

Zoning Board of Appeals

TOWN OF BRUNSWICK

336 Town Office Road

Troy, New York 12180

MINUTES OF THE BRUNSWICK ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REGULAR MEETING HELD APRIL 21, 2025

PRESENT were ANN CLEMENTE, CHAIRPERSON, PATRICIA CURRAN, E. JOHN SCHMIDT and DARYL LOCKROW.

ABSENT was JOHN MAINELLO III.

ALSO PRESENT were WENDY KNEER and KEVIN MAINELLO, Brunswick Building Department.

Chairperson Clemente reviewed the agenda for the meeting, as posted on the Town sign board and Town website.

The draft minutes of the February 24, 2025 regular meeting were reviewed. There were no edits or corrections to be made. Chairperson Clemente made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 24, 2025 regular meeting without correction, which was seconded by Member Curran. The motion was unanimously approved and the minutes of the February 24, 2025 regular meeting were approved.

The draft minutes of the March 6, 2025 special meeting, specifically page 1 to the top of page 10, were reviewed. Chairperson Clemente made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 6, 2025 special meeting, specifically page 1 to the top of page 10, without correction, which was seconded by Member Curran. The motion was unanimously approved and the minutes of the March 6, 2025 special meeting, specifically page 1 to the top of page 10, were approved.

The first item of business on the agenda was an application for area variances submitted by Maries Muse, LLC for property located at 727-737 Hoosick Road and 4 Mohawk Avenue. Tim Freitag, from Bohler Engineering, and Colton Hill and Jared George, from Maries Muse, were present to review the application. Chairperson Clemente stated that written responses to all comments made at the public hearing and by written letter or email had been received by the Zoning Board. Mr. Freitag stated that the project review had been going on for approximately two years at that point; that the project had undergone extensive review by the Town, NYS Department of Transportation (DOT), and Rensselaer County; that a Negative Declaration had been made on the project by the Planning Board under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA); that a joint public hearing on the project had been held by the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals; and that the applicant had submitted written responses to comments. Mr. Freitag stated that traffic, particularly along Mohawk Avenue, was one of the major concerns raised at the public hearing, but that the Zoning Board would be considering area variances, which traffic did not apply to. Mr. Freitag stated that traffic was a Planning Board and SEQRA issue, not a Zoning Board issue, that extensive review of traffic and required off-site mitigation had been done, and that that extensive review had resulted in the Negative Declaration under SEQRA. Mr. Freitag then reviewed the eight area variances being sought: the first was for the total square footage of an accessory structure (canopy over the gas pumps and a storage shed), as 1,500 square feet is allowed and 4,560 square feet was proposed; the second was for having an accessory structure (canopy over the gas pumps) closer to the primary road (Hoosick Road) than the primary structure on the site; the third was a front setback variance for having an accessory structure (canopy over the gas pumps) within 75 feet of the front property line; the fourth was for the maximum height of the building on the site, as 30 feet is allowed and 32 feet was proposed; the fifth was a side yard

setback variance for the trash enclosure, as 25 feet of setback is required and approximately 5 feet was proposed; the sixth was for having parking spaces within 20 feet from a residential property line, as one proposed parking space was within 20 feet from the nearest residential property; the seventh was a rear yard setback variance for the trash enclosure, as 25 feet of setback is required and approximately 2.8 feet of setback was proposed; and the eighth was for having a fuel dispenser within 50 feet of the side lot line, as the fuel dispenser is proposed to be 45 feet from the side lot line. Member Schmidt asked if the Zoning Board could consider the issue of traffic, specifically on Mohawk Avenue, as part of its consideration of the eight variances. Attorney Gilchrist stated that the Zoning Board's jurisdiction was limited to the area variances currently before it, and reiterated Mr. Freitag's point that traffic data generally applied to the site plan, which was a Planning Board issue. Member Schmidt asked if the Zoning Board could ask the applicant about traffic issues and Mohawk Avenue. Attorney Gilchrist reiterated that traffic and vehicular circulation were generally Planning Board issues, and advised the Zoning Board that it must consider information relevant to the issues before it concerning the area variances. Chairperson Clemente stated that traffic is relevant to the character of the neighborhood, which the Zoning Board takes into consideration, and that while significant additional traffic was not anticipated by the applicant, it should still be considered at this point. Chairperson Clemente also noted that requiring signage and/or curbing onto Mohawk Avenue was suggested at the public hearing. Member Schmidt asked if a gate onto Mohawk Avenue accessible only by emergency vehicles could be required. Mr. Freitag stated that the applicant had discussed the secondary entrance to the site via Mohawk Avenue with QuickChek, the tenant for the proposed retail store, and that QuickChek was not interested in having a secondary entrance to the site being open only part-time. Mr. Freitag stated that the applicant was adamant about having the secondary entrance from

Mohawk Avenue, that the major issue being raised in relation to traffic along Mohawk Avenue was that cars may turn right out of the secondary exit and drive along Mohawk Avenue to Roosevelt Avenue, at the end of which is another traffic light. Mr. Freitag stated that the applicant did not believe there would be many cars going out of their way to drive to a traffic light further away when there would also be a traffic light at the main entrance to the project site at the intersection of Hoosick Road and McChesney Avenue, and that traffic would not increase much along Mohawk Avenue if the project were approved, which was supported by traffic studies of the project. Mr. Freitag also stated that the applicant would agree to add signage to the exit to Mohawk Avenue as a recommendation from the Zoning Board to the Planning Board. Member Curran stated that she drove along Hoosick Road almost every day and that traffic is often at a standstill at the intersection of Hoosick Road and McChesney Avenue and the intersection of Hoosick Road and Mohawk Avenue, so cars driving up Mohawk Avenue to Roosevelt Avenue to avoid that standstill was very likely. Chairperson Clemente noted that the Zoning Board had the ability to put conditions on the approval of an application. Member Curran asked what kind of barrier would be used along the rear property line near the dumpster. Mr. Freitag stated that a masonry enclosure, berm, and new landscaping would be installed on the site. Member Curran asked if there would be any screening provided for the canopy of the gas pumps. Mr. Freitag stated that a retaining wall would be built along the front of the site, and that there would be a row of shrubbery installed along that retaining wall. Chairperson Clemente stated that the potential widening of Hoosick Road in the future had been brought up at previous meetings, and asked why the Zoning Board should grant a variance for front setback when Hoosick Road could be widened in the future and change the setbacks. Mr. Freitag stated that the potential widening of Hoosick Road had been reviewed by NYS DOT, and that the application had been modified over time to increase the setback of the

structures from Hoosick Road. Member Curran stated that if Hoosick Road was widened and the project site got smaller, then several proposed parking spaces would be lost. Mr. Freitag stated that while that was true, all businesses along Hoosick Road would be impacted in the same way. Chairperson Clemente asked where fuel for the fuel dispensers would be stored. Mr. Freitag stated that the fuel would be stored underground and pointed out where it would be on the plan. Member Lockrow asked if the project could be redesigned to eliminate the Mohawk Avenue entrance to the site. Mr. Freitag stated that the Planning Board had done a thorough review of the site and that other options were considered before finalizing the current site layout. NYS DOT encourages exits onto side streets for projects such as this one, and that DOT encourages the elimination of curb cuts, not the introduction of them. Chairperson Clemente stated that in her opinion, Mohawk Avenue was not adequate for this use. Mr. Freitag stated that the applicant had met with NYS DOT for approximately three years reviewing the project, that the Town had retained an outside traffic consultant, that the applicant had reviewed several intersections near the project site, that the Planning Board had declared itself lead agency under SEQRA with the Zoning Board's consent, that the Planning Board had extensively reviewed traffic, and that the project would ultimately improve the traffic flow for the area. Chairperson Clemente asked if the applicant had any suggestions for mitigation of traffic on Mohawk Avenue. Mr. Freitag stated that the applicant was willing to put up signage prohibiting right turns onto Mohawk Avenue and allowing local traffic only. Chairperson Clemente stated that among the elements that the Zoning Board needed to take into consideration were any undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood, including the pre-and-post construction condition of the road, meaning that the applicant may be required to ensure the condition of the road. Mr. Freitag stated that he understood the concerns over the condition of Mohawk Avenue itself. Member Curran asked if the new traffic light at the

intersection of Hoosick Road and McChesney Avenue would be complete before construction on the project started. Mr. Freitag stated that the new traffic light would be installed concurrently with construction, not before, and that the project would require a work permit from NYS DOT. Member Curran asked how construction vehicles would get to and from the site. Mr. Freitag stated that construction would not be done all at once, but on a phased schedule, and that construction vehicles would enter and exit the site from Mohawk Avenue. Member Curran asked what the construction schedule would be, specifically what hours workers would be doing construction on the site. Mr. Freitag stated that the applicant would work with the Building Department on the construction schedule. Member Lockrow asked how long construction was expected to take. Mr. Freitag stated that construction was expected to take 6-8 months. Member Curran asked if there were limits on working hours for construction. Mr. Freitag stated that NYS DOT limitations would be applicable. Member Curran asked if the Zoning Board could place limitations on construction hours. Chairperson Clemente stated that the applicant had requested construction hours of 6:00 A.M. to 8:00 P.M., seven days a week. Mr. Freitag stated that the construction schedule was not relevant to the area variances currently before the Zoning Board, but that the applicant would work with the Building Department and neighbors in finalizing the construction schedule. Jared George, of Maries Muse, stated that the applicant understood the concerns about increased traffic on Mohawk Avenue due to the project, that the applicant was willing to agree to curbing allowing left-only exits onto Mohawk Avenue toward Hoosick Road from the secondary entrance to the site, and that he believed QuickChek would agree to that curbing. Mr. George also pointed out that should that curbing be installed, then people living on Mohawk Avenue would be directly affected, as they would not be able to turn right back onto Mohawk Avenue if they drove to the site and would have to find another way home. Member Lockrow noted that the canopy over the gas pumps

was in the area of emergency vehicle access and asked if the setback variance for the canopy would impede emergency vehicle access. Mr. Freitag stated that the applicant had worked with the Fire Department on the project, that the Fire Department had concluded that the canopy location did not impede emergency vehicle access, and that the applicant had worked with the Fire Department on truck routes and fire hydrant locations. Member Lockrow asked which Fire Department had jurisdiction over the project site. Mr. Mainello stated that he believed it was Brunswick Fire Co. No. 1, but that he would need to confirm that. Colton Hill, also of Maries Muse, reiterated that the applicant had made edits to the application based on comments from the Fire Department. Chairperson Clemente asked the other Zoning Board members if they would prefer to review the variances all at once or individually. Member Lockrow stated that he would prefer to review the variances individually, and the other Zoning Board members agreed. Member Curran asked if the Planning Board had asked if the number of gas pumps proposed for the site could be reduced. Mr. George stated that the proposal had initially been for eight gas pumps, that only six gas pumps were now proposed, and that QuickChek would not go any lower than six gas pumps as it would no longer be cost-effective or competitive with other nearby gas stations with fewer than six gas pumps. Mr. George also noted that the canopy over the gas pumps was not in front of the retail store, but beside it, which the applicant believed was more attractive to customers. Member Curran asked if the setbacks of the retail building complied with all zoning requirements. Mr. Mainello confirmed that they did. Member Curran asked if a variance was required for the size of the retail building. Mr. Freitag stated that a variance was not needed for the size of the building, just the height of it. Chairperson Clemente discussed SEQRA, stating that the project was in a non-residential zone and that a Full Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) had been submitted. Attorney Gilchrist noted that the Planning Board was serving as lead agency under SEQRA for

this project pursuant to a coordinated review, that the Planning Board had adopted a Negative Declaration on the project under SEQRA, and that the Negative Declaration was binding to all other involved agencies, including the Zoning Board. The Zoning Board members had no further questions or comments. The Zoning Board then reviewed the elements for consideration on the area variances requested in the application individually. The first variance reviewed was for the total square footage of an accessory structure (canopy over the gas pumps and a storage shed), as 1,500 square feet is allowed and 4,560 square feet was proposed. As to whether the requested variance would result in an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or create a detriment to nearby properties, Chairperson Clemente stated that it would be a change, but that the project was designed to reduce the significance of that change to the neighborhood, including adding a vegetative buffer. As to whether a feasible alternative was available, Member Lockrow stated that there was not, and that the neighbor adjacent to the project had submitted a letter in support of the project. As to whether the requested variance was substantial, Chairperson Clemente stated that 1,500 square feet was allowed and the applicant was requesting 4,560 square feet, meaning that a variance of 3,160 square feet was being requested, but did note that the size of the lot mitigated this factor. As to whether the variance would create an adverse environmental impact, Chairperson Clemente stated that it would not. As to whether the difficulty giving rise to the need for the variance was self-created, Chairperson Clemente stated that it was. The Zoning Board then reviewed the second variance, which was for having an accessory structure (canopy over the gas pumps) closer to the primary road (Hoosick Road) than the primary structure on the site. As to whether the requested variance would result in an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or create a detriment to nearby properties, Member Lockrow stated that the front of the canopy lined up with the parking in front of the building. Chairperson Clemente stated that,

like the first variance, the applicant had designed the site to mitigate impacts and make it visually appealing. As to whether a feasible alternative was available, Member Lockrow stated that there was no alternative without decreasing the number of gas pumps, which QuickChek was not willing to do. As to whether the requested variance was substantial, Chairperson Clemente stated that it was not, and noted that there were no dimensions listed in the Town Zoning Law concerning accessory structures being in front of primary structures, only that it was prohibited. As to whether the variance would create an adverse environmental impact, Member Curran stated that it would not, and that nothing about having the canopy closer to Hoosick Road than is allowed in the Town Zoning Law would have any environmental impact. As to whether the difficulty giving rise to the need for the variance was self-created, Chairperson Clemente stated that it was. The Zoning Board then reviewed the third variance, which was a front setback variance for having an accessory structure (canopy over the gas pumps) within 75 feet of the front property line. The proposal is for the canopy to be 56.5 feet from Hoosick Road, and that a variance of 18.5 feet is requested. As to whether the requested variance would result in an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or create a detriment to nearby properties, Member Curran stated that her comment on the second variance, that nothing about having the canopy closer to Hoosick Road than is allowed in the Town Zoning Law would have any environmental impact, applied here as well. As to whether a feasible alternative was available, Member Curran stated that there was no alternative without decreasing the number of gas pumps, which QuickChek had stated it was not willing to do. Chairperson Clemente stated that whether alternatives were available should be viewed in the context of need for future expansion of Hoosick Road. As to whether the requested variance was substantial, Member Curran stated that it was not. As to whether the variance would create an adverse environmental impact, Chairperson Clemente stated that it would not, as the applicant had

worked with the Planning Board to mitigate impacts to drainage, dust, odors and noise. As to whether the difficulty giving rise to the need for the variance was self-created, Chairperson Clemente stated that it was. The Zoning Board then reviewed the fourth variance, which was for the maximum height of the building on the site, as 30 feet is allowed and 32 feet was proposed. As to whether the requested variance would result in an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or create a detriment to nearby properties, Member Curran stated that it would not. As to whether a feasible alternative was available, Member Lockrow asked if the additional two feet of height was non-negotiable. Mr. George stated that it was, as it was part of QuickChek's design. Mr. George also stated that the project site was in a commercial zoning district, which extends into the Mohawk Avenue neighborhood well beyond the project site. Member Curran stated that even though the area was zoned commercial, there were still people living there in a residential neighborhood. Mr. George stated that the applicant was aware, and worked with the adjacent neighbor, who had submitted a letter in support of the project. As to whether the requested variance was substantial, the Zoning Board stated that it was not. As to whether the variance would create an adverse environmental impact, the Zoning Board stated that it would not. As to whether the difficulty giving rise to the need for the variance was self-created, Chairperson Clemente stated that it was. The Zoning Board then reviewed the fifth variance, which was for a side yard setback variance for the trash enclosure, as 25 feet of setback is required and approximately 5 feet was proposed. As to whether the requested variance would result in an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or create a detriment to nearby properties, Chairperson Clemente stated that it is the new internal lot line created by subdividing the lot that made the variance necessary, but that the variance would have no impact. As to whether a feasible alternative was available, Chairperson Clemente stated that the trash enclosure could be placed at the front of the

site, but that the applicant was choosing to place it at the back of the site. As to whether the requested variance was substantial, Member Curran stated that it would not be as it was a setback from an internal lot line. As to whether the variance would create an adverse environmental impact, the Zoning Board stated that it would not. As to whether the difficulty giving rise to the need for the variance was self-created, Chairperson Clemente stated that it was as the applicant was proposing the subdivision and placement of the internal lot line, and in that sense, it was self-created. The Zoning Board then reviewed the sixth variance, which was for having parking spaces within 20 feet from a residential property line, as one proposed parking space was within 20 feet from the nearest residential property. As to whether the requested variance would result in an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or create a detriment to nearby properties, Member Curran stated that it would not as the adjacent neighbor agreed with the setbacks. As to whether a feasible alternative was available, Member Curran stated that there was if the applicant reduced the number of parking spaces, but there was not if the number of parking spaces remained unchanged. As to whether the requested variance was substantial, Member Curran stated that it was not. As to whether the variance would create an adverse environmental impact, Member Curran stated that it would not. As to whether the difficulty giving rise to the need for the variance was self-created, the Zoning Board stated that it was. The Zoning Board then reviewed the seventh variance, which was for a rear yard setback variance for the trash enclosure, as 25 feet of setback is required and approximately 2.8 feet of setback was proposed. As to whether the requested variance would result in an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or create a detriment to nearby properties, Member Curran stated that it would not as the adjacent neighbor agreed with the setbacks. As to whether a feasible alternative was available, the Zoning Board stated that there was not. As to whether the requested variance was substantial, the Zoning Board

stated that there was not. As to whether the variance would create an adverse environmental impact, the Zoning Board stated that there was not. As to whether the difficulty giving rise to the need for the variance was self-created, the Zoning Board stated that it was. The Zoning Board then reviewed the eighth variance, which was for having a fuel dispenser within 50 feet of the side lot line, as the fuel dispenser was proposed to be 45 feet from the side lot line. As to whether the requested variance would result in an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or create a detriment to nearby properties, Chairperson Clemente stated that it would not as it is the new internal lot line created by subdividing the lot that made the variance necessary, but that the variance would have no impact. As to whether a feasible alternative was available, Member Curran stated that it would not. Member Lockrow stated that the only alternative was if the fuel dispensers and gas pumps were moved, which was not feasible with this project layout. As to whether the requested variance was substantial, Member Curran stated that it was not as it was only due to the internal lot line. As to whether the variance would create an adverse environmental impact, the Zoning Board stated that there was not. As to whether the difficulty giving rise to the need for the variance was self-created, the Zoning Board stated that it was. Chairperson Clemente stated that the Zoning Board needed to consider conditions on the application, some of which had already been discussed at the current meeting, including hours of construction, noting that working until 8:00 PM at night was too late and working seven days a week was too much, and that construction hours could be determined through a Zoning Board condition or Building Department determination. Mr. Freitag stated that construction hours could be a difficult condition as it may not be consistent with real world conditions, and stated that the applicant would request some sort of “carve out” for emergencies, which could be coordinated with the Building Department. Chairperson Clemente stated that for the Mohawk Avenue entrance, she would prefer curbing to

allow left turns only with signage stating left turn only or local traffic only. Member Schmidt again suggested a gate at the Mohawk Avenue entrance. Member Lockrow stated that curbing would not stop many people from turning right and driving up through the Mohawk Avenue neighborhood, that safety concerns for the surrounding neighborhood needed to be addressed, and that he also thought a gate would be a good idea. Chairperson Clemente suggested that a gate could be installed on a temporary basis to see what is developed across from Mohawk Avenue at the former dentist's office. Mr. George stated that the second entrance from Mohawk Avenue was being proposed as emergency responders wanted multiple access points to the site. Mr. George also stated that the curbing would be similar to the curbing at the Lowe's in Latham, which limited cars to turning left only when leaving the site, that that Lowe's also had left-only signage, and that the applicant was willing to further review signage and curbing at the Mohawk Avenue entrance with the Planning Board. Member Schmidt asked if the applicant was willing to agree that if the Mohawk Avenue entrance became a problem in the future, they would consider eliminating it. Mr. George stated that the applicant could not agree to that. Mr. Freitag stated that the applicant would be willing to work with the Planning Board on a Zoning Board recommendation for a gate at Mohawk Avenue. Mr. George stated that the site has been designed to set up future cross connectivity to adjacent properties going to the new traffic light at Hoosick Road. Chairperson Clemente stated that the Zoning Board could make a recommendation to the Planning Board concerning the condition of Mohawk Avenue and require post-construction repair if necessary. The Zoning Board further discussed construction hours/days; signage, curbing, and/or a gate at the Mohawk Avenue entrance; and the physical condition of Mohawk Avenue before and after construction as possible recommendations. Chairperson Clemente asked the other Zoning Board members if they wanted to make determinations on the eight area variances individually or

together, and the Zoning Board decided to make a determination on all eight variances at once. Member Curran made a motion to grant all eight area variances, with a condition that signage be installed at the exit from the site onto Mohawk Avenue prohibiting right turns and allowing local traffic only; a recommendation to the Planning Board that it consider curbing and/or a gate at the Mohawk Avenue entrance; a recommendation to the Building Department to consider hours and days of operation of construction; and a recommendation to the Building Department to consider making the applicant responsible for the physical condition of Mohawk Avenue before and after construction. Member Schmidt seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved and the eight area variances were granted subject to the stated condition and recommendations. Chairperson Clemente directed the applicant to continue working with the Town Building Department on this matter.

The second item of business on the agenda was an application for a sign variance and use variance submitted by Dan Levesque for property located at 557-561 Hoosick Road. Brian Holbritter, PLS, was present to review the application. Mr. Holbritter stated that he would be representing the applicant, that he had only very recently been hired by the applicant, and asked what the procedural status of the application was and what was needed. Mr. Holbritter stated that a copy of the application had been provided to him, that he needed to do survey work on the site, and that he needed to assess the building envelope. Mr. Mainello stated that 30-foot setbacks would be required, even after the proposed three lot consolidation. Chairperson Clemente stated that a use variance has a difficult standard, which includes the applicant not being able to obtain a reasonable economic return for the allowable uses on the site, and noted that the standard is for a “reasonable” economic return, not a profitable one. Chairperson Clemente reviewed what proof the Zoning Board required to prove the lack of a reasonable economic return. Chairperson

Clemente also stated that the parcel needed to have unique characteristics that were not applicable to the zoning district as a whole, and whether the need for the use variance was self-created, and that it is relevant as to whether the applicant acquired the property with notice of the condition for which it now requires the variance. Attorney Gilchrist also briefly reviewed the use variance and sign variance issues for Mr. Holbritter. This matter is tentatively placed on the May 19, 2025 agenda for further deliberation.

The Zoning Board discussed two items of new business.

The first item of new business was an area variance application submitted by Hal Smith for property located at 13 Heather Ridge Road. Hal Smith was present to review the application. Mr. Smith stated that he was proposing to build an attached accessory apartment on the side of his daughter's house and that it did not meet the required side yard setback, as 25 feet of side yard setback is required and he was proposing 12.8 feet of setback. Mr. Smith noted that there was not much area on the lot that was buildable due to wetlands on the lot, and that existing pine trees would serve as screening for surrounding neighbors. Member Curran asked if site plan approval and a special use permit would also be needed from the Planning Board. Attorney Gilchrist confirmed that they would be, but that the Zoning Board needed to act on the area variance application before the Planning Board could act. Chairperson Clemente stated that the application was complete for the purpose of holding a public hearing. Chairperson Clemente asked the applicant if the Zoning Board members had permission to visit the site. Mr. Smith confirmed that the Zoning Board members had permission to visit the site. A public hearing on this application is scheduled for May 19, 2025 at 6:00pm.

The second item of new business was an area variance application submitted by David Irons for property located at 8 Clinton Avenue. No one was present to review the application.

Chairperson Clemente noted that the applicant was seeking a front setback variance, that the parcel was an existing nonconforming structure, and that the proposed expansion of the house would meet all setbacks. Mr. Mainello stated that it was a nonconforming legal structure and that the Town Zoning Law prohibited altering or enlarging nonconforming structures, creating the need for the area variance. Chairperson Clemente asked if any renderings of the building had been submitted. Mr. Mainello stated that none had been, but that the existing building was a brick house and that the proposed addition would have vinyl siding. Chairperson Clemente reviewed the calculations on the application form. Mr. Mainello stated that the current and proposed lot coverage would be in compliance with the Town Zoning Law, noting that the house is currently 1,260 square feet, that 238 square feet was proposed to be added, that the expanded house would be 1,498 square feet, and that the maximum allowable lot coverage was 2,128 square feet, so it would still be in compliance. Chairperson Clemente stated that the application was complete for the purpose of holding a public hearing. Chairperson Clemente asked the Building Department to contact the applicant to see if the applicant granted permission to the Zoning Board members to visit the site. A public hearing on this application is scheduled for May 19, 2025 at 6:15pm.

The index for the April 21, 2025 regular meeting is as follows:

1. Maries Muse – area variances (approved with condition and recommendations).
2. Levesque – use variance and sign variance (May 19, 2025).
3. Smith – area variance (May 19, 2025).
4. Irons – area variance (May 19, 2025).

The proposed agenda for the May 19, 2025 regular meeting is as follows:

1. Smith – area variance (public hearing to commence at 6:00pm).
2. Irons – area variance (public hearing to commence at 6:15pm).
3. Levesque – use variance and area variance (tentative).