

City of Gardiner
Ordinance Review Committee Meeting
Monday, May 8th, 2017 3:00pm
City Hall Council Chambers

Agenda

- 1.) Welcome- Member, Joel Alexander welcomed everyone.
- 2.) Roll Call- Louis Sigel, Les Young, Claire Marron, John Burgess, City Staff Dot Morang, CEO Barbara Skelton, City Staff Robin Plourde. Chair Deb Willis arrived a few minutes late as did committee member Pat Hart.
- 3.) Consideration of meeting notes of April 10, 2017. Motion made by Louis Sigel to accept minutes, second by Barbara Skelton. Motion passed by unanimous vote. Les Young and Claire Marron abstain (not at the meeting on April 10th.)

Old Business

- 4.) Continued review of amendments to the sign provisions.

Purpose- OK

Definitions- Dot suggested using sandwich board.

All definitions will be in alphabetical order.

Applicability- 10.24.3.2.4 Overhanging Banners and 10.24.3.2.5 Banners Displayed in Gardiner Common, will be removed and will put in standards.

Nonconforming Signs- 10.24.3.3.2 Take out "or if there is a change of ownership".

Below please find interpretation from city counsel John Pottle regarding legal nonconforming signs, prohibited signs and proposal to change such signs.

Dot Morang

From: David Cichowski
Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:45 AM
To: Dot Morang
Subject: FW: Sign Ordinance Interpretation

Dot, could you forward this to Planning Board Members?

Thanks Dave

From: Pottle, Jonathan [<mailto:JPottle@eatonpeabody.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:05 AM
To: David Cichowski
Subject: Sign Ordinance Interpretation

Dave,

You recently asked for an interpretation of the Land Use Ordinance with respect to legal nonconforming signs, prohibited signs, and proposals to change such signs.

Under the Land Use Ordinance, existing legally nonconforming signs (that pre-date the relevant Ordinance prohibition or limitation) may continue provided they are not made more nonconforming when replaced. On the other hand, signs that are illegal or prohibited cannot be replaced under Section 10.24.3.3.2. Prohibited signs would be those that were put up previously in violation of the Ordinance and installation occurred after the ordinance limitation or prohibition was in place.

We would advise the following general approach to legally nonconforming/prohibited sign issues:

1. Inventory the current signs at a given location to determine whether each sign is either "conforming", "legally nonconforming", or "prohibited". A useful tool in this regard could be a table (with the columns addressing the appropriate legal status of each and all of the signs) tied to a sketch of the signage placed on a particular site together with dates identifying when the sign was originally placed (i.e., a timeline).
2. With respect to any existing legally nonconforming signs, determine whether a proposal simply changes out the sign faces (including names, words, logos, etc.) or whether they will make the sign structures more nonconforming. If the proposal makes a legally nonconforming sign more nonconforming, then that would also be prohibited by the Gardiner ordinance.

If you should have any follow-up questions in this regard, please feel free to contact me at any time.

Thanks,
Jon

Ordinance Review Committee May 8th, 2017 Cont.

10.24.3.4 Permit required: replace “erected” with altered.

Prohibited Signs:

10.24.4.4 Add Fences

10.24.4.10 Mark Eyerman is still working on this one.

Illumination

10.24.5.1.5 Les suggest a picture be added as an example of a “graphic”

10.24.5.3.3 This will be removed from ordinance.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30

Submitted by Robin Plourde