

## **APPROVED MINUTES**

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

**August 7, 2008**

### **Members Present**

Reynell Andrews  
Susan Cleaver  
Mary Israelski, Acting Chair  
John Lupinski  
Ray Myruski

### **Also Present**

Neal Halloran, Building Inspector  
Sean Hoffman, Engineer  
Ed Garling, Planner  
Karen Schneller-McDonald, Consultant  
Rick Golden, PB Attorney  
Kelly Naughton, PB Attorney

### **Absent:**

Lee Bergus  
Ralph Huddleston

### **CALL TO ORDER**

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

### **MINUTES**

The minutes of the Planning Board Meeting of July 17, 2008 were approved by a vote of the Planning Board.

**Dickerson – 13-1-69 & 37.1 – 92.90 acres**, 2 lot subdivision located on Dunmore Lane, Gibson Rd., and Route 17A in the RU zone with an AQ3, AQ6 and scenic road corridor overlay. Signs

Mr. Golden said the applicant asked for direction as to what the ESA signs that have been required by the PB should look like. Mr. Garling showed samples of signs consisting of fiberglass posts and lettered stickers. The PB decided that applications requiring ESA signs should be orange with black lettering and wetland signs should be light blue with black lettering. The signs should be placed in the ground before construction begins.

**VOTE BY PROPER MOTION**, made by Ms. Cleaver, seconded by Mr. Myruski, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen directed the Dickerson project to place ESA signs consisting of green fiberglass posts and orange stickers with black lettering stating “Environmentally Sensitive Area” spaced at distances of no less than 25 ft. nor more than 100 ft. Passed unanimously.

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

Mr. Halloran said the PB received a letter from the applicant’s consultant asking that the applicant be taken off the August 7<sup>th</sup> agenda.

Mr. Golden said the PB had scheduled a public hearing on the application for tonight and that anyone present from the public should be given an opportunity to speak.

Ms. Israelski asked for public comment. There was none.

Mr. Golden said the applicant needs time to put together the additional information required before continuing the public hearing.

**VOTE BY PROPER MOTION**, made by Mr. Andrews, seconded by Mr. Myruski, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen adjourned the public hearing on the application of Maplewood to October 2, 2008. Passed unanimously.

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

**VOTE BY PROPER MOTION**, made by Mr. Myruski, seconded by Ms. Cleaver, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen directs the Building Inspector to re-publish the public hearing on the application of Maplewood in the newspaper. Passed unanimously.

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

**Lone Oak – 11-1-58 & 11-1-49.2 – 217.4 +/- acres**, located on Harriman Drive and Arcadia Rd in the HR zone with an AQ6 & stream and reservoir overlays. SEIS completeness.

Present for the applicant:

Steve Esposito

Mr. Golden told the PB that there is an issue of what should be part of the Lone Oak application. The applicant has included the developed area where the houses will be built but has not included an adjacent parcel that contains the utilities to service the development. Mr. Golden said that he agrees with the Building Inspector's position that the adjacent parcel should also be part of the application. Mr. Halloran will write a letter to the applicant notifying them that the other lot needs to be part of the application.

Mr. Hoffman said Riddick Associates has issued two recent memos on the application. He noted that originally the application was for 162 lots and now the plan calls for 132 lots on 103 acres on the southern parcel with the northern parcel containing the infrastructure. He said the applicant is planning to tie into the Arcadia Hills Water District but isn't proposing a hydraulic connection. He said that wells tested in 1997 and then again in 1999 have shown a declining yield and recommends further testing to see if the yield continues to decline. He said the applicant has a preferred option of tying into the Village sewer plant but since the Village is not inclined to allow that, the applicant has discussed construction of an on-site plant, using two different technologies. He said he is asking that the applicant look at a third technology, MBR, which might be better suited for the property. He said the process takes up a smaller footprint and provides a higher degree of treatment. He said the waste would go through a filter prior to being discharged to a tributary to the Otterkill. PB members expressed concern about nine-year-old well tests.

Mr. Garling said he agrees that the adjacent lot should be included as part of the application and said that the other big issue is the issue of the road. He said there is no mention of a Harriman Drive extension which was always contemplated as a through road. He said it must be addressed and fully discussed by the PB. He said he believes the SEIS is not complete at this time.

Mr. Golden said he is comfortable with the SEIS being deemed complete provided certain modifications are made and provided the PB consultants look at the modifications to determine if the PB directives have been complied with. Basically it would be a conditional completeness, he said, and added that the real review starts when it is deemed adequate for public review.

Karen Schneller-McDonald of Hickory Creek Consulting, the PB's environmental consultant, said she thinks the SEIS is incomplete and referred to a detailed letter she had addressed to the PB. She said that the percentage of impervious surfaces on the site needs to be corrected as it doesn't include rooftops and houses. She said that there are additional environmental impacts that have not been addressed because the adjacent parcel, which contains most of the DEC wetlands, has not been included and added that indirect impacts to the large DEC wetlands have not been mentioned at all in the SEIS. Water issues are discussed only as to water required for household use, she said and the SEIS doesn't include a discussion of the water available to maintain the natural eco

system services that they provide. In terms of habitat, she said the field survey was not done at the right time of year to be able to tell much about the species on the property.

Mr. Golden said that Mr. Garling's memorandums dated July 30 & August 1 should be updated in the SEIS before public review. He said that the state of the document as to whether or not it is ready for public review has a lot to do with what was the scope required at the time. He said he thinks the scope was not detailed in certain of the areas commented on by the environmental consultant, saying that while not required to be addressed at this time, the applicant will have to address them between now and the FEIS.

Mr. Golden said he agrees that the adjacent parcel needs to be a part of the application and to the extent that it impacts some of the applicant's other statements in their SEIS, such as wetland size, the impacts ought to be addressed in the SEIS. He also agrees that the applicant needs to identify the temporary impacts to the wetlands and state how they plan to mitigate them and that roofs should be considered impervious areas, stating that it is misleading if they are not. He said the PB identified covered land as impervious on other applications and should utilize one standard.

Mr. Golden said a letter can be drafted to the applicant listing what they need to do to make it ready for public review and that compliance with that directive can be assured by the PB consultants.

Ms. Cleaver asked about the accumulated impacts of the development on the watershed (Otterkill and Black Meadow Creek) and requested that the applicant supply that information and what mitigation they are going to be doing. Mr. Golden said this can be done at review and said he believes the wells and the sewer can also be addressed during the comment period with whatever additional testing needs to be done. It will be finalized in the FEIS, he said. He said he can meet with the applicant at the staff meeting to decide what their schedule will be to address these issues and when they will be ready to set a public hearing schedule.

**VOTE BY PROPER MOTION**, made by Mr. Andrews, seconded by Mr. Lupinski, Planning Board of the Town of Goshen determines that the DEIS/SEIS for the Lone Oak application is adequate and ready for public review and review by all involved agencies provided the applicant complies with the list of items as noted in Mr. Garling's memorandum of July 30 & Aug. 1, 2008 and certain of the comments of Karen Schneller-McDonald's memo dated July 31, 2008 and further provided that the applicant includes, within the list that will be provided to them outlining the specifics of what was just generally referenced, the identification and inclusion of the additional parcel containing the utilities as part of the project and that the project specifications have to address that additional parcel being a part of the project and the applicant has to address why they are not connecting to the existing water system in Arcadia Hills and address

Mr. Golden's memo dated July 22, 2008 and make available full size drawings for the public to view. Passed unanimously.

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

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting of the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen adjourned at 8:50 p.m. on motion made by Mr. Myruski and seconded by Ms. Cleaver.

Mary Israelski, Acting Chair  
Notes prepared by Susan K. Varden