

**TOWN OF ELKTON
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
JUNE 19, 2014
MINUTES**

Present: Robert Olewine; Dawn Schwartz; Charles E. Cramer, Jr.; Charles A. Bromwell, Director, Building & Zoning; Cameron Brown, Esquire, Attorney

Absent: Jared Roudybush; Shirley Hicks

Mr. Olewine called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ACTION: Motion was made by Mr. Cramer to approve the minutes from the May 22, 2014 meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Schwartz and unanimously approved.

CASE # 1463 – REQUEST OF CHANDRAKANT REPRESENTING BRIDGE STREET LIQUORS, 120 N. MAIN STREET, NORTH EAST, MARYLAND FOR THE FOLLOWING VARIANCES: 1) 27’6” FRONT SETBACK VARIANCE, 2) TO HAVE A SECOND SIGN AND 3) TO EXCEED THE ALLOWABLE SIGN SQUARE FOOTAGE BY 19 SQUARE FEET. THIS ACTION CONCERNS PROPERTY LOCATED AT 701 BRIDGE STREET, ELKTON, MARYLAND, TAX MAP 310, PARCEL 2437, ZONED C-2

Mr. William Riddle and Mr. Chandrakant K. Patel were in attendance to address this request. Both men were sworn in by Mr. Brown. Mr. Riddle stated they had appeared before the Board in February of this year and are not requesting any changes to their previous submittal. He explained that the sign they wish to place is different from the one he initially presented and that he was in error in his presentation at the February meeting. He then explained the difference between the two signs and gave specifics of the size and height of the sign being requested at this submittal. He stated the location of the building is such that the front of the building faces the shopping center rather than Bridge Street. He pointed out that other businesses along Bridge Street have similar perpendicular signage which will allow customers to locate their business. He mentioned that the existing sign on the building which faces Bridge Street will remain.

Mr. Cramer asked if they would be keeping the sign that had been approved at the previous meeting. Mr. Riddle clarified that the previous sign would not be placed. Mr. Cramer pointed out that he viewed the sign they wish to place as more of a temporary sign rather than a permanent one. Mr. Cramer asked if the sign would have electric run to it. Mr. Patel confirmed that it would have electric. Mr. Cramer stated the sign would be used more like a billboard. Mr. Patel stated they would use it to announce sale specials and that it had changeable letters for that use.

Ms. Schwartz addressed Mr. Riddle and stated that she was not in agreement with the original submittal for the sign presented in February and is not in favor of the sign currently being submitted. She stated she felt this type of sign was not appropriate as a permanent sign. She said she has not seen any signs similar to this on Route 213.

Mr. Olewine asked if the legs that come with the sign would be removed prior to permanently mounting it on the posts. Mr. Patel confirmed the legs would be removed. Mr. Olewine asked if the arrow is permanently attached to the sign. Mr. Patel stated it is a separate piece which is mounted on top of the sign by a bolt. The posts on which the sign will be mounted are 4" x 6" posts and would be placed in concrete. Mr. Olewine asked if Mr. Patel would be amenable to placing the sign without the arrow. Ms. Schwartz asked if anyone was aware of this type of sign along Route 213. No one responded to the question. Mr. Olewine asked Mr. Bromwell if he was familiar with any of these signs in the area. Mr. Bromwell stated he was not aware of any within Town limits that have the arrow on the sign.

Mr. Olewine asked if Mr. Riddle had any additional comments. Mr. Riddle stated they would be amenable to removing the arrow if that would allow the request to proceed. He wondered if the Board would be amenable to removing the arrow from the top piece and allowing the remaining part of the top piece with the lights to remain. Mr. Cramer asked if the white part of the sign which holds the lettering is lighted. Mr. Riddle stated that it was lighted. Mr. Cramer asked their reasoning for the top piece with the lights remaining. Mr. Riddle stated they are yellow lights and felt it would draw more attention to the sign and therefore the business.

Discussion ensued regarding specifics of the sign (width, etc.) Mr. Riddle confirmed that the sign is 3'6" tall by 8' wide. Mr. Olewine asked if the posts would be painted a light color in order to match the sign. Mr. Riddle agreed that they could paint the posts. Ms. Schwartz reiterated that she was not in agreement with the sign.

Mr. Olewine asked if Mr. Riddle had any additional comment. Mr. Riddle stated they would be willing to modify the sign as necessary.

Mr. Olewine entertained question or comment from the audience. Mr. David Mangano, a sign professional, pointed out that this type of sign is made for temporary use and said they would have a difficult time maintaining it as a permanent sign. He felt that anchoring the sign, which they are proposing, would be an advantage. There were no additional comments regarding this submittal.

MOTION: Motion was made by Mr. Cramer to approve the 27'6" front setback variance for Bridge Street Liquors. The motion was seconded by Ms. Schwartz and unanimously approved.

MOTION: Motion was made by Ms. Schwartz to deny the request for a second sign for Bridge Street Liquors. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cramer and unanimously approved.

The final variance was not addressed due to the fact it was associated with the variance for the second sign which was denied.

CASE # 1464 – REQUEST OF PAINT ‘N PLACE SIGNS REPRESENTING U TRI C 5, LLC, 11987 DEWES LANE, KENNEDYVILLE, MARYLAND FOR A TWENTY-ONE (21) FOOT FRONT SETBACK VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A SIGN. THIS ACTION CONCERNS PROPERTY LOCATED AT 210 CHESAPEAKE BOULEVARD, ELKTON, MARYLAND, TAX MAP 316, PARCEL 2443, PARCEL 11, ZONED BI (BUSINESS INDUSTRIAL)

Mr. David Mangano of Paint ‘N Place Signs and Mr. Aaron Royston of Triangle Health Alliance were in attendance to address this request and were sworn in by Mr. Brown.

Mr. Mangano provided an additional rendering of the sign that is being proposed for Triangle Health Alliance located at 210 Chesapeake Boulevard. He stated that the sign was designed to complement the building. He noted that the sign was left out of the original drawings for the building when it was being constructed. He stated they believe the location they are proposing for the sign is the best location for this property.

Mr. Olewine asked if the sign will be lighted in any way. Mr. Mangano stated that it would not. Mr. Royston added that due to the business hours there would be no need for a lighted sign.

Mr. Royston pointed out that due to the location of the substation the sign would not be visible at the setback required by the Ordinance in this zone.

Ms. Schwartz inquired whether the sign would cause any vision issues at the location they are proposing. Mr. Royston confirmed that it would not block vision.

Mr. Cramer asked if they were the only business located within the building. Mr. Royston stated that they are the only tenant.

Discussion ensued regarding a pole at the substation. It was determined that the pole was used during construction of their building and was likely left at the location for use during future development in the area.

Mr. Olewine entertained questions or comment from the audience. There were none.

MOTION: Motion was made by Ms. Schwartz to approve the twenty one (21) foot front setback variance for placement of a sign for Triangle Health Alliance. Motion was seconded by Mr. Cramer and unanimously approved.

The meeting moved into discussion phase prior to motions being called for the cases presented.

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS: There were no submittals for the July meeting.

There being no further business to discuss Mr. Olewine adjourned the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda Humphreys