

Town of Monroe Planning Board Workshop Meeting MINUTES

— 06/13/2019

Town of Monroe Planning Board Workshop Meeting (Thursday, June 13, 2019)

Generated by Norinne McSweeney

Members present

Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Chairwoman - Bonnie Franson, James McKnight, Jeff Manson, John Allegro

Members absent:

Jason Czerwinski

1. Welcome

Procedural: 1.1 Roll Call

Procedural: 1.2 Point out Fire Exits

Procedural: 1.3 Pledge of Allegiance

2. New Project

Discussion: 2.1 150 Valley View Ave - **Schonfeld** (0174-2019) SBL # 11-1-5

David Niemotko representative

Started meeting with Jeff Manson reviewing his findings:

Application says Accessory Apartment, EAF says 2 story house addition, and map shows 1 story house with addition

code indicates accessory apartment within the existing structure

Proposed size of addition is 1440 sq ft

existing house is only 1200 sq ft

Town code Accessory apartment can be either 750 sq ft or 30% of current residence which ever is smaller with a minimum apartment size of 450 sq ft

can you give us an idea for starters more about what is proposed here because there's something that are unclear here

David Niemotko:

we are proposing a 1 story addition for 750 sq ft for an accessory apartment

adding an addition to the current structure

we understand the parameters of the rezoning code we're asking that perhaps that this could move forward or move froward with the process to see if it can be approved rather than building as an addition and then coming and asking for an accessory apartment

Jeff Manson:

I am going to continue with what I saw:

the entity disclosure form although its an individual it still requires that it be filled out as to who the owner is

missing a floor plan as indicated on the application

owner affidavit owner currently occupies the dwelling as his principal domicile, but Mr. Schoenfeld lives on Garfield Drive, not current living there , Per David he owns it will be moving in and can do it

missing the deed

EAF # 5 doesn't fit within the permitted use

Chairwoman Franson:

definitely need clarification and consistency on the owners residence

if this application is not meeting necessary requirements then this action may require other approvals namely variances from the ZBA

this application needs some additional information prior to anything moving forward. The dwelling currently is to small and does not fit the standards it would be considered a 2 family and that is not permitted in this zone then it becomes a use variance the whole thing we were trying to avoid with accessory apartment regulations is people actually building 2 families.

Ashley do you have any comments or recommendations

Ashley Torre:

the issue doesn't meet the code as they are seeking an extension the code says you can't extend for a roof line, foundation or facade. If moving forward they would have to go to ZBA and or Building Inspector for type of interpretations to see if they would be permitted to do that issues with the actual paperwork as Jeff had pointed out issue with the square footage of the accessory apartment will need to go to Building Inspector for interpretation and the ZBA prior to this board taking any further action.

Open conversation regarding 10 yr as a single family dwelling, type of service - sewer and well

Main dwelling would be application accessory apartment would be in-laws

Regulations clearly say: No exterior changes or expansion which may alter its existing foundation, existing roofline or existing facade maybe made to the principal single family detached dwelling except for the installation of an entrance to serve the accessory apartment

The best course of action for this application is to go to the Building Inspector as there may be an issue with the proposed parking in the front yard . Building Inspector to weigh in on the

proposed extension vs addition and the front yard parking then go to ZBA with whatever variances are necessary.

Chairwoman Franson asked Ms. Torre to draft a letter to the Building Inspector as to the issues we see here for his determinations

Recommendation that the application gets cleaned up and corrects necessary items that were pointed out prior to going to the Building Inspector.

Discussion: 2.2 **Foreign Objects Beer Company** (0175-2019) SBL# 38-9-1.1

Member Allegro addresses the Chairwoman saying a third party had had discussions with the owner of Foreign Objects regarding potential business relationship between myself and the business so for the purpose of avoiding any sense of impropriety or conflict I would like to recuse myself from this project.

Chairwoman Franson verified with Ms. Torre that this was all that is needed to be done regarding Member Allegro recusing himself. Yes all is good

David Niemoetko representative
Foreign Object Beer

thus is a project for Beer tasting and selling of Beer, present intent is not to use as a bar or a restaurant, there will be no food preparation

not proposing any changes to the footprint of the building except for a privacy screen off to the north side of the project

privacy screen will hold a sign about the establishment

in the back proposing a walk in cooler (east side of the building)

did the parking calculations and while the parking lot is striped the Building Inspector would like clarity on that - proposing a park lot layout with one handicapped space and access to the building and 3 other spaces along the north side of the building, actually only proposing 1 additional space from what already exists

provide floor plan of inside layout and front elevation

replace stucco, replace awnings

Mr. Edsall reviews his notes:

should be memorialized on the plan the intended use

inside plans do not show any uses, seating, storage, sales

although we don't want to have that as part of the record stamp plans from the planning board, it is important for the board to understand what the uses is

plans show building code terms not planning board terms

plans need to show zoning group and bulk group as proposed Planning Board will compare that use to the last record use for approval from the site plan

Mr. Niemotko we didn't come up with the use on our own the State Building Code did , it's a lesser impact than restaurant assembly use has a greater impact on a building than a business use

Mr. Edsall - you are before the Planning Board the plans need to reflect that with the proper codes for Planning not Building Code

Chairwoman Franson: questioning if retail or restaurant use

Zoning Code it is in the Neighborhood Business Zone

there will be tasting of beer and purchasing beer, no food no snacks, need more details as to what will be happening there

General question is there any regulations regarding bars and distances from houses or liquor license or not at all

Ms. Torre there are regulations, whether they need a liquor license for the tasting, there is a bar tavern use for this area and I think the Building Inspector needs to inform us as to where this use fits in

Chairwoman Franson it would be good to have a narrative that says X amount of floor area to be used for display of beers , seating for tasting, definitely need more narrative as to what they are planning

Mr. Niemotko not intended to be a bar or tavern, it's not open night, only a select number of nights

Mr. Edsall I will discuss with Mr. Maldonado, this will have to go for GML 239-f and a GML-m create some separation from the front row 3 parking spaces to make sure enough room for door opening

slide handicapped sign/ location down to the south currently if door location correct you will walk out door and running into the handicapped signs

fencing like a facade wall has some lighting on it just need to have the standard note added about lighting, again if fixtures create glare you have a county highway 25 feet off lot

walk in cooler is that access from the outside any inside access - No

in front of parking spaces is that a sidewalk? needs to be depicted.

its a reuse of the building just need to make sure the board is fully documenting what they are approving

Chairwoman Franson: concern with the parking and backing out onto county road

Ms. Torre: a couple of items to clarify on the plans:

the front yard is actually labeled the rear yard it has the proper 40' set back just needs to be labeled properly

zoning table should reflect the watershed fifteen percent coverage restriction

since it is a corner lot the side on Lakeview also has to comply with front yard setbacks

Member Vaccaro: just wondering if you are proposing site plan modifications doesn't the site have to be brought up to current standards, we would have to review curb cuts on Lakeview Drive

That is something that we definitely have to look into, refers back to how the property use is being determined

Mr. Niemotko if you go to the site there is some interior work going on there has been a building permit issued for that

3. Returning Project

Action, Discussion: 3.1 **DG Management** (0172-2019) SBL # 1-1-95

John Queenan Lanc & Tully engineering

DG realty management

9.5 acre subdivision

Conventional layout plan

last month grading, accessibility to the houses, and a little more detail on the road grades specifically lot # 10 in the corner

issues with lot 10

2 plans submitted, first plan is original layout that we started with, 2 plan has a different layout for lot 10

redone the road grading for access to all driveways

open discussion regarding grading and layout

not sure if Town allows Flag lots any longer, but since lot 10 has frontage on Oreco Terrace

not sure if it would be considered a flag lot or not

Chairwoman Franson questioning lot 12 odd shaped lot does it meet all the requirements

Mr. Queenan yes it meets all the setbacks SR10

checking with Highway supervisor regarding size of cul-de sac Bonnie and Mark will reach out to John Scherne. John has the right to waive the length of cul-de-sac

going through the village reduces road length to get to property

Jayne Court Subdivision was the original subdivision that left this property with the 50 ft easement off Schunnemunk Road

How many lots can you get with the 500 ft?

What is distance from Schunnemunk Rd to the Town property line? Distance from Schunnemunk to town line is 400' conventional plan length of cul-de-sac is an additional 500' for 900' total. In the cluster layout it reduces down to 800'.

Are the economics of it part of the feasibility and is there a check list to review. There is no checklist it goes along with the Planning Boards judgment and what could be approved if this were the plan before you this conventional plan would could be and what would be approved obviously if something was so out there, ex. needing to build a bridge, to get to the lot that would be something to consider

Open discussion between board members, applicant and consultants regarding what can and can't be approved, waiver for the cul-de-sac, entrance from Village road vs Schunnemunk Rd, would like to talk with highway Supervisor regarding length of road w/cul-de-sac and emergency vehicle access, maintaining the road etc.

Follow up will be:

Talking to Highway Superintendent

John Q letting us know if done to 500' what your yield would have been

next meeting hoping to come up with maximum number of lots so that we can move forward on the cluster

John scan the Maple Leaf subdivision plan to Norinne to distribute to board

4. Minutes

Action, Minutes: 4.1 November 13, 2018 Minutes

held over Action: 4.2 December 13, 2018 Minutes

held over Action: 4.3 December 18, 2018 Minutes

held over 5. Adjournment

Action: 5.1 Adjourn Meeting

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby adjourns tonight's meeting at 8:43 PM.

Motion by James McKnight, second by Jeff Manson.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Chairwoman - Bonnie Franson, James McKnight, Jeff Manson, John Allegro