

Town of Monroe Planning Board Workshop Meeting MINUTES

— 06/12/2025

Town of Monroe Planning Board Workshop Meeting (Thursday, June 12, 2025)

Generated by Norinne McSweeney

Draft

Members Present:

Jeff Manson, J Louis Rivera, Robert Garstak

Members Absent:

Bonnie Franson, Dylan Penn, Pat Shea

Planning Board Consultants:

Ashley Torre, Esq.

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

Applicant Representative:

Vince Pietrzak - P&P

Jon Dahlgren - Tim Miller Assoc

Mr. Dahlgren reviewed the current status of the application:

- submitted our consistency analysis which compares the current plan to what was approved in 2015
- the consistency analysis goes through a number of topics to just evaluate the former plan and the current plan
- we submitted in March and more recently in May
- part of this process we're coordinating with different agencies such as fire department, OCDPW and other agencies included in the process
- we are responding when we can
- we are here today to discuss any questions on the wetlands - I believe there was some

coordination with the Town's wetland consultant in responding to his comments so that is part of the package here

Mr. Pietrzak -

- in addition we are starting to receive responses back from the other agencies which will be included in the next submission
- we got a response letter back from the DOH, DPW and the Fire Chief

Deputy Chairman Manson - anything you want the board to be aware of that is more important

Mr. Dahlgren -

- wetland mitigation plan approved by Army Corp in 2015
- wanted to let the board know that this is an involved process meeting with the Army Corp there was a site visit and several meeting after the permit we had to consult with US Fish & Wildlife which we did and then there was a bog turtle survey, bat survey with mis nets the point is the mitigation plan we provided suggested planting the area grading plans what were approved by the Army Corp our position at this point is to proceed with that mitigation plan
- still have to go back to the Army Corp and they may have some adjustments the impact to their regulated wetlands is less with this plan then the previous

Deputy Chairman Manson - just so I am clear the plan with Army Corp was developed before or after the most recent settlement and the changes where the housing to single family homes was that prior to the wetlands mitigation plan or subsequent to them?

Mr. Pietrzak - that was part of the original approval

Mr. Dahlgren - prior to all these changes yes and the reduction of the senior housing the Army Corps mitigation included the senior housing.

Mr. Pietrzak - it would make it easier for the applicant to get a reapproval from the Army Corps than to go through a new process of getting a separate approval okay

Mr. Sickler comments:

- MHE performed a review of the Consistency analysis it focused on areas that we had previously reviewed
- the first area was the cut/fill analysis the revised project now results in an excess of about 11,000 cubic yards of material that has to be cut from the site, may be used to create a building pad on the commercial lot otherwise it will be removed from the site
- section 2 need for blasting - rock will be removed by chipping or mechanical means to the greatest extent possible
- later it indicates that a boring program will be done to determine the potential need for blasting
- think it would be good to add to that section that once the boring program is completed that it

be reviewed from a representative of the Town to determine if mechanical means of excavation is possible

- received the SWPPP for the amended layout meet with applicants engineer to discuss the applicable DEC design criteria to complete review
- section 3 incorporate a brief summary of the differences between the two layouts and the impacts on storm water - a table would be the easiest format
- a brief description of the overall storm water management has not changed and compare the results
- section 4 includes an updated traffic section

Ms. Torre comments:

- regarding traffic when you prepared the scope for review you decided a traffic consultant would not be necessary, but you wanted the county to weigh in on the need for further study
- the applicant has been in contact with the County DPW and received some correspondence but they didn't address whether or not a study was warranted - if the applicant could follow up with the county on whether or not anything further is needed
- there were a few clarification or corrections to some of the numbers that need to be discussed with the wetland consultant
- a couple of questions on water quality testing that should be reviewed by the hydro-geologist consultant
- main question was whether those tests should be done as part of SEQRA rather than waiting for when they're doing them for the OCDH. They were done previously, but those permits have expired for the water quality I believe. Defer to Mr. Sickler and the hydro-geologist on this matter.

Mr. Pietrzak in regards to the permits they don't expire but the OCDOH after 20 years that everything be redone. We don't have any questions, just that we don't think the water testing should hold up SEQRA.

Deputy Chairman Manson - I did read the consistency analysis and it seems there is still work to be done to get us all on the same page.

Ms. Torre - one more things we did just receive comments from KALA on the landscaping I have forwarded to the applicant. There was a questions in regards to the tree preservation code it doesn't apply as it wasn't in effect at the time of the prior approval. That will be removed from her comments.

Deputy Chairman Manson - in regards to traffic don't feel it is necessary to have our traffic consultant look at the information in relation to that the project to some degree is less units so we can see that in looking at the analysis that there's going to be some less traffic because of that but it's going to change up the kinds of traffic a bit again without the senior component,

but I didn't think we were so vastly different that it necessarily required the consultant to look.

Ms. Torre - waiting on comments from Mr. Tompkins and Mr. Getchell

Action, Discussion: 2.2 Monroe Commons (0182-2019) SBL # 2-1-10 Nininger Road, Monroe, NY

Ms. Torre - they are on the agenda for an extension they are very close to being done there is one agreement to be revised and filed with the county and once done the plans can be signed.

The plan approval currently expires on Monday, June 16, 2025. It'd would be appropriate to approve an extension of the conditional approval and your code does extensions for 180 days although that may be excessive it would be appropriate to make that motion which would be December 12, 2025.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to approve the 180 day extension for approval until December 12, 2025.

Motion by Jeff Manson, second by J Louis Rivera.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Jeff Manson, J Louis Rivera, Robert Garstak

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Action, Discussion: 2.3 **Pallotti Village** (0196-2021) SBL # 33-1-1.21 Harriman Heights Rd, Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative

Mike Morgante - Project Engineer

Chris Durr - Rockaville

Mr. Morgante project review:

- we are here with an amended site plan
- we had some state funding requirements that have changed and have required us to modify the southern site building to have a mix of senior and non senior units
- those changes in turn required the need to add 27 additional parking spaces
- the additional impervious surface required some slight modifications to the stormwater pollution prevention plan
- we had an abundance of capacity in the existing design so there's really nothing that has changed with the storm water basins, we updated it to include the additional impervious surface
- the changes were submitted for the Town Planning Board and MHE for review
- a slight change in the traffic patterns associated with the project - essentially weekday AM

peak hour additional 2 trips, weekday midday peak an additional 10 trips, and weekday PM peak additional 14 trips, and Saturday mid peak hour would be 8 trips.

- provided a summary table residential units don't change 178, additional 27 parking spaces, site disturbance went up 8/10 of an acre, impervious surface increased by a little over half acre and the open space went down by a little over 1%, otherwise the plan is fairly similar to what this board approved.

Deputy Chairman Manson - all the building layouts the same, all the additional parking on the one side of the development.

Mr. Morgante - the northern site has not changed at all

Mr. Sickler comments:

- reviewed SWPPP discussed with Mr. Morgante who made revisions we just received will do an additional review
- most of the comments are carried over comments from last submission

Ms. Torre comments:

- with SEQRA you previously declared your intent to be lead agency which was circulated on June 3, 2025 the 30 days hasn't passed yet
- recently received response back from the County
- needs GML referral ?

Mr. Morgante - do we need a public hearing for this again?

Ms. Torre - you don't for the site plan but you will for the subdivision but you can't get the subdivision until the site plan has final approval

Action, Discussion: 2.4 **Meadow Hill Subdivision** (0169-2018) SBL # 37-1-1 Corner of Camp Monroe & Lakes Rd, Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative:

Zachary Peters - Mercurio-Norton-Tarolli-Marshall, PC Engineering-Land Surveying

Mr. Peters reviews project:

- minor changes to plans since last meeting
- reached out to OCDPW have an application in to them, received a conceptual approval of the entrances locations, part of approval they requested the driveways on lots 3,4,5, & 6 be split instead of shared driveways now individual, lots 1&2 still have the shared driveway
- made a change on lot 6 reduced the house size to pull away from wetland
- received some preliminary correspondence with OCDOH in regards to the old landfill across the street after some discussions with them we basically ended up flipping/mirroring the wells and the sewers on those 2 lots, sewers in front yard wells in back yard
- it actually gave more flexibility to preserve a little more undisturbed area between the road

and the house

Mr. Sickler comments:

- as discussed that was the primary revision to the plans flipping the wells & sewer, and reducing the house size
- previous comment there was an offer of dedication on the southern end of 50 foot strip for potential expansion of the trails NYNJ trail for a period of 5 years
- applicant will revise SWPPP once the plans layout have been agreed upon
- will also provide the tree plan once layout approved
- applicant received feedback from OCDPW that process is still in the works
- conservation easement on lots 1&2 when revisions made it's not clear where the easement is currently proposed
- in regards to wetlands - your consultants reviewed these back in 2020 applicant provided correspondence from Peter Torganson in 2024 that stated the original delineation from 2019 is adequate. With the length of time passed not sure if you want wetlands consultant to review it again.

Deputy Chairman Manson - Do to the time frame I believe an updated review from Dave Tompkins would be acceptable

Member Rivera - have you ever considered less units on this property to get away from the wetlands

Mr. Peters - I can discuss that with the applicant, but this is what they came back with as part of having the conservation on the remainder of the lot

Deputy Chairman Manson - the original proposal was seven or eight lots

Mr. Peters - the environmental consultant did coordinate with the DEC on getting a jurisdictional determination - that is currently still in the works

Ms. Torre comments:

- no new comments I had some back when you were last here about a year ago that I could resend those to the applicant
- don't believe you ever applied for a local wetlands disturbance permit and that requires a narrative under section 57-6 sub 4, 5, 6
- this was really to review the new layout before the applicant got started on the SWPPP and the other information and studies that will be needed for SEQRA
- needs to do SWPPP

Action, Discussion: 2.5 **Walmart** (0233-2024 & 0218-2024) SBL # 2-1-31.1 Larkin Drive, Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative:

Don Flood - Dewberry Engineers

Mr. Flood review:

- last meeting there were questions on contents of the storage trailers and how they open making sure enough space between
- also questions on adding additional safety measures for employees delivering the good to curb side pick up area
- we submitted revised plans
- provided more details on the storage trailers
- we noted on the plans that the storage trailers would be on property from September to January
- noted things regarding the contents
- we provided a list of items that are also stored in the back area including cardboard bales, wooden pallets
- there were comments on providing more screening for the containers that were in view of the residential area.
- screening will be included as necessary
- there was a question regarding existing canopy that will remain no additional canopy will be added

Mr. Sickler comments:

- it was determined this would need a referral to the ZBA for parking count
- canopy to remain please note that on plan C.2
- add the approval box on every sheet
- best to discuss the correspondence from the Building Inspector on the use or the number of storage trailers and his opinion on whether it is considered an accessory use to retail accessory storage

Ms. Torre - that just came to use today and I don't believe the applicant has seen that yet. We did reach out to the Building Inspector based on, you might recall the Target application that had 3-5 storage trailers, and he determined that was an accessory use to the retail use accessory storage. His determination based on the number of storage units proposed here which is 38 that it does not fit within the accessory use it's no longer subordinate to the retail use. We will forward that interpretation on to you and you'd have recourse to appeal to the ZBA.

Deputy Chairman Manson - if it wasn't determined to be an accessory use is it determined to be a separate use

Ms. Torre - I am not aware of any permitted use that would fall under. Previously when it was less containers was allowed as accessory for the retail. To the applicant you can research it further and see if you find something under the code.

Ms. Torre -

- cleanup on application forms
- come comments from the last time still outstanding
- the narrative in the second to last paragraph it says that the number of trailers per year varies plus or minus four, but based on the math that should say plus or minus three
- include revision dates on the narrative
- you are combining the applications on actual plans if you could show both the store all the storage units and the addition in a single site plan
- circulated the lead agency notice on May 1st can assume lead agency status tonight

Deputy Chairman Manson - would that be appropriate if the applicant needs to head over to the ZBA for us to still do that at this point or does it make more sense to hold off

Ms. Torre - you could maybe hold off because maybe do uncoordinated if right I think see what the applicant's going to do

Deputy Chairman Manson - the one other comment I have is this is the second time that Walmart has come to us in relation to a project where they're expanding their pickup and curbside delivery and I find that what Walmart proposed the first time around and is proposing this time around to be a very considerate use for this function that is growing in stores, but they've managed to propose something yet again where it doesn't interfere with the traffic or the ability of those people who want to come in and shop in the store anyway that they've been smart to sort of separate it and expand it incrementally to grow with that portion of the business.

Deputy Chairman Manson - do we need to make a referral to the ZBA for the parking

Ms. Torre - you can refer them but you don't have to it all depends on the direction the applicant is going to take

Mr. Flood - we will need to speak to our applicant as to what they want to do at this point

Action, Discussion: 2.6 **O&R Substation** (0237-2025) SBL # 1-2-43 Forest St, Monroe, NY

Applicant Representatives:

Leslie Snyder - Snyder & Snyder

Kevin EN Engineering

Mike Homenick - O&R

Ms. Snyder reviews the project:

- submitted updated plans May 27
- which included some additional response to landscape comments
- we also addressed MHE comments
- addressed the OCPD comments which was noted as a local determination
- submitted an updated SWPPP

- submitted a construction management plan which addressed it's an unmanned station but during construction we won't interfere with the traffic in the community
- we are here to review the environmental assessment form to continue to move the SEQRA process along

Mr. Sickler comments:

- we reviewed the SWPPP and we prepared some comments on that, we have a meeting set with O&R representative

Ms. Torre comments:

- circulated draft EAF part II to review
- reviewed the EAF with the board and the applicant

Deputy Chairman Manson - what is the projected length of time for the project to be completed

Mr. Homenick - filtered in delays with materials approximately 16 months

Mr. Fordham - submitted comments 2 days ago any comments back on those
Deputy Chairman Manson- still under review

Ms. Snyder - reviewed the comments regarding the spacing of the trees spoke with our landscape architect and he said 6 feet separation is sufficient

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to authorize a negative declaration at this time.

Motion by Jeff Manson, second by J Louis Rivera.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Jeff Manson, J Louis Rivera, Robert Garstak

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

Motion by Robert Garstak, second by J Louis Rivera.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Jeff Manson, J Louis Rivera, Robert Garstak

Nay: None

Abstain: None

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

approved at 5/20/2025 meeting

Action, Discussion: 3.4 March 13, 2025

held over

Action, Discussion: 3.5 March 18, 2025

held over

Action, Discussion: 3.6 April 10, 2025

held over

Action, Discussion: 3.7 April 15, 2025

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 the meeting.

Motion by Robert Garstak, second by J Louis Rivera.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Jeff Manson, J Louis Rivera, Robert Garstak

Nay: None

Abstain: None