

Village of Walden  
Planning Board Meeting  
June 15, 2020

Chairman:	Stan Plato	Present
Members:	Jay Wilkins	Present
	Lisa Dore	Present
	Jason Trafton	Present
	Zac Pearson	Present
Alternate:	John Thompson	Present
		Absent
Building Inspector:	Dean Stickles	Present
Village Attorney:	Robert Dickover	Present
Village Engineer:	John Queenan	Present
Secretary:	Marisa Kraus	Present

---

Chairman Plato - Called the meeting to order at 6:00pm.

**1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**2. BOARD BUSINESS**

**A. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**Falcon Rest, Site Plan/Special Exception Use, Conceptual**

**Attorney Dickover:** The current Governor's executive order that provides for a video conference board meetings will expire on July 6th. Until we see what the Governor might do in that respect, we are still meeting by video conference.

**Chairman Plato:** In a normal meeting, if we had a public hearing, generally, we get very few people from the public anyways and I would be surprised if we get any this way. And it's just doesn't seem like we're doing the community a service by holding a public hearing this way, where they can't see a presentation of what's being done.

**Member Pearson:** I agree with you. Being able to show plans, explain things, a verbal presentation is one thing, but to really understand it, I feel like you need to see it as well.

**Chairman Plato:** This is one of the biggest projects the Village has had. It just doesn't seem right to me. I would like a motion to hold this over until the next meeting.

**Larry Marshall:** Excuse me, but you haven't even held the public hearing yet. This is a legal meeting in terms of the executive order of the New York State Governor. No comments have been presented. In regards to the ability to review plans, we have the ability to show the plans on our screen. I have all of the submitted documents, the site plan, building renderings. In terms of visibility, I don't agree with the board's determination that this is less accessible than any other forum.

**Chairman Plato:** First of all the board didn't make that statement. I did.

**Larry Marshall:** But you're asking for a second on extending a public hearing for a public hearing that hasn't even been opened yet.

**Chairman Plato:** There is no one from the public, apparently even on Facebook, to do this. I think it's kind of presumptuous even in this that somebody has to be on Facebook to be part of this meeting. I don't have a Facebook account. So, if I was in the public, I couldn't be in this meeting.

**Larry Marshall:** That's not true. Just as the same as you were able to create a Zoom account to attend this meeting, you're able to create a Facebook account. These are free services that are provided that are easily downloaded. If a board wishes to hold public comment open for written comment, I've seen that

Village of Walden  
Planning Board Meeting  
June 15, 2020

done with other municipalities. But to automatically extend the public hearing, that hasn't even been opened yet, I don't understand it.

**Attorney Dickover:** For the record, I am monitoring the Facebook page as we're speaking. There are a number of people who have logged into the chat feature. I'm sure they're monitoring this meeting, watching the Facebook page. Before there's a motion to extend this hearing, we need to open it. It was advertised to be held this evening and so the appropriate procedure would be to have a motion and it needs to be by roll-call vote to open this meeting. Because the applicant's representative is here and I see the applicant is also present here, I think it would be appropriate for the board to hear from them because we also have members from the public listening in now and watching. Then after going through that, if you and the board decide that you want to continue the public hearing, that would be then appropriate motion. My suggestion is simply, if the board is ready to make a motion to open the public hearing, they'll need a second and then take a roll-call vote on that, please. Hear from the applicant. See if we get any comments from the public. If we do, the board certainly would take them into consideration. Remember, this is not a question and answer period for the public. It's simply for them to have their input. Then if the board thinks it's appropriate, a motion to continue the public hearing would be then in order.

Member Pearson made a motion to open the public hearing. Seconded by Member Dore. All ayes. Motion carried.

**Member Thompson:** Dean, any time prior to this Zoom meeting, as anybody from the areas that would be affected in these developments, have they called up and complained or stopped by your office and complained that they wouldn't be able to have the technology or get on Facebook to observe this meeting and make public comment?

**Building Inspector Stickles:** I had one gentleman in the office today who lives on Liberty Street and has no knowledge about getting on Zoom or Facebook. But I did tell him that he could submit whether he was for or against and the board would take it into consideration.

**Larry Marshall:** This application is for the development of a senior housing complex on the westerly side of NYS Route 52 or North Montgomery Street. It's basically the vacant parcel, it has a small house on it, but primarily vacant parcel located between Liberty Street and the mobile home park. The applicant is proposing to construct a 3 story building that will have a total of 23 apartments on it per floor for a total of 69 apartments. 68 of those would be rented out to senior citizens. The last apartment would be a caretaker's unit. The existing house that's on the property. Would be converted into an office and the existing garage that's on the property would be converted into a maintenance shed, primarily consistent with what it's used for now. Access to the site would be located directly across the street from the existing entrance to another multifamily residence on the easterly side of North Montgomery Street. I would go travel into the site up the hill and then the building is an L shaped building that we're partially cutting into the hill to construct and then partially filling to balance that site out. The applicant has provided a building rendering to demonstrate what the building would look like. As the applicant has proposed it as a culture stone bottom with a clapboard siding, small outdoor areas for each of the residences, whether it be a porch on the second and third floors or a ground level patio area. What is missing from this is the sidewalk that would be along this proposed along North Montgomery Street trees. We've prepared a full set of plans for this including a full landscaping plan. We've shown all the large trees that would remain along the south property line in addition to supplementing them with evergreen roe that would surround the limits of disturbance on the south, the west, the north and a majority of the east sides of the building. The access drive is proposed to be planted with street tree look. Trees every 40 feet and then we would continue that down along North Montgomery Street on the west side of the proposed driveway. We have also prepared a lighting plan for this facility, making sure that none of the light spills over onto adjoining properties. All the light fixtures proposed are \*inaudible\* mounted, but they are full cut off fixtures to prevent any glare or light spill over onto adjoining properties. The rendering from the inside of the L. It's more of the public view from if you're driving up. But if you drive into the facility around the sides of the building and get to the main parking area toward the main entrance of the building, this is towards the

Village of Walden  
Planning Board Meeting  
June 15, 2020

north end of that, looking towards the south. Again, it demonstrates to what would be proposed on this side. The finishes are consistent with the other sides of the building. I'm trying to follow along with some of the Facebook comments. Here's a question from Jojo Med, "Is this apartment complex?" It is a senior housing apartment building, yes. Age restricted. Regarding the Fire Department comments, \*inaudible\* the plans to address those, I think the only comment that is outstanding is we need to get the standard details from John Queenan. We had asked for the standard details the Village uses for the installation of fire hydrants. That, I think, is the only outstanding comment, to my recollection. That's a primarily a technical detail in terms of access and ability for the truck to turn through the facility. We've provided the truck turned diagrams for the board's consideration and we'll be happy to change any technical details in terms of which fire hydrants the fire department would like to see in any subsequent submissions. We just need to receive what exactly the standard Village details so that we can incorporate them into our plans.

**Engineer Queenan:** Larry, if I may follow up on that, your plan does have the correct detail on it. I went over that with Public Works. The other one, I think the fire department's concerned about at the time of the plans, you weren't proposing any hydrants on site, which now you are proposing, 2 or 3 additional hydrants.

**Larry Marshall:** There is an existing hydrant on the site. It's been there for quite some time. That will be removed and then in its place, we are proposing to have 2 additional hydrants. 1 near the entrance to the facility and then the other hydrant would be located on basically the opposing side on the extreme north end of the facility. This would supplement the existing hydrant that is on the south side of the proposed entrance. There's a hydrant already there. So, there would be 3 hydrants serving the facility. Obviously, the size and nature of the construction, this building would contain a sprinkler system, a fire suppression system consistent with the New York State building code.

**Chairman Plato:** On the building rendering, I noticed the cars are actual cars. Does this building exist somewhere?

**Louis Donnelly:** No. It was designed as it is because we have height limitations. I thought it was a nice looking building.

**Larry Marshall:** Those are just inserted by the architect. They prove they're realistic rendering.

**Attorney Dickover:** I'm looking at the submissions from public on the chat, someone is asking, "what will I be looking at when I look out my back window?"

**Larry Marshall:** I do apologize, I don't have the visual analysis that we completed for the site available, but I believe that Annetta Langlitz commented lives here \*referred to Liberty St on screen photo\*. We are keeping the large the individual tree here or all the trees that are 12 inches in diameter or larger that is to remain. The tree line that's shown here is the proposed tree line that will remain. Regarding the back of her property, I would approximate that at the widest area, which is her back left corner, if you're standing on Liberty Street, approximately about 30 feet of the existing vegetation remain at the nearest corner, which would be her back right corner for proposed disturbance. That would be approximately 15 feet. In order to further screen the building from any of the rear yards here, we are supplementing that back area with a row of pine trees. That row of pine trees continues around the entire perimeter. Then it picks up on the north side of the access driveway as well. Again, you're looking through approximately 30 feet of existing vegetation and then the row pine trees if you're standing on the back corner of the Langlitz property.

**Louis Donnelly:** And you'd be looking up at the trees as well. The trees would screen even more because her house is even lower.

**Member Pearson:** You guys did all the work for the visuals and we had studied all those sections, you guys don't have any access to that right now?

Village of Walden  
Planning Board Meeting  
June 15, 2020

**Larry Marshall:** As we talk, I can log into my machine at work and see if I can get it back in time to demonstrate that.

**Member Pearson:** I think we have been talking about visuals for a long time. I think it's important for the people to understand the work that you guys have done to date.

**Larry Marshall:** Give me a minute and as we go through any other any additional comments from the board or the public, I'll continue to work on it and see if I can get access.

**Chairman Plato:** From her property line, is that going to be grass or brush?

**Louis Donnelly:** We have a limited disturbance there and there's probably a 30 foot buffer of untouched vegetation that's going to be there from where we're disturbing anything. It's a pretty big space between the property line and what we're disturbing of natural vegetation.

**Chairman Plato:** I know you want to make the property as nice as possible. Do you think just keeping it natural is good?

**Louis Donnelly:** I don't want to cut it clear to someone's backyard. It's a double edged sword. People want to see the natural vegetation, because you're not going to really be able to see the building from those homes as you go up the road. There's so much vegetation the back that it's not being touched. What we're doing, I think with all the pine trees is really overkill. When we flew with the balloons, you couldn't even see them and we waited all that time for the leaves to come off the trees. You really couldn't even see them. That's with no leaves on the trees. So, when the vegetation blooms in, leaves on the trees, 8-9 months out of the year, you're not going to see anything. In the wintertime, you may be able to make it out through the through the trees, but there's so much natural stuff that's going to be there. I don't know, would people rather see a lawn? I'm going to maintain the edge and have a nice defined edge with landscape with grass. But at some point I think it would be better to just leave it natural so that people that live there is going to look at the back yard and it's not going to look any different.

**Larry Marshall:** The common property line between the 2 properties and the limits of disturbance that will remain as loose and natural as it currently is. It'll be woods probably with some leaves and forest litter. Then after that, that's when Lou will have a manicured supplemented with the landscaping that's proposed on the site plan.

**Attorney Dickover:** We have additional comments, "is this where the trailer park is?". I think the answer to that question is no. That's a different location in the Village.

**Larry Marshall:** This property is immediately south of the trailer park.

**Attorney Dickover:** The other comment is back from our fire fighter saying that "we still need the information requested in our letter. We have received nothing requested. The additional hydrants are welcome. However, they should be located best use for our operations, which we still need the requested interior layouts, sprinkler system locations, standpipe locations, et cetera, to determine that." It sounds like they're still looking for some additional information, either from John Queenan or from Mr. Marshall.

**Larry Marshall:** That's not a problem. We have no issue sending that information over. I do apologize that it wasn't sent over. The Village had coordinated submission of that in the past. I assume that that was forwarded. But we can certainly coordinate that with them. We just got the interior layouts. In terms of the sprinkler system locations and the standpipes, \*inaudible\* we have no intention to get to that level until a building permit is applied for. We can provide the interior layouts, but actually, the full design of the sprinkler system interior to the building, that's building level detail. That's typically not provided at this

Village of Walden  
Planning Board Meeting  
June 15, 2020

time. We can provide any additional information that we have available that is typical of a site plan. But I'm not sure if we can provide that specifically.

**Attorney Dickover:** The same commenter is saying you can submit the information to an email address [chiefs@waldenfd.org](mailto:chiefs@waldenfd.org).

**Larry Marshall:** Not a problem. I can send out all the links to the updated site plan and information tomorrow.

**Louis Donnelly:** All of the fire suppression system would be designed by fire suppression apparatus. They design to the building for code. So, whatever the code requires, they'll design to the code.

**Attorney Dickover:** \*Referring to photographs\* each of these dots here is a photograph location where we've taken photographs of the balloons, where we flew them in an attempt to see them from Liberty Street. We provided 2 different photographs of each location. One is a standard photograph and then the second is a red enhanced photograph. This is photograph, you can kind of see through the backyard of the Langlitz property up towards the site. We flew approximately 5 foot diameter balloons at the full height of the building. Based upon the existing vegetation that was seen at the time. There's no red. \*referring to another photograph\* this is in between the Langlitz property and her neighbor to the west. You can see the red that's enhanced and that would be the top corner of the building in terms of where it is physically on the property as well as overall height. As I stated, approximately 30 feet of the existing vegetation in between the 2 parcels would remain. Then it would be supplemented by a row of pine trees around the edge of disturbance.

**Louis Donnelly:** You might want to mention, because the public hasn't really been to the site, that the building is actually sunk down into the ground because of the pit. It's an old gravel bank.

**Larry Marshall:** The property as it stands now, especially behind the Cahill residence and the Entrary residents, you can see the topography reaches a berm in between those properties before it falls back down into the facility where the old gravel mine was. We're further dropping the site down where the finish for elevation is at 531.69 on the site. The berm in between the Entrary and the Cahill properties is as high as 548. So, we're about 17 feet lower in elevation than that berm. Behind the Bernard property, we're about even. But again, that area will be supplemented with some landscaping. The applicant has elected to maintain a larger buffer at the board's request to limit the amount of disturbance along that property line. He's proposed to install a small retaining wall. What that does is it just limits the amount of grading that would be necessary to get down to the parking lot level.

**Attorney Dickover:** I don't see any additional public comment.

**Chairman Plato:** How many people actually logged on to the meeting?

**Larry Marshall:** The Facebook page currently has 23 people watching.

**Chairman Plato:** That's a fair number.

**Louis Donnelly:** Maybe could speak to the public, we all know the lack of housing there is for seniors in our area and our community. Every facility in the county has at least a 3 month waiting list. Most have a year. Not only that, I think it would be very beneficial for the Village to have something like this. That's not going to have any impact to the community other than bringing people. It will be done very peacefully and I think it'll be a big asset to the community.

**Chairman Plato:** If we close the public portion of the hearing, can we reopen that if there's a need? Also this is for the special exception use. Not the final site plan approval.

Village of Walden  
Planning Board Meeting  
June 15, 2020

**Attorney Dickover:** This public hearing is on both. The special exception use requires a public hearing, your site plan applications, it's optional. This is a hearing on both. You can close the public hearing and what would come from that is if public comment was received after you close, then you'd have to make a motion to reopen the public hearing. In fact, republish notice and re-mail it because you're reopening something that wasn't noticed and then you reconvene it that way. My suggestion, we announce this evening that if the public wants to submit written comment that the board would receive written comment for perhaps 20 days after tonight's meeting. So that board would have it in time to consider it and that the public hearing be held open for 1 month, see what written comment might be received. If there is none and no further comment from board members, perhaps then a motion to close the public hearing would be in order.

**Chairman Plato:** I think that's a reasonable approach.

**Member Pearson:** I would make that motion to hold public hearing open. Give people a chance to get their comments in and see the plans. It's probably a little hard to see on computer screens if they're even watching at all.

**Attorney Dickover:** 3 additional comments, One is a person asking whether an environmental impact statement was done on this project. The answer to that is no. An EIS was not provided for and the board has resolved to issue a Negative Declaration with respect to its environmental determination. The other question is, "Is this assisted living or 55 plus?"

**Louis Donnelly:** Yes, it's 55 and older. It's not assisted living.

**Attorney Dickover:** Next question is, "are there plans to develop the Route 52 side of the entry road?"

**Louis Donnelly:** No. With what you see on this site plan is what we're proposing and that's all we plan to develop.

**Attorney Dickover:** We provided sidewalks along the Route 52 to side of the property, extending from the extreme north side of the property down to the extreme south side, the proposed entrance would be curbed with the appropriate drainage improvements. Obviously, we do still have to comply with DOT regulations and we're working with DOT on their comments and questions. So, any improvements within the right away would be mandated by DOT. We have not received final approval from them, nor did we expect to at this point. Any modifications or alterations would be subject to their rules. The board did complete an environmental review. That's part of the SEQR and reviewing all the aspects, environmental impacts of this. But they just did not issue a Positive Declaration which would have dictated a draft environmental impact statement. But an environmental review was completed and a Negative Declaration was declared.

**Attorney Dickover:** Someone is whether children will be allowed to reside in this complex.

**Louis Donnelly:** I can't by law tell someone they can't bring a child. I don't know how many people have children that are 55 and older. I certainly can't mandate nor can the Village, because it's against the law. Would be discrimination. I don't foresee a lot of children being there, but I certainly can't guarantee you that there won't be any.

**Attorney Dickover:** Because we don't know what the governor is going to do with respect to extending the time for these video conferences, my suggestion is to hold the meeting open until the next meeting of the board. Whatever date that might be. There would be a notice on the Village with respect to the meeting, there is also be a posting of the notice of the public meeting and that's how the public would find out whether it be by video conference or in person.



Village of Walden  
Planning Board Meeting  
June 15, 2020

Member Pearson made a motion to hold the public hearing open until the next meeting. Seconded by Member Dore. All ayes. Motion carried.

**Larry Marshall:** There was some there was additional questions on Facebook regarding the number of parking spaces being proposed, as required by the Village Code, there are 72.7 parking spaces required for the proposed development. We have a total of 97 proposed. We will continue to work with the outside agencies, DOT as well as the Fire Department. Get them over information. We welcome any additional comments from them and we'll, of course, copy the board with any of the any of the submitted documents or correspondence from the same. We look forward to seeing you on the 20th.

**30 Sherman Avenue, Site Plan/Special Exception Use**

**Tom Olley:** The applicant, 30 Sherman Avenue, LLC, is proposing to restore the previous types of uses that were at the former Cloyd Howard Propane site. As far as offices and retail in the front, they would continue to use the existing block garage as a warehouse and they would like to expand at that warehouse with a 2000 square foot addition that would be located to the rear of the existing block garage and would involve the removal of the existing loading dock portion of the shed at the rear of the garage and would occupy about the same footprint as is there now. The existing 2 story building and the 1 story addition to it, that was formerly used for the offices and retail area of the Cloyd Howard business, the intention is to have that available for retail and or office uses. There are no tenants identified at this point, but they would like to get that back on the market. The remainder of the property would be used for warehouse for appliances.

**Engineer Queenan:** All of our prior comments have been addressed with the latest submission.

**Chairman Plato:** 1 of the things we talked about was the paving of the gravel area. Any comments on that?

**Tom Olley:** I spoke with my client and we agreed that we would pave that area and they plan to resubmit it to show the car parking to be paved with the aisles behind it. The bulk of the lot will still remain gravel where the truck loading is, but those parking spaces will be will be paved.

**Chairman Plato:** Lightning plan.

**Tom Olley:** Yes. In that plan, we also submitted what I would describe as residential scale fixtures or a foresighted colonial lamp on a 12 foot pole with LED full cut off. We would have 3 of them located along the eastern side of the driveway and those parking spaces. They would have house side shields on the east side so that they wouldn't shine on that 1 residential property that's on the corner of Union and Sherman.

**Engineer Queenan:** 1 other thing I'd like to add, if the applicant could just add some screening shrubs along that eastern property line. Just to block car headlights from going into that residence.

**Tom Olley:** We will do that.

**Attorney Dickover:** We still need a motion and call the question on opening the public hearing. I don't think we've done that yet.

Member Pearson made a motion to open public hearing. Seconded by Member Dore. All ayes. Motion carried.

**Attorney Dickover:** No one has logged on the Facebook page on this particular application. I would just like to note that for the board and I don't know what the applicant's position is on this, but in the previous site plan applications in this particular zoning district, the board has imposed 2 conditions that were specific conditions. They both deal with trucks and truck traffic. The first one was that truck traffic into and

Village of Walden  
Planning Board Meeting  
June 15, 2020

out of the projects site should be limited to the hours between 6:00 in the morning and 7:00 p.m. That's a limitation of truck traffic. I don't know that it's applicable to this. So, the applicant might want to speak to that. The second truck item was that no trucks shall be allowed to idle on the site for a period of time in excess of 15 minutes. I think both of those were being sensitive to surrounding residential properties, but perhaps even the commercial users as well.

**Chairman Plato:** Years ago, we used to put a time restraints on hours of operation and then my understanding was that we could not do that anymore. So how is this any different?

**Attorney Dickover:** Good question. Clearly, hours of operation is a touchy topic. The standard advice that this board has received as well as other boards is to try and stay away from it and you have. Truck traffic, on the other hand, goes to the noise that emanates from trucks that are idling. It goes to the traffic impacts and the surrounding streets and users. It's really a different topic than hours of operation. That's why I'm asking the applicant what their position would be with respect to this. If the board needs to make a hard determination, you could. But, if the applicant is willing to abide by that condition, I don't think there's any problem in asking them to do so and having their consent to do it voluntarily. I see a note, if we have blueprints of what this would look like at 30 Sherman Avenue? I don't know if you can pull those up, Mr. Olley.

**Tom Olley:** 1 with regard to the idling, there is a state law that is enforceable by the PD actually on truck idling. The hours of operation that falls generally within the same hours that the owners other business operates in and we don't see that that's a restriction that would have any great impact. They don't have a lot of truck traffic. There would be probably once, twice a week delivery of new merchandise to the warehouse.

**Chairman Plato:** If that was more like 8 a.m., would that impact them?

**Tom Olley:** 8, may. There may be people in there at 7:00 a.m. getting the trucks loaded up to go out for their day.

**Chairman Plato:** What about 7:00 a.m. instead of 6:00 a.m.?

**Tom Olley:** That is probably a reasonable compromise.

**Chairman Plato:** Without seeing the plan, without the public having it, I don't know the impact on the residential.

**Tom Olley:** \*Referenced to plan\* this is a 1 story portion of the building that was used for the dispatch and retail at Cloyd Howard. The 2 story portion is where the offices were located. The second floor is unfinished and would not be used for offices. It would be storage. No products or no warehousing. The existing 1 story garage is located along the westerly property line. The grayed in area is what we're proposing for the addition. This line work in this area are the existing loading docks. There's an overhead door and shed roof right in here. That would also be removed. We would go back to the end of the existing loading dock squared off and have the 2000 square foot warehouse right there. The light poles that we proposed are shown here on the plan with call outs for the LED type luminaire full cut off and they would be located in 3 locations right here. We would use the existing gated entrance that is there for either onsite parking or for truck deliveries. We would have a loading dock or a loading area. It would be partially raised floor in here to accommodate the loading dock.

**Attorney Dickover:** I don't see any other questions being put up. The blueprints are available for inspection at the Building Department during regular hours. Dean, unless you're having people make appointments for that during the COVID restrictions.



Village of Walden  
Planning Board Meeting  
June 15, 2020

**Building Inspector Stickles:** What they would have to do is contact the office and make an appointment and we'll make the plans available for them.

**Attorney Dickover:** Whether you want to close the public hearing or make an announcement that written comments would be received for perhaps the next 20 days and hold the meeting open to the next meeting of the board for review of any of those comments. You could close it this evening if the board was so inclined or you could continue it. Mr. Olley, I think has 1 change that was mentioned earlier to show some additional screening along the easterly side of the property. I'm not suggesting that that amendment should require holding the public hearing open. That could be a condition to a resolution of the board were inclined to close the meeting.

**Chairman Plato:** I would tend to tend to think that we should, almost a precedent has been set with a previous applicant that we should do treat this the same way.

**Attorney Dickover:** Every case gets handled on its own merits. I don't think a precedent's been set one way or the other, although I understand your comment. There's been less comment on this one than the other.

**Member Thompson:** I think we should close the meeting. I don't think we should extend it.

**Member Dore:** I agree. I think we can move forward and closed the hearing.

**Member Pearson:** I agree. This is pretty straightforward.

Member Thompson made a motion to close public hearing. Seconded by Member Dore. All ayes. Motion carried.

**Attorney Dickover:** You have done everything necessary to render a decision on this application. If the board would like to hear a resolution approving the site plan, a special exception use. I can outline for you what that resolution would say.

**Chairman Plato:** The only comment I had was the truck traffic to go from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. instead of 6 a.m. to 7 p.m.

Member Thompson made a motion to accept the resolution as recited by council and grant final approval. Seconded by Member Pearson. All ayes. Motion carried.

Member Pearson made a motion to adjourn the Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Member Dore. All ayes. Motion carried.

**B. FORMAL APPLICATIONS:**

**B.1 49 Main Street, Architectural Review Board, Sign**

**Building Inspector Stickles:** It's approximately 9 foot 4 inches long and 14 inches high. It does meet the sign code regulations.

**Chairman Plato:** Colors?

**Building Inspector Stickles:** Sign will have a gold background and the letters spelling out the name of the store, Broadleaf Books will be navy blue. The sign is made out of a PVC material to be mounted to the building as per the code.

**Member Dore:** I think it's very nice.

Village of Walden  
Planning Board Meeting  
June 15, 2020

Member Dore made a motion to approve sign with colors presented. Seconded by Member Pearson. All ayes. Motion carried.

Member Wilkins made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Member Dore. All ayes. Motion carried.

**C. DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

**D. INFORMATION ITEMS:** None

**E. CORRESPONDENCE:** None

**3. COMMUNICATIONS:** None

**4. EXECUTIVE SESSION:**

**5. MEETING ADJOURNED at 7:31pm**

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED  
Marisa Kraus, Village Clerk  
Planning Board Secretary