

**MINUTES OF THE TOWN OF FORT EDWARD ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2021 AT TOWN HALL
COMMENCING AT 6:00 P.M.**

The meeting was called to order at 6:00pm

Pledge of Allegiance

PRESENT: Chairman Ken LaFay
Richard Fisher
Dolores Cogan
James King

ABSENT: James Maskell

OTHERS PRESENT: Brian Murphy, Jamie Webb and Town Engineer Chris Koenig

Chairman LaFay read the resignation letter of Jim King:

MOTION by Dolores Cogan, Seconded by Richard Fisher to accept the resignation of Jim King effective December 17, 2021 **ALL AYES**

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: MOTION by Dolores Cogan, Seconded by Jim King to approve the minutes of the meeting of August 19, 2021 **ALL AYES**

BUSINESS:

**Glens Falls National
343 Broadway
Area Variance – Sign**

Chris Koenig: The following items need to be clarified on the form:

- **Pg. 3 – Is the lot or parcel for the project within 500 feet of a County or State Highway, Right-of-Way or Park, or Municipal Boundary?** This should be marked yes because the parcel is on State Route 4.
- **Pg. 4 – Under Site Development Data (H) –** Should be 108sf not 29sf.
- **Pg. 6 – Character/Uses of surrounding or adjacent lands –** Commercial Highway
- **Pg. 6 – From which section of the Zoning Law are you requesting a variance? –** Section 108-12.2 (J)

The applicant is seeking 18sf of relief from the sign area regulations and must answer the following Balancing Test questions.

- 1) Whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties will be created by the granting of the area variance: **Board consensus: NO, commercial/highway area with similar signs.**
- 2) Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an area variance: **Board consensus: NO, this allows the bank to use brand consistent signage.**
- 3) Whether the requested area variance is substantial: **Board consensus: NO, the proposed sign is smaller than the sign they have now and they are only asking for a 38% increase in allowable area.**
- 4) Whether the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district: **Board Consensus: NO**
- 5) Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created, which consideration shall be relevant to the decision of the board of appeals, but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of the area variance: **Board consensus: YES, because they are asking for a new sign that is larger than current regulations allow.**

MOTION by Dolores Cogan, Seconded by Jim King to refer the application to the Washington County Planning Dept. **ALL AYES**

Chairman LaFay went through SEQR Part II with the Board:

MOTION by Dolores Cogan, Seconded by Richard Fisher to declare a negative declaration for SEQR review due to no potentially large adverse environmental impacts as a result of the project **ALL AYES**

Dolores Cogan: Do you have a start date?

Jamie Webb: We are planning to put it up the 2nd or 3rd week in January.

MOTION by Richard Fisher, Seconded by Jim King to approve the area variance contingent on review and approval from the County Planning Dept. and payment of fees **ALL AYES**

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION by Jim King, Seconded by Dolores Cogan to adjourn the meeting at 6:27pm **ALL AYES**

Dated: December 22, 2021

Aimee Mahoney, ZBA Clerk

