

APPROVED MINUTES

**Town of Goshen Planning Board
Town Hall
41 Webster Avenue
Goshen, NY 10940**

July 17, 2008

Members Present

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

Also Present

Neal Halloran, Building Inspector
Dennis Lindsay, Engineer
Kelly Naughton, PB Attorney

CALL TO ORDER

Planning Board Chair Ralph Huddleston called the regular meeting of the Town of Goshen Planning Board to order at 7:30 p.m. at Town Hall.

Stewart's – 12-1-8.31 – Located on Rt. 17M in the HC zone with an AQ6 overlay.
Possible Negative Dec – referral to ZBA

Mr. Halloran told the PB that the project needs a negative declaration before the ZBA can act upon the applicant's request for a variance and that once the ZBA acts, the applicant will come back to the PB for site plan approval.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Ms. Cleaver, seconded by Mr. Myruski, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen issues a negative declaration relative to SEQRA on the application of Stewart's. Passed unanimously.

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

Pskowski – 12-1-118 & 45.2 – (15.20 & 48.40 acres) located on Gate Schoolhouse Road in the RU zone with an AQ3 & AQ6 overlay.

Present for the applicant: Chris Pskowski

Mr. Pskowski said that his application is for a lot line change and that he is looking at 1.39 acres to acquire from Mr. Menner. The 48 acre parcel runs parallel with one half of his, he said, and he needs it for open space and grading for a subdivision application he has in front of the PB and also so that he can relocate his house further back. He has met with the professionals at a work session, he said.

Mr. Lindsay said he has reviewed the application and that it is a simple application requesting transfer of 1.39 acres from Menner to Pskowski. He said that Town Code requirements for a lot line change call for the applicant to confirm compliance with the zoning dimensional requirements and to ensure that the existing utilities and the other structures don't get transferred from one lot to the other. These lots are well in excess of the minimum requirements, he said, one lot will end up at 47 acres, the other at approximately 16.7 acres. The Code requires that there aren't any buried fuel tanks, septic or wells. Mr. Lindsay said that the area proposed to be transferred is far away from the improvements on the property and the houses, so he would assume that those types of utilities are not there, but said it is impossible to discern from the plan. He said it should be sufficient if a surveyor certifies that to the best of his knowledge, after inspection, there are no buried utilities that will result in encroachments or violations of the health department or other agencies.

He said there is no requirement for a public hearing.

Mr. Lindsay said that Mr. Barbone's lot has access over this property and that an easement description will need to be reviewed to see if there are any encumbrances. To-date the applicant has provided only a plat. Mr. Lindsay said that there are a number of properties that derive access from the same private driveway that provides access to this lot. They are not proposing any changes or any new lots but are proposing an amendment to one of the lots. There are some changes on Gate School House Rd. that are proposed by Goshen Meadows across the street and this has been discussed with the applicant and details are being worked out, he said. There will be slight changes to the driveway access.

Ms. Naughton said her office requests the language of the right-of- way as well as any access or maintenance agreements. She told the PB that there are no other permitting agencies on the application so it can assume lead agency. She said the application does have to be sent to the County Planning Department before approval is given.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Ms. Israelski, seconded by Ms. Cleaver, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen declares itself lead agency in terms of SEQRA on the application of Pskowski. 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. Myruski, seconded by Ms. Cleaver, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen types the application of Pskowski as an Unlisted Action in terms of 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 Ms. Israelski, seconded by Ms. Cleaver, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen waives a public hearing on the application of Pskowski. Passed unanimously.

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

CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING

Maplewood (Salesian Village) 8-1-48 – 94 acres, 229 units, Hamlet residential and open space subdivision in the HR & RU zone with an AQ6, scenic road and stream corridor overlay. DEIS & subdivision.

Present for the applicant: Art Tully, Lanc & Tully
Richard Cantor, Esq.

Mr. Huddleston told the public that the public hearing was to discuss the DEIS and subdivision and asked Mr. Tully to provide a brief description of the project.

Mr. Tully said the project is located on 95 acres of the former Salesian property, located between Craigville and Coleman roads in the RU and HR zone. The proposal is to subdivide the property and develop it into residential homes and some commercial activity, in accordance with the present zoning of the Town. He said he had given a detailed presentation at the public hearing last month.

Mr. Kenneth Wooley of 12 Knapp Terrace said he would like to know the options for water and sewer.

Mr. Tully said the project will be served by its own wells, stating that there are several options available for distribution of the water including an on site hydrometric system, an on site storage tank or working with Hambletonian Park and putting a storage tank on

property there. He said there were two options in regard to the sanitary sewer, either build a sewage treatment plant on site or connect to the Village of Goshen. He said the PB has not selected any options at this point in the review process. Mr. Wooley said residents in Hambletonian Park have been on water restrictions for several years and that it was not acceptable for the applicant to draw on the same water resources.

Mr. Huddleston asked the consultants and PB members to comment.

Mr. Lindsay said he has provided the PB with a 10-page memo on the DEIS but would mention some of the highlights. He said that while there is currently a moratorium and rezoning considerations taking place by the TB that may weigh on the application eventually, he has reviewed the application under its current zoning of Hamlet Residential. He said there is a zone requirement on rear access for multi-family and town houses and that the plan would not comply in certain areas with these zone requirements for rear entry. He said that some of the proposed structures are 60 ft. tall and that there is no height restriction in the Code in this circumstance so the PB may want to consider under SEQRA whether the height is appropriate under a view shed analysis. The PB should review the view shed analysis to determine whether it is satisfactory. The Town Code provides latitude for the PB in determining what the bulk density requirements should be here, he said.

Mr. Lindsay said the applicant has stated that they included 30,000 sq. ft. of commercial space due to code requirements and because of early discussions with the PB's representatives but they have said they are not sure of the viability of the commercial space and asked for it to be a flex space. They then said they would provide information in the DEIS to allow the PB to review the environmental impacts either way, as commercial or residential. Mr. Lindsay said he didn't see that kind of analysis in the DEIS, so he reviewed it only as commercial. He said the area of commercial space appears to be greater than the 30,000 sq. ft., more likely 40,000 so he has asked for clarification. He said that if it does go to a flex use and switches to residential, that there will be different kinds of environmental impacts on water, sewer, parking, etc.

Mr. Lindsay said the site appears to have an abundant water supply and that there could be some beneficial effect to connecting to Hambletonian Park. "If this development or some type of development like it takes place, from a water works perspective, there are a great number of benefits to be achieved by combining water systems in general," he said. The applicant proposes to put up a second water tower next to the existing tower in Hambletonian Park which would provide additional stored water for fire fighting and would provide the capability to take out one of the tanks for maintenance. He said he has posed questions on the water supply including the demand requirements of the development. He said the wells were tested at lower rates of pumping than the table in the text of the DEIS proposes that they be pumped at. He also said he is asking for the fire flow requirements of the structures and an analysis on stored water. He said that currently he doesn't have sufficient information to provide an opinion.

Mr. Lindsay said the applicant provided some limited detail on the waste water treatment for an on-site plant and said he has asked to see the DEC letter outlining the treatment requirements. He said the PB needs more information on the type of process, a basic site plan, a location, space requirements and where the discharge takes place so it can access the environmental impacts.

Mr. Lindsay said the applicant has proposed a storm water system that will address water quality and that they have addressed the channel protection storms and suggest that it is better to pass the flow, rather than store it on site. Mr. Lindsay said that he will want to review that further before giving an opinion.

Mr. Lindsay said a number of items have been requested in terms of traffic analysis and that because of the density and narrow roads, the PB needs to be sure emergency services can properly negotiate the area and provide the services.

Ms. Naughton said her office has two issues of importance for the public to have in order to comment, a parking plan and a septic system plan. The plan as is currently proposed is not code compliant in regard to the parking, she said, and the sewer plant is not identified on the plan in enough detail regarding the visual impact and the impact on the stream in terms of species and temperature.

Mr. Bergus said the well analysis demonstrated that the one smaller yielding well just marginally met the requirements of the residential housing and didn't address the extra loading that would be placed on it if converted to multi-family homes, possibly resulting in 5,000 gallons a day higher of a demand on the system. He said he thinks the well tests should demonstrate that there is an excess of water not just meet the demand at the present time. He said one well tested at peak demand at 90 gallons a minute. Over time wells tend to diminish in yields, he said. The larger well on site, a 250 gallon per minute well, more than meets the requirements, he said, but of course if that was out of service, we would have to rely on the smaller, he concluded. The recovery on that well was allowed to go over 48 to 60 hours as opposed to a 24 hour recovery and that needs to be discussed, he added. Mr. Bergus pointed out that the DEIS looked at it in terms of 173 units, but it needs to be looked at in terms of 229 units if that is what the proposal is. He said that while the development might be eligible for bonus densities (additional units) based upon the 65% of open space, he is not certain the PB needs to give any bonus units since some of the site itself and the wetland areas can't be built upon and were counted as open space. Mr. Bergus said the proposed hours of construction, especially 9 am to 8 pm on weekends, must be re-visited. He questioned that only 90 school age children, or one child per 2-1/2 units, will come from this development. He said the report referenced the Rutgers Study but it relied upon only one multiplier when it should have considered two. He said he'd like to consider some sort of cross walk, perhaps an elevated walkway, between Maplewood and the other side of Craigville Road, or at the least a signaled walkway because of the movement of children between Maplewood

and Hambletonian Park. Mr Bergus said the DEIS indicates that there are public benefits from deed restrictive conservation easements at the rear of the lots, but the applicant needs to elaborate on what that public benefit is. The report should also elaborate on the capital costs of adding 90+ students, he said.

Ms. Israelski said that an improved Coleman Road providing a wider engineered road with a 6 ft. bike lane should be considered in order to provide interconnectivity, saying that both sides of this huge hamlet should be connected. She questioned having only one access in Maplewood and said that a road along the left side of the parcel will help satisfy the Code requirement of interconnectivity. She said the road should connect to an improved Coleman Rd. She said painted bike lanes must be installed and the PB must see the engineering detail of all of the roads and pathways. She said that the large trees on the site must be inventoried on the map. She noted that large buildings are proposed to be sited on top of bedrock ridges that are located in the center of the plan. This will increase the height of the buildings and suggested that instead the large buildings should be located alongside the ridges and nestled so that the large trees running alongside the ridge lines can be preserved. Constructing the buildings around the ridges and the existing topography will help mitigate the view and using the ridge as a backdrop will help lessen the negative visual impact, she said. Ms. Israelski said she is also concerned about the height of the structures. She said that building envelopes must be established and areas of disturbance located and kept to a smaller area. The larger trees should be preserved along Coleman Road and there should be plantings of substantial native trees and natural stone walls built along the road to enhance the scenic road corridor and help to mitigate the visual impact. Ms. Israelski said that combining water systems could be advantageous if there is an abundance of water in the development. Providing interconnectivity of water sources should be investigated and all visual impacts of a water tank should be fully investigated. Ms. Israelski said that a 30 day pump test would be more appropriate than a 72 hour pump test for a development of this size.

Ms. Israelski suggested that bike lanes connecting the hamlet to the Village and connecting the hamlet to the town park should be included with full engineering details. Water falls and water features should be included in the plan and natural paths and benches along the stream corridor should be provided. Ms. Israelski said that the sizes, location and materials for the public amenities must be provided in detail, stating that currently the scale of the amenities seem too small for the scale of the project. She said that storm water management should require a landscape design and should include plants and rock structures for cascading water. The ponds should also be considered for skating. The architectural design details, including size and color of all the buildings, should be discussed. She said the commercial space proposed is too much and that it should be re-designed. The proposed plaza, focal point and market place should be together and surrounded by residential buildings, she said, adding that putting the market space on the outskirts is too remote. She said the commercial plaza should be reduced in

size. Ms. Israelski said she is concerned about the flex space becoming more residential space.

Mr. Andrews said the study is incomplete and that more information is needed on the septic system. He said that it is very important that the Town Board give its own input on the developer's suggestion that the Town take possession of the ownership of the open space.

Mr. Myruski said he has a negative view of the project, saying that the hamlet development is too close to the Village and one will destroy the other.

Ms. Cleaver said that so much of the property is wetlands that it doesn't suit being a hamlet area. She said she found that the application was not presented well. She said the water figures and the sewer figures don't match up. She said she understands that the well testing had to be stopped but it was not marked down when it had to be stopped. She said the 30 days were not looked at for the amount of rainfall and she thinks it was over the amount that is allowed under the Middletown station. All of this information needs to be shown, she said. Ms. Cleaver said that there is a pond within 200 ft. of the well and so that well needs to be tested to make sure it is not under the influence of above ground water with the pond. Ms. Cleaver said that while the report says the applicant is planning to cool off the effluent temperature using well water, there are no figures. How much well water will it take and what will be the cumulative impacts from the sewer treatment discharge and the storm water ponds into the stream and how much, looking at all of that, is it going to raise the temperature of that stream. The DEC says any groundwater stream can't be raised more than 5 degrees. Ms. Cleaver said she'd like to see the figures cumulatively. She also wants to see the location and all details of the sewage treatment plant and said she's not sure it is right to put a plant next to the Veterans Cemetery. She said she wants to see the sight views from the cemetery taken into consideration of the huge buildings that are planned. She said the plans show a storm water pond right below the Veterans Cemetery and wants to see the visual impact from the cemetery. She said the cemetery must be considered when setting up a construction schedule. She said she believes the stream is on the draft Threatened Streams List for thermal impacts and that needs to be addressed and the thermal effects reviewed. She said that Craigville Rd. is a scenic corridor and she would like to see the views of what those tall apartments are going to look like. She said she wants to know how the proposed development meets the regulations of the stream corridor overlay. She also said that Coleman Rd. should be buffered its entire length. Ms. Cleaver said she wants the applicant to address how the development is going to meet the requirements in the conservation analysis for both primary and secondary conservation areas. Ms. Cleaver said that while the applicant states there will be a 2% increase in traffic, they also say that it won't increase any of the air impacts. She said she wants the applicant to provide exactly how many cars and what their emissions would be. She said she wants to see data that backs up the applicant's statement that there won't be any increase in police services. Finally, Ms. Cleaver said

she would like the public hearing left open until information is provided on the sewer treatment plant so that the public has a chance to review it and comment.

Mr. Lupinski said he is concerned with fire safety and the ability of fire equipment to access the buildings. Mr. Lupinski said he wants the appropriate distance for buffer areas to be closely looked at considering all of the wetlands on the site and surrounding areas.

Mr. Huddleston said he is concerned about the on site sewage treatment because of the location of the receiving stream that runs through the heart of Goshen. He said that the DEC will issue, or not issue, the permit for the stream but that the PB has an obligation to gather as much information and offer as much on the impact as it can. He also said he is concerned with traffic because of the busy intersection. He said the PB needs to have its own hydrologist look at the water situation and what level of information has been provided "so we can see where we stand in this investigation." If this is an unusual situation where longer term testing is needed, he said he would feel better if the PB's own hydrologist tell the PB that. Mr. Huddleston acknowledged that the plan was built with a lot of hard work and money over a period of years and with the aid of the PB's professionals.

Mr. Halloran said there is an issue with the multi family dwellings and parking. He said that the Town Code stipulates that all multiple dwellings in a hamlet zone shall have parking behind the buildings, meaning that no front entrance parking is allowed. He said that some of the town houses don't comply and would need to be changed or the applicant would have to seek a variance. He said that there is a horse farm along Coleman Rd and the Code requires a buffer between agricultural land and any other use. He said the PB will have to determine what is needed in this particular case. He said the storm water pond next to the cemetery is considered a structure in the Town Code and that in the case of any structure within 200 ft. of a cemetery, the PB is required to look at and determine if it is compatible. Mr. Halloran said there is no maximum height requirement in the hamlet zone and that height will be a determination of the PB.

Mr. Halloran referred to a report from the Town's Environmental Consultant, Karen Schneller-McDonald of Hickory Creek Consulting LLC, stating that her basic concern at this point is that the plant life has not been identified on site so she can't say there will be no impact until that has been done.

Mr. Huddleston said there is a two-page list of comments from the Environmental Review Board that will become part of the record.

Mr. Huddleston opened the hearing to public comment.

Susan Bloom of 10 Hillcrest Ave., said that it will take an enormous amount of water on a daily basis to run a sewer plant for a project of this size and said she'd like to see the

calculation and how much water will be used. She said the development needs another ingress and egress off Coleman Road, that the houses are too close, and that she is worried about the lighting affecting the residents of Hambletonian Park.

Gerald Boss, 223 Craigville Rd., expressed his concern with the small stream taking the effluent from the project and said the applicant didn't properly prepare a sewer plan. They are going to need sewer and water, the water is questionable and the sewer they don't have, he said.

Robert Lawrence of Hudson Valley Realty said that the Town and Village boards have to decide who and what they want developed. He said it bothers him to see a community and a board divorced from any growth whatsoever and that before putting a higher standard to people coming into the area, the municipalities have to clean up their own mess first, and that comes from sewer to water. He said, "Your problems are created by yourself in a lack of understanding of planning and what true development is."

Ken Wooley, 12 Knapp Terrace, Hambletonian Park, said it is contradictory to consider expansion in this community right now considering the limited resources and said that if someone wants to develop, then it should be self-sufficient and the burden should not be passed down to the taxpayers who are living here now.

Dan Matteo, 21 Knapp Terrace said he hopes the TB "has the courage to correct this disaster waiting to happen here and reduce these houses to a more acceptable number." He asked if the PB will make the decision of whether or not to put a water tank in Hambletonian Park and asked if there will be another public hearing. Mr. Huddleston said that Mr. Lindsay will study the water situation to supplement the information provided to the PB so that it can find out whether or not there is a glut of water on the property. It will be the PB's decision and there still will be opportunity from the public to comment on that, he said.

Mr. Bergus told Mr. Matteo that the idea of putting a second tank at Hambletonian Park also came from the County Department of Health. He said he could see a benefit to both parties and that rather than build an unsightly tank across the street from Hambletonian Park, a tank at Hambletonian would provide redundancy for its residents and would give it flexibility if something happens to its tank.

Richard Rodstrom Sr. 1 Goodtime Park, asked about the public's ability to comment through the process. Ms. Naughton responded that the public can comment during the time that the public hearing is open. She said that answers will be provided in an FEIS, and that the public will have a 10 day period to comment on the FEIS once the findings are accepted by the PB. Mr. Rodstrom questioned the prediction of 90 children living in the development and suggested that the developer is building right up to Craigville Road so that the County couldn't widen the road if it wanted to. Mr.

Huddleston said the developer will not be able to interfere with the County's right-of-way.

Dana Champlin, 43 Magic Circle, said he was concerned about public safety issues with a sewer treatment plant on the site.

Ed Connor of 173 Murray Ave. questioned how close the developer could build next to the Veterans Cemetery and said they are planning to expand the burial area. Mr. Halloran acknowledged that there is a local law that will dictate that. Mr. Connor also asked that the DEIS be made available at the public library and suggested that all developers should be asked to supply the library with the reports. He told the PB that while hamlet zoning does work, such as in Warwick Grove, this is really five separate developments under the guise of hamlet zoning. He said he hoped the TB will reconsider the zoning on this site.

Mr. Matteo asked what would happen if there is not an adequate water supply at the Maplewood site, and they are tied into Hambletonian's water lines, would they then draw from Hambletonian's wells? Mr. Lindsay responded that the water district would share the water supply so that if the wells were not as valuable a resource as they are calculated to be, you still have to supply the water to the users of the district. That is why the analysis of the water supply is so crucial, he said. If there is a solution to the water supply problem in Hambletonian Park the PB would be derelict if they didn't look at it, he said. The PB will consider if the sharing of the water supply would be a benefit or a detriment. If it would be a detriment, then the PB won't propose such a connection but if it does have the ability to be a beneficial sharing of water and an additional adequate water source, then it would be an appropriate decision to make, whether it is this development or any other kind of development there, Mr. Lindsay said.

Clare Leonard, 19 Brookside Drive said there are 20 homes on Brookside Drive that are not shown, but that should be considered because the development will have a visual impact and an impact on the water supply. She said that on Brookside Drive not one homeowner would be willing to enter into a water district with Heritage Estates because it would be a gamble where a guarantee would have to be essential. She encouraged the PB to think about the future.

Mr. Connor suggested that architectural renderings be presented at the public hearing. Mr. Huddleston said they are available on line and at Town Hall and Mr. Tully agreed to provide two copies to the public library.

Mattie Bono, 14 Storms Rd. said that construction should not be allowed on Saturday and Sunday when there will be a lot of traffic on Craigville Road, children in the park and visitors to the cemetery.

Village of Goshen Mayor Bob Weinberger said he never considered that a PB would consider something based on anticipated market conditions, referring to the 30,000 sq. ft. of commercial development “with the possibility of being renovated to 24 additional residential homes”. “What is this talk of about good planning and building 30,000 sq. ft. of commercial space that will possibility be converted to 24 more residential units, I think it is a development hedge because if zoning is changed, it would be easy to switch it over and to convert it to 24 residential units.” He said that the proposed 30,000 sq. ft. for commercial use will destroy or tremendously impact the downtown business district, which is “barely surviving” now. He called the statement that 616 new residents will not have any substantial impact on the demand for police services a “joke”, stating that 616 people will demand more police service, cars and more equipment. He said the fiscal impact of the development is an unfair burden to the village taxpayers and urged the PB to be cautious and to “put this in the context of the Arden Hill sale and GoGo water park and see what you will be doing to our village.”

Reporter Neil Hickok asked how affordable housing is being defined and how the calculation of one child per household was determined. Mr. Halloran said that “affordable housing” is defined in the Code as 65% of what the people in Orange County can afford and is based on annual income. In a hamlet zone 10% is required to be “affordable housing.” Mr. Huddleston stated that the PB will evaluate the developer’s calculations and methodology.

Richard Rodstrom, Sr. said that the developer should use a more current aerial photograph of the site, suggesting that the one used is about 12 years old.

Richard Cantor, Esq. addressed the issue of continuing or closing the public hearing. He said that he believes the purpose of the public hearing, to identify the questions, criticisms, and deficiencies, has been satisfied over the past two lengthy meetings and asked that the public hearing be closed. He said that in terms of further public hearings, the PB can hear from the public whenever it chooses, that it is not an issue of foreclosing the public by closing the hearing.

Ms. Naughton asked the applicant how long it will take to provide information about the sewer treatment plant. Mr. Tully said he can’t answer that until the public hearing is closed. Ms. Naughton said that her office advises that the public hearing be adjourned until a day that the applicant can provide a plan that is code compliant in regard to parking and until the applicant can provide information about the sewer treatment plant.

Town of Goshen Supervisor Doug Bloomfield said that the public is unable to comment on a sewer plan because there is no proposal and said that the citizens need to know what the development is going to look like and what is being proposed before they can adequately comment on it. He said he would support keeping the public hearing open.

Ms. Cleaver said she has been told by the DEC that they did not have enough information to actually comment on this and suggested that the information also be sent to the DEC.

Mr. Huddleston said there had been a major assumption that the development would tie into the Village sewer treatment plant and so there was very little consideration given to the option of providing its own treatment. He said he too has a problem with the lack of information that the public has before it. He polled the PB members. They all wanted to keep the hearing open until additional information is received and made available to the public.

Mr. Cantor asked the PB to provide Mr. Tully with a list of the specific information it is seeking during the continuation. Mr. Huddleston said that Mr. Lindsay and the attorney will provide that.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Mr. Bergus, seconded by Mr. Andrews, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen adjourns the public hearing on the application of Maplewood to August 7, 2008 at which time the PB will discuss the scope and the schedule for further adjournment until the information is received pertaining to two issues, parking and the sewer treatment plant. Passed unanimously.

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

Ms. Naughton recommended that the County will need the Findings and the PB agreed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting of the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Ralph Huddleston, Chair
Notes prepared by Susan K. Varden