

DRAFT - UNAPPROVED

**Town of Goshen
Planning Board
MINUTES OF THE
REGULAR MEETING
July 20, 2006**

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

ALSO PRESENT

John Cappello, Attorney
Richard Golden, Attorney
Neal Halloran, Bldg. Insp
Joe Henry, Engineer
Susan Roth, Planner

ABSENT

Ray Myruski

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Huddleston called the regular meeting of the Town of Goshen Planning Board to order at 7:30 pm at Town Hall. Mr. Bergus led the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the July 6, 2006 meeting will be reviewed later in the meeting.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Goshen Properties 13-1-34.1 & 39.1 - 39.7 acres, 14 lot subdivision located on Houston Road and Route 17A, located in the RU zone, with an AQ3, 2 scenic road, and stream corridor overlays. **Preliminary approval**

Present for the applicant: Steve Esposito

Mr. Esposito explained that the Conservation Analysis has been done. The calculations show that the area could yield 17 lots and they are asking for 14 lots. There is a significant area of open space. Access will be via a cul de sac thru the center, with the possibility of a connection to the adjoining parcel. The Chairman opened the meeting to questions from the public.

Ms. Diana Lupinski, owner of the neighboring farm stated that she is finding it increasingly difficult to farm her property with the number of housing developments coming in to the area. She has four points she would like to see addressed.

- 1) She requests that the houses on Houston Rd. all face in the same direction to present a more uniform look.

DRAFT - UNAPPROVED

Town of Goshen
Planning Board

July 20, 2006
Page-----2

- 2) They hope to turn a portion of their property into a horse farm and request a 50' buffer from any future housing
- 3) The property was part of 250 acre Borden Farm and now that it is subdivided she questions if the entire 250 acres was reviewed for the total environmental impact and if not, would they consider doing so?
- 4) The availability of water is a major concern. Her well has run dry in the past and with the many new projects coming into the area, she questions the impact of this intensive water use. She has spoken with an ERB member and they both question the Schoor dePalma water study that the Town is currently using.

Ms. Cleaver stated that the Board has requested a 50' natural buffer to be left untouched. Mr. Henry asked which parcels were part of the Borden Farm. Ms. Lupinski pointed them out. Mr. Esposito explained that the original Borden farm consisted of three parcels. One consisted of 216 acres, another was the old railroad bed and the remaining 42 acres is this Goshen Properties piece. He also reminded the Board that the applicant completed an overall review for the 216 acres and prepared an expanded Part 3. He further noted that they have agreed to have the homes on Houston facing that road. There will be a 50' "no build" area around the entire development, which will be on the filed map. Under the constraints analysis they have tried to preserve the existing hedge rows and to minimize the impact. He also stated that the density conforms to the AQ3 zone and the DOH will require extensive water testing. One purpose of the open space area is to increase the ability for recharge.

Mr. Henry has made some recommendations regarding the shifting of the property lines for lots 13 & 14 and a change in the roadway profile. He also suggested changes in the detention basins, which would enable them to eliminate catch basins and reduce road maintenance costs. A change in the sanitary design was also suggested. These items have been discussed with the applicant.

Ms. Cleaver asked if a storm water district should be formed. Ms. Roth also suggested changes to the location of the detention ponds for aesthetic reasons. Mr. Huddleston noted that maintenance of these features is an issue, so he would rather they not be visible. The members concur that they would like to have minimal visual impact. Mr. Bergus questioned if the ponds should be screened.

Mr. Esposito replied that the plan shows one large pond and it is designed to tie into the grade and will be landscaped. Ms. Israelski noted that if it contains water, could it be beautified with a fountain or some similar feature. Mr. Huddleston asked the members if they want one detention basin out of site or 2 smaller systems that would be easier to maintain. Mr. Esposito stated that the decision was made early to keep the field open. After further discussion the members agree (4-2) to leave the area with one large pond.

DRAFT - UNAPPROVED

Town of Goshen
Planning Board

July 20, 2006
Page-----3

Ms. Lupinski asked who would be responsible for maintenance of the ponds. Mr. Cappello stated that they would be the responsibility of the homeowner of the parcel that contains the pond. The Town will have the right to go on the property if necessary. They could also form a district and charge additional costs back to the homeowners, therefore they should not create an environment that will be difficult to maintain. It will be the responsibility of the property owner to keep people away from the pond and to maintain it. Mr. Henry feels the average homeowner will not have the knowledge to carry out proper maintenance. Mr. Cappello stated that the Town would have the right, through an easement agreement, to provide yearly maintenance. Ms. Roth asked if the size of the pond would allow for some type of recreation. Mr. Huddleston replied that this type of activity cannot be allowed as the detention pond would not function properly. It must be left in a nearly natural state.

Mr. Huddleston asked if the Board is in a position to act at this time. There are some comments to be addressed, however the Public Hearing could be closed at this time.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Mr. Andrews, seconded by Ms. Israelski, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby closes the Public Hearing in regard to Goshen Properties. Passed by a vote of 5 ayes, 1 abstention.

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

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Mr. Bergus, seconded by Ms. Israelski, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby declares that the Goshen Properties project will not have a significant impact on the environment under NY SEQRA. Passed by a vote of 5 ayes, 1 abstention.

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

The County has received their 239m notification and has replied that this project is under local determination. Mr. Henry and Mr. Cappello agree that a conditional preliminary approval could be granted subject to the applicant addressing the engineer's technical comments. Mr. Lupinski asked if the applicant will address the issue of the homes facing parallel to Houston Rd. He asked if they could require that the homes could only be moved within the building envelope. Mr. Cappello suggested wording that the application be

DRAFT - UNAPPROVED

Town of Goshen
Planning Board

July 20, 2006
Page-----4

subject to the applicant obtaining easements protecting the areas and lots located and parallel to Houston Rd., between preliminary and final approval.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Ms. Israelski, seconded by Ms. Cleaver, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby grants conditional preliminary approval subject to the following:

- 1) The applicant responds satisfactorily in writing to the comments in the Engineers memo of 6/15/06.
 - 2) The applicant obtains the necessary easements protecting the areas and lots located and parallel to Houston Rd., between preliminary and final approval.
- Passed unanimously.

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

Zalunski 20-1-8 - 74.8 acres, 20 lot subdivision located on Pulaski Highway and Cross Roads in the RU zone with an AQ3, scenic road and stream corridor overlays. **Continued public hearing for Preliminary approval**

Present for the applicant: Steve Esposito
Amadur La Put
Chad Wade

Mr. Halloran summarized the project and stated that the two issues remaining were the need for a buffer and the regulations involving the shooting of deer. Mr. Esposito reviewed the project. In regard to the need for a buffer, the applicant is suggesting a 50' buffer that restricts any residential building. The owner can mow lawn or plant a tree, and otherwise maintain the area as a yard, but can have no structures in the buffer area. The applicant has developed responses to the public comments of last month's meeting as follows:

- 1) In regard to the comments from the County DPW - They have justified the proposed driveways for lots 5 & 6 in order to allow access to lot 6 and to line up with the drives of lots #1 & 2.
- 2) Also regarding the County comment concerning the location of the homes - the applicant stressed the importance of keeping the view corridor open, of which the County preparer may not have been aware.
- 3) The public commented on the plans for the 2 existing springs. The one on lot #4 is in wetlands, so there are no impacts proposed for the area. The spring on Lot #6 is also part of wetlands.

DRAFT - UNAPPROVED

Town of Goshen
Planning Board

July 20, 2006
Page-----5

- 4) Mr. Esposito read from the DEC regulations regarding the discharge of firearms. A weapon cannot be discharge where the load or arrow passes over a road nor within 500' of a school, factory, playground or Church. You also cannot discharge a weapon within 500' of a structure unless you own it or have the owners consent. Two areas would be affected by this - the Madura property to the south will overlap by 250' and the other area is owned by the applicant.
- 5) The public expressed concern regarding the availability of water. The constraints analysis allows for a density of 26 lots and they are proposing 20 lots. They are also subject to DOH regulations regarding drilling and testing. The soils have been tested and will be reviewed by the DOH
- 6) There is a stream on lot #4, which is in the wetlands and no development is proposed.
- 7) The dance hall will be demolished as it is in poor condition. The applicant hopes that the existing farm on lot #6 will continue to be farmed
- 8) The section of black dirt is in the conservation easement. It can be attached to lot #13 or merged into the surrounding black dirt fields.

Mr. Henry stated that there are some significant changes to be incorporated. Mr. Esposito expects to have them ready by next week. Mr. Cappello suggested that the applicant finish these changes and supply the written replies to the comments to the consultants to serve as their final report to be sent to the County. Mr. Bergus asked about access to the adjoining property (owned by Mr. Dykshoorn). Access could be from the cul de sac and there is a farm road in that area.

Mr. Huddleston opened the discussion to the public. Mr. Burt Dykshoorn asked that the 50' buffer area be mowed up to the fence line. He also asked if the houses would be 50' from the line. Yes, they will. He asked for clarification of the well locations. Could a house be built where the dance hall is now? They would have to come back to the Building Inspector. Mr. Dykshoorn also questioned the dangerous location of the access road. Mr. Esposito replied that this has been approved by the County DPW.

Mr. Huddleston asked if they could find a way to provide access to Mr. Dykshoorn's property. Mr. Henry replied that they would lose a lot. Mr. Esposito noted that they do have some access, but not a through road. The applicant may be able to provide a 50' r.o.w., but this is a steep section of the property. He will review this possibility with the owner.

Ms. Maxine Saracino asked about the type of architecture as she is concerned that if a home is too massive (or too tall) it will disrupt the view they are trying to protect. Mr. Esposito stated that the applicant has no control over the design as he plans to sell the lots to individuals. Mr. Lupinski asked if there was any way to

DRAFT - UNAPPROVED

Town of Goshen
Planning Board

July 20, 2006
Page-----6

incorporate something as a deed restriction. Mr. Cappello stated that any deed restriction needs to be within the mandates of SEQRA. They would have to tie any restriction to environmental impacts.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Mr. Bergus, seconded by Ms. Israelski, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby closes the Public Hearing in regard to the Zalunski application. Passed unanimously.

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

The Chairman directed the consultants to prepare a draft neg dec for this project once they have been provided with the applicants responses and their response to the County. This should be available for review at the 8/17 meeting.

Heritage Estates - 8-1-9.22 - 249.76+/- acres, 92 dwelling units located on Old Chester Rd & Brookside Dr in the HR & RU zone with an AQ6, AQ3, scenic road and stream & Reservoir overlays. **EIS approval & preliminary subdivision approval**

Present for the applicant; Steve Esposito
Joe Pfau
Tom Cusack

Mr. Halloran reported that the two major concerns raised by the public at the last meeting were the lack of water and the possibility of making Brookside Dr. a thru road. Mr. Esposito explained that the purpose of this hearing is to solicit comments from the public. A court stenographer is present to provide a transcript. The applicant is obligated to respond in writing to these comments. He presented a brief summary of the steps taken to date on the project. The Constraints Analysis has been completed. Wetlands, steep slopes etc have been identified. The Conservation Analysis was approved and the PB has declared lead agency. A Scoping Session was held and the DEIS was prepared, reviewed and deemed complete. The document has been submitted to the appropriate agencies and the applicant will have to respond to their comments as well as those of the public in the FEIS.

Sixty-five percent of the parcel will be left as open space. The applicant plans a cluster area consisting of 41 rear-loaded single-family units set in a Traditional Neighborhood Design. A pedestrian-friendly streetscape will be developed in this area. There will be 47 single-family homes around the perimeter. There will be a

DRAFT - UNAPPROVED

Town of Goshen
Planning Board

July 20, 2006
Page-----7

Village Green in the center of the development. The Kolk farm will be saved as an aesthetic resource.

Mr. Cusack gave an overview of the water studies that have been done. Eight wells were dug and wells numbered 5, 6 & 8 met the requirements. The State requires that they meet 2 times the demand with the best well down. The results were presented to Schoor DePalma and deemed acceptable. Mr. Cusack explained that they only tested what they needed for SEQRA requirements as any additional withdrawals might have had an impact offsite. Mr. Huddleston asked if they have some excess. They do have a small amount of excess.

Mr. Huddleston stated that there has always been a problem in this area regarding the wells. He noted that this project has been considered the "poster child" for the code. The applicant has complied with the intent of the code. He asked if there would be a potential of establishing a water district, which could link Brookside into it. Mr. Cusack stated that when the applicant turns the water system over to the Town, the Town could then form a water district. Mr. Huddleston asked Mr. Cusack if he considers this to be feasible. He replied that the three wells would have to go on line and once historical data has been inventoried, it might be possible to bring Brookside into the district. He also noted that the well at the farm is a good well and could be considered an independent source.

The applicant monitored 23 neighboring homes and did not have a significant impact. The hydrogeology in Brookside is unique as this area has very little re-charge. Mr. Cusack stated that some of the other projects coming into the area might have a greater water supply and therefore would be better candidates to supply Brookside. Mr. Bergus asked for clarification of the development of wells 5 & 6 in relation to the phasing.

The Chairman opened the hearing for questions from the public. Mr. Olsen noted that most of the neighbors have had to extend their wells. Will the Developer be required to put money aside to re-drill the existing wells if this project causes them to "go dry"?

Ms. Geri Corey, 155 Old Chester Rd. noted that her well has always been impacted. She also asked what kind of water system is being proposed. Dr. Manuel Perry read from a written statement. He has lived on Brookside for 9 years. For the first 5 years there were no problems. Five years ago they had to hydrofrac their wells. Last year they re-drilled to extend the depth. There has been no significant increase in the yield. He also noted the following points:

- 1) There appears to be a discrepancy in the reported yields in the tables on pg. 99-100. The yields varied from one year to the next.

DRAFT - UNAPPROVED

Town of Goshen
Planning Board

July 20, 2006
Page-----8

- 2) On pg. 17 the refer to "some" impact on off site. What do they mean by "some"?
- 3) On pg. 104 they state they will carry out monitoring and give a performance guarantee. Will the PB rescue them when their wells fail? If they find that their wells are not sufficient to support the project after it is begun, will they abandon it before it is completed?
- 4) He questioned the calculations used to establish density, in particular the granting of the 15% bonus. He noted that open space is desirable, but will this increase in density cause serious water issues.
- 5) On Page 101, the applicant refers to recharge. Dr. Perry asked what will occur if they have less than the predicted rainfall.
- 6) The water districts that have been developed in the past have been less than perfect. Hambletonian and Arcadia were appropriate at the time, but that is no longer the case.
- 7) The potential for Brookside Dr. to become a thru road is a major safety concern. There are many children in the neighborhood.

In summary, Dr. Perry asks the Board to consider the existing residents when making a decision on this project.

Ms. Charlene Caffrey, 213 Knoell Rd., stated that her well has been affected and therefore they are being impacted by this project. She also questioned the density – the homes are much too close together. Mr. Matt Kelly asked for clarification on access from Knoell Rd. Mr. Halloran stated that there will be no new access from Knoell Rd. Mr. Kelly also noted that wells 5 & 6 did have a large impact on his well. He asks how the developer will compensate the existing homeowners when their wells run dry.

Mr. John Melville, 26 Brookside Dr., also questioned the density. The homes in the area are on 2-5 acre lots and these will be clustered in such a way that there may be as many as 12 houses on 2 acres. This does not fit in with the neighborhood. Mr. Bob Smith, 22 Brookside Dr. noted that the developer is not responsible for the possibility of making Brookside a thru road. The Planning Board is. The traffic studies say there will be no impact, but it is well know that the Village and County have a traffic problem. Therefore, Brookside will be made a thru street to solve these problems. There are more large projects coming to this area, which will cause even more impact. Everyone will use Brookside to get to the Park. Any decisions on thru roads should be made before these homes are sold as these people will also be impacted by this increase in traffic.

Mr. Scott Knapp, 56 Old Chester Rd. also expressed concern regarding traffic. He has seen an increase in the accidents in front of his home in the past year. Ms. Geri Corey questioned the number of new children coming in and that impact on

DRAFT - UNAPPROVED

Town of Goshen
Planning Board

July 20, 2006
Page-----9

the schools. Mr. Steve Brown agreed with Mr. Melville's comments. He also questions the concept of density. He questioned the proposed location for a sewage plant. It appears it will be near one of the wells. He also noted that the Town has not had great success with the water districts. In reference to the performance guarantee of 2-years from the completion of the project, Mr. Brown feels that time should be extended. He also questioned how the Board can approve the project if they plan to use the Village treatment plant, when that is not completed.

Ms. Maturana, 96 Old Chester Rd. emphasized that there are concerns with access for emergency vehicles. She asked for clarification of the location of the access off of Old Chester Rd. in relation to her driveway. She should come to the Building Inspector's Office to review the map in detail. Ms. Carol Quinn, 6 Florican Ln., also questioned the impact on the schools. If all of the proposed developments are built, and each unit has 2.3 children, where all of these children be schooled? Can the developer be required to contribute to the cost for a new school. Mr. Huddleston replied that this is not allowed in New York. Mr. Halloran explained that the school board has set up a committee to address the problem.

Mr. Huddleston reminded the public that the Planning Board can only administer the code and try to minimize the impacts. The possibility of 3,000 new homes is based on the owner's right to develop their land. Mr. Halloran stated that the Town Board has hired a firm to conduct a traffic study, to be completed by September. He also noted that a citizen had asked him if there was any plan to reduce the sharp turn on Knoell Rd. A solution is under consideration. Mr. Huddleston read a letter from Mr. Joseph Suresky, Brookside Dr. Mr. Suresky expressed concern regarding the water shortages in the area and the safety issues that would arise if Brookside Dr. becomes a thru street.

Mr. Cappello explained that the PB needs to review the alternative of hamlet design in regard to the density issue. This alternative needs to be discussed to see if the 30% bonus is appropriate. In regard to stormwater management, it would be preferable to have a water district. The Planner and the Engineer will submit their comments within a week. Ms. Cleaver and Ms. Israelski will also submit written comments. Ms. Cleaver also advised the applicant that §79-18 of the Town code requires stream testing in case they decide to construct a sewer treatment plant. The transcript will be provided within 10 days.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Mr. Bergus, seconded by Mr. Andrews the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby closes the Public Hearing on the DEIS noting that the public will have 10 days from today to submit written comments. Passed by a vote of 5 ayes to 1 nay.

DRAFT - UNAPPROVED

Town of Goshen
Planning Board

July 20, 2006
Page-----11

refuse to accept it. Mr. Golden stated that this project is just in the beginning of the process. We are at the point of deciding what studies need to be done. The applicant is not proposing either of these two roads. If the PB believes that they need to be built then the applicant will build them. Even if the Town does not accept the dedication, it may be possible to be done as a private road. He is not sure if this is an option and will research the possibility further.

Mr. Peacock noted that if all the developments before the Board plan for thru roads, then you would be able to mitigate at least a part of the traffic problem. Ms. Quinn stated that she does not feel that thru roads will help. Mr. Dan Mateo also asked for further clarification of the thru road issue. Mr. Golden will report back. There were no further comments from the public.

Mr. Bergus asked that the applicant discuss measures to deal with noise, storage of materials and equipment, phasing of the infrastructure and dust/dirt control during construction. Mr. Golden stated that Ms. Roth would begin to incorporate above concerns to a final scoping document. This document will be prepared as soon as possible. It should be complete by next Tuesday.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Ms. Israelski, seconded by Mr. Andrews, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby closes the Public Scoping Session for Hambletonian Park. Passed unanimously.

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

IV. AGENDA ITEMS

A & L Acres 13-1-34.2 - 217.8 acres, 49 lot subdivision 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

Mr. Esposito explained that this project is located on Route 17A. They are proposing the construction of 29 single-family homes with an average density of one home per 3.5 acres. There is a second portion consisting of 115 acres across the road. This is not part of this application, however the applicant did review the overall property when looking at the impacts. The plans are basically the same as previously presented. They have made some minor lot line changes. The access road is also the same.

DRAFT - UNAPPROVED

Town of Goshen
Planning Board

July 20, 2006
Page-----12

Mr. Cappello asked if there were any items of historical interest. Mr. esposito replied that thee is a small building, that is the property of the DAR, but it is not on this property. There is an adequate buffer provided. Mr. Halloran noted that the intersection of Houston and 17A is very bad and this project will impact this area further. Mr. Esposito noted that the applicant may be willing to consider turning lanes. The applicant is asking the Board to set a Public Hearing.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Ms. Israelski, seconded by Ms. Cleaver, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby sets a Public Hearing for the A&L application for the August 17, 2006 meeting. Passed unanimously.

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

Orleans / Makuen - 13-1-10.1 -87.05 acres, planned adult community located on Route 17A in the RU & CO zones with an AQ6 & scenic road corridor overlay.
Conservation Analysis

Present for the applicant: Steve Esposito
William Greigel
Kevin Makuen
Floyd Makuen

Mr. Esposito reported that the Conservation Analysis has been completed. The property is in the Commercial and RU zones. They could build 55 single-family homes. Sixty-five acres are not buildable. They are proposing a 210 unit PAC. The DOT has issued a permit for one access on Route 17A. There is also a possibility of connecting with Police Dr. The onsite wetlands have been delineated. Ms. Roth has prepared a draft conservation analysis. Mr. Halloran noted that you cannot see the rear of the property from Route 17A. There is a nice view of the Village. The center is similar to a bowl and is totally isolated. The members will do a site walk on their own. The Conservation Analysis will be reviewed further on August 3.

BMJB Enterprises, Inc. - 22-1-37.2, 17 acres, located on Pulaski Hwy, in the AI zone with an AQ3 overlay and scenic road corridor overlay. **Special use permit & site plan approval.**

Present for the applicant: Alan Lipman, Esq.

Mr. Golden is acting as Counsel to the Board for this project. Mr. Halloran explained that the original site plan showed multiple uses. The consultants have

DRAFT - UNAPPROVED

Town of Goshen
Planning Board

July 20, 2006
Page-----13

worked with the applicant to narrow the number of uses. The County DPW has replied that there is no issue with the existing access to Pulaski Highway. Mr. Huddleston asked the members if they are comfortable with the uses as now set forth. Yes they are.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Ms. Cleaver, seconded by Mr. Andrews, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby declares to be lead agency in regard to the BMJB Enterprises, Inc. application. Passed unanimously.

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

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Mr. Bergus, seconded by Ms. Israelski, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby declares the project known as BMJB Enterprises, Inc. to be an unlisted action under NY SEQRA. Passed unanimously.

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

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Mr. Andrews, seconded by Ms. Cleaver, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby declares that the project known as BMJB Enterprises, Inc. will not have a significant impact on the environment under NY SEQRA. Passed unanimously.

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

Ms. Israelski asked if the applicant could try to tidy the area as much as possible. Mr. Golden explained the various notes on the plan regarding the storage of agricultural and non-agricultural products and equipment. He noted that the storage containers are show in their actual locations on the plans.

VOTE By Proper MOTION, made by Mr. Lupinski, seconded by Mr. Bergus, the Planning Board of the Town of Goshen hereby grants preliminary and final approval to the application of BMJB Enterprises as presented on the plans dated. Passed unanimously.

DRAFT - UNAPPROVED

Town of Goshen
Planning Board

July 20, 2006
Page-----14

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

V. Upcoming Public Hearing scheduled for August 3, 2006

Nextel Communications - 11-1-45 - 18.1+/- acres located at 338 Harriman Drive in the RU zone with an AQ6, AQ3, and stream & reservoir overlays. **Special use permit for an extension of existing cell tower.**

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 11:15 pm upon motion made by Mr. Andrews, seconded by Ms. Cleaver.

Ralph Huddleston
Chairman

Notes prepared by Linda P. Doolittle