

**VILLAGE OF GOSHEN
PLANNING BOARD
Work Session/Regular Meeting**

The work session/regular meeting of the Village of Goshen Planning Board was called to order at 7:30 p.m. on Tuesday, July 22, 2014.

Present: Augustine DeRosa
Rebecca Lafargue
Elaine McClung
Scott Wohl, Chair
Michael Torelli

Also Present: Michael A. Donnelly, PB Attorney
Art Tully, PB Engineer
Ted Lewis, Village Building Inspector

Approval of Minutes

The Minutes of the Planning Board Meeting of June 24, 2014 were approved.

**Murphy Subdivision #124-2-2 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and (16 road subject of request),
Horseshoe Court, R-1 Zone.**

Representing the applicant: Frank Nutt, Owner

Mr. Nutt told the PB that financial arrangements have been made to enable him to move on with the Murphy Subdivision that was started several years ago. The subdivision as approved by the PB years ago included a sidewalk extending down Scotchtown Avenue to the baseball field, he said. However, Mr. Nutt said he was notified that there are fiber optic lines and water lines underneath what would be the sidewalk that didn't show up in the original subdivision application and so he is requesting that he be allowed to exclude the sidewalk. Mr. Nutt said he would be willing to financially compensate the Village instead. Mr. Nutt said he believes that creating another sidewalk entrance, which will not have a cross walk, will confuse the elementary and middle school kids that walk up to the elementary or high school.

Mr. Nutt said that there are internal sidewalks in the five lot subdivision. He said there are no sidewalks on Scotchtown Ave. running along the other side of the subdivision.

Mr. Nutt said he met with Village Trustee Chris Gurda who said he doesn't want more sidewalk to shovel. He said he was also told that the junction pool cannot be closed or encased in anything. He said that the Goshen School Superintendent of Grounds told him not to dig on top of this. Mr. Nutt said it is impossible to put a sidewalk there as per the plans and that he doesn't believe the sidewalk is necessary.

Mr. Wohl pointed out that the sidewalk was necessary at the time because the PB made it a condition of approval. He told the applicant that if the schools don't want it, the PB will need to see their objection in writing.

Mr. Tully said that he has to look at the engineering and the junction pool. He said that because it can't be built as per the plans, the applicant will have to come up with an alternative design that works as far as the utilities and drainage are concerned. He said this issue will have to be resolved before the PB can decide whether the sidewalk will be placed there or not.

Ms. McClung summed it up for the applicant telling him that there are now two issues; the drainage/junction pool/utilities and the sidewalk. She said that the connectivity of the sidewalks in the Village has been a goal for some time.

Mr. Wohl told the applicant that the PB needs to review it and get more background. Mr. Nutt said he is ready to move forward and wants to get the issues taken care of.

Referral for review from Village Board regarding rezoning petition from Red Maple Holdings, #110-4-1, off Fletcher Street, R-1 Zone.

Representing Red Maple Holdings: Steve Esposito
Frank Haghi, Principal

Mr. Esposito said that the applicant has petitioned the Village Board for a zoning map amendment for the 20.9 acre parcel from R-1 (Residential Single Family) to R-3 (Residential Multi-Family). The property was subdivided in 2001, he said.

Mr. Esposito said that given the current market the applicant has looked at alternatives for developing the parcel in a way other than for single family homes. He said that based on national and local trends there is a large demand for rental or alternative housing, rather than single-family, and he believes the request is consistent with the market and current trends. Mr. Esposito said that the Village has the infrastructure and that within 2.5 miles from the site there will be 900+ new jobs through Amy's Kitchen and Kikkerfrosch. He said that the housing market will respond to the energy that is being put to economic development in the area.

Mr. Esposito said that R-3 is "low density multi-family." He said that deducting wetlands and slopes, there is 14.7 acres of developable land and that if the applicant built all one-bedroom units there could be 80 units, all two-bedroom units could result in 60 units and all three-bedroom units could result in 39 units. He added that there could be any combination of all three. He said that the applicant is not asking to annex any land, in or out, of the Village.

Ms. McClung said she agrees with the need for multi-family housing, but stated that the Village doesn't have a comprehensive plan, only an "old" zoning code. She said she believes the Village needs to study where multiple family housing should be put on available land and said she hopes the Village will invest the time and resources needed to produce a comprehensive plan. She said she doesn't necessarily think that this site is the proper site for multi-family.

Mr. Donnelly said that the petition is for a map change and that the Village Board has asked for comment by the PB. According to the zoning code there are five factors for the PB to report on. The PB discussed the five factors. In response to the first factor, whether the uses permitted by the proposed change would be appropriate in the area concerned, Ms. McClung and Mr. DeRosa said they were not sure this is the place for it. Ms. McClung said it is hard to answer without having a comprehensive plan for the Village. Mr. Wohl said he thinks this is the factor that is going to be the obstacle. Mr. Donnelly said that it will be proper to report back to the Village Board that there are a mix of sentiments about this factor.

The other four factors were discussed: whether adequate public school facilities and other public services exist or can be created to serve the needs of any additional residence likely to be constructed as a result of the change; whether the proposed change is in accord with any existing or proposed plans in the vicinity; the effect of the proposed amendment upon the growth of the village as envisaged by the comprehensive development plan and whether the proposed amendment is likely to result in an increase or decrease in the total zoned residential capacity of the village and the probable effect.

Mr. Tully said that the biggest issues from the engineering perspective will be the grading and drainage because of the topography of the property itself with its steep slopes. He said that where the applicant wants to put the first three structures is where it will have the greatest impact to the nearby single-family homes.

Mr. Wohl stated that without a comprehensive plan or a specific concept for that part of the Village, it is difficult to weigh in as to what impact it will have on the Village.

Mr. Donnelly said he will write a letter to the Village Board outlining the PB's concerns. The letter will first be sent to PB members.

Comment Letter from OC Department of Planning. Re: Kikkerfrosch

Mr. Wohl acknowledged receipt of a comment letter from the Orange County Planning Department on the application of Kikkerfrosch which simply stated that this is a matter of “local determination.”

The PB noted that they have the lead agency status on the application but that the PB’s role will be delayed until the Village Board decides the subdivision and zoning issues.

The Village of Goshen Planning Board adjourned at 8:50 pm.

Scott Wohl, Chair
Notes prepared by Susan Varden