

WHITEHALL PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES JANUARY 7, 2021

The Whitehall Planning Commission meeting of January 7, 2021, was called to order by Chairman, Terry Anderson, at 6:45 p.m.

Chairman Anderson asked for a roll call.

Terry Anderson – Present

Mike Brown – Present

Denny Roberge – Present

Barb Blake – Present

Amy Smith – Present

Jason Thomas – Present

Zach Woodruff – Present

Mayor Maggard swore in member, Jason Thomas, for another term on the Planning Commission. Ms. Morton confirmed that a copy of Mr. Thomas' oath will be kept in the files with a copy given to the auditor's office and human resources.

Mayor Maggard opened the first planning commission meeting of 2021 and asked for nominations.

Mr. Brown made a motion to elect Terry Anderson as Chairman. Mr. Roberge seconded the motion. All voted in favor and Mr. Anderson was elected Chairman.

Ms. Blake made a motion to elect Mike Brown as Vice-Chairman. Mr. Woodruff seconded the motion. All voted in favor and Mr. Brown was elected Vice-Chairman.

Mayor Maggard thanked all members for their dedication to the planning commission and wished all a great new year.

Chairman Anderson called roll for validation of terms of office. Anderson – Yes, Brown – Here, Roberge – Here, Blake – Here, Smith – Here, Thomas – Present, Woodruff – Here.

As all members were present, there were no members' absence to excuse.

Chairman Anderson introduced a motion to elect Lori Morton as secretary. **Mr. Woodruff motioned.** Mr. Roberge seconded. All voted in favor to elect Lori Morton as secretary.

Chairman Anderson requested a motion to adopt the rules of procedure 2021. Mr. Woodruff motioned and Mr. Roberge seconded. Rules and Regulations were approved.

Chairman Anderson asked for a motion to approve minutes from September 3, 2020. Mr. Woodruff motioned to approve and Mr. Roberge seconded. All voted in favor to approve the minutes.

Chairman Anderson introduced Case 806. Brad Petrow, CESCO Imaging, is seeking sign variances A. 1124.10(n)(4) and B. 1124.10(n)(4). Mr. Petrow stated CESCO Imaging is seeking additional wall signage, both in square footage and quantity of signs. Mr. Petrow stated the property is unique, sitting on a small sliver of property sitting pretty close to the road. CESCO has proposed a sign on the front corner, front of the building, and the east corner built up on a parapet – both of those signs would match. There is also a proposed sign on the parapet on the west elevation which would be over the drive thru. Mr. Petrow stated these signs are important in terms of visibility. A monument sign will be placed in the front of the property which meets code. Mr. Petrow states DelTaco is very visible traveling from both the east and west. Mr. Petrow states CESCO Imaging is asking for consideration in the amount of signage, using McDonalds as an example with their number of signs, eight wall signs on all four elevations. Mr. Petrow states this is a new concept restaurant and advertising is of utmost importance. Chairman Anderson expressed concerned regarding the setback of the proposed monument sign. Mr. Petrow states the setback, which is on the opposite side of the exit drive, meets code. There will be 20 ft +/- between the exit drive and the monument sign. Mr. Woodruff stated that the monument sign was approved from a setback and size standpoint. CESCO is specifically asking is to allow the signage on the east the west elevations that does not have street frontage, as well as the size of the signs on the east and west, and the south exceeds the amount of square footage they would be allowed.

Chairman Anderson stated the planning commission is concerned about the signs on the sides of the building, as stated by Mr. Woodruff. Mr. Roberge asked for clarification regarding the size of the signs. Mr. Petrow stated the two signs on the front and corner are 49 sq feet per rectangle but if you were able to modify the rectangle, the sign would be 40 sq ft. The one of the drive-thru is smaller at 40 sq feet encompassed in a complete rectangle, without the rectangle is 32 sq ft. Mr. Brown asked if the signs would be illuminated. Mr. Petrow confirmed the signs are illuminated. Mr. Woodruff asked for clarification, along with Chairman Anderson regarding the two different sizes, one that is 40 and 49 sq ft and 34 and 41 sq ft. Specifically, the southern elevation above the window. Mr. Petrow stated that is the larger of the two – the 49 sq ft. Mr. Woodruff stated that current code allows for 1 sq ft per foot of building frontage. **Mr. Petrow stated the building is only 32 ft wide.** Ms. Smith pointed out that there was a similar case a couple of months ago where signs were removed, replace but were not grandfathered in, and the planning commission denied their case regarding the signs on the side of the building. Ms. Smith stated if we are using this as a precedent, we should reflect this similarly as what we decided on the other building.

Mr. Woodruff stated that no building in that corridor, since the current overlay being adopted, have not been given variances to his knowledge specifically that does not have street frontage. As an example, using the McDonald's as reference, that is on a partial public road on the corner at McDonald's and East Main Street. One side would have been allowed but, again, that was prior to the current overlay being adopted. Chairman Anderson confirmed with Mr. Petrow that the signs are to be illuminated, backlit, channel letters. Mr. Woodruff stated it is the city's staff recommendation that the variance request be denied for the signage on the east and west elevation and that potentially look to approve some additional signage square footage for the southern elevation signage. Mr. Woodruff deferred to the planning commission colleagues to make that suggestion. Mr. Woodruff asked to clarification on the intent of the chair to vote on the east and west sides, then south or vote all at once. Mr. Woodruff suggested potentially allowing up to 38 sq ft of signage for the southern elevation which would give 20 percent variance on the square footage on the front while denying the variance request, remembering to make the motion in the affirmative per the BZBA rules. Mr. Woodruff separated Case 806 into two motions.

Chairman Anderson asked for a motion to approve Case 806 A. 1124.10(n)(4). Motioned by Mr. Woodruff to grant the variance of 20 percent above the code requirement for square footage for the signage on the southern elevation. Mr. Roberge seconded the motion. Anderson – Yes, Brown – Yes, Roberge – Yes, Blake – Yes, Smith – Yes, Thomas – Present, Woodruff – Yes. All members voted in favor to **APPROVE** Case 806 A.

Mr. Woodruff motioned to approve the variance, Case 806 B. 1124.10(n)(4), for the additional signs on the east and west elevations as proposed by the applicator. Ms. Blake seconded the motion. Anderson – No, Brown – No, Roberge – No, Blake – No, Smith – No, Thomas – No, Woodruff – No. All members voted to **DENY** Case 806 B.

Mr. Woodruff stated to Mr. Petrow that CESCO would need to submit a new signage application to move forward with the south signage up to the 20 percent over code.

Chairman Anderson asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Woodruff motioned Mr. Brown seconded. All were in favor to adjourn.

Chairman Anderson asked if there was any further business.
Meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

APPROVED _____, 2021, respectfully submitted,

Terry Anderson, Chairman

Lori Morton, Secretary