

VILLAGE OF MONROE

Regular Meeting

March 24, 2026

Present: Chairman Boucher; Members Hafenecker, Iannucci, Karlich, and Kelly. Attorney Cassidy and Engineer Higgins

Absent: Members Umberto and Allen.

Pledge of Allegiance.

On a motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Hafenecker it was resolved to:
Open the Regular Meeting and go into the Continuing Public Hearing.

Aye: 5 Nay: 0 Absent: 2

PUBLIC HEARING

Site Plan Review – Proposed addition / Condos

581 Route 17M - Monroe Pharm Plaza Condo (220-5-16.312)

Proposed 14,370 SF 2 story office addition – condominiums

Present representing the applicant: Justin Lim, WeinbergLim Engineering

Per Attorney Cassidy, the public hearing was held open since architecture architectural materials were not received in time.

The Planning Board reviewed the renderings and materials samples. The rendering is a little out of sync with the actual site plan and does not show the landscaping or parking as it will be finalized. It is just to show the materials and the facade. Per chairman Boucher, the materials samples do not seem to have as much contrast as the rendering.

Attorney Cassidy is comfortable, closing out the public hearing at this point and prior to final approval, the actual colors will need to be clarified. Chairman Boucher stated that he is happy with the rendering and would like the materials to match the rendering which has more contrast between the two tan colors. Member Kelly noted that the new color scheme does not match the old color scheme of the existing building. Member Iannucci stated that it would look much better if they could make the existing building match the addition more. Member Kelly mentioned again that he would prefer to have the addition on the front of the building since it is much more aesthetically pleasing. Per member Iannucci, the problem with that is the retail buildings would be hidden by the new addition. Chairman Boucher also noted that the traffic pattern on the site is preferable with the addition in the back. Mr. Lim suggested having the architect come to the next meeting to discuss the materials and tying it into the existing building. Attorney Cassidy noted that the applicant still has an open application with these Zoning Board regarding the location of the dumpster. She recommends closing the public hearing and she will begin outlining an approval resolution.

On a motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Hafenecker it was resolved to:
Close the Public Hearing.

Aye: 5 Nay: 0 Absent: 2

Attorney Cassidy suggested the architect watch the meeting video online and send a letter to the Planning Board Secretary before the submission deadline asking to be put on the agenda to further clarify the material colors proposed for the addition.

Site Plan Review – Proposed 72 rental apartments

The Q 41 Still Road (222-1-13,14,15)

Construction of 72 two-bedroom open market rental apartments. Parking, recreation, utilities, site lighting, landscaping. 2 story units with municipal water & sewer

Present representing the applicant: Stephen Esposito from Engineering and Surveying Properties, PC

Engineer Higgins went over his comment memo (attached) at the last meeting and the applicant made a resubmission providing all of the information that was asked for and approvals that were received. Engineer Higgins continued, the applicant provided the DEC revalidation of the wetlands and they have the Orange County sewer District approval for the sewer. They have also provided a letter of continued coverage for stormwater. The application is subject to architectural review but it went through this review on the first approval and per Mr. Esposito nothing has changed. Regarding the New York State, DEC permit, it has certain conditions and they recommend some of the general conditions be noted on the site plan so that they are not overlooked during construction. A work permit is required from the Village DPW for the sidewalk work. A Public Hearing is required. It was agreed that the applicant would submit an updated bond estimate. Per Attorney Cassidy she has no additional comments since her last memo (attached) and given the information that was provided we are in a position to set the public hearing for next month. Chairman Boucher asked about comment 3 from Planner Fink's memo (attached). Per Engineer Higgins, the retaining wall is built on the fill side and reinforcements will be on the project side which is outside the wetlands buffer. Chairman Boucher said that Planner Fink seemed concerned about the wetland disturbance. Engineer Higgins does not see that as an issue and noted that the retaining wall was shown on the plan that was approved by the DEC. Attorney Cassidy also confirmed that the buffer will be flagged during construction, which should address the issue.

On a motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Iannucci it was resolved to:
Set the Public Hearing for April 28, 2026.

Aye: 5 Nay: 0 Absent: 2

Site Plan Review – Proposed 2,000 SF addition

123-125 Elm Street – (207-1-2&3)

Proposed 2,000 SF addition & 4,000 SF addition above. Office space and to support the existing auto body repair shop

The siding materials were reviewed by the board since the darker vertical siding listed on the final plan set did not match the original sample provided and approved. The board approved the new darker color and the materials and serial numbers will be confirmed so that they will be correct on the resolution.

On a motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Iannucci it was resolved to:

Modify the existing resolution to this new sample.

Aye: 5 Nay: 0 Absent: 2

Chairman Boucher confirmed that the material samples on the resolution will reference back to the architectural plans so that there will be no confusion.

Minutes

On a motion made by Member Hafenecker and seconded by Member Karlich it was resolved to:

Approve the minutes from 01/12/26

Aye: 3 Nay: 0 Absent: 2 Abstain: 2

On a motion made by Member Karlich and seconded by Member Hafenecker it was resolved to:

Approve the minutes from 02/09/26

Aye: 3 Nay: 0 Absent: 2 Abstain: 2

On a motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Iannucci it was resolved to:


Approve the minutes from 02/24/26

Aye: 4 Nay: 0 Absent: 2 Abstain: 1

On a motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Iannucci it was resolved to:

Adjourn the Meeting

Aye: 5 Nay: 0 Absent: 2



Village of Monroe Planning Board Review

Project:	The Q Multi-Family Development
Tax Lot No.	222-1-13, 14 and 15
Reviewed by:	David Higgins, PE
Date of Review:	March 20, 2026
Materials Reviewed:	Comment response letter March 18, 2026; Orange County Clerk's recording signed May 24, 2022; Lot Consolidation Authorization dated April 27, 2022; NYSDEC Sewer Main Extension Approval dated July 12, 2023; Orange County Sewer District No. 1 Sewer Approval dated November 15, 2022; New York State Department of Health water main extension approval dated April 11, 2022; Letter of Continued Coverage dated February 17, 2025; Site Plans, consisting of 24 sheets prepared by Engineering & Surveying Properties, last revised date of March 16, 2026

The following items are listed to assist you in completing your submission to the Board. It is only a guide; other items may be listed at future meetings. If you need further assistance, please contact this office.

Project Description:

The project includes the merger of 3 tax lots for the construction of a 72 unit, maximum 144 bedroom multi-family development on a single 10 acre property at the terminus of Stephen Lane in the UR-M Zone. Units will be 2-bedroom rental units contained in 4, two-story buildings. This project was originally approved in 2022 however the approval lapsed and no work was completed. The applicant is submitting once more with plans that we understand to be substantially similar to the originally approved plans. We offer the following comments:

1. General Note #7 on Sheet EX-1 indicates that the DEC revalidated the boundary of the wetlands on December 18, 2025. Applicant should provide letter of approval from NYSDEC or map of the revalidated wetland signed by the NYSDEC.
2. Our office previously determined that all SWPPP related comments had been satisfactorily addressed, and found the report and design acceptable. The applicant has

also provided a letter of continued coverage for coverage under GP-0-25-001.
(Informational)

3. This application is subject to Architectural Review by the Planning Board [§200-73].
4. We recommend the General Condition 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11 of the sewer main extension granted by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation be noted on the plans.
5. A work permit will be required from the Village DPW for the proposed sidewalk.
6. A public hearing will be required [§200-72E(4)].
7. A bond estimate in the amount of \$985,300 was accepted in January 2022. An updated construction cost estimate should be provided for review and acceptance.

This concludes our review at this time. We have attempted to make this review as complete as possible, however, the applicant is advised that once additional materials or plan changes are provided, our office may have additional comments.

LAW OFFICE OF ELIZABETH K. CASSIDY, PLLC
7 GRAND STREET
WARWICK, NEW YORK 10990
P: 845.987.7223 | F: 888.549.3886
WWW.EKCASSIDYLAW.COM

February 9, 2026

MEMO

TO: Village of Monroe, Planning Board
Applicant

CC: Terri Brink, Planning Board Clerk
John O'Rourke, Village Engineer
Ted Fink, Village Planner

FROM: Elizabeth K. Cassidy, Esq.

RE: Attorney comments on application of 41 Still Rd LLC to authorize the construction of 72 multifamily dwelling units to be known as "The Q"

The Q previously received conditional site plan and special use permit approval from the Village of Monroe Planning Board on January 25, 2022. The site plan resolution and special use permit were signed April 22, 2022. The site plan approval has expired pursuant to § 200-72(F). The Applicant is seeking to reinstate the previous approvals in order to commence construction.

I offer the following comments:

Comment	Status
1. Applicant to confirm that no changes have been made to the plans since the approval. Any such changes shall be specifically identified so that the Planning Board may evaluate the impact of any such changes. To avoid unnecessary review, I have not performed a side-by-side comparison of the plans relying on the engineer's revision dates.	
2. Applicant to provide a narrative detailing the status of all conditions as set forth in the 2022 approval resolution.	
3. SEQR – The Board previously adopted a negative declaration on January 25, 2022. Provided there are	

<p>no changes to the plans that alter the findings as set forth in the Negative Declaration, the Planning Board may rely on that declaration.</p>	
<p>4. I recommend the application be referred to the Village Planner for purposes of determining whether any of the zoning amendments which were adopted subsequent to the approval would necessitate changes. My understanding is that the Applicant has already filed its Notice of Intent with NYSDEC.</p>	
<p>5. Applicant to confirm whether recent changes to wetland regulations will impact the plan.</p>	

Upon confirmation that the plans have not been substantially changed and do not need to be changed in light of modifications to the Village of Monroe Zoning Code or the wetland regulations, the Planning Board should set a public hearing

This memorandum is based upon a preliminary review of the application. Additional submissions may generate further comment.

GREENPLAN

MEMORANDUM

To: Jeff Boucher, Chairman
Village of Monroe Planning Board

From: J. Theodore Fink, AICP

Date: March 24, 2026

Subject: The Q Final Site Plan Approval Review

GREENPLAN INC.
Environmental Planners
302 Pells Road
Rhinebeck, NY 12572-3354
T 845.876.5775
JTFink@greenplan.org

This updates my March 6, 2026 Memo on the application for Site Plan approval by 41 Still Road LLC. A letter dated March 18, 2026 prepared by Engineering & Surveying Properties has responded to the March 6, 2026 Memo. The original comments are in regular type while new comments are in **boldface** type as follows:

1. An 11,656 square foot recreation space that was to include a children's play area and structures, picnic and barbecue areas, and a hardscape area for other recreational activities has been removed. There is now one open area labeled as "Recreational Area" on Sheet C-101 along with a four foot wide walking trail. The applicant should discuss what "active" recreational facilities will be provided in the 13,500 square foot area in addition to the 182,820 square foot "passive" recreation.
Comment has been addressed.
2. Electric and other wired utilities were to be installed underground. The Stephen Lane improvements indicate such utilities will be above ground (see references to OHW on plan) at least in this section of the applicant's parcel. There does not appear to be a utility vault where above ground wired utilities will be routed underground. In any case, Stephen Lane: "Will be owned and maintained by the developer/owner and its successors and or assigns in perpetuity." (see Sheet EX-1 note 9). The applicant should discuss the discrepancy and should confirm that all wired utilities will be underground on the site. No details were provided for such utilities.
Comment has been addressed.
3. The proposed retaining wall at the western portion of the site are shown two (2) feet from the New York State Freshwater Wetland 100 foot adjacent area. The Negative Declaration states that the 100 foot adjacent area will be avoided. However, it does not appear practical to construct the retaining wall without some disturbance to the adjacent area. The applicant should provide a copy of the Freshwater Wetlands Permit to the Planning Board outlining the measures that will be in place to avoid impacts on the wetland and its adjacent area.

Comment has been addressed but the Village Engineer should agree with applicant's response.

4. The applicant had proposed the use of a conservation easement to protect the wetland areas on the site. I was unable to locate a copy of a draft or other conservation easement document in the OneDrive files. The Negative Declaration required that this document would be submitted prior to Final Site Plan review. Further information should also be provided as to what entity will hold the easement. **Comment has been addressed.**
5. References in the adopted Negative Declaration for water, sewer, and stormwater requirements will be deferred to the Planning Board's engineers for comment. **No further comment.**
6. Sheet EX-1 contains a Note 8 stating that potential summer bat habitats will be protected on the site through restrictions on tree removal between October 15 to March 31st. Since the Negative Declaration was adopted, some of the State guidance has changed.¹ The applicant should provide a complete description of the protocol to be used. **Comment has been addressed.**
7. The Stephen Lane improvements shown on Sheet C-104. These include the addition of a proposed sidewalk and crosswalks on Still Road. A Village sidewalk detail is provided on Sheet C-305. Crosswalk and signage details also need to be provided along with NY State Department of Transportation Highway Work permits that have been or will be obtained to accomplish this work. **Comment has been addressed.**
8. The proposed lighting fixtures identified on Sheet L-3 indicate a color temperature of 4000 Kelvin. The Negative Declaration also referenced that such light fixtures will be "Dark Sky Compliant and will meet IDA, LEED or Green Globes Criteria." Color temperatures of 2700 Kelvin to 3000 Kelvin are preferred to avoid blue light emissions. **Comment has been addressed.**
9. The proposed days and times when construction activity will occur on the site needs to be provided on the plans. **Comment has been addressed.**

¹ See <https://dec.ny.gov/nature/animals-fish-plants/biodiversity-species-conservation/endangered-species/northern-long-eared-bats-protection>