

**Town of Goshen
Planning Board
MINUTES OF THE
REGULAR MEETING
May 18, 2006**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ralph Huddleston, Chairman
Reynell Andrews
Lee Bergus
Susan Cleaver
Mary Israelski
John Lupinski
Ray Myruski

ALSO PRESENT

Richard Golden, Attorney
Neal Halloran, Bldg. Insp
Joe Henry, Engineer
Susan Roth, Planner

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Huddleston called the regular meeting of the Town of Goshen Planning Board to order at 7:30 pm at the Goshen Senior Center. Mr. Lupinski led the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the May 4, 2006 meeting were accepted as modified upon motion made by Ms. Israelski, seconded by Mr. Myruski.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Maplewood (Salesian Village) 8-1-48 - 94 acres, Hamlet residential and open space subdivision in the HR & RU zone with an AQ6, scenic road, and stream corridor overlay. **Public scoping hearing**

Present for the applicant: Richard Kantor, Attorney
 Art Tully, Lanc & Tully
 Chris Vriebeck, Lanc & Tully
 Steve Esposito, Esposito & Assoc.

Ms. Cleaver asked to be recused from this discussion due to a conflict. Mr. Huddleston explained that the applicant would give a brief presentation of the project. He also noted that this a scoping session to address what the board and the public want the applicant to study in their DEIS. Mr. Kantor stated that the applicant has submitted a draft scope, which has been reviewed by the consultants. This meeting tonight is the time to hear from the board and the public as to what they need to address in their DEIS.

Mr. Tully explained that this project involves a portion (90 acres) of the Salesian property in the Town of Goshen between Craigville and Coleman Rds. They have been going through the review process with the Board and the consultants for approximately 18 months. They have covered zoning, drainage, traffic landscaping, water and sewer and many other issues. This is a proposal to construct approximately 229 housing (single-family, town homes and condos) and 20,000 sq. ft. of commercial space. Approximately 40% of the area will be developed, leaving the rest as open space. There will be pathways to connect within the development as well as to connect to neighboring areas. The commercial area will provide more of a presence on Craigville making the development part of the overall community.

Mr. Esposito stated that the purpose tonight is essentially to provide a Table of Contents for the DEIS. This is part of the SEQRA process. The engineers' and planners have made their comments and after the public comments are heard, all the information will be compiled and distributed to the involved agencies. The applicant needs to look at the existing conditions and any impact on them and at possible future conditions and related impacts. It is then up to the applicant to find ways to mitigate these impacts. They have reviewed the physical aspects of the property, wetlands etc and will study the impacts on traffic, socio-economic issues and community services. They will also have to provide alternatives. Once the DEIS is thoroughly reviewed all the details will be laid out in the Findings Statement. He also explained that there would be approximately 28 other permits that the applicant will need to obtain.

Mr. Huddleston stated that the plan has been extensively modified. This area is zoned for this utilization therefore it is zoned for high density. However, they are also mandated to provide water and sewer and to meet all the other standards. The applicant has come a long way toward complying with the intent of the code. He also explained to the public that this board administers the code. They did not set the code. That was all decided upon in the Master Plan. This Board is working to develop the best project for this area.

Mr. Golden stated that they are referring to the draft scope, which was last revised April 14, 2006. The Board has 60 days to finalize the scope. This deadline would be June 13, therefore all comments need to be incorporated by the next PB meeting, June 1. There were no comments from the other professionals. Mr. Huddleston opened up the meeting to the public with the reminder that this is a scoping session. The purpose is to add items to the list, not to debate individual issues.

Ms. Diane Gonzales, 143 Coleman Rd., began with three questions. Does the zoning include wetlands in the open space? Mr. Huddleston replied that it does. She then

asked why it was not excluded. Mr. Golden stated that this was a policy decision made by the Town Board. Ms. Gonzalez asked how much of the open space is wetlands? Mr. Huddleston replied that the wetlands comprise a large portion of the open space, however, they do qualify as open space.

Ms. Gonzalez then presented the following list of issues she feels should be addressed:

1. The aesthetic impact of the water tower. How high is it and what is the size? If it is on a hill, it will have a large visual impact.
2. The impact of the lighting on the surrounding neighbors.
3. The impact on the flood plain.
4. Traffic impacts, especially on Craigville and Coleman Rds. She also noted, that if these roads are improved speed is likely to increase. Can the roadways handle the increase in traffic? There will also be an increase in commercial traffic, i.e., garbage trucks, delivery trucks etc.
5. Impact on sewer treatment plant.
6. Impact on the wildlife and plant life.
7. Impact on the taxpayers, i.e., cost of schools, fire equipment etc.
8. Noise impact. She moved here for the quiet. Now it will look like Whispering Hills.
9. Impact on air quality from traffic emissions.
10. Will the developer build with environmentally conscious materials., i.e., "green buildings" - energy efficient.
11. Monitoring of neighboring wells. Will this be done? She would also like her well to be monitored.

Mr. Carl Bennett, Scotchtown Ave., asked if there would be street lighting. If so, will it be "night sky friendly" in order to avoid light pollution. Mr. Richard Rodstrom, Sr., 1 Good Time Court commented on traffic controls. Will there be an increase in light signals. He has spoken with Mr. Halloran with some suggestions regarding means to keep traffic flowing, by doubling the width of roadways and the implementation of right turn lanes. He is not against the building, he would just like to know how the traffic would work.

Ms. Carol Quinn, Florican Lane, asked why the project is so close to Craigville Rd. She feels it could be set back further to lessen the impact. Ms. Roth explained that this is part of the Master plan, although in this instance, the wetlands did play a role. When buildings are close to the street they tend to slow traffic and give a sense of place and appropriate streetscape. It is a design preference and it will be addressed under the visual impact portion of the document. Ms. Quinn asked if there would be a signal light at the entrance, as this entrance is directly opposite the entrance to

Hambletonian Park. Ms. Roth replied that it is better for safety reasons to line streets up. The traffic impact portion will address signalization possibilities. Ms. Quinn also asked if the existing green areas would remain or be replaced. They will remain "as is." Ms. Israelski noted that there are wetlands on most of the project, which does dictate location for the units, but they are also trying to plan for an appropriate streetscape.

Ms. Gonzalez asked about the road in the rear that appears to connect to the cemetery. Mr. Halloran replied that it does connect to the cemetery at the County's request. It would be used as an exit only when they have more than one funeral scheduled. Mr. Anthony Bair, 1 Yankee Maid Lane, noted that the plan has changed a great deal since the first presentation. He has heard that this parcel is over a major aquifer and there is a great deal of water. Since, water is a serious problem for the Town and Village, he suggested we take the property back to have the water. He questioned why the Town was able to sell this portion of the Salesian property. Mr. Huddleston stated that this is a question for the Town Board. Mr. Halloran stated that that this was never owned by the Town of Goshen. Mr. Golden noted that the County originally sold the property. Mr. Huddleston explained that this is often called the Town portion of the Salesian property, due to it's location. He further stated that if they find that there is a large amount of water, the Town would work with the developer to have access to it. However, the water study has not been completed at this time. We also will need to know what the applicant's needs are in order to determine how much will be left over. He also explained that the previous water study was a town-wide study.

Mr. Chris Wildfoerster, 41 Lower Magic Circle, noted that all outlets are on to Craigville and none are cutting through to Coleman Rd. Ms. Roth responded that there may be one area where they could cut thru, but there are significant wetlands in the area. He noted that this plan would allow for approximately 700 more people in the Town. These changes are taking away the "town feeling" of the area. He also had questions regarding the possible opening of Bridle Path and Brookside Dr. Mr. Huddleston noted that these are not part of this application, but the possibility will be reviewed in the town-wide traffic study, which the Town Board authorized last week. Mr. Wildfoerster noted that "we have put the builder in Ham Park (only 38 units) through so much on the water issue" and wonders how this large project can even be considered.

Mr. Tully stated that there have been wells drilled and preliminary testing done. They will be studied further and he notes that it is not just a road that separates the areas that have water and those that do not. There are geologic factors that have caused their area to have an abundance of water. If they find that they have more water than they need, they will certainly share with the Town.

Mr. Halloran submitted a letter from Ms. Sally Cleaver opposing the project (see file). Ms. Gonzalez again asked why the wetlands were allowed in the density calculations as this is not normally done. Mr. Halloran replied that this question is for the TB as they established the Master Plan and Zoning Code. The PB can merely administer the code. She asked how many units would have been allowed if the wetlands were not part of the calculation. Mr. Huddleston stated that that number would be difficult to calculate, and is really a moot point at this time. Ms. Roth explained that when the DEIS is written it is the responsibility of the applicant to explain how the Zoning Code was applied to this particular property.

The Chairman called for comments from the board members. Mr. Lupinski had no further questions. Mr. Myruski expressed concern for the traffic congestion and asked that the applicant consider the use of "roundabouts". He notes that they work in other areas to keep traffic moving. Mr. Andrews had no further questions. Ms. Israelski stated that she is pleased to hear the applicant is discussing the possibility of sharing water. She read from a prepared statement, the text of which follows:

“Each application for development requires careful scrutiny that we use the New Zoning laws to mitigate the effects of development. Our new town Zoning Law requires that the higher density areas provide greater amenities to the community. Maplewood is one of the planned high-density communities.

Since our zoning requires amenities, the following is a list quoted from Town of Goshen §97-15:

Requirements:

1. Public Water and sewer
2. 50% open space of which 20% must be accessible to the general public, which may include public greens, parks trails... This implies improvements may be given.
3. Hamlets and all developments are required by code to have interconnections to neighboring parcels whenever possible.

I have asked that this scoping document include discussion of the town's water supply. Since Public water and sewer are part of the requirement for hamlet the applicant should seek measures that will make it worthwhile for the town to take dedication of a water supply that would include Maplewood. I have asked that this new development look at the neighboring developments that use town water and investigate if it could be improved by new development.

Fifty percent open space is a requirement and the wetlands along with the community facilities in this development are those features that can fulfill this

requirement. I am now asking that the scoping document investigate the Home Owner's Association ownership of the wetlands and the common buildings that can be also used as the necessary focal areas. Shallow ponds should be investigated to be used as homeowners skating area. The wet lands along with gathering and focal areas such as those mentioned can be used to fulfill the 50% open space requirements and help create meaningful terminating street views. These integral parts of hamlet design must be discussed in the scoping document. The design of each must be large enough for practical usage. Large Gazebos and Pavilions owned by the Homeowners Association should be built instead of small ones. The developer should look at The Fairways clubhouse and Gazebo for size requirements. This is a hamlet that is being built in Middletown. Discuss numbers of visitor to gathering places.

Since 20% open space for the general public and mandatory interconnections connections are requirements of the code the scope should look at what will benefit the public the most. I believe pedestrian sidewalks along Craigville Road with no short-term maintenance or up keep requirements must be investigated and fully discussed as a solution to meeting these zoning requirements. The improvements constructed should be part of the plan with no immediate cost to the town. The long-term costs of this main sidewalk should be also investigated so that the cost of dedication to the town for this one pathway can be determined.

Hamlet by design must have all possible interconnections and the one possible road interconnection would be to connect the development to Coleman Road. Traffic conditions and major road improvements to Coleman Road should be investigated as mitigation for the development. Pedestrian connections between Craigville and Coleman roads must also be discussed.

Discussion of the plan for and square footage of commercial and mixed-use space should be part of the scope.

Discuss building heights and visual impact of buildings. Discussion of foundation heights and views from the road must be part of the scope.

Discuss architectural designs of all structures.”

Mr. Bergus noted that the water supply needs to be approved by the NYS DOH, not the County. He suggested that the school district be added to the list of agencies having an advisory role in the process. There should also be some discussion of the phasing. Perhaps they should limit the number of CO's issued in a given year to lessen the impact on the schools. Is the impact of Star exemptions being considered in discussion of taxes to be generated. Mr. Halloran stated that he was asked to suggest

to the applicant that they consider coordinating the commercial with the residential when they consider the phasing aspects.

Ms. Roth asked Mr. Golden if the PB should approve the document now or wait until all the comments are incorporated. He suggested that the scoping session be closed and the document be finalized by June 1. She noted that the applicant has a stenographer present and asked if a copy of the transcript could be provided to the consultants in a timely manner. Mr. Kantor replied that they will provide a transcript, possibly by Tuesday, May 23. He also noted that if the PB needs a couple of weeks to finish, they will consent to an extension. Mr. Huddleston thanked the applicant for this consideration and stated they would work as efficiently as possible to finish the document. Much of the work can be done at the staff meeting next week.

Mr. Wildfoerster asked what would be the target price of these homes. Mr. Kantor stated that they could not really answer this as there are several types of units and the timing for approvals has not been determined. It will be market-based housing and the required 10% will be classified as "affordable housing". Mr. Golden stated that the zoning code requires this and these units will also be scattered throughout the development. Ms. Quinn asked what will be in the commercial buildings. Mr. Huddleston stated that this will also be "market driven", but may contain a convenience store or professional offices. This will be reviewed further.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Mr. Bergus, seconded by Mr. Lupinski, the Planning Board the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby closes the Public Scoping Session for the Maplewood project. Passed unanimously.

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

IV. Continued Public Hearing (to be re-scheduled for June 1, 2006)

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. **Special use permit for extension of existing cell tower.**

Mr. Halloran explained that this applicant has again asked for a postponement. The members agree to postpone this Public Hearing as requested.

V. AGENDA ITEMS

BMJB Enterprises, Inc. - 22-1-37.2, 17 acres, located at 1033 Pulaski Hwy, in the AI zone with an AQ3 overlay & a scenic road corridor overlay.
Special use permit..

Present for the applicant: Al Paccione
 Dave Higgins, Lanc & Tully

Mr. Golden stated that he has spoken with Mr. Lipman and the applicant is working on narrowing the use further. Mr. Paccione asked if he could address the Board tonight regarding the engineering issues as Mr. Higgins is present.

Mr. Higgins stated that it is his understanding that the only engineering item left in question is the letter from the County DPW. Mr. Higgins was surprised by their comments as the site is in existence and these comments are standard notes for new access. He has been trying to contact Mr. Kennedy to make sure that he understands that the entrance is existing. They will provide whatever is needed, but would like to show him the area.

He asked if the PB has any other engineering questions. Mr. Golden replied that some of the uses may have engineering impacts, therefore the uses need to be narrowed. Some narrowing has occurred and they are working on defining these uses more clearly. Mr. Higgins asked if he cannot meet with Mr. Kennedy in time, can the board consider a conditional permit. The consultants will discuss this if it becomes necessary.

Gerrick Associates - 21-1-108 - 131.5 +/- acres, located on Celery Ave in the AI zone with a flood plain and stream & reservoir overlays. **Non-residential - 2 lot subdivision for agricultural use.**

Mr. Halloran explained that at the last meeting the PB was in favor of the project and sent the applicant to the TB for a special use permit according to standard procedure. The TB now wants a subdivision approval prior to issuing the special use permit. Mr. Golden stated that he was not present at the TB meeting to explain the situation to them. The topic is on the work session agenda for Monday 5/22 and the Public Hearing is scheduled for the Thursday 5/25 meeting. Mr. Myruski, Ms. Cleaver and Mr. Huddleston will try to be at these meetings to answer the TB's questions.

Mr. Huddleston asked why anyone would create a subdivision prior to knowing if they could use it for what they were planning. Mr. Huddleston noted that if the applicant proceeds with subdivision it would be a risk, because the special permit may not be granted. Also, the PB does not have the applicant's permission to take these steps.

The Chairman polled the members on how to proceed:

Mr. Lupinski	This request for subdivision first appears to be backwards. The special use permit should be granted first.
Ms. Cleaver	Agree, obtain special use permit first
Mr. Myruski	Agree, obtain special use permit first
Mr. Andrews	Agree, obtain special use permit first
Ms. Israelski	Agree, obtain special use permit first
Mr. Bergus	Agree, obtain special use permit first

Mr. Huddleston agrees and noted that this places an unnecessary burden on the applicant. Mr. Myruski noted that this places a burden on all the farmers. The members concur that if the special use permit is granted then they will approve the subdivision if it is still necessary at the June 1 meeting. The Chairman will convey this information to the Supervisor and the PB will have representation at the TB work session and Public Hearing.

Hacienda - 11-1-25.21 - 2.7 +/- acres, located at 1753 Rte 17M in the CO zone with an AQ6 & scenic road corridor overlays. **Addition to existing parking lot**

Present for the applicant: Jesus Morales

Mr. Halloran explained that this is an existing use. They are not adding to the building. Additional parking was part of the original site plan, but this is now a slightly different configuration than what was previously approved. Mr. Morales stated that they wish to improve the traffic flow as well as add to the parking. They are expanding into the vacant field and are not near the septic system or the property line.

There were no comments from the consultants. Ms. Cleaver noted that the front of the building and the landscaping are very nice.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Ms. Cleaver, seconded by Ms. Israelski, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby finds that the proposed site plan for the Hacienda Restaurant will not have an impact on the environment under NY SEQRA. Passed 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. Bergus, seconded by Mr. Myruski, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby grants site plan approval to the Hacienda Restaurant for parking expansion. Passed unanimously.

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

Sunset Ridge (MUST BE RENAMED) - 10-1-28 - 55.22+/- acres, located on Hampton Rd & Phillipsburg Rd in the RU zone with a Stream & Reservoir overlay. **Conservation Analysis**

Present for the applicant: Michael Morgante

This is the first time for this application. The applicant is in the process of preparing a Conservation Analysis for this 54-acre parcel at Hampton and Philipsburg Rds. Mr. Morgante stated that they have identified the steep slopes, the NYS and the Federal wetlands and are in the process of flagging and identifying the trees. Mr. Halloran noted that a site walk is planned for Wed. 5/24 at 1 pm. They expect to build on approximately 13.5 acres, which will leave at least 60% open space.

Kolk - 11-1-98.6 - 10+/- acres, ? # of lots subdivision located on Rte 17M (and Old Chester Rd) in the RU zone with an AQ6 & scenic road corridor overlays. **Conservation Analysis.**

Present for the applicant: Steve Esposito

They are here tonight for approval of the Conservation Analysis. Ms. Roth felt the only concern was the closeness to the Heritage Trail. Mr. Bergus asked if a portion of this farm had been used as part of the calculations for Heritage Estates. Mr. Esposito replied that the portion in question is not part of this parcel. Ms. Roth asked if they should delete the reference to wetlands since there are no wetlands on this property. This modification will be made to the Conservation Analysis.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Mr. Myruski, seconded by Ms. Cleaver, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby approves the Conservation Analysis for the Kolk application as modified. Passed unanimously.

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

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

Present for the applicant: Steve Esposito & James Sweeney, Esq.

The applicant is present tonight to receive any further comments regarding the completeness of the DEIS. There are new comment letters from the planner and the engineer. Ms. Cleaver asked if they could put some sort of notation regarding any possible cost to the taxpayers for the open space in order to make it clear to the public that this will not be a burden to the public as there have been some misconceptions circulating. Mr. Esposito noted that much of this area will be an active farm and the responsibility of that owner. The second area is woodland that has never been maintained and will be owned by the HOA or some other institution. The third portion adjoins the Town Park. It will either be owned by the HOA or will be dedicated to the Town. It is also an area that has never required any maintenance, but if the Town accepts it, any cost issues will be decided at that time. All of this is discussed in the DEIS. Ms. Cleaver asked that each project be asked to address this issue.

Mr. Esposito noted that there is a very small strip of land that they are giving to the neighboring Westinghouse property that was not used in the calculations. Ms. Israelski asked for justification for the lack of use of road interconnections with other areas. Mr. Esposito stated that they feel they have adequate capacity on Old Chester Rd. and therefore do not need to show interconnection. Mr. Huddleston noted that when the town-wide traffic study is completed that should help to define these interconnectivity needs. Mr. Lupinski asked about the barns and outbuildings. They will be retained by the family. Mr. Huddleston asked if all of these comments can be included prior to distribution.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Ms. Israelski, seconded by Mr. Lupinski, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby accepts the DEIS for Heritage Estates as complete with the above mentioned modifications with the condition that prior to distribution all the comments will be incorporated. Passed unanimously

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

The consultants will review the final draft at the work session. Mr. Esposito asked that they set the date for the Public Hearing. Discussion ensued regarding the timing and the need to make the modifications and complete the mailings. Ms. Roth noted

that the draft SEQRA notice will have to be modified to include the 10 day written comment period allowed after the close of the Public Hearing. Mr. Esposito will address this modification and review it at the work session.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Ms. Cleaver, seconded by Ms. Israelski, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby sets a Public Hearing for July 6 for the Heritage Estates DEIS. Passed unanimously.

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

Hamlet at Goshen -11- 1-46 - 272.78 acres, located on Harriman Drive & Conklingtown Rd in the HM & RU zone, with and AQ6, AQ3, stream & reservoir, and scenic Rd overlay.

Present for the applicant: Steve Esposito
Adam Paget

The applicant is beginning work on their Conservation Analysis. Mr. Esposito noted that there are two zones involved - a mixed-use hamlet and an RU section. They have delineated the wetlands, steep slopes and flood plain. Mr. Myruski noted that the restaurant that used to be on the site had serious water problems in the past. Mr. Esposito responded that they are in the process of completing their water testing report. There is a site walk planned for Wed. May 24 at 2 pm.

Zalunski 20-1-8 - 74.8 acres located on Pulaski Highway and Cross Roads in the RU zone with an AQ3, scenic road and stream overlays. **Updated site plan**

Present for the applicant: Steve Esposito

Mr. Esposito noted that approximately one year ago sketch plans were presented. The consultants have been reviewing the plans. The County DPW reviewed the plan to have shared driveways, which the PB had requested, and the County is asking that they be placed next to each other, but not shared. They would have one curb cut for two drives. The property line would be between the two. They will meet with Mr. Kennedy to work on this issue. Mr. Esposito requested a Public Hearing date be set.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Ms. Israelski, seconded by Mr. Myruski, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby sets a Public Hearing for the Zalunski application for June 1. Passed unanimously.

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

Schmidt - 20-2-10 - 2 +/- acres -, located on Industrial drive in the CO zone with and AQ3 overlay. Change in use from current plumbing & heating contractor (Coleman) to satellite office of Schmidt's wholesale, Inc. **Site plan**

Present for the Applicant: Mr. Schmidt

Mr. Schmidt explained that an updated plan has been submitted. The parking computation and septic locations are now noted. Landscaping has been changed to more deer resistant varieties. The curb cut issue has been resolved. Ms. Roth has no further comments on the landscaping.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Mr. Myruski, seconded by Ms. Cleaver, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby finds that the Schmidt site plan as proposed, has no significant impact on the environment under NY SEQRA. Passed 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. Bergus, seconded by Mr. Andrews, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby grants site plan approval to the Schmidt project. Passed unanimously.

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

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

Ralph Huddleston, Chairman

Notes prepared by Linda P. Doolittle