

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

A G E N D A

TOWN OF CHINCOTEAGUE, VIRGINIA

March 8, 2011 - 7:00 P.M. – Council Chambers - Town Hall

CALL TO ORDER

INVOCATION

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

AGENDA REVIEW/DISCLOSURES:

1. Approval of January 26, 2011 work session minutes and the February 8, 2011 meeting minutes.
2. Old Business
 - Work Plan - Zoning Map/Districts
 - Update on Map Revisions
 - Review Questions from Workshop
 - Approve Revised Schedule
 - Work Plan - Sign Ordinance
 - Review proposed Ordinance revisions for Flags, Banners and Pennants and set public hearing date
 - Review proposed Ordinance revisions for building mounted signs and set public hearing date
3. New Business
4. Commission Members Announcements or Comments
(*Note: Roberts Rules do not allow for discussion under comment period*)

ADJOURN

PLANNING COMMISSION Work Session
26 January 2011
MINUTES

Members Present:
Mr. Ray Rosenberger, Chairman

Members Absent:

Mrs. Mollie Cherrix, Vice Chairperson
Mr. Tripp Muth, Councilman

Mr. Gene Wayne Taylor
Mr. Steve Katsetos
Mr. Jeff Potts
Mr. Spiro Papadopoulos

William Neville, Planning Director

CALL TO ORDER – Chairman Rosenberger called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm and established a quorum with two members absent.

Chairman Rosenberger requested a review and/or requested changes to the Agenda. Commissioner Papadopoulos moved, seconded by Commissioner Katsetos to approve the agenda, The motion was approved.

1. Review of Zoning Ordinance – District Regulations
 - Impact to other sections
 - Floodplain Overlay District
2. Review of Zoning Map
 - Powerpoint test slides
3. Discuss Next Steps in the Process
 - Joint work session with Town Council (2/17)
 - Town newsletter
 - Town website
 - Draft newspaper advertisement
 - Wall maps on display at Town Office
 - Public Hearing (Day/Evening Sessions)(Summer Residents)
4. Proposed Action Items for next meeting

No public comment was received.

Chairman Rosenberger began a discussion of the zoning update agenda by requesting action at the end of the meeting and limitation of discussion to major issues only so that a presentation can be prepared for Town Council. Commissioner Potts indicated that the Council may have a concern regarding 12 zoning districts.

Review of Zoning Ordinance – District Regulations

Following discussion, it was concluded that presentation to Town Council on February 17th would be important prior to the first public hearing in order to hear concerns or direction that Council may have. Any concern for how long the process is taking must recognize that the Comprehensive Plan is the necessary vehicle that leads to the Zoning Ordinance which then implements it.

Staff presented a summary report with recommendations for next steps. One of the steps is to review other sections of Town Code that may be affected by the proposed change in zoning districts. The zoning districts have been grouped within the current numbering system for Residential Districts, Commercial Districts, and Article 5 was used to contain the remaining Public Use Districts. Commissioners Papadopoulos and Potts confirmed the numbering system and asked questions about the agriculture district and public uses. Mr. Potts reminded the Commission again that the different R districts and C districts may have a future impact on real estate assessment value.

Each of the other highlighted sections of Town Code was reviewed for potential changes to coordinate with the new 12 zoning districts. Commissioner Taylor suggested that commercial noise ordinance standards should be applied to the public uses in order to allow for concerts and special events that may occur in park or civic areas.

The Floodplain Ordinance (Section 30) was identified as a zoning overlay district that is created separately from the Zoning Ordinance. There is no revision necessary however, Mr. Neville suggested that the Floodplain Overlay should be shown on the Official Zoning Map for the Town of Chincoteague since the entire island is located within the 100 year floodplain. A cross reference should be added to the revised zoning ordinance sections. Chairman Rosenberger suggested that Staff review the Cape Charles zoning ordinance to see how floodplain areas are referenced. Commissioner Papadopoulos asked about the current FEMA floodplain maps.

The Commission briefly discussed the larger issue of changes to Assateague Beach and the Inlet which have an effect on floodplain elevations and the exposure of Chincoteague Island to coastal storms. Commissioner Taylor spoke about seeing 1962 survey markers in a stable area of beach to the north of the current recreational use area at Toms Cove.

A brief review of the Sign Ordinance highlighted the need to add a new section to address the public use districts (proposed section 7.14) that could be based on the commercial standards. Mr. Neville noted that the redline version of the district regulations included corrections for the new name and number system. A final review was still necessary to make sure that all recommended corrections have been made before a public hearing copy is issued for review.

Commissioner Taylor asked how much private property was included in the RC Resource Conservation district. The Commission had previously recommended that certain parcels would not be zoned to RC at this time if there was a concern about loss of property rights.

The proposed zoning map has not been revised yet. The issue of piers and docks that cross an RC zoning area was raised.

Commissioner Taylor also asked about split zoned properties and how that would be handled. Should a long property with commercial along the road frontage and residential to the rear be allowed to choose one or the other district or the decision made based on the largest area? This has the potential to change the recommended land use areas that have been defined by the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Neville asked if this should be one of several issues that are presented to Council for their input and direction. Another issue for consideration is whether individual landowners will be allowed to request changes as a part of the comprehensive zoning map update (extended process) or only adopt the land use plan map (quick first step process). Commissioner Papadopoulos recommended three options for considering zoning changes for the Council to consider.

Review of Zoning Map – Power point test slides

Use of ‘power point’ as a presentation tool was tested by Staff to see how effective it will be to illustrate basic information, color maps, the land use comparison spreadsheet and photos that define the character of the different land use/zoning areas. Sample pages were reviewed by the Commission and a limited number were selected as useful.

Next Steps in the Process

Commissioners discussed the Town Council presentation and how to summarize work completed and next steps in the process. Commissioner Papadopoulos suggested that it was important to start with a basic explanation of why this effort is necessary, the goals of the comprehensive plan and how the update to the zoning map and districts will be done.

Chairman Rosenberger identified the Town Newsletter, the Website, and possible newspaper advertisements as a good way to start informing the public on the zoning changes. Commissioner Taylor asked for the maps to be available for public viewing up close prior to having a public hearing. Public information meetings held in both the afternoon and evening were suggested during the month prior to a public hearing.

The Planning Commission will review the summary report and presentation for the Town Council work session at the next meeting with the goal of preparing for public hearings in several months.

Sign Ordinance

The staff report from January 11th was used as an outline to continue discussion of potential changes to the Sign Ordinance regarding banners, flags, and pennants. Several Commission members expressed a concern that there should be additional flexibility and

freedom of choice for business owners to select the right type of signage. Further, that the limitation of banners to 8 weeks did not recognize that the tourist season is closer to 16 weeks long.

Mr. Neville suggested that several Commission members may wish to meet with Mr. Lewis in a smaller working group to prepare recommended changes so that specific action may be taken at a future meeting.

Chairman Rosenberger requested the previous survey results used to prepare the sign ordinance several years should be copied in the next staff report for reference.

Commissioners Taylor and Potts discussed the number of properties for sale on Chincoteague Island, particularly commercial properties that indicate the small profit margins that business owners deal with. Chairman Rosenberger added the thought about creating a link between children receiving a good education and then not having strong job opportunities that allow them to remain in the community. This should be balanced against encouraging so much change that the character of the community is damaged.

Commissioner Katsetos requested more information about the number and type of businesses, and how many startups do not survive as a way to evaluate what is working well. Discussion continued about the difference between local businesses and franchise businesses, and the balanced needs of the tourist community.

Commissioner Papadopoulos suggested that the community profile, with strong schools/medical care, needed to attract 'Wallops Island' employees should be considered and promoted on Chincoteague in addition to tourist amenities. Sign ordinance regulation must address the primary purpose, whether tourist amenity, or quality retirement community, or family oriented small town character that is desired.

Commissioner Taylor made a case for the good judgment of local business owners to do what is best for both the business and the community without over regulation. Commissioner Katsetos agreed and mentioned that meals tax revenue for the Town will be up this next year based on higher food prices not necessarily higher business profits. It was agreed that the total number of people who visit the Island may not have significantly changed over the last few years.

ADJOURN

Commissioner Katsetos moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Commissioner Potts. The motion was unanimously approved.

Ray Rosenberger, Chairman

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
8 February 2011
MINUTES

Members Present:

Mr. Ray Rosenberger, Chairman
Mrs. Mollie Cherrix, Vice Chairperson
Mr. Tripp Muth, Councilman
Mr. Gene Wayne Taylor
Mr. Steve Katsetos
Mr. Jeff Potts
Mr. Spiro Papadopoulos

Members Absent:

William Neville, Planning Director

CALL TO ORDER – Chairman Rosenberger called the meeting to order at 7:08 pm and established a quorum with all members in attendance.

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – Chairman Rosenberger led the invocation followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no speakers. Chairman Rosenberger closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

AGENDA

1. Election of Officers

Item #1 was delayed until later in the meeting so that all member would be in attendance. Commissioner Taylor nominated Ray Rosenberger as Chairman, and Mollie Cherrix as Vice Chairperson, seconded by Commissioner Papadopoulos. Commissioner Papadopoulos nominated William Neville to serve as Secretary, seconded by Commissioner Cherrix. The nominations were unanimously approved.

2. Approval of January 11, 2011 minutes

The minutes as submitted were reviewed with no corrections. Commissioner Potts moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Councilman Muth. The motion was unanimously approved.

3. Old Business

Work Plan – Zoning Ordinance

Staff summarized the Commission's work from the two meetings in January and presented the staff report as a draft version of the one that will be presented to Town Council for the workshop on February 17th. Commissioners were asked if there were any major changes that should be made to the report.

Chairman Rosenberger commented on the policy issues listed on page 14, and agreed that items 1b and 1c should be combined. Councilman Muth offered his thoughts on what Council wanted to hear at the workshop and that in general he expected approval of the approach and work to date of the Commission. The proposed schedule will answer the question of: where are we now?

Large format maps that illustrate proposed changes in zoning were requested by several Commissioners. Updates to the Town map will be completed by Planner Neville with help from County GIS staff if necessary.

Commissioner Taylor motioned to forward the report to Council for consideration at the workshop, seconded by Vice Chairperson Cherrix. The motion was unanimously passed.

Work Plan - Sign Regulations

The staff report was updated to include the results of a 2004 Sign Survey and proposed ordinance revisions for Items # 1, 2, and 4 of the compliance issues based on discussions from the last meeting. Color images of sample banners were provided for reference.

Proposed standards for commercial banners were discussed that may allow additional display time compared to residential or non-profit organization use. Commissioner Papadopoulos raised the issue that proposed ordinance language proscribes specific materials and does not include vinyl. It was agreed that the type of material should be removed from 7.2.5 and 7.4.4.1.

Issues regarding exemption of non-profit organizations from a time limit, residential use of banners for home occupation versus decoration, and the difference between a 32 square foot permitted banner versus smaller areas for home occupation were debated. The core issue is whether banners are signs and that there should be a maximum area allowed regardless of the type of sign.

Councilman Muth returned to questioning the intent of the current ordinance that allows permanent signs plus the right for temporary display of other signs (banners). Commissioner Potts made the case for businesses who will display banners for limited periods throughout the season such as just on weekends. Mr. Neville pointed out the range of banner use in the photo samples that includes both temporary and semi-permanent use. Chairman Rosenberger noted that the

proposed Home Occupation Ordinance would limit signs to either/or, while the sign ordinance currently allows the use of both/and as long as banners are listed under 'temporary signs'.

Commissioner Taylor questioned the proposed limitation of one banner per business and one per parcel for each 100 feet of road frontage. He suggested 'or' rather than 'and', and that the parcel must be where the business is located. Vice Chairperson Cherrix agreed that more than one banner would only be permitted if the property had more than 100 feet of road frontage. Commissioner Potts tested this approach by asking about a property that is exactly 100 feet wide versus 101 feet wide. Commissioner Katsetos confirmed that each business is defined by a separate business license. This section needs more work to address the problem at the Circle where one temporary sign per business is excessive because multiple businesses are located on one parcel.

Commissioner Papadopoulos returned the discussion to the question that if each sign type is still defined as a 'sign', why should there be more area allowed than 32 square feet, for example. How much is a reasonable amount for a business? Mr. Neville commented that this determination would cause a significant change in the Sign Ordinance if the Commission recommended a total permitted sign area regardless of sign type.

Chairman Rosenberger suggested that the Commissioners focus on just the Home Occupation sign issue. A clarification was offered that the process for approval of a permanent business sign seems to work well, however it is the uncontrolled 'temporary signs' that cause the problems. Councilman Muth considered whether the review of repeated code violations had expanded the direction from Council to consider the Home Occupation sign issue.

Pictures of sample banners were discussed and it was agreed that Staff should also provide images of flags, pennants, directional/incidental signs. Councilman Muth suggested that the definition section should be reviewed to deal with the difference between a 'feather banner' and a 'flag', and between a 'banner' and a 'sign' based on the mounting method.

Commissioner Taylor expressed the local opinion that if something is regulated, then the limits should be challenged. He suggested that less control would lead to good decisions on the part of local business owners, and that the rules need to make sense to people. There should also be an opportunity to try new solutions.

Chairman Rosenberger pointed out the results of the 2004 sign survey that most people do not believe that more signs are better. There was discussion about the unintended response to sign restrictions using the example of off premise signs and vehicle mounted signs. If setting a cap on total signage allowed is a goal, is there an equation that would be fair for all businesses regardless of size?

Commission discussion returned to Home Occupation sign issues with a consideration of the 4 square feet and 16 square feet proposed sign areas. Commissioner Papadopoulos made a motion that banner signs (or any temporary signs) not be permitted in residential areas for home occupation uses. He explained that small permanent signs meet the intent of home occupations, while banners, flags, etc. change the residential character of the area. Councilman Muth asked if there should be a difference for Limited and General Home Occupation uses and then led a continued discussion including 'open' flags/signs, and realistic enforcement issues.

Mr. Muth seconded the motion to allow consideration of this change to the prior Planning Commission recommendation to Town Council. He stated his agreement with the idea of maintaining residential character and encouraging larger businesses to locate in commercial areas. The Chairman called for the vote and the motion passed by majority (Katsetos, Taylor opposed). Clarification was provided that Pony Penning signage, and other flags or decoration that do not promote home occupation business use would not be restricted by this change.

Staff presented redlined changes to the pennant section based on Commission discussion at the last meeting. Pennant use would only be permitted by non-profit organizations and would be excluded from residential areas. Commissioners commented that the Fireman's Carnival was exempt because it was on public property, and that holiday decorations have been considered as pennants in the past. It was agreed that pennant code violations were mostly a result of a need for public information about the requirements and therefore no change would be proposed by the Commission.

Staff introduced a proposed ordinance section in the general requirements that would limit the total signage allowed to include all types of signs. Since this standard had already been incorporated into the draft Home Occupation Ordinance, there was no further discussion.

A proposed sign ordinance change to permit flexibility in the 12 foot maximum sign height for building mounted signs was debated by the Commission. Chairman Rosenberger indicated prior support for maintaining the maximum height limit that defines community character today. The BZA process for considering a variance was reviewed as a poor alternative to working within the Zoning Ordinance requirements. Commissioner Papadopoulos asked about roof mounted signs.

Staff suggested that flexibility in placement of building mounted signage could be offered as an incentive for voluntary participation in an architectural and site design guideline program. Commissioner Katsetos commented on the importance of this issue based on the major costs involved.

Chairman Rosenberger directed the Commission to review the last proposed redline change about the difference between public art and signage. Commissioner Taylor asked if this section would apply to both residential and commercial areas. Commissioner Papadopoulos asked that this section also regulate 'symbols'.

A final review of the 5 questions about sign ordinance changes contained in the staff report was concluded as follows:

- 1) Banner size should be increased from 30 to 32 square feet
- 2) Time limit/permit fee for banner use to be amended
- 3) Continued (commercial sign height)
- 4) Pennants would be restricted in residential areas. Commercial areas unchanged at this time.
- 5) Continued (public art)

4. New Business

- Revised Planning Commission Work Plan for 2011 - list of items was updated from the last meeting to include suggested review of energy conservation/alternative energy topics.

5. Commission Member Announcements or Comments

Census 2010 results were discussed. Commissioner Papadopoulos added his concern about the fuel tank anchoring process and the question of who is responsible for the \$250/day fine for non-compliance. Chairman Rosenberger concluded by encouraging the Commission to continue with the scheduled zoning map and district update process.

ADJOURN

Councilman Muth moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Commissioner Potts. The motion was unanimously approved.

Ray Rosenberger, Chairman



STAFF REPORT

To: Chincoteague Planning Commission

From: Bill Neville, Director of Planning

Date: March 8, 2011

Subject: Work Plan – Zoning Map and District Update

Comments were received on the Zoning Work Plan at the Town Council workshop held on February 17, 2011. The approach and schedule were supported by Council and all agreed that including public comment was the next step. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission consider the following questions and confirm a revised project schedule.

Questions

1. Has the Planning Commission or Staff reviewed the proposed zoning districts areas (on the ground) for conformance with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan and the zoning requirements?
2. Are there any subdivisions or 'pristine areas' of residential use that should be included in the R-1 and R-2 districts that were overlooked during the Comprehensive Plan?
3. Should the RC district be more consistent to include all marsh areas and if so, will the district allow for construction of docks and piers for water access to buildable areas? Should a conditional use permit be required for marsh areas of parcels in private ownership?
4. Are Town limits/property lines incorrect if the Town includes up to the high water mark of Assateague Island?

5. Does the ownership of Town property in the vicinity of the Curtis Merritt Harbor include more than currently shown on the County tax map records?
6. Are there certain terms such as ‘historic downtown’, ‘public/semi-public’, and ‘resource conservation’ that need to be better defined?
7. Will the written description of the zoning districts currently contained in the Zoning Ordinance be needed with adoption of an Official Zoning Map?
8. Can the matrix/chart of permitted uses be highlighted to show proposed changes?

Revised Project Schedule – Alternate A

Resolution of questions/issues and Peer Review	March 2011
Public information display, presentations, advertisement	March/April 2011
- PC regular meeting	March 8th
- Website information available	March 21st
- Open House #1	week of March 28 th _____
- Open House #2	week of April 4 th _____
PC Public hearing	April 12, 2011
- PC review and recommendation	May 10th
- <i>Presentations to Chamber of Commerce, Downtown Merchants, Realtors, others?</i>	
TC Public hearing	June 6, 2011* or August 1, 2011*

*allows for participation by seasonal residents

Revised Project Schedule – Alternate B

Resolution of questions/issues and Peer Review	March 2011
Public information display, presentations, advertisement	April 2011
- PC regular meeting	April 12th
- Website information available	April 18th
- Open House #1	week of April 25 th _____
- Open House #2	week of May 2 nd _____
- <i>Presentation to Chamber of Commerce, Downtown Merchants, Realtors, others?</i>	
PC Public hearing	May 10, 2011
- PC review and recommendation	June 14 th *
TC Public hearing	June 6, 2011 or August 1, 2011*

*allows for participation by seasonal residents

Proposed Action

Planning Commission motion to select the revised project schedule (A or B), and to schedule the open house/public hearing dates.



STAFF REPORT

To: Chincoteague Planning Commission

From: Bill Neville, Director of Planning

Date: March 8, 2011

Subject: Sign Ordinance Revision - Banners, Flags and Pennants

The Planning Commission has included a review of the Sign Ordinance (as amended 6/19/08 and 4/6/09) in its current Work Plan as a result of concerns expressed by business owners and residents. Following discussion at the November, January and February Planning Commission meetings, a strategy for reviewing the Sign Ordinance was proposed.

Minor corrections to the Sign Ordinance may be necessary based on a review of violations and community requests from the last 3 years. A comprehensive review may create as many problems as it would solve, so it was determined to narrow the current review to only Banners, Flags and Pennants as requested by Town Council, and to consider a list of compliance issues provided by the Zoning Administrator.

Commissioners voted on a motion that banner signs (or any temporary signs) not be permitted in residential areas for home occupation uses. It was generally agreed that small permanent signs meet the intent of home occupations, while banners, flags, etc. change the residential character of an area. The motion passed by a majority vote with two opposed. Clarification was provided that Pony Penning signage, and other flags or decorations that do not promote home occupation business use would not be restricted by this change

Commissioners agreed by consensus that:

- the maximum size permitted for banners would be increased from 30 square feet to 32 square feet.
- the time limit/permit fee for banner use would be amended to allow a single permit for the extended tourist season of 16 weeks or May 15th to September 15th.
- the type of material used for banners would be removed from section 7.2.5. so that it will include all materials such as vinyl.
- pennants would be restricted in residential areas, and there would be no change for commercial areas
- the number of banners permitted for commercial uses should be tied to the number of businesses or the linear feet of road frontage.

The following proposed ordinance revisions have been shown as ‘redline’ corrections based on Commission direction:

Zoning Ordinance

Article VII

Signs

Sec. 7.2 Definitions

7.2.5. *Banner.* A sign that is mounted on or attached to ~~a~~ any non-rigid surface. ~~such as cloth, fabric, or paper.~~

7.2.53. *Temporary sign.* ~~Temporary signs shall be permitted~~ A sign for the purpose of advertising ~~any event held by any nonprofit or charitable organization during a limited period of time.~~ See Section 7.4 for permitted signs.

7.3.6.1 Limited home occupation signs. Such sign shall not exceed four (4) square feet in area and shall only identify business information and/or the business owner. There shall not be more than one sign permitted per dwelling. The sign shall be non-illuminated.

7.3.6.2 Home occupation signs. Such sign shall not exceed ~~four square feet a total of~~ sixteen (16) square feet in area and shall ~~contain only the name of the business only~~ identify business information and/or the business owner. ~~There shall not be more than one sign permitted per dwelling. The sign shall be non-illuminated.~~

Sec. 7.4 Temporary Signs

7.4.1. Permitted by right. The following temporary signs shall be permitted as a matter of right and no sign permit is required, subject to the conditions specified, and the other provisions of Article VII, as applicable. Use of banners, flags and pennants are prohibited in residential zoning districts.

7.4.4 Banners. On-premises banners shall not be more than ~~30~~ 32 square feet in area. Total banners shall not exceed one per residence and one per business, or one per building lot for each 100 linear feet of public road frontage. Such placement shall not exceed 4 times per calendar year not to exceed 4 consecutive weeks for each placement. Such placement shall not exceed 2 times per calendar year not to exceed 4 consecutive weeks for each placement. Non-profit organizations are exempt from the above time limit provided the banner is removed within 7 days after the event has ended. Placement of such banners must comply with Article VII of the ordinance. Banners shall not be placed closer than ten feet from any property line. A permit is required.

Sample Banners



Sample Flags



Sample Pennants





STAFF REPORT

To: Chincoteague Planning Commission
From: Bill Neville, Director of Planning
Date: March 8, 2011
Subject: Sign Ordinance Revision - Maximum height for building mounted signs

The Planning Commission has included a review of the Sign Ordinance (as amended 6/19/08 and 4/6/09) in its current Work Plan as a result of concerns expressed by business owners and residents. Following discussion at the November, January and February Planning Commission meetings, a strategy for reviewing the Sign Ordinance was proposed.

Minor corrections to the Sign Ordinance may be necessary based on a review of violations and community requests from the last 3 years. A comprehensive review may create as many problems as it would solve, so it was determined to narrow the current review to only Banners, Flags and Pennants as requested by Town Council, and to consider a list of compliance issues provided by the Zoning Administrator.

Zoning Administrator Kenny Lewis was consulted about the code compliance issues that he has repeatedly encountered. His recommendations for Planning Commission review included the following issue:

- Increase the maximum allowable height of commercial signs from 12 feet, to 12 feet or a maximum of xx feet if the sign is attached to the primary structure, beneath the top roof line or gable, and is in proportion to other architectural details. Other performance standards may be proposed. This would address an ongoing issue that is currently being decided by the BZA on a case by case basis.

The following proposed ordinance revisions have been shown as 'redline' corrections as suggested by Staff:

Zoning Ordinance

Article VII

Signs

SECTION B. STANDARDS AND CRITERIA

Sec. 7.11. Generally.

The regulations in this section specify the number, types, sizes, heights and locations of signs which are permitted within the jurisdictional boundaries of the Town of Chincoteague and which require a permit. Any sign regulations incorporated into a development plan approved by council may supersede all or part of this section. Unless otherwise provided in this chapter, all signs shall be set back a minimum of ten feet from the right-of-way, unless attached to a building without any ground supports, in which case it shall conform with the required size restrictions and not protrude into any right-of-way unless a land use permit is obtained from the Town of Chincoteague. All permitted signs in this chapter shall only advertise those uses being conducted on the premises on which they are displayed.

7.11.1. Determination of sign area. In measuring the area of signs permitted under these regulations, the entire face of the sign (one side only) and any wall work incidental to its decoration shall be included. Where both sides of a sign contain lettering or other allowable display, one side only shall be used to compute the allowable size of the sign. Where the sign consists of individual raised letters or a sign face of irregular shape, the sign area shall include the area of the smallest rectangle that can encompass the letters or sign face.

7.11.2. Determination of sign height. The height of a sign shall not exceed 12 ~~(XX)~~ feet in height. The height of all signs shall be the distance from the grade level where the sign is erected to the top of the sign or, whichever is greater. No sign shall be erected that will obstruct the sight distance triangle at any street intersection. ~~Roof signs and wall signs~~ shall be excluded from 7.11.2 if the sign is located below the roofline of the building and incorporated into an architectural feature such as a gable, dormer, entrance, etc.

7.11.3. Sign Illumination.

- (1) Externally lit signs shall be illuminated only with steady, stationary, fully shielded light sources directed solely onto the sign without causing glare.
- (2) External illumination for signs and outdoor advertising structures in which electrical wiring and connections are to be used shall require a permit and shall comply with the Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code and approved by the building inspector.
- (3) The fixtures and source(s) of illumination used to illuminate signs shall not be directed toward nearby residential properties.
- (4) Illumination of a grandfathered off premise sign is prohibited.

7.11.4. Installation of wall signs. All wall signs shall be installed flat against the wall of a building and shall not extend from the wall more than 18 inches.

7.11.5. Other uses. In cases where the regulations within this section do not specifically address a sign requested in conjunction with a permissible use, the zoning administrator shall make a written interpretation of the ordinance, which shall be kept in the permanent record for that application. (Ord. of 4-4-1994)

Sample Building Mounted Signs



