



not be used for repair of any equipment except his own. He also stated that he plans to abandon the entrance on Pulaski Highway.

Mr. Urbanski, a neighbor, asked if they would use the entire 7 acres. Mr. Dysinger replied that they would not – they are only expanding the driveway to allow for a turn around for the trucks. Mr. Brown asked what would be done in the front portion. There are no plans for this portion. Mr. Urbanski asked what they plan to do with the other barns on the property. Mr. Dysinger stated that they are in disrepair. Their condition will be assessed and they may be taken down.

Mr. Urbanski expressed concern that chemicals had been stored in the barn in the past. He asked if the DEC had been contacted and has an environmental study been done.

Ms. Emmerich noted that this is not a subdivision and no variance is needed. This is a special use for storage. Mr. Dysinger emphasized that he wants to be a good neighbor and he wishes to have an attractive facility. He is voluntarily putting up a berm with plantings to screen the view. Mr. Urbanski feels this will not be sufficient to keep his cows off the property – he would prefer an 8' fence. Mr. Brown expressed concern for his view and the noise factor. Mrs. Brown asked what the hours of operation would be. Mr. Dysinger stated that they have one truck, which they load in the morning and bring back at night. Conditions can be put on the approval regarding the hours. Ms. Ann Graham asked how this would affect their taxes. Ms. Emmerich explained that this is a permitted use.

Mr. Halloran stated that this is a permitted use under the code and it is before this board so that everyone will understand that the applicant will be repairing his own equipment on the property. The uses go with the property. Mr. Dysinger feels that the agricultural equipment that has been on the property currently is no different than what he proposes. Mr. Brown asked what the neighbors could do if this situation is not acceptable after a period of time. Mr. Andrews stated that there will be conditions on the approval that are enforceable by the Building Inspector. He also noted that the PB will review the issue, if at some time, the applicant needs to store equipment outside.

Mrs. McDermott, a neighbor, asked what affect it would have on the value of her property. Mr. Dysinger replied that his plan would have no negative impact. He is hoping to improve the property. Most of the time his equipment will be out on jobs and not on this property. Mr. Andrews asked how much equipment would be stored outside. Mr. Dysinger replied that he could put nearly all the equipment inside, but some would be outside for a short time (approximately a day) while repairing vehicles inside.

Ms. Cleaver asked if there is anything that should be done regarding the past storage of chemicals. She also noted that the ERB has asked for screening between this property and the neighbors. The applicant feels that the cracks in the floor appear to be from a normal aging process and there has been no report of any leakage. Ms. Cleaver asked if they would be repairing the floor. Mr. Dysinger stated that he would do whatever is required, but he does not see it as a problem. Mr. Trelstad noted that there has been no evidence of storage of hazardous materials in the barn and the applicant is not proposing to disturb the soils, therefore, there is no imminent hazard.

Mr. Andrews asked for further comment. Ms. Daly noted that the 239m from the County has not been received, which means the public hearing must remain open

VOTE Upon Proper MOTION, made by Ms. Cleaver, seconded by Mr. Bergus, the Planning Board hereby continues the Public Hearing on the Dysinger application until the June 16 meeting until the County report is received. Passed unanimously.

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

#### IV. AGENDA ITEMS

**Country Convenience Store 12-1-8.12** - located on Route 17M in the HC zone with an AQ6 overlay –sign.

Present for the applicant: Darryl Anderson

Mr. Halloran explained that the PB approved this project approximately 2 years ago, but there was no sign plan in this approval. He has walked the area with the applicant. The allowable signage is 340 sq. ft. The applicant is proposing 305-sq. ft. of signage and he would like to use the balance of his allowance for a temporary sign that would change periodically. The applicant’s engineer could not be present tonight.

Ms. Cleaver asked if the gas pump sign would be lit. No, it would not, there will be small lights under the canopy, which do not spread off the property. They would like to put the words Citgo on the canopy, which falls within the 340-sq. ft. allotment. The applicant showed a sample of the proposed Country Convenience sign. Ms. Cleaver noted that the ERB generally asks people to stay away from plastic signs, although they have not seen this application yet. Mr. Anderson replied that he feels this sign is well done and is not lit.

Mr. Halloran noted that temporary signs tend to proliferate around convenience stores and he has asked the applicant to confine them to one specific spot. They have chosen a spot, and it will be put on the plan. Mr. Andrews asked about the hours for the gas pumps. They may want to have lighting if they are going to open late at night. Mr. Myruski agreed that this area should be well lit.

Mr. Trelstad asked for clarification of the number of signs. There will be one on the face of the convenience store, one Citgo sign on the canopy and one free standing sign for temporary signage. Temporary signs are generally restricted in duration. Mr. Andrews suggested that they have a 60-day restriction on them. He asked that the applicant note this area on the plan.

Mr. Henry asked if this would be a modification to the site plan. Mr. Halloran stated that this is a separate issue and can be granted an approval with conditions.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Ms. Cleaver, seconded by Mr. Myruski, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby declares that the sign application for Country Convenience is a Type II action under NY SEQRA requiring no further action. Passed unanimously.

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

Vote By Proper MOTION, made by Ms. Cleaver, seconded by Mr. Bergus, the Planning Board hereby grants final approval to the Country Convenience sign application with the following conditions: Notes to be added to the site plan restricting the location of any temporary sign to one sign and restricting it's location to one area 2) note stating the hours of operating and the lighting. Passed unanimously.

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

**Dogherty 13-1-9** - located on Police Drive in the RU zone with an AQ6 overlay, Request for a special use permit for an accessory dwelling.

Present for the applicant: Joe Dogherty

Mr. Halloran explained that this is the first request the board has seen for an accessory use option on a property. The code allows an accessory dwelling of no more than 1000 sq. ft. or 30% of the original house. This would be a second

dwelling on the property. The property cannot be subdivided and the accessory dwelling would stay with the property if it were to be sold. The accessory dwelling will have its' own well and septic. Mr. Dogherty stated that he is planning on having this dwelling for his daughter.

Mr. Trelstad suggested that it be placed closer to the existing home, so only one curb cut would be needed. Mr. Dogherty responded that their engineer felt this was the only feasible location. There is a spill way to the pond and some wetlands. Also, any other area would be too far away for the electric service. The applicant showed a picture of the type of home. It would be an A-frame style with a garage underneath. Ms. Cleaver asked that the pond be protected before any work can be done.

Ms. Daly stated that she feels this application is “at the very edge of what the code allows”. Lengthy discussion ensued regarding the interpretation of the code and the interpretation of the term “incidental use”. Mr. Bergus suggested that if they could use a common driveway, it might help bring it closer to the intent of the code. Mr. Henry asked if this will set a precedent, as it is a separate dwelling. Ms. Daly read from the code – an accessory building must be subordinate and incidental to the principal dwelling. Mr. Andrews suggested that the ZBA may need to render an interpretation. Mr. Huddleston pointed out that the language in the code is a problem. The Board was polled on the subject:

Mr. Andrews	prefers one common driveway
Mr. Bergus	prefers one common driveway
Ms. Cleaver	Likes the plan, but feels it sets a dangerous precedent. It opens the door to double the housing in the entire town. She also asked how this would affect the water protocol procedures. She feels the Town Board should review this section of the code and in the meantime, this application should have an interpretation from the ZBA
Mr. Lupinski	Agrees with Ms. Cleaver
Mr. Myruski	ZBA should issue an interpretation.
Mr. Huddleston	The verbiage should be reviewed and the ZBA should provide an interpretation.

Mr. Halloran explained that this applicant has already been to the ZBA for subdivision and that Board sent them to the PB with this current application. Mr. Henry stated that the density issue is a problem in the code. Ms. Daly will draft a letter to the ZBA explaining the need for an interpretation.

**Ashford - 9-1-4**, 51 acres located on Hambletonian Ave in the RU zone, with an AQ3 overlay. Conservation Analysis

Present for the applicant: Steve Esposito

Mr. Halloran noted that the conservation analysis was discussed at the last meeting. The Board also agreed to let Chester assume lead agency status, with Town of Goshen an involved agency.

Mr. Esposito stated that they will honor the request to locate some of the larger trees for conservation while they do the soils work. He feels there are not any in the area to be disturbed. The applicant has sent letters to Fish & Wildlife and the DEC. Mr. Huddleston noted that the Indiana Bat has been located in the area. Mr. Huddleston advised the applicant that they would have to address this issue. The applicant needs to be aware that any removal of habitat will have to be in the winter months. Mr. Trelstad suggested that they make this a part of all the Conservation Analysis Findings in the future.

Mr. Esposito stated they have established their constrained areas. They would be building 21 units, with 11 of them in Goshen. This will leave 42.3 acres not built upon. They are satisfied with the Conservation Analysis. The applicant is proposing a private road in Goshen with an HOA to deal with maintenance issues. Mr. Huddleston asked about police patrol. Should our Town Police Department be notified that they may have to leave the Town of Goshen to patrol this area? Ms. Daly noted that possibly an intermunicipal agreement could be arranged with the Town of Chester for police protection.

Mr. Esposito explained that they have tried to work with Broadlea for access and were unsuccessful. Mr. Andrews asked if taxes would be affected if the homeowners have to pay for road maintenance. This would not affect the taxes. The applicant will provide a 50' r.o.w. to the property line with an offer of dedication, so that access thru Broadlea could be considered in the future.

A protection buffer along the Heritage Trail was discussed. Mr. Esposito stated a restrictive covenant of no disturbance would be established. It was agreed that there would be a 150' visual buffer to the Heritage Trail with a structural buffer of 300'.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Mr. Myruski, seconded by Mr. Lupinski, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen, hereby grants final approval of the Conversation Analysis as re-drafted by Mr. Trelstad. Passed unanimously.

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

**A & L Acres 13-1-34.2** - 39.7 acres located on Houston Road in the RU zone with an AQ3 & 2 scenic road and 1 stream corridor overlay. Sketch plan

Present for the applicant: Steve Esposito

The Conservation Analysis has been adopted. The applicant is presenting 2 sketch plans for the Board's review. The project is at the corner of Houston Rd. and Route 17A. It is primarily a wooded site. There are four fields on the south side and one large field on the northwest. They are trying to preserve all of these elements. The plans were presented at the consultants' workshop last week. They are planning to cluster the homes around each field. The road will have to pass through an existing woodline and then access to 17A. They have tried to tuck the homes into the woods to minimize their visibility.

Mr. Bergus asked about the intent of the pond. Mr. Esposito replied that this is part of the open space and will most likely be part of one lot with a covenant. They are planning to have a HOA. Plan B will eliminate the exit to Route 17A and has 26 lots. It will have the same basic house locations, but will have a loop road instead of the rotary in Plan A. The hedgerows will serve as property lines. Mr. Huddleston noted that they would want some type of connection along the rail bed. Mr. Esposito stated they would be dedicating a strip of land along Houston to the Town. They need to site the houses first and then connect them with roads.

Mr. Bergus asked if there was a traffic analysis of the use of the two outlets. Mr. Esposito noted that the traffic in the area has been studied extensively and feels that Plan B would help to control traffic. Mr. Huddleston asked if recreational use of these fields is possible. Mr. Esposito noted that the applicant does not feel this would be appropriate. The property is very unique physiologically and has dramatic landscape features. The open areas will be maintained. Mr. Bergus asked if homes 3 & 4 could be rotated. Mr. Esposito stated that they want the homes to face into the field, but they will look at this possibility.

Mr. Halloran stated that this is only a portion of the site. There is more on the other side of Route 17A. Mr. Esposito stated that there is a potential for acquisition of this other portion and they would like to do a full build out plan for SEQRA purposes. Therefore, they plan to do an overall development plan – a generic overview for the other portion for the SEQRA analysis. The Board agrees that Plan B is preferable and advised the applicant to continue with this plan.

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

Present for the applicant: Steve Esposito

The Conservation Analysis has also been approved for this proposal. This applicant is also here for sketch plan review. The Pulaski Highway physically separates the site. There are three areas all under one tax parcel. The maximum density would be for 20 lots. Lot #6 will be a large piece and will preserve the view shed. Mr. Esposito noted that this entire section of the road is worthy of preserving. They are proposing 19 new homes plus the existing house.

Mr. Bergus asked what would happen to the old dance hall. It will probably have to be removed. Mr. Trelstad asked if Lot 5 could be put on the other side of the street in order to give a better entranceway to lot #6. Upon review of the code it was found that the frontage requirements would not allow this. Mr. Huddleston asked what was planned for the retention basins. The applicant should consider creating wet bottom basins. He has plans that have met with DEC approval in the past, which he can provide to the applicant. Ms. Cleaver asked the applicant to remember that utilities should be underground if possible.

The applicant is advised to proceed with this sketch plan.

**Goshen Properties 13-1-34.1 & 39.1** - 42.30 acres, located on Houston Road and Route 17A, located in the RU zone, with an AQ3, 2 scenic road, and stream corridor overlays. Sketch Plan.

Present for the applicant: Steve Esposito

This Conservation Analysis has also been approved. The applicant plans to develop 12 units, with 50% of the property remaining open space. They are proposing one road access off of Houston Rd. They will bring the road to the property line to allow for connection to any future development. This plan does include the railroad bed as this owner also owns the railroad bed from Houston Rd. to the corner of their property.

There will be a common driveway for lots 4 & 5 as they would like to limit the number of entrances onto Houston Rd. Mr. Henry questioned the roadway location. Mr. Esposito responded that they feel this is the best area for the road. He will check to be sure each lot has 300' frontage. Mr. Trelstad stated that he would prefer to see less frontage in order to preserve more open space and to keep the hedgerows. The Board could consider waiving the frontage requirement if

necessary. He also noted that views onto the site are not the best in regard to lots 6,7 & 8. He asked if the applicant has considered the possibility of common wastewater treatment in conjunction with A&L. The applicant has not considered this. It is also noted that there is no affordable housing being considered in this project. Mr. Trelstad noted that the topography has made it difficult to achieve the neighborhood feel to the development. Mr. Henry suggested changing the orientation on some of the homes.

The applicant is advised to continue work on this plan and devise some alternatives to meet the above suggestions.

**Goshen Associates – 10-1-44.2, 3.9 acres**, 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  
John Shafron

Mr. Halloran stated that the Public Hearing was closed on May 5 and the applicant is now looking for final approval. Ms. Daly still needs a complete deed description to compare this description with the original. Ms. Benedict noted that they have surveyed the existing tree line and have relocated one driveway in order to save the large trees. The rest is scrub or dead and they will remove these and plant pin oak. They have provided Mr. Henry with a bond estimate.

Mr. Myruski asked if there are wetlands on the property and have they been delineated. Ms. Benedict stated the area has not been delineated. They have set up a conservation easement to preserve the area in question. Ms. Cleaver presented a map that had been drawn by Lanc & Tully for a previous plan in the Village. It appears to show wetlands. She would like to have someone come in to view the site. Mr. Huddleston asked if Mr. Henry has seen the site and does he feel the conservation easement is appropriate. Mr. Henry stated that it is appropriate especially in view of the fact that some of the area has been altered previously. Ms. Benedict stated that the limits of disturbance have been shown. Mr. Huddleston stated that he will visit the site and if he feels there are wetland problem, they will revisit the issue.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Mr. Myruski, seconded by Mr. Lupinski, the Planning Board hereby grants a conditional approval to the minor subdivision presented by Goshen Associates. Passed unanimously.

**TOWN OF GOSHEN  
PLANNING BOARD  
RESOLUTION GRANTING  
CONDITIONAL SUBDIVISION APPROVAL  
GOSHEN ASSOCIATES**

**WHEREAS**, an application has been made to the Town of Goshen Planning Board for subdivision approval on a 3.9 acre parcel of land located at 60 Fletcher Street, Town of Goshen Tax Map Section 10, Block 1, Lot 44.2; and

**WHEREAS**, on May 5, 2005, the Planning Board conducted a duly notice public hearing to consider comments from the public; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Board conducted an Environmental Review, which included a Short Form EAF; and

**WHEREAS**, on May \_\_, 2005, the Town of Goshen Planning Board adopted a SEQR Negative Declaration determining that there were no significant impacts associated with development of this site which have not been mitigated by project design; and

**WHEREAS**, on May 19, 2005, the Town of Goshen Planning Board adopted a Revised Conservation analysis determining that the rear portion of each proposed lot and possible wetlands contained therein are areas of Primary Conservation; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Board has determined that the subdivision shall create an additional need for recreational facilities and there is no land appropriate at the site to be set aside for such recreational use;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Town of Goshen Planning Board finds that the applicant has submitted all applicable materials, and met all applicable requirements as set forth in the Zoning Code and Subdivision Regulations of the Town of Goshen and hereby grants conditional final subdivision approval to Goshen Associates subject to the conditions set forth in this resolution:

- A. Construction of a split rail fence delineating the conservation area, which shall be erected prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the 1<sup>st</sup> unit;
- B. Execution and filing of a Conservation Easement prior to issuance of any building permits, preserving the areas containing potential wetlands;
- C. Review and approval by Planning Board Attorney and Engineer of metes and bounds description for conservation easement;

- D. Planning Board Chairman's final review and determination that the wetland areas will be adequately protected;
- E. Posting of bond in an amount to be determined by Engineer to secure roadway restoration and utility service connection; and
- F. Payment of all fees including recreation fees in the amount of \$3,000.

Motion made by Mr. Myruski seconded by Mr. Lupinski. Vote of 6 ayes and 0 nays whereupon the resolution was declared adopted by the Town of Goshen Planning Board.

Dated: June 2, 2005  
Filed in the Town Clerk's Office on June 7, 2005

**Maplewood (Salesian Village) 8-1-48** - Hamlet residential and open space subdivision in the HR & RU zone with an AQ6, scenic road, and stream corridor overlay, declare intent to be lead agency, Type 1 action

Present for the applicant: Steve Esposito  
Chris Viebrock

Mr. Golden is acting as counsel to the Board for this project and Ms. Cleaver is recused from this discussion. Lead Agency has been declared and circulated noting that a pos dec will probably be issued and scoping will begin. The applicant has met with the consultants and is now presenting two alternatives for the areas along Craigville. The two alternatives address the concerns of having backyards along Craigville. They did look at the manor type of housing and single-family units. The Community Center has been moved to the front. They hope to connect the two sections with a walkway along Craigville Rd. The applicant has created two streetscapes. The applicant prefers the individual facades plan. There would be front porches facing a central area and the rear would also have porches made to look like a front of the home. They are trying to create a neighborhood feel.

Mr. Huddleston noted that the distance between the two sections still makes it look like two subdivisions. Mr. Trelstad stated that the central section should relate more to Hambletonian Park. The Board agrees that alternate A with the Community Center up front is preferred and the single-family alternative rather than the manor style is preferred. The applicant plans to have a pedestrian connection along Craigville outside of the County r.o.w. Mr. Trelstad pointed out that mixed uses are required in the Hamlet design, so they have added a commercial building. It would most likely be used for a general store type of

concept as there are several other projects coming into the area that could support a store.

Mr. Golden asked if they plan to have public water and sewer as this is required in the Hamlet Residential zone. Mr. Esposito responded that they expect to tie in to the Village Sewer and will have on site public water, therefore both would be public. Mr. Trelstad stated that they need to begin the SEQRA process. Many of these details can be resolved as the plans progress. Mr. Golden referred to the e-mail received from Ms. Israelski, in which she states that she feels this does not meet the requirements of the HR zone. Mr. Huddleston feels that if it does not meet the requirements of the HR, then the plan needs to be changed to meet the requirements.

Mr. Trelstad stated that it is difficult to apply the requirements consistently due to physical constraints. This particular site is bifurcated by wetlands. He believes that there are times when a hamlet design does not have all the elements. Mr. Golden disagreed. He feels that all of the elements have to be met, or it becomes a zoning change. Mr. Huddleston agrees that it must have all of the elements.

Mr. Esposito stated that it is the applicants' responsibility to show how this meets the hamlet requirements. He feels that this project can meet the intent of the TND requirements. Mr. Trelstad also stated that he feels that you can define traditional neighborhood in many different ways. Mr. Golden read from §97-10A of the Zoning Code. He stated that the applicant needs to identify for the Board that they can show they meet the requirements. The Board needs to be concerned with the consequences of setting precedent. Mr. Trelstad suggested that the applicant may want to show full development as RU as one of the alternatives in the EIS. However, if an RU design is used, the wetlands would be lost to community view. Mr. Huddleston stated that he cannot create a situation that violates the code.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Mr. Bergus, seconded by Mr. Myruski, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby declares lead agency in regard to the Maplewood submission. It is also noted that it appears this project will receive a pos dec under SEQRA. Passed unanimously.

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

**Prospect Hill 20-1-58** located on Route 17A in the RU & HR district with a AQ3 & scenic road overlay. Lead agency, positive declaration.

Present for the applicant: Marcia Jacobowitz, Esq.

Mr. Halloran explained that intent to be Lead Agency has been circulated. The Village of Florida has replied stating that they would like to be considered an involved agency as there is the possibility the project will hook up to their sewer plant.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Mr. Andrews, seconded by Mr. Myruski, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby declares Lead Agency in regard to the Prospect Hills Project. Passed unanimously.

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

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Ms. Cleaver, seconded by Mr. Bergus, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby declares that the Prospect Hills project is a Type I Action and will have a positive impact on the environment under NY SEQRA. Passed unanimously.

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

Scoping documents will be reviewed at the next meeting and the Village of Florida will be listed as an involved agency.

**Glenview Hills - 20-1-28.22 & 31.1**, 1.238 acres, located on rte 94, in the CO zone with an AQ3 overlay. Lot line change & subdivision.(EP & RG)

Present for the applicant: Jane Samuelson

Mr. Golden is representing the PB as counsel for this project. Mr. Halloran explained that this subdivision is necessary to allow access to a new development in the Village of Florida. It is not creating any buildable lots., but it will create 3 non-buildable lots.. Ms. Samuelson stated that they have started the preliminary approval process with the Village of Florida. There is one existing house with access to Route 94 via an easement. They are proposing to deed a piece to that homeowner, for his access and this will split the remainder. Also a piece will be deeded to the Village of Florida, so they can maintain the road.

Mr. Golden asked if the Town of Goshen was considered an involved agency when they declared Lead Agency. Mr. Halloran stated that we were notified. Mr. Huddleston noted that we did not participate. Mr. Golden asked if this subdivision application was part of the initial project. No, it was not. Mr. Trelstad stated that this

lot line change was not mentioned in the original application, therefore we have to go through the SEQRA process. Notification and a Public Hearing will be necessary. Mr. Golden also noted that the applicant does not own the property. There is some question regarding the original owners statement, so a new owners endorsement will be needed. Ms. Samuelson will provide this. Mr. Golden advised the applicant that the Town also needs to see the 239m response from the County. He asked if the submission to the County included this portion. No, it did not.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Mr. Myruski, seconded by Mr. Lupinski, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby classifies the application of Glenview Hills as a minor subdivision. Passed unanimously.

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

Ms. Samuelson asked if a Public Hearing could be scheduled. Not, at this time, as the sketch plan needs to be complete. The applicant should come to the next staff meeting.

#### IV. OTHER

Hot Diggity Dog – Mr. Halloran reported that this application has been withdrawn.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 11:50 pm upon motion made by Mr. Andrews, seconded by Mr. Myruski.

Ralph Huddleston, Chairman

Notes Prepared by Linda P. Doolittle