

Town of Monroe Planning Board Regular Meeting MINUTES

— 05/20/2025

Town of Monroe Planning Board Regular Meeting (Tuesday, May 20, 2025)

Generated by Norinne McSweeney

Draft

Members Present:

Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea, J Louis Rivera

Members Absent:

Dylan Penn

Robert Garstak

Board Consultants:

Ashley Torre, Esq.

Matthew Sickler, PE

1. Welcome

Action, Discussion: 1.1 Roll Call

Procedural: 1.2 Point out Fire Exits

Procedural: 1.3 Pledge of Allegiance

2. Returning Projects

Action, Discussion: 2.1 **Henry Farm** (0201-2022) SBL # 29-1-2.52 Lakes Road & Camp Monroe, Monroe NY

Applicant Representative:

Vince Pietrzak - Pietrzak & Pfau Engineering

Planning Board consultant Dave Tompkins on Zoom

Mr. Pietrzak reviewed project status:

- tonight we are here to review wetlands permit information

Chairwoman Franson:

- we have Dave Tompkins available via Zoom

- Mr. Tompkins and Mr. Marino went into the field to discuss the wetlands

- Mr. Tompkins provided a memo summarizing the results

Mr. Tompkins:

- spoke with Mr. Marino regarding relocating some flags to more accurately reflect the wetland delineation
- most of the flags close on either way of the line
- the delineation is acceptable as is especially since there's a 100 foot buffer which kind of counts for any nuances in the delineation
- requested copy of wetland delineation report from Mr. Marino
- there's an assumption that wetland G is isolated I would like a description of that finding and the justification for it in a report
- another question came up regarding a jurisdictional determination that was issued possibly by Brian Rosell from Army Corp I don't have a copy of it but would like to check the date to make sure that there is no expiration date.
- Mr. Marino and I talked about moving the mitigation area, where it is now on the side has lots that abut to the back of properties which becomes a convenience dumping area for grass clippings, etc. I would like to see a buffer or better the mitigation area relocated to down along the road
- the road to the water tower right now goes right through the buffer around the wetland, questioning whether or not it can be moved out of the buffer, it's a civil question not sure if it can be moved to the edge of the buffer
- is the commercial lot still part of this approval Mr. Marino was not sure
- noted lots 67,68 and 35 all impact wetland A or the buffer, there might be a way to re-engineer that so it could be reduced would like to see the wetland impacts removed and i like to see the buffer impact reduced
- box culverts questioned why being used in 2 locations and not 4. They are a very good tool to mitigate any kind of stream disturbance, would like to see them in all four
- asked for a quick table on what is total buffer disturbance, what is total wetland disturbance and then total mitigation, not sure if it needs to be on site plan
- would like to see the storm water basin moved out of the buffer area
- status of DEC with the new regulations Mr. Marino indicated this was in the works requested copy of application and status
- this is more KALA field of determination, but there are large trees on the hillside was wondering if there is a plan to reduce the impact to them

Chairwoman Franson - prior meeting you mentioned that you were going to the DEC to determine whether any of the wetlands could be considered now DEC wetlands

Mr. Pietrzak - yes we made that submission and the initial response I got back from the DEC was we're going to try to get a response back to you in three months, so we have one more month to wait before we get something back, we submitted it the end of March.

Mr. Tompkins - could Mr. Pietrzak confirm that there was a wetland delineation report

prepared for this project.

Mr. Pietrzak - I cannot, well originally there was but I haven't seen a report for the current flagging yet

Chairwoman Franson - you'll check with Mr. Marino to get a report from him for the current wetland delineation, because there have been significant changes.

Mr. Sickler comments:

- previously issued comments back in April and May on the project SWPPP and site plan
- Mr. Pietrzak indicated they are preparing responses and revisions for submission soon

Ms. Torre comments:

- you're working on the revised consistency analysis for a future submission

Action, Discussion: 2.2 **Nick Gordon** - (0220-2023) SBL # 3-1-25 18 Stairway, Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative:

David Higgins - Lanc & Tully

Mr. Higgins - application for Nick Gordon at 18 Stairway this is the lot adjacent to 22 Stairway

- the public hearing was closed at the last meeting
- made some revisions to the plans to address the prior comments
- believe there is a resolution of approval that was drafted for review this evening

Mr. Sickler comments:

- note removal on encroachments to neighboring properties and stabilized with seed and mulch
- they added note 12 to the plan which addresses the storage of organic materials and chemicals on the site - notes that there won't be any

Ms. Torre - nothing new at this point

Chairwoman Franson - reviewed the resolution

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to approve this resolution for amended site plan special use permit for Nicholas Gordon as amended this evening.

Motion by Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, second by Jeff Manson.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea, J Louis Rivera

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Action, Discussion: 2.3 **Mountain View Ave** (0235-2025) SBL # 43-1-10 290 Mountain View Ave, Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative:

Joel Mann - Brach & Mann

Mr. Mann -

- revised plans with regards to the parking in the front yard setback revised on both lots
- received letter from landscape architect KALA didn't have a chance to make those revisions
- everything is reasonable and doable - we will address that for the next meeting
- would like to possibly schedule a public hearing for next month

Mr. Sickler comments:

- majority of comments from previous submissions have been addressed
- applicant will submit for jurisdictional determination from the DEC haven't received response
- additional comments they are working on addressing OCSP
- the pavement to be widened needs to be added to the plans
- they need to obtain building permits for the retaining wall proposed along the side of the unit when they reconfigured the parking
- the parking spaces come right up to the wall there'll probably be or need to be some geo grid or reinforcing with that which can be part of the building permit
- there is a railing mounted at the top of the wall at the edge of the parking spaces recommend you incorporate a curbing or some parking blocks
- need to submit the colors of materials and finishes - the elevations are finished

Mr. Mann - in our response letter we noted that we delineated the wetlands with Mike Newiki and he submitted to the DEC

Ms. Torre comments:

- this is an unlisted action under SEQRA
- you circulated for lead agency on March 27th - you can assume lead agency this evening
- since it's a subdivision you do have to complete SEQRA before opening a public hearing
- you can schedule a public hearing subject to receipt of the color information and the architectural
- you will have to do a negative declaration prior to opening a public hearing
- the one house on the property was originally listed as under construction please update plans to show completed

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

assume lead agency status for 290 Mountain View a proposed subdivision.

Motion by Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, second by Pat Shea.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea, J Louis Rivera

Nay: None

Abstain: None

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to set a public hearing for this subdivision and special permit application, subject to receipt of the color elevation architectural rendering information for June 17, 2025 at 6:30 or soon thereafter.

Motion by Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, second by Jeff Manson.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea, J Louis Rivera

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Action, Discussion: 2.4 **81 Raywood Bias Properties** (0228-2024) SBL # 43-1-11.3 Raywood Dr, Monroe, NY

Ms. Torre - this is another amended resolution. At your last meeting you did amend the resolution to modify that condition required an amended water agreement with the Village and that was because they changed to a 2 family dwelling so they needed a letter showing that the water would still be covered by the Village we need a signed version submitted.

Chairwoman Franson - this is the Second Amended Resolution of approval for site plan and special use permit for Bais A Properties on page seven number four prior to the issuance of a building permit the applicant shall provide the Building Department with written confirmation from the Village of Kiryas Joel satisfactory to the Planning Board attorney clarifying that the additional dwelling unit is permitted to connect to the Village water supply system under the restrictive covenant easement and developer agreement.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to approve the Second Amended resolution of approval subject to revision that was just read by out attorney.

Motion by Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, second by J Louis Rivera.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea, J Louis Rivera

Nay: None

Abstain: None

3. Public Hearing

Action, Discussion: 3.1 **Paul Reiser** (0239-2025) SBL # 3-1-26 20 Stairway, Monroe NY

Applicant Representative:

David Higgins

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to open the public hearing for Paul Reiser 22 Stairway.

Motion by Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, second by Jeff Manson.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea, J Louis Rivera

Nay: None

Abstain; None

Mr. Higgins:

- 22 stairway North of Village of Monroe
- 1.67 acres in size
- GB Zoning District
- proposed use property contractor storage yard special use permit 57-13V
- made changes previously discussed
- 20x30 foot asphalt pad for parking heavy equipment anything over 2,000 pounds
- some existing storage containers on property to be relocated to meet yard setbacks
- showed parking on the site plan - applicant is sole proprietor but we did provide 2 spaces
- hours of operations on the plans as being 8am -4:30 pm Monday - Friday closed Saturday and Sunday
- there are some restrictive notes on the plans - no parking trucks or loading within 30 feet of the adjacent residential properties
- there is also a note on the plan regarding the oil spill mat shall be kept on site and used under any machinery that is leaking fluid or being worked on
- the existing driveway that's shown on the plan, that crosses over into the adjacent lot, we now show that as to be abandoned and reclaimed with top soil seed and mulch and that'll be essentially watered as needed until vegetation is established

Mr. Sickler comments:

- we have a couple comments from discussions at your previous meeting you asked me to reach out to the Building Inspector for an interpretation regarding the storage of motor oil on site for applicants use and maintaining his machinery the response was as long as they don't

exceed the Fire Code of NYS for storing motor oil

- also asked the Building Inspector for an interpretation regarding the placement of jersey barriers along the property line and that response was those SHALL be set a minimum of 5 feet from the property lines with screening.
- the Board requested an aerial overlay which was submitted

Ms. Torre comments:

- no comments
- prepared a draft resolution for the board to consider

reviewed resolution

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to close the public hearing.

Motion by Pat Shea, second by Jeff Manson.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea, J Louis Rivera

Nay: None

Abstain: None

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to approve this resolution for Paul & Dawn Reiser at 22 Stairway as amended.

Motion by Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, second by J Louis Rivera.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea, J Louis Rivera

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Action, Discussion: 3.2 **O&R** (0237-2025) SBL # 1-2-43 Off Forest Ave, Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative:

Leslie Snyder - Attorney

Christopher Mink - EN Engineering

Michael Homenick - O&R

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to open the public hearing for Orange & Rockland application off of Forest Avenue.

Motion by Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, second by Pat Shea.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea, J Louis Rivera

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Mr. Sickler comments:

- previously issued comments on the projects SWPPP back in April there have been some discussions and a meetings with the O&R team they submitted a revised SWPPP today will review
- received comments from our wetlands consultant
- applicant has submitted to DEC regarding jurisdiction determination for the wetlands
- received comments from the MCC
- referred to KALA have not received comments yet
- application proposes some minor drainage work within Forest Street update plans to show pavement replacement and limited pavement removals any details related to that

Ms. Torre comments:

- submitted to County for GML review still waiting for response letter
- prepared a Draft EAF Part II
- need to complete SEQRA this is an unlisted action
- previously declared your intent and assumed lead agency
- note color of fence needs to be specified on the plans

Ms. Snyder answers to comments from board consultants:

- we did receive an answer from the DEC they agreed with our jurisdictional determination, we had a site visit on April 28th with Mr. Fleisher of Capital Environmental he concurred with those wetland delineations
- we also have the Army Corp of Engineers who also concurred with the wetland determination
- the color of the fence is galvanized steel

Public Comments:

Cecilia Mutchler 97 Forest Ave

- lived in my home for 50 years
- surrounded by wildlife and wetlands
- very concerned about the power line
- children in neighborhood
- very concerned about substation going up very dangerous
- within the power line
- traffic problem coming from Kiryas Joel, coming around Schunnemunk - very high speeds trucks - can't get out of my driveway due to the traffic

- need a solution
- why can't it be put up by the old substation over by the ponds

Yehoseph Grunhut -

- reside at 103 Forest Ave
- traffic have blind spot
- many accidents at least once a week - can show you from my cameras
- live before the col-de-sac
- with the added traffic very dangerous for children getting on and off the school bus
- trucks parked along the side of the road causing more of an issue
- relocated to a different area that is safer

Kieran Mutchler

Forest Ave Monroe

- environmental impact for the animals
- my interest is the constant deforestation and cutting down trees
- impact on communities we seem to be overdeveloping the area and losing the natural characteristics from the description of a beautiful hamlet with foothills
- the historically section of Bald Hill was essentially reserved as parkland all the way to Smith Clove Park
- wondering what the impact upon that will be with the size of the substation
- impact of the springs on the side of the hill
- look what's happening in South Blooming Grove see the great impact it's having with the water with that village
- simply over development
- question anywhere else substation can be placed even on alternate side of Rt. 17
- is it absolutely necessary and already a foregone conclusion has this project already been approved if it has been
- look at the impact essentially from Bald Hill the historic nature of it remember that it was donated to the Town and the Village by Smith as parkland it was systematically used in the last 40 years that I've seen it by the Boy Scouts of America and it stands as a symbolic image to the top of the Town and I would hate to see that systematically cut up and destroyed especially if a substation is not pertinent and absolutely necessary to the area.

Mary Bingham Councilwoman for the Town of Monroe

- would like to read from Dennis Fordham's letter from the MCC dated May 5, 2025
- the tree preservation plans identified only trees 10 dbh and larger other than trees on slopes greater than 30%. I believe this is an incorrect interpretation of the new tree preservation law section 57-83B subsection 2 which states trees greater than 6 dbh that are located over slopes greater than 30% or that are listed on the list of landmark native protected or specimen

trees appendix to the zoning local law see attachment number four or as identified as landmark protected or specimen trees by the MCC, Monroe Conservation Commission, during a site inspection associated with this article. I interpret this to mean that all native trees greater than 6 in DBH are to be considered as regulated trees and therefore should be shown on the tree plan.

- some of the residents have already expressed a concern as to why this location is being used owner already has a substation on O&R Road so why do we need another
- couldn't the substation on O&R Road be used could it be expanded it's next to a commuter lot not necessarily next to more residential areas
- future technology keeps changing and we have heard in the past about PCB's when transformers don't work right and they leak into the environment
- want to make sure that whatever technologies are in the future concerned about lithium batteries, I know Warwick had a problem with them. Not sure if O&R plans to store anything like that at the substation, so just to clarify for the residents that nothing hazardous now or in the future will ever be stored at this site.

Jeff Sculley - Catania, Mahon & Rider, PLLC

- representing Sheri Torah Inc Orthodox school directly adjacent to the O&R parcel at which the proposed electrical substation is to be installed
- 6,000 students across Monroe, South Blooming Grove and Kiryas Joel.
- the Monroe schools provide classroom instruction and physical education to more than 1,500 children the youngest are kindergarteners (age 5) to 12th graders (age 18)
- approximately 400 staff members
- some of the students and staff live locally and walk to and from the Schools
- Monroe school composed of 2 buildings with a combined floor space of approximately 200,000 square feet
- between the 2 buildings is a pool which the children use for both recreation and physical education
- this application immediately raises numerous issues under SEQRA including potential concerns given this proximity between the substation and our school
- we seek to emphasize to this board that there are legitimate evidence-based concerns that exist about the environmental, the health and the safety effects of this proposed substation particularly under SEQRA and the risks to the children of the Monroe school who would be every day in close proximity to this substation.
- we address each of these issues in our submittal letter and I'm going to touch on just a couple of these, but before I do, I just want to say because this project raises numerous concerns Sher Torah is objecting to it as currently configured in close proximity to the school and therefore raising the issues we've discussed in our submittal. Regardless of those concerns Sher Torah is committed to working cooperatively with this Board and O&R to explore ways in which the project may be modified, including as a number of resident have already said, possibly identifying alternate locations or other measures relieving our concerns

to mitigate the risks inherent in placing an electrical substation so close to an operating school that has kids as young as five years old there every single day. The proposed substation site plan involves a wetland disturbance permit and therefore it implicates storm water management runoff and potential contamination of local water resources, this concern is heightened given again the proximity of this substation to the school and more than 1,500 kids who are going to be drinking that water every day and swimming in that pool. Consequently, the proposal implicates health engineering and drainage issues directly affecting site plan review and special permit approval you respectfully submit that under the SEQRA regulations this board conduct a thorough environmental review of this application evaluating all potential impacts including both the short and long-term effects on the surrounding community moreover a full environmental impact statement should be provided assessing ethological impacts including wetland disruption and mitigation measures to protect the Monroe school its staff, its children along with the nearby residential areas. SEQRA environmental review and the EIS must consider more than just drainage storm water management runoff potential contamination it should also assess traffic impacts again as a number of the residents have already brought up and I'm going to touch on in a moment here the SEQRA analysis requires that the board consider the cumulative effects of the proposed substation given that Q&R is proposing multiple applications before this board they don't have multiply environmental review Incorporate cumulative impact analysis evaluating the broader implications of the substation not only for the school but for the broader community turning briefly to traffic as a number of residents have said there's already concerns at this location regarding traffic and the proposed driveway for the substation and related construction activities are almost certainly going to increase in both the short and the long terms traffic along Forest Avenue and Forest Street increased safety risk to the public the surrounding neighborhood the Monroe school staff and our students. The impact of this risk is likely to disproportionately be born by school staff and students as I've said a number of them live locally and they're walking to and from the school every day considering these factors we respectfully request that the board commission a detailed traffic study and a mitigation plan ensuring safe pedestrian ingress and egress for staff and children both during and after construction such a study should consider both those students and staff who came to the school motor vehicles and also those who are walking along these roads. There's some other things in our proposal, but I want to avoid the ever-present on and on so I'm just going to sum up here pretty quickly. We submit that this station proposed risks even beyond traffic studies risks we talked about in the environmental effects there's an enclosed 2016 aerial image that demonstrates this substation's footprint will directly abut the school's property line, both of our buildings and the swimming pool leaving little margin for error in the event of equipment malfunction or catastrophic event these events could include electric fires explosions or equipment failures. We've talked about down power lines these could endanger the staff in such an emergency as such we're also asking the board to consider a comprehensive emergency response plan including evacuation protocols for children and staff the installation of safety barriers or setbacks these risks and we further seek the inclusion of noise mitigation measures such as

sound barriers and additional landscaping to minimize aesthetic effects on the school. As we've discussed this substation poses numerous potential concerns we're sure the board's going to discharge it due diligence and study each carefully and fully before proceeding with this application. Having said that Sher Torah is happy and will welcome the opportunity to work cooperatively with this board and with the applicant trying to formulate risk mitigation strategies including as everyone all the residents have discussed here with you a possible alternate site, but even if not an alternate site then how to create solutions allowing this important project to proceed while protecting both the Forest Avenue street neighborhood and the staff and most especially the children of the Monroe School. I thank the Board very much. Chairwoman Franson - thank you just to clarify this is the one image that was attached. Mr. Scully - and again there is a second building that's been construction since that 2016 image, as you're looking at it to the right of the swimming pool.

Chairwoman Franson - board members comments at this point

Member Rivera - that was one of my concerns at a previous meeting was I talked about trees and then I spoke about the safety and if you can reiterate what you said the last time about the safety concern.

Ms. Snyder comments:

- you've been listening to this application for months
- this property is in a light industrial district it has O&R electric transmission lines those lines have been there when they built the school and other things.
- we've submitted an EMF report to show that it meets all the criteria
- we've submitted a noise report to show there'll be no noise impacts to the neighboring properties
- we've shown storm water runoff that there'll be the pre and post there'll be no runoff
- there'll be no impact on drainage or any water resources
- we've also shown not only noise EMF
- we've done visuals
- we've done landscaping we met with Mr. Fordham on the MCC at the site visit and he actually concluded, I don't want to read anything out of context, but he concluded that the applicant is attempting to preserve as much of the tree boundary as reasonably possible given the design of the access way and the substation
- this substation is unmanned there'll be no traffic impacts once it's built
- maintenance maybe once a month but other than that it's unmanned
- and during the construction they will address whatever is needed to make sure that it won't be during school hours so they can go before school begins and leave before school ends assuming we can work out a plan to that effect
- for the electromagnetic fields the lines are there the substation doesn't add to it but we did

provide a study to show that the substation would not impact and met all the criteria of the New York State Public Service Commission

- the plans that we submitted albeit that it was yesterday and I apologize for that was really to deal with Mr. Fordham's comments under the tree law because when they wrote the new tree law

- there's really three criteria if you have trees greater than six that are on a slope of 30% do you have trees greater than six that meet the native species and the third thing is trees greater than 10 that are

individually, we actually did a chart and we had our tree person show each category so that was the only thing that changed if you recall since we've been revising our plans now for several months all our plans there was really very few changes from the engineer it was really to focus on the tree and to do it in a manner that was very clear that it met the tree law the new tree layout which we did obtain from the town clerk with the attachment for that's in the tree law

Member Manson - Mr. Homenick you over the last couple of meetings you've been giving us a tutorial on the purpose and need for substation for O&R and what that does for our community. Several of the residents brought up in comment about why that location and/or why it's not feasible to expand the substation on O&R Road. Why would that not meet O&R's need in this situation?

Mr. Homenick - just to discuss what a substation does first off the transmission lines carry high voltage electricity through the area currently the area is fed from Monroe from Harriman there's also substations on Sugarloaf Mountain where those transmission lines carry the high voltage hit a substation and transform that voltage down to a lower voltage it then distributes that out into the roads on our distribution circuits currently the Harriman substation and the Monroe substation are reaching their capacity. There's an extreme level of growth in the Monroe area into the Kiryas Joel area so O&R is obligated to serve all of the development that goes on in an attempt to basically shorten the circuit lengths from Harriman and from Monroe to provide better reliability and better service as well as increase the capacity of our system. The substation was situated in between the other two to shorten those circuit lengths and provide 15 additional circuits into the area providing better reliability and a higher capacity for all the growth that's going on in Monroe. It does also allow for the addition of solar into the system and some of the newer technologies. To answer one of the other questions there aren't currently any batteries proposed at this site.

Member Manson - I also don't see where there's going to be much in the way of a traffic impact from this project in that area there's an incredible issue with traffic in that area but this substation is not really going to be part of it and we've already brought it up Ms. Snyder that this is an unmanned station with once a month maintenance and technicians out there work hard to keep it that way. I do think that there's some benefit in the comments by Mr. Sculley in

relation to the project being so close to the schools I understand the EMF and all of those things we did talk a little bit about noise and we want to maybe just ensure that there's not a bleed over from the equipment because it is located somewhat adjacent there was talk in the past there's two schools there now there was talk when we started with Sheri Torah years ago of possibly a third school eventually being in that same location so we want to be sort of sensitive to that and it might make sense for the applicant to have a conversation with representatives of Sheri Torah to understand exactly what's going on at the school and possible expansion plans if those are still applicable. I would encourage you that's your most adjacent neighbor by far so having an understanding of it's always important to understand what's in the plans for the future not only on your property but what's adjacent to that I think that's warranted in this case.

Ms. Snyder - we're happy to have that those conversations but we did submit a noise report to show there'll be zero increase in the ambient noise levels so even if they add another school that'll be their own noise that they're creating and we do meet all the setbacks and we do have screening around it as well and vegetation.

Member Shea - hearing all the comments my concern and I think all our concern would be what effect if any it's going to have on the children in the school? What can be done to mitigate that at all perhaps you can speak with the council and other members of the community.

Ms. Snyder - we're happy to speak to the school I think the other comments really were focused on traffic which we've documented but we're happy to speak to the school. We did spend a lot of time designing and locating the substation which is in a small area on our 12 acre parcel. We did work to maintain as many trees as possible and we are adding trees. We did a very detailed natural resource inventory study to show that we would not have any impact on any habitat including the bog turtle we did a special assessment about that we have taken out duties very seriously including all the natural resources.

Member Shea - I can appreciate all the work you've done and I think that you've answered a lot of the questions about traffic noise and lighting and all that sort of thing but again I just want to make sure that we've done everything we can do to alleviate the concerns and to answer create a rejoinder to address those questions about the children that's the main thing I'm concerned about.

Ms. Snyder - we did do a study to show that there would be no impact there is electric transmission lines there they chose to build their facility near those lines but we did show that there would be no impact from an electromagnetic energy standpoint but we're happy to have a discussion with them and if there's anything else we'll see what we can do to work together on that. There is a

pressing need for reliable electricity and there is a growing demand in the area.

Ms. Torre - Is the EMF changing at all from what is there presently as a result of the substation.

Chairwoman Franson - in terms of alternatives I agree with my colleagues what they've expressed I do appreciate Member Shea's comments with regard to having a dialogue with the school so that they are more informed in fact if it was a forum where some residents could also attend if the council woman or you know I could be made available or a Planning Board member wanted to attend we'd be happy to set something up so that there's more ability to discuss back and forth as opposed to you know more formal setting like this. But I would think it'd be beneficial to talk about the alternatives so we have one O&R

station off of O&R road by the lakes and then we have another all the way over by Harriman by the shopping center and so essentially you're saying you need to add circuits between those two points just looking at the maps it seems that there's limited right of way that you currently control where you could put something. It seems to me this looks like there might be a limited right of way (looking at the maps of area) near your neighborhood and then you go on what you have are the transmission lines but they're really crossing over properties they look like easements or right a ways on those properties but you don't own them. Then you have the piece that you're proposing the substation on which essentially goes from Forest and it's actually the length of the school property and then again once you get beyond that you're on to private property again. The lines continue on and then ultimately they go through the shopping center again privately owned until you get to the Harriman station so they do have to be located next to the high tension lines because they're stepping down the voltage in the wires. There are no high tension lines on the other side by Kiryas Joel which you would be able to situate a station that's why it's proposed on this side.

Mr. Homenick - it would require us to extend transmission facilities to that new location not only to build the station. We would have to build what is called a transition yard which would takt the overhead lines underground line and then have to run that the distance to the facility.

Chairwoman Franson - couple of questions:

- are there any projects right now that O&R is pursuing to bring transmission lines to the other side of the highway?
- In terms of the easements you have on the private properties those easements don't give you the right to build substations on those properties?
- So you are limited in terms of the properties on which this could be located for what O&R owns

Mr. Homenick - answers Chairwoman's questions:

- no facilities or project proposed for the other side of the highway at this time.

- That is correct in regards to the easements we can't build on them.
- That is also correct for locations.

Chairwoman Franson continues her comments:

- With regards to this property your property is paralleling and running the length of the school property and so anywhere you may locate that substation within that path is going to be next to the school. I think o that's speaking to alternatives but I think it'd be useful to have a narrative that summarizes this discussion and then ultimately it comes down to is this location on this property given the fact that it's next to the school the best location on this property so that's something to discuss and explore.
- has this been situated in a location where it's furthest form ?
- are there any alternative designs that would be more mitigative. Other locations actually put substations in buildings or somehow housed them in structures don't know if that's necessary or provides more protection than say this open facility but it is useful to understand.
- in terms of traffic you have expressed that this is an unmanned station and it sounds like the traffic issues that were experienced were from construction workers or doing testing that might have parked on the side.
- in regards to noise you did do the study - we might need to have a consultant look at that in order to confirm all the assumptions are appropriate
- hold public hearing open until the second meeting in June and at the first meeting discuss the FEAF and various reports and the SEQRA components as we are still waiting for the GML and the additional SWPPP review

Ms. Torre - i think that makes sense and if you did want anyone to review noise other than Mr. Arnott's review you'd want to discuss that this evening that way it could be referred to them. One other item when you do your submission if you could also mention in terms of traffic construction traffic that you'd avoid school bus times and school traffic if you could explain what you'd propose in that regard that way you could consider that.

Chairwoman Franson - wildlife it's not only the bog turtles there's more we looked at all the species. It's not regulated species we're concerned about but we don't know what's there we had asked for additional wildlife inventories to see if there were any amphibians or other species of concern that might be regulated you know if they're ephemeral if they're vernal we want to make sure what are the impacts identify them.

Member Manson - a question in relation to the location of the substation and the decision to put it on this parcel

- because you're working through the process on this my understanding is that at the head of

Larkin Drive over by Rt 105 there's a temporary substation to start to deal with some of the distribution issues that's there until this substation would come online do I understand that correctly? Generally that's not a residential area right there along that stretch is it not feasible to place a substation there was that a consideration at any time.

Ms. Snyder - It's not feasible because that is not O&R property we have a lease with the Town and it's very limited the size is very limited location.

Member Manson - this more of a comment I guess in relation to those who expressed the concern about the traffic in that area of town not so specific to this project but certainly specific to the concerns that were brought up at the public hearing. Councilwoman Bingham for your behalf and frankly on behalf of those who sit with you on the board and the boards of the adjacent communities the single biggest thing that would help that area of town Forest Ave Forest Street Schunnemunk Road Oreco Terrace would be the completion of the Larkin Drive extension between Route 208 and Forest Ave right over by the back entrance to Kiryas Joel. The issues that the Mutchler's are having are the issues that I'm having getting off my street I understand what they're dealing with because we're dealing with the same traffic and it's just a factor of growth. We need to accommodate the growth and by pulling that traffic out of these small residential streets and onto something that's really purpose-designed to move people effectively from the highway into the areas of our town and the adjacent towns that are growing just makes sense. I just want to pass that along.

Chairwoman Franson - the site plans are available in the Planning Office and on website.
- reviewed the location of the substation in regards to the Shari Torah school wetlands on property there is a retaining wall on the property as well
- can the facility be elongated?

Mr. Homenick - the transformers are 3 in a row and it is about as narrow as we can make it
Mr. Mink - there will be a landscaping buffer with evergreens cedars and spruce that will be the most effective noise mitigation.

Member Shea - you're saying that where that station is placed next to the school or where you want to place it it's not going to affect the amount of the EMFs. It won't be any greater than what's there now

Mr. Homenick - we're not adding any high tension lines. The EMF report that was provided we're not EMF experts the experts prepare the report but essentially the EMF that exists for the transmission line is there substation is not a major impact to EMF doesn't really increase especially when there's existing transmission lines it doesn't increase the EMF typically EMF dissipates by the time you get to the fence line
in these sorts of scenarios and I believe that's what the report essentially shows.

Member Shea - well assuming all that's true I think a dialogue between yourselves and he

public and Mr. Sculley from Sheri Torah.

Member Rivera - is there some type of a barrier that can be put between the school and the substation to prevent EMFs from reaching the school? Is that something that's possible?

Ms. Snyder - the lines are there they're overhead no EMF is in the air it's everywhere you go if you use a cell phone so that is not feasible but you know we can see if there's any other physical barrier to see we've already proposed the landscape barrier but we'll look into whatever other barriers that we can.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to continue the public hearing until June 17 2025 at 6:30 pm or soon there after.

Motion by Chairperson - Bonnie Franson second by J Louis Rivera.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson Jeff Manson Pat Shea J Louis Rivera

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Action Discussion: 3.3 **Moses Hirsch** (0231-2024) SBL # 1-1-11.21 47 Seven Springs Road Monroe NY

Applicant Representative:

Isaac Stein - Ideal Design

Mr. Stein- I am here for a 2 family dwelling in the 2FO district

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to open the public hearing.

Motion by Jeff Manson second by Pat Shea.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson Jeff Manson Pat Shea J Louis Rivera

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Mr. Sickle Comments:

- previously issued comments back in April
- submitted tree plan with all trees greater than 6 DBH 37 removed 37 proposed
- plans indicate the location and the variety of trees
- architectural plans with elevations and materials
- question of basement proposed in new unit plans indicate no

- requested report on the suitability of the site served to well on site to serve 2 family dwelling
- provided a report from applicants licensed engineer indicating that the well had stabilized rate of 6 gallons per minute they are providing a 500 gal storage tank with a booster pump to accommodate daily flows
- revised plans updated need to increase the number of Elgin units
- must be connected to public sewer or that MHE receives certification from a licensed engineer that the on-site system is adequate to serve was included in this submission

Ms. Torre comments:

- since prior appearance the tree law was will send over the language for an amended new map note
- tree plan needs to be referred to MCC and Kala for review
- on the architectural details you have a rendering that notes colors proposed but you need to show the colors if already done then comment is irrelevant
- classified as Type II action so it is exempt from SEQRA review
- items left would be the tree plan referral to MCC & KALA
- assuming no other changes I could prepare resolution for the next meeting

Public Comments:

Bersh Stern 55 Seven Springs Road

- wonder if accessory/addition go on the other side of the house or only this side
- I live next store and did and addition will be very close

Chairwoman Franson - reviewed what the resident was asking about moving the addition to the other side

- asked the applicant to look into making some adjustments to the location of the addition

Mr. Stein- concerns with the septic and the well

- will talk to the client and see what can be done
- Ms. Torre to draft a resolution for the next meeting

leave public hearing open until June 17 2025

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to leave the public hearing open until June 17 2025.

Motion by Chairperson - Bonnie Franson second by Pat Shea.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson Jeff Manson Pat Shea J Louis Rivera

Nay: None

Abstain: None

4. Minutes

Action Discussion: 4.1 June 13 2024

held over

Action Discussion: 4.2 September 12 2024

held over

Action Discussion: 4.3 September 17 2024

approved

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to approve the September 17 2024 minutes.

Motion by Jeff Manson second by J Louis Rivera.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Jeff Manson Pat Shea J Louis Rivera

Nay: None

Abstain: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson

Action Discussion: 4.4 February 18 2025

held over

5. Adjournment

Action Discussion: 5.1 **Adjourn Meeting**

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

Motion by Chairperson - Bonnie Franson second by J Louis Rivera.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson Jeff Manson Pat Shea J Louis Rivera

Nay: None

Abstain: None

"