

1  
2 **MEETING OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**  
3 **OF THE TOWN OF GLENVILLE**  
4 **THE GLENVILLE MUNICIPAL CENTER**  
5 **18 GLENRIDGE ROAD, GLENVILLE, NY 12302**  
6 **November 27, 2023**

7  
8 **PRESENT:** Chairman David Hennel, Dick Schlansker, Brian Peterson, Barry Suydam  
9 and Charles Beers.

10 **ABSENT:** None.

11 **ALSO ATTENDING:** | Attorney: Colleen Pierson, Esq | Building Inspector: James  
12 Pangburn | Planning Department/Stenographer: Nicholas Chiavini |

13 **Chairman Hennel called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.**

14  
15 **MOTION:** To accept the October 23, 2023 minutes.

16 **MOVED BY:** David Hennel

17 **SECONDED:** Barry Suydam

18 **AYES:** 5 (Hennel, Schlansker, Peterson, Suydam, Beers)

19 **NOES:** 0

20 **ABSENT:** 0

21 **ABSTAIN:** 0

22 **MOTION APPROVED**

23  
24  
25 **PUBLIC HEARING**

- 26 **1. Application of Bova Engineering and Olson Signs**, for the proposed installation of a  
27 40sqft monument sign at 65 Saratoga Road, Glenville NY 12302. This property is  
28 located in the Professional Residential Zoning District. It is identified on the tax  
29 map as Parcel # 22.18-2-37.1  
30

31 The application requests a variance from the Glenville Town Code in the following  
32 section(s):

33 1. **§ 270-69B(1)**: A maximum of 15 square feet of total sign display area is  
34 permitted. Said sign may be a wall sign, monument/ground sign or combination  
35 of both.  
36

37 Brian Peterson read the submitted application and the review factors for the variance  
38 request into the record.

39  
40 1. The particular hardship or difficulty to the petitioner if the variance request is  
41 denied.

42  
43 Answer: Building is a multiple tenant property, sign needs to be larger to  
44 accommodate space for tenants.  
45

46 2. The magnitude of the variance being sought.

47  
48 Answer: In keeping with other commercial business.  
49

50 3. The visual impacts to the immediate neighborhood and impacts to vehicle and  
51 pedestrian traffic if the variance is granted.

52  
53 Answer: Minimal, many others the same size. This is beneficial for clients and  
54 patients seeking to find the building and services they offer.  
55

56 4. If the hardship or difficulty has been self-created.

57  
58 Answer: Yes, for safety reasons giving the public larger print on the signface  
59 allows for better identification and locating.  
60

61 The application was signed by Kelly-Lee Olson of Olson Signs on October 17, 2023.  
62 Notice of the application was mailed to 44 property owners within 500 feet of the  
63 affected property. This was not a County referral.  
64

65 --LETTERS RECEIVED--  
66

67 Letter 1:

68 *We are residents of One Miracle Lane in The Return development. This is in*  
69 *response to the variance request to install a 40 square ft. sign at 65 Saratoga*  
70 *Road. My comments are as follows:*

71 *•Any vertical signage anywhere in the vicinity of the buildings constructed at*  
72 *this address will represent a dangerous visual obstruction for residents*  
73 *attempting to exit from Miracle Lane onto Rt.#50. Existing traffic at this location*

74 already exceeds the capacity of the intersection/roadway. Any obstruction  
75 pertaining to that site will only exacerbate what is already a very bad condition.  
76 A 40 square foot sign could block vision for drivers, especially given the speed  
77 that careless drivers often exhibit on Rt.#50

78 • Information contained on any sign adjacent to Rt. 50 will be a hazard arising  
79 from drivers attempting to read content of the signage.

80 • The approved site plan indicates that this sign will be positioned between the  
81 65 Saratoga building driveway and Miracle Lane. Once occupancy is achieved,  
82 occupants of the two buildings constructed at this site attempting to access  
83 Rt.#50 will add further congestion. The distance from Miracle Lane to the exit  
84 driveway for the two buildings at 65 Saratoga Rd is already dangerously short. A  
85 five ft x eight ft. sign obstructing sight lines will further exacerbate an already  
86 bad condition.

#### 87 Suggestions

88 A review of the NYS SEQRA Negative Declaration pertaining to NYS Route #50  
89 that was used in the approval of the site plans for 65 Saratoga is necessary  
90 before any consideration of such variance given the increased traffic conditions  
91 that now exist in that section of the highway.

92 A wall sign affixed to one of the buildings would avoid all of these concerns.  
93 The Town of Glenville Highway Superintendent and Town Traffic consultant  
94 should both be consulted on the wisdom of granting a variance that contains  
95 such negative impact. The Return has an Advisory Committee that was created  
96 by the Town to address items involving the operation, maintenance and  
97 improvements pertaining to The Return and report to the Town Administration  
98 periodically on same. Given the impact that this variance could have on  
99 residents of The Return it is appropriate that the Committee be included in such  
100 discussions and issue a report to the Town on their findings.

101 Richard and Dorothy Usas One Miracle Lane

#### 102 103 Letter 2

104 We are residents of 3 Miracle Lane in the Return development. This is in  
105 response to the variance request to install a 40 sq. ft. sign at 65 Saratoga Road.  
106 Our comments are as follows:

107 • It is currently extremely difficult to take a left turn out of Return during high  
108 traffic hours (between 7:30- 9:00 AM and 3:00 - 6:30PM). We often wait over 5  
109 minutes just to take that left turn. This is without the added expected traffic  
110 entering/ exiting 65 Saratoga Rd. when all of the office space has been leased.  
111 Combined with the 40 MPH speed limit (often exceeded by Saratoga Rd. drivers)  
112 it is already extremely dangerous.

113 • Any signage of any size in front of the buildings, between the parking lot and  
114 Saratoga Road, will pose significant additional safety risk to Return residents,  
115 65 Saratoga Rd. patrons, and all those entering or exiting Return. This includes  
116 several school buses that enter and exit multiple times daily, daily delivery  
117 vehicles, waste collection, snowplows, etc.

118 • When vehicles waited to exit 65 Saratoga Rd. during construction, it was  
119 almost impossible to see beyond them when trying to exit Return when looking  
120 North (regardless of whether we're trying to take a right or a left. Regular traffic  
121 from 65 Saratoga Rd. will increase this hazard.

122 • From a zoning and land use document that we've reviewed, the sign is  
123 proposed to be placed between the 65 Saratoga Rd. entrance/ exit and The  
124 Return entrance/ exit. It is difficult to determine from this survey the exact  
125 location because there are no dimensions provided. Large signage  
126 perpendicular to Saratoga Rd. in this location will further reduce visibility for all  
127 drivers.

128 We offer the following suggestions or alternatives to approving the variance and  
129 putting Return residents, visitors and patrons of 65 Saratoga Rd. at significantly  
130 increased safety risk:

131 • Affix signage to the buildings themselves, similar to what C2 Design Group has  
132 done at 24 Airport Rd., Schenectady, NY 12302. This will eliminate all potential  
133 additional safety risks.

134 • Place the signage on the North side of the entrance to 65 Saratoga Rd. (in front  
135 of building 65B). The signage could be placed closer to the building and  
136 potentially eliminate the obstructed view to all drivers.

137 • If signage by the road is absolutely necessary, orient it parallel to Saratoga Rd.  
138 so that the visual obstruction is limited to the depth of signage, and not the  
139 width. For example, it could be 5 sq. ft. vs. 40 sq. ft. of blockage. Also, place the  
140 signage as close to the 65 Saratoga Rd. parking lot, and as far away from  
141 Saratoga Rd. as possible.

142 Michael and Carmelina Dagostino 3 Miracle Lane

143  
144 Letter 3

145 This letter is written in response to the notice that was given to very few  
146 individuals living in the neighborhood "Return" concerning the variance of an  
147 extra 25 sq ft for a sign. I would like to mention that the amount of notice given  
148 to react to such a request was beyond insufficient. A mailing received the day  
149 after a holiday with only the weekend to ponder this request and respond with  
150 less than one business day in writing is disrespectful and ludicrous. The  
151 grammatical errors in the notice also show that it was written in haste and

152 *makes one think that this agenda is being rushed through with very little*  
153 *thought.*

154 *This sign affects the entire neighborhood in the Return, therefore, every resident*  
155 *should have been considered, not just people that live 500 feet away from the*  
156 *sign. It isn't the matter of "will this sign make my house look tacky and*  
157 *insufficient?" It is a matter of SAFETY! Entering and exiting has always been very*  
158 *difficult. Taking a left out of the neighborhood is nearly impossible. Adding a*  
159 *sign will only exacerbate the difficulty of exiting the neighborhood blocking the*  
160 *vision of all drivers. There should NOT be a sign erected at all, let alone a larger*  
161 *one.*

162 *If this committee approves this request due to inadequate responses from*  
163 *residents, then the zoning board has not done their due diligence in keeping*  
164 *Glenville residents safe. There was lack of time and lack of proper*  
165 *communication to survey the entire community that will be inconvenienced and*  
166 *endangered by such a proposal. We received our notice Friday, November 24.*  
167 *This was the day after one of the busiest holidays. Then we were to respond in*  
168 *writing by 3pm Monday, November 27, 2023. That is not even one business day.*  
169 *The taxes that we pay to live here imply that we deserve better. So do better and*  
170 *reach out to the people that will truly be affected by such a variance and give*  
171 *them proper time to respond.*

172 *Sincerely,*

173 *Christopher and Michele Bailey 5 Miracle Lane*

174

175 D. Hennel clarified that the Town is legally required to post the notice in the Daily  
176 Gazette, a requirement fulfilled on November 22nd. He emphasized that the mailing  
177 of letters to residents within 500 feet of the affected property is completely a  
178 courtesy on behalf of the Town. New York State does not require the Town to mail  
179 letters and neither does Glenville's own Town Code.

180 C. Pierson affirmed that New York State Town Law requires the Town to post notice in  
181 the local newspaper and that the mailing of letters is entirely a courtesy on behalf of  
182 the Town.

183 D. Hennel asked if the applicant, Richard Olson of Olson Signs, wished to add to the  
184 application.

185 R. Olson expressed his opinion that the proposed sign's placement was far enough  
186 back from Route 50 to not create an issue for traffic or safety. He indicated that the  
187 proposed sign would be 18ft from the Right of Way and there was likely 18-20  
188 additional feet from the edge of the pavement.

189 C. Beers observed that the provided renderings only show the distance from the sign to  
190 the ROW boundary, and not the edge of Route 50's pavement.

191 D. Hennel affirmed that the distance from the edge of pavement to the sign was not  
192 shown on the provided renderings.

193 R. Olson further added that there would not be enough wall surface on the buildings to  
194 mount signs. He explained that the proposed sign, designed with a 3inch font, was  
195 the smallest possible size while remaining legible to drivers.

196 D. Hennel sought clarification from J. Pangburn regarding how sign area is calculated  
197 according to Town Code.

198 J. Pangburn replied that only the sign face is included in the calculation of sign size.  
199 The proposed structure has a 40sqft sign face, with the pillars excluded in the size  
200 calculation. Therefore, the actual structure is larger than 40sqft.

201 **D. Hennel opened the public hearing.**

202 D. Hennel asked if anyone wished to speak in favor of the motion  
203 No one wished to speak in favor of the motion.

204 D. Hennel asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition to the motion  
205 Richard Usas of 1 Miracle Lane wished to speak.

206 R. Usas opposed the proposed sign for several reasons, citing safety concerns,  
207 particularly concerning the existing challenges when turning onto Route 50. He  
208 sought additional details on how the development, which the sign is intended for,  
209 obtained a Negative Declaration during the State Environmental Quality Review  
210 (SEQR) due to potential traffic impacts when all tenant spaces are occupied.

211 R. Usas highlighted the presence of an existing smaller temporary sign near the  
212 proposed sign location that he said already causes traffic and safety problems. He  
213 elaborated that the proposed sign, which is larger and closer to the road, would  
214 worsen these existing problems.

215 R. Usas suggested that the Glenville Highway Department meet with the Return's  
216 Neighborhood Advisory Committee to discuss this sign and future developments  
217 affecting the neighborhood.

218 R. Usas closed his comments by stating he would like to see more information about  
219 the sign than was provided.

220 D. Hennel requested R. Olson to distribute renderings of the proposed sign to  
221 attendees.

222 R. Olson distributed renderings of the proposed sign to attendees.

223 D. Hennel asked J. Pangburn if several wall-mounted signs would count towards the  
224 15sqft size limit or if each would be counted separately

225 J. Pangburn replied that the combined area of all signs on the property must not  
226 exceed 15sqft. He further explained that signs on doorways and, with some  
227 limitations, in windows do not count towards the 15sqft limit.

228 C. Pierson stated she would like to address the comment about SEQR made by R.  
229 Usas. She explained the ZBA is an appellate board and that interpreting zoning law

230 is a Type II Action, so the ZBA does not deal with SEQR in the same way as a  
231 Planning Board.

232 Michael Trier, 25 Praise Lane wished to speak.

233 M. Trier expressed concern about potential traffic issues arising from drivers slowing  
234 down to read the proposed sign. He recommended that the applicant consider a sign  
235 featuring only the address without listing individual businesses. According to M.  
236 Trier, this approach would enable people to locate the development easily and then  
237 find their intended business upon entering the parking lot.

238 Additionally, M. Trier highlighted the anticipated interference with the line of sight for  
239 residents leaving the Reserve Neighborhood. He emphasized that the proposed sign  
240 could pose safety concerns and create problems for those turning onto Route 50  
241 from both the development and the Return Neighborhood.

242 Jenny Lippmann, 21 Praise Lane wished to speak

243 J. Lippmann wanted to echo the sentiments expressed by previous speakers. She  
244 stated her biggest concern is that the temporary sign near the site of the proposed  
245 sign already obstructs the line of sight, causes traffic congestion, and is much  
246 smaller than the proposed sign. She also explained that while the sign face is 40sqft,  
247 the total size of the structure should be considered as it relates to safety and the line  
248 of sight for drivers.

249 J. Lippmann suggested relocating the sign further north or increasing its setback from  
250 Route 50. She also stated that it would be in everyone's interest for a sight distance  
251 study to be conducted.

252 Donald Sweet, 29 Joyous Lane wished to speak

253 D. Sweet described the current challenges associated with turning onto Route 50 from  
254 the Return neighborhood. He noted that even if the first driver waiting to turn onto  
255 Route 50 could see past the sign, subsequent drivers in line would be unable to  
256 observe traffic on Route 50. He described the increased danger in this common  
257 scenario if a sign were to be erected, explaining that many drivers tend to follow the  
258 lead of the car in front of them without looking at traffic themselves, making the  
259 absence of visibility a hazardous scenario.

260 Michael Dagastino, 3 Miracle Lane wished to speak

261 M. Dagastino expressed his opposition to the proposed sign, citing safety as his  
262 primary concern. He estimated the actual size of the sign to be closer to 100 square  
263 feet when factoring in the pillars. M. Dagastino specifically voiced concern for new  
264 drivers and school buses entering and exiting the neighborhood, emphasizing that  
265 the sign would hinder their ability to observe traffic on Route 50 which would create  
266 a dangerous situation.

267 To address these safety concerns, M. Dagastino suggested a smaller sign featuring  
268 only the address number. He argued that in an age where GPS is widely used for  
269 navigation, there is less need for signage as large as the one proposed. Additionally,

270 he questioned the applicant's assertion that visitors and customers would be unable  
271 to find their way to the property without the proposed sign.

272 Carmelina Dagastino, 3 Miracle Lane wished to speak

273 C. Dagastino stated that she is opposed to the sign because she already feels like her  
274 and her children's lives are at risk when turning onto Route 50 and the proposed  
275 sign would make it more dangerous.

276 C. Dagastino voiced her opinion that if the Board Members lived in the Return they  
277 would understand the high level of danger the proposed sign presents.

278 D. Hennel asked the Zoning Board of Appeals members if they had any questions.

279 B. Peterson asked if the property owner was present for questions.

280 R. Olson replied that the property owner was not able to attend the meeting.

281 B. Peterson asked R. Olson if putting the sign on poles to elevate it high in the air  
282 would be possible so the sight line of drivers exiting the Return would not be  
283 affected.

284 R. Olson replied that elevating the sign in such a manner had not been considered  
285 because the property owner wanted the sign to complement the building. He stated  
286 an elevated sign would look out of place.

287 B. Peterson asked R. Olson if there was any room for the sign to be moved further  
288 away from Route 50.

289 R. Olson replied that the sign could feasibly be moved 5ft further back from the  
290 property line.

291 D. Hennel clarified that, despite the presence of signs of similar size along Route 50,  
292 they are situated in different zoning districts, each with distinct requirements and  
293 limitations.

294 D. Hennel elaborated that the parcel under discussion is zoned as Professional  
295 Residential, a lower-intensity zone compared to General Business. This zoning  
296 designation is intended by the Town to serve as a transition from residential to  
297 commercial uses. He emphasized that the zoning of this parcel has remained  
298 unchanged since the development's construction. Additionally, he noted that the  
299 applicant consciously chose to build in this zone, fully aware of the limitations  
300 imposed by the Town Code.

301 B. Suydam stated that any size sign would obstruct the view in that location and also  
302 inquired about the feasibility of raising the sign so it would not obstruct the view of  
303 drivers exiting and entering the Return neighborhood. He also asked the audience if  
304 the existing Return sign was obstructing their view when turning onto Route 50.

305 D. Hennel referenced a map of the area and pointed out that the Return sign was much  
306 further from the road and was oriented at an angle. He believed the Return sign was  
307 far less obstructive.

308 J. Pangburn stated that elevated signs are not allowed in the Professional Residential  
309 Zoning District, only wall and monument signs are allowed.

310 D. Hennel asked if a combination of a monument sign and wall signs would need to be  
311 under 15sqft in combined area.

312 J. Pangburn confirmed that the combined size of all signs on the property needed to be  
313 under 15sqft.

314 Jenny Lippmann, 21 Praise Lane wished to speak.

315 J. Lippmann, noting her past service on the Glenville Planning Board during the  
316 approval of this development, emphasized the importance of conducting a sight  
317 distance study. She highlighted that the site plan review was carried out by the  
318 Glenville Planning Board under the assumption that the sign would adhere to Town  
319 Code.

320 J. Lippmann went on to explain that, had the application undergone review by the  
321 Planning Board with the communication of the need for a Sign Variance, the  
322 Planning Board would likely have insisted on a sight distance study before  
323 approving the application.

324 There was further speculation by audience members and Board Members about the  
325 true distance from the sign to the edge of pavement as compared to the Right of  
326 Way. The exact distance from the sign to the edge of pavement was not illustrated  
327 on the provided materials.

328 D. Hennel suggests requiring an exact distance from the sign to edge of pavement by  
329 the applicant shown on the map.

330 D. Hennel asked R. Olson if the sign could be moved further north.

331 R. Olson replied that he would need to check with the property owner regarding that  
332 question.

333 B. Suydam referenced photographs of the property and expressed doubt at the  
334 applicant's claim that there was no room for wall signs on the building. He stated  
335 there appeared to be plenty of space to mount a sign.

336 R. Olson replied that he could place wall signs, but it would be difficult and impractical.  
337 No one would be able to read the wall signs.

338 D. Hennel asked J. Pangburn about the rules for door and window signage. He wanted  
339 to know if tenants may each have their own signs on the windows and doors of their  
340 leased spaces.

341 J. Pangburn stated that yes, this would be allowed depending on the percent coverage.  
342 There are restrictions, but he did not recall the exact details.

343 D. Hennel asked if address signs could be wall-mounted on each building and not  
344 count towards the 15sqft size limit. He suggested having a monument sign fronting  
345 Route 50 showing the address and installing wall-mounted address signs on each  
346 building.

347 J. Pangburn answered that address signs are only exempt from sign size limits in  
348 residential zoning districts. The address signs would still count towards the  
349 maximum allowed square footage of 15sqft in the Professional Residential Zone.

350 B. Peterson asked R. Olson if the sign would be illuminated at night.  
351 R. Olson replied that yes, the sign would likely be illuminated at night.  
352 D. Schlankser stated that if the applicant came back with a more tasteful proposal that  
353 took into account neighboring residents' concerns, then he would be more agreeable  
354 to granting the Sign Variance. He suggested, as an example, that the applicant place  
355 an address sign along Route 50 and install signs located within the development. He  
356 explained that if the combined sign area exceeded 40sqft, but a significant portion of  
357 that area was located within the development and did not obstruct the view of  
358 drivers, he would be willing to consider the application favorably. He reiterated that  
359 he was speaking for himself and not for other board members.  
360 D. Hennel stated that if this application is denied then the applicant may appeal the  
361 decision or they may submit a new Sign Variance application.  
362 J. Pangburn added that a new application would need to be "substantially different"  
363 from the original application to be placed before the Zoning Board of Appeals again.  
364 He recalled that a new application would need to be roughly half the magnitude of  
365 the variance based on prior legal counsel related to other applications.  
366 R. Olson stated he may be able to downsize the sign and put wall signs on buildings.  
367 He would need to check with the property owner concerning these requests.  
368 D. Hennel asked if R. Olson would like to table the application or have the Zoning Board  
369 of Appeals vote tonight.  
370 R. Olson replied he would like to table the application and discuss alternative designs  
371 with the property owner.  
372 D. Hennel stated that the public hearing will remain open and they will continue with  
373 this application at a later date. He also encouraged more residents and interested  
374 parties to come and review the proposed sign.  
375 Christopher Bailey, 5 Miracle Lane, wished to speak  
376 C. Bailey expressed frustration at the timing of the letters notifying residents within  
377 500ft of the parcel requesting the Sign Variance. He stated that with the  
378 Thanksgiving Holiday, the letters should have been sent out sooner and should have  
379 been sent to all residents of the Return. He requested that the letters go out well in  
380 advance when the applicant re-applies for a sign variance and are delivered to every  
381 household in the Return neighborhood.  
382 D. Hennel reiterated that the Town is only legally required to advertise 5 days prior in  
383 the Daily Gazette and that the mailings are a courtesy on behalf of the Town.  
384 D. Hennel asked C. Pierson if the mailings would be sent out again if this ended up  
385 being a continuation of the current application and not a new one.  
386 C. Pierson stated she believed mailings would need to go out, but would need to  
387 research the topic to make sure.

388 D. Hennel reiterated that the letters are a courtesy and not required. He stated that if  
389 they were to be sent out again it would be to the same 44 residents that fall within  
390 500ft of the property applying for the Sign Variance.

391 J. Pangburn confirmed that the letters would be sent out to the same 44 residents that  
392 fall within 500ft of the property applying for the Sign Variance. He said that, as a  
393 courtesy, the Town would attempt to send out the mailings again if the same  
394 application is scheduled to be reviewed by the Zoning Board at a later date.

395 D. Hennel shared the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting schedule and directed the  
396 audience to use the Town website where the schedule is readily available and  
397 updated.

398 R. Usas requested more information, such as renderings and maps, to be provided to  
399 residents before the next Zoning Board meeting.

400 D. Hennel suggested R. Usas reach out to Olson Signs for the information requested.

401 J. Pangburn shared that the cut-off for the December Zoning Board of Appeals  
402 meeting was today, November 27<sup>th</sup>.

403 C. Beers stated that the audience members had provided anecdotes and shared their  
404 feelings, but he would like to see evidence that the proposed sign would disrupt  
405 traffic and impede safety. He suggested residents take measurements and provide  
406 evidence of the negative impacts.

407 C. Beers concluded by saying that R. Olson brought materials and evidence to the table  
408 while the audience members brought feelings.

409 One audience member stated that they may have brought evidence if they received  
410 further notice about the application.

411 J. Lippmann responded to C. Beers by stating that she did not believe it was the  
412 residents' burden to prove the sign would be unsafe and impede sight distance. She  
413 explained that the residents are not the ones requesting the Sign Variance; the  
414 applicant is applying for the Sign Variance. The burden of proof should be on the  
415 applicant to show that they should be allowed to deviate from Town Code.

416 D. Hennel and J. Pangburn discussed the feasibility of pushing back the deadline for  
417 the applicant to apply for the Sign Variance. They decided upon Monday December  
418 5<sup>th</sup> at 3pm as a revised deadline for a resubmittal.

419 D. Hennel requested further information from the applicant next time, such as distance  
420 from the sign to the edge of Route 50.

421 B. Suydam asked if the applicant could build a 15ft sign and then come back for a Sign  
422 Variance afterwards for additional space if needed.

423 D. Hennel replied that is correct.

424 R. Usas inquired about the need for the applicant to apply for a site plan amendment if  
425 the sign was changed.

426 J. Lippmann stated that if the sign location was unchanged, they would not need to  
427 apply for a site plan amendment. If the sign location were to be changed, it would  
428 likely need to come back before the Planning Board.

429 C. Pierson stated that once Glenville staff has reviewed the revised sign variance  
430 application then they would be able to determine if the change warrants a site plan  
431 amendment and would need to be placed before the Planning Board. She further  
432 explained that it would depend on the magnitude of the change.

---

433  
434 **MOTION:** To table the Sign Variance application by 65 Saratoga Road at the request of  
435 the applicant.

436 **MOVED BY:** D. Hennel

437 **SECONDED BY:** C. Beers

438 **AYES:** 5 (Hennel, Schlansker, Peterson, Suydam, Beers)

439 **NOES:** 0

440 **ABSENT:** 0

441 **MOTION APPROVED**

---

442  
443 **MOTION:** To adjourn the November 27<sup>th</sup>, 2023 meeting of the Town of Glenville Zoning  
444 Board of Appeals at 8:05 pm

445 **MOVED BY:** D. Hennel

446 **SECONDED BY:** B. Suydam

447 **AYES:** 5 (Hennel, Schlansker, Peterson, Suydam, Beers)

448 **NOES:** 0

449 **ABSENT:** 0

450 **MOTION APPROVED**

---

451

452

453

454

455

456

457 Next scheduled agenda meeting: December 11<sup>th</sup>, 2023

458 Next scheduled meeting: December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2023

459

460 \_\_\_\_\_  
461 Nicholas Chiavini, Stenographer Date \_\_\_\_\_

462

463 \_\_\_\_\_  
464 ZBA Chairman Date \_\_\_\_\_

465

466 \_\_\_\_\_  
467 Town Clerk Date \_\_\_\_\_

FINAL