairman Boucher stated that a 3-D rendering maybe helpful. Chairman Boucher asked what the exterior material was. Engineer Torro stated it was vinyl siding and the verticals will be board and batten which are also vinyl. Chairman Boucher stated the Board would like samples of the material in their colors. Member Hafenecker asked if there

were lights over the door? Chairman Boucher stated it would be nice if they were recessed lights.

Member Umberto stated he would like to keep the village the way it is and not to modernize it. It is a historic area it should be kept that way. If it was up to him he would have them put a porch around the whole building so people could sit and wait.

Chairman Boucher asked if the Board had any other questions. Member Umberto stated the plan shows trees along the back end of the building, and short shrubby in the front and he asked if that was all.

Member Hafenecker asked where the heating and air conditioner units would be if they will be on the roof or on the ground. Engineer Torro stated they would be on the ground around the back side of the building. Engineer Torro stated the building is not actually on the property line, the units would be on the Police Station side.

Chairman Boucher asked what was proposed up to the door, a walkway? Engineer Torro stated yes, there will be a walkway in the front and along the side of the building. Chairman Boucher asked if the other side of the building was exactly the same? Engineer Torro stated yes, both sides are mirror images of each other. The building will have some dimension with the bump outs. Chairman Boucher stated if they plan to do a 3-D presentation it would be good that the air conditioner units be shown as well. Chairman Boucher asked Board Engineer O'Rourke what the set-back requirements were for the air conditioner units and if an enclosure is needed. Board Engineer O'Rourke stated the Village has none but the utility company usually does. He stated there is a good chance the air conditioner units will be placed up in the attic. The key to this is you don't want the air conditioner units to stick out. The street view of this building will be the view you see most of the time. Most people will not see the rear of the building so if they air conditioner units were there they would not be seen. Member Iannucci asked about signage in the building. Engineer Torro stated they did not have that information yet and it will come later in the project. Building Inspector Cocks stated there needs to be a ten-foot set back on the side that neighbors the residence next door. It is not needed on the other three sides but is needed for the side with the residence. Chairman Boucher asked PB Engineer O'Rourke what happens on the side that needs the set back. Engineer O'Rourke stated the whole site plan would shift so they would lose 10 feet, but the building is not on the property line so they may only lose about six feet. The engineer has options on how to handle that. Chairman Boucher stated the Board was good at this time.

The Pets I Love Veterinary Hospital

David Niematko, Architect for the applicant

Chairman Boucher stated he took some photos of the landscaping mainly between the back of the building and the Heritage Trail. A series of pictures were presented on the TV screen in the boardroom. Chairman Boucher stated the addition will be on the back side of the building. The applicant is adding six trees. Board Planner Fink's email stated there are no specific type of trees just that trees will be added. The site plan stated evergreen but needs to be more specific. Chairman Boucher stated the Board is looking for a type of tree that the deer will not eat.

Board Attorney Cassidy stated she will not be in attendance for the next meeting so she will write up a draft resolution for approval for this project so the Board can vote on this project and the sign off process can begin. The public hearing has been waived.

Chairman Boucher asked the Board if they all had their parking passes now. The Board members stated yes.

Member Umberto stated he wanted to discuss the building plans that were just reviewed. Chairman Boucher and Board Attorney stated this Board, as a standard, only talks about the site plans when the applicant is present.

Member Umberto stated that he would like to talk about office buildings in general. Member Allen asked if the Board can suggest how they would like the architecture to be. Board Attorney Cassidy stated, yes, the Board can make suggestions on the building design. This has been done for other projects. Board Attorney Cassidy stated one of the best ways to see the site is to drive or walk in the area of where the building is planned. As the project we just saw there are a lot of engineering issues such as grading, so the plans can and will change. Member Umberto was concerned as there is another office building being proposed down the street from this one, why can't they all look similar? Member Hafenecker stated there are an awful lot of office buildings does the Board have the right to say no, based on the amount of office space? Board Attorney Cassidy stated that is not in this Board's purview. But, that the Planning Board is in place to advise the Village Trustees about their concerns and the Village Trustees can look at the Zoning Code. Chairman Boucher stated that there is an Architectural Review guideline but they are very weak at the moment, and the Village Trustees are looking to make changes to the comprehensive plan. The Village Trustees are the only ones who can determine what can and should be built for the good of the community. Board Engineer O'Rourke stated at this time warehousing is a problem for Orange County and beyond. But, the Board cannot decide what can and cannot be build but they do have input on the architecture of what is being built.

Member Hafenecker inquired about Public Hearings, and the way the Board does them. Attorney Cassidy explained the Board is using the format she had suggested and when this format is used it gives the public an opportunity to speak when they address their comments/concerns to the Board and not to the applicant. This is done so that all the comments can be addressed at one time by the applicant and gives the Board a nice clean record of what was said and the response. If the Board and the Public and the applicant are all involved in the conversation, there is too much back and forth which leads to misunderstandings, lack of what was said by who, side conversations that don't get into the minutes, etc. it would be almost impossible to keep a clear and definitive record of what was said and if the conversation gets convoluted. Chairman Boucher used past public hearings as an example. The comments were addressed to the Board, a record of the comments was kept and the Board professionals and the applicant answered all the comments. The public can come back at anytime and get the answers or make more comments if they want to but the process is done in an orderly way. This prevents tempers from flaring. Board Attorney Cassidy stated it is not the job of the Board to do the applicant's homework in regards to the answers. The format we use allows the Board to give the applicant a list of the public comments and in return the applicant answers all the comments at once. This makes a cleaner more streamline process which is recorded.

Member Iannucci asked how does the Board all get on the same page? Chairman Boucher stated this discussion is being held during a public meeting and that means if there was public in

attendance they would be able to hear what is being discussed. Board Attorney Cassidy stated if there was a matter that needed to be discussed privately between Attorney/Client that could be done. For example, last month the Board was asked for an interpretation on whether the Board can waive a code requirement or not, so the Board and Board Attorney Cassidy paused the meeting and had an Attorney/Client session and discussed the interpretation. After the session Chairman Boucher polled the Board for their opinion. Each member at that point can state anything they feel about that item. The Board does not have to agree on the item but that part would be discussed in public as the Board does want that on the record. If at anytime any member wants a legal interpretation they can ask for an Attorney/Client session. Board Engineer O'Rourke stated the Board cannot just have discussion in regards to items before the Board. The discussion has to take place only in a meeting. Chairman Boucher stated if Board member had a discussion outside the normal meeting it is against the law. The Board must adhere to the Open Meeting laws. Chairman Boucher stated he encourages all members to ask question when they don't know something, especially at meetings when the professionals, applicant and public are in attendance.

On a motion by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Hefanecker seconded it was unanimously resolved: **The meeting be adjourned at 8:05.**