



1. Welcome

1.1. Roll Call

Members Present: Pat Shea, Curtis Kimbrell, Robert Garstak, Jeff Manson, Bonnie Franson

Absent: None

Consultants: Matt Sickler, P.E., MH&E

Ashley Torre, Esq. (via Zoom)

Frank Getchell, Weston and Sampson (via Zoom)

Spiros, Weston and Sampson (via Zoom)

1.2. Point Out Fire Exits

1.3. Pledge of Allegiance

2. Returning Project

2.1. Henry Farms Subdivision (0201-2022)

SBL#29-1-2.52 (Lakes Rd. and Camp Monroe Rd.)

Present for Applicant: Gardiner Barone, Esq., Vince Pietrzak, P.E.

Ms. Franson noted that the Applicant submitted the water data to Department of Health to start the permitting process.

Mr. Pietrzak indicated that they responded to the health department letter, the comments that they supplied us with, and we address their comments other than the water quality and quantity testing.

Ms. Franson confirmed the quantity and quality testing must still be done and Mr. Pietrzak responded affirmatively. He indicated they won't be able to get approval from them unless it's completed.

Ms. Franson indicated have to finish SEQR beforehand, but understood that like DEC, the DOH will still review it and will indicate its an incomplete permit application and they may give comments, but they still review it. They will not issue a permit.

Mr. Pietrzak agreed.

In August there was a consistency analysis reviewed in October.



Ms. Franson indicated the Board will not vote on anything this evening. The Applicant will update the consistency analysis based on whatever comments we had gotten from Shawn Arnott. Ms. Torres indicated she there were some comments that she needed to have addressed and that the analysis be resubmitted for the next meeting. The Applicant will provide the process that they are recommending for water and the rationale of why the Board shouldn't look at water quality right now and why it's okay to do the consistency analysis before we have the water quality testing – to embed that discussion in the water resources section of the consistency analysis and then the Board will review it and then next month, the Board will take action on whether we will or we won't accept that consistency analysis - the Board will have the most up-to-date version. The Applicant will have a chance to convince the board that water quality shouldn't be a component of the consistency analysis and then it will decide at that point based on what is submitted.

Mr. Pietrzak expressed “Wonderful. Thank you.”

Ms. Torres questioned is it just water quality or it's really the whole water section?

Mr. Barone stated in connection with that he goes back to the March 7, 2023 memo from the Board's hydrologist that said he will notify the planning board of additional efforts that are recommended to be taken to address the water quality/quantity issues. And Mr. Barone would like to have that from the consultant before we prepare and resubmit the consistency statement. So the Applicant has all that can be bundled together at this time taken care of whether it's quantity testing and impact on wetlands and how he wants that measured, what the metrics are, etc. The Applicant would like to have as much detail so we're not operating in the dark, if you will.

Ms. Torre indicated she thinks Mr. Getchell had given previous comments explaining what was recommended. Not specific parameters because that's something usually the applicant themselves would come up with. Was it comments on the prior version of the consistency analysis where Mr. Getchell may have given this information?

Mr. Getchell indicated it was a memo submitted dated August 14, 2025. He indicated we gave the background on the project and then we identified the areas of concern as they related to the proposed water supply and impact on the groundwater resources. It's not just the quality. It's the quantity in the sense that you would ask the question about the yield of the wells. It's also the impact of the use of those wells on the onsite water resources. That's what was never addressed. And regardless of the fact that it is a lower rate or alien amount that's going to be targeted for the new project, the fact that the higher rate addressed it doesn't mean that the lower rate doesn't need to address it either. It's still a significant amount, especially if the water's going to be leaving the site. So, he couldn't answer any questions or give opinions if anybody asks - well will this new system with the reduced yield is it going to impact any of the on-site water resource? - he can't tell the Applicant because I don't even know what the other [inaudible]

Ms. Torre asked if the applicant has the memo – Mr. Getchell can provide.



Mr. Barone stated he remembers the memo and it did not provide guidelines or metrics that he could hand to somebody and say go out in the field and do this work and collect this data and give a report. And that's what he would like to have is what it is that he needs to hire somebody to do so they can go out there and do it at the appropriate time.

Mr. Getchell stated that if the Applicant is going back to the health department to get this system permitted as they want you to address with, you know, in terms of quantity and quality, they typically will do is they will point you towards the DEC pumping test requirements and then the state has specified all the steps that one goes through and it talks about why. And so if you go through that, they will identify what you should be doing at least to evaluate the impact. Specifically what you're going to be doing is measuring the water levels in the wetlands when you run the pumping test. You're not going to discharge the water during the pumping test into the on-site stream. It's going to have to be discharged somewhere offsite. You're going to monitor the flow on that onsite stream over the course of the test. That's basically what you're looking at and it's a typical approach when you're looking for an impact on a pumping well relative to water resource impact. And obviously you'll be collecting your other data. Normally what'll happen is they're going to probably require you to conduct another 72-hour test regardless of the amount of water that you're looking to pump because it's for a proposed public water supply even if it's just for your NTNC¹ type system at this point. The quality comes in which is the Part A and again same thing health department will take the Part A listing of the parameters that the state health department follows for water quality and you can get that right from Steve Gagnon over at the county health department and he'll provide that list and it's basically the same thing except for a few parameters.

Mr. Barone asked they are only being asked to do what is in the DEC guidelines or the state health department guidelines and there's no other requirements or guidelines outside of those standards that we have to apply?

Mr. Getchell indicated those are the only ones that he is familiar with relative to conducting pumping test public water supply wells in the State of New York. Right.

Ms. Franson asked, so it's a 72-hour pump test, monitoring surface waters, doing the water quality test in accordance with Part five. The constituents we've been talking about are already part of the Part 5 water quality testing. So, it's not above and beyond. It's just getting us back to updated analyses with whatever the current testing is and the standards for that. If the Applicant is going to submit something that argues against doing the water quality testing before we approve a consistency analysis. I would ask Ashley, do you think they should also then state what they will be doing afterwards? Is that necessary?

Ms. Torre indicated if they're going to be arguing to do something after, I guess they could include that as part of their case. And I guess the question though was whether Frank would be recommending anything beyond those tests that he just mentioned. And if hearing correctly, the

¹ Non-Transient Non-Community (NTNC) water system



answer was no.

Mr. Getchell indicated to the group that if you address those in terms of how you lay out a pumping test for the state of New York whether it's for basically following those requirements which the Orange County health department will also point you to it and you address those particular points. Much of it is very similar to what was done before. The only thing that's missing that I could tell looking at it was this aspect of looking at the impact on the on-site water resources. And when you're looking at those, you must basically anticipate how you run your test is not going to mute or influence what those potential responses could be. And then on top of it, the water quality analysis is just going to now address the other compounds that the state has put on since about I think it's like 2015, 2016, which includes the PFAS.

Mr. Barone indicated he thought he heard what Mr. Getchell stated and will look at the minutes very closely when they come out.

Mr. Pietrzak made one last comment that if this was a project and SEQRA was not completed, we wouldn't be arguing about this. It's our opinion that Secret has been completed and that the well testing was completed as part of that SEQRA analysis and that all we're trying to do is look at the consistency between two projects.

3. New Public Hearing

3.1. None

4. Continuing Public Hearing

4.1. 20 Owen Drive Minor Subdivision (0207-2022) SBL#3-1-9.1 (20 Owen Drive)

Ms. Franson indicated this was on the agenda last month, but there was really nothing to discuss because I don't think we had received anything updated. And then prior to that, it was the March meeting where we had the public hearing and got some public input.

Mr. Pietrak was present for the Applicant. Mr. Pietrzak indicated they did submit new plans since the last meeting and one of the main changes are that the sewer district wants the Applicant to submit for a sewer extension and not run three separate laterals for each building. So we put on manholes and we're running one line. So we'll end up having to go for permitting for Orange County Sewer District for an extension. We got the archaeological letter back and there's no further studies required. The traffic study was completed and there's no issues with the project running through Smith Farm. We revised the storm water so that the SWPPP and everything is on our property and doesn't drain on to Smith Farm.



Mr. Sickler was asked for comments. The updated tree plan and landscaping plan has been submitted to the landscape architect consultant for review. We haven't received that back, but as soon as we do, we'll distribute those comments to the board and to the applicant. The water supply testing certification was provided and indicates that the wells capable of sustaining single family dwelling. The archaeological study was completed and SHPO indicated no further work was necessary in that regard. Still have to look at the drainage - that was a comment last month in regards to again the consistency similar to the consistency with the traffic through Smith Farm which has been clarified - just to confirm that the drainage was considered in that as well. I believe that is it but we'll just have to verify that.

Ms. Torre indicated she tried to set up a meeting with the applicant and the new Village of Monroe counsel just to discuss where we are with the project and SEQR. Back when we had met with the village attorneys previously, there were some questions on what type of analysis might need to be done to show that that the project is consistent with the Smith Farm analysis that had been done some years back. The applicant submitted traffic information. I think the one other question I had was about storm water because I believe they're connecting to the storm water for Smith Farm as well. So, if there's anything needed or if Mr. Sickler could perhaps comment on where they are with the storm water question. We are still waiting on a copy of the easement agreement for the right-of-way where the proposed private road will go. The applicant had previously asked for a waiver of the cluster requirements. So, that's something you'll have to do at some point. There is still a question about the square footage of the home. Most of the dwellings are labeled 3,469 square feet per floor, but add on that plan sheet of the site plan how many floors are in each and show the exact total square footage for each because of the house relocation notes - the square footage requirements is important. And on that plan sheet, there's a plus sign on lot 2 saying it's 3,469 plus square feet per floor - remove that plus sign - it's a typo. The main question - we're trying to confirm that there's no village approvals that are required that would require the Village to be involved in the SEQR process. The Board should keep the hearing open until you're able to complete SEQR. So hopefully that'll be next month.

The public hearing was opened to public comments.

Ms. Laura Salvaty indicated she is most affected because the house being built is 30 feet from my property line, which is pretty much in my backyard. Two months ago we spoke about the landscape architect and two months later we still don't have any answers for that.

Ms. Franson indicated the landscape architect did have comments that were issued at the end of March.

Ms. Sickler stated the Applicant revised the landscaping plans based upon those comments and resubmitted them. The plans were forwarded back to the landscape architect for further review. So the current landscaping plan is different than the one that was presented two or three months ago. There's been additional landscaping added.



Ms. Salvaty stated there really wasn't one presented two or three months ago. It was in progress and we did not hear any information. We spoke about at the last meeting was for my privacy because I have all those trees in my backyard which I have a lot of privacy and now this house is pretty much being built in my backyard. I just want some privacy and I'm sure the people who are building the house want privacy as well. So I'm just trying to find out the plan for that.

Ms. Franson brought up the landscaping plan on the screen - they're showing a proposed 10- foot wide landscaping buffer. The Board asked whether it was possible to slide the house away from the property line or was there a way to somehow change the piping in a manner that could allow for a little bit more planting between the property line and the new home. Was that done, Vince?

Mr. Pietrzak was unsure if it was shifted over or not, but he stated it is pushed away from the setback line from that property line. So, it's not right up on the setback from my property line.

Ms. Sickler indicated that the storm water conveyance from the basin over to the swale behind the house - that was changed with the intent to allow for more landscaping to go in there. Ms. Franson indicated the swale was closer to Ms. Salvaty's property and it has been shifted farther west. And so it's allowed for landscaping here. Ms. Franson provided the details of the landscaping – indicated they are white plan and at a size of 2-2.5 caliper – 5-6 feet.

Mr. Sickler indicated we conveyed to the landscape architect when we forwarded the plan to her for review you know the board's concern with the screening from your property and the desire to create some type of visual barrier through there. She's currently reviewing this plan. With that in mind, she may come back with comments for the applicant to change the plantings, increase the height, spacing, something. But that's that concern has been conveyed to her.

Ms. Franson indicated this is the first attempt to address the planting comments which are intended to again provide that screening - focused on putting a whole bunch of white pines along the property line. Knowing Karen, she will probably introduce a couple more different pines there. Not having a mono species but put in maybe some cypress or green giant arborvitae - she tends to be a bit more naturalistic.

When Karen comes back with a memo that can be placed online, the plans will be placed online and then any revisions will be online so that you can take a look at them in between the meeting.

Ms. Liz Battiato stated her property is to the right of Laura's. So Drake is the property. It's kind of the pies-shaped one. She asked what the black line is- it's the limits of disturbance.

Ms. Franson will put these trees where they can install them if there are other trees already there that you don't want to cut down.

Ms. Battiato stated it looks like they're missing on the corner of the property down there. Mr. Pietrak will look into this section and squeeze a tree there or stagger back. Could put one closer to



the disturbance limit line there.

Ms. Battiato asked if it has been considered that most of the houses along that line already receive water in the basement from storm runoff issues. The concern is there will be more water.

Ms. Franson stated that's the drainage and that's why they have this basin. So, the New York State DEEC and the regulations require that they must control the quantity of the runoff to preexisting levels. I don't know if they've actually enhanced it, but they're taking care of what's coming off of the property.

Mr. Sickler stated the post-development runoff rates were reduced to less than pre-development through capturing them in the basins there and then piping and conveyance system to the larger basin which is on the other side of the site from your house where it's then detained and slowly released out at that far corner of the property along Smith Farms.

Ms. Battiato asked about the private road – the vehicles will be going through Smith Farm and then there is that fire gate that will close the rest of the road off from the Smith Farm development. The access will be only for emergency purposes. In case there's an emergency and the fire department has to get up that way, not through Smith Farm if that's the quickest way, they will go up that way. It's not going to be for regular travel.

In regard to building construction, have to finish the process; obtain permits; cut the trees before March - there's Indiana bat timeframes.

Ms. Salvaty returned to ask about the gate on Owen Drive going into Smith Farm. All the trucks go around the gate -I can see it from my backyard. Matt will address with Ben the Building Inspector.

The public hearing will be continued. Ms. Torre indicated the Board needs consent from the Applicant to hold the public hearing open for more than 120 days if it is pushed to July. Mr. Pietrzak could not make that commitment. June 16th is the regular meeting.

Follow-up includes making any revisions to address KALA comments, and make sure this is able to be attached to Smith Farm. The Planning Board needs to complete SEQR before closing the hearing. The Planning Board Attorney will reach out the village again.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe continues the public hearing on the 20 Owen Drive minor subdivision application to June 16, 2026, at 6:30 PM or as soon thereafter that the matter may be heard. On a motion by Member Franson, seconded by Member Shea:

Ayes: P. Shea, C. Kimbrell, B. Garstak, J. Manson, B. Franson

Nays: None

Abstain: None



5. Returning Projects

5.1. Mohinie Peters Shaikh Fiyazuddeen Amended LLA (0223-2024) SBL64-1-1, 24-1-53 (Hilltop Road)

The Applicant is not present. Need to address reapproval as the approval expired.

Ms. Torre noted that hard copies of the updated plans submitted. The hard copy has the health department signature. The hard copy set is two sheets. The first sheet appears to be a full-size copy of the snippet of the title block that we received the PDF of that had the latest revision date for the health department of January 13, 2026. And that's entitled lot line change for lot one of Ridgetop Estates. One of the comments we were looking to have addressed was the titling. There's a second sheet which includes the topography that was requested for lot one and it extends about 100 feet onto lot two. So those were some of the main original conditions.

The Board went over the specifics of the plan for the resolution. As a reminder to the board members, this had already been approved and signed. It went to the health department and they required an approval from the health department because this lot was previously part of a subdivision that the health department had previously approved. Technically they had to then approve it again even if it was a lot line change - it got caught up in the technicality.

Ms. Franson summarized the second resolution of conditional approval.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby approves the second resolution of conditional approval for the lot line change map for Hilltop Road as modified at the meeting. On a motion by Member Manson, seconded by Member Shea:

Ayes: P. Shea, C. Kimbrell, B. Garstak, J. Manson, B. Franson

Nays: None

Abstain: None

5.2. Monroe Commons Amended Site Plan (0182-2019) SBL# 2-1-10 (220 Nininger Road)

Dan Richmond, Esq., with Zarin and Steinmetz and Lipa Deutsch present for the Applicant.

Mr. Richmond requested that the board amend its approval resolution for this project to allow for the project to proceed with the Orange County Department of Health application which has been submitted. It will allow us pursuing construction while that is pending. Specifically, condition 12B of the resolution of approval for the Monroe Commons project mandates that prior to the issuance of a building permit other than a permit for construction of foundation and structural steel, the



applicant is required to obtain written confirmation from the Orange County Department of Health in the village of Kiryas Joel that they there's adequate water capacity. We are respectfully requesting that this condition be revised so that the confirmation be obtained prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy of the project and we are amenable to returning to your board to update you on the status of the Orange County review. We recommended in our letter that it be when the project is ready for a rough in inspection. Although in speaking tonight we would be even willing to give an update on a more regular basis perhaps than six months. The point of this request is to allow us to proceed to continue building. You had a number of conditions that we were required to satisfy.

Mr. Richmond recited several of the approval conditions.

Mr. Sickler they discussed this preliminarily. There was discussion about requiring an update prior to certain building inspections or permits issued. The Building Inspector viewed this as another mechanism during the building permit process. No strong opinion either way. He indicated it was the board's choice to act on something like that, and it's conveyed to him in the resolution that that would go in the building department's files and if the board wanted that to occur prior to a certain inspection that they would not conduct that inspection without that happening. So he was okay with the general process.

Ms. Torre indicated the applicant just submitted to Orange County and I think the letter said that they hear back within four to eight weeks. They just submitted in April - where are they in that process and when they anticipate getting some kind of answer. The board might recall that this condition has to do with water capacity, which has always been a question for this project and wanted to confirm that there's adequate water capacity before too much construction takes place, of course. So when they were first before you to amend the resolution, the Board did agree to allow the Applicant to do some structural work that was integral to grading before they confirmed the water capacity because there's always been a question of when they were going to make that confirmation. Its up to the Board whether it wants to allow more work or wait and see where they are with the county and if they could get an answer sooner than later on whether there's enough enough water to really proceed with the project.

Mr. Richmond stated the applicant is confident we're going to get water. It's very costly to stop a construction project midstream - we'd like to be able to continue with construction while this process unfolds.

Mr. Torre asked is there a reason why you didn't submit to the county until April - you've been doing construction for a while knowing that this hurdle was coming up.

Mr. Richmond responded they were just trying to get the information and to make sure they were submitting a complete application so that hopefully the to streamline the Orange County Department of Health's review.



So, this is for water main extension. It's from an existing public water supply. So, are you you're connecting to the village of KJ's water system

Mr. Deutch indicated they're going to have the water - they already connected to that river. It's just the approval process that they still working with the county department

Ms. Franson indicated KJ had consented to that but you have to go through the permitting process to do the actual connection.

Mr. Deutch indicated the health department normally can take six months, sometimes it can take a year or more. They have 60 days to reply. Then we have to reply to them. And it's going again in the queue. They have 60 days or 90 days.

Ms. Franson asked where the construction is and how far out do you want to go until you have the permit? You've done grading, you're putting the foundations, the retaining walls.

Mr. Deutsch indicated will be ready in the next 2-3 months to continue starting the building. We're getting to the final approval from the health department and we have no problem every six months to come back to the board and give them an update. And the same thing is if you want to do that the building inspector knows roughing final roughing inspection we be done.

Ms. Franson asked what is what is final roughing inspection?

Mr. Sickler explained the roughing inspection would occur once your water supply piping is in the building, your drainage piping, the vent pipes. That's typically done after the building is framed. That's all roughed in. But then that occurs before any of the finishes are put on, insulation, subfloors, your roof is on, windows are in, it's weathertight, and you have those systems, the plumbing, the electrical installed, that's when they get their final rough in inspection before they start concealing them by putting the wall finishes on the ceiling.

Mr. Manson indicated that is before any fixtures are installed that would actually use the water source once it's turned on. There's still no way to use the water that would come into the building. You're not you're not going to be installing your sinks, your toilets, any right vanities.

Ms. Franson asked so the proposal is it would go up to and include roughing and at that point it would stop until they have their county health department approval?

Mr. Sickler clarified that they'd come back and give an update and if it for whatever reason looked like there's no water, then that's the ability to say no more. If they come back, they've gotten a review from the health department, they've responded, they have a handful of minor comments left and they've demonstrated to your satisfaction that that water is available. There is the capacity, then you could say continue to a CO at that point.



Mr. Deutsch indicated if the building inspector cannot do a final roughing inspection, that means we cannot go in before we come to the board. If the board says stop, we cannot do anything because the building inspector has to do a final roughing before we use insulation, sheetrock and anything else.

Mr. Torre stated the Applicant is asking to return to the planning board for an update on the status of review. They wanted to amend the condition to require that confirmation be obtained prior to CO with the condition that they return to you to give an update on the status when the project is ready for a roughen inspection. There's two different kinds of questions there. Under the way the Applicant is asking for it to be framed, it would allow them to continue up to a CO.

Ms. Franson indicates that seems to allow the Applicant to practically get to a CO without having health department approval.

Mr. Richmond indicated the rough in inspection is some time before the CO. There still needs to be a lot of work done before then. If we come in at the time of, our update in connection with the rough in and this planning board wants to say, "Hey, for some reason, we don't want you to proceed until you get a little more firm with Department of Health." I think we're okay with that.

Ms. Torre said they'd be okay with changing the timing be prior to the roughing in not go to the C of O.

D. Richmond inaudible – off the mike.

Ms. Torre indicated it would just be it changing the timing. I don't think you'd want to say prior to CO but come in and give us an update and maybe we'll change our mind. I think that would be silly. You would just change the timing of when you would want that trigger to be, but I don't know that the board wants to change it in that respect. I think you might at a minimum want to hear maybe from the county now that they've submitted to the county, see where things are, right? What if the county comes back and says, "Wait, there's no way, you know, this is never happening that would be obviously where you don't want them to continue with and they shouldn't want to, you know, continue either spending money without having this. This is a big question, right?"

Ms. Franson stated the Applicant would come back prior to Ben issuing or having an inspection on the rough in and you would give us an update on what the status is with the health department. At that trigger point, we will say you need to give us some kind of correspondence, you need to give us something from Orange County Health Department so we understand what the delay is so that there's a reasonableness to the fact that the Applicant has not gotten Orange County Health Department approval. If the health departments says there's some big issues here, whatever they are, that the Board has the ability to say, you can't continue with an inspection until you resolve your issues with the health department.



Mr. Deutsch confirmed that is ok as stated by the Planning Board Chair.

Ms Franson stated it's not about CO - it's what happens at the rough in.

Mr. Deutsch stated if we coming back before the roughing and the board feels comfortable that we addressed all the comments, only minor comments which we need to go back to the health department, the board says okay go ahead then but that's why we didn't want to say before roughing we want to say before co, but we have we have a stop before that, come to the board, o make the board comfortable.

Ms. Franson stated we may tell you you're not getting an inspection until we get more.

Mr. Manson stated we're placing a speed bump in the road, not putting a curb on the road.

Ms. Torree stated we can come up with language for your next meeting for the scenario here.

Mr. Manson asked - based on a timeline potentially of being two to three months out from starting the above ground construction of the walls and everything, how far from that point before you get to the point of the rough in inspection? Discussion regarding the timing of construction and health department approval.

Mr. Manson also asked when we made a decision to permit the grading and the belowground work to be done pending a final decision of what went on with the proposed grading on the Woodbury lot and I don't remember us ever hearing back as to what they decided And is that lot being graded? Are you coming back to us for a retaining wall? Because we looked at or did I miss a meeting somewhere?

Ms. Torre indicated the Board did an initial review but they had to come back. Last she knew the applicant did not have anything from Woodbury.

Mr. Deutsch indicated we are going to be back in Woodbury. Woodbury was not so excited about the grading. So they were asking us to do some retaining walls.

Ms. Torre asked if Woodbury adopted a Findings Statement

Mr. Deutsch stated they want us to do some nice landscaping in Woodbury.

Mr. Richmond confirmed that they haven't adopted Findings or an approval yet.

Mr. Manson indicated it is his recollection that while we agreed to the grading and the subflooring construction that going to actually above ground building we were going to have a decision that



you're going to be grading as per the plan or whatever the renewed agreement, whatever you come up with an agreement in Woodbury is or you will have come back to us for a final approval on a retaining wall so that you can go forward with the building.

Ms. Torre indicated there's other conditions in this specific condition 12. They were asking tonight specifically about 12b, but there are other conditions that were also tied to this timing. So, I think you want to know where they are with each of those items, which includes the approval from the Village of Woodbury because that's an issue that is supposed to be resolved before they could get any other permit aside from what they've gotten for the grading and structural steel. So the applicant needs to address everything that's in this now condition 12. Just changing one of them won't eliminate these other items.

Ms. Torre and the Board went through conditions A through E and where the applicant is in the process.

Off mike discussion between the applicants. Ms. Torre wants the Applicant to provide a response to where the project is, in terms of meeting conditions. A status report will be provided on the various conditions. The Applicant will propose which of these A through E the Applicant wants to change and then we will come up with language for allowing the health department aspect of this to occur. A letter will be provided where everything stands and then the Board will consider amendment to the resolution.

Mr. Shea asked how the traffic is going – Mr. Deutsch indicated all the traffic improvements are approved and work will start soon.

5.3. Walton Terrace Dwelling and Lot Consolidation (0240-2025) SBL# 18-4-19, 18-4-24 (80 Walton Terrace)

Jesse **Shei** with David Niemotko Architects represented the Applicant.

This is a proposed single family dwelling with private utilities on a 20,000 square foot lot. We would be combining the existing two lots so that it would meet the minimum required lot area along with the other setbacks. the project did require a 30-foot front yard variance which was approved. Since our last appearance a well was located on the neighboring lot on the east side. Due to that we flipped the layout of the house. So the driveway now comes in on the eastern side of the property and the leach field would be on the west side to give us as much space as we can from that existing well. Made revisions requested by the Board engineer along with some more detail on the landscaping. Have not heard back from your landscape architect yet. We are looking to submit to the department of health. the distance of the septic area is substandard to the existing well? The existing well is around 80 feet away whereas we would us typically require 100 feet.



Mr. Sickler indicated there is a dwelling on one of the adjoining parcels. They provided a well location map which showed wells within the area. If that house is on a municipal water system that takes care of that concern. The section that allows on-site systems requires that the soils testing be verified by the town engineer - needs to be scheduled. Update the approval block. We're waiting for comments on the tree plan. There are some separation distance issues that would require health department review. So probably before they proceed too far with the application process the soils testing should be confirmed and DOH consulted as to the acceptability.

Ms. Torre indicated the Board needs to complete SEQR before opening the public hearing since it is a subdivision and some of the things I think Matt had mentioned that you'll need for SEQR - soil testing, wastewater certification that was added to the plan needs to be signed by the engineer. Theres the question of the separation distance from the well if that's something the DOH is going to approve.

The Applicant will continue to progress the plans.

5.4. 2-Family Dwelling (0247-2026)
SBL# 43-5-7 (249 Mountainview Avenue)

Michael Morgante was present for the application. A public hearing was closed. The Board has a resolution to consider.

Mr. Sickler noted the sanitary note on plan sheet 4 the certification language needs a minor change and I believe Ashley noted the exact language in the draft resolution. Just to note the building plans submitted with us previously had several rooms that were labeled like game room and study that had closets in them. And in speaking with the building department, they would consider them bedrooms unless these are removed. The updated plans have removed them. Remove the closets. A tree plan was submitted because that is required with the application. It's up to the board to determine if any mitigation is necessary.

Ms. Torre prepared the draft resolution and the Board reviewed it. The Board would like the framing for the closet removed. The site plan resolution is amended to indicate framing for the closets to be removed. It was clarified that the plan shows a site plan approval box.

Ms. Franson asked if there is a measure of safety for the septic system, since one of the two-family dwelling units is only 1-bedroom. Mr. Sickler indicated that most days the flow is less than the design capacity. Mr. Morgante indicated the septic is designed based on 110 gpd per bedroom. This includes a safety factor. There is also a reserve area for expansion. They are expanding the existing septic. Designed for 4 bedrooms, and the soil testing was little slower for absorption area – extended to meet it for today's standards. There is an existing single elderly woman in one of the dwellings, so the demand is likely accurate.



BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby approves the 2-Family Dwelling at 249 Mountainview Avenue resolution of conditional approval, as amended. On a motion by Member Garstak, seconded by Member Kimbrell:

Ayes: P. Shea, C. Kimbrell, B. Garstak, J. Manson, B. Franson

Nays: None

Abstain: None

**5.5. Manuelpillai Minor Subdivision (0243-2025)
SBL# 13-1-7.1 (52 Catskill Avenue)**

Brad Cleverly from MJS Engineering and Land Surveying represented the Applicant.

Mr. Cleverly indicated this is a two lot subdivision over Catskill Avenue a private road. It has municipal sanitary sewer and municipal solid waste management. And the main changes to the drawing were the addition of the details and also the tree plan.

Mr. Sickler indicated the proposed lot is intended to connect to Orange County system - a connection needs to be shown. Potable water is going to be provided by a private well. They need to demonstrate compliance with the groundwater supply test section of the subdivision ordinance. A tree plan was provided and forwarded to the landscape architect for review. Need to address SEQR and 239 GML review. Need board approval blocks added to the lower right-hand corner of each sheet. The dwelling is set right up to the front yard setback. Discuss with the client whether that's where they want the dwelling - if they want a porch in the future, maybe slide it back a little bit. Provide some inverts for proposed culverts. Catskill Avenue is a private road for the length in front of the proposed project. Are there standards that the board needs to see in regard to the road condition.

One of the topics that came up there was potential parking um in the front yard. Is the pool definitely within the requirements? Mr. Sickler will check setback requirement. Ms. Franson not sure if it has to be behind the front setback or the front of the house.

Ms. Torre indicated Catskill is a private road. It is shown on a very old subdivision map. So, for purposes of 288a, it would satisfy that prong of the statute, but there's also the prong that asks whether or not it's suitably improved. I believe the town has private road specifications. The question is whether it's suitably improved. The road has to be suitably improved to the specifications.

Mr. Sickler indicated he can find the private road specifications and review with Bill Brown prior to next meeting.



Ms. Torre had a question on the fence that's shown on the boundary line. There is a question the proposed drive also the proposed driveway does include what appears to be parking turnaround area in the front yard. The town does not allow parking in the front yard setback. So that'll just have to be clear that that section of the driveway can't be parked on.

Mr. Cleverly indicated it's not parking the two required parking spaces will be outside the front yard.

Ms. Torre stated the plans do show the town's house relocation notes, but you do need the square footage and the number of bedrooms in each in the dwelling. For purposes of SEQR, this is an unlisted action. Are there any other involved agencies? County approval of sewer is required then the county environmental facilities and services would need to be added to the EAF question two. The other potential would be the ZBA for a 28A variance as well. The question would be whether the board wants to declare its intent to be lead agency and circulate or do an uncoordinated review.

Ms. Franson asked if there is a propane tank in front – the response was yes. And then this is a playset. Is there a foundation for the playset? It's just a play set that can be moved. I'm not sure either of those are allowed in the front yard.

There was a discussion regarding the Moodna Creek and the current moratorium. The Applicant would like to connect to the public sewer since the other dwellings are on public sewer.

With regard to SEQR, this is a minor subdivision. Wanted to make sure there were no wetlands. A letter from Pete Torgersen was submitted. With regard to SEQR, this is pretty simple process. I don't know if we need to do a coordinated review.

The Planning Board consensus is to conduct uncoordinated SEQR review.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby determines that the proposed application is a SEQR Unlisted Action, and that is will conduct uncoordinated SEQR review. On a motion by Member Franson, seconded by Member Garstak:

Ayes: P. Shea, C. Kimbrell, B. Garstak, J. Manson, B. Franson

Nays: None

Abstain: None

The applicant has a little bit more research to do with Moodna. Address the Engineer's and Attorney's comments. Ms. Franson will take a look at the wetlands – and see if there are any questions she has.



Ms. Torre indicated that Member Manson had a question last week about the DEC wetland regulations. The DEC did just finally come down with some guidance. There was a question of whether or not they were going to appeal but they did determine not to appeal and now the result is that you're back to the prior regulations.

6. Minutes

6.1. February 21, 2026

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby approves the February 21, 2026, minutes, as amended. On a motion by Member Garstak, seconded by Member Manson:

Ayes: B. Franson, J. Manson, B. Garstak, C. Kimbrell, P. Shea

Nays: None

Abstain: None

6.2 March 17, 2026

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby approves the March 17, 2026 minutes, as amended. On a motion by Member Manson, seconded by Member Shea:

Ayes: B. Franson, J. Manson, B. Garstak, C. Kimbrell, P. Shea

Nays: None

Abstain: None

6.3 April 21, 2026

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby approves the April 21, 2026, minutes, as amended. On a motion by Member Franson, seconded by Member Garstak:

Ayes: B. Franson, J. Manson, B. Garstak, C. Kimbrell, P. Shea

Nays: None

Abstain: None

7. Adjournment

7.1. Adjournment of Meeting

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby adjourns tonight's meeting.

On a motion by Chairperson Shea, seconded by Board Member Garstak:



**Town of Monroe Planning Board Minutes
Tuesday, May 19, 2026
Monroe Planning Board Regular Meeting**

Ayes: P. Shea, C. Kimbrell, B. Garstak, J. Manson, B. Franson.

Nays: None

Abstain: None