

Town of Monroe Planning Board Workshop Meeting MINUTES

— 01/09/2020

Town of Monroe Planning Board Workshop Meeting (Thursday, January 9, 2020)

Generated by Norinne McSweeney

Members present

Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson, John Allegro

Members Absent

Bonnie Franson

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. Appointments

Action, Discussion: 2.1 Acting Chairman

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby appoints Jeff Manson as Acting Chairperson in the absence of the current Chairwoman during the year of 2020.

Motion by Jason Czerwinski, second by Anthony Vaccaro.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Jason Czerwinski, John Allegro

Abstain: Jeff Manson

Action: 2.2 Planning Board Attorney

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby appoints Burke, Miele, Golden & Naughton, LLP as the Planning Board attorney for 2020.

Motion by Lisa McQuade, second by Jason Czerwinski.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson, John Allegro

Action, Discussion: **2.3 Planning Board Engineer**

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby appoints McGoey Hauser & Edsall Consulting Engineers as the Planning Board Engineer for 2020.

Motion by John Allegro, second by Jason Czerwinski.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson, John Allegro

3. Approval

Action, Discussion: **3.1 Approve 2020 Planning Board Meeting Schedule and Tech Review Schedule**

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby approves the 2020 Planning Board Meeting Schedule and Technical Review Schedule.

Motion by Jason Czerwinski, second by Anthony Vaccaro.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson, John Allegro

4. New Projects

Discussion: **4.1 Yoel Shtosel** 501 RT 208 (0183-2020) SBL # 1-1-87

Yoel Shtosel - owner

ARB

before the board for ARB for removal of windows
have permit from building department to work on interior of building
during inspection it was noted the windows were removed not part of the original plan
adding a ramp to the second floor

landscaping - eventually

lighting - eventually

llc paperwork needs to be corrected

signage for the building - nothing decided yet

Mr. Arnott review

just received plans this evening thought here for ARB review

would like to see details stripping and handicap parking spot

Springtime new paving

Ms. Torre

purposes of SEQRA Type II action

requires referral to OCDP 500 ft of T/ Blooming Grove boundary

question for applicant was this previously a medical building?

Mr. Shtosel response just an office building

Ms. Torre reason for question need to verify if change of use

Ms. Torre are you adding additional parking

Mr. Shtosel no have over 40 spaces now ok with Building Inspector

add sign information to the plan

Mr. Shtosel making sign to meet code regulations

entity disclosure needs to be filled out with LLC information

applicant needs for next submittal

GML review

Town Tree code

LLC Paperwork fixed (Entity Disclosure)

landscaping plan

ARB

signage plans

lighting plans

plans with no windows

5. Returning Projects

Action, Discussion: 5.1 **HBP Lot 4B-Outside Area** (0181-2019) SBL # 2-1-34.2

George Lithco Jacobowitz & Gubits attorney for the project

Christian Greene - RD Management

Nate Burns - Langan Engineering

Mr. Lithco reviewed where the project stands

from last meeting we were to provide consents from the sewer and Village of Harriman

sewer district does have an easement there they do consent I provided that to your engineer, attorney and Norinne

Village of Harriman sent a letter even though it is only a service line that is located in that area

Questions of signage on the building has yet to be decided

the first set of plans submitted in September shows a design for a sign

further discussion on signage when there is an actual tenant

discussion of tenant option items could be done without further ado, we would submit if

substantial changes by the tenant requested
maximum occupancy was discussed and how it was calculated
asked to look at parking issue and asked to memorialize it in a table
proposed conditions hoping to have a resolution

Mr. Burns reviewed what changes were made on the plans
included a project narrative on recent submittal
first revision potential facade signage
showed actual 70 seats within seating area
area for fire pit has been noted - if not constructed will be a continuation of the pavers around it
cafe tables have been removed from the non tenant space and added benches
we added a note to the lawn area with the tenant space, for that space to be decorative gravel as opposed to lawn or vice versa
we added note to the outdoor patio notes that the tenant should provide an occupancy plan for outdoor seating to the code enforcement officer
added that surface improvements within tenant area shouldn't be able to change without prior planning board approval
added note for revised calculation for parking associated with the outdoor area - few adjustments since then have a memorandum
proposed lighting for the ballard has been revised to 2700 degrees kelvin

Mr. Arnott
improvements should be easily removed and reinstalled should there be necessary utility work
note saying were existing trees are being relocated to - will be discussing with the EAC

Ms. Torre
have you had any discussions with the EAC yet
parking calculations
still waiting for the County GML - if the 30 days has passed then this board has jurisdiction to take action you don't have to wait for the letter

Acting Chairman Manson prior to going over any of the changes that have been discussed in the plans with the landscaping any comments or questions from the board
Member McQuade what kind of flammable substance would it be - is this something we should be concerned with for safety
Mr. Burns it is just an option if the tenant wants it, would be reviewed under the building permit and any additional restrictions at that point would be added, most likely a propane fire pit
Member McQuade questions no door in the front only on the side
Mr. Lithco response was small area and plans for seating inside the space would be utilized

Ms. Torre that would be a building code issue and to make sure there was proper fire and safety issues addressed

Acting Chairman Manson when we were reviewing this with the architect as this is a small space off a larger space they have converted the frontage of this space onto the patio area

Mr. Lithco had a couple of conditions to review (see attached)

1 recites the plans

2 notes that tenant options may change when a specific tenant is selected

3 memorializes the maximum outside tenant area and occupancy limit, and allow BI to permit accessory patron amenities

4 sets out my understanding of Mark's suggestion to have the outside patio occupancy plan reviewed by the BI

5 is a holdover from the ABE resolution

6 in an abundance of caution, it requires contractor to mark out the water and sewer lines before starting outside work

7 is a holdover from the ABE resolution

8 is a holdover from the ABE resolution

9 memorializes the parking determination. Langan is providing the parking table requested at the December meeting, but I believe the table will be consistent .

#10 is a holdover from the ABE resolution

Acting Chairman Manson - Board any feedback on proposed conditions

Acting Chairman Manson I have a question on # 6 in marking the water & sewer lines as the Building Inspector directs are they marked out for construction to take place or marked out in a permanent fashion

Mr. Lithco I was thinking construction but it make sense to make it a more permanent marker

Acting Chairman Manson I was looking at the lighting plans what is the maximum foot candles within the area that's lit by the ballards

Mr. Burns not included on plans as they give off very minimal lighting professional guess 1 1/2 -2 foot candles max

Ms. Torre I have started a resolution I will continue and work with these proposed conditions
Action, Discussion: 5.2 **Berchtold** (0178-2019) SBL # 28-4-8 84 Circle Dr

Caleb Pavelski P&P

Cliff Berchtold property owner

just under 16 acres of property in the OSR-3 Zone

client proposing a 2 lot subdivision - already 2 existing homes on the property and they share

a driveway coming in
we are proposing to have a smaller lot for the one existing home and the balance with the main house
no proposed construction of any type on this property
Last before the board in September minor comments
add the wetlands and include a note any future construction would require a full wet land delineation
from there we were sent to the Zoning Board

we were before the ZBA and the variances were granted for net lot area, lot width, rear yard and lot coverage
GML review local determination
ZBA had a public hearing one resident came strictly to see if any development was being proposed on the smaller lot connected to their property

We are here hoping to receive final approval tonight

Ms. Torre quickly no because this is a subdivision you do need a public hearing
SEQRA unlisted action and the board is doing an uncoordinated review the applicant submitted part 1 of an EAF and the board has to complete part 2
not sure if the board wants to review the questions or have me prepare and make any necessary changes at that time
Acting Chairman Manson this is the first time we are getting to this point, addressed the board as to how they want to handle part 2 of an EAF
Ms. Torre will prepare part 2 for review at the January 21, 2020 meeting after which a public hearing can be set
Ms. Torre application needs to be classified as a minor subdivision
Ms. Torre on the plans general note 3 can you mention a portion of the parcel is located in the ridge line protection overlay
common driveway easement and maintenance agreement - pre existing non conformance action

Mr. Arnott
bulk table lot one still shows greater than 10% - Caleb that's a typo
added wetland note
house relocation note added
waive well test requirements - already existing homes should be appropriate
Per Mr. Edsall note be added that any further subdivision of lot 1 (the bigger lot) should require a private road way or driveway to lot 1
waive topography if so choose

open conversation among the board about whether to test the well water or to waive the testing

Ms. Torre well testing deals with quantity not quality is what you would be waiving decision put off until the next meeting

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to designate this 2 lot proposed subdivision as a minor subdivision.

Motion by Jason Czerwinski, second by John Allegro.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson, John Allegro

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby waives the Topography on plans.

Motion by John Allegro, second by Jason Czerwinski.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson, John Allegro

Discussion: 5.3 **81 Raywood Dr** (0176-2019) SBL # 43-1-11

Joel Mann representing application

Larry Torro Engineer

last time before the board had multiple options to look at, decided on this one 3 lot subdivision main issue was frontage on a main road

right-away existed but extending that right-away so that all 3 lots would have road frontage changed to single family residences took away concept of duplex

Acting Chairman Manson do we have clarification from the Building Inspector regarding the back lots

Ms. Torre he has been contacted and is waiting to see the new submittal before making decision

Mr. Mann we were also waiting to hear back from the Highway Superintendent regarding the extension of the road

Ms. Torre your cover letter says you were submitting to the Highway Superintendent

Mr. Arnott

lot 3 on the average of the front and rear yard width don't meet the 150 ft
re number the pages

2 notes on sheet 2 lower note not necessary upper note to right should be confirmed by the

building inspector the the unroof deck is not part of the building

6. Miscellaneous Items

Action, Discussion: 6.1 V/Monroe Lead Agency Notice - 208 Business Center Site Plan

Member Czerwinski addressed the Board that he is an alternate Board Member for the Village of Monroe ZBA and he will recusing himself from any discussion with the Town of Monroe Planning Board regarding this application.

Acting Chairman Manson I need clarification on this because we are an involved party do we also have the opportunity to declare ourselves as lead agency

Ms. Torre so the board can object to their intent to be lead agency for the project if you wanted to be lead agency you have 30 days from when you received the letter. This Board is an involved agency because there is a portion of a drainage pipe that will be located on land in the Town so that will require site plan approval and is also looks like it's going to require a wetlands permit, they don't have that in their notice, but we should reach out to them and let them know that's another approval that is going to be required. Primarily the development is in the Village of Monroe.

Acting Chairman Manson what does it mean if we let them be lead agency

Ms. Torre you will get copies of all submissions and everything, can comment on any environmental impact statements, the board will be kept aware of all that Action, Discussion: 6.2 Cell Tower Project before ZBA

Acting Chairman Manson reviewed that the Town Boards both Planning and ZBA have received an application from Verizon regarding a new cell tower he explained it is before the ZBA currently and that there is a time frame on how this application needs to be handled.

Asked Ms. Torre to explain

Ms. Torre this is a federal law the Telecommunications Act and it requires an application like this which is for a new cell tower it would require action to be taken within 150 days of when the application is complete. As of right now the application is not complete because they have not submitted a formal planning board application but also various things missing from what they submitted that you would require as a Planning Board such as a visual analysis . The shot clock again is 150 days period for this board or the ZBA to take action on the application, doesn't start to run until the application is complete. Need to notify the applicant as to what is missing and what is needed to make the application complete. that way they can submit a complete application. It is a unique type of application and I do highly recommend that the board hire a wireless engineer as a consultant to assist .

Ms. McSweeney explained that the ZBA has not had the opportunity to review it at this point.

7. Minutes

8. Adjournment

Action: 8.1 Adjourn Meeting

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby adjourns tonight's meeting at 9:15 pm.

Motion by Jason Czerwinski, second by Lisa McQuade.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson, John Allegro