

RE: Carlisle Family YMCA, : ZONING HEARING BOARD OF
Applicant : THE BOROUGH OF CARLISLE
Request for Variances : CASE NO. 2020-09
: **Date of Decision: November 5, 2020**

DECISION OF ZONING HEARING BOARD

I. Procedural and Factual Background

Carlisle Family YMCA (the “Applicant”), has applied for variances from §§255-219.B.(1) and 255-216.O. of the Carlisle Zoning Ordinances (the Ordinance”) (related to maximum size of sign), to allow a new branded “Y” logo on the South West Street exterior wall of the building (the “Application”). The Applicant is the owner of a property located in the Borough’s INS-Institutional District, with an address of 311 S. West St., Carlisle, PA 17013 (the “Property”). The Applicant operates an existing fitness facility at the Property, which has recently undergone significant renovations and expansion.

A public hearing on the Application was held on November 5, 2020, in the Carlisle Borough Hall. Zoning Hearing Board members participating in the hearing and decision were Chairman Vince Champion and members John Rovegno, Dana Culbertson and Robin Guido. The Zoning Hearing Board (the “Board” or the “ZHB”) was represented by Kurt E. Williams, Esq. of Salzman Hughes, PC. The Applicant was represented by its Executive Director, Marcia Droddowski. Appearing as witnesses for the Applicant were its Architect, Benedict Dubbs of Murray Associates Architects, Ray Wenger of Strickler Sign Company and Rob Frey, Esq., President of the YMCA Board of Directors. The hearing was advertised in the *Sentinel* newspaper

on October 21 and 28, 2020.¹ Notice of the Application was sent to neighboring property owners on October 5, 2020. Aside from the Application submitted, the Applicant offered four (4) exhibits, Applicant's Exhibits A-1, A-2, A-3 and A-4.

As part of the renovations and expansion of the YMCA, the Application seeks to install a new "Y" sign on the building that is consistent with the national YMCA branding requirements. Several objectors appeared at the hearing in opposition to the Application, three (3) of whom entered their appearance as parties to the hearing. They were Ethel Carryer, Marcia Anchors-Jones and Shawn Jones.

II. Findings of Fact

The following Finding of Facts were accepted by the Board:

1. The hearing on November 5, 2020, was properly advertised and noticed.
2. The Application was administratively complete as filed.
3. The existing use of the Property is as a fitness facility.
4. The Property is not located within the Borough's historical district.
5. Although the proposed sign is not a solid pane, pursuant to Ordinance §255-216.O., for freestanding letters, the size of the sign is determined by the area contained between the highest and lowest point of any letters and the extremity points of the first and last letters. See also, Exhibit A-2.

¹ In accordance with 35 Pa.C.S.A. §5741(e), notice of proposed action on Application 2020-09 was also published in the *Carlisle Sentinel* on October 28 and November 4, 2020, with call-in instructions for residents wishing to participate in the hearing remotely..

6. Applicant proposes to install a lighted wall sign on the Property's principal building measuring 12' x 10' overall (120 SF). See Exhibit A-2. The proposed sign would face S. West Street. See Exhibit A-1.
7. In the INS District, the maximum area of one sign is 25 SF. Ordinance §255-B.(1).
8. The proposed sign exceeds the maximum allowed by the Ordinance.

III. Conclusions of Law

The Board hereby makes the following Conclusions of Law:

1. The Applicant did not meet its burden to satisfy the requirements of 53 P.S. §10910.2.(a) and Ordinance §255-250.B. (requirements for variances).
2. No evidence of hardship, unique physical circumstances or conditions presented in support of the requested variances.
3. The Applicant did not satisfy its burden for the granting of variances for the proposed sign.

[Decision and Order on following page]

IV. Decision and Order


Based upon the Application as submitted and the testimony provided, the Board makes the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and issues the following Order and Decision as set forth below.

It is hereby ordered and decided as follows:

- A. The Board finds that the Applicant has not met its burden of establishing those criteria set forth in 53 P.S. §10910.2. and Ordinance §255-250.B., necessary for the grant of variances from Ordinance §§255-219.B.(1) and 255-216.O.
- B. The Board hereby decides by unanimous vote to DENY the Application as presented.

Borough of Carlisle Zoning Hearing Board

By: 
Vincent Champion, Chair

MAILING DATE: December 11, 2020 

Any person aggrieved by this decision of the Zoning Hearing Board may appeal to the Court of Common Pleas of Cumberland County. The appeal must be taken within thirty (30) days of the date of this Decision.