

Town of Monroe Planning Board Workshop Meeting MINUTES

— 02/13/2025

Town of Monroe Planning Board Workshop Meeting (Thursday, February 13, 2025)

Generated by Norinne McSweeney

Draft

Members Present:

Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Pat Shea, J Louis Rivera, Robert Garstak

Members Absent:

Jeff Manson

Dylan Penn

Board Counsel:

Ashley Torre, Esq.

Shawn Arnott, 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 Farms** (0201-2022) SBL # 29-1-2.52 Intersection of Lakes Rd & Camp Monroe

Applicant Representative:

Mark Siemers - Pietrzak & Pfau

Mr. Siemers reviewed:

- for this evening we submitted a revised amended subdivision design plan set
- the plan set reflects the revised design to match the amended layout as well as showing the updated wetland delineation
- also submitted a wetland comparison plan which shows the newly delineated wetlands versus previously delineated wetlands
- submitted an updated storm water pollution prevention plan which now matched the revised project layout
- submitted a letter from Jon Dahlgren from Tim Miller Associates which is updating the board on the SEQRA Consistency Analysis

- summary on letter wetlands have been re-delineated and located on site, Dave Tomkins visited site and walked the site with Steve Marino from Tim Miller Associates,
- during the field work in 2024 and the re-delineation is now shown on the plans this is being compared to the old delineation and all the other work is being completed by TMA and will be submitted for the March Planning Board
- tonight we wanted to come back in front of the Planning Board and give you an update on where we are with the project and answer any questions to keep moving forward

Chairwoman Franson - asked regarding a report on the wetlands which will be provided in March from Tim Miller Associates, as she is interested in seeing why some of these shrank to the extent that they did or is the re-delineation because this is what is believed to be jurisdictional or they actually shrank in size. Another question for Ms. Torre how do the new regulations from NYSDEC come into play for this particular site or if they're exempt.

Mr. Arnott - it is not within the urban area, it's just outside and it didn't appear to have any of the 11 criteria so I don't believe it's under jurisdiction, but the board can ask for jurisdictional determination.

Mr. Arnott comments:

- the applicant is still working on some of my older comments don't have many new ones
- one of the comments I want to bring up is during the site walk I had brought it up plus in my last round of comments about potentially moving a portion of the road because it could be significantly less grading
- we do have the SWPPP and that is under review
- I was going to suggest Dave Tompkins visit the site and confirm the wetland flags, but lets wait until the report comes in from Tim Miller Associates and we'll refer the delineation and the report to Mr. Tompkins

Mr. Siemers - we appreciate your comment on the road and understand where it's coming from, but it's my understanding that nothing on the layout changing based on what was stipulated in the agreement

Open conversation with regards to the updated regulations of the DEC in regards to the Wetlands. Looking at the current site noticed two little areas that are showing up as informational freshwater Wetland mapping, they also have included Wetland soils, which cover a part of the site and then of course there's the NWI they're not significant large areas, but the question is if not exempt then there's 100 foot jurisdictional area around them if DEC decides to. I think it's up to the applicant to make the case that if you think you're exempt because it was previously approved. The exemption language isn't entirely clear but, I think it is a case to make to the DEC as this is all new to us.

What we're talking about folks is that the New York State DEC has passed regulations to update the freshwater wetlands regulations and they're no longer mapped they're still 12.4 acres in size but they're not mapped, but then in addition there are these Wetlands of unusual importance and if any of them meet 11 criteria it can be considered a wetland that's regulated by the New York State DEC one of the criteria is called whether the Wetland is in an area that's a census urban area and (showing map on large screen if you see this map here).

Ms. Torre Comments:

- the plans currently identify the old zoning districts and I know this is pursuant to the stipulation it's subject to the old zoning but the plan should reflect the current zoning districts
- there should be an explanatory note explaining the distinction for the bulk table
- add the dimensions the required and proposed for commercial lot E
- on the first sheet you have a Wetland disturbance table if you could add a column indicating the Wetland buffer disturbance. Not indicated if the column for wetland disturbance is meant to Encompass that or not but if you could break it out I think they're all local Wetland disturbances but whether it's to the local Wetland itself or to the buffer just to make that clear
- still have points from June 20, 2023 not yet completed please review for your next SEQRA submission

Chairwoman Franson -

- my comments are related to the wetland report and perhaps prepare a narrative indicating sort of what changed
- make sure they did a Town of Monroe Wetland delineation

Action, Discussion: 2.2 **Lands of Leva** (0230-2024) SBL # 21-2-12 Crnr of Stevens Ct & Rye Hill Rd, Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative:

Mark Siemers - Pietrzak & Pfau

Chairwoman Franson - there is a cluster plan, conservation plan and a conventional plan which would you like on the screen

Ms. Torre - lets start with the conventional plan you need to have that zone and compliant

Mr. Arnott comments:

- standard comment for all plans need the number of proposed bedrooms for each dwelling on the plans plus the number of existing bedrooms for the existing dwelling
- note regarding conventional had significantly more impervious area than the cluster, that could be a consideration for the board between conventional and cluster

- lot 2 utilizing shared access way along Steven Court based on Town Road Code that would create a private road that would need a turnaround, not sure if sufficient land under control by the applicant to create said private road
- not sure lot 2 would work as currently configured
- no front yard setback on lot 2

Chairwoman Franson - some of there look like flag lots or rear dwellings, need to verify if they meet lot frontage requirements under zoning

Mr. Siemers - submission was copied to the Building Inspector and Highway Superintendent so hopefully they will give a determination regarding rear lots

Ms. Torre - unless it is requested they don't normally submit a determination.

Spoke about the area for lot 2 was it a private road or a shared driveway which is permitted. Possibility of one of the lots being landlock needs looking into. Possibility of being part of Phase 1 that was going to be on a road dedicated to the Town, unsure of this was if it was offered to the Town formally and whether it has been accepted or not.

Mr. Arnott - conventional plan review

- there is a wetland to the north of the parent parcel which appears to be in the census of the urban area that could be jurisdictional by the DEC give their recent regulations, this one should be submitted to DEC for their potential jurisdiction.
- in both the conventional and the cluster roadway cul-de-sac limit exceeded which is worsening because of additional driveways off the dead end.
- their opinion that their secondary egress out to Rye Hill that was previously proposed under the first phase to be constructed in the second phase they believe is no longer required at this time either.

Mr. Siemers -that approval just on the basis of it having valid it lapsed that project doesn't exist this is a new project. It's our opinion that the the restrictions and conditions on the phase two approval that lapsed and no longer exists doesn't apply to the new proposed subdivision that has to go through a full new review. Need to come up with solution or path forward that's going to settle this discussion for both parties.

Ms. Torre - it's correct that that approval previously has lapsed but it's essentially seeking approval of the same thing, a little different there would need to be presented to the Planning Board reasoning studies why those conditions would no longer be warranted because they were warranted back then and in order to find a reason why they shouldn't be warranted now I think the big issue is with the cul-de-sac it was proposed previously as a temporary cul-de-sac and as Mr. Arnott noted it doesn't meet zoning or it doesn't meet the subdivision requirements or restrictions in terms of length. Assuming it was approved previously because it was going to be temporary you would have to get around that somehow whether it'd be asking the board

for waivers from the subdivision regulations.

Mr. Siemers - what would the waiver be on though it's an existing cul-de-sac?

Chairwoman Franson - but the cul-de-sac was part of this overall subdivision that was built and it was allowed to be built and exceed the length because it was anticipated this would go all the way around. We have to see where the standard is located and whether we can waive it. We need to communicate with the Highway Superintendent and the Fire Chief in terms of the preferences of the Town and a fire safety perspective.

Chairwoman Franson - based on the conventional how many lots have been proven and which ones are still questionable? The flag lot/rear lot determination has to be made.

Mr. Arnott - lot 2 at this point is the only one not proven to be buildable, the other 4 are. This is based on it being a private road.

A cluster plan has to have 50% open space available. There is a loop that goes down to Rye Hill Road which would all be open space and then 5 houses coming off the cul-de-sac. Rear dwelling can be permitted by the Planning Board in a cluster subdivision.

Mr. Arnott - cluster plan review

- 50% open space

Conservation Plan:

- the applicant did prepare a conservation plan to identify some of the key features of the open space

- there is a shared driveway up top as well as the other driveway for the neighbor to the Northwest that traverses through conservation area. Are those portions of the parcel really conservation?

- does the house at the top of the ridge exceed the height of the ridge. Not clear as the grading isn't done, but it is against the Ridge Line Preservation

Discussion of the previous approved project to current. Mr. Siemers stated there were many different iterations of that plan and originally proposed to bring the road all the way back around and create one big loop and there is also an unimproved right of way that could connect to Steven's Court Extension which has Orange & Rockland Utilities running through it. This area was looked into for making the cul-de-sac a shorter distance but during the public hearing and public feedback both of those connections were removed the public didn't want the improvements going through those roadways. There were many other projects at the time along the Rye Hill corridor including Fini which was an option for a connection as well. Original project was seven new houses with one existing and the current project is four new hoses with the existing one.

Chairwoman Franson from the feedback it looks like we need to settle the conventional plan

that sets forth the maximum number of lots and then from there I guess we make a decision whether cluster or conventional is pursued, can't really focus on a cluster until we know whether conventional works and that's based on some input from highway and looking at the regulations and what's allowed and in terms of rear dwellings and the private road. Also, need to verify with the Highway and Fire district for the layout.

Mr. Arnott 2 more items to mention there will have to be well testing, one well for 5 lots, the existing well could work for the testing. Both subdivisions rely on sewer and a sewer extension through private property is proposed.

Discussed the sewer hook up and that it is part of OCSD # 1

Do a quick check for the Wetland buffer?

Action, Discussion: 2.3 **Monroe Commons** (0182-2020) SBL # 2-1-10 Nininger Road, Monroe NY

Applicant Representative:
Mark Siemers

Mr. Siemers review -

- Town of Woodbury we submitted to them received a letter back will not be on February agenda looking at March
- revised the temporary grading plan and addressed Mr. Arnott's comments to his satisfaction
- we show temporary grading to allow for grading of our site
- with continued grading into Woodbury if we get approval
- it doesn't stop retaining wall
- for informational we prepared a proposed retaining wall, we showed the location would be between the parking lot and the road and the Town/Village line. We had a structural engineer submit a letter showing 3 different types of retaining walls that can be constructed in this area. Also attached to the back of the letter some views of what that retaining wall could look like with sculpted shotcrete on it to make the Planning Board a little more comfortable with an attractive retaining wall.
- shown a temporary grading plan allowing us to go to construction while we pursue the Village of Woodbury.

Further discussion regarding the retaining wall and using the shot-crete material and what it would potentially look like. What the height of the wall is in certain sections, how long total. Doing landscaping around the area of the retaining wall. Plans have been sent to Ms. Arent for review as to where and what type of vegetation to use.

Mr. Fordham - asked about the tree law. Mentioned 1960 trees being removed 240 dead.

These numbers need to be resolved still. Applicant asking to plant bushes versus trees.

Mr. Arnott -

- I agree that there is a viable alternative for the retaining wall as shown I wanted the board to concentrate on whether or not they thought if the retaining wall was to be constructed are they comfortable proceeding with some of the renderings that have been presented or are those completely out. Essentially you would not approve a retaining wall that would look like one of those and I think that's important because if you end up in a scenario where Woodberry does not approve the grading you would have to approve a retaining wall.

Chairwoman Franson - from that perspective some of these don't look like they would be in the Town of Monroe I mean we tend to have grayish Stone you know we don't have brown Stones but that doesn't mean this is about the pattern the color could be different the color could be changed there's dyes that they can put into concrete to make it whatever color you want. Find a better pattern that fits our area.

Ms. Torre - I did prepare a draft resolution for approving the phased grading plan.

Chairwoman Franson - okay so this is the resolution approving the phase grading plan for Monroe Nininger LLC dated February 13, 2025. whereas Monroe Nininger LLC the applicant you have applied for approval of a site plan issuance of a special use permit and local Wetland disturbance permit. Board reviewed said resolution and made adjustments here this evening.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to approve the Phase Grading Plan for Monroe Nininger LLC subject to the revision that our attorney made.

Motion by Pat Shea, second by J Louis Rivera.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Pat Shea, J Louis Rivera, Robert Garstak

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Action, Discussion: 2.4 **Walmart Parking** (0218-2024) SBL # 2-1-31.1 Larkin Drive, Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative:

Jeremy Eanes - Dewberry

Mr. Eanes reviewed the project:

- Walmart proposing 54 total storage containers in the lot during the holiday seasons (not necessarily what will be there trying to be conservative).

- 50 - 20 feet trailers
- 4 - 53 feet trailers
- seasonal items toys, decorations etc. for the holiday season
- time period November 1 - January 15
- 35 trailers were used during 2023 season

Chairwoman Franson - we don't want to see this turn into storage trailers year round. Previous applicant had mentioned other products being sold out of trailers not necessarily seasonal products. Why is this number so high?

Member Garstak is there an inventory of stored products?

Mr. Eanes - Walmart has communicated to us, Dewberry the engineers it's just seasonal items such as toys, Christmas decor, bikes, Etc and that is it against Walmart store policy to store dangerous items such as guns, chemicals, bullets, food Etc in these containers.

- 54 containers are proposed as far as the permit request a total of 35 containers were used during the 2023 Holiday season.

- Walmart anticipates the use of storage containers to be long-term over the years varying in number of containers throughout the year, peeking at holiday season

Ms. Torre - one comment Mr. Arnott and I had talked about this earlier is that Mr. Maldonado had determined for the Target application that those storage units were accessory to the retail use. Given the number it's a lot more than the three proposed for Target, we should ask Mr. Maldonado for a determination as to whether it's still allowed as an accessory to the retail use or it's something different.

Chairwoman Franson - The total number is that including the ones that are proposed in the Village Woodbury. They really shouldn't be shown on our map or they should be shown shaded or in a different color. as we can't approve them.

Mr. Eanes - it was six that spilled over into Village of Woodberry.

Reviewed with Mr. Eanes the locations of the trailers in comparison to Village of Woodbury and the Village of Harriman. Possible try and move all trailers to the Town of Monroe. We need to know from the Building Inspector is it accessory to Walmart, or third party storage. Brought up security issues, fire suppression system we don't have the resources for nor do we collect taxes off of storage containers. Walmart should do a building expansion instead of storage trailers. Need more information as to what is being stored in all the storage containers.

Ms. Torre - the new Walmart application, which you're really going to be reviewing together with this one in terms of SEQRA it is proposing an expansion so whether that you know expansion can be modified to incorporate the additional storage space that's being sought here. They're proposing them both so I assume it's a different purpose, but we'll need to know

that too as you're representing them for that.

Mr. Arnott comments:

- main comment this is going to impinge some parking that was already approved. The parking calculation that was provided is pursuant to Woodbury's code, Monroe's is stricter 150 s/f versus Woodbury's. Would effect parking calculations significantly. Will need to verify the number you are representing.
- secondly you're reducing an already deficient number parking spaces.
- number one have to verify the number of spots that your saying are there
- secondly find out if the board can waive those number of spots or if a variance is needed.
- can the board waive or variance needed
- last time I had brought up the residential dwellings to the back and potential noise and/or screening the applicant responded to that with the storage containers will only be delivered and taken away from the site during the hours of 8 and 6 p.m. as to not disturb the residential properties. My opinion that really doesn't answer the question because it doesn't talk about when they are in operation.
- we dwelled on the fact that it's more than seasonal their Narrative represents November 1st thru January 15th, is sounds more all year. Previously suggested a more long term solution.

Mr. Torre comments -

- as far as SEQRA goes this would be an unlisted action that you would consider together with the building expansion application
- applicant needs to submit a revised EAF that addresses both together
- make sure in the description identifies the correct number and size of storage containers so your prior EAF said 4 - 40 ft trailers not 4 - 53 ft trailers and give the total square footage and total parking that's going to be eliminated in that EAF narrative
- question one of the EAF needs to indicate the other agency approvals that are required so Village of Woodbury, Planning Board, Orange County DPW and possibly the ZBA if parking variance is going to be required.
- latest submission indicated revised narrative but wasn't part of the submission should of been August 28
- identify the square footage for each type of container and then the total square footage of all containers that are proposed
- clarifying the number of in Village of Woodbury if still being proposed or moved to Monroe side
- some pages of application have wrong SBL #
- need owners endorsement completed
- board has architectural review
- referral to OCDP
- classify action as unlisted

approve as unlisted don't send to GML until updated paperwork submitted

Chairwoman Franson - pulled property up on Google Earth to review. Lots of things going on the property need some clarification.

Mr . Eanes - reviewed:

- I will get clarification on the 54 total trailers and if full year or seasonal and if that is the maximum at one time
- find out the storage and what the purpose of that storage is

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to declare intent to be lead agency for the proposed Walmart Storage container application and its building expansion subject to receiving an adequate SEAF and we ask that the attorney put together the notice of intent.

Motion by Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, second by Robert Garstak.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Pat Shea, 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 classify this action as an unlisted action.

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

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Pat Shea, J Louis Rivera, Robert Garstak

Nay: None

Abstain: None

3. New Projects

Action, Discussion: 3.1 **Walmart Expansion** - (0233-2024) SBL # 2-1-31.1 Larkin Dr. Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative:

Jeremy Eanes - Dewberry

Chairwoman Franson - pulled property up on Google Earth to review. Lots of things going on the property need some clarification.

Mr. Eanes - reviewed:

- proposed building expansion of 4402 square feet mainly will be used on line grocery pickup, storage and staging
- increase pick up parking spots to 45 from existing 14
- there will be proposed additional striping and signage updates along the building frontage road to increase safety and maneuverability for pedestrians
- a majority of those signs on the bottom of plans are in the Village of Woodbury so will need approval from them

Mr. Arnott comments:

- applicant provided parking calculation again utilizing the Village of Woodbury requirement
- the Town of Monroe drives the parking requirement up
- need to look at that with the storage container to understand if a variance is needed and/or if the Planning Board can waive the requested number of parking spots to be reduced
- the expansion is proposed over an existing sewer line with a grease interceptor and that is proposed to be moved needs to work with OCSD # 1 as to how the sewer district would like that to be relocated
- review the design calculations for the grease interceptor as they're the owner of the sewer
- Ms. Torre had noted most of signage proposed in Village of Woodbury
- need to add Village of Woodbury and the Town of Monroe line to the plans
- there should be a plan for recoating and striping is going to be
- what are the limits of the seal coating
- comments on the handicapped parking stall one of the sheets included some SWPPP signage installation, it wasn't clear how much disturbance or if the disturbance was going to be over an acre and whether or not SWPPP would be required - need you to drill down on that
- total land disturbance is .42 acres
- comments on lightening and light poles that are supposed to be relocated

Ms. Torre comments:

- SEQRA
- need to be referred to GML once new paperwork in
- plan indicates non-conforming lot coverage it says 75.5% where Max allow is 75% just want to confirm that and figure out how that came to be. Reconfigure lot coverage.
- lot coverage look at findings
- plan showing impervious area - just grass

Member Garstak - purpose of the expansion again?

Mr. Eanes - store expansion of 4400 sq/ft for grocery pick

Chairwoman Franson - will there be refrigeration in there

Mr. Eanes - yes for the groceries. The architect submits that not us.

Mr. Arnott - important to note where the refrigeration units are going to be especially if not roof mounted

Chairwoman Franson - we have Architectural Review Authority so we're going to need to some elevations of what this looks like

Mr. Arnott - I think ground mounted equipment it could impede some of the fire access lane or you know how cars approach the building now

Member Garstak - do have you know where you're adding on the 4500 square feet that you're proposing? Just outside the supermarket end of the store is correct. Don't you think it would be more efficient for them and less taxing on the Town from support perspective that instead of going with 50 odd containers just to expand the building somewhat more to house everything that they're saying is really just because they need the room for it and just keep it inside since it's something they want 100% of the time. These containers aren't going away to just expand the building more if they're going to go into construction it's bound to cost them less to do that construction and have it there than taxing the Town from the perspective of fire and police and so on and so forth and safety for that matter again no fire suppression out there I think that's a concern for me and if they're talking about doing an expansion already why they wouldn't entertain that and just eliminate the other thing altogether.

Mr. Eanes I see exactly what you're saying with the expansion I know they're remodeling the rest of the inside of the store as well possibly making more room for retail area to have to store the items that would be in the containers actually on the sales floor I don't know that exactly that's an architecture question, but in terms of just adding on the store easier said than done in terms of actual buildability.

Member Garstak - I mean I realize it's a lot easier to back a bunch of 20 foot containers back there but that's not easier for us as a Town.

Is there still a need for a sidewalk? Conversation regarding the sidewalk, added concrete, safety for employees and adding some landscaping. Continued talk about how the pick up really works and if the canopy is staying or being removed.

We will need to see architectural renderings.

Action, Discussion: 3.2 **81 Raywood Drive Lot # 3** (0238-2025) SBL # 43-1-11.3 Raywood Drive, Monroe NY

Applicant Representative:

Mr. Gelb - Hartman Design

Aaron Warner - Zarin & Steinmetz, LLC.

Mr. Gelb reviewed the project:

- 2 family dwelling on lot 3 and a recently approved 3 lot subdivision
- we have submitted a site plan, architectural plans and 3D rendering of the front of the building
- we are hear to answer any board questions

Mr. Arnott comments:

- part of the 3 lot subdivision the board approved. This is the furthest one past the end of Raywood Drive located in the back converting to a two family dwelling
- the grading and site plan have been upgraded to include the new footprint of the building
- parking was expanded to include 4 parking spaces
- there was a stormwater pollution prevention plan prepared for the application - need to provide an update SWPPP for the new impervious area
- 1 additional tree to be removed possible 2 more will affect the tree preservation requirements in the code
- possible rear dwelling - portion of building rear dwelling waiting for determination from the Building Inspector
- re: water and sewer - sewer unchanged from the original application - water the Village of Kiryas Joel is providing water with a outside user agreement for all 3 lots needs some updates work with Ms. Torre regarding those
- need updated erosion sediment control plan
- applicant provided architectural plans comments regarding those.
- site plan identifies 5 bedrooms per unit but one unit has 6 bedrooms proposed
- there was a rendering provided but on 8x11 with no colors identified types of finishes. We need a rendering that identifies those finishes with respective colors.

Ms. Torre comments:

- Orange County Records has the property owned by Yanon Mann instead of LLC. Need to provide copy of recorded deed otherwise owners endorsement will be required
- architectural review all the colors
- special use permit - board will have to go through the special use permit criteria
- trees need to know how many being removed and replaced
- exempt from GML
- Type 2 action under SEQRA

Mr. Gelb - Yanon Mann was original owner from previous application. I am here on behalf of the new owner, not sure if finished closing yet I will have to get it clarified.
not sure if new owners have closed on property yet

Chairwoman Franson omments:

- what is considered a basement - is it a basement?

- looking at the stories of the building how much is below grade and is it a basement. It doesn't matter if it is finished or not it matters whether it counts as a story or not. Same thing with the attic as they are showing an unfinished attic.

Mr. Arnott - note to be added to the plans the site plan states "the proposed unfinished basement in each unit shall not be permitted without further approval by the Planning Board and as well as the unfinished attics."

Chairwoman Franson - so my comment isn't necessarily about whether they do or don't use it my comment is whether they meet height and story requirements. If they can be occupied what is the height of this building. I don't recall if we have stories in our regulations or just height.

Continued conversation regarding the basement and the attic and what they are classified as in regards to height and stories. More information needed on the plans in regards to both.

Also details on the type of stairs that will be used for going up into the attic (pull down or regular). Applicant going to add more information to the elevations to show compliance with the height. Spoke about Sprinklers in the attic area a the need to adjust the water agreement with the Village of Kiryas Joel to include the sprinklers and not with portable water.

Mentioned lot coverage and almost at the max if in the future going to need more parking then it is suggested that it be done now and get a variance. Spoke on pervious pavers they are still considered to be included in lot coverage.

4. Minutes

Action Discussion: 4.1 June 13 2024

held over

Action Discussion: 4.2 July 11 2024

held over

Action Discussion: 4.3 September 12 2024

held over

Action Discussion: 4.4 September 17 2024

held over

Action Discussion: 4.5 October 15 2024

held over

Action Discussion: 4.6 November 14 2024

held over

Action Discussion: 4.7 December 12 2024

held over

Action Discussion: 4.8 December 17 2024

held over

Action Discussion: 4.9 January 9 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 this meeting.

Motion by Chairperson - Bonnie Franson second by Pat Shea.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson Pat Shea J Louis Rivera Robert Garstak

Nay: None

Abstain: None

"