

CHILI ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
October 24, 2017

A meeting of the Chili Zoning Board was held on October 24, 2017 at the Chili Town Hall, 3333 Chili Avenue, Rochester, New York 14624 at 7:00 p.m. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Adam Cummings.

PRESENT: Mark Merry, Fred Trott, James Valerio, James Wiesner and Chairperson Adam Cummings.

ALSO PRESENT: Eric Stowe, Assistant Town Counsel; Paul Wanzenried, Building Department Manager.

Chairperson Adam Cummings declared this to be a legally constituted meeting of the Chili Zoning Board. He explained the meeting's procedures and introduced the Board and front table. He announced the fire safety exits.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Any issues with the sign?

The Board indicated they had no problem with the notification sign.

1. Application of American Packaging Corp., owner; 100 APC Way, Columbus, Wisconsin 53925 for variance to erect a 10'6" x 6' double faced monument sign to be 63 sq. ft. per Side (16 sq. ft. per side allowed) for a total of 126 sq. ft. (32 sq. ft. total allowed), variance for sign to be 8' tall (5' allowed), variance to erect a 42'7" x 27' wall sign to be 1,150 sq. ft. (100 sq. ft. allowed) at property located at 70 Beaver Road in L.I. zone.

Jeffrey LaDue and Brendan O'Hara were present to represent the application.

ADAM CUMMINGS: I am almost thinking it might behoove us to split this into separate applications just -- I will leave that to you as the applicant. If we vote on them all together and a portion of it gets voted down, then all gets voted down.

Whereas, if we split these different ones separately -- not to say which way our Board is going, but you just want to lend that out to the applicant.

MR. LADUE: Separate would be fine.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Separate sounds good.

If you could introduce yourself. Plead your case today.

MR. LADUE: Certainly. Chairman, Board members thank you for allowing us to present the proposed signage for American Packaging. My name is Jeff LaDue. I'm an architect with SWBR.

Also attending is Brendan O'Hara. He is a Facility Manager at the facility in question.

I would like to -- I have some -- a copy of the images, the image to the left that I don't believe was in the package. And I -- I went out two days ago and took a picture -- from -- that's from the end of the entrance drive at Beaver Road at the -- basically what is the elevation with the graphic -- we added the graphic on the rendering with software to scale.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Just to clear it up for everybody, that is a photo simulation where the logo is put on there. It is not that you constructed the building and took a picture a couple days ago.

MR. LADUE: The building is there.

ADAM CUMMINGS: The building is there.

MR. LADUE: But the logo is not there.

ADAM CUMMINGS: I don't want somebody to think that the logo is already there.

MR. LADUE: I thought since the building is there, it would be a more true representation.

ADAM CUMMINGS: No. That is great information.

MR. LADUE: So if -- does it matter which -- I prefer to start with the more difficult one.

ADAM CUMMINGS: The more difficult one, which would be the 1,150 square feet?

MR. LADUE: That's correct.

ADAM CUMMINGS: So we're going to stick with -- I will call it 1A, which is the variance for a 42 foot 7 inch by 27 foot wall sign to be 1,150 square feet where 100 square feet is allowed.

MR. LADUE: So to get background on the graphic, the -- the graphic was presented to the owner during conceptual design and actually presented as part of the package during our -- the approval process. From -- from an architectural standpoint, it was treated more as an element on the building, as an architectural element, not so much as signage. Initially internally we referred to it as a graphic.

The owner for several reasons took a liking to it. Number 1, because it does provide architectural treatment to the building at that east end. It allows us to sort of create an end to the building with the -- with that sort of -- that bookends the main entrance. I think primarily though from the standpoint of this facility, I think this is -- internally from American Packaging's

standpoint, this is a marquis building for them. I think the graphic has been viewed as a way of identifying the building.

I think it's important to them both in the Town of Chili, um, within the community, along that road, that they had an identity, that from the standpoint of the scale of this building, we're talking a building of -- a proposed 215,000 square feet with an additional 200 in the near future on 45 acres. They have just purchased the additional land to the west, so if that -- so the buildable land is 90 acres. The front facade is 750 feet long, 35 feet tall and it's about 900 feet from the road.

So I think from the standpoint of -- I know from the zoning standpoint, the most difficult one to sort of speak to is the self-created one. And I think what's important to note is, it is self-created from the standpoint they chose to build in Chili and build on 90 acres, build a 400,000 square feet building of this scale and want to basically mark the building in a proper way, a significant way. A significant way from the road. A significant way in the community. A significant way from their corporate standpoint.

I think the thing to keep in mind is this building currently is planned just for manufacturing operation and the people that will be basically working it. But because of the reaction to the building internally, they're actually picking -- increasing the speed at which the executives will be taking -- moving to this facility. So this is viewed more as a corporate headquarters facility, not just a manufacturing plant.

So from our standpoint, certainly from an architectural standpoint, certainly from an owner's standpoint, we believe that it's fitting for the building, believe that it doesn't -- it is not a detriment to the building, certainly not to the community. We believe that there is enough uniqueness to this facility, this site, that the Board can -- within the resolution, um, it can provide the information of the 900 feet from the road. The size of the building is a way that we're not creating a situation where you're going to have somebody come in tomorrow and want to put a 1,000 square foot sign on their house. So I think the idea is that while it is -- the sign itself is 1100 square feet, and understand how the dimensions are taken, the sign is not that big. It doesn't take up that area. It is seen more again as a graphic and the hope is that the Board considers it in that light, considers it into the light of the scale of the property and is willing to within the resolution or approval if -- if the Board so deems, that it is written within it in a way in which we're not creating precedent in the community.

The building -- the sign will not be lit. Um, it's one thing to note from the standpoint of long-term, um, if you look in the existing photo part of the site plan approval has basically a whole grove of trees across the front on the other -- which would be the north side of the detention pond.

In addition to -- if you're on Beaver Road to the east, there's vegetation and trees, as well. So in the near future that more than likely will be more of a glimpse of that sign, wouldn't be as apparent as it is in this graphic as it is today, first day one when they're opening.

But I think for them, when they're -- when they're presenting this facility, presenting it to the clients, their website, their own promotional materials and they're photographing the building, it adds sort of -- it accompanies not only the design, but also the image that I think they're trying to portray.

FRED TROTT: 1100 square feet is substantial to what is allowed. Is there any thought to a compromise on the size?

MR. LADUE: There was -- we presented before this meeting with the AAC. There was a comment which we did not -- it wasn't part of their approval, but there was -- they did speak of 10 percent to the sign. But I think -- I mean -- the hard part is that from the standpoint of the scale, on the building, and in that location, from an architectural standpoint, you know, I would -- I would like to see the sign and at -- at the scale that it is at. You know, I guess I would -- you know, that's -- you know, that's a question I -- I guess that in terms of -- you know, what the Board would be -- what -- what would be acceptable from that standpoint and I guess would be the question.

But I would -- but I would again ask for the -- while it is -- is, in fact, again, substantial, I think it's only substantial in the scale of what we know as building size. And this is -- you know, the scale of this building in comparison to what typically would come before a Board or for a sign approval is we believe substantial enough that the sign is fitting for the scale of the building and the project. So if -- so if the question is -- I guess the preference would be to present it as it is. I guess if it -- if it is a situation where -- we're talking approval.

ADAM CUMMINGS: This picture that you have here, is that from the road or is that -- or part way down the driveway?

MR. LADUE: I'm standing right at the -- basically at the shoulder -- the north shoulder -- well, not in the shoulder, but ---

ADAM CUMMINGS: That's part of the turn on radius going into it.

MR. LADUE: That's right.

ADAM CUMMINGS: So that's to scale. Taking the building size into account, but more importantly, the sight distance, the sight length to see that, that's what I would like to look at in terms of the size of that and what an eye's perception would be as people are speeding past and pulling into the driveway.

So -- to me that's a reasonable ratio. 900 feet away -- 900 feet is a sticking point, as you said. We'll keep it to that application. I would like to keep it to that application where 900 feet away justifies such a large sign.

MR. LADUE: As -- as I would also ask -- it should also be noted, we're looking at 750 feet

of length of the front and over nearly 27,000 square foot of front elevation. That again, I think proportionately, at that -- you know, it's depicted there, that would be the preferred direction. And -- and I guess from the stand -- go back to the approval being based on -- on those dimensional requirements for this particular project, um, within this Town would seem a reasonable way of preventing a precedent for -- you know, I can't imagine what -- what that scale would be, but...

MR. VALERIO: You mentioned not necessarily a hardship, but to me the distance from the road is a hardship.

MR. LADUE: Correct.

MR. VALERIO: It's proportional, like you said, to a sign on a smaller building and it's so far away. To me, it's like you said, a graphic. There's not words. It doesn't stand out. It's more part of the decor.

MARK MERRY: Not lit.

MR. LADUE: To be honest with the Board, as well, when we were doing it -- when I was working with the design of the site, I envisioned it as a graphic. I -- the whole notion of it from the standpoint of sign and approval, that is on me for not, you know, making that connection, but honestly, it was depicted strictly as we went through the design iterations for this elevation, which there were many, and we had got to this point and we were sort of resolving that into the building. It sort of seemed to make sense.

And, you know, in fairness and -- to -- you know, honestly, of the situation, presented to the owner, reaction to the owner was much more positive frankly than I would have initially known. But I think the idea they took to it because it -- it defines this facility properly for them, long -- short term and long-term. So I think they were pushing, you know, to move ahead with this, and that's kind of what finds us here at the moment.

FRED TROTT: Can you give me the dimension of the sign? I was trying to put them in its -- it's 42.

ADAM CUMMINGS: 42 feet 7 inches by 27 feet.

MR. LADUE: It's about half of the square footage, the actual graphic itself, of the 1100 as it is noted in the squared dimension.

ADAM CUMMINGS: They have inches first and then feet. Once again, it's more triangular in shape, but we turned it into a rectangle to come up with the square footage.

Side table, one question for you, Eric (Stowe). Can we put in a condition -- going along with their application specific to this one, it calls out as being a wall sign. Can we call out the dimension of 900 feet as a parameter on the condition?

ERIC STOWE: When your instruction is to grant the smallest variance possible, and that relates to why it is there, why they need the variance of that size is because of the distance from the road, I think that's a reasonable restriction on that variance so that you're not dealing with one that is on top of precisely the right-of-way.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Precisely. Much like where that vehicle is, I would like to put that in as a condition not only for you but for future ones, so that we wouldn't have a 1150 square foot where that vehicle is parked right there, right on the right-of-way lines.

MR. LADUE: Correct.

ADAM CUMMINGS: It wouldn't be on the right-of-way line because it has to be a setback, a wall sign, but I just want to make sure it's clear to you and I'm foreseeing this building is here for a long time and American Packaging Corporation will be here for a long time. So I would like to put that in as a condition for this one.

MARK MERRY: As part of that condition, can we limit it to what we see here tonight, rather than leaving it open ended and they get that much square footage of wall signage?

FRED TROTT: And placement.

MARK MERRY: And placement.

MR. LADUE: Which from the standpoint of this application, that -- that is -- you know, the intention is that is where the sign is and the only sign they will have on the front of the building.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Yep. I think that's reasonable. Must be placed at a distance, orientation on the building -- orientation on the building and size. It is unlit.

ERIC STOWE: We're not seeking -- I think that's fair, but I guess the distinction it's not a cumulative square footage. It is a solo square footage.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Correct.

ERIC STOWE: One wall sign.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Yes. So when I'm writing this, it's singular, not signs across the front facade of this entire building. It's sign. One -- one individual sign.

FRED TROTT: One unlit.

ADAM CUMMINGS: One unlit sign on the building. As proposed. That's -- I'm saying that on the record just more for our record benefit down the line.

MR. LADUE: Yep. We'll provide the -- this information as part of the information submitted to the Building Department?

ADAM CUMMINGS: Yes. Well, they're here obviously, but we stay in constant communication with them.

ERIC STOWE: Adam (Cummings), can we say non-illuminated?

ADAM CUMMINGS: Non-illuminated. I can.

ERIC STOWE: Not back-lit, not front lit, not down lit. No illumination on the sign.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Right. I do have to open up the Public Hearing.

COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE: None.

Fred Trott made a motion to close the Public Hearing portion of this application and Mark Merry seconded the motion. All Board members were in favor of the motion to close the Public Hearing.

The Public Hearing portion of this application was closed at this time.

ADAM CUMMINGS: So I have that one condition of approval for this one. Anything else to add? All right.

ERIC STOWE: Can we read that condition one more time just before we vote?

ADAM CUMMINGS: This condition of approval would be for a single sign placed at a distance of 900 feet.

ERIC STOWE: No less.

ADAM CUMMINGS: No less. I like that better.

Oriented --

ERIC STOWE: No less than 900 feet from what?

ADAM CUMMINGS: 900 feet from?

FRED TROTT: Right-of-way.

ADAM CUMMINGS: I would like to do right-of-way.

What is the distance from the right-of-way? When you say 900 feet, is that from edge of pavement? Is that from right-of-way, center line?

MR. LADUE: That's from right-of-way. Before I speak ---

ADAM CUMMINGS: Because I don't see that dimension.

MR. LADUE: It's not. It was actually just -- I -- I had -- you know, I did a dimension from I believe -- you know I can verify that for the Board and the Building Department, but I believe it was from the larger -- you know, from the face to the property line or edge of -- was 900 feet. So it is just the north end would be the road. And it sort of -- the road slopes away, so it is probably close to 900 at its closest and then it sort of ---

ADAM CUMMINGS: I wish I had a scale. I think it's risky to put a number on it, too, if we don't know that dimension exactly.

MR. VALERIO: If it turns out less --

ADAM CUMMINGS: Then they have to come back.

MR. LADUE: No. I think -- well, the question would be --

MR. VALERIO: He should know.

ADAM CUMMINGS: I don't have a scale here to scale this off.

There was a pause in the meeting for a passing train whistle.

ADAM CUMMINGS: So the Board wants to put a number on there, but I don't really want -- if we vote yes on this, I don't want them to have to come back in because we misquoted the number.

MR. LADUE: Would this Board accept 850 as the number? 850 is -- I know it's outside the 850 mark. Then I could provide the data -- I -- as part of the sign package submission that will be -- that will be dimensioned across the whole front.

ADAM CUMMINGS: The building is upright now. It's not like they're going to move the building closer. If anybody comes back in, it is 50 feet, which in my eyes, is not a huge number. If you wanted to equate that parking spaces and where that would be, any new building that came in, it would be to above the first or the closest travel lane going west to east on the site plan. Which is not a drastic change.

MARK MERRY: I'm okay with it.

MR. LADUE: Just for information purposes, taking this drawing to the right-of-way, center of Beaver Road, from what would be the north, south, west corner of the building is approximately 921 feet.

ADAM CUMMINGS: You just scaled that off?

MR. LADUE: I just worked it through the drawing in front of me. That would be from that edge to center of road.

ADAM CUMMINGS: To center of road.

MR. LADUE: So obviously you have the right-of-way, and that's ultimately 30 feet, so you're in the 890 feet range.

PAUL WANZENRIED: So call it 875.

ADAM CUMMINGS: I like 875. I don't know if -- if it's a 50 foot right-of-way, then we're right on because 25 feet on each side.

MR. LADUE: I apologize to the Board for not having that exact dimension.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Coming from a civil engineering firm, because my firm did the same thing where there is no scale bars any more -- it would be great to resurrect scale bars for plans. For reduced scale --

MR. LADUE: The way I calculate it, 750 feet across the building and 19 parking spaces, so that's how we get there.

ADAM CUMMINGS: So read -- so restating this condition, it would be for a single sign to be placed at a distance of no less than 870 feet from the right-of-way.

PAUL WANZENRIED: 875.
ADAM CUMMINGS: Sorry. 870 -- 875 feet from the northern bounds of the right-of-way.
ERIC STOWE: Of Beaver Road. Or State Route 252.
ADAM CUMMINGS: Beaver Road. Route 252. On the southern west corner of the -- road.
PAUL WANZENRIED: Southeast.
MR. LADUE: Actually, that was the dimension that -- yes, southeast. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I took the dimension from the southwest.
ADAM CUMMINGS: Non-illuminated with a size of 42 feet, 7 inches by 27 feet. That's the whole condition.
JAMES WIESNER: It says 27 feet -- could be over, right?
ADAM CUMMINGS: It does say 27 feet 1/8 of an inch.
I would call this a rounding error. So on the option, he is right. It does call out as being 27 feet, 1/8 of an inch for a height. I -- I personally will not worry about 1/8 of an inch.
Are you okay with that, side table?
PAUL WANZENRIED: Yes.
JAMES WIESNER: The 27 and the 42 ---
ADAM CUMMINGS: In the parentheses, it says under 3, 24 1/8 inches, and then it says parentheses, 27 feet 1/8 inch, that's the height.
JAMES WIESNER: Just wondering where you got the 27 feet before.
ADAM CUMMINGS: That's on the -- that's on the proposal and the agenda.
JAMES WIESNER: So it's on the hearing notice?
ADAM CUMMINGS: Yes.

Adam Cummings made a motion to declare the Board lead agency as far as SEQR, and based on evidence and information presented at this meeting, determined the application to be an Unlisted action with no significant environmental impact, and James Wiesner seconded the motion. The Board all voted yes on the motion.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Motion to adopt this application with that one -- hold on. Second condition. Sign permit. Goes without saying. They need a sign permit, right?
PAUL WANZENRIED: Yeah. Just assumed that was a given.
ADAM CUMMINGS: It was a given, but I still want to write it down. Adopt the application with those two conditions of approval.

James Wiesner made a motion to approve the application with the following conditions, and James Valerio seconded the motion. The Board approved the motion by a vote of 4 yes to 1 no (Fred Trott).

DECISION (on the wall sign portion): Approved by a vote of 4 yes to 1 no (Fred Trott) with the following conditions:

1. Approval is for a single sign placed at a distance no less than 875 feet from the northern right-of-way boundary of Beaver Road, NYS Route 252, orientation on the building to be on the SE corner, size to be 42'7" x 27', non-illuminated.
2. Sign permit must be obtained from the Building Department.

The following finding of fact was cited:

1. The distance from the road is a reasonable distance for recognition of the sign while maintaining a significant separation distance from the neighboring properties.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Let's go right back to the first one, which is the 10 foot 6 inch by 6 foot double-face monument sign to be 63 square feet where 16 square feet is allowed, which also comes with a total of -- it becomes a total of 123 square feet where 32 square feet is allowed. So I would like to bundle all that into one.

All right?

MR. LADUE: Per the --

ADAM CUMMINGS: Architectural Advisory Committee.

MR. LADUE: Thank you for that A part. I was having the hardest time remembering what the second A was. The -- the sign as it's presented here and has been presented to the Board is internally lit, which is not preferred lighting.

ADAM CUMMINGS: They would like ground lighting.

MR. LADUE: They want it ground lit, so they have agreed to make that change and want to at least let the Board know that was an item that came up earlier.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Yes. And I believe they would also like to -- or send stone samples of the sign over to the Building Department so -- those two recommendations I would like to put as conditions of this approval, that the recommendations of the AAC be part of our approval.

MR. LADUE: That would be -- they also -- the cut sheet on the lighting, ground lighting

and the capstone, as well, was another item that was brought up that we'll be providing if approved.

Background on the sign, as least as far as it is in this configuration, it's the -- basically the -- the imaging, the "Flexographic" sign, "Center of Excellence" is part of the branding, at least site branding. American Packaging, this sign is in keeping with what they are building at their other facilities.

From the standpoint of its size, it's outside the required distance or meets the required distance from the right-of-way. Part of -- one, the sign size is predicated on the corporate standard, but also that -- that -- at that intersection, just to what would be the west and the east, the vegetation grows fairly close to that access drive and I believe that the sign size and -- it's relative again to the scale of the -- as we have stated earlier in the previous application, with respect to the scale of the development, that there -- at present, there will be one access entrance at this point and it will be marked by this size sign and provides fairly -- the point at which you have visual -- or sight of this access drive is fairly close to when you are making the turn. They do have -- as was stated, I believe in previous Zoning Board applications regarding the deliveries, the truck traffic that will be onsite, you will have people coming to the facility that are not familiar with it and believe that both its -- again, size is in keeping with the scale and development, and in keeping with the fact that when approaching, it provides clear, um, identification along a busy road for in this case trucks that need as quick, I guess, a notification to be making that turn and oddly enough, um, the -- and so -- and it's the sort of -- it is the corporate standard in size. We -- we believe that it's -- it's tastefully done. I think it's -- it's not a detriment certainly to that street along Beaver Road.

The question was raised by the AAC why we chose to use stone in lieu of metal panel on the building and the response to that was because when you get closer to the road, with the detention ponds and the features, the natural features and elements along that road, which will, as they grow, buffer the building, the thought was that the stone was a better fit with that environment, closer to the road. So that was sort of the east -- at least the concept behind the materials.

The blue shade, working off the blue on the building to at least tie them together in a color way, even though they would be different in material.

Again, it will be ground lit and the lighting will be typical lighting, dusk to dawn, I believe it is noted. I believe from the standpoint of background on the sign, that it covers it, so I guess I would open it up to questions.

MARK MERRY: Having driven by this location several times in the last few days, I guess my question for you, Mr. LaDue, would be what do you see first? Your building? Or the proposed sign as you're traveling 45 to 50 miles an hour down that road?

MR. LADUE: I guess it would -- from the standpoint of you do see the building.

MARK MERRY: Good for the ownership that the building sticks out like a sore thumb with a pretty substantial vegetation this time of year. So, you know, it took me probably a third drive by to realize you had your base already placed.

MR. LADUE: Right.

MARK MERRY: That sign is so far off the road. So I -- so I don't know what you really, to be perfectly honest, gain by increasing the size of it. I don't know if you would gain anything by increasing the size of what is already permitted. Your building is your -- is your sign. You can't miss that, even if you were going over 50 miles an hour. And having today's technology, um, I don't think anybody's GPS capabilities will fail. If they did, again, I don't know if you gain anything from a sign that large.

I don't know if you have a Plan B like you talked about Plan B for the building signage. 10 percent reduction? I don't know if you have thought about -- is there a compromise between what you're asking for and what you're allowed to lessen the variance on that road sign?

MR. LADUE: I would ask to -- I would like to investigate that. I -- I can't answer that question. I mean it's hard to -- if -- if the question is a smaller sign, we could look at a smaller sign. How small? That -- you know, I -- part of it would be the amount of graphic that we're trying to present. I mean there is the field. Um, I guess the question would be, um -- would the Board be open to a size and decreasing the field of the sign? So that --

ADAM CUMMINGS: I would say -- just throwing an idea, the Flexographic Center of Excellence, that's not really part of the -- the logo and the naming of it, and that might be a compromise.

MR. LADUE: I guess where -- on that note, I think -- the -- the Flexographic Center of Excellence is important. They want to identify it, that that is what it is. You know, that this is a Center of Excellence and "Flexographic," that's the process that is done here. So I think the idea would be if there was a way in which we could modify the sign and maintain that would probably be the preference. So what I -- so I guess what I want to just propose, it was -- we -- you know, if we followed the shape of the sign where we were removing the edges of the sign and, you know, following -- so at least it's where -- you know, we're decreasing the amount of sign, that we're --

ADAM CUMMINGS: So what you're saying is getting all of the blue and white space that is on there, which would reduce the square footage calculation?

MR. LADUE: Right.

PAUL WANZENRIED: You also have 2 feet of base there, okay? I mean that -- that is incorporated in that height.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Are you sure about that?

PAUL WANZENRIED: Yeah.

MR. LADUE: It is included in the area, I believe, that was given.

ADAM CUMMINGS: The 2 foot stone base?

PAUL WANZENRIED: We're talking about the height, right? The height or --

ADAM CUMMINGS: No. We're not on the height right now. We're on the 6 foot by 10 foot 6 inch.

PAUL WANZENRIED: Okay. Thank you.

ADAM CUMMINGS: The 2 foot base is not part of that. The 2 foot base is part of the height, which we're not considering right now.

MARK MERRY: Right.

ADAM CUMMINGS: So what you're speaking to is, is a smaller sign, letters and everything.

MARK MERRY: Shrunk down. I don't know if my opinion matters.

ADAM CUMMINGS: You're stating, just to clarify it, almost making it pyramid shaped so that numbers wise -- the letters would still be the same ones again, but we would have a smaller sign square footage?

MR. LADUE: Right.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Is that clear to the Board?

MR. VALERIO: The shape of the logo with a pyramid at the top?

ADAM CUMMINGS: Yes.

FRED TROTT: Only thing, it doesn't change.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Yes, it does. That would change it.

ERIC STOWE: Don't we measure based on a rectangle?

ADAM CUMMINGS: Well, that's the tricky part. Speaking of rectangles, the 100 Beaver Road that we require on these signs, is that included in this calculation? I don't think so. So that would be additional. We don't count that?

PAUL WANZENRIED: (Indicated non-verbally.)

ADAM CUMMINGS: I'm glad to hear that.

JAMES WIESNER: I don't think so. I think we had that discussion before.

ADAM CUMMINGS: I'm glad we're doing it this way. I always thought it was unfair if we added it and it was a Town requirement to put it on there.

Okay. That clears it up on my end.

FRED TROTT: I agree with Mark (Merry). I think the sign is too big for the area and not needed. I do like the -- if they -- that does make the sign smaller, shaping it, would be better.

ADAM CUMMINGS: I'm not siding one way or another, but on the north side of the road, we have our Highway Department. They have a sign. The Cedars of Chili has a sign.

FRED TROTT: Not nearly as big.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Correct. That is what I want to get to. There are signs on the north side and I want to be similar to what those are. Case Hoyt -- it's not Case Hoyt any more. QCI Direct or whatever that was. That was from a long, long time ago, but I would like the sign to be similar in size to all of those, and I think what the Board is starting to say or two of the Board members have said and I'm going along with that, as well, is keeping this in tune with that and keeping the sign there. It is only 50 feet away and we already talked about perspective in terms of distance. I haven't seen anything that says we need it for the -- that far away. In terms of recognition, I think you will see -- some people will focus on the sign if they're trying to get there. They won't be looking at the building. But those that are just passersby, the thing we do notice is the building. So you do have two viewers that you will have coming in.

MR. VALERIO: I think one point that hasn't been brought up, though, it -- your name is not anywhere else. It is not on the building.

MR. LADUE: That's correct.

MR. VALERIO: This is the only ---

ADAM CUMMINGS: That's true.

MR. VALERIO: -- place where you know what it is.

ADAM CUMMINGS: And they do have to have a sign of 100 Beaver Road somewhere, correct?

PAUL WANZENRIED: Correct. I believe the Jehovah's Witness has a monument sign that is relatively tall, directly across the street, if memory serves me correctly.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Yes, you're correct.

PAUL WANZENRIED: It's a rather large sign.

MARK MERRY: Been there a very long time.

ADAM CUMMINGS: That building wasn't there when I went to high school.

MARK MERRY: Well, not that long ago.

PAUL WANZENRIED: I think the Board should be giving them more direction and more specifics on the direction they want him to go. Whether he is shortening it from a width or a height.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Or height or both.

PAUL WANZENRIED: Either way. But I think the Board should be giving him more correction than what you already have.

MR. VALERIO: I have one thing to say. I think that a -- is it 8 by -- 4 by 4 sign, which our code on a piece of property like this, it -- it looks ridiculous, like it is just -- don't even see it. So I think that is something -- when you're driving by a gas station that is on a half acre versus something on -- what is this, 45 acres?

MR. LADUE: It is actually 90.

ADAM CUMMINGS: 90 now.

MR. VALERIO: Because future facilities, just like the sign on the building, it has to be considered. It doesn't look right if it is 4 by 4.

MR. LADUE: Other thing to keep in mind, if they fully develop the 90 acres, this goes well beyond the 400,000 square feet that is planned, we're only looking for one monument sign. We're looking for a monument sign that is in scale with what's -- what that parcel is. It is an industrial zoned use on a busy street that we believe from a scale standpoint -- especially when I know the Kingdom Hall sign may be there for a while, but you look at the size of that building in relation to the building they have out front of this building, which certainly is not what the sign code allows, I believe that what -- what we're asking the Board to consider in this case is not -- is not a heavy lift from our standpoint.

And so I concur from the standpoint of its scale in relation to development along with the fact that the building is not identified. We have tried to blur the notion what the sign image is on the building to that point. It is an architectural feature, so that -- I mean, I would just ask to include that as part of your consideration or for this application.

ADAM CUMMINGS: I agree with all of that except our Town's view on the architectural element. In our eyes it is still a logo, which means it's a sign. So I just want to make sure that point was made. But the rest of it, I do agree with the point that if this Board -- Mark and Fred (Trott), I will point you guys out, since you brought it up, what compromise would you like to see? What size would you like to see? None I think is what I heard on one side. But he is allowed a sign. If we're reducing it down, what would be a reasonable reduction in your eyes? This is the only place that sign comes in.

The Flexographic Center of Excellence, I'm still not personally sold on that one. It's a tag line to me. "Flexographic," most people don't know what that means. It's not part of your logo. I know you're trying to advertise what your service is. That's not what our signage is really aimed to do, so we're trying to minimize that.

MARK MERRY: If you're asking for information from me, I would say none. I was looking for the designer to come back with an option he is comfortable with. I like what you suggested. That goes along with what James (Valerio) just said. It does give them their name on the sign, but you don't need to have that particular branding.

MR. LADUE: Or consider the application without the blue, without the "Flexographic Center of Excellence." If that reduces it by that, we could reduce that.

ERIC STOWE: With respect to the sign, we shouldn't be looking at the copy on the sign. We're looking at size.

MARK MERRY: If you eliminated that feature, I -- I'm okay.

ERIC STOWE: When we're talking about the copy on the sign, that is where I want to stay away from that.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Understood. So I am talking about the blue rectangle, reducing it by the blue rectangle.

MR. LADUE: We would forego the height that is added to the sign for the presence of the "Flexographic Center of Excellence," omit that, lower it by that height.

ADAM CUMMINGS: So what is that height of that? That is not dimensioned here. Do you know that? Because that ties into our next variance request and the height.

MR. LADUE: We'll call it 16 inches.

ADAM CUMMINGS: 16 inches. That brings it down to 56 inches. 10 feet 6 inches by 56 inches, so 120 inches by 56 inches.

MR. LADUE: On a similar note, because of what we're talking about with the scale, um, I would prefer to reduce it by 12 inches in height and take 2 foot -- 1 foot each side off the width.

ADAM CUMMINGS: You want to bring the width down, too.

MR. LADUE: The reason being, once we take all this out, the question is, you know, this sign, in relation to the base, you know, is going to be right on top of the base. So if -- if -- if reducing -- if reducing -- I would like to reduce -- if we reduced it by 12 in the height, that would still give some border between the bottom of the -- you know, what would be the corporation, which would be down at the bottom where "Center of Excellence" is. And if -- and take some off the side to, you know, I guess ---

ADAM CUMMINGS: I see.

MR. LADUE: Trade off that so we're not doing 16 all in the height, but we're doing 12 inches in height and taking a foot off -- you know, a foot off total -- off the width. So it would be a sign height of 5 feet, by 9 foot 6.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Okay. Just so I'm clear on that, you're going to bring the sign and the base in or just the sign?

MR. LADUE: We'll leave the base, move the sign in proportionality without the blue border and "Center of Excellence" and the scale of it with American Packaging Corporation, similar to what is seen now in the white space we're looking at.

ADAM CUMMINGS: I like that idea of still having the height in there, but graphically I like the change in colors between all of that, so that still allows to you have a blue space to break up the white and the stone. Right? What does the Board think? I like that. So 5 feet height on the sign.

FRED TROTT: 5 feet even?

ADAM CUMMINGS: 5 feet even.

Width is 9 feet 6 inches. So 6 inches from each side?

MR. LADUE: Right.

ADAM CUMMINGS: I like that.

FRED TROTT: We're down to 47 square feet. Each side. 47.5 on each side. So 95 square feet. So we're reducing it from 126 to 95. I like that.

ADAM CUMMINGS: So we're not on this one yet. But that would lead into the next one, where instead of an 8 foot tall sign, you would be looking for a 7 foot tall sign. Not that we're considering it right now, but I want to make it clear right now.

MARK MERRY: All this work, we might as well go to it now. You want to keep them separate?

ADAM CUMMINGS: Yes.

MARK MERRY: Do you?

ADAM CUMMINGS: Yes.

MR. LADUE: The other thing to note, it is showing 100 Beaver Road. The intention -- we're working now with the Clerk's Office in submitting an application into 911 to have the road be named 100 APC Way. So that will be what would ---

ADAM CUMMINGS: What road?

MR. LADUE: The access road. Renaming this, so the address here would be 100 APC Drive -- Drive. Not Way. Drive. I apologize.

So we had worked out ---

ADAM CUMMINGS: I thought you meant Beaver Road.

MR. LADUE: The QCI, they -- their road is similarly named, and their other facilities have that, as well, so that is the intention.

ADAM CUMMINGS: That's a great idea. I was fearful you would be changing Beaver Road. And Route 252 would have a sixth name.

MR. LADUE: The other thing to note, on the -- that was presented to AAC, that the -- the sign, the road sign, the back would match the Capstone, which is a grayish stone color with blue -- blue numbers on the letters.

ADAM CUMMINGS: And that request was with the AAC?

MR. LADUE: They asked what the intention was for the material. That is what was presented. It's not noted on the drawings. We'll note it as part of the permanent drawings.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Two conditions of approval. Adherence to the AAC recommendations, Number 1 being provide material samples of the stone materials to the Building Department.

Number 2, provide the lighting cut sheet to the Building Department.

And Number 3, illuminated to be upward ground lit and no internal illumination allowed.

Number 2 -- sign permit must be obtained. Again, this is for reduction of the dimensions of this double-faced monument sign to be 9 foot 6 inches wide by 5 feet in height. For a total of 47.5 square feet per side for a total of 95 square feet total reducing that from what we had before.

COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Fred Trott made a motion to close the Public Hearing portion of this application and Mark Merry seconded the motion. All Board members were in favor of the motion to close the Public Hearing.

The Public Hearing portion of this application was closed at this time.

Adam Cummings made a motion to declare the Board lead agency as far as SEQR, and based on evidence and information presented at this meeting, determined the application to be an Unlisted action with no significant environmental impact, and James Valerio seconded the motion. The Board all voted yes on the motion.

Mark Merry made a motion to approve the application with the following conditions, and Fred Trott seconded the motion. All Board members were in favor of the motion.

DECISION (on the monument sign square footage portion): Unanimously approved by a vote of 5 yes with the following conditions:

1. Adherence to the Architectural Advisory Committee recommendations must be followed:
 - A. Provide material samples of the stone materials to be used to the Building Department.
 - B. Provide a lighting cut sheet to the Building Department of the lighting fixtures to be used.
 - C. Illumination shall be upward, ground lit fixtures. No internal illumination allowed.
2. Sign permit must be obtained from the Building Department.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Now we'll move onto the last one, which is the variance for the sign to be -- the proposal was 8 feet tall where 5 feet is allowed. It has now been reduced down to 7 feet tall. Reduced this one quite a bit.

COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE: None.

Fred Trott made a motion to close the Public Hearing portion of this application and Mark Merry seconded the motion. All Board members were in favor of the motion to close the Public Hearing.

The Public Hearing portion of this application was closed at this time.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Condition of approval would be a sign permit must be approved. Were there any recommendations on this one in terms of height from AAC?

MR. LADUE: No.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Okay. I did not receive any. Just wanted to ask.

MR. LADUE: No.

Adam Cummings made a motion to declare the Board lead agency as far as SEQR, and based on evidence and information presented at this meeting, determined the application to be an Unlisted action with no significant environmental impact, and James Valerio seconded the motion. The Board all voted yes on the motion.

James Valerio made a motion to approve the application with the following previously stated condition of a sign permit is required, and Mark Merry seconded the motion. All Board members were in favor of the motion.

DECISION: Unanimously approved by a vote of 5 yes with the previously stated condition of a sign permit being required.

The following finding of fact was cited:

1. Variance for the height was reduced to be 7'. This is similar to the height of other signs in the neighborhood. Additionally, it provides adequate height to be visible during winter snowfall accumulation.

MR. LADUE: I just wanted he to add, appreciate the Board and -- this -- how you considered -- I know how difficult your job is as a Zoning Board and the notion of precedent and I appreciate the fact that you were willing to work with us for what you know on the surface may be a -- an extreme consideration, but we're able to, you know, see that -- through that and I do appreciate that.

And also because you were part of the approval process early on, you should be -- as a Board and as -- and representing the Town, be proud of the fact that the building that is being built on that site was done in seven months in a Town that I don't believe in -- would have happened in any other Town. And I think that it is important to note that.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Thank you.

MR. LADUE: The partnership that -- of the Town with American Packaging and the team members out there, it -- it should be something that you should spread and be proud of because it was a hefty lift from 11 months from inception to construction and C of O, hopefully partial in a couple days.

ADAM CUMMINGS: That's not part of this Board.

MR. LADUE: I just thought it was important having you here to note that that it doesn't go unnoticed.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Thank you. I would commend the Planning Board and the other committees that we had replied to that. It was really a team effort.

MR. LADUE: Spread the word. Spread the word.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Thank you. Thank you.

FRED TROTT: When do they plan on opening?

MR. SLACK: December 1 would be the plan.

ADAM CUMMINGS: One thing I would like to add, no one here was able to enjoy this. I will hold it out for the camera, but having photo simulations like that, I have had a couple applicants do and I hope more come up with that because it really speaks volumes to your application instead of trying to anecdotally say what you will.

MR. MERRY: Likewise, Mr. LaDue, nice presentation. Very well done.

ADAM CUMMINGS: Now we'll move on to any comments on the last month's Board minutes? None.

James Wiesner made a motion to approve the 9/26/17 minutes and Fred Trott seconded the motion. The Board was unanimously in favor of the motion.

James Valerio made a motion to adjourn the meeting, and Fred Trott seconded the motion. The Board was unanimously in favor of the motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.