

Town of Monroe Planning Board Regular Meeting MINUTES

— 06/18/2024

Town of Monroe Planning Board Regular Meeting (Tuesday, June 18, 2024)

Generated by Norinne McSweeney

DRAFT

Members Present:

Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jeff Manson, Dylan Penn, J Louis Rivera, Robert Garstak

Members Absent:

Pat Shea

Planning Board Consultants:

Ashley Torre - Esq.

Shawn Arnott - PE

1. Welcome

Procedural: 1.1 Roll Call

Procedural: 1.2 Point out Fire Exits

Procedural: 1.3 Pledge of Allegiance

2. Returning Projects

Action, Discussion: 2.1 **Owen Drive** (0207-2022) SBL # 3-1-9.1 20 Owen Drive, Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative: Vince Pietrzak - Pietrzak & Pfau Joel Mann - Brach & Mann Mr.

Pietrzak reviews where the project currently is at with the board.- submitted traffic analysis- the attorney sent a letter- we addressed the last set of comments received from MHE Mr.

Arnott comments:- last time there were some questions with regards to the bulk table- it looks like some the net lot area calculations have been updated except the proposed right of way - the right of way are still outstanding- the net lot area calculation and then proposed grading some of the steep slopes that are being proposed have to also be calculated in the net lot area calculation- roadway from Smith Farm is going to connect to the existing Owen Drive at Village of Monroe boundary- the whole portion of the road will be privately owned and maintained- they are going to move the fire access gate from the northeastern end of the property to the eastern end of the property- question to the applicant - where is snow storage going to be. I want it to be clear on the plat it can't be located in front of the gate. Mr. Mann - basically we did as a recommendation at one of the meetings. We did a wider driveway and we can widen it more so we can put the snow storage in that area on lot one. Sorry the wider driveway was actually for turnaround not snow storage. Mr. Arnott - there might be enough

room with some grading or clearing in order to accommodate it. Mr. Arnott comments continued:- the proposed roadway is going to change the grade and there's an existing Village water main that serves Smith Farm, so this application should be referred to the Village of Monroe on the grading above their water main.- disturbance is greater than an acre so a SWPPP needs to be prepared- sewer connections are going to be to the existing main within Smith Farm - will need review and approval from Orange County DPW for those- portable water supply switched from served by the Village to onsite wells- lot 2 is being served by an existing well will need to note that on the plans- question regarding existing easement agreement and if there was on to the existing lots in the town on the private road portion of Owen Drive. Mr. Pietrzak - I am not aware but I believe there is. I don't know about a maintenance agreement but there's an access agreement. Mr. Arnott - my suggestion would be to try to get other homeowners on a maintenance agreement. Mr. Pietrzak - an HOA will be maintaining everything. Mr. Arnott - only the portion serving the proposed lots not the portion of the road that will serve the existing lots. Chairwoman Franson - is there going to be a double road? There is a driveway coming off and there's a road coming up to serve those houses and a straight road. Mr. Arnott - there will be no vehicular access between Smith Farm and Owen Dr as the gate will remain to force these three lots to go out through Smith Farm and prevent from accessing Smith Farm through the back of Owen Drive. The roadway is going to be more or less in a cut so a retaining wall is proposed on the northwest side of the road that will be in excess of four feet in height so that will require building permit. Question is there was enough detail on the retaining wall detail as to whether or not there will be tiebacks necessary of the retaining wall which would potentially require grading easements on the adjoining lot. Chairwoman Franson - in general we have in our code that we want more terrain adaptive development, we don't want a lot of slope disturbance, we don't want a lot of tree disturbance. I'm not seeing that here I'm seeing retaining walls, a lot of grading I don't know that it's meeting the intent of the code, I don't know how to address it, but to me there's got to be something that's a little bit lighter on the land in terms of a layout you know adding like a whole new road for three houses even if it is HOA. Mr. Arnott - the roadway was approved as a gravel access drive so that the location of the roadway is in the same location although there will be some (inaudible) accommodate the three new driveways. Chairman Franson - that was for Smith Farm. Mr. Arnott - correct, but it would be for emergencies only, but in general the roadway is in the same location. Chairman Franson - my point to all this is Smith Farm is not terrain adaptive there's massive retaining walls. It was basically denuded I don't want to see that again. What I want to especially see on this is what's being left in its natural state. Is there going to be some trees along the hillside. That's what I want to see, is there a way to design the home so it's stepping down and not having to do as much grading because I mean and I know a part of Smith Farm was was agricultural I think it was farm field a portion of it. When you get up to the top it just feels like more and more is being graded and that's not necessarily consistent with our intent. Mr. Arnott - since the project has switched from main connection to wells subdivision regulations require that the applicant do testing. Since it's less than five lots one well test that'll be required. Chairwoman Franson - why did it go from connecting to the

watermain to wells. Mr. Pietrzak - we're not in the water district. Chairwoman Franson - is that a Village Water District or a Town water district? Mr. Pietrzak - Village - there is a water district behind you but that is for Smith Farm not this property. Chairwoman Franson - one of the things I'd like to know is whether if you connected to the water would there be less disturbance? Would that help with I'm just trying to figure anything. Mr. Pietrzak - no public sewer. Mr. Mann - history on the design of the lots when we started initially the first concepts we had giant retaining walls in the back and the basically the house the first floor was more flat with the road on top so in order to reduce the grading and change that and to keep as much possible from the back of the property to basically for the visual impact to leave some original vegetation we are sloping down the driveway so we are working with the grade to bring down the house as the lowest possible that we can so we working with the grade that's we try the best we can maybe adjust it a little bit more we'll talk about it when we get to the the board's comments we'll look at it some more. Ms. Torre comments:- at one of the last meetings we had requested the updated owner endorsement- it is a major subdivision because it proposes a new road- the tree survey needs to show the proposed trees to be replacing the ones that are going to be removed- the dwellings are labeled as 3,000 plus or minus Square ft so the square footage does need to be exact as it'll be relevant for the house relocation notes which define the maximum building footprint- as far as SEQRA goes for this application at the last time we did discuss that we would need to look at the traffic since the three homes are going to be connecting to Smith Farms to show that the traffic is consistent with the Smith Farm SEQRA analysis. When I did receive the applicant's attorney's letter and I think there might have been some misunderstanding because we weren't suggesting that a supplemental EIS be necessary but that there be a consistency analysis to show that the adding these three homes won't increase the traffic significantly.- I think there might need to be a supplemental lead agency notice sent to the Village of Monroe if they now have any approval authority over the road connection to the existing Village. I'm not sure what if any permitting Authority The Village would have, but the board can send a supplemental lead agency notice to the Village.- there are some standard storm water notes that you'll have to add per section 46-17- it sounds like the applicants looking to amend the HOA declaration with Smith Farms to include the maintenance of this access road by the HOA.- the one thing I'd want to know from the board is whether it's necessary to send supplemental lead agency notice to the Village if there's any Village approvals now required. Mr. Arnott - I would just add to keep in mind if you're going to send the lead agency notice that we have to send the plans for the to review the roadway grading. I would suggest we don't send the plans for the roadway grading until the drainage is which to date the roadway has not been provided with any improvements shown within it. Chairwoman Franson- suggest making TOPO lines darker- split zone any issue in terms of setbacks with the split zoning to get zoning adjustments. Ms. Torre - can't recall if this was the one that we checked with Mr. Maldonado because the improvements were all within the one zone it was determined that's what would apply. But we could certainly confirm with the Building Inspector on that. Mr. Mann we used the stricter zone. Chairwoman Franson - questioned the limits of disturbance on the lower lot area where

the applicant is not planning any disturbance. Chairwoman Franson - with all the grading is there a minimum required for the width of the road that's part of Smith Farm? Mr. Arnott - it has to be 24 ft within Smith Farm curb to curb. Chairwoman Franson - is that 24 ft established by the town? Mr. Arnott - I would have to look back I don't recall and that was the 24 feet is the improved surface foot right of way proposed. Chairwoman Franson - address the MCC asking if they have been to this location for a review of the trees. Mr. Fordman - relied no. Will stop in office to get a copy of the tree plan. Ms. Torre - are you proposing to add trees? Once a landscaping plan is submitted the MCC would want to see that also. Chairwoman Franson - in regards to the houses there are boxes there, is that an actual footprint? Mr. Mann - I have a conceptual plan I will send Chairwoman Franson - questions regarding the houses - will they have garages, will there be a basement, how many stories? Mr. Mann - no basement under the garage, walkout basement first floor, second floor. Chairwoman Franson - would like to see the detail of retaining wall with the top and bottom. Mr. Arnott - elevation details are shown on grading plan. There is a detail for the retaining wall construction. Open discussion regarding various items on the plans that Chairwoman Franson wanted clarified. - what is diversion swall for - temporary diversion swall for erosion sediment control during construction - northwest boundary should be the retaining wall - where's the (inaudible) top and bottom of the wall - the W is the water line - the diversion swale is going to be between the water line and the wall - temporary during construction - then it will be grass - any way to get rid of the retaining wall? Not unless we grade on someone else's property - we can add more retaining walls between lots 2 & 3 to help eliminate some more grading if you prefer. Ms. Torre - one additional item I mentioned it's a major subdivision because of the new road, so that does require compliance with the cluster provisions unless, (inaudible) which the board has the authority to waive the cluster requirements, it's a subdivision that's fewer than 5 acres. Board members should go to the site prior to making decision regarding cluster subdivision. Mr. Arnott - if I could just offer one suggestion to try to (inaudible) the disturbance - if you move the sewer laterals up into your proposed fill cut a little bit of the disturbance back by tree clearing. Mr. Mann - O&R requiring deducting Iron but it is doable. Mr. Pietrzak - we will review plans and try to seek out alternatives for unnecessary disturbance for temporary controls. Ms. Torre -- as far as the supplemental lead agency notice is that something to go ahead with. I would ask the applicant to send a revised EAF before I make the lead agency particularly the water as it is identified as public water. - the board wants to approve a motion to send a supplemental lead agency notice to the Village of Monroe. AT board has authority to waive cluster fewer than 5 acres. need revised EAF. BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of The Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to submit a supplemental lead agency notice to the Village of Monroe Board and Planning Board subject to receiving the revised EAF.

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

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jeff Manson, Dylan Penn, J Louis Rivera, Robert Garstak

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Action, Discussion: 2.2 **24 Raywood LLC** (0222-2024) SBL # 43-3-3 24 Raywood Dr Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative:

Zindy Feuerwerger - owner

Mr. Arnott comments -

- did receive letter from septic system proposed that is required by the two family overlay - we take no exception to letter or design for the septic system
- also received the letter in regards to the existing well and the testing that was completed - we take no exception
- if you recall there were some comments on the horse shoe driveway (inaudible) - just ask that the rim elevation of the proposed or of the manhole to see if it has to go up or down to accommodate the driveway
- one technical comment on the pavement section curb detail to make sure that matches the Town code requirement for the work within the roadway
- in regards to the elevation rendering that was proposed it didn't match the site plan with regard to landscaping. Colors of the dwelling do not match what was previously submitted. There are a couple of landscaping trees proposed up front that aren't on the rendering. My concern is with the colors and some of the architectural features the architectural elevations that were previously submitted.
- waiting on MCC comments for proposed tree plan

Ms. Torre -

- mine are incorporated into draft resolution

Mr. Fordham - Town of Monroe MCC

- some of the trees are shown too close (new trees to existing trees)
- we normally recommend more than one species
- under the legend for new trees should be White Pine
- some planting details - wraps and supports for new trees
- sheet title says existing tree plan - change to tree plan

Member Manson - can we just discuss the differences in tonight's rendering as far as color and and some minor things in the design both compared to the old rendering and the elevations. I myself actually prefer the design of the new rendering.

Chairwoman Franson - from which perspective? are you talking about the colors?

Member Manson - the colors, there's awnings over the windows in places on the old rendering where now the awnings really just exist over the doors and in the house that is set further

back that wraps around over a couple of windows, they should be on the renderings.
Mr. Feuerwerger - we are using the color Snow Lowes Paint by Encore

Chairwoman Franson - this is a resolution of approval for site plan and special use permit for 24 Raywood LLC is apply for approval of a site plan and issuance of a special use permit permitting the use of the property identified herein as a two family detached dwelling as regulated by section 57-13 new of the Town of Monroe zoning chapter. Applicant proposes to remove an existing dwelling and shed and portion of an existing driveway and construct a new 8,839 foot two family dwelling and associated improvements footprint.

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

Motion by Jeff Manson, second by Robert Garstak.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jeff Manson, Dylan Penn, J Louis Rivera, Robert Garstak

Action, Discussion: 2.4 **127 Seven Springs** (0204-2022) SBL # 1-1-41.2 127 Seven Springs Road Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative:
John Queenan - Lanc & Tully

Mr. Queenan gives an update and review:

- last before you proposed 3 lot subdivision
- within the 2 family overlay district
- we were proposing 3 lots each with 2 family dwellings
- we have had more in-depth conversations with regarding access, driveways, locations and whatnot and with the last iteration we needed to do a SWPPP and a tree plan both which have been completed
- plans have been updated with grading and utilities for the board's consideration
- we're hoping tonight that we are in a position to review the plan for a negative declaration and hopefully move on for the public hearing

Mr. Arnott - to touch on the SWPPP we provided comments a few weeks ago, the applicant responded on Friday and sent over the SWPPP our reviewer is okay from the SEQRA perspective to adopt as far as the SWPPP there are some technical comments but none that would prevent the board from acting on SEQRA

- had a comment who was going to be responsible for the ownership and maintenance responsibilities of the drainage facility - assume it would be one or a combination of the homeowners which will have to be worked out

- we have the Right-Way Dedication that will have to be forwarded to Ms. Torre that develops. That's for the lots that are within the Right-way for 7 Springs Road.

Ms. Torre - Just to clarify that it would actually go to the Town Attorney for approval.

Mr. Queenan - okay so we'll prepare the descriptions with the map and then send.

Mr. Arnott continues:

- applicant has responded to all our previous comments on the sewer disposal systems there is septic for each two family dwelling.
- the applicant has provided a letter with regards to the pump testing that was completed which our office takes no exception too.
- with regards to the Zoning requirement for the protection of woodland character the applicant needs to indicate how they will comply with 57-13 (U)(3) and the preservation of 50% front yard setback. Asked the applicant to look into that as he progresses.
- we need a letter signed and certified by a licensed professional engineer certifying that the lots may be occupied and waste water disposal of without resulting in danger to public health or personal property.
- the septic are adequate from our perspective
- the applicant's response memo dated May 30, 2024 notes that the architectural plans were updated to reflect the different materials and various different types of building colors; however no architectural plans were provided.
- should be referred to OCDP for GML239

Ms. Torre comments:

- in regards to SEQRA waiting on the SWPPP
- started drafting the negative declaration - don't have for the board this evening
- can schedule the public hearing for next month and adopt the negative declaration prior to opening the public hearing
- sheet 4 lots 1 and 2 front yard setback labeled as rear yard setbacks
- spoke about the special use permit criteria for the 2 family dwellings
- Mr. Arnott had mentioned the elevations weren't submitted, I believe you submitted some previously but had indicated that the color palette would be provided in the future, they still need to be submitted for the board's review
- correction to a map note - I will email you that
- tree plan - show the total number of trees or add up the total number to be removed and then proposed replacement trees - once submitted referred to MCC and Ms. Arent who has 30 days to provide comments.

Mr. Arnott - is there a proposed Landscaping plan? How are you going to offset the tree clearing fee?

Mr. Queenan - no there is not - I didn't think one was necessary, it's a pretty heavily wooded lot. There is not a lot of area to put any back.

Ms. Torre - if they are not proposing to replace any of the trees on a one to one basis then it'll be the tree fee in lieu of tree replacement. There are provisions for replacing trees in other areas within the town, that has a reduced fee.

Mr. Queenan - I wanted to touch on Mr. Arnott's comment regarding the woodland character of the frontage. How's the board been addressing that? We did our best to try to save what we could combined with the dedication and the drainage improvements. I can put some trees back but they'd have to be set back so that I can maintain sight distance so if that's kind of the direction you want then we'll get it on the plan but we're close.

Chairwoman Franson - (inaudible) that's the Law the way it's written. I had this comment about the Owen Drive subdivision and are these temporary or permanent, those are permanent. I look at these plans for a few houses and the amount of the SWPPP eat up is just incredible. Is there not alternative designs to cut back on this.

Chairwoman Franson - because sometimes there is, but everybody wants to do a basin because it's cheap.

Mr. Queenan - no, you can't get away from this it's fairly, using all those little techniques rooftop disc connect, swales it just comes to the regulations for storm water are quite ridiculous and this is what you end up with. This is low impact, because I still have to do quantity control, quality and I have to do infiltration.

Chairwoman Franson - how many acres are we at?

Mr. Queenan - three three-ish. To meet all three trust me if we could do less we would.

Chairwoman Franson - are there any alternatives, again that take up less land or waivers that can be granted as part of a storm water permit?

Mr. Arnott - they're using sand filters which are really the minimum, the small smallest footprint that you can possibly do.

Mr. Queenan - the other balance is there's a third component of the storm water which is called runoff reduction (RRV) that limits you to only two or three practices in reality and it's infiltration bioretention or swales.

Chairwoman Franson - like closeup to the house there's not something like a big cistern you could put in to hold the water.

Mr. Queenan - I need separation from the well and separation from the septic.

Member Penn - at least this one is permanent. I think for Owen Drive or future applications that have similar issues is it possible for a multi structure build temporary erosion and sediment control could be on the previous lot if I'm going lot one, two, three I start on one then I go to two then I finish with three maybe a smaller system is needed I don't know I was going to look.

Chairwoman Franson - like the temporary moves down so that you're not having to put the temporary right up front so that's additional land.

Mr. Arnott - specifically for Owen Drive that sediment trap is for the roadway, the home construction.

Chairwoman Franson - there's got to be like better shapes, better something that can you

know again, I don't know this is just, I'm tired of seeing all this land taken out from, we need the storm water I get

that, the regulations I understand the drainage, but the amount of in these kind of areas of disturbance that's occurring so in this instance you're introducing these facilities are you going to be able to put trees in them these facilities.

Mr. Queenan Yes except for the one that's a sand filter bay. The others are bio retention area and are okay for plantings.

Chairwoman Franson - so you're going to have Wetland vegetation Trees go back in that area.

Mr. Queenan - we could plant throughout there sure. None of these basins retain water they don't hold water for any extended period.

Chairwoman Franson - we should talk to Ms. Arent so you'll do a landscape plan for these.

Mr. Arnott - are you using a dry swell?

Mr. Queenan - yes, we're doing rooftop disconnects from the roof leaders that go to the two dry swells, those are have vegetated dry swells that then go to the treatment.

Chairwoman Franson - that's again another area where here's the drive right but now you're going to be clearing all this out to put swales in right

Mr. Queenan - yes but I need the swells both to capture the drive and the runoff and it's also being treatment and it's protecting the septic's like it all flows.

Chairwoman Franson - why do we have to have two as opposed to one?

Mr. Queenan - because I'm getting disconnect credit for the lot you know South and I'm getting disconnect credit for the lot to the north.

Chairwoman Franson - so they can't just have one?

Mr. Queenan - no because I need that volume to get the credit otherwise I'd have to put double the length of swale if they both were to be combined and I don't have the room for that.

Mr. Arnott - it does look like from my perspective minimal impact for the storm water you know those they're pretty small.

Chairwoman Franson - marking out areas on the monitor. Right roughly is all for storm water management right grading all this out here all this right that's over an acre of disturbance for storm water. Of the three or so acres of disturbance so one third is for the storm water basin I think that's an issue.

Member Penn - there is and and it's not rigid so I mentioned lead during our last meeting and one of the sections of lead certification within version 4.1 is protect to restore the habitat and two points it's all ultimate an accumulation of points is restoration of disturbed area and ultimately depending upon what percentage of restoration of disturbed area or even reduction of disturbed area you gain points to obtaining a certain lead certification so there's initiatives that they're trying to drive to reduce what you're doing and I think some of the engineering practices and site plan developments are following but it's not rigid it's s applicants that want to go above and beyond obtain that certification not minimum requirement.

Chairwoman Franson - I mean honestly in looking that one house between (inaudible)

Mr. Queenan - I can't put the house down in the gully - open conversation regarding house location

Mr. Queenan - I've got the three criteria I have to meet quality, quantity, and infiltration and the storm water law is written for Long Island because things infiltrate very rapidly they don't work in the mountains and that's the problem. To get a waiver the Town wants to sign off on an MS4 that you have to sign it too, and you want to support a waiver.

Chairwoman Franson - I'm wondering at what point depending on the amount of disturbance do you, is it reasonable to waive a requirement now we're not the storm water management officer, the Planning Board isn't, I mean we approve the storm water, we approve SEQRA Etc, but we're not the Building Inspector.

Mr. Queenan - has to get the MS4 acceptance form signed off on right it has to be justification I can't go to the state and say oh you know we we're doing these waivers because we don't like the amount of area it was taking up because the Planning Board Chairwoman doesn't want disturbance. They want to prove it.

Chairwoman Franson - what could you get a waiver for have you ever gotten waivers to so in order to reduce some of this.

Mr. Queenan - no not on new development retrofits and redevelopments yes but not new.

Member Penn - I was actually thinking of going the opposite direction is instead of waivers impose certain restrictions to prevent what is required, because I think that's a little bit more in our purview.

Mr. Queenan - you can't do that you really can't do that I mean he's this development or any developer is abiding by the the regulations to provide a plan we can tweak it but essentially it's my design.

Chairwoman Franson - I'm curious what the waivers are that's what I'm curious to what extent can you waive anything.

Mr. Queenan - there's no specific waiver, so it's are you meeting water quality volume you're going to put no why because I don't want to disturb an extra half an acre of land when I could.

Chairwoman Franson - so in this instance the SWPPP goes to the storm water management officer who's responsible for signing off on this, but you still have to send it to DEC.

Mr. Arnott - no it doesn't go to DEC not where you have our office signs off on the SWPPP that it meets all the requirements and then the storm water management officer the supervisor signs the MS4 acceptance which goes to the applicant which they file that with their NOI to get coverage.

Mr. Queenan - the state does not look at these they've made MS4s and they passed the book.

Member Manson - from a quantitative issue you have to do a SWPPP basically you have to

be able to show that it's a better situation after the improvements from the SWPPP than what exist currently correct for Peak flows.

Mr. Queenan - so that's the quantity

Mr. Arnott - but the volumes are regardless going to be increased it's the peak flow, the discharge.

Mr. Queenan - if you had a stream pre-development and it'll run for eight hours right, after development it won't have any greater rate but it might run for 10 hours, there's more volume.

Member Penn - but does that change with alternate surfaces or impervious surfaces versus drainage rock or anything else does that adjust your quantity calculation or your values.

Mr. Queenan - quantity calculations wrapped up into impervious surfaces and then change in cover types. For instance like wooded areas go from wooded to grass that'll be an increase also just increase and run off. Just so you know the state considers gravel impervious.

Member Penn - really, because of the compaction rate.

Ms. Torre - as action items for tonight the first thing would be to assume lead agency status you had circulate the lead agency notice back in April.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to designate ourselves lead agency.

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

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson Jeff Manson Dylan Penn J Louis Rivera Robert Garstak

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Chairwoman Franson - then we have to submit this to MCC right.

Ms. Torre - Yes you should refer the tree plan and the landscaping plan. If the board wanted to schedule a public hearing for your next meeting now that the SWPPP issues sounds like its resolved from a technical standpoint. You would be able adopt a negative declaration before opening the public hearing.

Chairwoman Franson - I don't know that the SWPPP has been resolved but I don't think it's going to be a significant adverse impact so I'm okay with you know opening it because it's more details than it is going to be a massive issue.

Mr. Queenan - what's on that paper meets all the requirements so if we have to tweak here and there we're still going to meet them.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to schedule a public hearing for July 16 2024 at 6:30 pm or soon thereafter and that we also have our attorney draft the negative declaration for this action.

Motion by Chairperson - Bonnie Franson second by Robert Garstak.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson Jeff Manson Dylan Penn J Louis Rivera Robert Garstak

Nay: None

Abstain: None

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to that in the event this application is subject to GML review that we refer it to Orange County Department of Planning.

Motion by Chairperson - Bonnie Franson second by Jeff Manson.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson Jeff Manson Dylan Penn J Louis Rivera Robert Garstak

Nay: None

Abstain: None

3. Minutes

Action Discussion: 3.1 March 14 2024

tabled

Action Discussion: 3.2 March 19 2024

tabled

Action Discussion: 3.3 May 21 2024

tabled

4. Adjournment

Action Discussion: 4.1 Adjourn Meeting

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

Motion by Chairperson - Bonnie Franson second by Dylan Penn.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson Jeff Manson Dylan Penn J Louis Rivera Robert Garstak

"