

**Present:** Mark Nicholson, Bill Baker, Larry Hohl, Atty. David Mayer, Building Insp./Code Enforcement Officer Will Barham, Deputy Clerk Jo O'Neill, Trustee Karl Laurer  
**Absent:** Bob Fantauzzo, Mike O'Connor

Meeting came to order at 7:30pm.

- 1) **Application:** Michael Mammano of Clinton Signs, INC., representing 40 North Avenue, tax ID # 080.09-1-44. Application to install a 28 square foot free standing business directory sign. Applicant seeks relief from current zoning regarding required distance from street line pursuant to section 175-54D(3); D(3)a. Property zoned Central Business.

**Presentation:** Michael Mammano of Clinton Signs, Inc., represented Ernest Gasbarre of 40 North Avenue in regards to his pole sign. They have reviewed various designs and revisions, spoken with Will Barham, and decided on a single pole configuration to keep it off the sidewalk. It will be raised higher than the previous sign so as not to block the view of vehicles pulling in and out. They've maintained a small square footage footprint, and added a "hat" on top.

Mark Nicholson questioned why they needed to put the sign that close to the road, requiring a variance, and why they couldn't put it on the building.

M. Mammano replied that there is only so much space between the sidewalk and the building, so they opted to place it between the road and the sidewalk. They would like what was there before, which was a double-sided sign, viewable from both directions.

M. Nicholson then inquired about the old sign and the electric supply for the lighting.

M. Mammano responded that the new sign will be in the same location as the old sign and use the existing power supply. It will have goose neck lights, with no projecting illumination and no back lighting. The lights will be at the top pointing down. It will be higher than the old sign for the line of sight. Additionally, Mr. Mammano noted that the sign is already partially constructed.

M. Nicholson asked Will Barham whether projecting lights are allowed, to which Will indicated that they are as long as they are not distracting to drivers.

M. Mammano explained that they have not yet selected the lighting fixtures, but plan on low 17-20 watt LED goose neck lights.

M. Nicholson then informed the applicant that there was not a full board present to rule on the application. With only three members in attendance, they would need a unanimous decision in the positive to grant the variance. The applicant does have the option of waiting for a full board to be present to rule on their application. Mr. Gasbarre then indicated that he would like to try to reach his daughter by phone before responding. Mr. Nicholson mentioned that they would continue with questions without making a ruling while they wait.

Larry Hohl questioned as to whether the sign would be in the right of way, to which David Mayer replied that it would not.

Bill Baker asked whether the applicant had sent out letters to the surrounding property owners in accordance to our by-laws.

Will Barham expressed that in this case he did not require the applicant to send out letters because it is in a commercial district, and does not affect any residents.

L. Hohl inquired as to how long these signs last, and what material the sign is made of.

M. Mammano explained that the old sign was a wooden sign on a steel pole. It was the pole that actually rotted, which is why the sign came down. The new sign will be made of aluminum with a special coating. Signs like this typically last about 30yrs. He added that the tenants are anxious to have the new sign up. There are currently three businesses that will be listed on the sign. There are three blank panels for future businesses to be listed.

W. Barham added that the pole sign was preferable, as a monument sign would be a problem for our sidewalk plows.

B. Baker asked whether the lights would be on a timer, to which Mr. Mammano said they could be. There isn't anything in our code regarding light timing.

**Open to the Public:**

No comments were made.

**Closed to the Public:**

M. Nicholson then gave Mr. Gasbarre the option to proceed with a decision, or come back with his daughter when a full board is in attendance. The board chose to review the prior meeting's minutes while Mr. Gasbarre attempted to reach his daughter via phone.

Mark Nicholson asked for a motion on the minutes from October 19, 2017.

**Motion:** Bill Baker made a motion to approve the minutes of October 19, 2017 as written. Seconded by Larry Hohl. All were in favor. Minutes were approved.

B. Baker requested clarification of the distance needed for the sign variance.

D. Mayer replied that a 19ft setback variance is needed.

E. Gasbarre then indicated that he would like the board to proceed with his application.

M. Nicholson then asked for a motion on SEQR..

**Motion:** Bill Baker made a motion to declare the Zoning Board of Appeals as the lead agency for a Type II in this matter.

Seconded by Larry Hohl. All were in favor. Motion passed.

M. Nicholson stated that they need a motion for a front yard (street) setback variance, which could include a stipulation regarding the lighting of the sign.

**Motion:** Bill Baker made a motion to grant a 19ft front yard setback variance for the distance from the street line to the sign.

Seconded by Larry Hohl. All were in favor. Motion passed.

W. Barham reminded the applicant that he will still need a permit for the sign.

M. Nicholson then asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

**Motion to Adjourn:** Larry Hohl made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded by Bill Baker. All were in favor. Meeting adjourned at 8:03pm.

There is no meeting in December. The next Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting is scheduled for 7:30pm on January 18, 2018.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jo O'Neill, Deputy Clerk