

Town of Monroe Planning Board Regular Meeting MINUTES

— 10/19/2021

Town of Monroe Planning Board Regular Meeting (Tuesday, October 19, 2021)

Generated by Norinne McSweeney

Members present

Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea

Members Absent:

John Allegro

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 **DG Management** (0172-2019) SBL # 69-1-1.2 Schunnemunk Road

John Queenan - Lanc & Tully

September revised plans addressing Mr. Arnott & Ms. Torre's comments, supplied traffic analysis, working on water, recently received SHPO sign off
there has been back and forth between Town of Monroe, Village of Monroe and applicant regarding access to the project and the drainage
the applicants attorney and the Village of Monroe attorney discussion regarding road, the filed map and the dedication
we are continuing with our design with the understanding the road would be dedicated
we received comments from Mr. Arnott tonight
also comments on the traffic study which we sent to our traffic consultant Creighton Manning for their review

AKRF Traffic Consultant brought in through Zoom

Nina Peek and Alex Auld

AKRF reviewed the traffic assessment report that was prepared by Creighton Manning dated June 23rd and the most recent site plan drawing set prepared by Lanc & Tully dated August 25th.

We reached out to Creighton Manning for a copy of the 208 business center traffic assessments which is resourced a lot for the data used in their traffic assessment , so we included that in our review as well.

Zoom added for AKRF traffic Consultant

Nina Peek and Alex Auld

reviewed report from C&M and one from L&T
report referenced

requested copy of traffic assessments

memo listed findings and comments were reviewed:

Traffic Assessment report should include:

a set of volume figures and or tables that clearly depict how the 2022 Build Traffic volumes were developed from Rt 208 Business Center

Traffic analysis confirm whether the assessment includes 4 or 5 lots proposed in the Village of Monroe

should indicate the queue conditions at the intersection of Schunnemunk St and North Main including queue lengths and queue storage capacity

without the 208 Business Center & Larkin Drive Extension projects residents will use courtesy gaps to enter & Exit site during peak hours

left turn movement restrictions to enter the site should be considered during peak times

should provide a comprehensive assessment of traffic conditions in the absence of the 208 Business Center Project

the proposed project generates less than 100 peak hour trips and is therefore below the threshold that would typically require analysis based on NYSDEC guidance

include a sight distance analysis for the Schunnemunk Street/Monroe Village road intersection to demonstrate the adequate sight distance

include a turning path analysis drawings

traffic analysis for fire truck navigation

traffic conditions on and off site during construction

Ms. Peek just received from Ken Wersted regarding the Schunnemunk project proposed additional lots, property already included one resident and proposed 2 additional building lots, so with the DG realty subdivision 15 units there would be a net increase of 16 units also indicated that the future no build included 21 units in the analysis for 208 Business Center. So this answers the earlier question if the 4 or 5 units in the village were included and the answer would be yes for 3 units total

Chairwoman Franson there is also a potential for 3 lots on the other side of the road, where I believe an application was submitted to the village and since withdrawn Ms. Peek we will get more details regarding that and get back to the board

Member Czerwinski there was no source data just some data figured out or was there any secondary evidence on it

Chairwoman Franson so the study they relied on is the Rt. 208 Business Center, which is the proposed shopping center over by the Mobil.

Mr. Queenan concurred it was the 208 Business Center

Mr. Queenan I am going to defer to our traffic consultant but I do have one question on # 6 as it can trigger a lot more work than what we have already done, if we could discuss that tonight

Member Vaccaro is there a minimum distance that an intersection can be from a traffic light? My other question is in regards to queuing on proposed street thinking about buses trying to make a left turn on to Forest and was that considered?

Mr. Auld no standard distance NYS DOT weigh in when 2 driveways adjacent to each other restricting turning in and out of driveway to one way during peak hours

Chairwoman Franson lets go on to comment # 6 at this point the applicants engineer has not provided a level of service analysis

Mr. Queenan yes there is a level of service A & B provided from Creighton Manning
Chairwoman Franson addresses Mr. Auld can you explain the 100 peak hour trips and not doing a quantified analysis and what that means?

Mr. Auld future quantified analysis is considered to be a typical complete traffic study. Example with regards to NYS DOT typically a quantified traffic study would fully assess existing conditions, future conditions without the proposed project and future conditions with the proposed project, and a safety analysis and possible traffic assessment due to the potential low volumes projected by the proposed project as it stands right now this would not appear to require a full quantified analysis. The traffic assessment looking at projected essentially provided basic conclusions. Depending on the actual threshold a more quantified traffic study would include some of the other elements including full assessment of existing conditions, a full existence assessment of existing conditions without and then with the proposed project they did provide basic analysis to draw conclusions from.

Chairwoman Franson so basic analysis meaning they did an LOS for the intersection, but basically took into account the existing conditions and then the number of trips they were adding to it.

Mr. Auld typically a quantified analysis you would assess the project site driveway and other adjacent intersections especially on major signalized intersections which was not the case for this traffic assessment, so there was no analysis done for Schunnemunk and Main Street which is why we are asking for additional information not just for the queuing but because it wasn't analyzed as part of the study.

Chairwoman Franson so what you are stating in # 6 is that we can still get an understanding of mitigations or improvements that may be necessary without having to do a full-blown quantified analysis.

Mr. Queenan I would agree with Mr. Auld except our project was included with the 208 Business Center analysis, that is why we are using the 208 analysis and then doing a site specific study for the driveway.

Open discussion in regards to the data that has been provided and what still might be needed as far as the traffic. The information for the surrounding projects has been included just need to be filtered out if the board is willing to accept the data currently provided by Creighton Manning.

Is the Creighton Manning data acceptable to the board?

Member Manson reviewed 208 Business Center traffic study is very applicable to this proposed project - queuing will go past the street a minimal amount of time maybe 15%. In the discussion there seems an assumption in what we are reading that the preponderance of the trips off this street are going to go into this intersection. The residents will learn to go other ways.

Member Vaccaro just want to make sure the study realized that there is only one access road to this site

Member McQuade - I thought there was something with reconfiguring the road at the intersection of 208 were North Main and Schunnemunk connect

Chairwoman Franson that depends on the approval of projects in the area

continued discussion of the traffic in the area.

Chairwoman Franson currently not looking for a full-blown quantified analysis but the data to be provided to AKRF so they can understand and recommend mitigations

Mr. Arnott - comments:

regarding bulk table steep slope in some of the lots #3&7 have additional steep slopes not accounted for need to get that clarified

Mr. Queenan are you looking at existing or proposed Mr. Arnott - proposed

SWPPP revised one was submitted dated August 25th need some clarification regarding pre-development drainage areas and time of concentrations. Most of the drainage is coming down to that one reserved easement area on lot one which what's there is protecting the proposed roadway connecting to the village the SWPPP takes into account an underground sand filter as well as additional storage in that area, however the proposed detail only shows proposed storage so the sand filter and the SWPPP are taking into account 75% or more of the water quality treatment so that needs to be added into the detail

how the proposed additional drainage quantity will be addressed with the proposed village subdivision and proposed stormwater mitigation.

Applicant should confirm how the outlet of the proposed drainage will be handled in the Village.

In regards to erosion and sediment control plan:

the applicant has not included any mitigation for sediment control aside from the silt fence - might consider utilizing a sediment trap

should include detail for fence to identify limits of disturbance

limits of disturbance does not include proposed plantings on site

as recommended by NYS Blue book check dams should be utilized within the temporary diversion soils

typical stock pile detail should be updated to include silt fence installation completely encompassing the stock piles

the cut sheet/model number should be included for the streetlight at the end of the cul-de-sac applicant submitted hydrogeologic report for the well testing performed, board should receive comments from Town's Hydrogeologist

spoke in detail on traffic

should discuss with the board the letter from the village of Monroe regarding the dedication of the proposed "Village Roadway"

outside agency approvals board should be aware of OCDOH major subdivision approval & NYSDEC approval for sewer main

Ms. Torre - comments:

at the last meeting the board authorized me to write a letter to the village asking whether they intended to accept dedication of the road for the 310 Schunnemunk subdivision they wrote back and said that the road is not currently shown to spec for a village road, it had to do with the cul-de-sac or the whole specifications, I did receive today a letter from the applicant's attorney Mr. Myrow and he indicates that they're are not going to be proposing that as a

cul-de-sac they are going to be looking to have a through road connecting with what they would seek to be a Town Road which is this subdivision. Not sure if this is a question for Mr. Queenan or Mr. Myrow if you are going to be submitting something to modify that roadway as I understand they can't accept dedication as the road is.

Mr. Queenan responded as Mr. Myrow is handling that for now. All I can tell you is what we have been told from the beginning and through the minutes of the Village planning board the road was designed as a temporary cul-de-sac that's why it's not a full cul-de-sac it's in the minutes that it was going to be in the future most likely extended and that is reason not a full cul-de-sac there it's a temporary cul-de-sac notes on the plans. I didn't do the plans, I wasn't part of the village approval process but the minutes it's to be a public street with a temporary cul-de-sac for a turnaround until such time that it is extended into the town.

Ms. Torre I will reach out to Mr. Myrow and see where things stand, because access as the board knows it's one of those important threshold issues you need to make sure there's adequate access just like water and sewer.

Chairwoman Franson my comment is if both subdivisions were processed together I don't know that we would have some of these issues. I think that there was segmentation and the reason I say that is because to be able to get an approval from that planning board you had to show a cul-de-sac because at that point in time it wasn't going to be extended, so that was assuming access to two lots the cul-de-sac didn't meet the specifications because it was arguable temporary, but if it had been designed the way it was supposed to be designed in accordance with the village specifications initially would you have been able to get 2 lots.

Mr. Queenan I think it was also a function of our application seeking access. We were originally looking at the O & R Easement for our 50 ft right of way, we tried combining with subdivision next door and we just ended up going in that direction.

Chairwoman Franson ultimately whatever is happening in the village has to get resolved as it creates complications for how the town addresses a private road going to a potentially a public road

Mr. Queenan Mr. Myrow is working on that with the village and seeing if any other avenues available

Ms. Torre make sure Mr. Myrow is including the town board

Ms. Torre continues her comments:

property owned by different owner - Premier Circle LLC new owner endorsement paperwork needs to be submitted

SEQRA

SHPO approval needs to be submitted

SWPPP regarding drainage into Schunnemunk

the board previously requested with the visual analysis some kind of narrative with the DEC methodology and Heritage Trail

Spoke with county attorney about the sewer comment and they confirmed that if you not in the Moodna basin and if your in the sewer district then it is not an issue, they will be including on all applications

Mr. Queenan we are in sewer district # 1 and they have issued a technical approval and we did submit to DEC awaiting that approval

Natural Heritage program letter - Mr. Queenan checking
waiting on comments from Ms. Arent on landscaping
tree plan - sheet 10 should be part of the tree plan and that is the sheet to list the number of trees being removed and the new ones being planted
tree plan needs to show the limits of disturbance and the buffer zone around the tree stands to be protected

Chairwoman Franson did you submit the archaeological? Mr. Queenan we did a Phase 1 A with Tracker and we recently got the letter back from SHPO giving the sign off - please submit

Action, Discussion: 2.2 **Yoel Shtosel**- Arch (0194-2021) SBL # 1-1-87 501 Rt 208

Joel Mann Brach and Mann

some small items still being worked on at my office

Mr. Arnott Mr. Mann's office responded to my comments today and I submitted back. Spoke with Mr. Rosenberg he is working on the last few minor items. Condition of the proposed resolution is to satisfy the open items and my final review.

Ms. Torre main item was the sign color and I also spoke with Mr. Rosenberg now in the materials is the paint colors for the different signs. Making the material list and the paint color list numbers all match needs an updated revised date. Last page question on the blue color need to make sure it is the same and labeled correctly.

Discussion on the colors making sure they match each other and the numbers on the list are correct.

Member Manson question for clarification a couple of meetings ago I asked for the materials

list to delineate between existing elements or new elements in particular the siding, is all the siding going to be replaced on the entire building.

Mr. Mann a portion of the siding is there and we are going to keep the same colors. If the color is remaining the same as the current siding then it is staying otherwise being replaced.

Member Manson there is one area of damaged siding and some areas of discolored siding we want to ensure everything looks uniformly new and fresh when this is complete.

the back door has been reinstalled per the building inspector for an emergency exit make sure it matches what is on the renderings

reviewed the resolution for any changes from the last meeting

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to approve the resolution prepared by attorney subject to the modifications recommended this evening.

Motion by Pat Shea, second by Lisa McQuade.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jason Czerwinski, Pat Shea

Nay: Jeff Manson

Action, Discussion: 2.3 **Meadow Hill** (0169-2018) SBL # 37-1-1 Lakes Road

James Rugnetta from Pietrzak & Pfau

last time here was July 20 since then we've added a 50 foot parcel to be dedicated to the Appalachian Trail located on the left side of the property off towards the conservation area added 100 foot buffer area that was recommended

looking to schedule public hearing

also if the board could refer us to the DOH so we can get soil testing done

Mr. Arnott comments

some confusion letter and plans showing zone as SR20 - Town code is RR1 which affects bulk regulations

50 foot parcel A - entity of who land will be dedicated to

whoever is accepting the dedicated land are they ok with location

DPW ok with locations of driveways

modifications to landscaping within the scenic road buffer - once DPW okay proposed

modifications we can refer to boards landscape architect for review

no water or sewer to serve property, but important to note on the plan where electric will be brought into the property - see utility lines gas & electric
some of vegetation to be cleared for sight distances for lots 1 & 2 the southwestern most lots, doesn't note actual locations of trees and if being trimmed
there is a odd jog in the right-of-way where the proposed roadway connection is the 25-foot buffer it should be from the right of way and it's not
you'll need preliminary approval with the DOH for wells and septic
SWPPP will need to be prepared since over 2 acres of disturbance
not sure if water quality and quantity mitigation is needed there is a clause in the SWPPP that residential lots that disturb less than 25% of the overall lot can utilize erosion sediment control
you will need to gain coverage underneath the stormwater general permit
revised EAF was requested last time

Chairwoman Franson - we wanted open space to be associated within one lot, this kind of splits it among lots, reason for keeping to one lot it makes less of an encroachment from multiple owners.

Ms. Torre it was addressed September 12, 2019

Chairwoman Franson consolidate the conservation easement as well for the same issues

Ms. Torre - comments

regarding SEQRA the board declared intent to be lead agency in 2019
assumed lead agency yet you could do that but need revised EAF that reflects current proposal

not sure if additional agencies added with the Appalachian trail for example if NYS/NJ trail conference if it's a governmental agency they would have to be added and if they accept ownership or dedication of that parcel, would need to recirculate to them
again need revised EAF to continue SEQRA

Zoning RR1 bulk table needs to be revised - show in bulk table whatever is being proposed
the cluster subdivision regulations doesn't allow the board to vary the lot width requirement or the lot coverage for single family homes

Chairwoman Franson do we have a calculation of the open space area - is it 50%?

Mr. Rugnetta yes I believe it is over 50%, total acreage of the parcels is 13 acres and the conservation easement is 9 acres so that comes out to over 50%

Ms. Torre continues

Note # 14 on the plans if you could modify that to specify that the disturbance for the individual driveways is as approved by the planning board on the final plat
add a note regarding the required maintenance of structures and preservation of vegetation in the scenic buffer

map note # 15 needs to affirmatively say no further subdivision is allowed because this is a cluster subdivision

you added the house relocation notes but you should have a table showing the square footage and the number of bedrooms for each home because house relocation notes are tied to the square footage and bedroom count

tree plan needs to be updated including complying with the tree preservation law

Member Manson I would like to know the purpose of the land being preserved for the Appalachian trail is.

Mr. Rugnetta during our review of the other Meadow Hill subdivision in the Town of Chester the board there was a question where the Appalachian trail wanted to extend to Camp Monroe and this give them access instead of going all along Lakes Road. So there is a 50 foot wide parcel on this project and the other project that can connect to the Camp Monroe site

Ms. Torre the applicant asked for the public hearing to be set, SEQRA needs to be completed first, still some information needed before you can make a determination of significance, you can do some of the soil testing to satisfy the town planning board from a SEQRA perspective and get the conceptual satisfaction here and then a determination of significance followed by preliminary and then go and formally get soil for the testing with the county.

Mr. Rugnetta that has already been done and we show that on page 7 soils testing for each of the lots

Chairwoman Franson what is status as far as jurisdictional determination for ACOE? Mr. Tompkins went out for that and reviewed it an updated by his comments

Mr. Rugnetta we are working with North Country on that

Mr. Arnott Mr. Getchell did review the proposed well testing since the town code requires well testing 1 for each 5 lots. So he okayed the proposed procedure for the testing with one exception he suggested that the perfluorinated chemicals PFAS and f foam be tested for which at this point the applicant is objecting. So Mr. Getchell is asking the boards opinion on that testing. It is not required by OCH or NYSHD

Chairwoman Franson feels the applicant run the perfluorinated test

Chairwoman Franson consider pushing back the houses on lots 1 & 2 to give more of a front yard off Lakes Road and the buffer

open talk about the land for the Appalachian Trail

get us a copy of the latest plan set of the property going on in Chester.

superimpose both subdivisions onto one plan would be great

Action, Discussion: 2.4 **Pallotti Village** (0196-2021) SBL # 33-1-1.21 98 Harriman Heights Road

Michael Morgante Arden Consulting - PE

updated site plan

updated bedroom count

shifted some of the buildings

updated EAF

submitted a habitat study

traffic study

Creighton Manning has been speaking with OCDPW waiting letter from them

not requiring us to do a traffic study we have less than 100 trips which is the threshold for requiring a traffic study

provided information from our hydrogeologist reviewed wells on site not sure how being used as of yet, took a look at the fracture trace analysis to see if any fractures

Mr. Arnott Comments:

town recently adopted the Conservation Cluster of Residential Floating Zone (CCR)

this application has been before the Town board to "land" the zone

the Town board deferred the applicant to the Planning Board for SEQRA review

applicant submitted hydrogeologist letter - should it go to Frank Getchell for review

NYS DOH will have to accept those sources for public water supply

there will be 2 separate water systems one for each side of the road

the applicant submitted expired SPDES permits for the 2 existing sanitary sewer treatment

plants. The applicant will need either new SPDES permits or have the old ones reinstated by NYSDEC permits expanded

endangered species - refer to DEC for comments

of wetlands on site including wetland buffers disturbances I understand they are ACOE has jurisdictional determination been issued

Mr. Morgante we are still working on the ACOE to come out for the jurisdictional

determination, we have had the NYS DEC wetlands validated, the site over the years has had several delineations the wetlands on the northern side indeed are ACOE wetlands.

Mr. Arnott are there maps validating this wetlands correctly.

back to Mr. Arnott comments:

there is a number of disturbances to the 100 foot buffers that the town of Monroe regulates. Mr. Morgante even though shown in the 100 foot buffers this was the original development there was housing there so the site pads already exist within the 100 foot buffer site's literally set up for development in that spot

Mr. Arnott one of my concerns behind the apartments there's significant amount of parking proposed on a steep slope within the buffer

SWPPP needs to be prepared

reminder there are a number of design requirements and guidelines within the conservation cluster section of the zoning code

Ms. Torre comments:

declared intent to be lead agency circulation was completed

tonight the board can assume lead agency status

SEQRA main things to address

the board needs to decide on the outside consultants needed for this project

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby assume lead agency status for this proposed action.

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

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea

Absent: John Allegro

Chairwoman Franson at our next meeting we go through the part 2 of EAF so that we can narrow down what we think might be potential impacts

Hydrogeologist - Frank Getchell

wetland and ecological - Dave Tompkins

landscape - Karen Arent

AKRF - Traffic study

roads to include in traffic study Harriman Heights road and orange turnpike

do part 2 EAF

SWPPP

in terms of density maxing out what can happen on the whole site taking into account any other activities there

big area behind senior area open space?

Mr. Morgante there is a calculation on the master development plan and it is maxed out at 170

we have 89+ acres we get half a unit per acre so that is where the 178 units comes from that's including the land still being used by the sisters kind of connected to the project
Chairman Franson there is a big area behind where the senior development would go that's basically open space is there a conservation easement
Mr. Morgante that is all a NYS DEC wetland back there and a buffer so I believe the conservation code calls for 60 or 65 % open space and this plan is providing a little over that like 67-68%

Ms. Torre the code says 65 % of the total gross area has to be preserved as open space subject to conservation easement in favor of the Town of Monroe and or acceptable alternative land trust or dedication to the Town of Monroe County of Orange or State of New York as parkland dedication. Then it prioritizes the area to be preserved.

Mr. Arnott one more item in regards to the water system and the sewer systems who is going to own and maintain.

Mr. Morgante there is no decision on this as of yet.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to retain the following outside consultants to assist with the Pallotti Village project Westin & Sampson, CHA, AKRF, Karen Arent

Motion by Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, second by Jason Czerwinski.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea

Absent: John Allegro

3. Minutes

Action, Discussion: 3.1 **July 20, 2021**

no quorum

Action, Discussion: 3.2 **August 12, 2021**

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby approves the August 12, 2021 minutes.

Motion by Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, second by Anthony Vaccaro.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jason Czerwinski, Pat Shea

Abstain: Jeff Manson

Action, Discussion: 3.3 **August 17, 2021**

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby approves the August 17, 2021 minutes.

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

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea

Abstain: Jason Czerwinski

Action, Discussion: 3.4 **September 9, 2021**

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby approves the September 9, 2021 minutes.

Motion by Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, second by Jason Czerwinski.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson

Abstain: Pat Shea

4. Adjournment

Action, Discussion: 4.1 **Adjourn Meeting**

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby adjourns the meeting.

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

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea

Absent: John Allegro