

THE TOBYHANNA TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING - SIGN ORDINANCE
APRIL 17, 2017

The April 17, 2017 Special Meeting of the Tobyhanna Township Planning Commission was held at the Tobyhanna Township Government Center Building, 105 Government Center Way, Pocono Pines, Pennsylvania 18350.

Present were Board Members Mark Sincavage, Michelle Bisbing, Patricia M. Rinehimer, Brendon Carroll and Anne Lamberton. Township Engineer Robert McHale, Solicitor Jonathan Reiss, Esquire and Zoning Officer Maureen Minnick.

1. Vice Chairperson Michelle Bisbing called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. It was determined that a quorum was present.

Proposed Sign Ordinance

Brendon Carroll opens the discussion and comments that the sign ordinance is well put together and the Committee worked hard over the six months to go through the ordinance and make it very clear.

Anne Lamberton asks Mr. Reiss if our ordinance is legally up to par with the other municipalities. Mr. Reiss responds that it is really up to the township to determine what they want the sign ordinance to be; what do they want their township to allow regarding signage.

A. Definitions

Maureen Minnick suggests that paragraph A in ss 155-1111 on page 17 should be reworded regarding signage at both entrances.

Bob McHale suggests that Mr. Reiss review and rewrite this paragraph. Mr. Reiss agrees.

Mr. Reiss suggests that definitions that are not listed in the ordinance should be removed from the definitions, or put into the ordinance where applicable.

B. Numbering

Mr. Reiss suggested that the 1100 numbering should be changed to fit within the townships codification and go back to the 155 codifications.

C. Materials and Styling

Ms. Minnick states that in the design guidelines the free-standing sign requires hardline or stone and recommends that it should be required in the sign ordinance as well.

Mr. Reiss states that currently it is an incentive to follow the design guidelines not a requirement.

Mike Christian suggests that digital signs have required materials and style but nondigital signs should be recommended instead of required.

Question was raised whether digital signs are brighter than regularly lighted signs. Mr. McHale brings attention that Ms. Minnick had done a study in the past and found that there is no difference in the illumines for both signs.

Mr. Sincavage asks if there is a requirement of distance between signs in a commercial district. Ms. Minnick answers no.

D. Sign permit applications

Maximum size of sign for a 100,000-square foot building is 240 square feet. If there are two entrances they could have two signs at 120 square foot with separation requirement of 660 square feet or one sign at 240 square feet. Clarifying language in the ordinance will present an abundance of nonconforming signs which the Board is aware of.

E. Resort Overlays

Kalahari came in for application of a roof sign done by a conditional use. Ordinance currently allows roof signs up to three story high building. Ms. Minnick asks if it would be better to change the section on roof signs. With Mr. Reiss advises and Board agrees that the conditional use application is the best way to address roof signs that are being requested outside of the ordinance guidelines.

F. Ms. Lamberton asks Ms. Minnick to indicate on the map the number of potential signs that could be present on the 940 corridor, not including signs on buildings for future review.

2. Summary

Mr. Sincavage asks Mr. Christian if he and the Sign Committee would review and put together a revised ordinance addressing the items that were discussed above.

Ms. Minnick agrees to work with sign committee to review definitions to be included in the ordinance.

Mr. Reiss agrees to rewrite section pertaining to maximum sign size.

3. Meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Minutes recorded by Debra S. Jean.