

**Design Review Board  
Minutes of Meeting  
June 15, 2005**

Present: Cheryl McGuire, Jim Goldsmith, Tim Berres, Bob Turgeon,  
Ron Litten, Tim Hart  
Absent: David Jenkins, Bob Turgeon  
Town Staff: Carol Rollins and Gayle Curry

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Cheryl McGuire, chair.

**Maryland Bank & Trust, 101 Charles Street**

The approved master sign plan for the Baldus Centre is attached. The signage requested by the tenant complies with the master sign plan, and has owner approval. The applicant is requesting two wall signs, one on the south elevation (2.67 sq. ft.) and one on the west elevation (24 sq. ft.). The signage is code compliant.

Mr. Goldsmith asked if this was in lieu of what was going over top the canopy? The person representing Sign-a-Rama replied with a positive answer and was even able to get the Board samples.

Mr. Goldsmith made a motion to approve the Master Sign Plan as was given to the Board.

Mr. Berres seconded the motion.

Motion was approved.

**Rock Church, One Calvert Street**

The tenant is requesting 24 sq. ft. of signage. Building frontage is 54 linear feet. Maximum allowable attached signage is 50 sq. ft. The signage is code compliant.

Craig from Sign-A-Rama also represented Rock Church. It's a single faced box sign constructed of aluminum and it would be internally illuminated and mounted.

Mr. Hart was concerned that the sign looks like a fast food restaurant sign. He was very pleased with the Baldus Centre sign. The Board has tried to get away from "Box" signs along Central Business District.

Mr. Berres asked if it wasn't originally proposed to be in the center?

Ms. McGuire does not like the "box" sign, but is also in favor of the Baldus Centre Sign.

No decision was made on the Master Sign Plan, but suggested that Craig go back to Rock Church and let them know that they like the Baldus Center Sign, but not the box sign.

### **ReMax, Charles Street**

NO SHOW

### **Johel Partnership, 6 St. Mary's Avenue**

A revised landscaping plan was submitted for review and comment by the Beautification Commission. The angled parking along St. Mary's Avenue has been revised to move spaces out of the northbound travel lane, encroaching little, if any, into the ROW. The additional HC parking has been added, with the required striped loading zones shown as requested. The new locations for the spaces are more functional in terms of safe access. The specification for the site lighting has been provided. All of the dimensional requirements for this CB-zoned site have been met - there are no required setbacks, and the building is within the maximum height limitation of 50'. A site narrative with project tabulation will be presented with the full site development plan submittal, from the civil engineer, Lorenzi, Dodds & Gunnill. At that time, all adjacent property owners, topography, property line bearings and distances, and map references will be shown. Storm drainage, storm water management, site grading and erosion control, and utilities will be handled at that time. For purposes of DRB review, the site lay-out plan as shown, is Code compliant. Site signage, both detached and attached, is Code compliant as show. The southern entry sign has been removed from the ROW as requested. Specifics have been provided on the Greene Turtle signs. The master sign plan as submitted, contains all of the required elements of a master sign plan per code - size, font, color, location, number, square footages, mode of illumination, and approval process. The MSP is code compliant.

Ms. McGuire wanted some questions clarified with regard to the Master Sign Plan. The last two sentences under the description of Property needs to be stricken. Has nothing to do with the Master Sign Plan. Under Detached Property Signage, in the first sentence the word "property" should be stricken from that sentence.

Mr. Litten suggested that if "Greene Turtle" is not Nationally Registered they will have to follow the Master Sign Plan guidelines.

Mr. Todd Ray elaborated on the corrections/revisions/modifications made since the last meeting.

Mr. Hart made the motion that the Johel Partnership building be approved as presented with all the updates.

Mr. Goldsmith seconded the motion. All was in favor. The Board approved the building.

Ms. McGuire stated that there are some items that need to be cleaned up on the Master Sign Plan, nothing major.

Mr. Litten asked if the "Greene Turtle" was being submitted as part of the Master Sign Plan? Mr. Litten asked that the last two sentences be stricken from the Master Sign Plan. The second paragraph under "Detached Property Signage", the second sentence that begins with "The letters will be 2.5" tall", add the word, "Federally" registered trademark.

Under the "Attached Tenant Signage" strike the word "linear" and replace it with the word "Bracket" for the light fixture. Also strike the image of the Greene Turtle Sign.

Mr. Litten clarified that the Federally registered signs dictates font, logo but does not have anything to do with color.

Mr. Litten made a motion to approve the Master Sign with the modifications that were presented to the Board.

Mr. Hart seconded the motion. Motion was approved. Mrs. McGuire was opposed.

### **Edelen Station, Maple and Railroad**

The site consists of 6.69 acres, to be developed as 19 condominium style town homes and (6) 16-unit condominium buildings for a total of 115 dwellings. Density at 17.2 DU's/acre falls below the maximum of 20.

Parking requirements are for 2/dwelling unit, or 230 spaces for the residential use. To provide, per Code, for the community club house, an additional 15 spaces are required. A total of 245 (9' x 18') parking spaces are required on site. As shown, 246 (10' x 20') spaces have been provided. "Commercial" size spaces may be used on this site. As the CBT zone is primarily commercial in the majority of its permitted uses, the "residential" size (10' x 20' space) is not required here. On this particular site, the reduction in space size could result in the ability to provide/retain more green space. Provide an additional HC parking on the other side of the clubhouse. Make this the one van-accessible space required on the site. As shown, all dimensional requirements for the CBT zone have been met - 15' front and side yard setbacks, 20' rear yard setback. The CSX side of the property is being taken as the "rear", so as to get the maximum setback possible from the buildings to the railroad. No buffer is required between the site and the adjacent R-8 and R-5 zoned properties. Building height is restricted to 50' or less. A detail of the proposed site lighting has been provided, and the style emulates the lighting used at Town Hall. However, more perimeter lighting is needed - so far, only locations around the clubhouse have been shown. The parking areas and pedestrian walkways need to be addressed. A landscape plan and a proposed plan material list have been provided, and the applicant will address comments and obtain approval from the Beautification Commission. The community signage is Code compliant in terms of height (8' max.) Locations have been shown on the plan, so some indicate of the length of the signs is given; more detail is needed. Also, the lack of signage at the gateway to the community (at Maple Ave.) seems amiss, while two at the Clubhouse seems overdone. The applicant will be required to make the connection between the perimeter sidewalk on site to the existing sidewalk at Town Hall, allowing residents pedestrian access to events at Town Hall and patronage of the downtown businesses.

Mr. Litten recused himself from the proceedings.

Mr. Steve Murray gave an overview of the site plan for the development as well as Mr. Jeff Love of Devereaux and Associates.

Ms. Rollins stated that this property is actually zoned CBT and not CB according to the guidelines.

There will be 13 garages for 16 units for the Condominiums.

It was asked about the signage regarding the gateway to the community.

It was stated by Mrs. McGuire that this was a very well presented project and that it will be a welcome addition to the Town.

There was no decision made on this particular project.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:20 a.m.