



Planning Board Meeting

June 15, 2026

Meeting Minutes

In Attendance:

Chairperson:	Zac Pearson	Present
Members:	Chris Batson	Present
	John Thompson	Not Present
Alternate Members:	Jerry Hanen	Not Present
	Leslie Dotson	Present
Village Attorney:	Maria Donavon	Present
Village Engineer:	John Queenan	Present
Recording Secretary:	Angel Rodriguez	Present

Chairperson Z. Pearson called the Planning Board meeting to order at 7:30PM.

- Pledge of allegiance
- Approval of minutes for April 20, 2026 and May 18, 2026.

J. Queenan: I have the minutes for April 20, 2026.

Z. Pearson: Can I get a motion to approve May's minutes?

- Member C. Batson, motion to approve the minutes for May 18, 2026.
- Motion to accept 2nd by member L. Dotson
- Vote: 3-0
- Board's Business
 - Public hearings:
 - **80 West Main Street**

Project Description: To expand the existing building located at 74 West Main Street onto the vacant lot located at 80 West Main Street.

- Member C. Batson, motion to reopen hearing
- Motion to accept 2nd by member L. Dotson
- Vote: 3-0

Z. Pearson: Board has heard back from the county with regarding the GML review for this project.

J. Queenan: The county did get back to the board regarding the GML review with one comment: that the parking meets village codes, which it does. Applicant submitted revised plans keeping the parking entrance

at Oat Street and removing any gates, fences or obstructions to keep the continuation of the driveway through. There is one discrepancy on the map, referring to note 3, which is not on the map.

Z. Pearson: We can work on having that cleaned up. Do we have an approved resolution drafted?

J Queenan: Not yet.

M. Donavon: We can approve the draft at the next meeting.

Z. Pearson: Or we can vote to approve it now

J Queenan: The draft can be approved now and then just have the resolution made and circulated. A motion can be made to reaffirm the negative declaration.

Z. Pearson: Ok that works. Can I get a motion to approve as stated.

- Member C. Batson, motion to reaffirm the negative declaration resolution procedure
- Motion to accept 2nd by member L. Dotson
- Vote: 3-0

Z. Pearson: Can we get an approval for the site plan

- Member C. Batson, motion to approve site plans for professional use with an expansion of four senior apartments to be connected to the existing structure with the following conditions: payments of all outstanding fees made to the Village of Walden, final consultant review of the Planning Board, village attorney and engineer.
- Motion to accept 2nd by member L. Dotson
- Vote: 3-0

▪ **35 North Street**

Project Description: Site consists of three existing tax parcels, two are vacant lands and one contains an existing single-family dwelling. The applicant proposes a minor subdivision to create one additional residential lot and adjust the lot line between lot 305-14-12 and 305-14-16.1 so that the line no longer runs through the dwelling.

Z. Pearson: The board has not received any response to the concerns the public had during the May 2026 meeting. Does the project engineer have any comments before the public portion of this meeting is reopened?

Shawn Arnott, Project Engineer: Was waiting for the minutes to respond formally. Currently has all the responses and will address them now, if allowed.

- Member C. Batson, motion to reopen hearing
- Motion to accept 2nd by member L. Dotson
- Vote: 3-0

Shawn Arnott, Project Engineer:

- Concerning animal species we've addressed in the EAF, the only species we have on this site are bats, which we will adhere to the standard mitigation of the clearing of trees during November 1 to March 31. There is only one tree on the site that may be potentially impacted by the development.

- Concerning the trees along the neighbor's boundary, we feel that the excavation for the foundation is outside the critical root zone. Therefore, there is no need to remove the adjacent trees along the property boundary.

- Concerning traffic, the construction of three single family dwellings will be on existing improved roads, two will go out onto North Street and one onto Center Street. We feel like that's a negligible amount of traffic that will be generated on this project Concerning property boundary with the neighboring Duffy property

- Concerning the property boundary along Duffy's property line. I did reach out to our surveyor; and I will read his response. He disagrees with a few things on the map. referring to the map that I had taken a picture of at the last meeting. His response; "After surveying the entire block, I found that many property corners have two monuments set close to each other, which we saw on the map last time. A surveyor can easily determine the boundaries by looking only at the client's block. Feeling all the property boundaries along the block makes it easier to see which pins fit better and how they align with all the neighbors. Every pin on Center Street lines up, but you can see in the picture that there are multiple pins near the Duffy Corners. I found almost all the pins shown on that map, but they don't match the measurements in the property line as it is shown. My assessment is that the previous surveyor held the existing monuments he found, regardless of whether or not they fit the geometry. But he failed to note a surveyed versus record measurement. It is shown like everything fits the description, but it doesn't. I am confident in my boundary solution."

So, if you recall, they are about three feet apart. And the distance between the two along the sideline are identical measurements. They are just offset by three feet. So, you know, from what I understand, the surveyor of the neighbor held the outside boundary, de-plotted, but didn't check how it fit within the block. Our surveyor is saying that his survey is correct and he will be taking liability on it.

The only other thing I can offer is that we could concede three feet on the house so that we meet the side yard regardless of whoever is correct. No houses have been chosen for these lots, so we could concede the side yard to make it 15 and a half feet, whereas 12 and a half is required. Therefore, regardless of where the line is, you're buffering the three feet.

Z. Pearson: Could you just take the worst-case scenario and prove that? Not necessarily the map that you have to file, but if you prove it to the board that what your surveyor is saying is incorrect, by pushing three feet the opposite way away for the neighbor, you're protected.

Shawn Arnott, Project Engineer: Correct. We have a 1,382 square foot dwelling shown along the lot lines. We can just shorten that up by three feet and still meet the lot area and the lot width.

Z. Pearson: Have the applicant demonstrate that. So that we're covered. Any comment on this from the public?

Mr. Duffy, 42 Center Street: Concerned about the project survey changing the property line, by three feet, will cause him to have to remove part of a structure (a pre-existing shed). Would like to have the property line issue resolved now to avoid any issues with future property owners regarding the three-foot overlapping into their property. Mr. Duffy also expressed concern with the loss of mature forest canopy, wildlife habitat, stormwater absorption capacity, visual screen, neighborhood character, and established ecosystem.

Ann Traffey, 41 Center Street: Moved to her home for its peaceful environment and is concerned about the congestion additional homes on the project site will cause to the neighborhood. Ground absorption capacity of stormwater as well as drainage issues associated with additional structures are a major concern.

Mr. Fredrick Thurman, 46 Center Street: Concerned over the ground absorption capacity of stormwater as well as drainage issues associated with additional structures are a major concern. Trees along his property line are still a concern.

Z. Pearson: A land swell from Center Street to the back of the property can help manage stormwater runoff, addressing drainage issues. A tree drip line needs to be drawn on the map. This can help with the visualization of where the roots may be to prevent root damage, as well as how far back tree limbs may be trimmed. Property lines still need to be addressed.

J Queenan: Will confer with the surveyor in his office about the property line.

Shawn Arnott, Project Engineer: A land swell can be done. A tree drip line can also be incorporated on the map.

Brian Amrhein, Applicant, 35 North Street: States he is willing to work with his neighbors to have this project move forward.

- Chairperson Z. Pearson motion to keep public hearing open until July 20, 2026
- Motion to accept: 1st by C. Batson, 2nd by L. Dotson
- Vote 3-0

➤ **Adjournment**

- Chairperson Z. Pearson motion to adjourn this public meeting.
- Motion to accept: 1st by C. Batson, 2nd by L. Dotson