

Town of Monroe Planning Board Workshop Meeting MINUTES

— 03/10/2022

Town of Monroe Planning Board Workshop Meeting (Thursday, March 10, 2022)

Generated by Norinne McSweeney

Draft

Members present

Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson, Nicholas Napoli

Members Absent: Pat Shea

2 Vacancies

Consultants:

Rick Golden, 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. Board Members

Discussion: 2.1 **Lisa McQuade** Departure (Jan 2015-March 2022)

3. Returning Projects

Action, Discussion: 3.1 **Dominick Santiago** (0198-2021) SBL # 25-3-8 339 RT 17M

David Niemotko - Niemotko Architects

altered design

mixed use application

retail 1st floor

office 2nd floor

regarding parking in the front yard altered the design to have directional parking around 3 sides of the building and has 24 foot emergency access along front of the building

building footprint and ultimate area square footage is basically the same

received Mr. Arnott's comments had opportunity to review and address them

recent storm issues shows its further evident an underground pipe and bringing it to the

existing basin will help with the water runoff it won't be an open swale

Mr. Arnott comments:

application previous square footage was 8,400 square feet that has been reduced to 7,850 square feet

retail and office on the first and second floors

application located in the GB district, but the SR015 is immediately behind

there are screening requirements and setback requirements

GB district has 65% lot coverage maximum allowable, asking for a calculation to be provided since it is noted right at 65% currently

parking calculation required parking is calculated at 21.67 for retail and 16.25 for office,

numbers not rounded but decimals were included prior to adding the two together

currently 38 is what's required, Ms. Torre did reach out to the Building Inspector and each use needs to be rounded prior to adding together so that would create an additional required space

another requirement with regards to parking in GB there is over 30 spaces required additional landscape requirements

regarding the grading there are significant retaining walls proposed in the western, southern, and eastern sides of the building, they get quite tall in some areas near 15 ft,

noted some concerns with proposed drainage pipe the applicant should do a profile of the drainage pipe to confirm whether or not it's either going through the retaining wall or under.

with that drainage pipe need a little more analysis for the pipe. The applicant provided a hydraulic analysis using manning's equation generally the manning's equation is used for a bit small or flatter slope so more detailed analysis be prepared for that.

clean up items in regards to setbacks

applicant did prepare a profile for the roadway all the way around or the driveway around the lot there are a couple of locations where the grade was noted greater than 10% needs to get below 10%

previously noted that the building receive potable water from Village of Harriman that has been changed to portable well for the site

Mr. Niemotko checked with all surrounding municipalities there is no water to the site must provide a well system

Mr. Arnott your working with DOT on access and the modifications within the right-of-way

Mr. Niemotko have not heard from DOT

Mr. Niemotko I reviewed the comments agree with them but have a few comments that I would like to share some replies

comments on retaining wall west side can move that wall a little further away from property line

the access along the west side goes from 17 feet to 25 ft on the south side at the aisle actually increases we tried to maintain 90 degree relationship between the parking and the building if we skew the retaining wall away from the property line but still maintain a 16 foot access lane that would allow for the geo-grid in that location
we didn't note the landscaping along south side of the property there is a slope there, will investigate further how to maintain a vegetation or landscaped area along the south side to buffer this project from the neighboring houses.

discussed the buffer area must be eight foot in height and 6 foot wide

Mr. Niemotko continued:

lot coverage confirmed maximum is 65% within the GB zone
the need for the 5% landscaping within the parking area is calculated as 670 square feet can be provided within the islands
the additional parking space shown in southwest corner of property, the dumpster location works well there, if I relocate it to northeast portion of the property and surround it with vegetation allow additional parking

Mr. Arnott the 2 handicapped stalls can share the middle isle per ADA and make the 2nd striped area a standard parking space

Mr. Niemotko asked for additional clarification on comment # 7 and the retaining walls or fence whichever the board wants we will do

Is it going to be...Inaudible

Chairwoman Franson whatever we decide it will be attractive as we have architectural review over the building and the site. I will defer to the engineer and building inspector regarding a code requirement for fencing along retaining walls.

Mr. Arnott wherever there is a 30 inch or greater drop a barrier is required I believe it is 36 inches high

Mr. Niemotko is asking for some relief from height of trees since the retaining wall is so high?

Mr. Golden Planning Board Attorney this evening:

sent out NOT for lead agency you can assume lead agency this evening
bulk table required rear yard is 50ft needs to be noted on the bulk table
you talked about moving the dumpster, note on plan doesn't match up to where it is located or

where you plan to move it so that needs to be cleaned up

in regards to the planting buffer, would have to look into it to see if the board has any leeway with respect to the height not less than 8 feet in height.

As to the specific language it's not less than 8 feet in height so as to provide an effective buffer. Unless there is a general provision dealing with this statute itself the board would not be able to provide relief.

parcel viewer shows owner as Dominick Santiago provided deed but it doesn't indicate it was filed, need proof it was filed

the board has architectural review so you would need to submit building plans

need to show limits of disturbance for the tree planting and all trees being removed under chapter 57-20

board members comments:

Member Czerwinski question on lights southwest side of the property along that retaining wall are those built into the wall or stand alone lights like street lights?

Mr. Niemotko hoping to work within retaining wall

Member Czerwinski put a more downward shield behind the property is zoned residential. The last time I believe there was a comment about using impervious (inaudible)... or surface cover. It is borderline with 65% or has then been removed from the equation.

Mr. Niemotko removable pavers is what was discussed. The 65% has been removed once we moved the retaining wall further away from the property line also clipped the southeast corner and that allowed less coverage.

We can't use permeable pavers they are not allowed in the code.

Member Czerwinski any idea on the type of business's in regards to the parking and demand for parking?

Mr. Niemotko my knowledge it would be conventional with typical office hours 8-5/6 and retail hours 8/9-8

Member Manson size of the building reduced once or twice since original concept, 5 retail 5 office with the current reduction still proposing 5 and 5.

Mr. Niemotko depends on what the market bears we still maintain a 60 foot length along the front that could equate to 4 15 foot wide retail units or 3 20 foot wide .

Member Manson with the parking being removed from the front will the primary entrances for the building be facing 17 or parking view

Mr. Niemotko retail will be facing 17M office entrances will be on the south side of the building

Member Manson regarding the lighting there is a notation the hours of operation of the site are 7am - 6pm 5 days a week. The lights on site should be used as required only during these hours. So that being said on weekends and after 6pm those lights would be dark?

Mr. Niemotko oversight on our part will have to amend that as there will be lights on at night and weekends.

Chairwoman Franson comments:

regarding the drainage design with all that is going on it should be reviewed by DOT as it is already a problem area issues with storms

in terms of net lot area the steep slopes of a grade that had to be netted out or not or has it been provided already.

Mr. Arnott they didn't provide that calculation, but yes over 30% any steep slopes would have to be netted out

Chairwoman Franson continues:

need to look at the purposes section the intent is not to do a lot of grading on steep slopes but to have terrain adaptive and protect certain features. We will be considering that as we continue with this application because there's a lot of grading and retaining walls going on when you talk about the geo grid. What does that look like?

Mr. Niemotko geo grid is a structural component of the retaining walls. As a retaining wall a modular retaining wall is laid down there's a horizontal fabric or grid that's laid with it and submerged on the ground. It is done at different intervals to hold the wall back from allowing the earth to push it over.

Karen Arent to review the landscape plan

regarding the drainage looks like a outlet to a pond sits above the stream/swale need to make sure there is no wetland vegetation, that it is not a wetland stream.

Need to send out Dave Tompkins wetland

Mr. Niemotko look at the relationship between the pond and drainage swale the pond is far away from the swale and it is not the only outlet of the pond it is one of many. Not sure what type of classification you would give the swale regarding wetlands habitation or wetlands vegetations.

Chairwoman Franson I don't know that there is a classification, but it is showing up on the NMI maps as wetland. Is this actually a natural drainage or man made, so it needs to be checked and see if in fact it is regulated by the Army Corp perspective.

eventually you will submit a design for the building

the handicap spaces are angled is that allowed?

this is going to be one way circulation so there needs to be signage and details on the plans do we need a loading facility? where would it occur and it needs to be noted on the plans.

Mr. Arnott it is not required by zoning code but it is a good point. A location for the retail space to be able to load and unload for deliveries.

Was this referred to the fire department?

Since this is a one way circulation does it allow for a box truck, not expecting a tractor trailer, but FedEx, UPS and possible an occasional box truck. Is there a place to drop off when unloading?

Mr. Niemotko the front roadway across the north side of the project is 24 feet wide a truck can definitely stop in front of the retail stores and load or unload quite easily. It wouldn't interfere with the parking spaces or any customers as parking is not allowed along the front.

Chairwoman Franson is there enough space to stripe a loading/unloading areas in the front area?

the 2 spaces at the southeast corner getting out of that one space next to the well feels awkward just review the turning radius

site plan shows rubber wheel stop? Is that enough or should it be concrete? Are they set back enough to not hit retaining wall. Things to look into.

using LED and are they 3000 or less kelvin? Yes

well right now is located next to the stream don't know if there is a separation distance required

Mr. Arnott there may be a requirement (inaudible) ... my understanding if not on environmental resource mapper (inaudible)

Chairwoman Franson it needs to be looked into

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion that the Town of Monroe Planning Board be officially designated the lead agency.

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

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson, Nicholas Napoli

Absent: Pat Shea

2 vacancies

4. Minutes

Action, Discussion: 4.1 January 13, 2022

no quorum

Action, Discussion: 4.2 January 19, 2022

no quorum

5. Adjournment

Action, Discussion: 5.1 Adjourn Meeting

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

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

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson, Nicholas Napoli

Absent: Pat Shea

2 vacancies