

**Town of Goshen  
Planning Board  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
March 7, 2006**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Ralph Huddleston, Chairman  
Reynell Andrews  
Lee Bergus  
Susan Cleaver  
John Lupinski

**ALSO PRESENT**

John Cappello, Attorney  
Neal Halloran Bldg. Insp  
Joe Henry, Engineer  
Susan Roth, Planner

**ABSENT**

Mary Israelski  
Raymond Myruski

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Huddleston called the meeting of the Town of Goshen Planning Board to order at 7:30 pm. The meeting originally scheduled for March 2 was postponed to this date due to inclement weather.

**II. MINUTES**

The minutes of the February 16, 2006 meeting were approved as corrected upon motion made by Mr. Bergus, seconded by Ms. Cleaver.

**III. PUBLIC HEARING - CONTINUED**

**Fordham University / Wood Rd - 5-1-58 - 10.6 +/- acres - located at 3 Wood Rd, in the RU zone with an AQ6 overlay, for religious/charitable and education use for a proposed retreat house. **Special use permit & Site Plan.****

Present for the applicant: Michael Donnelly, Attorney  
Sr. Regina Devito  
Fr. Joseph Currie  
Mark Alero, Fordham Univ.  
David Higgins, L & T  
John Queenan, L & T

Mr. Donnelly gave a brief overview of the plan presented so far. The existing house is located at 3 Wood Rd. in the RU district, which permits religious activities. The applicant is planning to use the home as a retreat center. There will be no changes to the exterior. They have had meetings with the PB consultants and have re-submitted a long form EAF and an expanded Part 3. They have agreed with the consultants that water will be subject to DOH approval

and the septic system will have to be approved by the DEC. Depending on the DEC findings, there may need to be some tree removal. The applicant does not plan to remove any of the trees except for dead, diseased or otherwise dangerous specimens.

The project narrative has been revised and a final “red-lined” copy has been submitted. The applicant has removed the sentence regarding having the center open for public use as the neighbors expressed great concern over this possibility. However, they do wish to make the center available for similar activities sponsored by St. John’s Parish in Goshen.

The Chairman asked for comments from the Board. Ms. Israelski submitted her comments via e-mail as she could not be present. Mr. Huddleston read these comments into the record as follows:

“Site plan should provide actual size and capacity of sanitary waste system with room for expansion. Application to be reviewed as a large project and not a small one as written in the Town Goshen Zoning Code.”

Mr. Cappello noted that the first of Ms. Israelski’s comments has been addressed by the topo map submitted by the applicant. Mr. Higgins reviewed two maps for the public. He noted that the property is heavily wooded except for the actual location of the house. The maps show the location of surrounding homes and the area where the septic is located. There is a long driveway into the property that is 16’ wide at a minimum. The building cannot be seen from Wood Rd.

Mr. Henry has reviewed all the submissions and noted that the applicant will be going to the County DOH for approval for a temporary residence water PERMIT. Ms. Cleaver asked Mr. Henry if the septic system could be checked yearly as part of the approval. Mr. Henry replied that the DOH will inspect on an annual basis. Mr. Halloran noted that since this would be considered a commercial entity, the Town will also be inspecting the facility on an annual basis.

Mr. Huddleston opened the meeting to the public, asking them to keep the comments informative and to address only new topics that were not covered at the previous hearing.

Mr. Ronald Kossar, 4 Wood Rd., an attorney for the extended Wood Rd. HOA explained that many of the residents could not attend this newly scheduled meeting. He introduced into the record a transcript of the Feb. 2 Public Hearing and other documents regarding State sanitary code and guidelines. He attended

the Feb. 23 staff work session and noted that they did review many issues. The vegetation will be preserved. However the applicant has not submitted the information regarding the location of the septic system and the wells of adjoining neighbors, which was requested by the PB. He has not had an opportunity to review the most recent EAF, but noted that the applicant responded “no” to question #20 in the Part 2 portion regarding the issue of public controversy. He feels that there certainly is public controversy and therefore the entire document is suspect.

Mr. Kossar noted that the members could not have reviewed the transcript of the prior meeting nor the conditional neg dec and therefore questions how they can make a determination at this hearing. He asks that they give a hard look to these documents and continue the Public Hearing. He commented that Fordham has emphasized being a good neighbor and if they truly wish to be a “good neighbor” they should consider a voluntary payment in lieu of taxes and should consent to no further development on the site. This would preclude the proposed 30-unit dormitory from happening and give the neighbors some peace. He feels that this quasi commercial-transient use in a residential/agricultural area drastically alters the neighborhood. The proposed 30-room dormitory would be “devastating.” He further noted that Fordham had an opportunity to amend their application to include a GEIS on full build out basis and they have chosen not to do this.

Mr. Kossar requested that if the PB grants the application the approval be subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Limit number of participants to no more than 15 retreaters as represented by Fordham in their original proposal.
- 2) Limit the number and length of retreats to 7 each semester, not to eXceed 3-5 days as represented by Fordham in their original proposal.
- 3) Limit the number of vehicles to 2 vans and 3-4 automobiles as represented by Fordham in their original proposal.
- 4) Limit use of the site to religious retreats for Fordham University students only.
- 5) No change to the exterior vegetation and any violation would be subject to action by the Building Inspector.
- 6) Any required exterior railings should be made of natural materials.
- 7) No further development of the site.
- 8) Fordham University to obtain approvals from the DOH, DEC and the Building Inspector.

He further requested that the PB clarify the matter of retreats being held at the site prior to obtaining the special use permit and site plan approval. The applicant should be barred from holding any retreats until all permits and approvals are

granted. The Town would be subject to liability issues if this is not done. Mr. Kossar requests that the PB take a serious hard look at all the relevant submissions and that they not "rush to judgement".

Mr. Thomas Spreitzer, President, Extended Wood Rd. HOA explained that they had an opportunity to attend an Open House at the facility and two key points were made. He asked if they planned to rent out to others and they replied "no", but the literature given out later stated that they were planning to allow use by others. This was a misrepresentation on their part. He also noted that the HOA asked the applicant to stop the PB meeting and meet with the neighbors for discussion and they did not do so. He feels personally insulted by this and asks that the PB not assume that this project is acceptable just because it carries the Fordham University name. Mr. Spreitzer also stated that the applicant has held their first retreat meeting without permission.

Mr. Don Sullivan, 41 Minisink Trail, stated that he checked the Fordham website and found that many retreats have been scheduled in Goshen and they do not yet have a permit. He also expressed concern regarding fire safety and noted that the basement is being used for living quarters.

Mr. Quentin Coneen, Fairway Dr., stated that he feels this "whole thing is sad". He has no problem with the proposed use and feels that the neighborhood should be working together.

Ms. Sandra Kossar, asked how the roads would be affected. She is also concerned with the transient nature of the use. She asks if the retreaters will be walking on the road as she is concerned for her children's safety. Mr. Mark Alero, Fordham Univ. Campus Ministry Program stated that the students will be advised on the neighborhood and he expects most activities will be on the property or in the house.

Francis Donoghue noted that there are many questions arising from this application and he hopes the PB will give this decision the time and energy it deserves. He stated that the applicant is welcome as long as they stick to the guidelines. The PB should make these guidelines and the consequences of failure to comply clear to all parties.

Ms. Cleaver noted that the possibility of payment in lieu of taxes is not under the PB's jurisdiction. Mr. Cappello stated that this is true, however the applicant could offer a payment in lieu of taxes. We cannot require them to do so. Mr. Henry asked Mr. Higgins about the location of the septic system and neighboring wells. Mr. Higgins replied that they did obtain "as built" maps from the Building

Department and their locations are as accurate as possible. Mr. Henry noted that as part of the DOH review they would review the location of the septic system in relation to the neighboring wells. He feels confident that the location of the septic system is appropriate.

Mr. Bergus noted that one of Mr. Kossar's documents referred to the operation of a small public water supply. As long as the number stays under 25 they are not a public water supply. It is considered a temporary residence supply and they do have to have DOH and DEC review. Mr. Andrews asked Mr. Donnelly if the Goshen Fire Dept. has been contacted. Mr. Donnelly replied that the Fire Dept. has not been contacted, however the applicant has discussed this with Mr. Halloran. They have agreed that some increased fire protection is needed. It may be by sprinklering, but there are other methods and they are continuing to research this. The applicant does not wish to widen the drive as it would impact the beauty of the site.

Mr. Henry sent a memo clarifying that the applicant must keep the number of occupants under 20. This number includes everyone staying at the house, not just the number of retreators. Mr. Huddleston asked about the restriction on the number of vehicles. Mr. Cappello stated that they could include language in the approval that if the applicant's representation of the number changes materially they may be asked to mitigate the traffic impacts.

In regard to the use of the facility by other groups, Mr. Donnelly explained that they had hoped to open the facility to other groups for religious and educational uses. However, the opposition from the neighbors was such that they removed this from their plans except for use by St. John's Parish in Goshen. They will be subject to the same restrictions as the applicant.

Mr. Huddleston noted that a statement was made that this is a strictly residential neighborhood. He noted that Silent Farm is a commercial establishment (bed & breakfast) and an agricultural use, which borders on many of the homes. Mr. Halloran stated that this is an agricultural use and they hold some wedding receptions. In regard to the mention of handrails, Mr. Cappello stated that the PB did ask for a guardrail along a portion of the drive. It is on the plans, and will be constructed of natural looking materials. Mr. Donnelly noted that there is lighting on the driveway and they have installed one light for the parking area as requested.

Mr. Huddleston asked if they are currently holding retreats and are they allowed. Mr. Cappello responded that the Town has no authority to tell the owners of the house that they cannot have overnight visitors. If the applicant is having retreats they are proceeding at their own risk, and the Town has no legal responsibility. If

they were to have 20 people there every weekend, then violations could be considered.

The prospect of future development was discussed. Mr. Donnelly stated that they are not planning to give up this right in the long term. There is a possibility that they may need to expand depending on the popularity of the program. The applicant was advised to be "up front" with the Town about this possibility. There are no plans at this time to expand. Mr. Cappello stated that in the draft neg dec, they have included that all the substantial concerns have been identified. Any approvals would show these concerns.

Mr. Lupinski asked if the number of retreats being discussed would include any that may be conducted by St. John's. Mr. Donnelly stated that seven retreats per semester will be held by Fordham. There will be other types of retreats at different times of the year. These would be in addition to the 7/semester currently proposed. The applicant feels they need to increase the utilization of the facility as they have had to incur the additional expense of expanding the septic system and applying to the DOH and DEC. The fourteen yearly retreats is not intended as a limit. That would be the minimum number and the maximum would vary from year to year depending on the popularity of the program. They are reserving the right to have additional retreats. Mr. Donnelly also advised Ms. Cleaver that they will be putting up the signs as she requested and she should let them know what she would like to see.

Father Currie stated that they need to make good use of the property, but he emphasized that this is still a home and they are just beginning their planning. Sister Regina also noted that they would be holding retreats during vacation times and the summer months. Mr. Huddleston noted that they could end up with full year round use of the property. Therefore the evaluation of the septic system needs to be based on 20 people for 365 days/year.

Mr. Cappello noted that it is clear that the students will be brought to the facility in vans. How will transportation be arranged for the other retreats? Will there be the need for several cars. Mr. Donnelly stated that they would be coming from Fordham in vans except for those coming from St. John's. Mr. Alero noted that all these programs are subsidized by the University. Basically, the cost is covered as part of the student's tuition. They are asked for a token payment of approximately \$25.

Ms. Cathy Barnett asked if they need to know the well capacity to activate a sprinkler system. Mr. Halloran replied that there are ways to use a tank for storage. Mr. Sam Fast noted that it is apparent this facility will be taken off the tax rolls. Many of the people in the Village and Town have reached the limit on

their taxes and placing this extra burden on them may cause some to feel they need to move out and he feels this is unacceptable. He also questioned the fact that they will not be bringing any income into the community. Mr. Huddleston noted this position, but reminded the public that this is not within this Board's jurisdiction to address.

Mr. Kossar expressed concern that when the neighbors attended the open house they were led to believe there would be 14 retreats/year lasting 3-5 days, now they hear the applicant plans to expand the program. He summarized his concerns as follows:

- 1) He feels they should not be able to change these figures just because they find that it is going to cost them more for the permitting process.
- 2) Their own literature states they will be adding a 20-30 unit dormitory. This needs to be clarified.
- 3) They had an opportunity to prepare a voluntary GEIS and they did not.
- 4) Silent Farm is 9/10 of a mile from the site. Wood Rd. is a quiet residential road. It is not a commercial zone.
- 5) It appears the Town is tacitly condoning the illegal use of the facility and this could lead to liability problems, which could result in a lawsuit.
- 6) The increase in taxes to the community because this facility will be taken off the tax rolls is of concern.

The Chairman polled the members on whether they feel the Public Hearing can be closed.

Mr. Andrews -	issues have been covered, appropriate to close.
Mr. Bergus	agrees
Ms. Cleaver	agrees
Mr. Huddleston	agrees
Mr. Lupinski	It should not be closed. There are too many unanswered questions particularly in regard to the number of times to be used.

Mr. Cappello stated that they have to base their approvals on the assumptions the facility will be used on a fairly regular basis. The definition of transient residency was discussed. Mr. Bergus stated that is anything that is not a family unit and is a regulated transient community if it is 10 or more.

**VOTE** By Proper MOTION, made by Mr. Andrews, seconded by Mr. Bergus, the Town Board of the Town of Goshen hereby closes the Public Hearing on the Fordham University Special Use Permit application. Passed by a vote of 4 to 1.

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

Mr. Donnelly summarized the limitations the applicant expects to be incorporated in the approval.

- 1) They will not remove any but dead, diseased trees except for any they may be required to remove as part of the permitting process.
- 2) They will show 2' contours in the vicinity of the septic and expansion area.
- 3) They will review the nature of the use
- 4) In regard to traffic, the retreators will be transported in 2 vans and as many as 4 cars arriving on Fri. evening and leaving on Sun. afternoon. (The trip generation will be no more than that of a single family.)
- 5) There will be no exterior changes, with the exception of the requested guardrail, which will be constructed of stone or wood.
- 6) Fire safety will comply with code.
- 7) The number of participants is limited to no more than 20.
- 8) Applicant will obtain DOH, DEC and BI approvals.

Mr. Cappello suggested that possibly one more work session with the consultants would be adequate. Ms. Roth suggested that there is one area between the closest property that should have some more landscaping. The applicant will revisit this possibility after they find out what the DEC will require in regard to tree removal. Mr. Cappello will prepare the resolution for a neg dec and site plan approval for March 16. The PB will allow receipt of written comments until close of business on March 12.

**Nextel Communications - 11-1-45 - 18.1+/- acres** located at 338 Harriman Drive in the RU zone with an AQ6, AQ3, and stream & reservoir overlays.

Mr. Halloran stated that this public hearing had already been noticed before the cancellation of last weeks meeting. A letter has been received from the Telecommunications Advisory Committee. Mr. Henry noted that the report regarding the structural integrity of the existing tower has not been submitted.

#### IV. **Agenda Items**

**Makuen - 13-1-10.1 & 10.2 - 96.07 acres** located in the RU & CO zones with an AQ6 & scenic road corridor overlay, located on Route 17A, next to the Village. This is a 4 lot subdivision apparently proceeding under the small scale subdivision section of the code.



Present for the applicant: Thomas DePuy

Mr. DePuy explained that when they received their conceptual approval from the DOT they were asked to review the sight distances for lot 4. As the rear drive was in the CO zone, the DOT asked that they show commercial access. He has put a note on the map stating that this commercial access is not being approved at this time. Mr. Henry asked that they change the wording from "future" to "potential".

Mr. Cappello noted that this was considered a significant change, which is why the applicant came back in. The PB needs to re-grant the final approval. The Board agrees to this and authorizes Chairman Huddleston to sign the maps.

**Heritage Estates - 8-1-9.22 - 256 acres** locate on Old Chester Rd & Brookside Rd in the HR & RU zone with an AQ6 & AQ3 overlay with a scenic road and stream & Reservoir overlay. **DEIS completeness**

Present for the applicant: Steve Esposito  
James Sweeney

Mr. Halloran stated that the applicant is here tonight to receive additional comments regarding the completeness of the DEIS. The Planner and Engineer have submitted comment letters.

Mr. Huddleston read Ms. Israelski's comments into the record as follows:

“Density cannot be absolutely determined until water availability and land suitability are determined as per the Water Protocols, the town codes and County Health Department. I do however want it noted that I like the overall development plan as shown in the 2nd selection. This plan demonstrates our new Zoning . This plan can create, connect and integrate neighborhoods, bicycling trails, parklands, fishing areas, forest land, river ways, cross country ski areas sledding and short run snowboarding runs. This project is adjacent to the Land of Goshen Park and can connect it to Old Chester Road. The Heritage Estates project more so than any other project before the planning board demonstrates significant public benefits to the town.

However these lands can only become acceptable if they are dedicated in a manner in which liability and costs do not become immediately apparent to the town. In light of the concern about increase taxation I urge the developers to explore presenting dedication of open space lands with improvements or funds toward improvements. This request is only being made so that this unique property be taken over by the town without being a burden. That is not to

suggest that this will be in lieu of recreation fees but only as part as any acceptance of the overall plan.

It is only because of the unique landscape and exceptional location that bonuses should be considered. IF this application has the water and other land requirements that bonuses should be given This rationale could not be used on any other property. Additionally the farm preservation is extremely valuable.

- I ask that the DEIS explore making improved dedications to the town. A board walk (as drawn), painted lines on roadways, lighting or other small amenities that can be later identified by the town board or planners would make the dedication more acceptable. Our town board is very concerned about increase taxation and liability! Make this offer of open space have little or no cost to the town after dedication and show this to the town board. Our zoning enables the planning board to negotiate for amenties to be granted for the town therefore I ask that these minor improvements be used as mitigation in the DEIS so that the open space areas can be dedicated to the town without concern over increased costs and taxation to the town.
- The DEIS does not show vehicular and pedestrian access to the Lands of Goshen park from Old Chester Road. Show easements and or walk or bike ways leading North from Old Chester Road to park. Show northerly connection on new Boulevard from Old Chester Road to side walks from proposed roundabout to Brookside.
- The DEIS should discuss the impact to Brookside Drive and investigate mitigation perhaps by cleaning or resurfacing and painting a bike lane after Heritage is complete.
- Compact development benefits the environment, the town and is less costly to the developer. The DEIS should show and provide calculation of savings to the town for maintenance of low impact development compared to conventional development.

Explore the acceptance of Parcel B to be dedicated or used for small commercial with road way to Hambletonian

Ms. Cleaver submitted her comments via e-mail to Ms. Roth and they have been incorporated into the AKRF comments. Between Mr. Henry and Ms. Roth they feel they have raised the pertinent question. Mr. Bergus had a question on #82 regarding the numbers to be used in reviewing the water standards. Mr. Huddleston asked if there actually are town standards that they must follow. Mr. Henry stated that there are no specific standards. The Schoor de Palma report is meant to be a guide. Mr. Cappello reminded the applicant that they need to address these water protocols.

Mr. Sweeney reminded the members that the application has been before this Board for approximately one year. He feels it is too late to decide that the number is in flux subject to some environmental constraints. Mr. Cappello stated that the

Conservation Analysis clearly states that it is based on SEQRA. From the beginning it was stated that the Board agrees conceptually with this but the SEQRA analysis should demonstrate that the PB should grant these bonuses. The document needs to show why the PB should grant these bonuses. Mr. Sweeney asked if the density numbers were still in flux. Mr. Cappello stated that the PB has given concept approval, but the document still needs to prove that the bonuses are appropriate.

Mr. Esposito has a few comments. He agrees that #82 should be discussed. Item #66 on the AKRF letter mentions the use of photo simulation for the project. He thought that they had agreed that since much of the project is not visible from 3 out of 5 of the points of reference they would not need to do a photo simulation. A cross section and standard photographs would be sufficient. The members agree that photo simulation is not necessary.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Ms. Cleaver, seconded by Mr. Bergus, the Planning Board hereby deems that the DEIS presented for Heritage Estates is incomplete. The applicant will address the comments listed in the 2/14/06 letter from AKRF with the exception of #66, the 2/13/06 memo from Dufresne & Henry, and the written comments from Ms. Israelski. The applicant should also take note of the comments submitted by the County to the extent practicable. Passed unanimously.

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

**Station Office Plaza - 10-1-56.1 - 3.29 acres**, located on 6&1/2 Station Road in the CO zone with an AQ6 and scenic Rd corridor overlay.

Present for the applicant: Steve Esposito

Mr. Esposito explained that they have rescinded their subdivision application and eliminated a building. They are planning to put a well in that area of the property. However, they still do not meet the 200' radius requirement of the DOH. They are hoping to work on an arrangement with the Hendler representatives as they are not planning to use the property near the proposed well site.

**Hills of Goshen - 11-3-37 - 67.4 acres**, 34 lot subdivision located in the RU zone with an AQ6, AQ3 and scenic road corridor overlays.

Present for the applicant: Steve Esposito  
Barak Pullo

Mr. Halloran explained that this subdivision was approved approximately 2 years ago. The applicant is here tonight in regard to the possibility of opening a thru road connecting to the Hills of Chester. Mr. Noble stated that they are now before the Chester Planning Board for 20+ homes and are asking this Board to make the connection for ingress and egress through the Goshen portion to terminate in Whispering Hills. They presented a traffic study and a map with an overlay showing both parcels together. He noted that the County recommends opening the road completely. Mr. Esposito stated that they are trying to make it as inconvenient as possible.

Mr. Huddleston asked if the primary access for these residents would be the Arcadia Rd. entrance. Yes, it would be. Originally any connection was supposed to be for emergency access only, and he emphasized that the Town would have no enforcement ability. Mr. Noble suggested that they agree to condition any approval that the easement could not be modified unless there was an approval from the Town of Chester and that they agree that it be an emergency access road. Mr. Cappello stated that we would have to have evidence that this could not change in the future. He also noted that people have bought lots in the Town of Goshen that stated this would be an emergency access only.

Mr. Esposito emphasized that the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Code stress the need for connecting roads. He also noted that the traffic study shows that 90% of the people from Goshen are traveling South. Mr. Henry stated that the traffic study is incomplete. The Board needs to know the full impact if the road is opened. The study also needs to consider that there are other potential developments in this area of the Town that will add to the traffic impacts. Ms. Cleaver asked to see the impact on the trail that is located on this property.

Mr. Cappello also noted that this issue of the connecting road may not be under the PB's purview. It may be a matter for the TB. The applicant will also need input from the Highway Department. Mr. Noble stated that they would take these comments in terms of a scope and work with the attorney. Then, with the PB's recommendation, they will take the question to the Town Board.

**RTE 17M Storage - 12-1-103 - 3.75 acres**, located on 17M & Musket Rd, in the I zone with an AQ3 overlay. **Amended site plan.**

Present for the applicant: Angelo Ferrante  
Michael Blustein

Mr. Halloran explained that there are wetlands on the property that need to be mitigated. Mr. Huddleston asked that the applicant provide a map with the wetlands on the building drawing for a more appropriate review. Mr. Blustein

stated that the wetlands are being mitigated by moving them to an adjoining property, which they also own.

Mr. Cappello stated that they need information from the ACOE regarding this mitigation plan and then they should attend a staff work session. Mr. Blustein stated they have received 3 variances from the ZBA, submitted a landscape plan and now they have the wetlands issue. Mr. Huddleston stated that they need to expedite the ACOE information before they can proceed further.

**Keith Sullivan - 17-1-50 - 1 Winner Circle Lane** located in the RU zone with an AQ3 and Scenic Road Corridor overlay. Site plan Approval for a pool.

Present for the applicant: Mrs. Sullivan

Mr. Halloran explained that the code says any structure in the Scenic Road Corridor Overlay needs site plan approvals. Ms. Israelski's comments were read into the record. The consultants had no comment.

"Application is for a pool to be located in excess of 100 feet from Houston Road. I recommend landscaping along fence that will **obscure** view from Main Road. This does not have to be opaque because a tree line is already in existence and the distance is great from the road. The landscaping should just detract from the view into the pool yard. There should be no further review by the planning board of this project and the applicant should be given a pool permit."

VOTE by Proper MOTION, made by Mr. Andrews, seconded by Ms. Cleaver, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby declares that the site plan for a pool for Sullivan will not have an adverse impact on the environment under SEQRA. Passed unanimously.

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

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Mr. Bergus, seconded by Ms. Cleaver, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby grants site plan approval to the

Sullivan application with the addition of fencing and sufficient landscaping.  
Passed unanimously.

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

**Michael Doherty - 4-1-99** - 32 Woodcrest Lane located in the RU zone with an AQ3 and Scenic Road Corridor Overlay. Site plan approval for a pool.

Present for the applicant: Michael Doherty

The professionals have no comments. Ms. Israelski's comments were read into the record. "The pool is not visible from the road. The location is more than 130 feet and is behind the house. I recommend light landscaping (a couple of bushes) around the pool equipment to obscure the view from the Woodcrest Lane. There should be no further review on this project and they should be given a pool / building permit." Mr. Doherty suggested that the Board consider establishing a more simplified procedure for these types of small applications.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Mr. Andrews, seconded by Ms. Cleaver, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby declares that the site plan for a pool for Doherty will not have an adverse impact on the environment under SEQRA. Passed unanimously.

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

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Mr. Bergus, seconded by Ms. Cleaver, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby grants site plan approval to the Doherty application with the addition of fence and sufficient landscaping. Passed unanimously.

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

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 10:50 pm upon motion made by Ms. Cleaver, seconded by Mr. Andrews.

Ralph Huddleston, Chairman  
Notes Prepared by Linda P. Doolittle