

Town of Monroe Planning Board Workshop Meeting MINUTES

— 07/11/2019

Town of Monroe Planning Board Workshop Meeting (Thursday, July 11, 2019)

Generated by Norinne McSweeney

Members present

Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Chairwoman - Bonnie Franson, James McKnight, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson

Members absent:

John Allegro

1. Welcome

Procedural: 1.1 Roll Call

Procedural: 1.2 Point out Fire Exits

Procedural: 1.3 Pledge of Allegiance

2. New Project

Action, Discussion: 2.1 **J6 Construction** (0177-2019) SBL # 10-5-2,3,4

Tom DePuy - DePuy Engineering

John Sorrentino applicant

Mr. DePuy: This is the old Hillside & Scott application that we are now bringing back to the board to do a lot line change on the original approved 3 lots. Lot line change will make the lots more even and give more green space around the houses themselves

Chairwoman Franson: has the board had a chance to look at the proposed layout

Mr. Edsall: include on the new plans the utility services from the old plans we can have a complete set

narrative showing everything

any approvals should be listed in the narrative

sewer layout, any easements required properly depicted

there is an accelerated process for a lot line change under A65-5B

topography needed

Chairwoman Franson:

needs to be sent to OCDP for GML review

house relocation notes, how many bedrooms, where house located (house site) can be

moved within certain distances section 57-21.8

Type II action, No SEQRA

3 complying lots

there already are 280-A variances approved for the existing lots

either as a map note or language that the area being transferred is not a developable area it's part of what's being transferred from one lot to another

recommend that Ashley drafts a resolution, once we hear back from OCDP you will be placed on the next agenda

Discussion: 2.2 **81 Raywood Dr Subdivision** (0176-2019) SBL # 43-1-11

Larry Toros- Civil Tech Engineering

Joel Mann - Brach & Mann Associates

1.28 acre parcel off of Raywood Drive and we are proposing a 3 lot subdivision, 2 flag lot shape and 1 full frontage required

proposing a duplex on each lot services by municipal sewer and water

Mark Edsall:

Bulk table on the plan as far as the required information is correct for SR-10 Single family proposing duplexes which are not allowed in the SR-10 Zone - significant problem, another problem for lot configuration going back to a single family dwelling the lot width calculation under the code 57-3 calls for the lot widths to be measured as an average or a mean dimension of the measurements at the front and rear , so the lot width dimension would need to be corrected and show the board that each lot meets the bulk requirements balance of the criteria appear to be satisfied but you have to verify that lot width meets the requirements if they do the board can consider this as a 3 lot single family subdivision

Ashley Torre:

Agrees it can only be single family dwelling

the flag lot shapes are not allowed

issue with parking in front yard setback

the owners endorsement needs to be filled out correctly

unlisted action under SEQRA

require referral to the county , 239-nn to Kiryas Joel and Palm Tree

Joel Mann:

it would be 2 units on each lot

intent was actually to get a referral to go to the ZBA for a USE variance for the Duplex, is it a use or area variance

Chairwoman Franson:

it would be up to the building inspector as to what variance is needed

what allowed is a single family detached dwelling, what is being proposed is not a single family

also need area variance for lot width

Joel Mann:

I can try to reconfigure the lots so that there won't be a flag lot

revised plans need to be seen by the building inspector

Mark Edsall:

for your reference look at Prohibited uses in all districts 57-37

does allow in cases of cluster

Chairwoman Franson:

are you going to have sidewalks connecting to any of the other properties

Joel Mann:

yes I will be connecting to neighboring property plus a sidewalk into the Village

Chairwoman Franson:

need to see more information as to what is supposed to be provided on the subdivision plan, topography and grading

Ashley have you looked at the cluster subdivision regulations - its under 5 acres so you can waive the provisions - we don't have to but we can

asked applicant regarding water & sewer - response: going to be municipal water & sewer

will want evidence or a letter that you can use water from Kiryas Joel

visit Building Inspector to determine necessary variances required

resubmit for the next workshop meeting

Planning Board has ARB review so make sure house relocation notes are on the map and we will like to see more information on the houses themselves

Mark Edsall:

addressed applicant to make sure it is very clear the number of units proposed for each lot

what are your intents with the decks are the open or enclosed - response: open wood decks 3.

Returning Project

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

John Queenan Lanc & Tully engineer for the applicant

Chairwoman Franson:

I believe you have submitted a cluster plan no other conventional plan

John Queenan: I emailed Norinne for distribution to the board regarding the cluster plan and the applicants' stance the conventional layout plan based upon some information that we received from the highway superintendent regarding the cul-de-sac

Mark Edsall:

I meet with Highway Superintendent on June 17th in person went over the plan, discussed the issues related cul-de-sac lengths regarding his position as highway superintendent and then with the benefit of being Chief of the Fire department. I issued a memo to the Chair on June 18 (see attached) which indicated that Mr. Scherne had no real concern with regard to the length of the cul-de-sac as long as the road was built to full width as required by the code and that it meet Town road specifications and that at the end of the road there is a full diameter cul-de-sac or in lue of that a turnaround that meets the Appendix D of the NYS Code. From a practical standpoint what he's concerned about is being able to get in and have access, room to turn around, not concerned about the length once in cul-de-sac in ways of maintenance. He was concerned about 3 family houses and fire protection, he had no real concern regarding the duplexes considered as part of the cluster, but he was concerned about the 3 families. In terms of snow removal the cul-de-sac is a better layout for the truck to get in and plow through the full diameter cul-de-sac and not worry about backing up.

Chairwoman Franson: you are saying the cul-de-sac is a better layout that's as opposed to a T-Turn. The T works but the cul-de-sac is a much better option.

right now we have to come up with what the maximum yield is going to be ultimately you also have to meet the cluster subdivision regulations
we need to decide what the potential maximum yield is

Chairwoman Franson:

Ashley could you give us some guidance as far as looking at the conventional and how we should approach the conventional and determining the maximum yield

Ashley Torre:

You should be looking at it as this is the plan before you for a subdivision that someone is seeking approval for all factors should be considered here reasonable layout, configuration, topography, is this conventional plan something that is approvable

Chairwoman Franson: so if we had to pursue the conventional plan and had to make a

determination on it would we approve it that configuration
lets take this lot by lot and see if we think it will be an approvable lot
what are you allowed to do within an O&R Easement? John Queenan response: driveway
access no structures
are yards allowed - children can play - yes
equipment - not sure about equipment

Member Vaccaro: we've talked about the essence of reasonableness and the conversation Mark had with the highway superintendent about the length of the cul-de-sac and also the stub cul-de-sac to the side, because geometrically you can do it and just because slopes can be cut to fit in I don't think any of that is reasonable especially when you are trying to max in the number of lots that are reasonable for that site. We can go through each lot to see if it's buildable but that to me does not meet the test of reasonable

Chairwoman Franson: agrees, would we approve it because it was reasonable, would it have been a lot which we allowed

Member Vaccaro: aside from that i don't feel I will be inclined to vote on a waiver to extend the length of the cul-de-sac to meet the purposes of maxing out this subdivision, so I say the whatever the maximum cul-de-sac length from the beginning of the intersection at Schunnemunk road whatever that takes you to that's what this subdivision should be designed around

Ashley Torre: just a comment on that - so the waiver is obviously something that this board is able to grant and this is why I think it's important to try and divorce the cluster from the conventional plan when you are at this stage it's going to determine the maximum yield it's really would you grant the waiver for this conventional plan, just putting aside the cluster and just focusing on this before you now would you grant that waiver. If not then why not, the highway superintendent has commented that its not the end all and be all that this is something for you to consider and whether or not this conventional plan if that's something that you grant

Mr. Vaccaro: to that extent I appreciate the highway superintendents comments I don't think that it's necessarily in their purview and I take it into consideration

John Queenan: can I just touch upon the length of the cul-de-sac, we have been over this many months now, in order to get to the property the shortest path is the path that the applicant secured from Schunnemunk to the beginning of the cul-de-sac, which is 420' before we get to the property line. To put a 500' cul-de-sac I can even put that on the property without even granting the waiver because the cul-de-sac diameter from right away is 100' so I am still short by 20' . So know matter what scenario I'd still need to request the waiver, granted what the applicant has gone through to secure that access, which is a better access point from all

the other access points that he could of potentially looked at and what happened in the past the subdivision basically creating this, this is how we basically ended up at this layout which we believe is a unique situation to this property as it doesn't have a dedicated usable frontage anywhere because of what happened with the prior subdivision map that we went over at the last meeting.

Group discussion on cul-de-sac 1 vs 2 bulbs, approving waiver for cul-de sac, sight distance of driveway from lot one, went lot by lot to discuss reasonableness, big discussion on lot 10,

Board discussed opinions regarding 2 cul-de-sac, 4 members do not like 2 cul-de-sac discussed making 1 lot and taking out cul-de-sac B (smaller one)

recommendation is:

short cul-de-sac be eliminated combining lot 2 & 3

lot 10 being eliminated combine into other neighboring lots

majority will consider granting the waiver for road A cul-de-sac

John do a revised conventional plan removing cul-de-sac B and reconfiguring lots 2 & 3

next meeting have a resolution as to memorialize the conventional yield Action, Discussion:

3.2 Foreign Objects Beer Company (0175-2019) SBL# 38-9-1.1

David Niemotko - Architect

Appreciate Mark's letter dated June 18, 2019 re: meeting with Building Inspector the use for a Restaurant Tavern which is permitted and noted on the plan

not necessary to bring the building up to the current zoning codes as the renovation is less than 50% of the value of the building

Mark Edsall:

as mentioned my conversation with the Building Inspector Ben Maldonado the site use has been resolved (see attached)

agreed building does not need to be brought into compliance with the current building codes GML to OCDPW & OCDP

Surveyed location of the improvements on the site plan relative to the traveled way

improvements, does show small traveled way, but I anticipate OCDPW wanting location of the striping on the road and as long as that is the white shoulder line then fine, if it isn't you should get that shown

3 parking spaces in the north the front row should be increased, there are wheel stops there now , but the 3 northerly spaces on the front row still need to be increased

from last meeting I mentioned the conflict between the signage for the handicapped parking and the entrance that hasn't changed, if you walk at the front door, if door depicted correctly,

you're walking right into the no parking sign for the cross-hatched access aisle suggested shifting space to the south so the signs could be mounted to the building or at least not conflict with the door entry

Chairwoman Franson: you are not changing the facade are you?

David Niemojko: they are upgrading it, existing awnings being upgraded, stucco needed to be repaired, and a new privacy fence on the left side of the elevation with the 3 LED lights and the Foreign Objects sign

Mark:

handicapped parking: detail needed corrections where standard space joins a handicapped space double line needed blue and white, handicapped symbol needs to meet the current standards needs to be new symbol also no parking anytime sign at the cross-hatched section any walk way need to the walk in freezer/frig, if so indicate it standard lighting note needs to be included on the plans

Chairwoman Franson: brings up the need for a public hearing, board discusses it Public hearing set for August 20, 2019

Ashley Torre:

size of the sign one says 14 sq ft another says 8 sq ft needs to be consistent cooler & fence close to 40 ft setback on first page need to be adjusted

Requests items:

sample requested for the type of awning being used
need detail for the lights and the color not stark white something warmer, something in the 2500 or 3k range versus the 5000

approval box with project number lower right hand corner

picture of the outdoor cooler

travel way note

GML OCDP & OCDPW

no pedestrian isle

handicap space sign on building, access isle cross hatch with no parking

3 ft wide strip by spot marked 3

stone around front door staying

show what colors painting after stucco repaired

flood light aimed downward

no trees to be removed BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby sets a Public hearing for August 20, 2019.

Motion by Chairwoman - Bonnie Franson, second by Anthony Vaccaro.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Chairwoman - Bonnie Franson, James McKnight, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson

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 Action: 4.4 March 14, 2019 Minutes

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby approves the minutes from March 14, 2019.

Motion by James McKnight, second by Jeff Manson.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Chairwoman - Bonnie Franson, James McKnight, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson

Action: 4.5 March 19, 2019 Minutes

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe has hereby approved March 19, 2019 minutes.

Motion by Chairwoman - Bonnie Franson, second by Anthony Vaccaro.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Chairwoman - Bonnie Franson, James McKnight, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson

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 10PM.

Motion by Chairwoman - Bonnie Franson, second by Anthony Vaccaro.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Anthony Vaccaro, Lisa McQuade, Chairwoman - Bonnie Franson, James McKnight, Jason Czerwinski, Jeff Manson