

**VILLAGE OF CHATHAM
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
AUGUST 24, 2020
7:30 P.M.
MINUTES**

Call to Order at 7:31 p.m.

Present: Chairman D. Herrick; Members L. Ponter, and L. Korda, B. Gaylord, F. Iaconetti; Village Attorney Ken Dow; Building Inspector E. Reis; Village Deputy Clerk P. DeLong; Pete Wallin, Ed Golden, Representatives from the Shaker Museum; Paul Cassidy, Lacy Schutz, Chad Lindberg, Mark Strieter, Muriel Mechling, and Multiple Residents

- 1) Application # 2020-172: 59 Church Street, Chatham, NY; Peter Wallin, Applicant; Application/Site Plan for Two-Family Dwelling - *Tabled to next meeting on September 28, 2020 for remaining requests.***
- 2) Application: 5 Austerlitz Street, Chatham, NY; Shaker Museum and Library, Applicant; Application/Lot Line Adjustment - *Approved***
- 3) Application # 2019-092: 5 Austerlitz Street, Chatham, NY; Shaker Museum and Library, Applicant; Application/ Amendment to Site Plan Review and Historic Review - *Tabled***
- 4) Approve Minutes from July 27, 2020 Meeting - *Approved.***

Other Business:

- 1. None**

D. Herrick starts by welcoming Brandon Gaylord to the Board as a new Board member.

1) D. Herrick notes this is a reapplication with the reason for coming back in front of the Board was because the work was not finished in the time frame previously approved for. He asks the other Board members for their input. F. Iaconetti asks if an application expires if the applicant would need to comply with the new zoning. K. Dow explains that if an application has expired it has run its course and is now back to square one. Once the approval expires, it is gone, and they must come in with a new application. He continues; Boards are bound by their presence to reach a decision. If the circumstances or facts have changed, explain the changes. If it has expired, start fresh. If the zoning has changed, review under the new zoning. They come back and go through the process; it may have a lot of information you need. F. Iaconetti states, looking at the application, what is the nature of the proposed work? Says addition to the

building, what is being added? L. Korda observes she did not see addition to the building. F. Iaconetti refers to the application and notes alter building and change occupancy with his understanding is an addition to the building and asks what is being added. L. Korda, B. Gaylord, and F. Iaconetti discuss the application and resolve it is adding to the beauty of the residence and not adding to the building itself. F. Iaconetti states he tried to look at the exterior dimensions of the structure. The first-floor apartment is 722 sq feet with 783.6 sq feet for storage. Making the first floor 1,505.6 sq feet. The apartment on the second floor 986 sq feet. The second floor should be the same as the first floor. L. Korda, F. Iaconetti, and D. Herrick discuss the application turning a 2-story house into 2 apartments and observe that the 2nd floor is not being used entirely for residence. F. Iaconetti states that it is confusing in terms of square footage and the aspect of parking. He continues that he visited the site and could not find any available parking, observing that there were spaces where cars were double parked. He adds he could not find a landscape buffer noted on the site and asks how many parking spaces are needed. L. Korda notes that only one parking space is needed because it is under the amount of sq footage. F. Iaconetti questions the amount of square footage on the second floor. D. Herrick suggests tabling to the next meeting as the applicant was not on the call, giving time to straighten everything out and send to County. K. Dow confirms that everything on County or NYS highway has to be sent to CCPB for review.

Motion made by L. Korda to table to the next meeting, seconded by L. Ponter.

B. Gaylord-aye, L. Ponter-aye, L. Korda-aye, F. Iaconetti-aye, D. Herrick-aye: Approved by all
K. Dow adds that they will need to make sure that parking conforms with code, specifically the requirement for square footage and if the applicant will need a variance.

E. Golden joins meeting and speaks on behalf of Pete Wallin.

D. Herrick explains that a motion was made to table the application for 30 days.

L. Korda notes it would be helpful to clarify and get some specifics from the applicant.

F. Iaconetti states he has a question on the parking and the square footage on the first and second floor. When he adds up the numbers, they do not agree, and are bearing in the amount of parking. D. Herrick asks if there are any other requests for the applicant for next month. L. Korda asks for specifics and the application be clarified a bit. E. Golden states he will redraw, measure, and resubmit. F. Iaconetti notes that on the drawing they refer to a landscape buffer, tell the size and what it is. Affirming that when he went there, he did not see anything that looked like a landscape buffer.

2) D. Herrick reads the next application number, noting that the applicant already owns both parcels on the lot line adjustment, making one piece of property. P. Cassidy introduces himself to the Board. He mentions that the Shaker Museum has the 2nd and 3rd points on the agenda. He continues they are here again as we presented 1 year ago for a site plan approval, they are now back to request an amendment to that site plan, in the year since they have been to the Planning Board they have purchased property, hired an architect, a landscape architect, and an engineer. C. Lindberg refers to the map of the two parcels showing the dissolving of the boundary line between the two lots in preparation of the survey map. K. Dow confirms they are just dissolving one line and turning two parcels into one. He adds this may not be in the authority of the Planning Board review as there is no code requirement for the lot size. C. Lindberg states that in most authorities, that process is just reviewed by the Planning Board to

ensure the lot meets those requirements. K. Dow states that the Village of Chatham does not have a subdivision law. D. Herrick clarifies that they are taking out the line, so the lot is big enough to do the addition. P. Cassidy confirms that this is correct, that the new plan shows the brick building and the extending out in addition to the new building. F. Iaconetti asks a question about the map on the screen. L. Ponter asks if there is any land in between that belongs to someone else. C. Lindberg confirms there is not.

Motion made by F. Iaconetti to approve should our jurisdiction be of that nature, the combining of the two parcels, seconded by L. Ponter.

B. Gaylord-yes, L. Ponter-yes, F. Iaconetti-yes, L. Korda-yes, D. Herrick-yes: Approved by all

3) C. Lindberg refers to the site plan. He explains the pages as they pertain to the project. D. Herrick asks about the doors on the southside of the building on the 2nd floor that used to have a ramp, asking if there will be a change in the landscape to have the doors on the ground floor. M. Strieter confirms that door will not be accessible. C. Lindberg explains where the door is now, there will be stairs but will not be accessible in the proposed condition. D. Herrick confirms they will be permanently closing the door off. C. Lindberg refers to the drawing and explains the proposed grade, the lower windows that are currently exposed will remain exposed with no access to that door. L. Korda asks if a level is being added to the main building and if there is an elevator in the complex that will go to the other floors. C. Lindberg remarks those are solar panels on the roof and that there will be an elevator for access to the upper floors of the building. P. Cassidy and C. Lindberg explain the main entrance to the museum. D. Herrick asks to clarify the location of the elevator. P. Cassidy and C. Lindberg confirm it is inside the addition. P. Cassidy explains that the stair tower is an egress from the brick building. F. Iaconetti asks about the proposed parking spaces, stating that 9 x 19 is typical and there is existing parking along that street now. He adds while they may be modifying the bump out, there were 4 cars parked there today in basically the same location you show. He states, he not exactly sure what you are doing but you are not creating parking in those 4 spaces. M. Strieter suggests talking about the landscaping as it may answer some of the other questions. F. Iaconetti states they can get to that; he has a number of other questions. He asks first if they will be provided with details regarding the proposed retaining wall; the appearance and height. Second; the aspect of the proposed garbage bins, are they open bins or a dumpster. Third; the proposed generator, the manufacturer, size, concern about noise, it is adjacent to residences. Fourth; the plan states existing building. It is the existing building but for the rest of the board members they should understand that the one-story section in the front, which is about 18 feet, has been removed. Fifth; there is no curb detail and the curbing in that area is granite. Sixth; there is no road pavement detail or parking space detail. All of the parcel is in the Village right of way. The Village is going to have to give you some directions or at least you need to make very clear what you are doing because you have some construction or encroachment in to the Village street particularly where the drive entrance comes in or the parking in the back by the proposed building. Seventh; nothing has been mentioned to date what are the number or parking spaces required for this development, which we need to know. Eighth; the rear parking spaces in the back by the proposed building do not meet the zoning of 10 feet from the property line. If you are applying for variances, that may be another variance you have to look at, unless there is some way you can redesign it so you can meet the 10 feet. Ninth; there is

nothing that indicates to us the total square footage of the existing building and the proposed buildings components, also something we need in terms of the aspect of the number of parking spaces required. C. Lindberg confirms he has taken good notes into what is being asked for and will develop a response for all the questions. L. Korda asks about the parking spaces on Austerlitz Street, if as shown they leave the required amount in the street for each lane. She observes there are a lot of trucks and tractor trailers that come down and the train is right above that. She voices concerns about the spaces encroaching on existing lane, about ADA parking getting out of their cars in those spots and opening their door right into traffic, and traffic backed up from the train could cause a potentially dangerous spot to be. C. Lindberg explains the design process for those spaces and how along Austerlitz it does press back into their property to maintain the existing traffic lanes in the roadway there. He adds he will develop a more thorough response to the other questions. L. Korda asks if the DOT must approve those parking spots. C. Lindberg states they have had a conversation with DOT Road Superintendent about this design feasibility. One aspect to address that would be to provide a letter to you that outlines the review of this. D. Herrick refers to the design asking if the 4 parking spots are partially off the museum property and in the road property. C. Lindberg confirms he will go back into it and develop a response. K. Dow notes with off street parking regulations there is no specific numerical requirement. There are things for residential uses, retail, industrial, office, lodging, restaurants. As appropriate to the circumstances and their criteria, there doesn't seem there is a square footage based quantitative requirement. F. Iaconetti echoes he is right; we need to classify what this is and how does it fit into some of the other titles for development or is it a stand alone by itself. That goes back to what I said about the square footage, eventually we will need some information about the number of employees, what the history has been for the number of people; all stuff that will help the Board in terms of determining parking. L. Korda asks if the Metzwood parking lot is still available on the weekends. P. Cassidy explains the original site plan application and how they have an agreement with Metzwood to utilize their parking lot on evenings and weekends. He adds more recently they are in discussion with the purchaser of The Pizza Den, how that becomes an alternate, and a benefit to the Village. K. Dow observes an amendment to the site plan is treated like a site plan application. He reads code 110-15, recommends sending to County for review, and the Public Hearing is at the discretion of the Board. D. Herrick asks the Board for their input on Public Hearing. F. Iaconetti implores absolutely, adding that the magnitude of this project, the impact on the Historic Over zone, and the visual character of that area is crucial and public comment is most important. F. Iaconetti continues that he has questions on the next page regarding the drainage plan. He asks for an explanation of an existing storm drain to day light over by River Street as he thinks of a pipe opening up and running down the slope or something. C. Lindberg explains there is a drainage structure on the property that ties to the municipal storm drain which runs under River Street and discharges on the northwest side. F. Iaconetti observes the storm water piping going around the building and states he didn't see anything where the roof drains are going; mentioned they are going into the storm water but it does not show that connection between the roof drain and the storm water system that you are installing. C. Lindberg states he will update that connection. F. Iaconetti continues, in the front of the building there are 2 sets of stairs. Looking at the grading plan, he states he can't understand how they are going to construct stairs with five risers with a grade difference of 1

foot. C. Lindberg and M. Strieter explain there is some minutiae there. They refer to the map and the grade lines. F. Iaconetti states if you could work somehow without putting stairs and a hand railing it would be a lot safer situation for everybody. His observation based on 1-foot contours, don't lend itself to five risers so, that's something to be looked at. C. Lindberg explains those elevation lines are separated by two steps, 2 risers per 1' elevation. D. Herrick revisits and asks if all of the drain water from the whole project is actually going out to the river. C. Lindberg explains the current configuration for the drainage from the property is caught in those catch basins and diverted to the site. We are enhancing and maintaining that direction. F. Iaconetti asks if the area along River Street where 4 parking, is that where the water is going, out the drive entrance? C. Lindberg explains the current system that they plan to tie in to. F. Iaconetti asks if all the water from the site is running into that storm drain, asks has anybody done any calculations to determine that the storm system can handle additional water, and provide that information to the Board and Village DPW so they feel comfortable they are not overloading the system. C. Lindberg affirms that has been reviewed in the design portion of the project and will provide the numbers. F. Iaconetti asks if they will be providing a planting table with types and varieties, size, root type nature of the plants, planting detail, landscape architect seal and signature regarding the landscaping plan in conjunction with the application. D. Herrick asks where the sewer lines are running if there will be a problem with the roots in the sewer lines. F. Iaconetti asks about the path light detail and the pole light detail, what the height of these elements is going to be, what color they are going to be, is the picture a reflection of a manufacturer's cut or is it just an example. C. Lindberg states that is the specification they are proposing. The pole lights are to be mounted on a 14' pole as noted in the plan, path lights are typically 27" tall. More detail on color can be provided on the update. D. Herrick asks about the recessed lighting on the building, and if it will be LED lighting for the steps. M. Strieter confirms this is for the steps alongside the building and also those in the landscape at the curb. F. Iaconetti asks if there is lighting fixtures at the entrance doors. M. Strieter and M. Mechling confirm that will be shown in the architecture review at the next meeting. C. Lindberg notes the additional details requested and will include those additional details, ADA curb details, parking sign details, and curb stop details. L. Korda asks about the pathway, front curb, property line, edge of the pavement and pavement line, adding is there pavement there now. C. Lindberg explains there is pavement there now, proposing to push the pavement back to increase the effectiveness of the parking along this area, and shows the existing edge of the driving path. P. Cassidy refers to M. Strieter to present in hopes to blend the questions together. M. Strieter explains how landscape fits into the fabric of the Village of Chatham, also how the landscape will reflect the museum, the history of the Shakers and their mission. He references the drawing explain how they are creating an edge to the Village center and their hope to clear up the area a bit and make a beautiful promontory or prow that could bracket the end of the Village. He continues explaining the planting, sidewalks, use of the prow, accessibility for ADA, amphitheater, flowers, grasses and how this all ties into the values and heritage of the Shakers; making this area about community and a welcoming, open gesture to the community. L. Ponter asks about the flying bridge on the diagram and if the proposed sidewalk protrudes into Village streets, if they have an easement of some kind. M. Strieter refers to C. Lindberg. C. Lindberg explains that the purpose of tonight was to see the response to some of these concepts, in future pursuing further discussions with the Village regarding

feasibility and how they can make these pieces come together. L. Korda expresses how she likes the thinking about bringing in the Shaker way of thinking and looks forward to the project. F. Iaconetti refers to the planting being done at the nose area, questioning the planting there and the rest of the site, the aspect of maintenance. He continues, what you are showing is something that would require, in order to keep it nice and well maintained, is going to require dedicated maintenance, is the Shaker Museum prepared to do that? L. Schutz expresses they have done a lot of thinking on all areas, aspects, security, fire safety, and maintenance of the property. It is obviously important to us as it is an asset to the Village of Chatham to be a welcoming place and we want it to look as beautiful as possible. D. Herrick asks about the perennials and grass in the project and by the Amphitheater. M. Strieter explains the plantings by the entrance will be similar to those at the project and the circular area with ground cover and low shrubs because those are areas that gather water. L. Korda asks if they will be planting any trees. M. Strieter points out there will be 5 trees on Austerlitz and 4 on River Street that will be street size stature. B. Gaylord voices concerns on the bus drop off as it is close to the railroad and asks how far it is from the railroad tracks. M. Strieter explains how the ADA parking is closer to the railroad tracks and the bus drop off is to the left further away to lessen the dangers. It is approx. 200-250 feet. F. Iaconetti suggests making the parking space wider than 9 feet and bring it in toward the building so when a person pulled in there was actually more space for them to be parked so when they open the door it would be 11' so they have more space to maneuver, only impact a couple of feet of the paved area that they show. C. Lindberg notes all concerns and states they will study solutions. D. Herrick voices concern about the ADA parking spots being deeper than the regular parking spots next to them. L. Korda asks about moving the ADA parking spots. C. Lindberg states again they will study alternatives, but they were not going through a design reiteration tonight. D. Herrick moves to table to next month. F. Iaconetti states he still has questions on the next detail page. First, the sidewalk is shown with 4' 6", sidewalks in that area are 5'. The sidewalk that is replaced there has to be 5' like the existing walks are, stating he measured them today, reiterating that they are 5' and that does not include the curb. Second, there is a note under the ADA stall detail that says van parking spaces shall contain designated van accessibility, adding he does not see anything that that is van parking spaces. He asks for an explanation. C. Lindberg states he will get clarification on that notation. F. Iaconetti states the Village Zoning talks about parking spaces being 19' long, or as indicated by the Board. What he would ask the Museum to do is look into architectural graphs, standards, or some other resource that applies to parking and see what recommendations they make the length of the parking stall where you have parallel parking. His experience is those spaces need to be 22', something in that range, it may be different. He would say that 19' would basically not end up working. C. Lindberg states he will look into it. F. Iaconetti references the drawing bollards; typical style per architect; we will need a detail, manufactures cut, and the kind of information you provided with the lights. F. Iaconetti Continues with the 3 wooden benches; asking if they will be providing any detail to show what these wooden benches are that you are putting in. M. Strieter affirms they are still working that out and there will be detail in the future. L. Korda asks if they will be taking questions on the building tonight. P. Cassidy explains they are not to the point to present as an architectural review yet. Their plan was to present what was relevant to the site plan amendment. L. Korda asks if the connections between the buildings are glass and if the connections between the

building and tower are glass. P. Cassidy confirms the glass connection between the building and the addition and explains that the independent stair tower is connected by an open-air bridge. F. Iaconetti states he has more general questions. First many of the windows are covered with plywood, what are you planning on doing with those windows and doors? M. Mechling confirms they will be replaced with non-operable fixed windows. F. Iaconetti asks if the wood frame windows match the openings, the openings will not be modified. M. Mechling confirms. F. Iaconetti continues, he is looking at the west elevation and he is trying to figure out the roof that he sees, noting it is currently a gambrel type that comes forward, or a hip roof that comes forward and asks if that is being removed. M. Mechling confirms they are proposing a gable roof. F. Iaconetti adds, so you are proposing on removing the hip portion of the roof, that comes out toward the circle. M. Mechling explains they are not changing the slope, just removing the hip portion to the East and West. F. Iaconetti asks for an explanation why. He adds architecturally looking at the building that is an important element to the appearance of the building. M. Mechling notes they will explain at a later point with images. F. Iaconetti speaks as himself adding, he will tell you that the tower you have on the side of the building on the River Street side, I have great difficulty with the appearance of that. The back of the building, you can tell me the architectural style, but this tower you are putting on the side of the building comes in contact with the more historic portion of the structure and I would truly like to see you put some sort of tower that architecturally blends in and matches the brick portion of the building because it's a stand-alone by itself and it really detracts from that whole side of the building. L. Korda asks what the vertical siding is on the tower. M. Mechling Notes it be explained with renderings in the next presentation. F. Iaconetti asks on the exterior south elevation, the Austerlitz Street side, it might be helpful for people who are looking at the drawings to put the street side. His question is the item that is being put on the top of the roof on the existing building is solar panels? M. Mechling confirms that is correct. F. Iaconetti asks if that is supposed to be the roof sticking up that the panels are on. It looks to him like a wall is being built on top of the building and hanging solar panels. M. Mechling explains how they are following the slope as tight as they can. F. Iaconetti continues, a couple of instances on the same elevation on the left-hand side, the third window from the door is technically now a door that is slightly higher than the existing window, adjacent to it and lower. He asks if that will be bricked and a window put in. M. Mechling confirms that is the one adjustment being made on the south side of the building. F. Iaconetti asks what is being done to the brick. M. Mechling states repointing, cleaning, and filling. F. Iaconetti asks, not painting. M. Mechling confirms there is no painting. F. Iaconetti states it is important that the brick match. M. Mechling affirms they know that well. F. Iaconetti continues that the building will have external down spouts on it, leaders coming down. He asks if these can be shown on the drawing, so he knows where they are. M. Mechling confirms that is being worked on with civil. F. Iaconetti asks about the last elevation on the River Street side, same thing with the down spouts on that side. His question, he does not see on the plans where the electric service will be located, the meters, the pipes, everything else associated with electricity coming into this building. Adding, will there be overhead lines or underground, where will the fuel tanks be? M. Mechling explains they are planning on underground and they will provide more detailed information. F. Iaconetti states that the meters and things are visual elements that are often overlooked. F. Iaconetti asks how the building will be heated. M. Mechling explains that the boiler will be in the building. F. Iaconetti continues

assuming because of the nature of the artifacts you have the building will be airconditioned and have humidity control; where will this be located. M. Mechling states within the building. F. Iaconetti asks, the a/c is in the building? M. Mechling confirms and explains the venting will be on the roof. She adds all information will be provided with a mechanical drawing at the next meeting. F. Iaconetti reads from the 4 Short Environmental Assessment form, stating he is glad they recognize this building significantly enhances and architectural cornerstone of the Village. He is not excited or supportive of the roof line being changed or that the stairwell being out on the River Street side because those are elements you can clearly see from the circle. He reads question number 6 on page 2 asking why they checked yes that the proposed action is consistent with the predominant character of the existing building. C. Lindberg explains that refers to the surroundings and not the existing building. F. Iaconetti Reads question number 8 on page 2 asking if the proposed action will result in increased traffic. He adds he doesn't know if it was explained or not, the hours of operation. Adding it would help to know what they generally see as the number of cars and people that currently come to their facilities and what they expect here in terms of cars and that nature. He continues, there is mention of a bus stop on the plan and that's the kind of information that would be helpful because it has great promise to it, but parking and traffic in that area by the circle and the railroad tracks is something he thinks the Board would likely have some concern about and requests more information be given. C. Lindberg confirms they will. F. Iaconetti reads question number 12 asking if the project site contains or is substantially contiguous to a building, archeological site or site that is listed on the historic registry. He asks for an explanation why yes was checked. C. Lindberg explains the site comes up on the DEC Mapper which directed that answer. F. Iaconetti adds, let me give you a bit of background information in terms of the DOT Highway project that took place in the Village which included that area. A cultural resource survey report was done in conjunction with NYS DOT in 2003 and it listed 5 Austerlitz Street as being Chatham Village Historic District, circa 1895, modified Second Empire Queen Anne. He continues; now I tell you I looked at the survey report. The front of the building has been significantly changed from the picture they show in the report. His concern is what is being proposed will affect the building from being eligible for the Chatham Village Historic District. L. Schutz explains how she spoke extensively with SHIPPO the NYS Historic Preservation Office as it was one of the first things they did when they started looking at the building 2 years ago. She explains how initially SHIPPO was excited about the building being on the Historic Registry, however the Regional director determined that it had been altered to much from its industrial knitting factory era, and the historic fabric of the building had been stripped away. She points out that they were particularly dismayed by the removal of the elevator tower on the North side. The addition of the fire tower was one of the ways they were gesturing toward the historic nature of the building. F. Iaconetti states in the aspect of it not being a building that's eligible for the National Historic Registry. What his question is, is it a building that is still eligible for the Chatham Village Historic District. He notes the buildings that were added. He adds for the benefit of the Board, because they view it as a historic and important building, it would be interesting to know weather in fact what has been done to the building would make it a non-contributing structure or if what you are doing to the building would make it non-eligible. He states he understands the building is not eligible by itself. He adds that we as a group they have various abilities and skills in historic preservation and he in fact was involved in that. He adds how he looked at this building, looked at the photo from 203 agrees modifications were made that he

does not know when they were done. He voices concerns that this is a big project dealing with structures in the Historic Over zone. He does not want to set a precedence or do something that upsets the Historic Over Zone by having something that looks out of place. He voices his concerns for the tower and the hip roof removal again. He adds that he has worked with architects and know that when a building is being expanded there is a choice to change the footprint or of the existing building or make it such contract that clearly it's a stand by itself. He sees that is what is being done. L. Korda points out that the existing roof line is not the original and it was a mansard when the building was a hotel. F. Iaconetti states he did try to look through historic stuff he has at home. P. Cassidy explains that is all part of their plan to use the collection of historical documents collected doing their due diligence that will be part of the architectural presentation to show how they arrived where they are now. D. Herrick explains their input is to help so they know what they are looking for in future drawings. He adds his concerns about the staircase and the additional building and how much it could detract from the existing building. P. Cassidy concludes for the evening stating that they will need to come back with their clarifications and architectural review. He asks the Board how they see this going forward. L. Ponter agrees with a continuum presentation, as they evolve their design based on the feedback and their own development schedule, see the progress before they go to Public Hearing, then everyone is more informed to answer questions. D. Herrick adds from his previous experience do present all together as they might find something in the second presentation that should have been in the first. L. Korda agrees. F. Iaconetti presents that he would also as the architectural portion develops and based on some of the comments about the site plan they may end up finding as the project develops they are making changes in the architecture that have an impact on the site plan. If the site plan has been approved, they get in a situation about going back and forth, and it should be done as one package. P. Cassidy express that they will regroup on their end. He makes a statement that he does not know if they will be ready with architectural review by the next meeting. He would like to keep the momentum going to the next step. D. Herrick excitedly agrees and voices he has a strong feeling they want to do this right; therefore, they can wait to ensure everything is done properly. L. Ponter expresses his appreciation for the thoroughness and patience. He adds that as a Planning Board they are there not to discourage but to support and the questions are to help with ideas as well as preserve the Village in its beauty and historic form. K. Dow points out there is no separate architectural review in the code, that it is incorporated into the site plan review.

*Motion made by L. Korda to table the application until further review, seconded by L. Ponter.
B. Gaylord-yes, L. Ponter-yes, L. Korda-yes, F. Iaconetti-yes, D. Herrick-yes: Approved by all*

*Motion made by L. Ponter to approve the minutes, seconded by L. Korda.
B. Gaylord-aye, L. Ponter-aye, L. Korda-aye, F. Iaconetti-nay, D. Herrick-yes: Approved*

The Board members discuss the doors at Mavis. The Building Inspector will follow up.

F. Iaconetti voices concern over the sign at the florist shop and the work that was done there. It is determined the parking lot was altered for maintenance.

Motion made by D. Herrick to adjourn the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT: 9:41 p.m.

Meetings are being held through Webex as per state government regulations due to the pandemic.

Respectfully submitted,
Patricia DeLong