

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

DECEMBER 3, 2009

Members Present:

Reynell Andrews
Lee Bergus
Susan Cleaver
Ralph Huddleston, Chair
Mary Israelski

Also Present:

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

Absent:

John Lupinski
Raymond Myruski

MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Board meeting of November 19, 2009 were approved with corrections.

Reiger – 9-1-8.452 – 360.9 acres, 108 units, located on Craigville Rd in the RU district with an AQ3 & AQ6 overlay with a Scenic Road Corridor Overlay. Possibly set public hearing for EIS.

Representing the applicant: Chad Wade, Esposito Associates

Mr. Golden said he believes the DEIS is complete although his office hasn't received the final document incorporating the changes discussed. He said he has been told that it will be to him by December 14, 2009. Chad Wade of Esposito Associates confirmed that it will be provided to everyone by December 14th. Ed Garling will file the Notice of Completion.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Ms. Cleaver, seconded by Mr. Bergus, the Town of Goshen Planning Board sets a public hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the application of Reiger for January 21, 2010. Approved unanimously.

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

Healey Motors – 12-1-8.11 – 5.20+/- acres, located at 2528 Route 17M in the HC zone with an AQ6 overlay. Site Plan approval.

Representing the applicant: Ray VanVorrhis, Architect
Paul Healey, John Kerner

Mr. VanVorrhis said that this is an application to perform cosmetic changes to the building façade, updating it with silver metal panels to conform to the parent company’s (Ford Motor Co.) design. The panels will be attached in front of the existing façade and the applicant will paint the second floor a grey color. There will be no additions or changes, except to the façade. The front piece comes out 16 ft. and is one foot wide and will be attached to panels with metal clips, Mr. VanVorrhis said.

Mr. Healey said that Ford Motor Co. wants to make the look consistent with all other new renovations and construction across the country, in order to have a common look to all Ford dealerships.

Mr. Golden said that the application is a minor site plan and that no public hearing is required. He said it is a Type II Action because it is a rehabilitation of an existing structure. The PB has received the 239F Report from the County DPW who has stated that there will be no new traffic or drainage impacts. The PB also received the 239M Report from the County Planning Department stating that is a “Local Determination”. Mr. Golden said that the only specific condition to add to an approval will be that the applicant must comply with requirements and conditions set forth in the ZBA variance having to do with signage.

The PB recognized that the application is a Type II Action and therefore no further SEQRA has to be done.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Ms. Israelski, seconded by Mr. Andrews, the Town of Goshen Planning Board approves the minor site plan of the Healey Motors’ application as presented, subject to the normal conditions and the specific condition that PB approval is subject to the decision on signage recently set forth by the Town of Goshen Zoning Board of Appeals. Approved unanimously.

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

Zalunski – 20-1-8 – 74.8 acres, 18 lot subdivision located on Pulaski Highway and Cross Roads in the RU zone with an AQ3, scenic road and stream & reservoir overlays.

Representing the applicant: Amador Laput, Project Manager, B.E.S.T.

Mr. Halloran said that the PB has to address the issues of street trees, cul-de-sacs, the access road and the agricultural setback.

Street Trees: Mr. Halloran said the internal streets must have trees every 40 ft. and that he interprets the Code as also requiring street trees along Pulaski Highway and Cross Roads. The PB can't waive that requirement but could suggest that the applicant go to the ZBA to seek a variance from the requirement. "This is a Scenic Road Corridor and one of the scenic views is that when you drive out Pulaski Highway you look out onto the black dirt area and if you put in street trees, you won't be able to do that any longer," he said. Mr. Halloran said that both roads, Pulaski Highway and Cross Roads are in the Scenic Corridor and asked if the PB wants to support the idea of seeking a variance.

Mr. Huddleston said he believes that one tree every 40 ft. will prohibit the scenic view but that he might recommend one tree every 120 ft. Ms. Israelski said she would like to see trees at the entrance.

Mr. Golden told the applicant that if they can't get the variance done by the Jan. 27th deadline for Conditional Final Approval, that they can put all of the trees in the plan, then ask the ZBA for a modification, and then come back to the PB for an Amended Conditional Final Approval.

The consensus of the PB members was to recommend one tree every 40 ft. on Cross Roads and at the proposed roads A & B, but along Pulaski Highway (Route 6) a reduction to one tree every 120 ft. with special consideration for landscaping at each of the entrances.

Cul-de-sacs: Mr. Halloran said that there are two cul-de-sacs being proposed and that the PB must determine if that is okay. The PB agreed that cul-de-sac "A" is not an issue and discussed whether cul-de-sac "B" should be continued over to the Dykshoorn property, and end at this property with a hammerhead. Mr. Hoffman said he thinks it is a good idea and said that the applicant has no problem providing a hammerhead right up to the property line, providing the grading works out. Mr. Garling concurred, stating that it resolves a lot of problems and the PB agreed.

Access Road: The PB discussed the access road to Pond B. The topography determines

the road layout, Mr. Laput said and added that if allowed to be steeper, the access road could come straight down the hill to the pond. It would be a 13% slope for an access road that will be used once or twice a year, he said. Mr. Hoffman said that NYS restricts the slope to no greater than 15% and that a 13% grade will reduce the amount of disturbance for an access road that may be used once or twice a year to remove brush. Mr. Huddleston said he thought it makes sense and Ms. Israelski asked for a landscape plan for the pond.

Agricultural setback: Mr. Halloran said the property adjoins an active dairy cattle farm owned by the Dykshoorns and asked the PB to determine what kind of buffer is needed against the agricultural property.

Mr. Golden said that on another project, Goshen Properties, the PB asked for a 50 ft. wide agricultural buffer along the property line, with the first 25 ft. a no disturbance/no build buffer, prohibiting any disturbance or structures with the exception of subdivision roadways and the remaining 25 ft. a no build buffer prohibiting structures with the exception of any septic field, appurtenances and the roadway, but permitting mowing and maintenance of the area.

Mr. Huddleston suggested staying consistent and said that the 25 ft. will protect the existing hedgerows along the property lines on both sides. Mr. Golden said that the PB ought to stay consistent unless the circumstances warrant a different result.

Burt Dykshoorn, whose farm borders on the applicant's property, said he is not in favor of the no disturbance buffer because brush and sumac will grow along his fence line. He said he'd want the property owner to mow up to his fence, and that he doesn't need a hedge row that he has to take care of.

Mr. Golden said that the agricultural buffer is required by the code for the purpose of protecting the residential land from the agricultural land.

Mr. Huddleston said that requiring the property owner to cut down the buffer that protects the residential from the agricultural is not consistent with the code, adding that he understands Mr. Dykshoorn's situation but that the PB has an obligation not to intentionally go against the code.

The PB agreed to stay consistent with the buffer requirements as outlined in the Goshen Properties approval.

ADJOURNMENT: A motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:30 p.m. was made, seconded and approved unanimously.

