

APPROVED MINUTES
Town of Goshen Planning Board
Town Hall
41 Webster Avenue
Goshen, NY 10924

FEBRUARY 4, 2010

Members Present:

Reynell Andrews
Lee Bergus
Susan Cleaver
Ralph Huddleston, Chair
Mary Israelski
John Lupinski
Raymond Myruski

Also Present:

Neal Halloran, Building Inspector
Rick Golden, PB Attorney
Kelly Naughton, PB Attorney
Sean Hoffman, PB Engineer
Ed Garling, PB Planner

MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Board meeting of January 21, 2010 were approved with corrections.

Heritage Custom Homes – 18-1-127.21 – 59.6 +/- acres, 21 lot subdivision located on Clark Rd in the RU zone with an AQ3 overlay. Declare intent to be lead agency.

Mr. Halloran said that the project has been scaled down to a 5 lot subdivision.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Mr. Myruski, seconded by Mr. Andrews, the Town of Goshen Planning Board declares itself to be the lead agency on the application of Heritage Custom Homes. Approved unanimously.

Mr. Andrews	Aye	Ms. Israelski	Aye
Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Lupinski	Aye
Ms. Cleaver	Aye	Mr. Myruski	Aye
Mr. Huddleston	Aye		

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Ms. Cleaver, seconded by Mr. Andrews, the Town of Goshen Planning Board types the application of Heritage Custom Homes as an Unlisted Action for purposes of SEQRA. Approved unanimously.

Mr. Andrews	Aye	Ms. Israelski	Aye
Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Lupinski	Aye
Ms. Cleaver	Aye	Mr. Myruski	Aye
Mr. Huddleston	Aye		

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

Reiger – 9-1-8.452 – 360.9 acres, 106 units located on Craigville Rd at the end of Broadlea Road in the RU district with an AQ3 & AQ6 Overlay with a Scenic Road Corridor Overlay and Flood Plain Overlay.

Representing the applicant: Steve Esposito

Planning Board consultant Sean Hoffman said his office produced two memos on the DEIS, the first one contained 100 comments. The most recent memo which the applicant has not yet received, contains comments on the subdivision plat as presented in the DEIS and is not intended for discussion tonight, he said.

Mr. Garling said he reviewed the plans and has comments about some possible environmental issues such as the wetland locations and water issues, although he said he anticipates there will be adequate water. He said there may be changes in the unit count and that he has suggested some changes in the location of a couple of dwellings. He said he also listed areas he believes should be eliminated from potential clearing. He said the main concern in terms of visual issues is the location of the water tower and getting that information on the map.

Mr. Huddleston asked for comment from the public.

Dorothy Szeffc of 35 Ridge Rd. said she has submitted written questions and asked when they will be answered. Mr. Huddleston replied that all questions and comments will be addressed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Mr. Golden said the applicant will take all of the comments and address them in an FEIS which will be filed with the Town and that the FEIS will be on as an agenda item for the PB to discuss to make sure it adequately addresses all of the comments. He said that the public will have an opportunity to comment on the FEIS, at least in writing, before everything is finalized in a Findings Statement. Mr. Huddleston said the PB agendas will be posted on the website and Mr. Halloran invited the public to call his office.

Gerald Boss of Craigville Road said he has requested a 12-month environmental study of endangered and threatened species on the site. He also said that the Town of Chester has a lot of projects that will utilize the Black Meadow for their sewage systems. He said that because there are so many sewage systems being planned for various projects, he questions if there is an aggregate figure that will be used to see how much effluent and discharge the Black Meadow and the Otterkill can absorb.

Mr. Huddleston replied that the DEC will issue the permits for sewage treatment and will be monitoring and calculating the capacity of what goes in and out. He said that the PB engineer will look at it so that the PB will know what it needs to know to make its assessment.

Mr. Golden said that currently a 12-month study is not planned and that unless the PB thinks it is necessary in connection with the scope requested, it will not be done, unless the applicant does it voluntarily.

Mr. Huddleston said that he intends to access the scope in relation to the request and make sure that these comments fit within the scope. He said he wants to stay within the boundaries of the scope as required by SEQRA.

There was no other public comment.

PB member Mary Israelski read from four pages of written comments. She said that her concerns revolve around the sustainability of the domestic water supply, forest protection, the visual character of the horizon views and landscape from the scenic roads, odor pollution, and the fiscal impacts and justification of Town ownership of the open space and recreation areas. She said that the applicant is proposing 106 units while the aquifer density calculates to be only 79 units and added that the proof of sustainability of domestic water should include water testing in July or August and the testing of more off site wells in Ridgeview Estates and along Farmingdale Road. She asked if a two year post construction period is enough time to insure that off site wells are not greatly impacted. She asked how the public can tell if there is going to be an impact on the water supply when there is no information in the DEIS about the connections between ground water and the water supply. Ms. Israelski said she would like to see the areas of disturbance actually flagged on site with precise attempts to save significant trees in the development area and said that tree preservation wherever possible should be enforceable. She said that approval of the project should be subject to the Town accepting dedication of the roads, drainage and storm water districts and water and sewage districts for the proper allocation of all financial obligations and to insure proper maintenance of all facilities with the applicant providing the Town with a business plan for generating revenue. Approval of the project should also be predicated on the Town's acceptance of all open space trails and improvements to the pond identified as appropriate for skating and that the project sponsor should show fiscal impacts for improvements and provide a plan to create profit from the improvements. Ms. Israelski called for "a better description" of the impacts on schools and a worst case scenario. She said that careful attention to the height, placement, color, landscape and efficiency must be given to the water tower, stating that a low profile tower and connection to the Stonehedge system would be preferred. Ms. Israelski said that the DEIS does not include a discussion of

energy efficient homes and green technology. She suggested that the applicant pay the cost of improving the road intersection. She also suggested that the Town Engineer propose the best design and technology for waste water treatment and make a presentation to the Town Board.

Ms. Israelski suggested that the written comments of the Town's Environmental Review Board (ERB) and those of Town Building Inspector Neil Halloran be made a part of the record.

Ms. Cleaver said she wants to know the annual cost per house for infrastructure depreciation, saying it is important for the Town to set up funding from the beginning to avoid future problems when all of a sudden the sewer treatment plant, or piping, has to be replaced.

Ms. Cleaver also commented that there are a multitude of old, open wells on the property and said the applicant should locate the wells so that everyone knows where they are so they can be properly sealed.

Mr. Golden said he wanted it "on the record" that the applicant was given the written comments of PB member Susan Cleaver as well as the written comments of the PB's Environmental Biodiversity Consultant Karen Schneller-McDonald. Mr. Esposito said the applicant also has the ERB comments and Mr. Halloran's comments.

Mr. Halloran said that the applicant's consultant suggested that providing corridors for wildlife will cause more harm than good. Mr. Halloran said the PB should review and discuss the issue. He pointed out that homeowners will be allowed to clear portions of their land and said the PB should consider what effect this will have on the volume of runoff downstream. Ms. Israelski said that the clearing trees in backyards should be prohibited.

Mr. Halloran said the applicant should show the structures that will be in the scenic road corridor. He also suggested that an inexpensive upgrade to the intersections be done now, rather than waiting until they become a problem. He said he thinks that construction traffic should be kept off of Broadlea Rd.

Mr. Golden said that if the PB wants the applicant to perform any additional studies, the PB should let it be known now. He said that some of the documents submitted by the PB's consultants were submitted today and that the public and the PB has not had a chance to review them so it would be appropriate to keep the public hearing open.

He reminded the PB that this is a combined public hearing for the subdivision and SEQRA. He said that after the close of the public hearing, the close of SEQRA and approval of the Findings Statement, the PB has 62 days to make its decision on preliminary approval, unless the time is extended by the applicant.

Mr. Golden suggested that the PB work on the subdivision review and related site plans on a continuing basis, rather than waiting until the Findings Statement is approved. He said “the reason for SEQRA is to make sure you consider those environmental issues when you make your subdivision decision.”

Mr. Huddleston asked the applicant if he will give a 60 day extension beyond the 62 days, in order to iron out the subdivision issues. Mr. Esposito said the applicant will agree to 122 days, or the additional 60 days, after the Findings Statement is filed. For the record, it was noted that there was confirmation given by the owners.

Mr. Huddleston said the PB wants to hear comment from the public on the subdivision plans and would like an opportunity to look at all of the comments and possibly whittle them down to what it wants answered in the FEIS.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Ms. Israelski, seconded by Mr. Andrews, the Town of Goshen Planning Board continues the public hearing on the Reiger application to March 4, 2010. Approved unanimously.

Mr. Andrews	Aye	Ms. Israelski	Aye
Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Lupinski	Aye
Ms. Cleaver	Aye	Mr. Myruski	Aye
Mr. Huddleston	Aye		

ADJOURNMENT: A motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:55 p.m. was made, seconded and approved unanimously.

Ralph Huddleston, Chair
Notes Prepared by Susan Varden

