

## **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 DECEMBER 15, 2025**

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

ALSO PRESENT were KEVIN MAINELLO, Brunswick Building Department, and ANDREW GILCHRIST, ESQ., Attorney to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

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

The draft minutes of the November 17, 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 November 17, 2025 regular meeting without correction, which was seconded by Member Schmidt. The motion was unanimously approved and the minutes of the November 17, 2025 regular meeting were approved.

The first item of business on the agenda was an application for area variances submitted by Kyle Smith for property located at 1691 NYS Route 7. Kyle Smith was present to review the application. Chairperson Clemente asked if there had been any changes made to the application since the last Zoning Board meeting. Mr. Smith stated that there had been no changes made to the application since the last Zoning Board meeting, and that he was seeking the area variances to complete construction of a two-story building, the foundation of which had already been poured, which would be used as a commercial office space for a construction manager. The Notice of

Public Hearing was read into the record by Attorney Gilchrist, noting that the Notice of Public Hearing was published in the Troy Record, placed on the Town sign board, posted on the Town website, and mailed to the owners of all properties located within 300 feet of the project site. Chairperson Clemente opened the public hearing on the application. There were no public comments on the application. There were no questions or comments from the Zoning Board members. Chairperson Clemente made a motion to close the public hearing, which was seconded by Member Mainello. The motion was unanimously approved and the public hearing was closed. Chairperson Clemente stated that the application was for a nonresidential action under SEQRA and that a short Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) had been submitted by the applicant. The Zoning Board members reviewed the short EAF and concluded that there would be no adverse environmental impacts resulting from the action. Chairperson Clemente made a motion for a negative declaration on the project under SEQRA, which was seconded by Member Curran. The Zoning Board voted unanimously to declare a negative declaration on the application under SEQRA. Chairperson Clemente stated that the Town had received a letter from the Rensselaer County Bureau of Economic Development and Planning stating that the project would not have a major impact on County plans and that local consideration shall prevail. The Zoning Board then reviewed the elements for consideration on the area variances requested in the application. As to whether the requested variances would result in an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or create a detriment to nearby properties, Chairperson Clemente stated that a commercial building that was 816 square feet would not be out of place in the NYS Route 7 corridor. As to whether a feasible alternative was available, Member Mainello stated that the applicant was proposing to use the existing foundation, so there was not a feasible alternative. Chairperson Clemente stated that other options for the site had been explored, but that the proposed

use was the best option. As to whether the requested variances were substantial, Chairperson Clemente stated that the project site was a 0.49-acre parcel in a Business Light Overlay zoning district, and that the applicant was requesting four area variances for minimum lot size, minimum floor area of the proposed building, and two front setback variances since it was a corner lot. Chairperson Clemente stated that for the front setback variances, the applicant was proposing a 14.5-foot setback from Hoosick Road where 75 feet of setback is required, and 25 feet of setback from Deepkill Road where 75 feet of setback is required. Member Mainello stated that the two front yard setback variances were substantial, but that there were no other feasible options for the lot, and that the two other requested area variances were not substantial. As to whether the variances would create an adverse environmental impact, Member Mainello stated that there would not be due to the small size of the building and the building having the same use as the previous building on the site. As to whether the difficulty giving rise to the need for the variances was self-created, Member Curran stated that it was not self-created due to the previous building on the site needing to be taken down when it was hit by a car and suffered significant damage, and that the applicant was proposing to replace the original building with a building of the same size and use. Chairperson Clemente stated that the Zoning Board needed to balance the benefit to the applicant with any potential detriments to the surrounding neighborhood. Member Lockrow made a motion to grant the four area variances, which was seconded by Member Mainello. The motion was unanimously approved and the four area variances were granted. Chairperson Clemente directed Mr. Smith to continue working with the Town Building Department on this matter.

The second item of business on the agenda was an area variance application submitted by Jessica Gould and Robert Gould for property located at 538 McChesney Avenue Extension. Jessica Gould and Robert Gould were present to review the application. Chairperson Clemente asked if

there had been any changes made to the application since the last Zoning Board meeting. Mr. Gould stated that there had been no changes made to the application since the last Zoning Board meeting, and that he and his wife were proposing to build a garage on their property next to their house and that they had already discussed the project with their neighbors. The Notice of Public Hearing was read into the record by Attorney Gilchrist, noting that the Notice of Public Hearing was published in the Troy Record, placed on the Town sign board, posted on the Town website, and mailed to the owners of all properties located within 300 feet of the project site. Chairperson Clemente opened the public hearing on the application. There were no public comments on the application. There were no questions or comments from the Zoning Board members. Chairperson Clemente made a motion to close the public hearing, which was seconded by Member Curran. The motion was unanimously approved and the public hearing was closed. Chairperson Clemente stated that the project was a Type II action under SEQRA, which does not require any further SEQRA review. Chairperson Clemente stated that the Town had received a letter from the Rensselaer County Bureau of Economic Development and Planning stating that the project would not have a major impact on County plans and that local consideration shall prevail. The Zoning Board then reviewed the elements for consideration on the area variance requested in the application. 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 garage was proposed for an area of the property where it would not be very visible due to be screened by trees. As to whether a feasible alternative was available, Member Curran stated that there was not due to location of a well and septic system on the site, and that the proposed location worked best for the property owners. As to whether the requested variance was substantial, Chairperson Clemente stated that the project site was a 1.81-acre parcel in an R-15

residential zoning district, that the applicant was requesting a side yard setback of 10 feet where 15 feet was required, that the applicants were proposing a 30-foot by 48-foot garage, and that the variance was not substantial. As to whether the variance would create an adverse environmental impact, Chairperson Clemente stated that it would not due to the garage not resulting any increases in noise, odors, or drainage. As to whether the difficulty giving rise to the need for the variances was self-created, Chairperson Clemente stated that it was not due to the constraints on the property. Chairperson Clemente stated that the Zoning Board needed to balance the benefit to the applicant with any potential detriments to the surrounding neighborhood. Member Curran made a motion to grant the area variance, which was seconded by Member Mainello. The motion was unanimously approved and the area variance was granted. Chairperson Clemente directed Mr. and Mrs. Gould to continue working with the Town Building Department on this matter.

The third item of business on the agenda was a sign variance application submitted by AJ Sign Company for property located at 733-735 Hoosick Road. Tom Wheeler from AJ Sign Company was present to review the application. Chairperson Clemente asked if there had been any changes made to the application since the last Zoning Board meeting. Mr. Wheeler stated that there had been no changes made to the application since the last Zoning Board meeting, that the applicant was proposing one monument sign showing the logos of the Chipotle restaurant and Mattress Firm store at the site, that the Brunswick Zoning Law allowed only one business to be advertised on a monument sign, and that the applicant was proposing to consolidate the two businesses on the site on one sign instead of two. The Notice of Public Hearing was read into the record by Attorney Gilchrist, noting that the Notice of Public Hearing was published in the Troy Record, placed on the Town sign board, posted on the Town website, and mailed to the owners of all properties located within 300 feet of the project site. Chairperson Clemente opened the public

hearing on the application. Bill Bradley, of Bald Mountain Road, stated that he was very familiar with different types of signage used across the country, that the sign law in the Town Zoning Code was well-written, that multiple tenants on one sign is a good idea in this case, and that the proposed monument sign would be consistent with the character of the area. Mary Ellen Adams, of 18 Cooper Avenue, asked if the proposed sign would be 9 feet high. Kevin Mainello confirmed that the sign was proposed to be 9 feet high. Ms. Adams asked, because the site would be elevated, if the sign would be 15 feet off the sidewalk along Hoosick Road, which Mr. Mainello also confirmed. Ms. Adams asked why all three tenants on the site were not being advertised on one sign. Mr. Mainello explained that there were two parcels on the retail plaza project site – the left side of the site with the QuickChek convenience store, and the right side of the site with the Chipotle and Mattress Firm – and that the sign was only advertising the businesses for the parcel on the right side of the site. Ms. Adams stated that it made sense to consolidate the two tenants on one sign. Ms. Adams asked if the sign would be a monument sign or a pylon sign. Mr. Mainello stated that a monument sign was being proposed. Tim Galvin, of 5 Mohawk Avenue, read a letter written by Jim Tkacik discussing all signs being proposed for the site. Chairperson Clemente stated that six letters had been received by the Town concerning signs on the site. Member John Mainello asked if the illumination of the sign was an appropriate question that Zoning Board could ask about, and Attorney Gilchrist confirmed that it was. Member Mainello asked about the hours the sign would be lit, and specifically what would happen if one tenant of the site closed earlier than the other. Mr. Wheeler stated that the sign turned on and off all at once, that it could not only illuminate the sign for one business if one closed earlier than the other, and that the sign would stay lit until the tenant that stayed open later closed. Member Mainello noted that that could be an issue if a tenant that stayed open 24 hours a day later moved onto the site. Vincent DamaPoletto,

of 6 Mohawk Avenue, stated that he had no issue with a monument sign on the site, but asked how bright the sign would be. Mr. Wheeler stated that LED lights would be used in the sign that were less bright than other lights, and that those lights would only illuminate the sign, not shine outward. Member Curran stated that the Zoning Board should consider a condition that the monument sign could only have two tenants, in case other businesses were added to the site in the future. There were no further public comments on the application. There were no further questions or comments from the Zoning Board members. Chairperson Clemente made a motion to close the public hearing, which was seconded by Member Lockrow. The motion was unanimously approved and the public hearing was closed. Chairperson Clemente stated that the application was for a nonresidential action under SEQRA and that a short EAF had been submitted by the applicant. The Zoning Board members reviewed the short EAF and concluded that there would be no adverse environmental impacts resulting from the action. Member Mainello made a motion for a negative declaration on the project under SEQRA, which was seconded by Member Lockrow. The Zoning Board voted unanimously to declare a negative declaration on the application under SEQRA. The Zoning Board then reviewed the elements for consideration on the sign variance requested in the application. 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 a multi-tenant monument sign was being proposed and that only one tenant was allowed on a monument sign under the Town Zoning Code. Member Curran stated that it was a good idea to have both tenants on one sign instead of installing two signs. As to whether a feasible alternative was available, Member Curran stated that the applicant could install two monument signs, but reiterated that putting both tenants on one sign was a better idea. As to whether the requested variance was substantial, Chairperson Clemente stated that the total square footage of the proposed

sign was compliant with the Town sign law and that it would not be substantial. As to whether the variance would create an adverse environmental impact, Chairperson Clemente stated that the Zoning Board had adopted a negative declaration under SEQRA, and that there would be no negative environmental impacts from the sign. As to whether the difficulty giving rise to the need for the variance was self-created, Member Curran confirmed that it was, but that it was not determinative in this case. Chairperson Clemente stated that the Zoning Board needed to balance the benefit to the applicant with any potential detriments to the surrounding neighborhood. Member Mainello made a motion to grant the sign variance, with the conditions that the monument sign was limited to two tenants and that the sign must be turned off at 11:00pm. Member Schmidt seconded the motion, subject to the two conditions. The motion was unanimously approved and the sign variance was granted subject to the two conditions. Chairperson Clemente directed Mr. Wheeler to continue working with the Town Building Department on this matter.

The fourth item of business on the agenda was an application for sign variances submitted by AJ Sign Company for property located at 735 Hoosick Road. Tom Wheeler from AJ Sign Company was present to review the application. Chairperson Clemente asked if there had been any changes made to the application since the last Zoning Board meeting. Mr. Wheeler stated that there had been no changes made to the application since the last Zoning Board meeting, and that these sign variances were for the Chipotle restaurant on the site. Mr. Wheeler stated that the applicant was proposing a wall sign for the east side of the building; a wall sign on the front of the building facing Hoosick Road; directional signs to get customers to and through the drive-thru, including at the pick-up area; and a tenant panel on the previously-approved monument sign. Chairperson Clemente clarified that the Town Zoning Code allowed two signs on a site and that the applicant was seeking a variance for having more than the maximum number of signs allowed,

as well as having a wall sign on the side of the building, which was not allowed under the Town Zoning Code. Chairperson Clemente also stated that the total square footage of all proposed signs was in compliance the Town Zoning Code. The Notice of Public Hearing was read into the record by Attorney Gilchrist, noting that the Notice of Public Hearing was published in the Troy Record, placed on the Town sign board, posted on the Town website, and mailed to the owners of all properties located within 300 feet of the project site. Chairperson Clemente opened the public hearing on the application. Bill Bradley, of Bald Mountain Road, asked if the proposed panel in the pylon sign was for the monument sign that the Zoning Board had just approved, and Chairperson Clemente confirmed that it was. Mary Ellen Adams, of 18 Cooper Avenue, stated that the applicant was proposing a lot of signs for a small area, and that the sign on the side of the building was not necessary. Tim Galvin, of 5 Mohawk Avenue, again read a letter written by Jim Tkacik discussing all signs being proposed for the site. Vincent DamaPoletto, of 6 Mohawk Avenue, agreed that too many signs were proposed for the Chipotle building and that the sign on the side of the building was not necessary due to the proposed sign on the front of the building and panel on the monument sign in front of the site. Tim Galvin, of 5 Mohawk Avenue, spoke again and asked if the signs would be visible from the dentist's office on the east side of the site, which has shrubbery along the property line. Mr. Wheeler stated that he did not know if the signs would be visible from the adjacent dentist's office. Member Curran asked if the proposed wall signs on the front and side of the building would be lit. Mr. Wheeler stated that those signs would be lit, and that just the letters and logo would be lit, not the whole sign. Mr. Wheeler also stated that LED lights would be used in the wall signs, and that there would be no light spillage. Kevin Mainello noted that the short EAF submitted by the applicant needed to be edited to show the correct square footage of one of the proposed signs, and noted that the total square footage of all signs was still

in compliance with the Town Zoning Code. Member Mainello asked if the two wall signs would have backlighting. Mr. Wheeler stated that there would be no backlighting for the wall signs, and that only the letters and logos would be lit up. Chairperson Clemente stated that two sign variances were before the Zoning Board: for the total number of signs on the site, with four signs proposed where two signs were allowed, and for proposing a wall sign on the side of the building, which was not allowed under the Town Zoning Code. Chairperson Clemente noted that the Zoning Board had just approved a variance for the monument sign in front of the site, and that the panel sign was for that monument sign. Chairperson Clemente reiterated that the applicant was proposing four signs: a wall sign for the east side of the building; a wall sign on the front of the building facing Hoosick Road; directional signs to get customers to and through the drive-thru, including at the pick-up area; and a tenant panel on the previously-approved monument sign. Member Mainello stated that he had no issue with the proposed directional signs, which would help with traffic flow through the site, but agreed with multiple public comments that the wall sign on the east side of building was unnecessary. Member Lockrow asked if the wall signs would be at the top of the building. Mr. Wheeler confirmed that they would be. Member Lockrow noted that the wall signs would be higher in elevation and visible to the surrounding neighbors. Member Lockrow agreed with multiple public comments that the wall sign proposed for the east side of the building was unnecessary as the wall sign on the front of the building would be visible from all points on Hoosick Road. Member Mainello stated that the wall sign proposed for the east side of the building would not be as visible due to vegetation on the adjacent parcel, and that the traffic light on Hoosick Road right in front of the project site caused traffic to slow down and would help drivers notice the site. Chairperson Clemente stated that the Zoning Board seemed to be in favor of the wall sign on the front of the building, the directional signage, and the panel on the previously-

approved monument sign, but that the members seemed to be against the wall sign proposed for the east side of the building. Chairperson Clemente stated that the signs only being lit during business hours could be a condition for the Zoning Board to consider. The Zoning Board then closed the public hearing. Attorney Gilchrist reviewed the procedural options for the Zoning Board, stating that the Board had 62 days from the close of the public hearing to act on the sign variances, and that the Board could consider the sign variances together or individually. The Zoning Board determined that it would consider the four signs individually. Chairperson Clemente stated that the Zoning Board needed to balance the benefit to the applicant with any potential detriments to the surrounding neighborhood. The Zoning Board considered the panel on the monument sign. Member Mainello made a motion to approve the panel on the monument sign, which was seconded by Member Curran. The Zoning Board voted unanimously to approve the panel on the monument sign. The Zoning Board then considered the directional signs on the site, including at the pick-up area. Member Lockrow then made a motion to approve the directional signs through the site, including at the pick-up area, which was seconded by Member Curran. The Zoning Board voted unanimously to approve the directional signs. The Zoning Board then considered the wall sign on the front of the building. Member Lockrow pointed out that that sign did not require a variance. The Zoning Board then considered the wall sign for the east side of the building. Attorney Gilchrist reviewed the elements for consideration on a sign variance for the proposed wall sign on the east side of the building, advising that a thorough review should be undertaken. The Zoning Board then reviewed the elements for consideration on the sign variance for the proposed wall sign on the east side of the building. 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 there would be a clear change to the

neighborhood due to the sign on the east side of the building. As to whether a feasible alternative was available, Member Mainello stated that a wall sign was also proposed for the front of the building, which would be adequate. As to whether the requested variance was substantial, Chairperson Clemente stated that it was substantial as one wall sign on the front of the building was adequate and a wall sign on the east side of the building would be excessive. As to whether the variance would create an adverse environmental impact, Member Mainello stated that a second wall sign would increase the amount of light pollution created by the site. As to whether the difficulty giving rise to the need for the variance was self-created, Chairperson Clemente confirmed that it was. Chairperson Clemente then noted that the Zoning Board has not yet addressed SEQRA for this application. Chairperson Clemente stated that the application was for a nonresidential action under SEQRA and that a short EAF had been submitted by the applicant. The Zoning Board members reviewed the short EAF and concluded that there would be no adverse environmental impacts resulting from the action. Chairperson Clemente made a motion for a negative declaration on the project under SEQRA, which was seconded by Member Curran. The Zoning Board voted unanimously to declare a negative declaration on the application under SEQRA. The Zoning Board then confirmed its earlier determinations on this application. Member Curran then made a motion to deny the sign variance for the wall sign on the east side of the building, which was seconded by Member Mainello. The Zoning Board voted unanimously to deny the sign variance for the wall sign on the east side of the building. Chairperson Clemente clarified that the Zoning Board had approved three signs for the site – the panel on the monument sign, the directional signage through the site, and the wall sign on the front of the building – and denied the wall sign for the east side of the building. Chairperson Clemente directed Mr. Wheeler to continue working with the Town Building Department on this matter.

The fifth item of business on the agenda was a sign variance application submitted by Anchor Sign, Inc. for property located at 733 Hoosick Road. Tom Wheeler from AJ Sign Company was present to review the application, and stated that the representative from Anchor Sign, Inc. could not be present at the current meeting. Chairperson Clemente asked if there had been any changes made to the application since the last Zoning Board meeting. Mr. Wheeler stated that there had been no changes made to the application since the last Zoning Board meeting, and that this sign variance was for the Mattress Firm store on the site. Mr. Wheeler stated that the applicant was proposing two wall signs on the building, one on the west side and one on the front facing Hoosick Road. The Notice of Public Hearing was read into the record by Attorney Gilchrist, noting that the Notice of Public Hearing was published in the Troy Record, placed on the Town sign board, posted on the Town website, and mailed to the owners of all properties located within 300 feet of the project site. Chairperson Clemente opened the public hearing on the application. Mary Ellen Adams, of 18 Cooper Avenue, stated that one wall sign on the front of the building would be adequate and the second proposed wall sign would be excessive. Bill Bradley, of Bald Mountain Road, asked who specifically owned the proposed signs, not just for the current application, but for all sign applications before the Zoning Board at the current meeting. Attorney Gilchrist stated that the sign variances run with the land, not the property owner, meaning that if another owner or tenant took over the site at 733 Hoosick Road, they would be entitled to the current sign variance if the Zoning Board approved it. Tim Galvin, of 5 Mohawk Avenue, stated that the wall sign proposed for the side of building would not serve any purpose as it would be hidden by the QuickChek convenience store and gas pumps on the adjacent parcel. Vincent DamaPoletto, of 6 Mohawk Avenue, stated that too many signs on the project site overall could cause cars driving by the site to become distracted and cause a safety issue, and stated that the wall sign on the side of

the building would be redundant since any potential customers for the Mattress Firm store would have already seen the panel on the monument sign and the wall sign on the front of the building before seeing the sign on the side of the building. Chairperson Clemente noted that four written letters had been received by the Town concerning the sign variance for the Mattress Firm site – from Patti Sbrega, Victoria Galvin, Kim Jensen, and Jim Tkacik – all dated December 15, 2025 and all in opposition to the sign variance. There were no further public comments on the application. There were no further questions or comments from the Zoning Board members. Chairperson Clemente made a motion to close the public hearing, which was seconded by Member Lockrow. The motion was unanimously approved and the public hearing was closed. Chairperson Clemente stated that the application was for a nonresidential action under SEQRA and that a short EAF had been submitted by the applicant. The Zoning Board members reviewed the short EAF and concluded that there would be no adverse environmental impacts resulting from the action. Chairperson Clemente made a motion for a negative declaration on the project under SEQRA, which was seconded by Member Mainello. The Zoning Board voted unanimously to declare a negative declaration on the application under SEQRA. Chairperson Clemente stated that the Town had received a letter from the Rensselaer County Bureau of Economic Development and Planning stating that the project would not have a major impact on County plans and that local consideration shall prevail. The Zoning Board then reviewed the elements for consideration on the sign variance requested in the application. 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 two signs would cause visual congestion on the site, which would be an undesirable change to the neighborhood. As to whether a feasible alternative was available, Member Curran stated that the wall sign on the front of the building and the previously-approved

monument sign were adequate alternatives, and that customers might not even see the sign due to it being blocked by the adjacent QuickChek convenience store and gas station. As to whether the requested variance was substantial, Member Curran stated that the sign was unnecessary, so it was substantial. As to whether the variance would create an adverse environmental impact, Member Mainello stated that a wall sign on the west side of the building would face the surrounding neighborhood, which would be an adverse impact. As to whether the difficulty giving rise to the need for the variance was self-created, Chairperson Clemente confirmed that it was. Chairperson Clemente stated that the Zoning Board needed to balance the benefit to the applicant with any potential detriments to the surrounding neighborhood. Member Curran made a motion to deny the sign variance for the wall sign on the west side of the building, which was seconded by Member Lockrow. The Zoning Board voted unanimously to deny the sign variance for the wall sign on the west side of the building.

The sixth item of business on the agenda was an application for sign variances submitted by QuickChek Corporation for property located at 731 Hoosick Road. Tim Freitag, from Bohler Engineering, was present to review the application. Mr. Freitag stated that the applicant had been present at the Zoning Board's September 15 and October 20 meetings, and that the initially requested signage for the site had been significantly scaled back, including eliminating directional signs through the site, reducing the height of a freestanding pylon sign, and removing a wall sign proposed for the side of the building. Mr. Freitag listed the four requested sign variances: for a two-sided freestanding pylon sign, each side being 80 square feet for a total of 160 square feet, where a freestanding pylon sign is allowed a maximum of 70 square feet; for having two signs on the gas canopy, each sign being 22.6 square feet for a total of 45.2 square feet, where zero signs are allowed on a gas canopy; for one wall sign on the front of the building with the "Q" logo being

more than three feet above the roofline, which is not allowed; and for proposing two wall signs on the front of the building, two signs on the gas canopy, and the freestanding pylon sign, which is a total of five signs, where either two wall signs or one wall sign and one freestanding sign are allowed on a commercial site. Mr. Freitag stated that while a fifth variance for total square footage of all signs on the site had been listed in the public hearing notice, that by eliminating the wall sign on the side of the building, the total square footage of all signs proposed for the site was under 300 square feet, which is the maximum square footage allowed for signs on a commercial site, so the fifth variance was no longer being requested. Mr. Freitag noted that at the October 20 meeting, he had compared the signage proposed for the site to signage at other commercial sites on Hoosick Road, specifically the Cumberland Farms, which has the same five signs (two wall signs on the building, two signs on the gas canopy, and a freestanding sign) that were being proposed for the QuickChek site and that the proposed signage for the QuickChek site was therefore not excessive. Mr. Freitag also clarified that the applicant was not proposing any signage to face the neighboring residences. Chairperson Clemente asked what specific variance was being requested for the wall signs on the building. Mr. Freitag stated that the “Q” logo was being proposed to be six feet nine inches higher than the roofline of the building, and that since a wall sign can be a maximum of three feet above the roofline of the building, a variance was required. Member Curran asked for clarification on the height of the building versus the height of the “Q” logo sign. Mr. Freitag stated that the Brunswick Building Department had determined that the height of the building was the roofline, not a tower on the building that was higher than the roofline, and since the “Q” logo sign was proposed to be attached to that tower, a variance was required. Chairperson Clemente asked to confirm that the freestanding sign was proposed to be 80 square feet on each side, for a total of 160 square feet, where a total of 70 square feet was allowed, meaning that the applicant was

requesting 90 square feet of relief. Mr. Freitag confirmed that was correct. Chairperson Clemente stated that she had recently travelled through northern New Jersey, where there were many QuickChek locations, and noted that several QuickCheks had no signage on the gas canopy and that it did not seem to affect business volume. Mr. Freitag stated that the purpose of the signs on the gas canopy was to confirm that the fuel being sold was QuickChek-branded fuel and not fuel from a separate brand, and noted that the Cumberland Farms on Hoosick Road had signs on its fuel canopy for the same reason. Chairperson Clemente stated that the fuel canopy being the same shade of green as the QuickChek logo should alert customers to the fuel being QuickChek-branded fuel. Mr. Freitag stated that QuickChek is currently not a brand in the NYS Capital District, so customers would not immediately make that connection. Mr. Freitag also stated that when deciding which sign to remove from the proposal, the applicant selected the wall sign on the side of the building as the signs on the canopy were more important. The Notice of Public Hearing was read into the record by Attorney Gilchrist, noting that the Notice of Public Hearing was published in the Troy Record, placed on the Town sign board, posted on the Town website, and mailed to the owners of all properties located within 300 feet of the project site. Attorney Gilchrist noted that due to the wall sign on the side of the building no longer being proposed, only five total signs were proposed instead of six, but that a variance was still required for total number of signs on the site as only two signs were allowed. Attorney Gilchrist also stated that the variance for total square footage of all signs on the site was no longer being requested. Chairperson Clemente opened the public hearing on the application. Bill Bradley, of Bald Mountain Road, stated that the heights of all proposed signs must be considered, and asked if having signs on the gas canopy was necessary. Mr. Bradley noted that the Zoning Board would be setting a bad precedent if all proposed signs were approved, as other gas stations and convenience stores would apply for, and potentially be

granted, excessive signage that goes against the Town sign law, and that setting such a precedent could cause big changes to the character of the area over time. Mr. Bradley stated that any approved signs should be low to the ground and unobtrusive. Mary Ellen Adams, of 18 Cooper Avenue, asked what was considered the front of the QuickChek building and where the wall signs proposed for the front of the building would face. Mr. Freitag stated that the front of the building faced Hoosick Road, so the two wall signs proposed for the front of the building would face Hoosick Road. Ms. Adams stated that signs on the gas canopy were not necessary and that the “Q” logo sign proposed for the front of building would be significantly higher than Hoosick Road since the site had been raised before construction. Ms. Adams stated that she was against the “Q” logo on the front of the building, and that the lights being proposed to be lit 24 hours a day, the same hours as the QuickChek store, was excessive. Ms. Adams stated that traffic significantly slowed down along Hoosick Road in front of the project site, which would give potential customers adequate time to know that the site was a gas station and convenience store, making much of the signage excessive and unnecessary. Ms. Adams stated that due to the retaining wall in front of the site, and the site being heightened, the signs would be even higher than necessary. Ms. Adams also handed up written comments to the Zoning Board. Tim Galvin, of 5 Mohawk Avenue, again read a letter written by Jim Tkacik discussing all signs being proposed for the site, then read a letter from Victoria Galvin. Vincent DamaPoletto, of 6 Mohawk Avenue, stated that he and his family lived directly adjacent to the project site, that the request for a freestanding sign greater than the maximum square foot age allowed was not necessary, and that bigger signs would result in more light pollution to the surrounding area. Mr. DamaPoletto asked if the proposed wall signs would use LED lights. Mr. Freitag confirmed that LED signs would be used and that the signs would have backlighting. Mr. DamaPoletto stated that there was already a significant lighting impact to

the surrounding neighborhood due to the overall project site and these proposed signs would make it worse. Mr. DamaPoletto asked if the height of the freestanding pylon sign was being measured from the sidewalk along Hoosick Road or from the elevated site. Kevin Mainello stated that the height of the freestanding sign was being measured from where it was in the ground, meaning from the elevated site. Robin Jones, of 105 Hillside Avenue, stated that the aesthetics of the surrounding neighborhood had already been destroyed by the project, and the proposed signs would only make it worse. Ms. Jones stated that the area was now a “commercial circus,” that no one on the Town Board, Planning Board, or Zoning Board lived near the site and had to deal with it, and that people were already starting to move out of the neighborhood due to the excessive commercialization of the area. Mr. Freitag asked if he could address public comments at the current meeting. Chairperson Clemente stated that the Zoning Board had the option of whether to require written responses from the applicant to all comments made at the public hearing and by written letter. Member John Mainello stated that he wanted to allow the applicant to respond at the current meeting. Mr. Freitag stated that the height of the proposed freestanding sign was compliant with the Town sign law. Member Mainello asked to confirm that the variance concerning the freestanding sign was for that sign’s square footage, not the height. Mr. Freitag confirmed that was correct. Mr. Freitag stated that the wall signs would not be visible to properties along Mohawk Avenue, and that backlit LED signs would be used for the wall signs, which would not shine outward. Mr. Freitag stated that the location of the proposed freestanding sign was consistent with the recently-approved monument sign for the Chipotle restaurant and Mattress Firm store on the adjacent parcel. Mr. Freitag noted that multiple comments had been made concerning the character of the neighborhood and stated that the applicant and Building Department had reviewed other signs in Brunswick, that those proposed by QuickChek were consistent with other signage in

Town, and that reducing the proposed signage would put QuickChek at a competitive disadvantage. Mr. Freitag also requested a determination on the sign variances at the current meeting due to the time needed to order and install the signs. Member Curran noted that there would be signage on the gas pumps themselves and asked why additional signs on the gas canopy were necessary. Mr. Freitag stated that potential customers driving on Hoosick Road would not be able to see the smaller logos on the gas pumps while driving by, but would be able to see the signs on the gas canopy. Member Curran stated that the signs on the gas canopy were to advertise QuickChek-branded gas, but if there were to be QuickChek logos on the freestanding sign, the front of the building, and the gas pumps, then the signs on the gas canopy would be unnecessary and excessive. Member John Mainello noted that at other gas stations along Hoosick Road, the gas canopy was in front of the building and blocked it, but that the gas canopy on this site was next to the building, allowing it to be fully seen from the road and surrounding neighborhood. Member Mainello asked what the freestanding sign would look like if the Zoning Board denied the variance request and it had to be redesigned to be a total of 70 square feet. Mr. Freitag stated that the freestanding sign would likely be the same height, but a smaller size, and noted that the writing on the sign needed to be clear, and that other gas stations in the area have requested a freestanding sign of the size the applicant was currently requesting. Chairperson Clemente stated that the freestanding sign should be consistent with the monument sign the Zoning Board approved earlier in the meeting for the adjacent site for the other tenants in that commercial plaza. Mr. Freitag disagreed, stating that the freestanding sign should not be compared to a sign for a retail site, but to signs for other gas stations along Hoosick Road. Member Curran noted that the monument sign on the adjacent parcel for the two retail businesses would be 9.5 feet tall, and that a 20-foot-tall pylon sign on the adjacent parcel would look strange. Mr. Freitag stated that QuickChek was not

involved with the application for the monument sign on the adjacent parcel and noted that the applicant for the adjacent parcel could have applied for a 20-foot-tall sign as well, but chose not to. Member Curran stated that other gas stations in the area have monument signs that are not 20 feet tall. Mr. Freitag reiterated that the applicant was not applying for a variance for the height of the freestanding sign, just the overall square footage of that sign. Member Mainello stated that decreasing the overall size of the freestanding sign would allow the sign to also decrease in height. The Zoning Board members then deliberated on the size and height of the freestanding sign. Bill Bradley, of Bald Mountain Road, spoke again, thanking the Zoning Board for asking questions of the sign variance requests. Mr. Bradley stated that the Zoning Board should have the authority to address the height of a sign within the context of a variance for the overall square footage of the that sign. Mr. Bradley also asked that the public hearing be kept open and that the applicant be required to submit an alternate rendering of the freestanding sign with a lower height and smaller size. Mr. Freitag and the Zoning Board members further discussed the size of the freestanding sign, with Mr. Freitag stating that the applicant was willing to decrease the size and height of that sign. Mary Ellen Adams, of 18 Cooper Avenue, spoke again, stating that she also appreciated the thorough review of the sign variances by the Zoning Board, and that she opposed the heights of all proposed signs on the site. Member Curran stated that she would like to see a rendering of the freestanding sign at a reduced height. Mr. Freitag asked what specific height the Zoning Board wanted the sign to be. After further deliberation, Mr. Freitag stated that the applicant would be willing to reduce the size of the freestanding sign to 50 square feet per side, for a total of 100 square feet, which would reduce the height of that sign to 16 feet. Mr. Freitag stated that a rendering of a smaller sign would be submitted, but reiterated that the rendering would be the same sign, just smaller. Tim Galvin, of 5 Mohawk Avenue, spoke again, stating that traffic is slow on

Hoosick Road in front of the site, making such excessive signage unnecessary. Mr. Galvin also asked if any signs would be installed on the retaining wall in front of the site. Kevin Mainello stated that no signs would be installed on the retaining wall. There were no further public comments on the application. There were no further questions or comments from the Zoning Board members. Chairperson Clemente made a motion to close the public hearing, which was seconded by Member Mainello. The motion was unanimously approved and the public hearing was closed. Attorney Gilchrist asked if the application had been forwarded to the Rensselaer County Bureau of Economic Development and Planning and if so, if a response had been received by the Town. Kevin Mainello stated that the Building Department had not received a response from Rensselaer County. The Zoning Board discussed whether the application had been sent to Rensselaer County. Attorney Gilchrist stated that the Zoning Board must act in compliance with the NY General Municipal Law and the application must be sent to the County, and that if action was taken within the 30-day timeframe the County has to respond, the action taken would be negated. The Zoning Board discussed scheduling a special meeting for January 12, 2026 to continue deliberation of these sign variances. The Zoning Board determined to confirm whether the application was sent to Rensselaer County and schedule a special meeting for January 12, 2026. Mr. Freitag asked if a SEQRA determination could still be made at the current meeting. Attorney Gilchrist stated that whether to make a SEQRA determination at the current meeting was at the discretion of the Zoning Board. The Zoning Board declined to make a SEQRA determination. This matter is tentatively placed on an agenda for a January 12, 2026 special meeting, if determined to be scheduled.

The Zoning Board noted that its regular January 2026 meeting would be delayed one week due to the Martin Luther King holiday and would be rescheduled for January 26, 2026.

The index for the December 15, 2025 regular meeting is as follows:

1. K. Smith – area variances (approved).
2. Gould – area variance (approved).
3. AJ Sign Company – sign variance (approved with conditions).
4. AJ Sign Company – sign variances (partially approved, partially denied).
5. Anchor Sign – sign variance (denied).
6. QuickChek – sign variances (January 12, 2026).

The proposed agenda for the January 12, 2026 special meeting (if scheduled) is as follows:

1. QuickChek – sign variances.