

**VILLAGE OF GOSHEN
PLANNING BOARD
Work Session/Regular Meeting
April 24, 2012**

The work session/regular meeting of the Village of Goshen Planning Board was called to order at 7:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 24, 2012 by Chair Jerome O'Donnell.

Present: Augustine DeRosa
Rebecca Lafargue
Elaine McClung
Jerome O'Donnell

Absent: Dominick Igneri

Also Present: Art Tully, P.B. Engineer
Ted Lewis, Building Inspector
Mike Donnelly, Esq. PB Attorney

Horizon Land Development, LLC, Hatfield Lane, #122-1-4.22, I-P zone, Minor changes to re-approved site plan

Representing the applicant: Steve Esposito

Mr. Esposito said that the applicant was before the PB in February to request a reinstatement of the site plan approval granted the application of Horizon Land Development. The PB granted the approval and now the applicant is asking for a minor change in the site plan to include a covered main entrance so clients can be dropped off and be protected from the elements. It will be the same building, same size, same location but with a covered walkway and with a slight reconfiguration of the parking area to address the covered entry, Mr. Esposito said. He added that the new configuration will pick up two additional handicapped parking spaces.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Ms. Lafargue, seconded by Mr. DeRosa, the Village of Goshen Planning Board approves the minor change of a covered walkway to the approved site plan of Horizon Land Development, LLC. Passed unanimously.

High Point Estates, Phillipsburg Road, #110-4-11.2, R-R zone

Representing the applicant: Steve Esposito

Mr. Esposito said the application is for a residential subdivision in the RR zone, located at the top of North Church Street and was before the PB a few months ago. He said he is appearing before the PB to show four alternative layouts. Mr. Tully said he has looked at the first three layouts and has discussed the possibility of the fourth alternative.

All of the four alternative layouts were discussed highlighting their positives and negatives. The first alternative had been before the PB last fall but while on site the idea worked well, the site distances were below what they should be, Mr. Esposito said. Some profiles were done on the road grades and Mr. Esposito said it was determined that some of the alternatives were not economically viable. The most viable alternative, he said, is Alternative #3 which has 19 lots, of which 17 are accessed off a proposed cul-de-sac and two lots use a combined driveway and access off North Church Street. Alternative #3 has one entrance off of North Church Street and will require Planning Board waiver for the length of the cul-de-sac which is estimated to be 1200 feet while 400 ft. is the maximum allowed. There is adequate site distance for the proposed cul-de-sac to the north and off-site improvements will be required to achieve adequate site distance to the south. The proposed driveways have adequate site distance both north and south, he said. He said Alternative #3 is the one that topographically works the best. The site has a lot of shale and some steep slopes.

Mr. DeRosa asked if there is a way it can be laid out without having the two lots access off North Church St. Mr. Esposito said it might be possible and he will look at reconfiguring and possibly clustering the two lots.

Mr. Tully said he believes the PB needs more information on all of the plans and that they must be looked at in more detail. He said it is the first time he has looked at the profiles. Research needs to be done on the offsite improvements that are necessary to get the site distance required for the intersection. The purpose is to show that there has been a lot of thought put into this over the last month and now we need to evaluate what is the best, he said. There is a public component as well, there are neighbors fairly close and that may have some impact on the PB's leaning, Mr. Tully said, adding that public comment might be helpful. "You don't want to spend a lot of time on the plan and find it is a difficult plan for the neighbors to accept." Mr. Tully concluded however, that the site itself is directing what is the best way to develop the property. He said that more time should be spent analyzing Alternative #3.

Mr. Esposito said he would like to be able to maintain the tree line buffer along North Church St.

Mr. DeRosa and Ms. McClung spoke about sidewalks. Mr. DeRosa said sidewalks are needed on the other side of North Church Street connecting Windsor Terrace.

90 Main Street, (former Cataract fire station) #109-3-7, C-S/ADD

Representing the applicant: Applicant Ray Quattrini

Mr. Quattrini said the site plan for renovation of the property was approved in 2008 with a final completion date of 2010 which lapsed without work being done, due to the economy. He would like a reinstatement of the same approval. The site plan is exactly as what was approved in 2008, he said.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Mr. DeRosa, seconded by Ms. McClung, the Village of Goshen Planning Board re-approves the site plan of Ray Quattrini at 90 Main Street, with a new completion date of April 24, 2015, and including the same conditions as were in its original approval. Passed unanimously.

Knolls of Goshen #104-2-40 & 41 - Six month extension of preliminary approval

A letter from Pietrzak & Pfau asking for a six month extension was noted.

Mr. Tully said he had some engineering questions that were expressed to the applicant. He said he met with the applicant's attorney James Sweeney and is waiting to hear back. Mr. Tully said that there are issues with the road design, which is not compliant with village road specifications, and that he wants the applicant to submit a revised drawing. Mr. Tully said the PB wants to get the plans to the point where they are approvable. If the PB grants an extension Mr. Tully would like to see a proviso that the applicant submit something to the Village engineer within the next two months.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Mr. DeRosa, seconded by Ms. Lafargue, the Village of Goshen Planning Board grants a 3 month extension to July 25, 2012 on the preliminary approval given the Knolls of Goshen application. Passed unanimously.

Heritage Estates #112-5-4.2 - Sidewalks -Letter from Peter Botti, Esq.

Representing the applicant: James Dillin

Mr. Dillin said that about four months ago the applicant had requested a change to the curbing material and also asked about not putting in sidewalks. The PB approved the curbing material change. It was changed to concrete curbing, he said. The VB was

studying the sidewalk issue in general at the time, he said, so there was no answer. Mr. Dillin said the applicant is now getting close to needing to know whether the sidewalks are going to go in. He said that in the Still Acres subdivision off South St. there is no curbing and no sidewalks.

Mr. Tully said it would be helpful to look at where the sidewalks would be and where they would go. PB members indicated that they have looked at the site in regard to the sidewalk issue. Mr. DeRosa said it would be a “sidewalk to nowhere” on this specific project.

Mr. Donnelly suggested figuring out the cost of putting sidewalks in so that an amount will be known if the Village Board decides to take a monetary contribution and put it into a fund for building other sidewalks, rather than building sidewalks in this subdivision.

Mr. Tully said the developer’s agreement gives the Village the ability to take the money without immediately figuring out where it will be spent.

VOTE BY PROPER MOTION, made by Ms. McClung, seconded by Ms. Lafargue, the Village of Goshen Planning Board determines that the applicant will not need to build sidewalks provided they reach a satisfactory agreement with the Village Board on a contribution to a sidewalk fund that the Village can use to place sidewalks where it deems is most appropriate. Passed unanimously.

MINUTES - PB members approved the minutes of its March 20, 2012 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT - The Village of Goshen Planning Board meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Jerome O’Donnell, Chair
Notes prepared by Susan Varden