

**Town of Monroe
Planning Board Minutes
Thursday, October 9, 2025
(www.townofmonroeny.gov)**

DRAFT

Generated by Norinne McSweeney

Members Present:

Pat Shea, Dylan Penn, Jeff Manson, Bonnie Franson

Members Absent:

Robert Garstak, Lou Rivera

Planning Board Consultants:

Ashley Torre, Esq.

Matthew Sickler, PE

Welcome

Roll Call

Point Out Fire Exits

Pledge of Allegiance

Returning Projects

Henry Farm (0201-2022) SBL # 29-1-2.52 Lakes Road and Camp Monroe, Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative:

Vince Pietrzak - Pietrzak & Pfau

Jon Dahlgren - Tim Miller Associates

Gardiner Barone - Blusten, Shapiro, Frank & Barone LLP

Mr. Pietrzak - we resubmitted the plans, making some minor modifications which I went through in my cover letter, and the consistency statement. The key thing, the difference between how we're looking at things versus your consultants is that we feel that SEQRA has been completed for the project and that the well testing that was previously completed for SEQRA is enough to satisfy the consistency analysis. We're going to be using substantially less water, about 10% of what the wells produce. We don't feel that there's going to be any impact on future testing of the wells, and we don't feel it's necessary to get the well testing mixed up for the agencies in with the consistency analysis. This appears, from review of MHE comments and your attorney's comments to really be the only issue that's outstanding between us and your consultants. There were some issues with the charts for the consistency analysis and a chart requested for the SWPPP for the storm water which we'll submit, and we'll get the other charts revised also.

Mr. Dahlgren - I'll comment on the well issue also, since we were involved with the original well testing and getting the DEC the water supply permit. In terms of environmental impact, we made a point and we provided a letter going through the potential issues of the well testing and water supply, and potential impacts on neighbors and their wells. The issue of the water quality testing, those are all addressed in the finding statement and in the water supply permit by the DEC which required a sentry well and this is all pushed into the future when the actual wells come into production. Sentry wells to make sure that there's no influence from the landfill. In terms of potential impacts to the neighboring wells, there was no impact found during the initial testing and we don't suspect that because we're requiring much less water, there's going to be any future impact to neighboring wells. So I think in terms of looking at the SEQRA impacts of the wells we feel they've been addressed by the findings statement and by the existing permit that was issued by DEC. And as far as the Town's involvement in the future testing, we'll certainly copy the Town and involve the Town in any future well testing that's going to be required by DEC and the Health Department.

Mr. Pietrzak - just to bring you up to speed on where we are with the drilling, I met with a well driller, Chuck Crover of Roarke Well Drilling two weeks ago. We walked the site, showed him where the wells were, and he's going to be preparing a proposal for us to do the testing. Now, he's booked up until spring sometime. So, we do not anticipate getting the testing completed, probably for another six months at best.

Mr. Dahlgren - this also involves not only the logistics of the well testing, but getting a hydrogeologist engaged, preparing a well monitoring plan or well pump test plan. There are quite a few steps and then once the testing is done which should take about a week physically to do the testing, there's the analysis of the groundwater, the analysis of the pump test results, preparing reports back and forth with the agencies and the DEC and the Health department. So we are looking at a substantial timeline to complete the work.

Mr. Barone - We can all agree that this project is smaller in scope than what was approved originally. It doesn't have the senior housing that it used to have and it has fewer residential units being proposed. So, presumably the level of consumption per approved unit is going to be lower because there's fewer units. And also I don't understand that between the last approval and when the well testing was done previously and presently that there's any really known environmental factor that's changed relative to this project or the surrounding areas. At least none's been pointed out in any of the documents prepared by your consultants that I've reviewed. The one apparent meaningful change is a regulatory change, different water testing standards and requirements. Number one we all know that regulations do change from time to time, but that doesn't invalidate a SEQRA determination. Number two, we all know that regardless of what level of approval we get tonight, next month, in the next three months, whether it's a preliminary or conditional final approval, one of those conditions will be water testing to meet the requirements of outside agencies. The water is going to be tested to the satisfaction of the requirements of the outside agencies that do have preemptive jurisdiction over these matters and if the water doesn't pass those tests, the project stops. It's not like adopting a consistency statement now or in the very near future is going to keep us from being before this Board to satisfy those requirements. Again, I point out that what we have is not an environmental change. We have a project that is less in its intensity. It's fewer units, entire significant component of the project has been eliminated, the senior housing. Logically, there's going to be less water being used than before, the requirements have changed that's not on us or the Board, it's on these outside agencies, but that doesn't invalidate the prior SEQRA determination and it doesn't indicate that those prior tests are invalid. But we will satisfy what we need to satisfy as conditions of the approval.

Chairwoman Franson - for my information, are there any state regulated wetlands. Was that done already?

Mr. Pietrzak - Yes, there's no state regulated wetlands on site. We submitted the determination from New York State DEC there were two letters, one to me and one to Tim Miller Associates.

Mr. Sickler comments:

- Item two in my memo the first bullet item they've amended the SWPPP dated May 6, 2025.
- the consistency analysis should include a summary comparison of stormwater impacts at the various design points to substantiate that stormwater flows have decreased under the amended plan. The SWPPP contains the supporting calculations, the data just needs to be presented in this section.
- had a discussion with the DEC regarding the speediest permit and the continued coverage of the 2010 permit. The DEC's position is that as long as revisions to the project reduce the scope of the project, it will reduce the impervious that is still eligible for continuing coverage.
- my second bullet item was the status of the well testing and discussing that with the Board's hydrogeologist.
- third bullet item we reached out to Orange County DPW there was a question about the alignment of the project entrance with Camp Monroe Road. The DPW got back to me this afternoon and indicated that there's still an open comment from them. I don't know if the concern was with the alignment or potentially how that could be addressed. It may be through realignment or something else.
- next item there was we also discussed traffic studies and the status of those and whether DPW would be looking for anything to supplement that. The response was that at this time they don't feel any additional traffic studies are required. I spoke with Chris Callahan and it DPW expectation that the applicant's engineer will reach out to them to discuss whether the realignment is needed or that there will be something else presented.

Mr. Pietrzak - Yes, we received comments from the Orange County DPW, which the board has a copy of, and that was one of them which will be addressed.

Chairwoman Franson - at this point it sounds like it's in your court as far as just resolving what the improvement will be there so we know whether it remains consistent or whether there's a change. Definitely it sounded like they weren't looking for any traffic impact analysis. So they just want to resolve the design aspect of it.

Mr. Pietrzak - To take it a step further, if you look at the previous SEQRA findings statement, you'll see that some of the

mitigation measures include a traffic light at the intersection, which currently exists. So that would come off the mitigation as part of the traffic consideration.

Mr. Sickler - my last comment dealt with the correspondence from the fire district. They noted that the minimum flow and pressure there was obtained, but they indicated that if they had to do a longer hose lay, they might require a relay pump to be installed. I'd just request at some point in the process go back and take a look at the main size from the tank down to the loop. I think it's about 700 feet, consider increasing that from 8 to 10 or 8 to 12 might resolve that concern with the flow and pressure.

Mr. Pietrzak - We'll run those analysis while we're doing submissions to the Health Department as the agency review and we'll submit it to the engineer for review. But again, we meet the fire flow, so that shouldn't hold up the consistency analysis for the project.

Chairwoman Franson - Ms. Torre has a memo for us that we can go through these.

- table of contents has some minor formatting issues.

- This is the well testing. She is essentially saying this is consistent with the scope of review that was set forth in the Planning Board's letter. Ms. Torre is indicating it should be done. She's indicating that was agreed to as part of the scope. I think if there's a discussion regarding that, then we need to have that. Maybe the two attorneys can communicate about that. From my perspective, groundwater was in SEQRA, and so we're trying to determine consistency I agree that overall that the gallons seem less. I don't know as far as household sizes, but I still think it would be less because of the fact you removed the seniors and the total unit count has gone down. When was the last water quality test done? When was the last water supply test done? The actual pump test?

Mr. Dahlgren - It was around 2003/2004 when we did the testing. So, it was it's a long time ago.

Chairwoman Franson - I appreciate that you're having difficulties finding people, but at the same time, this is 20 years old now, the data. And that was why it was embodied in this consistency analysis. I don't know if there's a middle ground. I don't know what that middle ground would be. If there are difficulties right now getting people to do a pump test. So, you know, I don't think a water quality test there's anything stopping you from doing that. You should be able to do a water quality test.

Mr. Pietrzak - No, because you got to pump the wells certain. You can't just take a sample and test it. So, the sample has to be done after the pumping. We're not anticipating monitoring any wells off site. When we did the previous testing, we tested to the maximum capability of the wells for the simple fact that the Town wanted a connection to other other areas on Carol Drive that was short on water supply. So, we pumped to the maximum amount we could get now and there were no detrimental wells that were affected by our test. Now, like I said, we're going to pump minimal amount just to show we have enough capacity for the project. So, there's not going to be any impact.

Chairwoman Franson - Only particular constituent that's now coming up for water quality testing is potentially PFAS. but you have to do the water quality testing to do that. The only reason it the potential exists here is just because you had the landfill in the vicinity, but that doesn't necessarily mean that it'll get drawn.

Member Manson - from where we were at when the original SEQRA was done in the original well testing and that original plan with the senior housing on the single family homes. Is there a change? I know we went from 66 to 70, but is there a change in the number, the size of those units, or the bedroom count?

Mr. Pietrzak - No, same size, same units that were originally proposed from the original SEQRA analysis.

Chairwoman Franson - additional comments from Ms. Torre's memo - revisions needs to be made to the fiscal analysis. I have a quick question in terms of the recreation fee and open space. Is there going to be a conservation easement on the open space? And I didn't think it was going to be used for any kind of active recreation, but I don't know if there's a trail or etc, but it's not being counted toward recreation fees is it. Because you had a cluster development so the open space was part of the cluster.

Mr. Dahlgren - in the original finding statement and in the stipulation that there are specific parcels that are going to be dedicated to the Town, and it's a lot of land. The space is dedicated for open space and there's one parcel the small lot that was specifically dedicated for recreation but that was like 0.7 acres. That was a connection between the development and the solar farm. That was part of the original development. That was specified as recreation.

Chairwoman Franson - at this point we still need some input from the Town Board whether it's still needed or has there been any discussion with the Town Board on that.

Mr. Pietrzak - they're the one that chose this layout and it was on a layout for the stipulation.

Mr. Barone - that's not going to delay a consistency determination because it's not a SEQRA issue.

Mr. Pietrzak - would it be best for the town attorney, planning board attorney, and our attorney to converse?

Chairwoman Franson - Maybe. And then maybe hydrogeologist too. I think we just might need to to resolve this.

Mr. Dahlgren - I want to add I think it would be helpful for the hydrogeologists Weston and Samson to weigh in on the technical merits and what the potential impacts would be in terms of environmental. There's a lot of documentation on the wells in the record and in the consistency analysis we provided here and also in the finding statement and the existing permit from that's now expired from the DEC.

Chairwoman Franson - in terms of process, we obviously have to finish SEQRA so we can open the public hearing. We still

have to do GML review. I think we're pretty close to the GML review in theory supposed to have the EAF or whatever. I don't know whether we need that since this went through SEQRA previously. We could give them the draft of the SEQRA consistency. So, let me talk to Ms. Torre if she thinks it would be prudent to do the GML. Now, I don't know that there's going to be significant revisions at this point. I think at one point Ms. Torre had talked about she wanted the new and the old zoning shown on the plan for informational purposes. The plans show the dwelling unit size and bedroom size. I believe Mr. Tompkins is down with the wetland delineations and reviews. Previously comments were submitted nothing new.

Chairwoman Franson - will speak to Ms. Torre regarding the GML. We need to address the water supply issue as it has been going on for awhile.

Mr. Pietrzak - the board requested the testing. However, we were not going to do any testing till we got comments back from the Orange County Health Department who has jurisdiction over it. That's what we waited for. Now we have Orange County Health Department's comments.

Chairwoman Franson - But now that you have the comments, you're saying to get the well driller there and do pump tests, there's a six month time period.

Mr. Dahlgren - I'll add that the the comments from the Health Department are extensive. They list everything they want seen in the retesting.

Chairwoman Franson - Let's figure out a way to get everybody on a call to make a determination. Our consultants, our preference has been to do the water quality the water supply testing because frankly it was part of the EIS and so it was also recommendation of our consultants but I acknowledge you know what you're saying in terms of time frames. I think this is as far as we can go tonight, but like I said, I think this is the one issue we have to get settled.

Manuelpillai Subdivision (0243-2025) SBL # 13-1-7.1 52 Catskill Ave, Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative:

Brad Cleverly - MJS Engineering

Mr. Cleverly explained the project to the Planning Board:

- existing lot with single family residence at the end of Catskill Avenue. The owner would like to maintain the existing residence and do a subdivision to construct an additional residence on the side of it.
- each lot meets the Town Zoning requirements all the setback and bulk requirements are met
- they intend to maintain the existing well for existing house with an existing sewer connection
- there will be a new well for the new construction and a connection into the sewer

Mr. Sickler comments:

- proposed dwelling on lot 2 will connect to municipal sewer - will need county approval
- location of existing sewer main should be shown on the plans
- potable water proposed by a private well. Section A65AL covers necessary details to demonstrate the suitability of that well.
- some details regarding the erosion control plan are recommended to add to the plan set.
- notes in section 46 of the Town Code pertaining to stormwater, soil erosion and sediment control can be copied and added to the plan set
- a tree code is required per section 57-85 of the Town Code - requirements listed in that section.
- the SEQRA and GML status will be address by the attorney
- note the appropriate sewer district on plans
- section 57-21.8 house relocation notes needed to be added to the plans

Chairwoman Franson reviews Ms. Torres comments:

- GML exempt from
- SEQRA unlisted action, will have to circulated a short EAF when we are ready
- need a tree plan to show what is being removed and being replaced
- well test typically needs to be done.

Mr. Sickler - information on existing well - should suffice to show ample yield

Chairwoman Franson - is this road public or private, seems to be an extension of an existing public road -

Mr. Sickler - I spoke to Bill Brown the Town maintains a certain section of this road but, not up to this location

Chairwoman Franson - you will possibly need 280a variance -

- we will need some background in terms of what the original approval was for the development.

- additional information required - is additional subdivision allowed, is there a road maintenance agreement?
- noticed on the map you show a lot of drainage ditches. Need to make sure there aren't any wetlands on the site, as we have a local wetlands ordinance.
- Mr. Cleverly - we had Peter Torgenson go to the site. The letter dated July 25th is attached he determined no wetlands at the site. variances - super large house where driveways are allowed need to know if variances have been issued
- Chairwoman Franson - there is the question about variances. The house is super large, and we have regulations about where driveways are allowed, example, if they are allowed in the front of the house.

Work to be done:

- status of private road, roadway maintenance agreement, town road or private road
- is additional subdivision permitted?
- fire access
- need a filing date for the original subdivision
- limits of disturbance
- our consultants and board members to conduct a site visit and check for wetlands
- Have the MMC input regarding the trees
- house size approximately 3000 square feet
- after SEQRA and Neg Dec are completed, they will need to schedule a public hearing.

Minutes

June 13, 2024

Held Over

September 12, 2024

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to approve the minutes from September 24, 2024, as amended.

On a motion by Planning Board Member Manson, seconded by Planning Board Member Shea

Ayes: Planning Board Member Shea, Planning Board Member Penn, Planning Board Member Manson

Nays: None

Abstain: Planning Board Member Bonnie Franson

March 13, 2025

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to approve the March 13, 2025 minutes as amended.

On a motion by Planning Board Member Manson, seconded by Planning Board Member Shea

Ayes: Planning Board Member Shea, Planning Board Member Penn, Planning Board Member Manson

Nays: None

Abstain: Planning Board Member Bonnie Franson

June 17, 2025

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to approve the June 17, 2025 minutes as amended.

On a motion by Planning Board Chairperson Franson, seconded by Planning Board Member Manson

Ayes: Planning Board Member Shea, Planning Board Member Manson, Planning Board Chairperson Franson

Nays: None

Abstain: Planning Board Member Dylan Penn

August 14, 2025

held over

August 19, 2025

held over

Adjournment

Adjournment of Meeting

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to adjourn the meeting.

On a motion by Planning Board Member Franson, seconded by Planning Board Member Shea

Ayes: Planning Board Member Shea, Planning Board Member Penn, Planning Board Member Manson, Planning Board Member Franson

Nays: None

Abstain: None