

**Town of Goshen Planning Board
Town Hall
41 Webster Avenue
Goshen, New York
March 17, 2022**

Members Present:

Lee Bergus, Chair
David Crawford
Cynthia Hand
Martin Holmes
Frank Leva
Diana Lupinski
Jeremy Zweig, Alternate

Also Present:

Sean Hoffman, P.E. PB Engineer
Kelly Naughton, Esq. PB Attorney
Neal Halloran, Building Inspector

Members Absent:

Phil Dropkin

The Planning Board meeting was opened at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Lee Bergus. The Planning Board deferred the approval of prior minutes, as the recording secretary was absent.

DeSharnais Garage – 5-1-9.2: Application for site plan for a residential garage on 2.8 +/- acres along Axworthy Lane in the RU Zone with AQ-6 and Scenic Road Corridor overlays. **Initial Presentation & SEQRA**

Representing Applicant:

Karen Arent and Valerie and Jeff DeSharnais

Ms. Arent stated that the family wishes to put another garage on the property that would be located within the 50-foot setback of the Scenic Road Corridor Overlay. It is 38' to the property line. With the turnaround for the garage, it is a very convenient location. It uses very little additional impervious surface. It works nicely to preserve an existing oak tree that they have observed grow for 38 years. There is a little grading required for a flat pad for the garage. There is a little stone wall near the existing garage, and that allows a flat grade to be met for the new garage. Ms. Arent took a lot of photographs to demonstrate the visibility of the garage. The new garage has no direct view, and it is a line of forsythia and trees. The Applicants would be removing two trees with this proposal. The roots of trees extend far beyond the canopy, so to save it they want to stay away from it. It is a Pin Oak.

Mr. Bergus asked, in Photo 4, is that the hill that it will be tucked behind? Ms. Arent responded that yes, that image is looking directly into the property. It would be tucked behind it slightly. The hill will remain, but they will dig into it only slightly. Mr. Bergus asked why there was an apron in front of the garage doors. Ms. Arent stated they would still be too close to the oak tree. They want to use pervious pavers to collect extra water, and wanted to give some more room to navigate into and out of the garage. They want to mimic the existing garage. There will be no

red door. She said that the wood tones are cedar, and the forsythias are truly dense, even during the winter.

Mr. Crawford asked if there was a retaining wall between the house and the garage. Ms. Arent stated that it is boulders set into the slope. The Applicant is going to replicate what the other garage has in that regard. They have not determined whether there would be any windows facing the road. There are gooseneck lights over the door and the garage lights. They shine down, and work well to keep the light focused on the activity area.

Mr. Hoffman discussed why the application was before the Planning Board – because it is in the Scenic Road Corridor, otherwise it would not require Planning Board approval. The 50’ buffer is the largest issue with this. Mr. Halloran will discuss whether the buffer precludes the construction of the garage. He stated that to the degree it needs to be determined, he has no issues with what is there now. That was put in about 10 years ago, and this will match that. The Planning Board will make that determination.

Ms. Naughton confirmed for the Planning Board that this is a Type II action, and a public hearing is within the Board’s discretion.

Ms. Lupinski noted that she does not think there is a problem with the bend in that area. Mr. Holmes stated that he likes the idea that the style will match what exists, and asked what would be in the loft. Mr. DeSharnais discussed how there will be lifts, so that four cars can fit into the garage. Mr. Leva noted that this is beautiful piece of property, and the garage will aesthetically fit in well. He did not think that the forsythias were that thick. There are two trees coming down, and they are mature. Would it be possible to replace them with two evergreens? Mr. DeSharnais said that once the garage is constructed, it would be a good idea to plant additional trees. Ms. Arent stated that the electric service to the garage would be underground, and the apron of the garage will be pervious pavers. The floor of the garage will be concrete.

The Board was polled regarding whether a public hearing should be held.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Mr. Crawford, seconded by Ms. Lupinski, the Town of Goshen Planning Board hereby waives the public hearing for this application. Unanimously approved.

Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Leva	Aye
Mr. Crawford	Aye	Ms. Lupinski	Aye
Ms. Hand	Aye	Mr. Zweig	Aye
Mr. Holmes	Aye		

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Ms. Lupinski, seconded by Mr. Holmes, the Town of Goshen Planning Board hereby declares this to be a Type II action under SEQRA. Unanimously approved.

Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Leva	Aye
------------	-----	----------	-----

Mr. Crawford	Aye	Ms. Lupinski	Aye
Ms. Hand	Aye	Mr. Zweig	Aye
Mr. Holmes	Aye		

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Ms. Hand, seconded by Mr. Crawford, the Town of Goshen Planning Board hereby authorizes the drafting of a Resolution. Unanimously approved.

Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Leva	Aye
Mr. Crawford	Aye	Ms. Lupinski	Aye
Ms. Hand	Aye	Mr. Zweig	Aye
Mr. Holmes	Aye		

All One One All – A D’Artagnan Foundation Regenerative Farm – 8-1-6: Application for site plan and special permit for conversion of an existing barn to restaurant and retail farm stand on 14.5 +/- acres along Coleman Road and Craigville Road/County Route 66 in the RU Zone with AQ-6 overlay. **Revised Plans & Consider Scheduling Public Hearing**

Representing Applicant: David Higgins, P.E. (Lanc & Tully)
Alix Daguin (owner)

Mr. Higgins gave the history of the project, and noted that it was last before the Planning Board about a year ago. At that time there was a public hearing, and there was some progress made on the plan. The Applicant approached L&T to work on the septic. Previously, it was going to be utilizing an aerobic worm system. When the Applicant approached them, they prepared a design for a conventional septic system. The barn is proposed to be converted to a restaurant and farm stand. They performed soils tests, and it worked out well. Mr. Higgins did the survey, and prepared the plan based primarily on the original design. However, they did modify the parking, grading, and landscaping. They also modified it to provide for ADA access to both floors of the building. They tried to address the comments from prior reviews. This is under 1 acre of disturbance, so no SWPPP is needed. Mr. Higgins stated that they included construction details and a lighting plan. They provided views from Craigville Road looking into the site. There is an existing tree line along the road, but they supplemented the gaps in those trees, and propose two rows of offset evergreens along the property line. They did work to maintain the existing trees along the driveway if they could. There were questions about endangered habitat, and they provided a habitat assessment saying there were no impacts.

Mr. Hoffman advised the Board that his approach on this application was to capture some of the comments from prior memos to give background to the Board members. The original application that came in had the farm stand referred to as a “roadside farm stand”. Now, it appears to be a retail component. The Code allows a roadside farm stand as an accessory use; however, for this

application it should be included in the review as retail, because it no longer is proposed as the accessory component. Mr. Hoffman stated that the Board had previously been waiting for information from the DEC regarding the sewer system, which is no longer necessary, and SHPO, which the Applicant has addressed. The Applicant also has to show that they have no greater overall off-site impact than would full development of the property with uses by right. Mr. Halloran has determined that "as of right" uses are those that can be approved by the Building Department. Traffic, noise, and odors – for the use that is being proposed, the Applicant needs to demonstrate that the project does not have any greater quantitative impact to those areas. Mr. Hoffman also had a comment on access by fire apparatus. It appears narrow closer to the building, and he suggests they speak with Mr. Halloran regarding this requirement. Mr. Hoffman received an aquifer test plan, and that be sent to the hydrogeologist. Mr. Hoffman recommends it be submitted to the DOH prior to submission to Bill Canavan.

Mr. Bergus stated that the DOH would not get involved in the actual protocol. Mr. Hoffman does not want to see the Applicant go around in circles, so it may just be a brief conversation with the DOH. He noted that the Applicant has added a detail for the sign. It appears they are seeking sign area bonuses, but it is not clear from the plans. The Applicant needs to identify those bases to the plans.

Mr. Higgins stated that the sign is there and existing, so he had not accounted for the sign bonuses. He then reviews the ability for sign bonuses to be issued under the Town Code. He stated that ran the numbers, and they could obtain a 32-sf sign. Mr. Hoffman requests that the Applicant put in writing to the Board the request for any sign bonuses. Mr. Higgins states that the Code says that a farm can have a sign that is 24 sf, and they would not need any bonuses. The sign is not lit. It is a 5x6 hand painted sign. They would like to keep it if the Board is ok with that.

Mr. Zweig noted that he reviewed the submission, and the Applicant was responsive, but the new area is the outdoor area. Does the Applicant expect there to be amplified music? Mr. Higgins stated that they may be in the interior, but he will check with this client.

Mr. Leva asked what the generator is going to power, and Mr. Higgins said that is existing, but does not know if it is still used. It might just be the pad.

Mr. Crawford confirmed that the ADA accessible parking were both paved areas because one appears not to be paved. Mr. Higgins said that both are paved. Mr. Crawford noted that the grading for the sidewalk should be ADA compliant, and questioned the dumpster location out front. It is right as you pull in near the road. Mr. Crawford asked if there any chance it could be relocated. Mr. Higgins responded that they considered moving it to the rear, but it would impact the paddock and access to the rear. The present location would be easy for the trucks to unload the dumpster and pull back around. It would be screened within an enclosure. Mr. Crawford asked if the large tree near the barn prohibited the widening of the road for fire apparatus. The Applicant will confirm. Mr. Higgins will check the existing septic tank, which was installed about

15 years ago. They propose to evaluate its construction, and it can be run down to the new pump chamber which can be sent to the field.

Mr. Bergus said that he likes that they did away with the innovative way to get rid of the waste, and glad to see a conventional system. He had questions about the details for the septic system. There need to be larger boxes – perhaps db20s. There needs to be consistency for the distances between the laterals. He appreciates the additional vegetation that has been proposed.

Mr. Holmes asked whether the shed interferes with the expansion area of the leech field. Mr. Higgins stated that the intent is to leave it there unless it has to be removed for the expansion area. Mr. Holmes said he is an advocate of moving the leech field to the higher portion of the property.

Ms. Hand asked if there a large tree by the entrance. Mr. Higgins said there are trees to the left and right and a sliding gate to enter it. They would be widening a portion of the driveway. They would need to move the stone pillar approximately 15 feet to the right, and the pavement is being widened by 10 feet.

Mr. Bergus requested a correction on the plans where one of the traffic control signs should say 500 not 1500 on the turning plan.

Ms. Hand stated that she has seen signage out front advertising workshops. She hopes there are not going to be additional signs advertising workshops if we are considering granting sign bonuses.

Mr. Higgins stated that the Silvio pasture has been mostly planted already, and the trees proposed are white pines and Norwegian spruce, so they grow to 15 feet in height. The mulched patches in the pasture will absorb more of the runoff.

Mr. Bergus asked what happens in the winter for designating parking stalls, and if there would be vertical markers. Mr. Higgins responded that the Applicant would plow the parking lot, and will remove the snow along the post. They do not want someone to drive into it. There could be vertical markers if the Planning Board felt that was necessary, but the Applicant was thinking that striping it was sufficient.

Ms. Hand said there was previously a lot of talk about where the animals would be on the property. Will there still be animals on the property? Ms. Daguin stated that they rotationally graze their animals. Ms. Hand asked if people would have access to the orchard when the animals are there, and Ms. Daguin responded that if it is a workshop on something related to the animals, then yes. They have sheep and chickens. Ms. Hand requested that the Applicant talk more about the events that will be held on the property. Ms. Daguin stated that they will not host events – no weddings – there are agricultural-education based events. There are some workshops on food. They range from basket-weaving to indigo-dyeing to tea collecting. Mr. Halloran stated that the workshops are all very small scale, likely they are all under 10 people at one time.

Ms. Hand asked how many parking spaces were proposed, and whether multiple programs would be going on at the same time. Mr. Higgins said there were 44 parking spaces, and Ms. Daguin said there is a small staff. The farm stand will be open at the same time as a farm tour. Ms. Hand asked if when the restaurant is open, would the Applicant have events at the same time. Ms. Daguin said the hours and days that they would be open, and noted that in the summer it would be a full season. She is not sure how much they would be able to stay open in the winter.

Ms. Lupinski asked if the fire truck fit into the parking lot with cars in the spaces. Mr. Higgins said that they proposed it with cars to demonstrate that it would not impact parked cars. Ms. Lupinski noted that in the FEAF, it said that the action obtains it from public water supply, but then it says that the liquid waste is equal to what is coming in. Mr. Hoffman responded that it is not unusual for an EAF to be structured that way. They are calculated the same way from an engineering standpoint. What is important in terms of the Zoning Code, is that the Applicant has quantified the water use based on the restaurant. They will use the pond for the agricultural use. Ms. Lupinski asked if the pond ever runs dry, and if it is fed by a natural stream. Mr. Hoffman said that the solution to that possible situation for this Board is to have a restriction to only use the well for the restaurant. Ms. Lupinski asked what the square footage of the barn was, and Mr. Hoffman said he obtained the number from the County website, but the Applicant did a survey, and it is less than 5,000. Mr. Higgins said the farm stand and kitchen will be downstairs and the restaurant will be upstairs in the barn.

Mr. Leva noted that the site plan is very busy, and asked if it could be cleaned up and clearly depict what portions of the fence will be removed and what is going to stay. He also suggested planting some shrubs around the dumpster enclosure.

Ms. Naughton said that she will provide the Board with updated revised Negative Declaration, and will await a submission from the Applicant regarding the off-site impacts discussed previously. After receipt, then the Planning Board can schedule the public hearing.

Broadlea Road and Vivian Lane Solar - 9-1-4 & 6.2: Application for site plan and special permit for a solar energy system along 297.2 +/- acres on Broadlea Road in the RU Zone with AQ-3, Scenic Road Corridor, Floodplain & Ponding and Stream Corridor & Water Supply Watershed overlays. Revised Plans & SEQRA Part 2 EAF

Representing Applicant:

Rejean DeVaux, Terrance Nolan

Mr. DeVaux presented a PowerPoint presentation to the Board, and summarized updates that have been made to the plans since the prior submission. They have added landscaping and reviewed various species. The Sisters of Dominica requested fruit species be intermixed within their garden. Mr. Bergus asked if that would encourage deer, and Mr. Nolan stated that there would be a fence; it is part of the Sisters' community garden.

Mr. DeVaux stated that they have more or less finalized the conservation easement of the Sisters' land. They have reduced the tree clearing to 1.74 acres. The project has mostly been shifted from the steep slopes. They would like an interpretation from Mr. Halloran related to slopes, because then they believe they would not need the waiver at all. The electrical is now all underground for Vivian project. There will be pad mounted switches up to the point of interconnection. Mr. Nolan stated that Orange & Rockland requested that it go underground. Mr. Holmes asked if the point of interconnection is to over ground or underground system, and Mr. Nolan said it would be underground under Ridgefield Drive. Mr. Holmes said that Orange & Rockland does not have any pad-mounted power quality meters. Mr. Nolan said the plans that we have submitted are the pads that Orange & Rockland has approved. Mr. Holmes said that the point of interconnection is going to be overhead. Some of that equipment just does not exist with Orange & Rockland.

Mr. Hoffman said the slide indicates the numbers of trees to be removed. This is not consistent with the survey prepared by your consultant. Mr. DeVaux said that of the area we originally proposed clearing, we have brought the number down. Just because we got them surveyed does not mean that we are going to remove them. Mr. Hoffman does not think the Applicant needs to have the report updated, but the plans need to accurately reflect the trees that are going to be removed.

Mr. DeVaux said that they use a pollinator mix for the plantings. There will also be bee nesting logs placed throughout the project. Mr. Bergus noted that the Applicant listed the incorrect weights for the seeds being planted on the plans. Mr. DeVaux will get clarification and update it if necessary. Mr. Crawford requested the Applicant explain a bee nesting log. Mr. DeVaux described that carpenter bees like taking advantage of logs, and they provide ecological benefits. They Applicant will also be putting out bird boxes. They will use all native seeds, and nothing invasive.

Mr. Nolan said that the bigger picture is to describe is the conservation outcome that is for the Sisters. As they are bringing the lines across the two sites, the easement proposal is for roughly 160 acres, including the forest block to the eastern portion of the property. It is mostly in Goshen, with a small portion in Chester. It would be conveyed by the Sisters to the OC Land Trust. It includes a pond and the Scenic Road Corridor section, and a buffer along the Heritage Trail. The Sisters have indicated that they are willing to open the property to the public with fishing in the Black Meadow Creek and potentially trails in the forest area. They will provide the easement to the Planning Board, which will held be in perpetuity.

Mr. Holmes asked how many feet from the trail is the fence proposed, and Mr. Nolan responded that it is over 100 feet. The Applicant will need to have the trees marked and then will coordinate with Mr. Halloran for a Planning Board site visit. Mr. DeVaux said it is 148' to the western portion and 126' in the corner, and 140' to the eastern portion. Mr. Hoffman stated that the closest clearing will be about 100' from the boundary line. Mr. DeVaux noted that the Applicant will be planting evergreens, bushes, there will be fruit trees on the Broadlea portion. Mr. Nolan said they would identify a location to plant an "orchard annex" to the project.

Mr. Bergus asked that if the Board is doing tree replacement, where would those be proposed? Mr. Nolan explained that the Applicant's proposal is for the Board to consider the conservation easement that are being protected. Mr. Bergus said that those trees would not be disturbed anyway because they are not part of the footprint for the proposed plan. Mr. DeVaux said they are landscaping, but they are not species-in-kind. Mr. Hoffman said he could not find a quantification of the proposed landscaping, or the identification of species. Mr. DeVaux said that for the next submission, they have the species, numbers, etc. Mr. Nolan clarified that they are asking that the tree protection in the conservation easement satisfy the 1:1 tree replacement requirement here.

Mr. DeVaux discussed the net carbon sequestration and loss numbers, as well as the visual simulations.

Mr. Bergus suggested not leaving a 6" gap between the wires for safety purposes. Mr. DeVaux said that generally towns request a wildlife gap. Mr. Halloran noted that the Building Code talks about less than 4", and Mr. Bergus said it would provide slightly less visibility.

Mr. Hoffman said that since Ms. Naughton distributed the FEAF Part 2, there was a question as to whether the project meets the frontage requirement of the Code. Mr. Halloran issued a written opinion that the project does not have frontage on a Town road and needs a variance. Mr. Hoffman further discussed how there are three approaches to the waiver for the slopes. The Applicant is requesting an interpretation from Mr. Halloran. The Applicant can also obtain a waiver from the Board, but they would need to demonstrate that they have an unnecessary and undue hardship and can accomplish it without environmental harm, or they could get a variance. Also, they could get an interpretation from the ZBA.

Mr. Bergus said that there is chain link fencing shown on the drawings; that should be removed. On Sheet C-7, the panels should be more pronounced. Also, for Vivian, on sheets C-3 and C-4, it would be helpful to superimpose the four lines of sight onto the drawing. The height of the lights has a minimum, but there should also be a maximum height. On Sheet E-2, and each one has an abbreviation, but there is no legend. Include a legend, or have a separate key on that page.

Mr. Zweig asked if there was anything that had been submitted as to where the public has access. Mr. DeVaux said that the equipment panels would be fenced off. The trees and fruit trees are outside of that fence.

Mr. Leva said that emergency access and snow conditions are concerns that he has. Mr. DeVaux discussed KnoxBox locations, and said that it is all up to the Fire Code. Ms. Naughton stated that the Board's standard condition is plowing and sanding within 24 hours of a snowstorm of 4" or more. That will be included for this project as well. Mr. Crawford requested pictures for how the panels would be installed on the slopes. He also asked: how is the fence installed? If maintenance needs to be performed, how is that taken care of? Mr. DeVaux said that they staple

the fence to the posts. Also, there is a maintenance group that goes out and fixes damage to fences. The light poles are only at the equipment pads, and they are motion activated.

Mr. Holmes would appreciate if the overhead vs. underground description could be clarified. Also, are the fruit trees confined to the orchard or intermixed? Mr. DeVaux said that they were going to be intermixed, but Mr. Holmes said that was not practical because they need to be pruned and maintained. Mr. Nolan said they should be located only where the Sisters would be maintaining them.

Ms. Hand asked whether the OC Land Trust had any preserves in the Town, and Mr. Nolan said that there were none in Goshen. The benefit is that it would be protected and accessible to the public. Ms. Hand asked why this was not being advertised as a preserve. Mr. Nolan responded that the OC Land Trust will have to present the stewardship. They have not decided how they will protect it specifically.

A further discussion on the conservation easement ensued.

Ms. Lupinski stated that the nun's community garden is a CSA (community supported agriculture).

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Mr. Crawford, seconded by Mr. Holmes, the Town of Goshen Planning Board hereby assumes Lead Agency status, having received no objection from any other Involved Agency. Unanimously approved.

Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Leva	Aye
Mr. Crawford	Aye	Ms. Lupinski	Aye
Ms. Hand	Aye	Mr. Zweig	Aye
Mr. Holmes	Aye		

Ms. Naughton reviewed the proposed FEAF Part 2 with the Board, and explained the differences between an Expanded Part 3 and a limited scope DEIS. Mr. DeVaux stated that he can address the items in an Expanded Part 3.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Ms. Hand, seconded by Mr. Leva, the Town of Goshen Planning Board hereby adopts the proposed FEAF Part 2, with a correction noted by Mr. Bergus. Unanimously approved.

Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Leva	Aye
Mr. Crawford	Aye	Ms. Lupinski	Aye
Ms. Hand	Aye	Mr. Zweig	Aye
Mr. Holmes	Aye		

Owens Road Solar - 10-1-10.22: Application for subdivision, site plan and special permit for a solar energy system on 126.3 +/- acres along Owens Road in the RU Zone with AQ-6, AQ-3, Scenic Road Corridor, Floodplain & Ponding and Stream Corridor & Water Supply Watershed overlays. Revised Plans & SEQRA Part 2 EAF

Representing Applicant:

Rejean DeVaux, Steve Long, Terrance Nolan

Mr. DeVaux reviewed his PowerPoint presentation summarizing changes made to the project since last submission. They are not seeking a waiver from the slopes, they have removed the panels from those areas. The Applicant will be planting the same pollinator mix. Mr. DeVaux requested feedback on the general planting discussion. It will be a 1:1 replacement of trees in the area previously identified by Ms. Hand. They have interspersed it over several acres. They are removing the wetland mitigation area on the next set of plans. Ms. Hand asked how the Board will know that the wetland mitigation is happening, and Mr. Hoffman said that the Board can condition your action on it.

Mr. DeVaux said that the Applicant's next submission will be more detailed regarding the tree replacement. The survey area was 1,900 trees. Mr. Hoffman noted that there is a discrepancy on the plans relative to the tree replacement.

Mr. DeVaux reviewed updated visual analysis. The Board requests that the fence be revised to an agricultural fence.

Mr. Hoffman stated that the plans contain modules within the Scenic Road Corridor, and the Board will need to make findings regarding the degradation of the Scenic Road Corridor. The Board might want to drive by the property before considering the findings. There are inconsistencies in the bulk tables. They need to be corrected to determine exactly what variances are required. Wetlands are still an issue. The wetlands are identified as Army Corps, but the DEC took jurisdiction of the wetlands, so there needs to be something from the DEC as to whether they want to retain jurisdiction. Previously, arrowheads were found on the site. The Applicant will need to address archaeological impacts and resources. Due to the revised design, the visual studies need to be confirmed whether they are still accurate. That analysis assumed an anti-reflective coating. Buffers for visual glare need to be shown and confirmed on the plan. This is a tough driveway in the southern portion, so it was forwarded to John Canning, the Board's traffic consultant. Mr. Canning requested trimming within the triangles. He also requested the stopping distance for the driveway. It appears to only be 250 feet stopping distance, and a person needs 330 feet. Mr. Canning recommended a common driveway if it is allowed, and also a "no left turn" into the driveway.

Mr. Crawford said that the landscaping for this project is shown in front of the fence. On the other application, it was behind the fence. What is the reason for the difference? Mr. DeVaux

said that it was because there are two separate areas of fence; it was shown on the exterior of the fence. Mr. Crawford noted that the KnoxBox location should be shown on the plans.

Mr. Bergus said that on Sheet 3.1, Note 3 refers to a Sheet that does not exist. The reference to Ward Street on Sheet 3 of 3 should be removed. Sheet C-4.1, the southern access road profile, the slopes are illegible.

Ms. Naughton reviewed the proposed FEAF Part 2.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Ms. Lupinski, seconded by Mr. Crawford, the Town of Goshen Planning Board hereby adopts the proposed FEAF Part 2. Unanimously approved.

Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Leva	Aye
Mr. Crawford	Aye	Ms. Lupinski	Aye
Ms. Hand	Aye	Mr. Zweig	Aye
Mr. Holmes	Aye		

Mr. Hoffman noted that the following applications will be listed on the Board's April 7, 2022 meeting agenda: Orange County Gospel Fellowship, Dunkin Donuts, DeSharnais, and Orange County Superior Concrete.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Mr. Leva, seconded by Ms. Lupinski, the Town of Goshen Planning Board hereby adjourned the meeting at 10:24pm. Unanimously approved.

Mr. Bergus	Aye	Mr. Leva	Aye
Mr. Crawford	Aye	Ms. Lupinski	Aye
Ms. Hand	Aye	Mr. Zweig	Aye
Mr. Holmes	Aye		