



around it. Ms. McManus said it did not appear that there was a big gap below the sign because of the plantings.

Mr. Komorsky asked how the existing nonconforming sign got to be there. Ms. McManus said the existing nonconforming sign was already at the site when her client purchased and renovated the site in 2005.

Ms. Swanson asked whether her client had considered having the two signs that would be allowed. Ms. McManus said she did not know. She said they needed this much square footage in order to have a digital sign so that the price could be changed from inside the building. If the sign was smaller there would not be enough room to have the name of the gas station and be able to inform the public of the price of the gas.

Ms. Swanson said the application says there will be external lights; she asked where those lights would be. Ms. McManus said she put that down because she was not sure if the client wanted a low light and she inquired if the code allowed a low light up or whether only a down light would be permitted. She added that she felt this would be a self-illuminated sign and an external light would not be needed. The area around the sign of brick and stone would not be lit.

Mr. Bisceglia asked the width of the existing sign. Ms. McManus said it is about 5 ½ feet excluding the posts. Mr. Bisceglia asked the width of the proposed sign. Ms. McManus said it is 5' 1.25", which is slightly narrower, plus the columns which are 2' wide. Mr. Bisceglia said that totals over 9 feet.

Mr. Bisceglia made a motion to open the public hearing. Mr. Komorsky seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Paul Bernabe of 302 Titusville Road was sworn in by Mr. McPeck. Mr. Bernabe asked to see the site plan. Mr. Bernabe asked where the sign is located now and where it was proposed to go. Mr. Bernabe indicated that his property was the Laundromat property around the corner on Titusville Road. Mr. McPeck said that the sign would be on Noxon Road. Mr. Bernabe asked about the visibility because of the size of the sign. Ms. McManus showed Mr. Bernabe on the plan where the sign would be located. Mr. Bisceglia asked Mr. Bernabe if he had any direct concerns. Mr. Bernabe now understood where the sign would be located. Mr. Bisceglia said the height of the sign is actually one foot lower but four feet wider than the existing sign, but it would be closer to the road.

Ms. Lane said the existing sign does not indicate "Dunkin Donuts" on it. Ms. McManus said that is correct. There are three price banners. They are going to put two price banners on the new sign. Ms. Lane asked how many signs were on the building advertising Dunkin Donuts. Ms. McManus said she was aware of at least one but was not sure if there were more.

Mr. McPeck said as he understood it, the illuminated part of the sign was going to stay basically the same, only the monument part would be different. Ms. McManus said that was correct. Sunoco has pretty standard signs and the existing sign is just an older sign, and these are the newer dimensions.

Mr. Bisceglia said he would like to see a mock-up of what is allowable in the code, i.e. a 24 square foot sign. Ms. McManus said when you make a sign that small, the size of the numbers



advisement of one of the board members he was back that night seeking relief of an additional 2 feet.

Mr. Bisceglia made a motion to open the public hearing. Mr. Komorsky seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

There being no public comments, Mr. Bisceglia made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Komorsky seconded and the motion carried unanimously. PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Findings:

**Character of the Neighborhood and Detriment to Nearby Properties**

This will be an enhancement of the property

**Alternative Methods for Achieving Benefit Sought by Applicant**

There is no alternative place for a front porch

**Substantiality of Variance Requested**

This is not a substantial variance. On 9/12/11 a variance was granted for relief of 8' from the r.o.w. of Diddell Road in order to construct a 42' x 8' front porch with a proposed setback of 47' from the road. The applicant now proposes to expand the porch to 42' x 10', thus requiring relief of an additional 2 feet. The total combined variances will result in relief of 10' from the r.o.w. of Diddell Road

**Effect or Impact on Physical or Environmental Conditions in the Neighborhood**

This will enhance the house and make the neighborhood better.

**Self-Creation of Difficulty**

This is a self-created difficulty but is justified because it will enhance the property.

Based on the Findings, Mr. Bisceglia made a motion to grant Michael Fiorisi of 289 Diddell Road an additional 2 feet for a total of 10 feet from the right of way of Diddell Road in order to construct a 42' x 10' front porch with a proposed setback of 45 feet from the right of way. Mr. McPeck seconded and the motion carried unanimously. AREA VARIANCE GRANTED

There being no further business before the board, Mr. Bisceglia made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 p.m. Mr. Komorsky seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted

Susan Quigley, Secretary