

**Town of Goshen  
Planning Board  
MINUTES OF THE  
WORK SESSION MEETING  
April 7, 2005**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

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

**ALSO PRESENT**

Jane Daly, Attorney  
Richard Golden, Attorney  
Neal Halloran, Bldg. Insp  
Joe Henry, Engineer  
Graham Trelstad, Planner

**ABSENT**

Raymond Myruski

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Huddleston called the work session meeting of the Town of Goshen Planning Board to order at 7:35 pm

**II. MINUTES**

The minutes of the March 17, 2005 meeting were approved as modified upon motion made by Ms. Israelski, seconded by Ms. Cleaver.

**III. AGENDA ITEMS**

1. **Prospect Hill 20-1-58** for conservation analysis for a proposed subdivision special use permit in the RU & HR district with a AQ3 and scenic road overlay on Route 17A.

Present for the applicant:     Marcia Jacobowitz, Attorney  
  Eva Billeci, Chazen Engineering

Mr. Halloran reported that the staff has visited the site and a Conservation Analysis has been drafted. The site visit for the members will be next Thursday. Ms. Jacobowitz explained that the property is situated on 110 acres. They have incorporated the elements of a Traditional Neighborhood Design into their plan with a goal of creating a community that will co-ordinate with the surrounding rural area.

Ms. Billeci presented two maps of the area and reviewed the Conservation Analysis. She noted that there is an existing farm road that provides access to the rear of the property. There is also a zone line that bisects the parcel. The area to

the east is zoned hamlet residential and the western section is zoned rural. There is an AG/I zone further to the west. The wetlands have been delineated and surveyed as well as the steep slope area. The wetlands will have to be verified by the DEC and the ACOE. The applicant found nothing that was currently listed on the Historic Register, but they will research this further. They are asking for the PB's comments on the map and they plan to elicit the ERB's comments next week.

Mr. Trelstad asked what is the nature of the cultural sites. Ms. Billeci responded that there may be potential archeological areas. Ms. Cleaver noted that the construction of the barn is quite beautiful and asked that the wood be saved if possible. She also asked that the railroad tracks in the rear be shown on the map. Ms. Israelski suggested that the barn be reserved as a meeting/community center. The applicant will look into this possibility. Ms. Israelski also asked that view considerations be taken into account when setting up the building placement. She also advised the applicant that they need to consider trail placement to allow inter community connection as well as connection to neighboring projects. She also inquired if a business establishment could be worked into the design.

Mr. Huddleston reminded the applicant that they do their best to avoid all primary and secondary areas as much as possible. Ms. Billecci has the EAF ready and will leave it for review tonight. Mr. Trelstad noted that a DEIS will most likely be necessary. The PB should plan to initiate Lead Agency at the next meeting.

2. **Zalunski** 20-1-8 open space subdivision, located on Pulaski Highway and Cross Roads on 74.8 acres in the RU zone with an AQ3 overlay, scenic road and stream & reservoir overlay.

Present for the applicant: Steve Esposito

Mr. Halloran reported that the staff has walked the site and arrangements have been made for the members to walk it next week. Mr. Esposito stated that the application is for three parcels on 74 acres. They have established that there are approximately 31.8 acres of primary conservation area. Mr. Trelstad has prepared a draft Conservation Analysis. Mr. Esposito pointed out that a small area of soil is identified as muck while it is actually gray soils. Mr. Trelstad will change this to read hybrid soils.

Ms. Cleaver noted that there is a large barn that they may want to try to save. Mr. Trelstad will put the "barn complex" on the northwest corner on the secondary list. Ms. Israelski asked if this property is on the Trail map. It is not. Mr. Trelstad will redraft the Conservation Analysis for the next meeting.

3. **Owens Road Associates** - 10-1-10.22 for sketch plan modification, located Owens Rd. in an RU zone with and AQ 6 overlay.

Present for the applicant: Steve Esposito

Mr. Halloran stated that the lead agency notices were sent out last month, but the 30-day period had not elapsed. The necessary time has now passed and there have been no responses. It is suggested that an expanded Part 3 EAF be prepared. Mr. Esposito noted that they submitted Part 1 & 2 with the proposed sketch plan. He would like to review the Part 2 tonight to see what may cross the impact thresholds.

Many of the items could be marked as "no impact". There will be a potential impact on land because there is a small area where the road may cross the wetlands and construction will last more than one year. There will be an impact on a protected water body as there will be some disturbance to the wetlands. Surface and ground water will be impacted as they expect to use in excess of 20,000 gpd. They also state there could be a potential impact to the agricultural resources in the area. They state that they do not expect to have any impact on historic or pre-historic resources. Mr. Trelstad asked that a Phase IA be done within the areas of disturbance. There may be archaeological sites along the river and even though that will remain open space, he asks that they identify any native American sites along the river if possible. A description based on this Phase IA review should be discussed to ascertain what landforms would be associated within the site and identify any upper areas that may differ.

Ms. Cleaver asked if they have considered the view from the River as the homes will be set on a high point above the river. . The applicant stated no to affecting recreational opportunities. Ms. Israelski asked them to change this to yes and asked that they provide a pedestrian path to the River and bike lanes on one street within the development. Mr. Esposito noted that last month they agreed to consider the Trolley bed which could connect to the PASNY easement. However, the applicant feels that the TB needs to state what they want to see. The Town needs to state if they will take responsibility for the bikeways in terms of liability, maintenance, design standards and protection. Ms. Israelski stated that the Trails Committee is meeting with the Town Board next week and hopes that these issues will be resolved. It was explained that they only need to address impacts that will cross the impact thresholds, and they have not crossed these thresholds. There is no negative impact. Mr. Trelstad suggested that they mention the above in the project description under their discussion of the use of the open space.

Mr. Trelstad summarized what the members need to see at the next presentation.

1. A project description the initial layout
2. An opportunity for access to the open space
3. The extent of the wetlands crossing
4. Storm water management study
5. Groundwater resources study
6. Correspondence with the NYS Natural Heritage and Wildlife Department
7. Description of prior use for agricultural uses.
8. Filing of the Ag notice
9. Phase IA Archeological study with the description of the areas to be disturbed and the differences.
10. Visual impacts from the river.

Mr. Trelstad will draft a memo to the applicant outlining these items.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Mr. Andrews, seconded by Mr. Bergus, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby declares to be lead agency in regard to the Owens Road Associates application. Passed unanimously.

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

4. **Hills of Goshen** 11-1-52 for change in well depths.

Present for the applicant: Steve Esposito

The applicant has decide to withdraw this request to change the well depths.

5. **Goshen Associates** - 10-1-44.2 for a minor subdivision for conservation analysis located on Old Minisink Trail and Fletcher Street in a RU zone with AQ 6 overlay.

Present for the applicant: Dawn Benedict, Lanc 7 Tully

Mr. Halloran explained that the applicant has been to the ZBA for a variance for density in the AQ6. They were granted this variance under the open space provision.

Ms. Benedict stated that they are looking for a two-lot subdivision on property that joins the Village. They have a commitment letter from the Village Attorney for hookup to the Village water and sewer. They also have a signoff from Mr. Nuzzolese, Village DPW Superintendent. Mr. Halloran stated that they will have

to have a conservation easement over half of the property. This note needs to be on the plan and the applicant needs to realize that this area must remain forever wild. It cannot be mowed as it is now. The applicant agrees to this.

Ms. Cleaver asked if the Village Planning Board was notified as a recent letter from their Chairman requested that this type of information be passed on to them. A Public Hearing will be necessary and they will be sent a notice of that hearing. Discussion was held regarding street trees. Ms. Benedict stated that they are on the plan just outside the right of way. Mr. Henry explained that they need to be on the line. If they are on the homeowners' property they can cut them down. This means they will be closer to the road and will need to be more resilient species as road salt will be a problem. Red Maple and Pin Oak were suggested. Ms. Israelski asked that the Board come up with a list of species that will qualify. She pointed out that in the hamlet area it is specified that they be 4" in diameter, but the subdivision code seems to state 1.5 to 2" in diameter and 4' above finished grade level. This needs to be clarified. Ms. Cleaver asked that the applicant try to bury the utilities if possible.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Mr. Bergus, seconded by Ms. Israelski, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby schedules a Public Hearing for the Goshen Associates subdivision for the May 5, 2005 meeting. Passed unanimously.

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

6. **Mid-Hudson II Holdings** - 2-1-5 for 2-lot subdivision on 22.19 acres, located on Scotchtown Rd. in an RU zone with an AQ 6 overlay.

Present for the applicant: James Dillin, Jr.

Mr. Halloran explained that this project has received preliminary approval. They have received response from the County DPW on the driveway. A few remaining items were reviewed at last week's work session and the applicant is here for final approval.

Mr. Andrews asked Mr. Henry if the County reviewed the sight distances for the driveway. Yes, they do. Ms. Israelski asked if the utilities will be underground. Mr. Henry responded that if the lines are on their side of the road it could be done, otherwise a road cut would be needed. Mr. Dillin stated that there is a pole at the corner of the property. There is a wooded section in the front of the parcel, which

does provide a buffer. The only outstanding item is the need for payment of recreation fees.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Ms. Israelski, seconded by Ms. Cleaver, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby grants final approval to the Mid Hudson II Holdings application conditioned upon the payment of recreation fees of \$3000 for the one additional lot and the payment of any other outstanding fees. Passed unanimously.

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

7. **Matchpoint Sports** - 11-1-25.22 for conditional approval, located on 17M in the CO zone with a AQ 6 and scenic road corridor overlay.

Present for the applicant: Karen Emmerich  
Bruce Roberts  
Harry Pharr

Mr. Halloran reported that the applicant has cleared up any final issues. The DEC and DOT permits are nearly complete.

Mr. Huddleston has received a letter from Mr. Morton Marshak, attorney for Mr. Wicke. Mr. Wicke owns the golf driving range across from this project. Mr. Huddleston read the letter into the record. The letter states that Mr. Wicke has raised objections to this project as there is a storm drainage problem. The water often floods the driving range, which has cost Mr. Wicke substantial sums of money to fix and has caused his property to diminish in value. The letter also states that this problem did not exist prior to the excavation work done on the subject property. Ms. Daly will prepare a letter in response, stating that there was a drainage study done and it was available for review. It is believed that this study is sufficient.

Ms. Emmerich reported that they are submitting a new lighting plan for incorporation into the final plans. The lighting will be less than it was originally. Landscaping was discussed. Ms. Israelski asked about trees along the Quickway. Ms. Emmerich stated that the applicant has spoken to Karen Arent, landscape architect who suggested that the rear of the property be allowed to go to a natural state. Ms. Israelski feels it should be more planned as it is in a view corridor. Mr. Roberts suggested some clusters of trees to buffer the visual impact of the large building. Mr. Trelstad asked for canopy trees. Mr. Pharr replied that high canopy trees will not hide the building as you will be able to see under the canopy. Mr.

Trelstad suggested adding a cluster of white pine with some dogwoods intermingled. Possibly some forsythia could be put on the bank. The applicant will review these suggestions and speak to Ms. Arent.

Mr. Henry stated that there is nothing else outstanding. The applicant is still waiting for approvals from the other agencies. The following items need to be addressed: the lighting plan needs to be reviewed and put on the plan, the additional landscaping in the rear needs to be addressed, the letter from Ms. Daly regarding drainage needs to be sent, and the applicant needs to pursue the DEC, DOT and DOH permits. Mr. Roberts asked for conditional approval so they could start the drainage study. The consultants advise against conditional approval at this time.

Ms. Israelski asked if the mechanicals would be on the roof and would they be visible. They will be in the rear of the building. Mr. Trelstad suggested the applicant cluster the mechanicals so they can be screened more easily and they should consider using some of the colors used in the building so they could appear to be in context with the design of the building.

Mr. Wicke spoke to the board about the drainage problem. He stated that the previous owner altered the stream, which appears to have caused the current problems. He spoke to these owners and they said they would take care of it. Mr. Trelstad stated that the storm water management plan would direct the storm water from the site to ponds for slow release. Mr. Henry noted that this owner did not make the changes that caused the problem. Mr. Huddleston stated that the new design would require that the water be released no faster than it is released currently.

Mr. Roberts explained that the problem was caused by the previous owner. Mr. Huddleston stated that the storm water management plan for this applicant will most likely help but it would not necessarily correct it back to the pre-development situation. Ms. Cleaver asked if Mr. Wicke reported the problem to the DEC. Mr. Wicke did report it to the building inspector at the time, but not to the DEC. Mr. Huddleston stated that we do not have the ability to solve the problem.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 10:15 pm upon motion made by Ms. Israelski, seconded by Mr. Bergus.

Ralph Huddleston, Chairman

Notes Prepared by Linda P. Doolittle

