

Town of Monroe Planning Board Workshop Meeting MINUTES

— 04/11/2024

Town of Monroe Planning Board Workshop Meeting (Thursday, April 11, 2024)

Generated by Norinne McSweeney

DRAFT

Members Present:

Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea, Dylan Penn, J Louis Rivera

Members Absent:

Nicholas Napoli

Robert Garstak (alternate # 1)

Planning Board 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 **BJ's Site Plan** (0200-2021) SBL # 2-1-30 Larkin Dr., Monroe, NY

Applicants Representatives:

George Lithco -Jacobowitz & Gubits

Pat Smith - R&D Management

Member Manson Recused himself

Mr. Smith -

- the reason we are here tonight is one of the conditions for the BJ's Gas Station Site plan approval was getting a no objection letter to the proposed gas station being adjacent to the O&R easement for the transmissions lines.

- We have been working with O&R for 2-3 years now trying to get this letter. We are not going to get one as they are being absolutely unreasonable primarily with regard to liability.

- what they're claiming is that even if they cause an issue while working in the easement area if their truck runs over someone or truck hits a vehicle or if something happens to the

transmission lines and someone gets hurt in the parking lot either in the easement area or in one of the adjacent parking lots that us as the applicant, what they call the owner entities, would be liable and there's no way that anyone, any owner of a property is going to agree to that. There's no way that BJs is going to agree to it either so I'm just coming here with a request that condition number seven and five be removed and that we be allowed to go ahead and build the gas station.

- we're still going to work with O&R with our engineering department we're going to abide by the work plan that they've given us. We're still going to have the meetings with them on site prior to construction and anytime they want to come out during construction. We're still going to do everything that O&R wants us to do, we're just not going to have this letter that's being held up by their legal department down in New York City.

- It's going to be built in connection with O&R in accordance to all our safety plans we're just not going to have this letter that doesn't do anything for the project anyway. It doesn't change anything in the project it's just a letter that's going to satisfy their legal department and at this point now we're never going to get that letter.

Chairwoman Franson - I don't understand what you mean by letter are you talking about a letter between you and O&R or the agreement between you and O&R.

Mr. Smith - basically it's a no objection letter from them, but if it was just a no objection letter it should just be one sentence long. We don't object and build it in accordance with the work plan. That's not what it is, we've shared drafts of this letter with the board it's three pages long and it's just it's a lot of nonsense but we're willing to live with all the nonsense we're just not willing to live with the liability provisions that they want to transfer all of their liability onto us, it's unreasonable and there's no way that we'll ever agree to it and there's no way that BJs will ever agree to it.

Ms. Torre - we have a copy and they're unable to my understanding is they're unable to come to an agreement on this liability language so you know that's something for the applicant or the owner and O&R to work out so it's not something we really have any say in. As far as the conditions, I did prepare a propose amended resolution for your consideration. It would remove those conditions, but add in there a statement that this approval is subject to any public utility easements on the property because if O&R ultimately has an issue the applicant has to work out whatever they do with O&R and they're proceeding at their own risk in that regard if O&R is going to try (inaudible)

Mr. Arnott -

- the only concern was with regards to the constructability of the stormwater Management Facility which is located within the easement. The whole design is premised on that should

O&R object to that, which my understanding is they have not to date, the applicant will have to seek a new location of those storm water management facilities in an amended site plan.

Member Shea - is this kind of indemnification issue?

Mr. Lithco - that's exactly what it is. Basically it's shifting all the risk for anything that happens to the owner entities whether or not it's related to the actions of O&R or the owners it's all going to be on the owners.

Member Shea - Let's just say something did happen would it have to happen in the storm water runoff district or area in order for there to be any liability on anyone's part.

Ms. Torre - (inaudible) to Mr. Arnett's concern was that they have to construct that storm Water Management Facility in order for the site plan to work that's an integral part of the site plan so his concern was that if for some reason O&R and the applicant if comes back and says no we changed our mind you can't build this and stops them from doing the work somehow brings them to court, I can't really fathom what would what they would do to actually try to stop that, but they'd have to return to you then for an amended site plan approval to have adequate storm water measures in place. It's really a private liability indemnification issue between the applicant and O&R.

Mr. Lithco - we recognize the responsibility to do what's shown on the site plan it has been reviewed by O&R engineering they had some minor comments those were addressed last year in June and they really were only minor things. This is really a dispute between the easement holder and the person who owns the land and how to use it.

Member Shea - is there any other way to mitigate this other than getting O&R to give a hold harmless agreement.

Mr. Lithco - O&R is looking for the owners to give a hold harmless agreement. If something was to happen, example was if a crane was to fall over and hit a car or if it fell over and hit the pavement O&R wants RD Management to be responsible even though it is their crane hitting a third party's car that would be our responsibility and that's not something we're willing to take on.

Ms. Torre - it is a private matter between them, that's their reading of the language that O&R is proposing. I don't know that O&R wouldn't or they shouldn't be seeking such a broad liability, but again that's for them to work out.

Member Shea - what's possible for us as the Planning Board?

Ms. Torre - amend the resolution that required this letter agreement in order to allow them to proceed.

Member Penn - so a matter of the board maybe this question is for Ms. Torre. If we eliminate that requirement and an agreement is not in place does it remain a private matter if there's an issue anywhere on that property.

Ms. Torre - if there's a issue between the easement holder O&R and the applicant that would be a private matter.

Member Rivera - Would we be liable?

Ms. Torre - No

Chairwoman Franson - that was my comment. I think we'd all feel more comfortable if the resolution in some way reflects that it is a private situation that's how the applicant has represented it and that we bear no liability for them moving forward to construct without whatever approvals they need from O&R based on the representations. All right so this is an amended resolution and everybody's seen this before but I'm going to scroll down to

Member Penn - another example I'm thinking of is if a member of the public got hurt during the construction or in the construction zone around the construction zone at what point.

Ms. Torre - that would be the applicant developer or the applicant they're the property owner so you would never be (inaudible) with any application (inaudible) that would tie you to (inaudible)

Chairwoman Franson - review of the resolution. Adjustments/edits were made.

Member Manson returning to the dais.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to approve the 5th Amended Resolution of Conditional Site Plan approval as amended this evening with the revisions to the language.

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

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Pat Shea, Dylan Penn, J Louis Rivera

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Not Present at Vote: Jeff Manson

Action, Discussion: 2.2 **127 Seven Springs** (0204-2022) SBL # 1-1-41.2 127 Seven Springs Road Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative:

John Queenan - Lanc & Tully

Mr. Queenan -

- submission was not a full submission there are numerous things to still be cleaned up and provided

- resubmit complete package for May

Mr. Arnott comments:

- really cleaned up the plans the access is consistent with what you reviewed last month if you remember Mr. Queenan came in briefly to discuss the access points
- there will be a shared curb cut for the rear lot and the northern lot and the southern lot will have its own separate access
- the plans were reviewed with the Highway Superintendent he is satisfied with the curb cut locations and his request was that drainage be provided along the entire frontage of the roadway that'll have to be added to the plans.
- one of the missing pieces of information that we're going to need is a storm water pollution prevention plan since the disturbance is over an acre and that'll be a full SWPPP because these are two family dwellings.

Chairwoman Franson - our regulations require a full SWPPP for two families dwellings

Mr. Arnott - that's actually NYS DEC, if the disturbance was between 1 and 5 Acres which this is and this was single family dwellings they would only be required to get coverage for an erosion sediment control plan, but because these are two family dwellings a full SWPPP with water quality and detention will be required

Chairwoman Franson - that the same for commercial activities

Mr. Arnott - yes

Mr. Queenan - commercial is anything over an acre

Chairwoman Franson - so it's not the one to five it's still soil erosion and five and above is storm water.

Mr. Queenan - that still holds for residential subdivisions, but the code is written like Mr. Arnott was saying it says single family homes only

Mr. Arnott continues:

- will also need the tree plan for the site
- there were a couple comments on the septic design or designs for each of the homes
- with regards of the architectural there was maybe one nuance, it looked like the bedroom count was consistent for the site plans in the architectural but there was a weird numbering it was the master bedroom then bedrooms three, four, and five. Was wondering if the second bedroom was missing on purpose?

Mr. Queenan - they have to go by whatever is put on the site plan so we'll clear that up.

Mr. Arnott -

- in that regard the septic will be okay as long as the bedroom count is consistent between the site plan in the architectural.

Chairwoman Franson - so when do the septic field design it's 110 gallons per bedroom per day. From Department of Health or in general for standards is the same assumed for water consumption or not really.

Mr. Arnott - that would be the max day

Mr. Arnott -

- with regards to water consumption the applicant did a well pumping test for 27 hours or so I just asked that the applicant provide a letter with a signed seal that the well is adequate. It did appear to be based on the data, but we just asked for the applicant to provide a letter to that effect.
- need a revised EAF, please provide that.
- then eventually we'll need to submit to County Planning for the GML 239 referral

Ms. Torre- it's actually exempt under that agreement with the county because it's a subdivision of less than five lots and so it just says subdivision of less than five lots and there's no access roads or structures within the 100-year flood plane.

Ms. Torre comments:

- some clean up things with the owner's endorsement
- changing the map notes since the town has now adopted that new law that clarifies all of the reduced bulk apply for Lots in public sewer that meet certain criteria - clean up that language
- they did submit architectural elevations for the board to review but you need to add some more details about the colors and materials the code requires for all the the exterior elements so make sure you know you're showing what you're using for the windows, the railings, and colors for everything so to have all of that labeled - - to confirm whether you're proposing the same design same colors for all of the three dwellings.

Chairwoman Franson - There's one kind of floor plan and elevation so is that essentially the same for all three.

Mr. Queenan - we might provide you with basically an array of colors that they could choose from not everyone's the same color

Chairwoman Franson - that's fair as long as we know what they're going to be correct because we'll probably want Earth Tones or something

Ms. Torre - I had prepared an EAF part two and neg deck but you are waiting on the SWPPP and some other information. It would be appropriate to wait for that information to review that because those items are anticipating that's all going to be good, but should wait until you review that.

Action, Discussion: 2.3 **Mountainview Shul** (0195-2021) SBL # 43-5-2 277 Mountainview Dr., Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative:

John Queenan - Lanc & Tully

Mr. Queenan - we're here before you with a familiar project over the last year or so 277 Mountainview Shul.

- we are back with a request that the board possibly consider amending the approval resolution for one of the specific conditions with regards to the water agreement between the applicant and the Village of Kiryas Joel that was a requirement that had it to be provided prior to the maps being signed.

- I was initially coming in for an extension, but apparently we only have one year to get the map signed. We're working with the village to try to get an agreement, the applicant has been pushing The Village of Kiryas Joel, basically they came back and said we gave you a letter that said we're more than happy to continue to service the property with water, why do we need to do an agreement. We're chipping away the applicant has demonstrated the urgency to the Village.

- What we are looking for is the board to consider making that a condition of a certificate of occupancy, kind of the same language that we use for condition number five which is the sewer from the DEC and the County Sewer District #1.

- I believe all the maps are ready to be signed minus that condition.

Chairwoman Franson - Mr. Arnott do you see any with this.

Mr. Arnott -

- no issues with moving the timing of the condition however one suggestion was to move that to building permit rather than CFO.

Mr. Queenan - if I could just clarify I don't have an issue with that I don't think the applicant would, but there's been a little confusion building permit versus starting site work. I don't know if we can make that differentiation because they'd like to begin site work so grading, leveling my understanding is site work.

Mr. Arnott - my understanding is site work would not require building permit.

Mr. Queenan - they want to start leveling the back to put the foundation in.

Ms. Torre - I prepared a proposed amended resolution just with two changes the first if you go down to page 10 the first specific condition deals with Mr. Arnott has to give his sign off for signing of the plans one of Mr. Arnott's comments in his outstanding memo was the sewer approval so I just added in language there to specify that's a condition of C/O so that wouldn't hold off getting Mr. Arnott's sign off letter.

- then condition number six on the next page I proposed to change the timing for when the agreement with the Village is required to prior to the issuance of a building permit for the construction of the new building. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the construction of the new building the applicant shall enter into an agreement.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to approve the first amended resolution of approval for the site plan special permit for Bright View Management Inc., which is Mountainview Community Shul as amended this evening.

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

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea, Dylan Penn, J Louis Rivera

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Action, Discussion: 2.4 **355 Rt. 17 M** (0221-2024) SBL # 25-3-6.12 Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative

Mike Morgante - Arden Engineering

Mr. Morgante - we received a resolution of approval for review I had a couple of small comments on it that I communicated with Ms. Torre today. We did also receive the latest comment letter from Mr. Arnott with some housekeeping items that we need to deal with which are minor. We do have some of this information we may have it shown on a plan so we might want to go over it and take a look at it with the board as well.

- the only comment we had for Ms. Torre as it related to the resolution was that there were no exterior walls, I believe it was specific condition number 10, I don't recall exactly it's not shown on the site plan, but on the architectural renderings we had discussed to redo that parapet wall around the front, I just wanted to make sure that was noted in the resolution.

- we just wanted a little extra detail and clarity on the proposed use, because even though we're okay with a medical office use, apparently when the applicant applies to the health department there's an application after they get a CO for the health department and the Health Department apparently is a little bit picky about what the actual use is so as long as it's noted properly in the resolution that helps us out a little bit.

- so we had prepared on the site plan some turning diagrams to show if we can get in and out with parking spaces in the upper parking lot. The furthest parking space to the West as you can see there will require a small amount of additional pavement just to make sure there's adequate room for the car to turn and get out of the site.

- we also prepared some more detail had the surveyor go back out to the site and get some spot elevations in the area of the ADA parking so we're close were like two and a half three % and it could also all depend upon where he took the shot but I've shown some area there in that ADA parking area as you can see that we may need to just mill that a little bit and just kind of resurface it.

- this is just some of the additional information like had been requested, you know the meat and potatoes of what was discussed at the last meeting.

Chairwoman Franson - this hatch area that you have along the line over here (pointing to the plans) is that rock, a wall or that's just the edge of pavement.

Mr. Morgante - it's more possibly like the edge of pavement we may need to add a a little bit

there like in front of the refuse area as well.

Chairwoman Franson - there was some topography there that wasn't actually in an area where

Mr. Arnott - I looked at that it is consistent with the rest of the parking lot at 5% plus or minus.

Mr. Morgante - to your note because we'll have to talk about that when we talk about the Landscaping plan there are rock outcroppings up in the back there's very shallow depth to rock one of the comments we received from the landscape consultant was to actually plant the tree in that area which I don't think we can plant it I think she requested a red maple, I'm probably going to try to talk to Karen and just let her know that I think you probably got rock like within a foot two feet over there because if you go behind the building like where the refuse is and further up that you can see the ledge popping out of the ground so we'll talk about that.

Mr. Arnott comments:

- the biggest one we were talking about last time was a potential need for a variance for the proposed parking within the front yard setback. I did speak with Mr. Maldonado and he determined that there is not a need for a variance, because the total number of parking stalls is decreasing. I have an email from him to that regard that were reducing the non-complying condition exactly.

- I had a couple notes that we had discussed last time the board wanted to see the front door locations, the existing ramp width to confirm that meets ADA dimensioned on the plan.

- We're going to need detail for the construction of the pavement on the upper parking lot

- the existing lights to be noted and include the hours of operation on the site plan

- then one clarification on the architectural you emailed me that proposed railings are going to be painted? The existing railings are going to be painted a black color. Mr. Morgante - that's correct it's actually like a dark gray to be exact the specific color was noted in in the resolution Chairwoman Franson - are those existing railings scroll or are they like what you're showing on the plans?

Mr. Morgante - they have a little bit more of like a scroll design. Needs to be noted as existing railing will be used and painted.

Member Penn - I had a note on the the architectural, you see how there's a painted brick facade on the corners just to carry that on the top roof line as well, on the edge of the sign, here on the corners of that corner of the facade (looking at the plans).

Chairwoman Franson -

- this was a type two action

- review of the resolution (brought up on screen)

- this is the resolution of approval amended site plan for 355 RT. 17 M LLC applicant has applied for approval of amended site plan to convert an existing 4,836 square foot restaurant building formerly TRI Angelina into medical office space for proposed Physical Therapy facility

with supporting offices and offices for Health Services training.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of The Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to approve the resolution for approval for the amended site plan for 355 Rt 17M LLC subject to the amendments discussed this evening.

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

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson, Jeff Manson, Pat Shea, Dylan Penn, J Louis Rivera

Nay: None

Abstain: None

3. New Project

Action, Discussion: 3.1 **37 Dry Hill Road** (0225-2024) SBL # 25-3-14.22 Dry Hill Lake Road, Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative:

Michael Morgante - Arden Design

Mr. Morgante - (pointing at items on the plan set on the large monitor)

- SR - 15

- Dry Hill Lakes Road is an unimproved Road - meaning it is not an actual Town Road

- we are showing a rather large building footprint, it's about 4,204 square feet

- there is a lake so naturally there's a 100 foot wetland buffer that's imposed by the town

- there is a driveway coming in up to a garage

- there's a separate entrance or sidewalk that would connect back to the street

- sewer manhole on location - ultimately would try to connect to the sewer

- need to talk to Orange County Sewer District number one for 2 items. #1 technical acceptance of the plans and # 2 ultimately to file a permit to connect

- we also have a water markout so it appears to be municipal water and sewer available

- rather steep site in the back then goes flat

- looking to construct a swimming pool in the back with a pool house

- because of the existing topography on the site in order to maintain the proper coverage for the building foundation we do require a retaining wall around the edge of the building in the back.

Mr. Arnott comments:

- as you know this is a single family dwelling project typically wouldn't get a site plan for a single family dwelling however when this lot was created there was a Planning Board resolution that required it come back for Planning Board approval in order to construct the house there as well as it be hooked up to sewer.

- Mr. Maldonado had referred this to me last month and we agreed that it had to come to

Planning in order for it to proceed.

Chairwoman Franson - question because the description application proposes a subdivision amendment is it a subdivision.

Ms. Torre- it would be an amendment to the subdivision because the Subdivision plat had a note saying that this lot can't be developed without Planning Board approval and without a sewer permit so it would be amending the subdivision plan.

Chairwoman Franson - there's no site plan?

Ms. Torre - Well site plan in the sense that it's site plan elements on a subdivision map.

Mr. Arnott continues:

- we were speaking about the dam part of that resolution actually requiring that the applicant prepare a covenant and file it in the County Clerk's office for the dam and spillways for the owner of this lot to maintain that Dam. We ask that the applicant furnish that Covenant.

Mr. Morgante - is there any understanding of who actually maintains it at this time?

Ms. Torre - this lot owner is supposed to be.

Mr. Morgante - whoever the current property owner is. The property owner before the one that I'm representing right now they would have been the ones who are also responsible for the maintenance.

Mr. Arnott - we would have to see the Covenant.

Ms. Torre - that's what the the condition was meant to require that it would run with the property owner. The owner of lot 3 for the Perpetual maintenance of the dam and Spillway.

Chairwoman Franson - the subdivision was for Dry Hill Road or a few Lots on Dry Hill Road

Mr. Arnott - the road had already existed and so 280-A Variances were also granted at that time for the three lots..

- I have a comment and it it may not be correct we'll have to talk to Ms. Torre with regards to the roadway specifications so section 63-13 (C2) c says that any private road cannot provide access for more than four lots except when two of the lots get their frontage on a public street. The existing private road provides access to more than 10 lots, however the lot has already been created so we'll have to talk to Ms. Torre about that nuance whether or not it can be private road or if the road has to be upgraded to a public road. Mr. Morgante noted that they'll be connecting the existing sewer and we will need approval from Orange County Sewer District number one all the improvements within Dry Hill Lake Road will require an easement from the owner of the roadway.

- a couple clerical notes for low sewerable elevation for the building it wasn't clear how portable water was going to be provided to the lot are you anticipating connecting to Water District #8.

Mr. Morgante - yes I actually wasn't anticipating these plans were going to even be submitted to the Planning Board, quite frankly they were submitted without me really knowing this so they're obviously not really advanced plans at this point, but yes that's our idea is to connect yes.

Mr. Arnott - I had a note which Mr. Morgante has recognizes that the Executive Office building

behind this is proposing a watermain extension across this property. The Executive Office building, think we saw it last month, obviously those improvements should be noted on this plan. The wetland boundary and the delineator is noted on the plans but we just ask that the date of the delineation be provided on the plans as well.

- the applicant should note the total disturbance on the plan.
- one last cleanup item the Village of Harriman boundary is actually the southern boundary of this property that should be added to the plan as well.

Ms. Torre comments:

- as we discussed this would be an amendment to the subdivision. The prior subdivision was for three lots, this lot and the lot adjacent to it did obtain 280-A variances but after they obtained the variances the Planning Board ultimately decided that this lot can't be built on until they obtain a sewer permit and they would also have to come back for Planning Board approval.
- discussing the road specs, in reviewing the provision that Mr. Arnott had mentioned it talks about creating a lot. It says in order to create in excess of four lots, this lot's already been created and at the time it was created the road specifications didn't have this requirement in place and they did already obtain the 280-A variances so I don't see that being an issue as long as the the private road has been improved pursuant to that 280-A variance. It required very specific improvements at that time.
- you will need to submit the EAF I didn't see that included
- it would likely be a unlisted action
- the board did issue a neg deck back in 2001, so I'm going to ask the secretary to look and see if she could locate that for me and if nothing major has changed you would potentially be able to just reaffirm that neg deck.
- it doesn't require referral to the county it is close to the Village of Harman and Village of Monroe boundaries, but because of that agreement with Orange County Planning says subdivisions of less than five lots are exempt as long as there's no structures in the 100 year flood plane.
- it will need a public hearing and you'll have to send the notice to the Village of Harriman and Village of Monroe
- you'll need a tree plan and that'll have to be referred to the Monroe Conservation Commission

Chairwoman Franson - for Seeker on the one hand it was a subdivision that was subject to a neg deck but the action right now is while it's an amendment to a site plan it's really construction of a single family dwelling.

Ms. Torre - but it's not, this is an nteresting one because it's construction of a single family dwelling on an approved lot. This lot wasn't approved for single family home yet.

Chairwoman Franson - this also talks about the owner of lot three should be responsible for

maintenance and condition of the dam Spillway in accordance with the Declaration to be filed. Ms. Torre - that's something that Mr. Arnott had mentioned before that he asked Mr. Morgante to locate a copy of that. I could look as well on the the county records. I might be able to find it easily but it was supposed to be filed as a condition of the the plan approval.

Chairwoman Franson - what's the status of a cul-de-sac is one there now or no?

Mr. Morgante - there is one there now physically? Just so I understand it how are we handling the road situation? Is it something that will need to be paved in its entirety is it not something that needs to be paved in its entirety?

Ms. Torre - it was already subject to a 280-Aa variance for this lot so there that 280-A variance had specific improvements that had to be done to the road. Those were required to be done before they constructed the home on the adjacent lot so theoretically they should have been done but it would have to be in conformance with that.

Chairwoman Franson - is that proposed pool meeting setback requirements?

Mr. Morgante - go to the site plan map it will have the dimensions on it. Need to verify the set back requirements.

Chairwoman Franson - questions the retaining wall shown on the plans. It currently doesn't exist it is proposed to be built applicant saying it will be tough as it is very close to the property line. Looking into it again.

Chairwoman Franson - I would like to see like a cross-section in terms of going through the house. Our regulations talk about building terrain adaptive housing and stepping down houses instead of you know doing a lot of filling and grading. I would just like to know sort of what this looks like in terms of a profile.

I would also like to see if the driveway is supposed to be a certain setback this is only going to be a one car garage. Asked how many bedrooms for the size house. Mr. Morgante will get more details on that and get back to the board.

Spoke about a culvert going on the property not showing on the site plan. Applicant will review that and make necessary changes to site plan.

4. Minutes

Action Discussion: 4.1 **October 17 2023**

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to approve the October 17 2023 minutes.

Motion by J Louis Rivera second by Jeff Manson.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson Jeff Manson Pat Shea J Louis Rivera

Nay: None

Abstain: Dylan Penn

Action Discussion: 4.2 **November 9 2023**

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to approve the November 9 2023 minutes.

Motion by Pat Shea second by J Louis Rivera.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson Jeff Manson Pat Shea Dylan Penn J Louis Rivera

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Action Discussion: 4.3 **November 21 2023**

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to approve the November 21 2023 minutes.

Motion by Jeff Manson second by J Louis Rivera.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson Jeff Manson Pat Shea Dylan Penn J Louis Rivera

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Action Discussion: 4.4 **December 19 2023**

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to approve the December 19 2023 minutes.

Motion by Chairperson - Bonnie Franson second by Pat Shea.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson Jeff Manson Pat Shea Dylan Penn J Louis Rivera

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Action Discussion: 4.5 **March 14 2024**

tabled

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 the meeting.

Motion by Pat Shea second by Jeff Manson.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Bonnie Franson Jeff Manson Pat Shea Dylan Penn J Louis Rivera

Nay: None

Abstain: None

"