

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

May 20, 2010

Members Present:

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

Also Present:

Neal Halloran, Building Inspector
Ed Garling, Consultant Planner
Dennis Lindsay, Consultant Engineer
Kelly Naughton, PB Attorney

Minutes – The Planning Board approved the minutes of its May 6, 2010 meeting.

A&L Acres 13-1-34.2 – 217.8 acres, 30 lot subdivision located on Houston Road in the RU Zone with an AQ3 & 2 scenic road and 1 stream corridor overlay. Lot Line Modification.

Mr. Halloran said that the applicant wants to make a lot line modification to an already approved subdivision in order to give a small parcel to the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Ms. Naughton said the lot line adjustment is not an action as defined by SEQRA and that a public hearing is up to the discretion of the PB.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Ms. Israelski, seconded by Mr. Bergus, the Town of Goshen Planning Board determines that the lot line adjustment for the A&L Acres is not an “action” as defined under the State Environmental Quality Review Act and is therefore not subject to SEQRA. 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 Mr. Myruski, seconded by Mr. Andrews, the Town of Goshen Planning Board determines that a public hearing is not needed nor required on the lot line application of A&L Acres. Approved unanimously.

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

Ms. Naughton said there are two Findings required and read them as follows:

“The PB finds that, in accordance with the requirements for the Stream Corridor and Reservoir Watershed Overlay District, this project will not result in the degradation of scenic character; will be aesthetically compatible with its surroundings and will not result in erosion or surface water pollution from surface or subsurface runoff.

The PB further finds, in accordance with the requirements for the Scenic Road Corridor Overlay District, that this project will not result in the degradation of scenic character will be aesthetically compatible with its surroundings; will minimize the removal of native vegetation, except where such removal may be necessary to open up scenic views and panoramas; and will locate and cluster buildings and other structures in a manner that minimizes their visibility from the road to the extent practical.”

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Mr. Bergus, seconded by Mr. Myruski, the Town of Goshen Planning Board accepts the Findings as read by the PB attorney on the lot line application of A&L Acres. Approved unanimously.

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

Ms. Naughton read the one specific condition that will be a part of the approval, along with the general conditions as:

“Prior to the signing of the plat, the applicant must (1) modify the plat to show the entirety of Section 13, Block 1, Lots 34.2 and 48, as they currently exist; (2) modify the title of the plat to “A&L Acres Lot Line Modification”; (3) identify all new lot lines on the plat; and (4) have the revised plat signed and sealed by the professional who prepared it.”

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Mr. Myruski, seconded by Ms. Israelski, the Town of Goshen Planning Board accepts the Resolution of Conditional Preliminary & Final Approval of the Lot Line Adjustment for A&L Acres. Approved unanimously.

Mr. Andrews	Aye	Ms. Israelski	Aye
Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Lupinski	Aye

Ms. Cleaver	Aye	Mr. Myruski	Aye
Mr. Huddleston	Aye		

Public Hearings

Hope Assets, LLC (A.K.A.) Ruby Construction – 18-2-13 – 2.1 acres located at 330 Route 17A in the HC zone with an AQ3 overlay. Special use Permit for non-conforming structure.

Representing the applicant: Applicant Peter Berman
Engineer Lawrence Torro, PE

Mr. Halloran said the original building was destroyed by fire and the applicant wants to re-construct the building at the original site and add a second floor. The applicant will demolish what remains of the building. He needs a special use permit because of its proximity to the road.

Mr. Torro said the applicant will occupy the same footprint of the existing building but that it will be two full stories instead of 1-1/2 stories. It will be strictly office space. The applicant will use the existing curb cut off 17A, and will use the subsurface disposal system and the well. Four additional parking spaces will be added, as well as additional landscaping.

Mr. Garling said that the PB has to approve the building design. Mr. Berman distributed the layout of the building design, showing a pitched roof, with a flat green (grass) roof in the rear. The green roof will reduce runoff, clean the water coming off the roof and keep the roof cooler. It will not be accessible, Mr. Berman said. A handicapped ramp near the entrance will be installed but isn't shown on the current plans.

Mr. Garling said that the original foundation is 9" over on one side and 15" over on the other side, and that it must be resolved. He said that the current sign extends out into the right of way and must be eliminated.

Mr. Lindsay said there is a provision in the code that allows up to 10% storage on the site but that the applicant stated he is not going to use storage. If the applicant wishes to do any storage in accordance with the code, he will have to come back to the PB. He said that the applicant is going to patch the existing paved surfaces and stated that it must be a safe, rut-free surface suitable for vehicles and pedestrians. He said that the applicant shows there will be a reduction (no residential usage) of the waste water disposal. He said the applicant will need to demonstrate that the system is not failing. Mr. Lindsay recommends that another test be done, the last one having been done in 2007.

Mr. Berman pointed out that the plantings are labeled on the site plan and that he is adding plantings to screen the additional parking.

Mr. Huddleston asked for comment from the public. There was none.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Ms. Israelski, seconded by Mr. Bergus, the Town of Goshen Planning Board closes the public hearing on the application of Hope Assets, LLC. Approved unanimously.

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

Ms. Naughton said that there are no other involved agencies so the PB can assume lead agency status. She said it should be typed as an Unlisted Action.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Mr. Myruski, seconded by Ms. Israelski, the Town of Goshen Planning Board assumes lead agency status on the application of Hope Assets, LLC and declares the application to be an Unlisted Action in terms 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		

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Ms. Israelski, seconded by Mr. Andrews, the Town of Goshen Planning Board issues a Negative Declaration on the application of Hope Assets, LLC under SEQRA, declaring that the project will have no significant impact on the environment. Approved unanimously.

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

Ms. Naughton said that a 239 letter was received from the Orange County Planning Department and they determined that the application should be a “local determination”. She also said that the Orange County DPW determined that there will be no traffic impact on a county road.

Ms. Naughton said that if there is to be a Conditional Approval, the PB will have to make the following Finding:

“The PB has determined that the following elements of the special permit application are not necessary and are hereby waived: Section 97-75(B)(8), (10) and (17).

Mr. Halloran read the sections from the zoning code.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Ms. Israelski, seconded by Mr. Andrews, the Town of Goshen Planning Board waived the requirements of Section 97-75(B)(8), (10) and (17). Approved unanimously.

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

Ms. Naughton said that the proposed Resolution of Conditional Approval contains 13 specific conditions which she read:

1. Prior to the signing of the plans, the applicant shall show adjacent driveways within 600 feet of the property on both sides of New York State Route 17A.
2. Prior to the signing of the plans, the applicant shall revise the plans to include the mounting height, intensity and bulb type of the proposed outdoor lighting. The light levels must be limited to 0.1 foot candles at the property line with shielding to prevent any offsite glare. The fixtures shall meet IDA, LEED or Green Globes criteria for Nighttime Friendly or Dark Sky lighting.
3. Prior to the signing of the plans, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Town Building Inspector that the proposed expansion will not exceed the Code limit of 50% in accordance with Section 97-32(B) of the Zoning Code and does not reduce any non-conforming setbacks by more than 20% in accordance with Section 97-32(B).
4. Prior to the signing of the plans, the applicant shall revise the plans to include a note indicating that there will be no outdoor storage of materials. The potential impacts of such storage were not considered by the Planning Board. If the applicant proposes to store materials outdoors, he must return to the PB to have this reviewed under the applicable criteria.
5. Prior to the signing of the plans, the applicant shall include a detail showing the dimensions of the proposed parking stalls and ADA aisles. Additionally, if the concrete sidewalk along the front of the building is to include an ADA compliant curb ramp, the plans should be revised to include all details necessary for construction.
6. Prior to the signing of the plans, the applicant shall confirm the proposed water use requirements will remain the same or less than the present use and

demonstrate how the water supply will be protected from the new parking stalls adjacent to the building to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer.

7. Prior to the signing of the plans, the applicant shall confirm the existing wastewater disposal system is appropriately designed for the anticipated flow conditions and is functioning properly as demonstrated by a dye test to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer. Should the applicant decide to utilize a water recycling system, additional information shall be provided to the Town Engineer for confirmation that the existing wastewater disposal system is appropriately configured for this technology. Should the applicant utilize a vegetated roof, the applicant shall revise the plans to show the proposed roof leader to confirm overflows will be directed away from the existing well and sewage absorption area.
8. Prior to the signing of the plans, the applicant shall revise the plans to include the limits of disturbance and shall confirm the total area of disturbance is less than one (1) acre.
9. Prior to the signing of the plans, the applicant shall revise the plans to correct the typographical errors noted in the May 14, 2010 memorandum of the Town Engineer.
10. Prior to the signing of the plans, the applicant shall revise the plans to include proposed sight distances, AASHTO requirements, and information on traffic movement as required in Section 97-50(N) of the Zoning Code.
11. Prior to the signing of the plans, the applicant shall provide a copy of the survey of the property to the Building Department that is signed and sealed by the professional who prepared it.
12. The applicant proposed no revisions to the existing sign as part of this application. Therefore, neither the Planning Board nor its consultants considered the potential impacts of any potential revisions.
13. Prior to the signing of the plans, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with Section 97-14(D)(2) to the satisfaction of the Town Building Inspector.
14. The applicant shall patch, seal and re-stripe the existing paved surfaces and provide a surface free of ruts, holes, and significant depression to provide safe movement for traffic and pedestrians.

Condition #14 was added by PB Engineer Dennis Lindsay.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Mr. Myruski, seconded by Mr. Bergus, the Town of Goshen Planning Board approves the Resolution of Conditional Approval, Site Plan and Special Permit for Hope Assets, LLC (A/K/A Ruby Construction) with the specific conditions as read. Approved unanimously.

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

T-Mobile – 10-1-55 – 7.8+/- acres, located at 78 Cypress Road in the CO zone with an AQ6 overlay. Special use permit for a Wireless Telecommunications tower.

Representing the applicant:

Doug Warden, Esq.

Mr. Halloran told the PB that the application had come before the PB a year ago. The site is located on Dr. Hendler's property across from Fletcher St. and Burke High School and next to the Village sewage plant.

Mr. Warden spoke about the facility T-Mobile is proposing. He said it is a wireless telecommunications monopole disguised as a pine tree. From the trunk of the tree, it is 80 ft. The tree will be surrounded by branches at the top to provide a cone which gives the shape of a pine tree. The branches will extend the height to 85 ft. The antennas will be hidden within the branches. Each antennae is 55" tall, 13" wide and 3" deep. They will be arranged in 3 sectors, one facing north, one south, one east. There will be equipment stored in the base of the tower surrounded by a 6 ft. chain link fence. There is room at the base for other equipment to allow for future co-location. Mr. Warden said that Town Code prefers use of existing structures so that if another carrier needs coverage in the area, they will be able to go on this existing tower, eliminating the unnecessary proliferation of other towers, he said.

Mr. Warden said they looked at seven alternatives and submitted their engineer's report indicating that only two of the alternatives would provide the coverage necessary. The needed coverage is along Route 17 between Cheechunk and Owen Rd. Both of those alternatives are owned by the County and the applicant reached out to the County to see if they were interested in leasing so they could use an existing structure, but they said they are not interested in leasing, he said.

Mr. Warden said the applicant is proposing to locate the tower in the rear of the property. He submitted a computerized visual analysis showing views from all over the Town showing what the facility will look like. He said he thinks it will have relatively minimal aesthetic impact on the area.

Mr. Huddleston asked for comments from consultant Richard Comi of the Center for Municipal Solutions.

Mr. Comi said the applicant provided information showing a gap in coverage in this area so there is the need for them to have a facility in that general area. He agrees that the two other facilities, the water tank and the tower, could both be utilized and provide better coverage than what is being proposed. He said the Town has been talking to the County for the past few weeks and that today, he received the 239 Response from the County. Mr. Comi read from the letter of David Church, County Commissioner of Planning

in which he said it had been determined that the proposed action has the potential to cause negative inter-municipal or county wide impacts. He referred to the County's significant tourist economy and interest in maintaining a scenic landscape. He said the proposed tower is located a few hundred feet from Route 17, one of the county's major thoroughfares, the County's popular Heritage Trail and the Audobon Society Wildlife Refuge awaiting official classification as a special protection water by NYSDEC and suggested that the applicant explore alternate sites or incorporate or camouflage the communication devises. The letter also suggested that his department may be able to facilitate a direct conversation that may permit future siting of such towers on Orange County property, including within the immediate Goshen area. Mr. Comi said that the letter implies an interest, at least by the Planning Commissioner, to talk about this going on the County's water tank or 911 tower. Mr. Comi said that the applicant has stated that both of those would work, and concluded that more discussion with the County would be appropriate considering the economic climate today where governments are looking for funding. He said he has done hundreds of these applications in NYS and this is only the second time he has seen a county suggest that a facility could have a detrimental effect. "I recommend serious consideration in addressing that further," Mr. Comi said.

Ms. Naughton said she spoke with the County Attorneys office and was told that the County is not interested in having this on their water tower, the 911 tower or the sheriff's tower.

Mr. Warden said that the "County Attorney and the 911 Coordinator has rejected us, but if the PB directs us to make further efforts to contact the County, we will comply with that."

Holly O'Hern of Summit View Drive said she spoke to Mr. Diana today and that he said he is not opposed to having a tower put on County land, but he feels that if a tower is added to the water tower it will interfere with the 911 system. Ms. O'Hern said she was encouraged by her conversation with Mr. Diana and urged the PB to start a dialogue.

Mr. Comi said there should be a technical dialogue with the County to discuss the interference issue.

Mr. Huddleston said that the PB will follow up with Mr. Church's suggestion and follow through with a discussion with Mr. Diana.

Mr. Huddleston opened the meeting to public comment.

John Monroe, of Houston Rd., said he doesn't want the tower to impact the wetlands, that wetlands are being lost already. He asked what will happen when the trees grow, since the tower is to be 80 ft. tall and the trees in the area are shorter.

Gerald Boss, of Craigville Rd., said that the jail sits on 360 acres and that the County Executive would be wrong not to let the project be put on the County tower. He said it doesn't belong on this piece of property but belongs on the hill.

Betsy Dunlevy, of 22 Oakcrest Dr., said that driving along the highways the telecommunication towers do not look like trees, and are in fact worse looking than an actual tower would be. She said the proposed tower doesn't belong in the bird sanctuary.

Lynn Barber of Pine Bush and a member of the Audobon Society, said she'd rather see it on the hill on County property even though she doesn't believe it will bother the birds where it is being proposed.

Holly O'Hern said that when the trees at the site lose their leaves, the only thing you will see is "that toothbrush tree". She said she'd like the County to paint the water tower blue so it will go with the skyline and said it looks like a "missile silo" now.

Mr. Halloran said that the 911 Center does not want co-location on any of its towers, but will accept another tower.

Joel Markowitz, of Wickham Ave., said there will be an advantage to having a separate tower in that if there is a disaster and everything is co-located on the one tower that goes down, then emergency communication and cell phone communication is lost.

Mr. Warden said the applicant has looked at the jail tower and that it comes short of filling the gap of coverage. Coverage maps have been submitted that show it, he said. Mr. Warden said that the technology has gotten better over the years and suggested that the public look at photos of the proposed tower.

Ms. O'Hern suggested that if the applicant can't use the water tower, that it locate its tower over on the hill where the topography is higher and where it is better aesthetically and environmentally.

Mr. Warden asked what the applicant can do next. Mr. Huddleston said the applicant should address the comments from the County Planning Department and then meet with Mr. Church, Ms. O'Hern, Mr. Comi, Mr. Halloran and himself. Mr. Comi said they can address the technical aspects with the County. It was noted that Mr. Halloran will arrange

the meeting. Mr. Lindsay said he would like the applicant to also address his memo. Ms. Cleaver asked the applicant to also contact the Audobon Society to discuss mitigation.

Mr. Garling suggested holding the public hearing open. He said that he doesn't believe it will be a real visual problem at 80 ft., but that if there will be future co-locations, the tree will be elevated and once it goes beyond the tree line, it becomes very visible.

Mr. Warden said that if there were to be a co-location, it would have to come before the PB for approval.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Ms. Israelski, seconded by Ms. Cleaver, the Town of Goshen Planning Board holds the public hearing open to June 17, 2010 on the application of T-Mobile. Approved unanimously.

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

Goshen Properties 13-1-34.1, 39.1,13-2-4, 13-2-5, 13-2-6 & 13-2-7 – 39.7+/- acres,14 lot subdivision located on Houston Road, located in the RU zone, with an AQ3, 2 scenic road and stream corridor overlays. Amended Major Site Plan.

Representing the applicant: Steve Esposito

Mr. Halloran said the applicant is requesting the re-location of three driveways.

Mr. Esposito said that in the original application Lots 5, 6 & 7 were a combined driveway. Combining driveways has been taken out of the new Code, he said. Lot #7 has already been built and sold. Now the applicant would like the driveway for Lot #6 to come out onto Houston Rd. and the driveway for Lot #5 to come out onto Gabriella Terrace. That is the compromise that PB member Andrews suggested at the last meeting, Mr. Esposito said.

Mr. Lindsay said the remaining issue is having the driveway for Lot #6 going out onto Houston Rd. He said that where it is proposed is probably the best in terms of sight distance at that location. The sight distance would be 520 and 530 ft. He said that some clearing will be required.

Mr. Huddleston opened the meeting to public comment.

John Monroe, of Houston Rd., said the last thing that is needed is another driveway entering onto Houston Rd. He said they are not far from being blind driveways. He called Houston a “raceway”, saying that people speed 60-70 mph and that the police don’t patrol the road. There is a lot of traffic, Mr. Monroe said, and he fears someone will get killed sooner or later.

Susan Chumerick, 50 Houston Rd., said his house is directly across from the development. She said she nearly got hit this morning going out her driveway. She said it is not only the motorcycles and cars, but construction trucks and the trucks going to the landfill. She that if there will be children waiting for the school bus at the proposed driveway, it will be inviting a disaster. Ms. Chumerick said that when she moved to Houston Rd., the post office wouldn’t deliver mail because of the sight distance.

Diana Lupinski, who owns a farm next door to Goshen Properties, said she has lived there 18 years and has seen the traffic increase 100 fold every year. She said she is concerned about school buses. Ms. Lupinski said that it is very narrow and steep with a high berm where the driveway is proposed to go and that the developer will have to substantially cut into the hill. She said she understands that the three houses were approved with the shared driveways and that is why they didn’t have the 300 ft. required frontage. She requested that the PB consider the people who live on the road. She said she is very concerned and that the police chief is also concerned because he knows no one goes the speed limit. She said that when she spoke earlier with the Highway Superintendent, Mr. Andryshak, he was quite against the driveway.

PB member John Lupinski said he called Judith Bressler, director of the NY Planning Federation, and that she has concerns about the traffic and sight distance. She said it will need a lot of clearing and will have a major impact on the aesthetics. Ms. Bressler stated it was a question of safety and that the Town could possibly be exposing itself to liability if it didn’t take a hard look at this issue. Mr. Lupinski asked how the sight distance was being measured and how fast people are actually driving.

Mr. Esposito said the sight distance was measured in accordance with IEP standards by a licensed land surveyor.

Mr. Fini, owner of Goshen Properties, said that Mr. Andryshak was against the re-location of the driveway until he met with him at the site this morning. He looked at the site and was pleasantly surprised and said he is very satisfied as to the sight distance, Mr. Fini said. “If you go there and look at it you will agree.” Mr. Fini delivered a letter from Mr. Andryshak.

Mr. Monroe said that at night when the car lights come over the top of the hill, you don't see a thing because of the way the lights hit you.

Ms. Cleaver said she is concerned because this is in the scenic road corridor and that Mr. Andryshak said in his letter that all brush, earth and berm must be removed for a safe entrance.

Mr. Lupinski asked how much will have to be cut. Mr. Lindsay said that the driveway grades are not shown on the new plan.

Mr. Garling said that the driveways for Lots 1 & 2 were cleared and that there is a distance of 60 ft. where the berms were eliminated for the two driveways. For this driveway, he said, you will have to clear back at least 40 ft. of berm for adequate sight distance and the PB will have to specifically waive the scenic road issue. The stop sign will have to be moved forward, he said.

Mr. Bergus asked how the PB resolves the issue of the school bus. Mrs. Lupinski said there will be a bus stopping in the middle of the hill for the house "and people flying over that hill." She said the school buses stop at every single house because they are afraid of having the kids wait on the narrow road.

Mr. Rudy, 60 Houston Rd., said he has young children and worries about them waiting for the bus. The bus stops at his driveway and he is across the street, about 50 ft. from the proposed driveway.

Mr. Monroe said that the people on Houston Rd. shouldn't have to suffer because the developer is having trouble selling his houses or because of the way the driveway was approved. Mr. Huddleston said that at the time of approval the PB was trying to support shared driveways but that the code doesn't support shared driveways now.

Mr. Bergus said there is no drawing showing how much berm is going to be cut away but that he wants to see the damage that is going to be done to get the driveway access. Mr. Lindsay said the applicant needs to show the grading and clearing and sight lines on the actual drawings, so the PB can access the impacts.

Ms. Naughton said that the PB waived the frontage on three lots, Lots 2, 5 & 6 due to topographic conditions and Mr. Esposito said they wanted to move one of the lots off the hill that bordered the Lupinski farm and had agreed that it would be worth moving the lot, reducing the lot width and putting it on Houston.

Mr. Lupinski said that this will make four curb cuts, including the road. He said that

across the street there is a 24 lot development with one curb cut, and that Winners Circle has 10 lots with only one curb cut. "I think it does something to the scenic quality of the area," he said.

Mr. Lindsay told the PB members that if they determine that it will damage the scenic corridor and isn't something they will approve, then the PB shouldn't have the applicant go through the exercise of doing the design of the driveway. "But if you think the driveway design, if done appropriately, can co-exist with the scenic corridor and these other issues aren't compelling, then you should get that information from the applicant," he said.

Mr. Huddleston polled the Planning Board. Ms. Israelski said she is concerned about the kids and school buses. Mr. Andrews, Bergus, Myruski, and Huddleston said they want to see the topography, that without it they can't determine if there is a significant impact to the scenic corridor. Ms. Cleaver said she wants to keep the scenic corridor and Mr. Lupinski said "no."

Mr. Linday told the applicant to show the Lot #6 driveway coming out, the cuts, the grading, the clearing in the area, the existing tree line, the final tree line after it is cut, the contours and any trees 12 inches or greater that will be cut down. He said the sight distance should be shown graphically.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Ms. Israelski, seconded by Mr. Andrews the Town of Goshen Planning Board closes the public hearing on the application of Goshen Properties. Approved unanimously.

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

Mr. Huddleston said that the public can review the information when it comes in.

ADJOURNMENT: A motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:30 p.m. was made, seconded and approved unanimously.

Ralph Huddleston, Chair
Notes Prepared by Susan Varden