VILLAGE OF MONROE

Workshop Minutes

October 5, 2025

DRAFT – subject to change

Present: Chairman Parise; Members Iannucci, Kelly, and Karlich. Attorney Bonet and Engineer Higgins

Absent: Member Hafenecker

Pledge of Allegiance.

On a motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Iannucci it was resolved to:
Open the Workshop Meeting

Aye: 4 **Nay:** 0 **Absent:** 1

Site Plan Review & Special Use Permit – Project Supply Gravel Lot
Project Supply Rt 17M - (214-1-56.22)
Gravel Lot to be used for Storage and Sale of equipment and building materials

Present representing the applicant: Avi Weinberg, WeinbergLim Engineering

Mr. Weinberg wanted to go over the items from the last meeting where his associate was present and asked for clarification on the items on the site that were discussed. Chairman Parise replied that some of the heavy machinery inventory is outside of the fence and he feels that it should be put back in the other side because people can get hurt. Also, he would like some type of slats in the fence to screen from all of the orange equipment that is visible as it doesn't fit the character of the neighborhood. Member Karlich does not like the machinery on top of the gravel displayed and would like to have it cleaned up. Engineer Higgins went over his comment memo (attached) and items were discussed as follows:

2: This is informational as it will be done after approval at the Building Department

4: Mr. Weinberg suggested decreasing the number of trees since the fence is doing some of the screening. Engineer Higgins said the intent is to have an evergreen hedge but maybe not using Green Giant Arborvitae as they get very large.

7: Mr. Weinberg has reached out to the surveyor for this.

Mr. Weinberg requested that if he submits the changes in the next few days could he be on the schedule for the next meeting on 10/27/26. Chairman Parise is concerned about cleaning up the property. Mr. Weinberg asked if that would be a note on the plan? Chairman Parise replied that it should just be done and it will be in the special use permit. The Special Use Permit will be valid for a period of time and the applicant will have to come back to the Planning Board have to be reviewed and renewed. Chairman Parise asked if Engineer Higgins would have enough time to review the submission for the 10/27/26 meeting if it were received within a week and he replied that he would. Member Iannucci expressed concern that once the permit is issued, things don't go back to the way they were and Chairman Parise said that is a job for Code Enforcement. If we notice things reverting back the Building Department should be notified. Engineer Higgins said that the special permit needs to be reviewed renewed after a year's time. At that point, the Board can evaluate the site conditions and not renew the permit if they are not comfortable with the condition of the site. Member Karlich asked about the gates and Mr. Weinberg replied that they eliminated the one gate in the front because the Board had concerns about maneuvering onto Route 17M. She also asked about a lock on the gate and Engineer Higgins said a lock was suggested to control access to the site. Member Karlich also asked about the Floodplain

development plan and who approves that. Engineer Higgins replied that typically they'll have an engineer that has to submit that to the building department and usually that'll come to him for review as Village Engineers to make sure that they comply with the requirements of the permit. Mr. Weinberg said that presumably the Village has a floodplain administrator. He also said that this is all on the floodplain and they are not touching the floodway. He continued that you are not allowed to put anything in a floodway an if that gets adjusted by an inch it is illegal. Putting items like this in a floodplain has zero effect on the stream or on the floodway. Member Karlich stated she just wanted to clarify that there was no DEC or Army Corps involvement. Engineer Higgins said it is not regulated wetlands so no. Mr. Weinberg said that the necessary changes would be made and submitted in time for them to appear at the next meeting.

Application Site Plan and Special Permit
386 Rt 17M - (217-3-12)
For sale and storage of lumber and building materials

Present representing the applicant: Michael Morgante, Arden Consulting Engineers

Chairman Parise asked for the applicant to advise what name to use for the application as numerous locations all on Rt17M is confusing. Is it Moshee's Landscaping? Mr. Morgante will have the name on his next submission. Engineer Higgins went over his review memo (attached) and items discussed were as follows:

5: Chairman Parise asked if there will be a 2nd story and Mr. Morgante responded that he is asking the applicant to provide all of this information on the next submittal. He suspects that there may be some mezzanine level for offices but not a full 2nd story.

7: Chairman Parise feels that the plans should be further along before submitting to emergency services.

14: Mr. Morgante asked for clarification on this comment. Engineer Higgins explained that there is no space on the plan for vehicles that go beyond 18' and there is no space for vehicles to overhang and since they provide more parking than the code requires, they may want to have less parking and address this issue. The Board agreed that ground mounted concrete curbs would be acceptable.

17: Mr. Morgante said the manhole was on the wrong location on the survey and is corrected. He will fix this issue.

19: Mr. Morgante agrees and said that there are 2 locations in the front and 1 of them may not receive the actual loading area runoff. He presumes that that one would not need to have the treatment practice the standard SMPP before it. If they are to do something below grade he is thinking of a subsurface sand filter as the treatment practice. They are trying to get through the actual grading and setup of the site but did do the soil testing out there and the soils are very good. Once there is a storm water plan in place, he will coordinate with Engineer Higgins' office too to witness soil testing.

20: Mr. Morgante noted that there is a box cover there, too that was missing on the survey and they will correct that.

21: Per Mr. Morgante they have contracted with Labella Associates as their traffic engineer and they are preparing all the documentation that's necessary for submittal to the DOT and will be providing that to them soon.

27: This is the only plan that was not submitted yet but it will be done with the next submittal.

29: They should be able to meet this requirement. Chairman Parise asked how the imagery was done and Mr. Morgante explained how he came to these findings. Engineer Higgins noted that he agreed with the numbers. Mr. Morgante said there is a tree table on the existing conditions plan and on the demolition plan there is a tree table that noting trees to be removed. He said he would rather put trees

on the landscaping plan for the sake of not adding an additional sheet. Engineer Higgins and Chairman Parise said this was acceptable.

31: Mr. Morgante said that for anything taller than 4T he adds a note that it should be designed by a professional engineer in the state of New York and he will put it in the notes for the wetland crossing wall as well.

34: Mr. Morgante said that this seems like this would be awkward. Engineer Higgins explained that there is a guide rail on either side of the driveway with a 5' drop off and the concern is that if someone is walking alongside between the guide rail and the wall it is dangerous and there could be a fall. The other alternative is to bring the wall up higher. Mr. Morgante will bring it up to code.

35: Chairman Parise said that no site visit was scheduled yet but it should be coordinated once the site is further along and staked out. Mr. Morgante encourages the board members to stop by and familiarize themselves with the site.

36: Mr. Morgante noted that the EAF as recently changed and it will be done.

37: There are no accessory structures other than the bins or the dumpster enclosure.

Chairman Parise asked if there will be a new sign and it should be submitted as the Planning Board will have to approve it. Mr. Morgante will make sure the exiting sign will not be impacted by conduction and thinking the owner would want to keep it. He will clarify.

Member Iannucci asked if anything was does to address the water problems from the homes behind the site? Mr. Morgante said this is the first he was hearing of this. Member Iannucci said that it is a big complaint when the work on the site first started and the homeowners were having a lot of water problems and runoff. She also noted that there is a roadway back there that also adds to the runoff. She said she is also concerned about leaching from the salt bin. Mr. Morgante found this odd because the topography goes from the back to the front but he will look at it. He said that post construction the water is coming to the front to be collected in underground storage chambers and then released into the roadside ditch along 17M. There will be curbing back there with catch basins and piping to capture and collect that runoff and nothing will flow to the back properties anymore. Everything is going to come to the front. Chairman Parise asked if there was a Public Hearing previously and Member Iannucci said she was not sure about how the comment came to the Board's attention. Engineer Higgins said he remembered the previous Chairman mentioning the complaints about water from the homeowners. Mr. Morgante will ask the owner if they are aware of the complaints and if anything has been done. Chairman Parise said that this will be addressed during the Public Hearing that is necessary and Mr. Morgante will get us some information prior to that regarding the situation. Mr. Morgante said that he can tell the people at the Public Hearing that it will be fixed and it will be a permanent solution. Engineer Higgins said when they do this storm water pollution prevention plan, they have to compare the post-development flow rates, the runoff, to what it would have been before all the trees were cleared and all the all the site work was done. It is not a matter of them just meeting what it is today, instead they have to limit their flows to what it was before. Mr. Morgante agreed and said that when they do the preexisting drainage analysis they will go all the way back to before the trees were cut. Chairman Parise asked if everything is going underground? Mr. Morgante replied that is the plan now. He was not sure how water was running uphill and showed the Board the contours on the map and how the water flows. He wondered if there was possibly ponding water? Engineer Higgins said that he recalls some fencing being installed that might be preventing water from flowing. Chairman Parise said that it was a flood area and historically that area floods and it may not be from this site. Mr. Morgante showed the board the stormwater management system on the plans. Member Iannucci asked were the salt bind will be and Engineer Higgins asked if they would be tarped? Mr. Morgante replied it will have to have a tarp or some kind of a small lip to help prevent runoff coming from it. He also explained if there was runoff it would be directed to the storm water drainage system and it'll go into the subsurface storm water system. Engineer Higgins said it should be covered in some way or moved to an area with a roof. Chairman

Parise asked why don't they just build a roof for it? Mr. Morgante explained they would need approval from the ZBA and he does not have a good argument for a variance. He will try to find a way to deal with it. Chairman Parise said that they would have to go to the New York DOT for your frontage on a road and asked if we should do Lead Agency. Engineer Higgins asked where they are with the wetland delineation and finding out if DEC has any jurisdiction over the wetlands? Mr. Morgante replied not that far and he would have to investigate it. Engineer Higgins said that typically they would need to send an inquiry to the DEC and asked if this was done yet? Mr. Morgante replied they don't do it anymore and he goes by whatever the wetland consultant is saying. If the delineation mapping shows its Army Corps they go with it and if they think there's an actual connection, then they get the DEC involved for anything that's bigger than 12.4. Engineer Higgins said that he has been working with Mr. Morgante on another project, and the DEC essentially said even though their new regulations were overturned, if the wetland is over 12.4 acres, they still had jurisdiction whether it was mapped or not. He thinks previously you would just go off the published mapping, if it's not in the published map, then you're covered. But now that they have their informational mapping, the DEC directed us on some other applications to send an inquiry and the concern is that the DEC may have jurisdiction over that wetland and if we don't have an inquiry sent to them, we won't know. Mr. Morgante said they may switch to Jim Bates and he usually moves quick but he will get the information to Engineer Higgins. Engineer Higgins said the issue is for lead agency we would like to identity on the EAF any permits that are required and if that's a DEC wetland then you're looking at a different layout because it's probably within 100 ft of the wetland. Chairman Parise asked if it's never been delineated or we don't know? Mr. Morgante replied that even if we trust that the delineation shown is accurate the question becomes whether the jurisdiction is the Army Corps or DEC. If it's the Army Corps, the plan's good. If it's the DEC, the plan is not good so they have to establish who really has the jurisdiction here. Chairman Parise asked why the Army Corps have jurisdiction and not the DEC? Engineer Higgins replied that the Army Corps basically has jurisdiction over most waters of the United States. If they're connected by drainage to larger drainage streams, the Ramapo, etc., they're considered under the Army Corps jurisdiction. New York State DEC will have jurisdiction over wetlands that are considered freshwater wetlands and are more than 12.4 acres in size. It's not just the acreage on the property, it's the acreage of the channel or the wetlands that surround it. There is the possibility that if the DEC were to take jurisdiction in addition to the Army Corps. The DEC doesn't just take jurisdiction of the wetlands, it takes the upland areas within 100 ft of the wetlands. A permit would be required for any disturbance within 100 ft of the designated wetland which would be the parking lots and the building. It would have a significant impact if the DEC had jurisdiction over that. Engineer Higgins said there is no doubt that the Army Corps has jurisdiction over it and they need to get a permit for any disturbance to the wetland from the Corps. The question is whether or not the DEC has jurisdiction. And if they do, it's not just the wetland, it's everything within 100 ft. Engineer Higgins continued that the DEC has an inquiry that you send to them online to find out if there's DEC regulated wetlands on or near it but this can take time and they have 90 days to reply. Mr. Morgante suggested that we wait and see what documentation he can supply to show who has jurisdiction and who is involved to give the Planning Board some comfort considering Lead Agency.

On a motion made by Member Kelly and seconded by Member Iannucci it was resolved to:
Adjourn the Workshop Meeting

Aye: 4 **Nay:** 0 **Absent:** 1

Village of Monroe Planning Board meetings may be viewed in their entirety at:
http://www.youtube.com/@monroevillagehall2935

LANC & TULLY
Engineering and Surveying, D.P.C.

Village of Monroe
Planning Board Review

Project:	St. Rt 17M Project Supply (Gravel Lot)
Tax Lot No.	214-1-56.22
Reviewed by:	David Higgins
Date of Review:	October 2, 2026

Materials Reviewed:

1. St. Route 17M Monroe, NY 10950 Planning Board Response to Comments prepared by WeinbergLim Engineering dated September 24, 2026; and
2. Map entitled, "Layout Plan", prepared by WienberLim Engineering dated November 26, 2025 and last revised September 29, 2026.

The items below are provided to help you complete your submission to the Planning Board. Please note that this is a general guide—additional items may be requested at future meetings. Ensure all listed items are completed and submit revised plans to the Planning Board at least fourteen (14) days before the regularly scheduled meeting. If you need further assistance, feel free to contact our office.

Project Description

The project is located on a vacant lot on State Route 17M and is just west of the Mombasha Fire Company. The applicant is seeking to use the site for the storage and sale of equipment and building materials. The submitted narrative indicates that access to the site is from an existing shared driveway with the Mombasha Fire Company and that no new structures are proposed. The property totals 17.8± acres and is located in the GB District and is permitted subject to issuance of a Special Permit from the Planning Board. The storage of equipment and materials is proposed to occur within the existing gravel area.

SEQRA STATUS

~~Type 1~~ ~~Type 2~~ Unlisted

EAF Form Submitted? Short EAF Submitted dated April 20, 2026

Lead Agency Status? Notice Sent to Building Department August 27, 2026

Referral to Orange County Department of Planning required? Yes

Date referred? August 10, 2026

Response letter received? August 14, 2026

Local determination or mandatory comments? Local Determination with no advisory comments

Public Hearing Required? Yes

Date of Public Hearing Opened: September 29, 2026

Date Public Hearing Closed: September 29, 2026

We have the following comments on the submission:

1. A project narrative has been provided by the applicant. The applicant seeks to utilize the existing gravel area for storage of equipment and materials only and in connection with their facility located adjacent to the project site. No retail sales, customer activity or employees are proposed at this location. The narrative includes information addressing the special permit criteria. The Planning Board should review the information provided to determine if the project complies with the special permit criteria summarized below.
    a. 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.

    b. 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.

    c. 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.

    d. 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.

    e. Existing municipal facilities are adequate for the proposed use, or plans for the immediate or reasonably near-term expansion of such facilities are adequate to provide for such use.

    f. The property will be suitably landscaped to protect the neighborhood and adjacent property.

2. According to the submitted EAF, portions of the property are within the 100-year floodplain. The Site Plan map provides the location of the floodway and floodplain. Any construction or development within any areas of special flood hazard would be subject to a Floodplain Development Permit as outlined in §107 of the Village Code. §107-4 (Definitions) states that development includes the storage of equipment or materials. A Floodplain Development permit will be required as stated in §107-11. **(Approval Condition)**

3. §200-45.E requires a minimum of 26 feet access aisle width for 90-degree parking. The plan shows a proposed fence 26 feet from the parking spaces serving the Mombasha Fire District which complies with the Code. We recommend noting the 26 foot maneuvering lane dimension on the plan.

4. Proposed landscaping consisting of 11 Green Giant Arborvitae trees is shown on the plans. The mature height of the proposed trees is 40'-60' and the mature spread is 12'-20'. The placement of the trees conflicts with the location of the proposed fence and will likely conflict with maneuvering for the adjacent parking area. We recommend relocating the landscaping to provide appropriate space around the proposed trees.

5. Planting details for the proposed landscaping should be provided.

6. A 6' tall chain link fence is proposed around the existing gravel area. Details for the fence should be provided.

7. The Site plan map indicates that the access easement is recorded in Liber 15328, Page 318. A copy of this recorded instrument should be provide to confirm shared access and identify any potential restrictions on use. **(Repeat Comment)**

8. As the project is located within 500 feet of a State Highway, referral to the Orange County Department of Planning is required per GML 239. A response letter was received from the County on August 14, 2026 indicating the matter is a local determination and offered no comments. **(Informational)**

9. A public hearing was held for the Special Permit on September 29, 2026 and closed. **(Informational)**

A written response letter addressing each of the above comments should be provided with the next submission. If you have any questions, or require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

LANC & TULLY
Engineering and Surveying, D.P.C.

Village of Monroe
Planning Board Review

Project:	386 Rt 17M
Tax Lot No.	217-3-12
Reviewed by:	David Higgins, PE
Date of Review:	10/2/26

Materials Reviewed:

1. Cover Letter prepared by Arden Consulting Engineers, PLLC dated June 25, 2026;
2. Short Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) dated September 22, 2026; and
3. Site Plan titled "386 New York State Route 17M" consisting of three sheets prepared by Arden Consulting Engineers, PLLC dated 1/25/2026 and last revised September 23, 2026

The following items are listed to assist you in completing your submission to the Planning Board. This is only a guide and other items may be listed at future meetings. Please complete all items and supply the Planning Board with revised plans fourteen days prior to the next regularly scheduled meeting. If you need further assistance please contact this office.

Project Description

This application involves construction of a 166'x180' building to be used for the sale and storage of lumber and building materials, as well as outdoor material storage bins, new fencing and parking areas. The Project Site consists of 2.5 acres with a single access drive from Route 17M in the General Business (GB) District. A land use determination was made by the Building Inspector on September 25, 2025 indicating that the proposed "Sale & Storage of Lumber and Building Materials" use is permitted under a Special Permit following §200-48.

SEQRA STATUS

~~Type 1~~ ~~Type 2~~ Unlisted

EAF Form Submitted? Yes, Short EAF (revisions needed, see comments below)

Lead Agency Notice Sent? Pending

Referral to Orange County Department of Planning required? Yes

Date referred? Pending

Response letter received? Pending

Local determination or mandatory comments? Pending

Public Hearing Required? Yes

Date of Public Hearing Opened: Pending

Date Public Hearing Closed: Pending

Preliminary Comments:

1. As noted in the Land Use Determination Form provided by the Building Department, Sale and Storage of Lumber and Building Materials is permitted under a Special Permit following §200-48. Accordingly, the Planning Board may approve the special use permit application, provided that it finds that all of the following conditions and standards have been met [§200-48.2]:
   A. 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.

   B. 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.

   C. 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.

   D. 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.

   E. Existing municipal facilities are adequate for the proposed use, or plans for the immediate or reasonably near-term expansion of such facilities are adequate to provide for such use.

   F. The property will be suitably landscaped to protect the neighborhood and adjacent property.

The applicant should provide a narrative describing the proposed uses, and sufficient information to address the criteria for issuance of a special permit. **(Repeated comment)**

2. The applicant has previously indicated the proposed use of the property to be for the sale of storage of lumber and building materials in connection with a landscaping business. We recommend the applicant clarify in their narrative if there will be any retail sales on the property.

3. Sale and Storage of Lumber and Building Materials in the General Business (GB) District area required to have a lot area of at least 40,000 square feet. The bulk table provided on the plans indicates the required lot area to be 20,000 square feet. We recommend revising the bulk table for consistency.

4. A note is placed under the Bulk Table denoting that "**" indicates a variance is required. The Bulk Table does not indicate any variances are required at this time. We recommend removing the note from under the Bulk Table stating "**Variance Required".

5. The Bulk Table appears to indicate the proposed building to be 2 stories tall, however the parking calculations appear to indicate the building is only one story. The applicant should confirm the number of stories provided. If only a portion of the building will have a second story, then we recommend showing the area that will have a second story on the plans.

6. On May 7, 2026, Assistant Building Inspector Bryan Berberena determined that the proposed bins are to be considered accessory structures, however stated that if the bins are roofed or otherwise constructed in a way that meets the definition of a building, then they would need to be considered buildings and comply with the applicable building setbacks. The plans propose 6 landscape material storage bin and one salt bin within the side yard setback. The applicant has indicated in their September 23, 2026 comment response letter that the storage bins are to be unroofed. We recommend noting the landscape material bin and salt bin as unroofed on the plans.

7. Village Code §200-34(D) requires nonresidential uses to provide a fire lane, approved by the Fire Chief, for access by emergency vehicles at all times. The plans have been revised to show a fire lane around the proposed building. Once the parking layout is complete, the plans shall be provided to the fire chief for review and comment.

8. The plans propose two gates limiting access to a portion of the property. We recommend providing Knox Boxes or similar devices and providing their location on the plans.

9. The applicant should advise if there will be any fire suppression for the proposed building.

10. It is our understanding that portions of the property were filled in without a permit or approval. As discussed during the February 9, 2026 Planning Board meeting, we recommend providing the source of the utilized fill and for the areas of fill to be tested. We also recommend the applicant identifies the areas where fill was previously placed. **(Repeated comment)**

11. Disturbance within the floodplain will be subject to a Floodplain Development Permit to be obtained from the Village Building Department in accordance with Chapter 107 of the Village Code. **(Approval Condition)**

12. The applicant has indicated in their September 23, 2026 comment response letter that they are in the process of re-delineating the on-site wetlands. Pending re-delineation, the plans should note who delineated the on-site wetlands and when the delineation was performed. Applicant should confirm the jurisdiction of the wetlands by U.S. Army Corps of Engineer and New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. Disturbance of wetlands will be subject to permitting requirements by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and/or New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. **(Repeated comment)**

13. Village Code §200-45.E requires a minimum of 26 feet access aisle width for 90-degree parking. The plans show one location with an access aisle width of 25 feet. We recommend revising the plans to provide 26 foot access aisle around all parking spaces.

14. The plans propose parking spaces directly abutting the exterior of the building. The plans should provide collision protection for the building either in the form of curbs or wheel stops. We also recommend shifting the parking slightly to account for vehicle overhang.

15. The applicant should advise if there will be any heavy equipment in connection with the proposed use, and where any heavy equipment will be stored.

16. The applicant should advise if there is any heavy equipment to be used in regard to the landscape material bins and confirm that the proposed maneuvering space is sufficient.

17. The plans propose landscape storage bin over an existing sanitary manhole. The proposed landscape storage bins should be relocated or modified to provide any required access to the existing manhole.

18. The project plan appears to require upwards of 2.0 acres of disturbance. Therefore, a SWPPP will be required as well as SPDES Permit from the New York State DEC.

19. We understand that a SWPPP is still being developed for the proposed project. Based on the conceptual stormwater treatment areas shown, the applicant appears to propose underground infiltration practices for the treatment of the WQv. The plan proposes a loading space in the front of the building. Loading spaces are considered designated stormwater hotspots in the 2024 Stormwater Design Manual. A non-infiltration practice will need to be utilized to treat runoff from the stormwater hotspot prior to treatment by an infiltration practice.

20. The inverts for the existing drainage structures along the drainage channel in front of the building appears to indicate the channel generally flows north to south. The proposed drainage structures along the drainage channel appears to direct the drainage discharge northward. We recommend the applicant confirm the direction of the flow along the drainage channel and revise the drainage as necessary.

21. We note the access road around the rear of the building to be relatively flat at 0.5% slope. We recommend adding an additional catch basin along the rear of the property to facilitate drainage in the flat area.

22. The plans show an existing gas line servicing the existing buildings. The plans should address relocation of the existing gas line.

23. The plans proposes a retaining wall near the property line to adjacent lot 217-3-11.5. At the nearest point to the adjacent property line, the proposed retaining wall is noted as having a top of wall elevation of 567.9' and a bottom of wall elevation of 564.3' for a height of 3.6 feet at that location. The code requires retaining walls that rise above the grade of adjacent properties to provide 1 foot of setback for each one foot of height. At the nearest point to the adjacent property line, the proposed retaining wall is located 3 feet from the adjacent property.

24. The sight distance table notes that for scenario B2, a sight distance of 500 feet is required, but that a sight distance of 475 feet is proposed. The proposed driveway expansion will be subject to review and approval by the NYSDOT.

25. The applicant should confirm the size of the existing and proposed water service, and confirm that the size is appropriate for the anticipated daily flows and any needed fire flows.

26. The lighting plan notes mounting heights of 14' and 18' for wall mounted lights around the building. The Pole Mounted Lighting Detail notes the mounting height of wall packs to be 20'. We recommend revising the Lighting Plan or Pole Mounted Lighting Detail accordingly.

27. Pursuant to Village Code §200-72(I)(1)(b) the following will need to be provided on or along with the site plan unless waived by the Planning Board: **(Repeated comment)**

a. A separate landscape plan showing both existing and proposed landscaping, retaining walls and tree plantings, including a note on the plan indicating that all approved landscaping will be maintained in perpetuity.

28. A landscaping plan shall be provided in conformance with Village Code §200-32(C) and §200-44.J and §200-45.J. **(Repeated comment)**

29. Pursuant to Village Code §200-32(E) a tree plan shall be submitted. Any trees greater than 8" in diameter should be marked on the plan. The plan shall indicate whether existing trees shall be removed or preserved, and the plans shall make provisions to preserve existing trees to the greatest extent possible. Other natural features should also be marked on the tree plan including ground cover, shrubs, vines, flowers, lawns, and similar natural plant formations. The applicant has provided mapping of the existing trees on-site and currently proposes 17 existing trees to be removed. The applicant has provided orthoimage to determine that 15 trees were previously removed without permit or approval. Based on our review of the orthoimagery provided and Nearmap imagery dated April 5, 2021, the estimate of 15 trees previously removed appears to be reasonable. Future tree plans shall provide a minimum of 32 proposed tree stands in accordance with §200-32.F(4) of the Code. **(Repeated comment)**

30. The plans should include a source and date for the imagery shown on the Orthoimagery Plan.

31. The Typical MSE Retaining Wall detail and the Wetland Driveway Crossing Detail specify a maximum height of 4 feet for the retaining walls. The plans show retaining walls in excess of 4 feet. A detail should be provided for retaining walls taller than 4 feet.

32. The Wetland Driveway Crossing Detail notes the transverse wetland surface drainage is to be three (3) Contech 17x13 aluminum pipes. The Grading & Utility Plan proposes two (2) 24" HDPE pipes. The plans or details should be revised accordingly.

33. Village Code §200-26.5.G(4) requires retaining walls over 5 feet in height to provide a fence at least 4 feet tall on top of the wall. The minimum fence height should be noted on the retaining wall detail.

34. Village Code §200-26.5.G(4) requires retaining walls over 5 feet in height to provide a fence at least 4 feet tall on top of the wall. The retaining wall along the wetland crossing exceeds 5 feet in height. A minimum 4 foot tall fence should be provided on the Wetland Driveway Crossing Detail.

35. At the February 9, 2026 Planning Board meeting, the Board discussed coordinating a site visit. If this has not yet been done, the Board may want to discuss scheduling a site visit.

36. The applicant has submitted a revised EAF for consistency with the current plan. We have the following comments.
    a. The submitted EAF is the previous version of the EAF. The applicant should resubmit the EAF that reflects the 2026 amendments.
    b. Question 2 of the EAF should indicate that a permit SPDES general permit wil be required from the NYSDEC, and that a permit from the ACOE will be required for the wetland disturbance.

37. The project is subject to Architectural Review per §200-73. The Code requires that the exterior of accessory structures be compatible with the principal structure in appearance, design, architectural character, color, and building material. Any accessory structures will need to be included as part of the architectural review. **(Repeated comment)**

38. Modifications to the driveway along with any other work within the NYS Route 17M right-of-way will require a permit from the NYSDOT. **(Repeated Comment)**

39. This application will require referral to the Orange County Planning Department for a review pursuant to GML 239 based on proximity to a state highway. Plans should be more developed with confirmation of the wetland boundaries and jurisdiction prior to this referral. **(Repeated comment)**

40. A public hearing will be required. **(Repeated comment)**

This review should be considered preliminary in nature. Further comments will be provided pending receipt of additional information. A written response letter addressing each of the above comments should be provided with the next submission. If you have any questions, or require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact our office.