

Town of Monroe Planning Board Workshop Meeting MINUTES

— 07/13/2023

Town of Monroe Planning Board Workshop Meeting (Thursday, July 13, 2023)

Generated by Norinne McSweeney

Draft

Members Present

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

Members Absent:

Nick 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. New Projects

Action, Discussion: 2.1 **Barret** (0214-2023) SBL# 9-2-6 145 Cooper Street Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative:

David Niemotko - Niemotko Architects

Mr. Niemotko - the applicant wants to convert an existing space above a garage into an accessory apartment for a family member

-the property is located at 145 Cooper Street

-we provided a site plan along with bulk table requirements

-documents showing they own the property

-provided architectural plans outlining the layout of the apartment and its compliance with the zoning code for square footage

-we have received Mr. Arnott's comments and we are in agreement with them

-some minor comments to work out regarding parking in the driveway or things of that nature

-there is no change to the existing footprint this is a pre-existing condition above the existing garage

Mr. Arnott comments:

- I pointed out some of the major points of the requirements of an accessory apartment
- applicant needs to confirm property is within the sanitary sewer or connected to sewer that triggers more restrictive or less restrictive requirements in the zone
- add a note to the plans once confirmed - if on septic the additional bedroom would require additional design requirements
- the square footage accessory apartment can't exceed 750 square feet or 30% of the growth floor area
- applicant noted that it's greater than 3,000 square feet for the growth floor area and they're proposing 600 square feet which complies with the minimum and the maximum allowable per the code
- one section of the code requires that the single family dwelling be lawfully constructed for at least 10 years - assessor's record provided shows house built in 1976
- applicant has to live there for more than 10 years in order to convert accessory apartment - applicant needs to provide the deed
- there is a requirement in the code that for each unit 2 parking spaces are required appears driveway may comply - have asked Mr. Niemotko to look into that
- there will be no change to the foundation or the roof line or existing facade all work will be interior
- one minor comment to look into the scale might be off on the plot plan so Mr. Niemotko needs to review that
- property within 500 feet of Town of Chester will require GML 239
- not sure if a public hearing is required - I believe it is discretionary
- need to discuss SEQRA

Ms. Torre Comments:

- advised that a public hearing is not required
- referral to OCDP for GML is required
- Type II Action under SEQRA
- application form and owner's affidavit form contains outdated Code references will work with Ms. McSweeney on that
- in addition to deed requirement, the applicant must submit voting records or such competent evidence as would be sufficient to establish domicile for purposes of voting. (See ■■■ 57-44(A)(2)(e)).
- Ms. Torre also asked that the size of the existing dwelling and the size of the proposed apartment be confirmed, as there were some inconsistencies on the application and floor plan.
- the EAF had indicated 0.01 Acres of disturbance, but you're not disturbing anything so that was probably just an error

Chairwoman Franson - are you doing anything for parking or no?

Mr. Niemotko - when we did the short form EAF that was prior to the comment we received from Mr. Arnott regarding the requirement of four cars we may impact a little I don't know we'll have to lay that out in the site plan and then go from there.

Ms. Torre - the application indicates the dwelling is 2460 sq ft but the floor plan shows it's over 3,000. There is also an inconsistency in the size of the apartment, somewhere it shows 600 sq ft but somewhere else it shows 575 sq ft. Please verify which is correct.

Member Manson - what is currently in the space above the garage, what is this replacing?

Mr. Niemotko - there's nothing there it's a frame to structure all the studs are exposed and there's no finishes there at all.

Member Manson - it hasn't been in use so they're not eliminating use to put in this use they're just finishing out something that was already there.

Mr. Niemotko - confirmed that the use is not being changed.

Member Manson - in relation to the square footage I don't know if there's subtractions but I know we're saying 600 square feet for the accessory apartment and not that I think we have an issue with being within our limits, but I'm not sure what would be subtracted from that. If I calculate out just by the length and width it's 624. Now I don't know if the stairs are able to be subtracted from that and then do we have to take into consideration the landing at the bottom of the stairs because effectively you're entering the apartment there so there's a small amount of square footage at the bottom of the stairs so I would imagine you're probably somewhere closer to 650. I would just ask you to double check all of that too when you're checking the square footages to make sure that we're counting everything that we should be counting.

Mr. Niemotko was inaudible

Mr. Arnott - in response to Mr. Niemotko we can look into the code regarding inhabitable space versus what's used for the apartment.

Mr. Niemotko - I will have that resolved for the next submission.

Chairwoman Franson - (inaudible something about 2 car garage, getting rid of or going over)

according to the tax records it says there's finished area over the garage 624 square feet, so what is there now? Asked questions about the floor plan and asked that dimensions be added, and to submit pictures of the interior. Also, asked about the height and whether there are existing windows on the backside. In terms of the parking are people still going to be able to given the lengths here park within the garage.

Mr. Niemotko - (inaudible - in and out) we have pictures of exposed studs we can submit. He also confirmed there is adequate height, and is unsure whether the two windows shown are new or existing. He also confirmed there are no decks. Regarding the parking question partial inaudible with the landing for the apartment it does reduce the one side of the garage so maybe a compact car in one side and a regular in the other.

Mr. Niemotko - the diagonal hatch that you see by the door it's a new wall so the vestibule or area and stair going up would be walled in separated from the garage.

Chairwoman Franson - what's in the middle that circle with the square is that like a drainage?
Mr. Niemotko - that's an existing Lolly column.

Chairwoman Franson - what I'm getting at if I'm looking at the garage area the vestibule and the stairs are dedicated to the apartment that doesn't have a door from the garage to access the apartment the way that it's shown right now so if you could just put dimensions in to speaks to the parking requirements, but the point is that we're going to have to show the parking spaces for the accessory apartment I don't know if you're including the garages or not and I think that depends on how much length is being taken away from the one side because the other side looks like it's still the same.

Mr. Niemotko - we will have that fully resolved in our next submission about definition of area inhabitable space and circulation and things of that nature.

Chairwoman Franson - is there right now an opening from the existing residents into the area it says finished area on the tax, but you said it's not is there right now a door or anything that goes from the existing residence into that finished area.

Mr. Niemotko - I don't we know

Chairwoman Franson - addressed the board regarding a public hearing. Final at this point in time no public hearing will be done.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to classify this as a Type II action.

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

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

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

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to refer this project to OC Department of Planning subject to receiving updated plans.

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

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1

3. Returning Projects

Action, Discussion: 3.1 **Eagle View Estates** (0168-2018) SBL# 18-4-60 & 61 402 Lakes Road Monroe, NY

Applicant Representatives:

David Niemotko

John Coladonato

Mr. Niemotko - I would like to ask Mr. Coladonato to sit in with this presentation. Through this exercise I would classify him as the sewer expert in the research and meeting with the Town Board and things of that nature so I appreciate him being here he has a lot of background with it in the last few months before we go into the sewer because that's really the Crux of this whole project it would be very difficult as we saw when we went through the exercise of introducing a septic to have that work on these two lots. We did receive Mr. Arnott's comments and if I could just bypass two and three since we'll be talking about that let me just if it's agreeable with the board one two three I mean two and three we'll be talking about in a few minutes four and five we agree number six I just want to remind the Planning Board on number six the driveways the entrance were all dictated to us by Orange County DPW they were very definitive very precise and what they wanted on the driveways the slow grading the configuration everything not to put too fine a point on it, but we would not be changing the driveways their grades, slopes or location. I could provide all the documentation from Orange County DPW they were very precise in their requirements and they made us change a lot to get their approval.

Chairwoman Franson - while that might be the case I think the question is whether they're waivable.

Mr. Arnott - I'll agree with that within the county right-of-way, but what's shown on the plan view versus the profile they don't match, the slopes and you have your own restriction of not more than 10 percent on your profile whereas what I scaled was actually greater than 13 percent.

Mr. Niemotko - so it's just about inconsistency in the plans.

Mr. Arnott - correct and making sure that the maximum driveway percentage is met for the town code

Mr. Niemotko - we'll look in to that, I'll withdrawals my comments my misunderstanding I read that comment under a different light

Mr. Arnott - I'm not suggesting that the driveways change, I just think there's some inconsistencies on the plan.

Mr. Arnott Comments:

- # 7 on lot one there's an existing well so just making sure that that's noted to be abandoned pursuant to AWA and DEC standards

- # 8 maybe we can Circle back with on the sewer discussion.

- #9 if you recall lot 61 is the one that front on Walton Terrace there's no proposed improvements to the sewer on that lot. So there's no subdivision application for that lot. I think that should be removed from the application at this time.

Mr. Niemotko - we'll remove it from the bulk table do you want it removed from the map as well.

Mr. Arnott - I don't see a need for it at this point because you're only really subdividing one tax lot. The only place that will show the Walton Terrace would be on the sewer plane so it should be shown on the plan, but you have it noted on the cover sheet as you know proposed project on Lots 60 and 61 so it should be removed from that list.

- # 10 was kind of more a suggestion to the rear of the dwelling you'll see that kind of bowl shaped grating to the rear of the dwellings that's a one-on-three slope as shown that's kind of steep to mow so I'm suggesting that perhaps that can be as shallower grade or less steep grade so that the person who has to mow that doesn't have to weed whack it.

Chairwoman Franson - maybe shared wall or some or retaining wall because I think the other issue is the runoff that's going to go toward the house right I don't know if that's been taken care of but would they do you know it could be maybe a four foot retaining wall of some sort but just to do more of a cut so it's not that so it's three on one.

Mr. Niemotko (partial inaudible) a retaining wall would be large in height

Mr. Arnott - go to one on four or not one on two we want to make it less steep

Mr. Niemotko - we will look into it

Mr. Arnott - # 11 the proposed Wells are partly up those slopes and actually the one on lot two is all the way on the top of the slope I'm not sure how a well drilling rig is going to access that one to be able to drill it.

- then comment 12, 13, and 14 have to do with the tree preservation the water supply protection overlay district and the scenic roads making sure that all those requirements are met in the zoning code

Mr. Niemotko - # 14 the applicant (inaudible) something about a typo

Mr. Arnott - the conditions of the scenic Road standards shown the buffer area

Ms. Torre there is language that we could provide to you

Mr. Arnott - regarding the sewer recently the Town Board adopted section 57 21.1 e which allows the minimum lot area to be reduced to a single family home that's on sewer for an application that's proposing a septic when it's within one of the sewer districts. There are some certain requirements that it has to meet which I believe this application will meet and then as basically the caveat that if the septic will be used until such time that the sewer main is connected when capacity is available. The sewer remains have to be proposed as part of the project. So currently this application shows the proposed sewer main connections but not the septic's to be used in the interim until sewer is available. With that only the lot area is reduced the rest of the zoning requirements have to be met for the septic whereas the application shows all of the setbacks to be reduced to that of which if they were on sewer so therefore I believe that some variances will be required from the ZBA as currently depicted.

Ms. Torre - the bigger threshold question here is I believe they're proposing public sewer connections at this point and not septic so at one point we'd had discussed going under this new law but they're still now proposing the public sewer connections which there is that binding letter from the county with the capacity issues under the Moodna that prevents this board or the town from allowing any sewer connections that are outside of Orange County Sewer District one.

It's 57 21.1 e.

Ms. Torre - because the properties are in the Moodna if the applicant were to propose septic's they would be entitled to the smaller or the reduced minimum lot size requirement, which they'd be able to meet the other restrictions would still apply but again they are proposing to have the public sewer connections which brings us back to the the issue with the sewer agreement and capacity and not being able to approve any connections outside of Orange County sewer district one at this point.

Chairwoman Franson - asking a question but goes inaudible regarding sewer and septic. Ms. McSweeney believes she is reading from the Town Code section 57-21.1(e). Still some confusion maybe we can reach out to the Town Attorney or Supervisor as to the intent.

Mr. Coladonato - I've had the opportunity to work on this property not with this the owner but the prior owner and when your Consultants had said back then when we designed the septic system for it that it wasn't even in the sewer district it you know I knew that was wrong so

when I went and pulled my old file and pull out the paperwork on it I went in front of the Town board with the paperwork and I would have had that with me tonight but I only found out about Mr. Arnott's recommendations here when I was up in Sullivan County and I didn't have time to stop my office and pick up the file. The paperwork that I submitted to the town board not only showed that the property was in the Sewer District it was granted sewer hookups by the Town of Monroe and the County of Orange has it on file that the property was granted sewer hookups not that it was just in the sewer district. All this paperwork I provided to the Town Board which I went in front of them over a three-month period was about four or five months ago they had a verify it all. Supervisor Cardone, the Town Board they verified that the paperwork was submitted was so the fact the county shows that it has three hookups and it has that it isn't in the district and it was like I said it was granted by the Town Board of Monroe prior board not this current board but the minutes of the on the record the the minutes of the the meetings shows that it has sewer hookups.

Mr. Arnott could you supply that to the Planning Board office. What I'd suggest to the board is we refer that to the Orange County Sewer District for them to confirm that you actually had entitled rights to connect three connections.

Mr. Coladonato when I talked to Moodna they're saying when you're granted sewer hookups you're figured in to what they call allocation or flows for down the road because you know once a sewer hookup is granted to a property owner he might not hook up right away but you know the numbers and figures and their flow were already put into the into the mix.

Mr. Arnott - who did you talk to at Moodna for that.

Mr. Coladonato - the last one I talked on this was Mr. Green.

Chairwoman Franson - just from knowing some projects one of the issues is that the Moodna because this was studied in the conference of plan which was back in 2017 was already over allocation for the Town of Monroe. On the one hand while there may have been promises to have you do hookups and part of the allocation the reality is their promises they exceeded by promising that to many individuals in a situation where it's already over capacity. We do have a map that we got from the county for the Orange County Sewer District and for the Moodna and it does show that the property was in the Moodna Creek Sewer District so I don't think that's a question, but I don't know what's solved because there's the issue of the allocation.

Mr. Arnott - so what drove all this was a letter from the Commissioner Eric Denega at the County that said that the Town of Monroe cannot allow any more connections in the Moodna district because they're over capacity so my suggestion would be let's get this promise of a connection or three connections to the County and have them see which takes priority and have them make the decision.

Chairwoman Franson - so is your proposal right now to put in wastewater or to connect to the sewer? Where does the line end?

Mr. Niemotko (inaudible) connect to the sewer. There is an existing sewer catch basin at Walton Terrace. We did profiles and Analysis and Moodna Basin actually through their consultant approved our sewer design and we have the letters you know from Lanc & Tully showing that the design at that time was approved.

Chairwoman Franson - so it would come in from Walton Terrace?

Mr. Arnott - discharged through the adjacent lot that the applicant also controls through an easement and discharge to the existing sewer collection in Walton Terrace. Chairwoman Franson - so it has to be pumped up? correct. So in terms of the application doesn't that other lot still have to be included for that purpose.

Mr. Arnott - to grant the easement, but as part of the subdivision.

Chairwoman Franson - in other words don't they have to put sewer lines in.

Mr. Arnott - they show an easement over that other lot but, I defer to Ms. Torre whether or not that should actually be included.

Ms. Torre - the law itself will be on the map and they'll have to show the easements and it'll be part of the application to that sense, but it's not actually not part of the subdivision. They would need to get an easement over it.

Chairwoman Franson - so it's still a two lot subdivision however their ability to get wastewater service is via another lot. So we're still in a holding pattern from the perspective that we need something more definitive that will indicate that they will have the ability to connect.

Mr. Arnott - just one more thing on a technical aspect I understand that it was approved by Lanc & Tully as a technical connection however as shown it's going to require DEC sewer main extension unless they're shown as two separate laterals one for each house. Right now you show it as one pipe both homes connect to that since more than one property is connected to that main New York State DEC has to review and approve it unless you separate the two.

Mr. Niemotko - (inaudible) not sure if he asked a question or made a comment regarding the next part of the process.

Ms. Torre Comments:

- the main one was figuring out the sewer and whether they're able to connect to the public sewer as been proposed

- Mr. Arnott had touched on the scenic buffer requirement on the tree plan showing the trees that you're removing with 6 inch DBH I don't know whether you're removing any if you have a separate okay so just to make sure if you're not removing any then that's wouldn't be required but if you are then you have to replace on a one-to-one basis.

- just kind of procedurally so when all this came about with the sewer it had been going on for a little bit

you had previously done SEQRA and then it was treated back in August of 2020 that

application was being withdrawn.

This was a new application so you did I think declare your intent to be lead agency, but you haven't gotten that revised EAF yet showing that this is now just a two lot subdivision and that you're showing the public sewer for the current proposal that way we could start that process I could circulate that once we get that EAF and then but given that it is you know new or different application it would be appropriate to send for GML as well. Unless I don't know if the town signed the agreement did you sign the intermunicipal agreement with the county they're exempting various types of applications don't recall I mean it's just not ringing a bell okay it might have been at the Town board level. You did already recirculate you can assume lead agency you just would want the revised EAF for your records to show that you could make your determination.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to assume lead agency for the Eagle View subdivision.

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

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1

Chairwoman Franson - let the minutes and the record reflect that Mr. Rivera is here sitting in as an alternate for Nick Napoli.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion if required Eagle View Subdivision for the Orange County GML review if required (if it is exempt under the agreement with the County then it will not be referred)

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

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1

Chairwoman Franson - we should probably get the information more definitively on the sewer and then at that point whatever happens and we still have to hold the public hearing again.

Ms. Torre - once they get that sewer information did you want your office or Ms. McSweeney forward.

Mr. Arnott - I'll forward it with a letter to the Sewer District asking them to comment on which took precedent the letter or the promise of sewer connection.

Action, Discussion: 3.2 **127 Seven Springs Rd** (0204-2022) SBL # 1-1-41.2 127 Seven Springs Road Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative:
John Queenan - Lanc & Tully

Mr. Queenan:

- before you tonight we have an application for a property at 127 Seven Springs Road it's been before the board maybe once or twice for a sketch review
- it was initially a four lot subdivision with a little cul-de-sac road that had kind of like a shared easement access
- recently come to light to the applicant that the Town Board has passed a new overlay Zone in the area for two families and the applicant would like to pursue that in lieu of the prior application so I wanted to just go over tonight with the board that new zoning before we get into the details of doing all the design and what needs to be done for septic and wells in that location I wanted to go through that with you guys to make sure that we're on the same page moving forward so we just don't come with an application and you know we're sitting here trying to figure out if it's correct or not so I had emailed you this afternoon a sketch of what we were thinking of doing. So essentially the applicant would like to pursue is to eliminate the road and go with a three lot subdivision each lot being a two family lot and essentially that ties into kind of the discussion you're just having on the prior application with the sewer because the way I understand it works is the two family overlay Zone allows for two things that law is written as is that the minimum lot area applying the two family overlay zone is either twice the minimum lot area for a single family dwelling or 1.25 Acres whichever is the smaller. The prior application because we don't have water or sewer was one acre lots that was what was required in the SR-10 zone. The new law for two families says that you can either do twice the minimum which would be two acres or 1.25 so that would be 1.25 Acres it's the smaller the two however local law number Six of 2022 amended the sewer to say that if you are within the district not part of a major subdivision and that the lot's been in existence for one year you can revert back to the smaller zoning of the of that zone which would be in the SR-10 would be 10 000 square feet if you were providing sewer. That is what this plan is predicated on it's reverting back to the SR-10 zoning using ten thousand square foot Lots as a minimum well.

Chairwoman Franson - when you say reverting back to the prior zoning do you mean there something in the new to family or is it you're talking about the minimum lot area we're bouncing between the two laws.

Chairwoman Franson - okay but so in other words you're saying that because usually the code has the two tiers correct septic or not.

Mr. Queenan - So the SR-10 Zone septic is one acre and if you have sewer it's ten thousand

square feet and what the sewer law the way I read it is telling you that you can use the ten thousand square feet if you meet the following conditions and that would be applied to the two family overlay that's how I have been made to understand it.

Chairwoman Franson - so we're hearing this for the first time.

Mr. Queenan - that's why I wanted to go through this because I had a discussion with Max about it and I was talking to him about the 1.25 Acres versus the one and he said no you can use the 10 000 square feet if you meet the criteria in local law number six which was the sewer change local law six 2022.

Chairwoman Franson - so the overlay allows them to do the two family subject to certain minimum requirements, but then the sewer allows use the SR-10 but I think the question is..

Mr. Queenan - what the two family does is it says that you need to do twice the minimum lot size and so if you're at the SR-10 it would be twenty thousand square feet then essentially if 10, 000 was your base.

Chairwoman Franson - that would be for the single family.

Mr. Queenan - it says two times the minimum lot area for a single family dwelling in the Underlying Zoning District.

Chairwoman Franson - let me ask you a quick question is are all these requirements part of a special use under the overlay or are they permitted.

Ms. Torre - family special use

Chairwoman Franson - okay so the references to the acreages is at the special use permit requirement or is that

Ms. Torre - I believe this special use permit requirement defines it as twice the (inaudible).

Mr. Queenan - the law just says it adds a new section to chapter zoning environmental design stands as follows and it says two-family Overlay District defines the purpose it says additional uses authorized in addition to the uses authorized in the underlying zoning District Two family detached dwellings shall be authorized as a special use subject to authorization and site plan approval by the Planning Board.

Chairwoman Franson - is it in the code - 57-13 (u). So this is under special use permits so it's a standard for a special unit in the laws right and and that's the important aspect of this because the special permit is a special permit and Ashley will opine but from my perspective my understanding would be to get a two family this is special use perm requirement so if there's something related to the lot area size that's part of the specials permit then I think it has to be met.

Mr. Queenan I don't think talks about should be item one should talk about waste water item two talks about the size of a single they want you like a single driveway accessing the lot and then number three would be protection of woodland's character.

Chairwoman Franson - was there a bulk standard added somewhere yes 21.9 C

Mr. Queenan - bulk standards for a two-family detached dwellings shall be the same as required for a single family detached dwelling in the underlying zoning District except as follows and then that's when it goes into say it's either twice the size of single family or 1.25 Acres

Chairman Franson - so I think that sewer provision works for single-family homes or in other words it would work for anything that's subject to the bulk requirement in the SR-10 but then they put this overlay in and they put these standards here so I don't think that it applies and not that I think it needs to be discussed but

it's just because these are all different sections of the code and the way they were implemented in the two family overlay District it says it's a special use it would have been cleaner if they had added the two family and and I guess this is a question let me check probably not because the two family isn't allowed in the SR-10 the two families allowed in the overlay correct the minimum lot requirements apply to the SR-10 and those uses allowed in the SR-10 right that's what the issue is.

Mr. Queenan - no the law is saying that the bulk standards for a two-family dwelling shall be the same as required for a single-family dwelling in the underlying zoning District except as follows that the minimum lot area shall be the smaller of the two which is either twice the minimum lot area for a single family dwelling in the zoning District or 1.25 Acres so they're giving you the bulk.

The Board consultants and applicant continued to discuss the interplay between the new sewer law and the two-family overlay provisions.

4. Minutes

Discussion: 4.1 October 18 2022

held over

Discussion: 4.2 April 13 2023

held over

Discussion: 4.3 May 11 2023

held over

Action Discussion: 4.4 June 8 2023

held over

Action Discussion: 4.5 June 20 2023

held over

5. Adjournment

Action Discussion: 5.1 **Adjourn Meeting**

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

Motion by Chairperson - Bonnie Franson second by J Louis Rivera.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

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

Nay: 0

Absent: 1

"