

Town of Monroe Planning Board Workshop Meeting MINUTES

— 04/10/2025

Town of Monroe Planning Board Workshop Meeting (Thursday, April 10, 2025)

Generated by Norinne McSweeney

Draft

Members present

Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea, Dylan Penn, Robert Garstak

Lou Rivera in audience

Planning 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 Farm** (0201-2022) SBL # 29-1-2.52 Lakes Road & Camp Monroe, Monroe, NY

Applicant Representatives:

Jon Dahlgren - Tim Miller Associates

Vince Pietrzak - Pietrzak & Pfau

Mark Siemers - Pietrzak & Pfau

Gardner Barone, Esq.

Mr. Dahlgren - been before the board for some time

- key milestone was getting the consistency analysis been discussed before the board in terms of SEQRA

- went through SEQRA 2000-2004 when there was a findings statement approved by the Planning Board

- the findings statement is included in the consistency analysis

- after the findings statement revisions to the plans were made and they were approved in 2015

- after the approval there was litigation and here we are now

- in terms of revised project the consistency analysis was intended to compare the current

plan or proposed plan with the plan that was approved in 2015

- the analysis goes through a number of topics that were approved by the Planning Board in 2023 including the soils and grading, water resources, traffic and wetlands, ecology community services and fiscal impacts, cultural resources, air and noise
- updated the data for those topics including a big effort was done by Tim Miller Associates and Pietrzak & Pfau was to re delineated the wetland on the site since time has passed
- another key issue was traffic on Lakes Road evaluated with current conditions with past conditions
- community services changed from 66 single units and 50 multifamily units to 70 single family
- obviously the population went down, number of school children went down and enrollments
- looked at taxes in terms of revenue to the school district and the Town of Monroe
- lots of numbers compared in a table in the consistency analysis which summarized the two plans one from 2015 and the current plan
- that is my summary I could go over some of the comparisons of the impacts if the board would like
- wetlands did go down due to changes in hydrology on the site
- large wetland at bottom of site appears to be reduced by beaver activity
- actual total construction disturbance went down by about 13 acres
- wetland disturbance went up to this town wetland disturbance
- wetland Army Corp went down
- the total impervious surface was reduced by 5 acres
- the cut and fill was reduced by the same
- there is a comparison chart in the consistency analysis

Mr. Arnott comments:

- amount of cut and fill did go up
- one mitigation measure that I thought the board and the applicant could consider is during the site visit there was a portion of roadway that potentially could be moved down the hill to reduce the amount of grading that was needed. This was discussed last time and the applicant wasn't to accepting of it.
- wetlands disturbances were reduced, the total wetland disturbance should be reviewed by the board's wetland consultant
- wetland delineation should be confirmed
- applicant submitted a SWPPP
- the consistency analysis noted blasting may be required wasn't evident of the total amount of blasting required, blasting protocol should be submitted
- there are some calculations for water demand, there is a proposed water system with a couple of wells to be dedicated to the Town to serve the 70 homes, didn't see any no quantity or quality testing, the consistency analysis referred back to the 2004 time period, but there was nothing more recent and it is important as there are newer parameters that DOH is required monitoring such as PFAS. Suggestion a full part 5 be done.

- updated traffic done - traffic should be reviewed by the board's traffic consultant
- get input from OCDPW on the access connections as well as the sewer improvements
- get input from DOH on the water facilities

Ms. Torre comments:

- minor typo and misstatements that I explain in my memo that need to be cleaned up
- there were mitigation measures in the 2004 findings statement some have been modified in this consistency analysis some of them are not clear some topics never discussed unclear if those are still proposed to be followed or if they're seeking to not be followed - need clarity
- as far as ecology there was some documentation from US Fish and Wildlife there are new species now and the board did ask for an updated habitat analysis referenced the 2004 analysis at a minimum you need the time of year tree clearing restriction for the bats but also there were other species that need to be addressed

Chairwoman Franson this is a SEQRA comparison analysis what are we required to do we have to send out again for Lead Agency status did (inaudible) respond back

Ms. Torre - we did, yes the DEC did respond January 12, 2023, they responded talking about stream disturbance, freshwater wetlands, water quality certifications, water withdrawal, speedy storm water and cultural in the wetlands also would be reviewed by your outside consultant.

Ms. Torre - I had a couple of questions just about some of the mitigation measures just to clarify the community services section with the recreational facilities, they're going to be donating it as a parcel to the Town and I wasn't sure whether that was the only recreation mitigation or if you're still proposing that recreations fees would be applicable as well because that was part of the prior findings

- I do think one item with the wetlands I think they may have just submitted today a wetlands permit application you've been waiting on that I haven't had a chance to review that yet but that's a big piece you'll have to review.

Chairwoman Franson -

- what is the average household size or was it based on standard census information?

Mr. Dahlgren - we did use census information and the Rutgers multipliers

Member Manson - I recall 3.87 was on the table. It was looking at a multiplier for school children and multiplier for the household.

Chairwoman Franson - this should be realistic to whatever individuals the homes are going to be marketed to which we have done with other development applications.

- In our community we have larger and smaller households so from a water and sewer prospective those items that might generate that are population based is this a realistic number based on who it may or may not be marketed to.

- agree with a full part 5 needs to be completed
- it would be useful to have an overview map. I know you did provide the old subdivision plan and the new subdivision plan but I want to say at some point in time I thought you guys had prepared a comparison map that showed the old and the new and with sort of a limits of disturbance so I think that'd be useful for SEQRA purposes just to have that upfront in the analysis. You don't have to show everything it's just more if you could outline and show the actual limits of disturbance old to new I think would be useful.
- with regard to species the Natural Heritage program recommends that you get information every two years that their database is updated and so whatever DEC submitted was dated from January 23 we're now two years old so I would just want to make sure that we've done runs with US Fish and Wildlife Service and Natural Heritage Program that are up to date
- the wetlands that are delineated are they all of them or are they the ones that you believe are regulated by like Army Corps

Mr. Dahlgren - all the wetlands and I'll be frank there's one area of wetlands that extends to the north of the property that we never intended to build there it's High View Avenue and we didn't check all those wetlands because we just assume they haven't changed it doesn't matter in terms of impact but all the other wetlands in the proposed area development were rechecked.

Chairwoman Franson - with the new New York State DEC wetland regulations they've been asking that things be forwarded to them to see whether they have any regulatory in the environmental resource mapper have you consulted with New York State DEC with regard to regulatory status.

Mr. Pietrzak - yes at the board's request I sent them out to the DEC about three four weeks ago okay and the response I got back was that we should hear something within the next three months.

Chairwoman Franson - have you recently spoken to the fire department to see their ability to provide emergency service protection.

Mark Siemers each phase under 5 acres

Mr. Arnott - full construction of the roadway before 1st c/o

Mr. Arnott - I've had a reoccurring comment with regards to how the project will be phased and built with regards to the roads and potential turnarounds during each phase. I suggest you prepare that before you send it to the fire department.

Mr. Pietrzak - we're planning on building the entire project at once. We proposed the phasing because that was part of what was requested for the stipulation but the project's planning on being built out.

Chairwoman Franson - are you doing the road all at once the only reason because the other is the school district.

Mr. Arnott - So the intent is to binder the entire roadway before pulling your first building permit.

Chairwoman Franson - From a storm water perspective are you going to ask for a five acre waiver or that's going to be done every five acres, but you are doing the road first.

Mr. Siemers - I believe we have a construction phasing plan in the plan set for construction of the road that keeps each phase under five acres while it's being stabilized and then you can disturb more.

The road is being dedicated to the Town.

The first C/O can't be issued until the road is complete. That's for 2 reasons one the buses and 2 the fire department accessibility.

Chairwoman Franson - next steps:

- send it off to our consultants
- part 5 will you do now or wait for our hydrogeologist

Mr. Pietrzak - we want to wait for comments from the Health department

Action, Discussion: 2.2 **Eagle View Estates** (0168-2018) SBL # 18-4-60 402 Lakes Road, Monroe, NY

Chairwoman Franson - we added Eagle View Estates to the agenda they had been approved previously, but we have to consider amendments as a result of taking a look at the final plan seeing some additional grading and looking at buffer and the tree removal.

Ms. Torre - originally there wasn't any tree removal contemplated by the approval, but as they hammered down on the final grading revisions there is some trees that are going to be removed, so I've updated the resolution to reflect that and I did circulate a redline version from the prior approved one so that way you could see what the changes are and I have one additional change I'll just go over when we get to it because Karen did send some additional comments this evening.

Chairwoman Franson - highlighted the changes from the initial resolution to this amended one.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion in terms of the resolution to approve the first amended resolution of approval for preliminary and final subdivision for Hudson One Enterprises Eagle View Estate Subdivision project number 2018-0168.

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

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea, Dylan Penn, Robert Garstak

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Action, Discussion: 2.3 **81 Raywood Drive Lot # 3** (0238-2025) SBL # 43-1-11.3 Raywood Drive, Monroe NY

Applicant Representative:

Mr. Gelb

Mr. Kaufman

Mr. Gelb reviews the project:

- 2 family home site plan approval
- referred to the ZBA for lot coverage
- found pavers that are 40% grass so we have not been to the ZBA as these won't increase lot coverage
- we want to continue with the application in front of this board

Chairwoman Franson - you have submitted a plan with the intent of trying to eliminate the need for the variance through the pavers

Mr. Arnott comments:

- don't necessarily agree that the variance is not needed
- the driveway is proposed to be pavers and they used 60% of the driveway as impervious because of the pavers
- based on the Monroe Commons application there was a determination by the Building Inspector that pervious pavers the entire area has to be calculated as impervious.

Mr. Gelb - these pavers are more grass than stone

Ms. Torre - ultimately what you would need is a written determination from Building Inspector these specific pavers will work

Chairwoman Franson - we're not going to resolve whether or not you need the variance it's going to come down to the Building Inspector reviewing what you're proposing and whether he agrees that

these can be considered pervious. Going for the variance is not a terrible thing if it works in terms of functionality. If you really want the pavers it might be better to seek the variance.

Mr. Arnott - currently as shown on the plans you might still need to go to the ZBA for a front yard parking variance.

Mr. Gelb - 2 spots marked with 2 behind them

discussed reason to go to ZBA for parking variance might also elevate some of the lot coverage as not having to make the driveway as deep making it wider for maneuverability.

Mr. Kaufman - I sent those pictures to Mr. Maldonado he said we could use it and 60% is considered as lot coverage and 40% is grass. I know you would need something in writing to show this.

Mr. Arnott comments continued:

- there is a walkway between the driveway and the house proposed to be 2 ft wide suggestion to increase to 4 ft wide which therefore exacerbates the potential need for a variance.
- once the impervious coverage is resolved an updated SWPPP will need to be prepared based on the updated amount of impervious coverage
- there 's an existing outside user agreement with the Village for water use and it takes time to get the language right to refile that agreement for the increased demand of the second unit

Ms. Torre -

- current letter from the Village should cover the existing additional dwelling
- need architectural details showing the colors and materials for all the exterior elements
- wasn't sure if any additional trees were going to be removed beyond what was approved in the original subdivision and if so must be shown on the current set of plans
- KALA landscaping looked at the original subdivision but it would be good to have a review on this
- review the new tree law it is Local Law # 1 of 2025

Mr. Kaufman - there will be some trees but they will be replanted on the property

Chairwoman Franson -

- Mr. Arnott will talk to Mr. Maldonado about the impervious pavers
- you talk to your client regarding the sidewalks and what they really want in terms of the layout

Action, Discussion: 2.4 **Aaron Zimmerman**, (0225-2024) SBL # 25-3-14.22 37 Dry Hill Road, Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative:

Mike Morgante - Arden Consulting

Daniel Richmond - Zarin & Steinmetz LLP

Mr. Richmond - briefly we are before this board to ask for a referral to the ZBA so we can seek to resolve certain conditions that were imposed by the ZBA when they approved a subdivision relating to this lot. They required Dry Hill Lake to be widened to 22 1/2 feet, certain storm drains be lowered and the road be resurfaced. None of these items were ever done even though the ZBA issued the resolution on September 13, 2000 said no building permit would be issued until the road improvements were done. Mr. Morgante met with the Fire Chief and

as discussed they indicated they responded to calls on Dry Hill Lake Road without any issues. We believe that working together with the ZBA and the Fire Department we can address these concerns and hopefully get them resolved.

Mr. Morgante - March 15 I met with Chief Lenahan at the site to assess the conditions and responses to fire calls on Dry Hill Lake Road. There were a few responses recently to fire calls and the fire departments had no issues accessing Dry Hill Lake Road. We discussed the 3 items that Mr. Richmond mentioned and asked what could we do to improve the situation. He mentioned low hanging electrical wires (actually cable wires) should be tightened up and raised so aerial fire truck maneuver around and minor pot hole repairs. The road is not in bad shape until the cul-de-sac where most of the potholes occur towards the bottom of Dry Hill and Orchard Lake Drive. We then discussed fire department protocols for Dry Hill Lake Road and mentioned potentially have a dry hydrant at the cul-de-sac with piping that extends into the lake. We would need to know the depth of the lake to make sure suitable and we would need a wetland permit as we would be going through the wetland buffer. I did a quick review of the road and it is about 17 1/2 feet on average and I couldn't find any catch basins out there. There is an asphalt curb along the edge of the pavement and it even goes in front of several of the residences driveways. All of the storm water runoff from Dry Hill Lake Road goes to the intersection of Orchard Lake Drive and that storm water collection at the bottom of the road via some existing catch basins. Overall the road was in good condition. It is very interesting that these were requirements of a resolution and yet it appears that the only thing that might have been done was asphalt curbing along the edges of the road to prevent runoff from going into any of the neighboring properties. This is a private road from the intersection of Orchard Lake all the way to the cul-de-sac.

Ms. Torre - Yes, so there was the prior 280-A and that's the conditions that they were speaking of that the road improvement requirements that were based on that prior 280-A variance, they're essentially seeking an amendment of that prior variance. They're seeking to modify that.

Mr. Richmond - Madam Chair I respectfully request that the board would refer us to the Zoning Board so that we could expedite the process. We are eager to work with the board and the fire department. I understand that last summer your board declared intent to be lead agency, I hope that you could establish yourself as declared as it was circulated last summer.

Ms. Torre - it was circulated and I am not aware of any objections received so you would be able to assume lead agency status.

Chairwoman Franson - the issue with going off to the ZBA to seek the variance we have to issue an negative declaration before they can make a decision.

Mr. Arnott - my notes from July have that the wetland boundary needs to be redelineated

which then affects the net lot area calculation. Didn't go as far as DEC but there's a lake on the property so it is at a minimum a Town and Army Corp wetland.

Ms. Torre - you potentially might need a net lot area variance that way you could do it all at the same time as the 280-A variance. I also noted that one of the other things required was lowering the storm drains not sure if that has been done, you should discuss with Mr. Arnott and the Highway Superintendent.

Chairwoman Franson - at this point are we clear on all variances needed. 280-A variance amended and potentially net lot area.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion that 37 Dry Hill Lake Road be referred to the ZBA for the net lot area and the 280-A requested variances and any others to be determined as necessary in connection with the conditions of the 2000 resolution.

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

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea, Dylan Penn, Robert Garstak

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to assume lead agency status for this 37 Dry Hill Lake Road application.

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

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea, Dylan Penn, Robert Garstak

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Action, Discussion: 2.5 **Moses Hirsch** (0231-2024) SBL # 1-1-11.21 47 Seven Springs Rd, Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative:

Mr. Stein - Ideal Design

Mr. Stein -

- application for a 2 family dwelling in the 2 Family Overlay district
- submitted additional documents for the board

Mr. Arnott comments-

- need for the letter for septic certification reduce lot area required - submitted
- tree inventory need to update plans to newest local law

- elevations and the floor plans were provided for the addition
- no colors and finishes provided
- is there going to be a basement no subgrade level
- septic testing was completed MHE witnessed the testing in January
- all wells within 200 feet of the site need to be identified
- length of proposed Elgen system it needs to be a little longer
- some typos on the details for the pump station that need to be corrected
- previously asked for a letter from the engineer regarding the additional capacity of the well to serve the addition

Ms. Torre -

- SEQRA classified as a Type II action
- tree plan to conservation commission & KALA Landscaping with the next submission
- width of driveway widest area in front yard can't be over 24 feet at any point in front yard - label the dimensions
- addition being constructed where existing driveway paved area is, it's hard to tell what is being removed - clearly mark that
- what parking area is existing and what is being proposed
- requires a public hearing
- bulk table needs to show net lot area calculation
- the tree preservation note on page 1 cuts off

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion schedule public hearing provided the applicant has submitted the information of the water capacity and the locations of the wells within 200 feet of the site determination made by the board engineer for May 20, 2025.

Motion by Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, second by Dylan Penn.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea, Dylan Penn, Robert Garstak

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Action, Discussion: 2.6 **Mountain View Subdivision** (0235-2025) SBL # 43-1-10 290
Mountain View, Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative:

Mike Morgante - Arden Design

Mr. Morgante -

- worked on comments from MHE and the Planning Board
- we have resubmitted from there
- waiting for the architect to produce elevations and renderings
- submitted to OCSD # 1 waiting for approvals on the sewer laterals connections
- new minor comments from MHE

Mr. Arnott -

- if you recall at the back of site flood plain and wetland, not that they are being touched, but we need to understand if there will be a jurisdictional determination from DEC, waiting their 100 day notice to get determination and that will affect the net lot area for each lot
- there is improvements within Mountainview Drive
- no comments from the Highway Superintendent - need to follow up
- plans were provided to KALA landscaping for review
- need architectural elevations and information on the reinforcement that was used on the existing retaining wall on the site
- lot 1 parking had a spot in the front yard set back for existing dwelling may require a variance
- special use permit requirements for the two family dwelling allow up to 24 foot width driveway at the front yard setback - there is a dimension of 35 feet provided may be a need for a variance from that condition as well
- new tree law Local Law # 1 will have to be addressed and complied with
- existing retaining wall noted over 4 ft did not receive a building permit - need to verify with Building Department

Ms. Torre comments -

- driveway width for 2 family if applicant plans on pursuing a variance from ZBA
- a response in the response letter indicated that the house on lot 1 is constructed previously the plan itself says that it's under construction - modify the plan accordingly
- circulated for lead agency late last month so 30 days hasn't passed yet have to wait to assume lead agency

3. Minutes

Action, Discussion: 3.1 June 13, 2024

held over

Action, Discussion: 3.2 September 12, 2024

held over

Action, Discussion: 3.3 September 17, 2024

held over

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.

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

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea, Dylan Penn, Robert Garstak