

**Town of Goshen Planning Board
Town Hall
41 Webster Avenue
Goshen, New York
October 20, 2016**

Members Present:

Lee Bergus, Chair
Reynell Andrews
Kris Baker
Phil Dropkin
David Gawronski
Giovanni Pirraglia
David Crawford, Alternate

Also Present:

Sean Hoffman, P.E. PB Engineer
Richard Golden, Esq. PB Attorney
Kelly Naughton, Esq. PB Attorney
Neal Halloran, Building Inspector
Cynthia Hand, Alternate
John Canning, Traffic Engineer
Ralph Huddleston

Absent: John Lupinski

The Planning Board meeting was opened at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Lee Bergus.

Mr. Bergus stated that people are passionate about projects here. If members of the public have signs, please keep them down on your lap or on the back wall. If the signs are raised, that individual will be asked to leave with his or her sign.

Some projects on the agenda have the opportunity for public comment; others do not. If it is not a public hearing, then all of the activity will be with the Board and not in the audience. If the Planning Board has to keep stopping because of heckling, comments, asides – it is a distraction. We would appreciate it if you would let us do our jobs.

Approval of minutes:

***** PLEASE REFER TO STENOGRAPHER TRANSCRIPT FOR THIS PORTION OF THE MINUTES *****

Cannon Hill Flex

Representing Applicant:

No one present

Mr. Bergus reads the September 22, 2016 letter from Pietrzak & Pfau Engineering and Surveying, PLLC requesting a six (6) month extension of the Conditional Approval of the Special Permit and Site Plan

No comments from the board.

Ms. Naughton stated that the six-month extension would be until the Planning Board’s March 16, 2017 meeting.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Mr. Dropkin, seconded by Mr. Andrews, the Town of Goshen Planning Board grants a six-month extension, to March 16, 2017, to the conditional final approval granted the application of Cannon Hill Flex Building. Unanimously approved.

Mr. Andrews	Aye	Mr. Dropkin	Aye
Mr. Baker	Aye	Mr. Gawronski	Aye
Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Pirraglia	Aye
Mr. Crawford	Aye		

Meadows of Goshen (aka The DM Equities of New York, LLC) – 12-1-86.1: Application for amended site plan and subdivision plat to omit the requirement for entrance walls and certain landscaping features on 98.394 +/- acres on Maple Avenue (County Route 31) and Gate School House Road in the RU District with AQ-3 and AQ-6 Overlay Districts.

Representing Applicant: David Makan

Mr. Hoffman stated that the Board did not receive any new plans, and did not expect any. This application involves the removal of the two entrance walls and the landscaping on the front two lots.

Mr. Halloran stated that the Planning Board received a response from the Orange County Department of Public Works, and the County has no problem with it.

Mr. Dropkin asked what is the rationale for the Applicant’s request?

Mr. Golden stated that it was originally a condition of the Planning Board’s approval to include a decorative wall, and the Applicant sold the two properties before the walls were constructed and the landscaping was installed. It was not integral to the project itself, but it is now difficult to finalize the site plan itself because there is a struggle to put walls on the property that is now private property.

Mr. Andrews stated that the people who own the property do not want the walls on their property. There is not much that the Planning Board can do about it.

Mr. Golden stated that there is not much the Town can do to enforce it.

Mr. Bergus asked the all speakers to state their name and address and their concern, and the Planning Board will make sure it is in the record.

Shawn Killian Morris (2 Howard Court) stated that it is not that we don't want the walls; we want something to beautify the land. One day I came home from work, and I had a 9-foot ditch on my property. Mr. Makan does not communicate with us. We never received anything from him telling us that he was going to be there. The other side of the street is not interested. You can put the wall on my property as a compromise, but after he leaves, who maintains it? I don't have a hose that reaches that far, so who keeps it up? With the installation of the trees, at 7am on a weekend, someone banged on my door to ask me if I want trees or not. Someone showed me an old plan and asked if I wanted trees on the property or not. It might have been easier to do this before we moved in. I'm not being difficult; I just want to know what they are doing. I am just concerned about the maintenance of it. How big is the wall, where does our property end, and where does the Town property begin? I just would like the plans. I don't know if you can do one side without doing the other side. I just want to know what the upkeep is.

Mr. Golden stated that to answer her question regarding maintenance, it would be the property owner's obligation to maintain it. This was on the approved site plan, and it was asked for by the Planning Board. It was filed prior to the owner's buying the property. When those walls are put up, they are the obligation of the property owner. The Planning Board cannot be negotiating who maintains them between the property owners and the developer. The Board could modify the requirement to allow the wall and the landscaping to continue on your property, but it would be your obligation to maintain it after it is put in. The most recent plan that was submitted to the Planning Board is the amended plan, that has taken the walls and landscaping off. That plan has not been approved yet, so the property owners will have to ask Neal for the prior plan, which will show what is to be done on the properties. I would ask that the property owners look at the plan fairly soon, and if the property owners could communicate with the Planning Board by letter to Neal, the Board can take that into consideration when it makes its determination.

David Makan (DM Equities of NY, LLC) stated that he is pretty much done with the punch list, and at this point is done, the paving is ready to start on Monday, and the trees are coming on Wednesday. As we are approaching the winter, he wants to have the road dedicated. Mr. Makan stated that he knows that he had some conversations about how the owners did not want these items, and other people from the community approached her, and she did not want the walls. The owners stopped him from building the walls. The owners gave us a lot of resistance. His question is that at this point in time, he is waiting for the Planning Board to approve this so the road can be dedicated. It has been here for 5 years, he is asking that the Board pass a resolution. All the homes have been completed.

Mr. Hoffman stated that in terms of the punch list, which is not germane to tonight's meeting, a lot of the items have been completed. All the remaining items to allow paving have been completed as of today. The developer's schedule is that the road will be paved as soon as possible. After the paving is completed, there will be some additional items to complete, and

then there will be some administrative items that will need to be completed. The punch list is not yet completed, but the paving can be continued.

Mr. Bergus asked whether the installation of the wall would impact when the Town could take the dedication of the road. Mr. Hoffman responded that he conducted an inspection in the fall of 2015. At that time, the developer indicated that he was having some difficulties with different owners. This item would be an open item and would affect dedication. He observed the trenches, and he instructed the developer to fill in the trenches.

Mr. Golden stated that with respect to the Applicant's request to have the Planning Board move forward, the Planning Board cannot do so because of the failure to have the 239 report back from the County Planning Department. The whole idea of the plan to take out the requirement for the walls and landscaping is to have the Planning Board hear comments.

Mr. Bergus asked if anyone else from the public would like to comment.

Shawn Killian stated that the developer was told to fill in the trenches, but he did not, I paid for it out of my pocket. We paid landscapers to fill them in; we did not know what the trenches were for.

Mr. Golden stated that the Planning Board can go ahead and leave the public hearing open as it does not have the 239 report back, or, if the Board wants to close it, it can. Anyone can submit written comments to the Planning Board to be considered by the Board.

Mr. Dropkin stated that regardless of the look of the wall, what is the property owner's preference, do you want it or don't you? Mrs. Killian stated that she fine with the wall and with the maintenance.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Mr. Pirraglia, seconded by Mr. Gawronski, the Town of Goshen Planning Board extends the public hearing on the Meadows of Goshen to November 3, 2016. Unanimously approved.

Mr. Andrews	Aye	Mr. Dropkin	Aye
Mr. Baker	Aye	Mr. Gawronski	Aye
Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Pirraglia	Aye
Mr. Crawford	Aye		

Orange County Gospel Church – 11-1-100.2: Site plan and special permit application for a religious use on 7.12 +/- acres on Duck Cedar and Old Chester Roads in the RU District with AQ-6, Floodplain & Ponding Area, Stream Corridor and Water Supply Watershed and Scenic Road Corridor Overlay Districts. **DEIS Scoping Session**

Representing Applicant:

Steve Esposito

Mr. Bergus stated that this application is on the agenda to continue the public scoping session on the DEIS, which was held open from the last meeting.

Mr. Esposito stated that he represents the Applicant, and Pastor Shelly Sampson, the elders and members of the church are present with him as well. The application was first before the Board in August 2014. There were several meetings, and there was a point in time that it became a question as to whether a religious use is a permitted use in the RU zone. The Applicant requested the Building Inspector opine on what should be used for bulk requirements for a religious use in the RU district. These are classified as community uses, not residential uses, and the Applicant objected to the use of residential bulk requirements. A year later the Applicant made an application to the ZBA, but the ZBA cannot decide that application until SEQRA has been completed. On April 7, 2016, the Planning Board authorized the preparation of a negative declaration, however, instead of issuing the negative declaration, a public hearing was scheduled, and the Planning Board went into an executive session, came out and issued a positive declaration. The Positive Declaration was received by the Applicant a month later, and the Applicant gave the Planning Board a draft scope in August 2016. SEQRA requires the Planning Board to adopt a scope within 60 days from submission, which is in about a week. The Applicant has done quite a bit of work on the visual aspects of the project, but the Planning Board apparently felt differently. The Applicant is also looking at groundwater and transportation. The Applicant is hoping that the scope will be adopted by the Board tonight.

Mr. Hoffman stated that the scope that the Board determined was necessary included groundwater, visual, and traffic elements. The scope has been redlined by the consultants, and distributed to the Board. If the Board has questions, that may be the best way to handle this.

Mr. Canning stated that he made recommendations in the scope, and would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Dropkin stated that on page 7 add "and recharge". Mr. Canning responded to Mr. Dropkin question concerning the purpose of the "population of the property" statement in the scope.

Mr. Esposito stated that no pavilions are being proposed with the project. There is a patio in the back, but that is about it. DOKEO is the main event that they have. Mr. Dropkin stated that what he wants to be clear about is that this is a one-day event that happens twice a year. Is that correct? It is a one day twice a year on either a Friday or a Saturday?

Mr. Golden stated that if he could go back to the first part of this section in the scope, and the Board limits it to building occupancy, the Town may run into problems with enforcement. It should state, "increase the number of people on the property."

Mr. Dropkin asked about the statement “concurrent onsite attendance”. Ms. Naughton responded that it was meant to consider whether DOKEO would be occurring at the same time as a service. Mr. Canning stated that the way it is presently contemplated, the applicant will undertake a traffic analysis to evaluate the property. The intent is to do an analysis for 410 attendees. If the Applicant plans to have more than that, by using both spaces, it is a different analysis. Mr. Golden stated that this is asking them to set forth and clarify the uncertain future expansion. Mr. Esposito stated then let’s go back. This is an either/or – commit to 410 people in the chapel, and the Board is implying that the DOKEO will exceed that number of people. If we are going to go over 400 people in the church and over 1000 people onsite, then we have to go over that analysis.

Mr. Bergus reviewed his comments with the scope. Mr. Golden stated that on page 3, five lines up from bottom of first full paragraph, insert “theater” after multi-purpose room. Mr. Esposito stated that the Applicant is not anticipating having the theater, but will include a “practice stage”.

Mr. Bergus opened the scoping session up to the public for any additional comments that have not already been made.

Geri Corey (115 Old Chester Road) stated that this is the first that she is hearing of 1,000 people attending. Mr. Canning stated that he was asked to review the scope and make recommendations as to what would be studied. There was no indication of how many people might be at these events, but based on his experience, he made a determination that if the Applicant was to have a special event with more than 1,000 people, then they need to take it up for another level of analysis. If the Applicant will be having the events in the sanctuary, then they will not exceed 410 seats. Ms. Corey stated that she is trying to visualize parking. Mr. Golden stated that if the Applicant is not going to have that many people, then they will not set forth that information. It is only in there because there was some uncertainty.

Mrs. Corey stated that she wrote a letter responding to two issues that were brought up two weeks ago. There was some insinuation that the residents were just giving their opinions, but they have set down some facts. They have lived through adverse water problems, especially when pump down tests are done for proposed projects in the area. This is a fact that we lose our water when a pump test is done. It’s unclear to us which well the applicant is using to collect their data in saying that the well has enough water. In 1999, Lone Oak conducted a 72-hour pump test on the well on the site. We’ve lived here for 36 years and in that time, water has been a major concern. The fact is that we’ve seen flooding on the proposed site, as much as 1/3 of it under water. We’re concerned with the 40% impervious space because the water will have no place to go but on our properties. We’re concerned with the size of the church and the parking – that’s a lot of ground cover. The second issue is the size of the church, not that we don’t want one. It is visually over-powering for a country neighborhood made up of homes, especially one that is located on a designated scenic corridor. The addition would double the

size, making it even more overpowering. The roads themselves are narrow country roads, built at a time when traffic was much less than now.

Mr. Golden stated that this is a public scoping session that is focused on the scope that is proposed to be adopted, not generally with respect to the project. There will be a hearing later, the public scoping session is to obtain public comment on what should or should not be in the scope.

Alan Jorgenson stated that Mrs. Corey pretty much hit all of the marks. He is curious what well tests they are currently going by because his well did not get tested. It was last tested in 1999 and 2006. Mr. Hoffman responded that the scope outlines what is going to be studied and evaluated. The last study was in 2010, which included both Mr. Jorgenson and Mrs. Corey's wells. The Applicant will make a determination if that will support what they need. They have to do an analysis because the 2010 review was based upon four residential lots there. The remaining two lots had sufficient water to support the church, and they need confirm that. This did include Heritage Estates.

Mr. Jorgenson stated, now that LEGOLAND is coming in directly across on Route 17, that developer is willing to give those wells to Arcadia Hills for use. That needs to be tested against his property. Mr. Jorgenson has thermal pollution concerns; he stated that Supervisor Bloomfield made a statement a while back about how one of the great things about Goshen is the historic charm and beauty of the community. Water has always been an issue and we do not have an over abundance of water.

Sean McKellen (138 Old Chester Road) asked whether the tests that are supposed to be done include a lighting plan. Is there a noise ordinance they have to comply with? Mr. Golden responded that those items will be part of the site plan, and there is a Town noise ordinance that the Applicant will have to comply with. Mr. McKellen asked, as far as the parking spots, where are they going to park if they exceed 1000? Mr. Golden stated that is what the Applicant will be studying. Mr. McKellen asked how is the Applicant going to determine how many people will be there? Mr. Golden stated that the Board will find out in the DEIS.

Jerry Boss stated that his concern is the Otterkill Creek. During Super storm Sandy, Old Chester Road flooded. This is a "C" stream, meaning it is intermittent to dry. The amount of water that is going to be emanating from here might impact the Otterkill Creek. Black Meadow Creek goes into the Otterkill, which goes into the Purgatory Swamp. From the Purgatory Swamp, it goes to Tomahawk Lake, and from there to the Moodna Creek and then to the Hudson, and that is his concern. Mr. Boss stated that he is concerned with the water and the pollution.

Mr. Hoffman stated that the scope includes the three issues: groundwater, which will have some impact on the Otterkill, and also visual and traffic impacts. Stormwater will be evaluated in the SWPPP. The Applicant has prepared a preliminary SWPPP.

Mr. Gawronski stated that he has a concern about flooding in that area, and the Board has brought up the potential impacts on the flooding. He is asking that a very careful look be taken at the different high water events.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Mr. Dropkin, seconded by Mr. Pirraglia, the Town of Goshen Planning Board closes the public scoping session on the Orange County Gospel Fellowship application. Unanimously approved.

Mr. Andrews	Aye	Mr. Dropkin	Aye
Mr. Baker	Aye	Mr. Gawronski	Aye
Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Pirraglia	Aye
Mr. Crawford	Aye		

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Mr. Andrews, seconded by Mr. Gawronski, the Town of Goshen Planning Board adopts the scope as modified. Unanimously approved.

Mr. Andrews	Aye	Mr. Dropkin	Aye
Mr. Baker	Aye	Mr. Gawronski	Aye
Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Pirraglia	Aye
Mr. Crawford	Aye		

Merlin Entertainments Group/LEGOLAND New York – 11-1-45, 46, 47, 49.2, 58, 60, 62 - 69 & 15-1-59: Application for site plan, special permit and subdivision for a commercial recreational facility on 523 +/- acres (total holdings) along Harriman Drive, Arcadia Road and Conklingtown Road in the RU and HR Districts with AQ-3, Scenic Road, Floodplain & Ponding and Stream Corridor & Reservoir Overlay Districts. **DEIS Completeness**

Representing Applicant: Dominic Cordisco, John O'Rourke,
Kristen O'Donnell, Phil Royle

***** PLEASE REFER TO STENOGRAPHER TRANSCRIPT FOR THIS PORTION OF THE MINUTES *****

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Mr. Dropkin, seconded by Mr. Baker, the Town of Goshen Planning Board hereby declares that the DEIS is not adequate for public review. Unanimously approved.

Mr. Andrews	Aye	Mr. Dropkin	Aye
Mr. Baker	Aye	Mr. Gawronski	Aye
Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Pirraglia	Aye
Mr. Crawford	Aye		

Amy's Kitchen, Inc. – 12-1-1.222, 1.41, 19.2, 23.2, 24.2, 101 and 10-1-11.2: Site plan, special permit and subdivision for a manufacturing and conference center on 395 +/- acres (total holdings) NYS Route 17M, Echo Lake Road, Hartley Road and Owens Road in the CO, RU and I Districts with AQ-3/AQ-6 Floodplain & Ponding Area, Stream Corridor and Water Supply Watershed and Scenic Road Corridor overlays. **SEQRA Findings Statement**

Representing Applicant:

Graham Trelstad,
Larry Wolinsky

Phil Dropkin recused himself from this application.

Mr. Wolinsky stated that the FEIS was adopted by the Planning Board previously, and the Applicant is here to discuss the Findings Statement.

Mr. Hoffman stated that his comments are incorporated into the redlined version of the Findings Statement, but he wanted to discuss the noise issue about the rooftop units. Is the Applicant expecting a second study? Mr. Hoffman stated that he is not sure if, from a practical standpoint, the Applicant should incorporate the screens now.

Mr. Andrews asked when the Board should start talking about the warehouse building. Mr. Golden stated that the way this was structured, this project would study the construction of that warehouse; however, the Ver Hage warehouse is not part of this application for purposes of approval. At some future time, that application may come in and at that time the Planning Board can determine whether SEQRA covered the proposal or if an SEIS is necessary. It was a mini-GEIS with regard to that particular project. That may be sufficient for the future warehouse application, or they may have to do additional SEQRA at that time. There is no timeframe involved in that.

Mr. Crawford requested that the statement “exceed background conditions” be clarified. Mr. Hoffman stated he does not know how the Planning Board can determine what the background noise is. The Planning Board could accept the Findings Statement as it is, but then later, after construction, it is impractical to evaluate that aspect. It may be easier to incorporate the noise screening at this point, or to outline a procedure going forward.

Mr. Trelstad stated that with regard to monitoring background conditions, it could be done with the measures in the DEIS or it could be done after construction but before the plant opens. The background levels in that area are already pretty high, and the sparseness in development does not warrant that additional study. Mr. Hoffman stated that he agrees with the analysis regarding the level of impact; he is trying to figure out how this is going to be implemented. What he is hearing is that the Applicant will issue a different study before the certificate of occupancy to determine the background noise.

Mr. Trelstad stated that if the equipment is inside the building there will be no need for screening. The Applicant can work out a plan to do the background noise levels before the building is complete. Mr. Bergus stated that there needs to be a mechanism in place to construct the screen, such as the mounting brackets.

Ms. Naughton read aloud a modification requested by Mr. Huddleston. Mr. Golden stated that on page 26, he added a line: "To facilitate this analysis, the Applicant shall conduct a noise study to determine the background noise study...." The Applicant was given a copy of this just recently, and he had some comments. Mr. Wolinsky stated that he raised the issue of growth inducing impacts, and other minor issues. Mr. Golden stated that it is a very important issue, the growth inducing impacts, which has a huge impact far beyond Amy's. To the extent that those water and sewer lines are constructed, the Planning Board wants to make it very clear that there has been absolutely no SEQRA done on growth inducing impacts. Mr. Golden had a similar issue when he was the County Attorney regarding the lines from the County Jail and the Village of Florida. Here, it is a matter of fact that the Applicant did not study any growth inducing impacts. Mr. Golden was concerned about the enlargement of the pipelines themselves, and he has added some proposed language. Mr. Wolinsky stated that on page II-25 of the FEIS, there were no growth inducing impacts, as the pipes were sized were for the facility. The Applicant did address it, and the Board accepted it as adequate. Mr. Golden stated that because the Applicant said it did not need to study it because of the size, does not mean it was studied. Mr. Golden wanted to make it clear that if anyone else wants to come in to tie in or you enlarge it, then additional SEQRA must be done.

Mr. Bergus asked where the Findings Statement says it must come back to the Planning Board, what if it is in a different municipality? Mr. Golden stated that because it has an impact on the Town of Goshen, he believes it is appropriate that it has to come back before the Planning Board. If there were a battle between potential lead agencies, the DEC Commissioner would determine that. Mr. Wolinsky stated that these lines would be owned by transportation corporations, which would need the approval of the Town, and they would need to come back to the Town if there is any expansion of them.

Mr. Halloran stated that this does not cover any other property other than the Amy's Kitchen, warehouse and Science of the Soul properties.

Mr. Bergus asked if Orange & Rockland should be an involved agency. Mr. Golden stated that it is not a permitting agency, but can be included as an interested agency.

Mr. Canning stated that on page 24, 7th line, that sentence should be broken up. On page 21, there was some discussion about including the right-turn movements at the Mid Hudson facility. After reading the timeframes aloud, Mr. Canning asked if the Planning Board wanted to limit the event to the morning or the afternoon. It is contradictory to the statement that the Applicant should avoid peak periods.

Mr. Trelstad stated that part of the Science of the Soul events would be that there is a traffic management plan in place. If it is determined that a shift in start times needs to occur, it will be part of that process. Mr. Trelstad thought that it was agreed in the last discussion that the traffic management plan would resolve those issues. Mr. Canning stated that he is not sure the Applicant can avoid all of the peak times. The traffic analysis did look at adding Science of the Soul and Amy's around the peak hours, to the extent that they are documented and there is a traffic management plan in place, that would be ok. Mr. Golden suggests language on page 23, adding, "other than as can be accommodated by and through the traffic management plan." Mr. Canning raised several other issues for the Planning Board to consider.

Mr. Golden stated that it is hard to anticipate all of the traffic impacts at one time; it is better to leave it flexible so there are options. Mr. Bergus would like to leave it flexible and have the ESOs meet and figure out the best way to handle the traffic. Mr. Baker stated that he likes including 'shall' instead of 'could', but would like to leave it flexible to work it out at the proper time to consider all of the variables. Mr. Wolinsky stated that his concern is that if the Planning Board uses "shall" and the ESOs say that something should not be done, what would happen then. Mr. Crawford stated that the Board should maintain the flexibility and rely on the traffic management plan.

Mr. Gawronski stated that Mr. Huddleston mentioned in his review that a wetland permit would be required for the work for the land along the Heritage Trail, and the Applicant mentioned that the 4.2 acres of wetlands should be mitigated.

Mr. Trelstad stated that the Applicant has some federal wetlands, for which a permit is needed, and some State wetlands may be impacted for the power lines. He does not believe the Applicant needs a permit for that. The Applicant is seeking a nationwide permit, and does not believe it will be required to mitigate the disturbance, as it is less than 0.1 acre. Some of the County's comments were received by the Applicant earlier, and they were addressed in the FEIS. At this time the Applicant's stormwater management plan is sufficient for the site.

Mr. Golden stated that this was referred to the County for its 239 report. What was received was not truly a 239 report. It was a non-mandatory report; these are simply comments on the FEIS, which is not a role of the County.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Mr. Baker, seconded by Mr. Crawford, the Town of Goshen Planning Board hereby accepts the Findings Statement as modified. Unanimously approved.

Mr. Andrews	Aye	Mr. Dropkin	Recused
Mr. Baker	Aye	Mr. Gawronski	Aye
Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Pirraglia	Aye
Mr. Crawford	Aye		

Mr. Wolinsky thanks the Planning Board on behalf of the entire project team. This is a key that unlocks proceeding forward to get the permits the Applicant needs, and the Applicant appreciates the very hard work that the Planning Board has put in.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Mr. Pirraglia, seconded by Mr. Andrews, the Town of Goshen Planning Board hereby authorizes the drafting of a resolution of approval, consistent with SEQRA, and the Planning Board’s comments. Unanimously approved.

Mr. Andrews	Aye	Mr. Dropkin	Recused
Mr. Baker	Aye	Mr. Gawronski	Aye
Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Pirraglia	Aye
Mr. Crawford	Aye		

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Mr. Baker, seconded by Mr. Pirraglia, to adjourn the meeting. Unanimously approved.

Mr. Andrews	Aye	Mr. Dropkin	Aye
Mr. Baker	Aye	Mr. Gawronski	Aye
Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Pirraglia	Aye
Mr. Crawford	Aye		

ADJOURNMENT – The Town of Goshen Planning Board adjourned at 10:30pm.