

**Lower Paxton Township
Zoning Hearing Board**

May 26, 2022

Members Present:

David Dowling

Jeff Staub

Greg Sirb

Mark Emery

Joe Murphy

Ron Reeder

Also, In Attendance: Isaac Wakefield, Amanda Zerbe, Kristi Focht

Docket 1454

Applicant: Colonial Park United Church of Christ

Address: 5000 Devonshire Road

Property Owner: Colonial Park United Church of Christ

Property: 5000 Devonshire Road

Applicant: Applicant is requesting relief to allow an electronic sign on the property. The applicant is also seeking relief to relocate the sign which is currently a non-conforming sign.

Fees Paid: April 15, 2022

The Hearing Began at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Dowling swore in applicants Thomas Feit and Kevin Krause of the Facilities Committee for Colonial Park United Church of Christ.

Mr. Dowling swore in Amanda Zerbe, Zoning Officer.

Mr. Dowling questioned Ms. Zerbe on what Township Ordinances are at issue.

Ms. Zerbe answered Section 203.713, non-conforming signs and Section 203-314, free standing signs.

Mr. Dowling questioned if the appropriate fees have been paid.

Ms. Zerbe answered that the applicant paid the fees on April 15, 2022. Mr. Dowling questioned if the application had been properly advertised and hearing notices posted. Ms. Zerbe answered that it was posted and advertised in the Hummelstown Sun.

Mr. Feit explained that the congregation at UCC is in the process of a capital campaign and doing a variety of improvements and updates to the property. The current sign is a track sign that is 30 to 35 years old and is in need of an upgrade and relocation for better visibility. He continued the proposed sign would benefit the number of activities that take place at the church.

Mr. Krause explained that when the sign was placed in the current location the Friendship Center, Colonial Commons and homes were not there. He explained that moving the sign will be more visible for the updated traffic in the area.

Mr. Feit noted that the proposed sign will replace the banner signs that are on the property that advertise events at the church. Mr. Feit noted to the numerous signs like this already in the Township.

Mr. Dowling noted his concern of how quickly the messages on the sign will change.

Mr. Feit gave examples of the various activities that could be posted on the sign and answered that they will find out from the Township what is allowable and comply with that.

Ms. Zerbe noted to Mr. Dowling that the sign can change one time per minute.

Mr. Krause noted that they would comply with that.

Mr. Sirb questioned Ms. Zerbe if this is an R-1 District.

Ms. Zerbe answered yes, noting churches are permitted in an R-1.

Mr. Dowling requested testimony on the current size of the sign and the proposed sign.

Mr. Feit stated the dimensions of the current sign are 8 feet by 8 feet and the proposed entire structure is 9 feet high by 10 feet wide. The current sign and banners used measures 159 square feet and the proposed electronic sign is 45.33 square feet making it a reduction of 114 square feet of signage.

Mr. Sirb questioned the applicant that they will remove all the banner signs and just have one electronic sign.

Mr. Feit stated that is the goal.

Mr. Dowling questioned that relocating the sign will be visible for persons travel both from the east and west.

Mr. Krause answered yes. He explained the proposed sign would be more centered on the property than the current sign.

Mr. Sirb questioned if the sign will be lit internally and how long it will stay lite.

Mr. Krause answered the current sign comes on at dusk.

Mr. Sirb questioned Ms. Zerbe if there are any regulations on having a sign lite in an R-1.

Ms. Zerbe answered that signs are not permitted in an R-1 so it will need to be addressed.

Mr. Wakefield noted they are permitted if they approve and attach it as a reasonable condition.

Mr. Sirb noted his concern with a variance to have a sign.

Ms. Zerbe explained the sign is a pre-existing, non-conforming but if the sign were to be relocated the applicant loses the non-conformity.

Mr. Sirb noted that the variance would not only allow the applicant to have a sign but to have a lit sign.

Ms. Zerbe answered yes.

Mr. Sirb noted his concern with the lit sign in an R-1 with the residential homes.

Mr. Krause noted that with the location and placement of the sign and the homes across the street he does not feel the light will be an issue.

Mr. Wakefield questioned what is adjacent to the property.

Mr. Feit noted to the Friendship Center YMCA, Best Buy and residential homes that have a business located in them.

Mr. Dowling questioned if the Board had any further discussion with the timing of the sign or conditions that the Board would like placed on the sign.

Mr. Sirb commented he would like the message to stay for the one-minute standard set by the Township. He suggested the light be turned off at 10 p.m.

Mr. Krause noted that the stores close at 10 p.m. and he would like for travelers to see the sign on their way home.

Mr. Sirb noted he felt the sign should go off at 9 p.m. Discussion followed with how the sign will be lit and the times of when the sign could go on and be turned off.

Mr. Dowling questioned if anyone from the audience wished to be heard.

Mr. Dowling swore in Roberta Jarnagin-Blaylock of 6509 Blue Ridge Ave.

Mr. Dowling questioned how far away Ms. Jarnagin-Blaylock lives from the sign.

Ms. Jarnagin-Blaylock answered 15 minutes.

Mr. Dowling questioned Ms. Jarnagin-Blaylock if she is a member of the church.

Ms. Jarnagin-Blaylock answered no. She explained that she wanted the Board to know that frequently changing signs can be a migraine trigger for persons like herself. She noted that flashing can be trigger for migraines and a trigger for seizures in children.

Ms. Zerbe noted that the signs may not flash.

Mr. Dowling questioned if any member of the Board wished to make a motion on the request for a docket 1454.

Mr. Sirb motioned to approve Docket 1454 with stipulations that all of the regulations including 1-minute sign change, no sign flashing and the back-lit be goes on at dusk and off at 10 p.m.

Mr. Dowling seconded the motion.

Mr. Dowling requested Mr. Wakefield to conduct a roll call vote: Mr. Reeder, aye; Mr. Sirb, aye; Mr. Emery, aye; Mr. Staub, aye; Mr. Dowling, aye.

Mr. Dowling noted the application has been granted.

This hearing ended at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kristi Focht

Kristi Focht, Recording Secretary

Lower Paxton Township
Zoning Hearing Board

May 26, 2022

Members Present:

David Dowling

Jeff Staub

Greg Sirb

Mark Emery

Joe Murphy

Ron Reeder

Also, In Attendance: Isaac Wakefield, Amanda Zerbe, Kristi Focht

Docket 1455

Applicant: Vanguard Realty Group

Address: 2630 & 2380 Colonial Road

Property Owner: Vanguard Realty Group

Property: 2360 & 2380 Colonial Road

Applicant: Applicant is seeking relief related to number, size and location of wall signs in a planned center.

Fees Paid: April 26, 2022

Posted: May 15, 2022

Advertised: Hummelstown Sun

The Hearing Began at 7:31 p.m.

Mr. Dowling swore in applicant Eric Kessler, 601 Running Pump Lane.

Mr. Dowling questioned if the appropriate fees have been paid.

Ms. Zerbe answered that the applicant paid the fees on April 26, 2022. Mr. Dowling questioned if the application had been properly advertised and hearing notices posted. Ms. Zerbe answered that it was posted and advertised in the Hummelstown Sun.

Mr. Dowling questioned Ms. Zerbe where the property was posted.

Ms. Zerbe answered it was posted directly across from the entrance of Weis on the applicant's property.

Mr. Staub stated to Mr. Dowling he would need to excuse himself from this Docket.

Mr. Dowling questioned Ms. Zerbe this has to do with signage.

Ms. Zerbe answered yes, the number of wall signs.

Mr. Dowling requested Mr. Kessler to begin his testimony.

Mr. Kessler requested the Board to refer to the packet that was provided to them. He noted that lot one currently has a day care in place and has signage on two sides of the building. Mr. Kessler explained the unique issue with lots two and three being double sided buildings, the front of the building will be the parking lot and the rear of the building will face Colonial Road. If the signage is placed in the front of the building, there will not be an identifier facing Colonial Road, and those driving on Colonial Road would not see those signs. He noted that the tenant in lot two will be an emergency veterinary clinic and clients would not be able to identify the building. He noted the size of the proposed sign is permitted by ordinance and will be identical to the sign that is currently on the day care that is lot one. The proposed plan for lot two and lot three will have the same appearance, noting to the address will be in the upper left corner of the building and a sign for each tenant will be displayed on the building. Mr. Kessler explained that he has two variances, the first variance is for the size of the address (2380), the current ordinance allows for two feet high by two feet wide, Mr. Kessler is requesting the sign to be two feet high by six feet wide. The second variance is seeking signage on both sides of the building. He noted the signage will meet the ordinance, will be the exact same signage that is currently on the day care. Mr. Kessler noted that the main issue that as people are driving on Colonial Road they will need an identifier to the building. The lights to the sign will go on at dusk and turn off between 1 to 2 a.m.

Mr. Dowling questioned Mr. Kessler on the hardship, noting that the ordinance allows for signs on the front of the building. Mr. Dowling noted the does not have an issue with the address on the back of the building.

Mr. Kessler answered this is the request of the tenants and their concern for clients to be able to find their building from the road without having any identifiers. Mr. Kessler explained he placed the signage on the Colonial Road side he would not have a sign for the entrance to the buildings for clients to know what building they are to enter. Mr. Kessler noted these are not LED signs.

Mr. Emery questioned if there are pillar signs at Colonial Road.

Mr. Kessler answered that is an identifier for the project.

Mr. Sirb questioned if the veterinary clinic would be on the pillar sign.

Mr. Kessler was not sure if they will be on the pillar sign but noted if they are it is a small slide in sign and do not have much value. He explained that the monument sign is more for the tenants in the rear of the property. Mr. Kessler noted that the proposed tenants all have questions about the signage.

Mr. Emery questioned the amount of tenants per unit.

Mr. Kessler explained the units are custom built units and if one tenant wanted the whole building they could have the entire building.

Mr. Emery noted his concern that based on the outcome a tenant could have a maximum of six signs.

Mr. Kessler explained that he will not exceed the number of signs per tenant, noting two signs per tenant. Mr. Kessler noted he will not give one tenant more than two signs.

Mr. Wakefield questioned Ms. Zerbe that the ordinance reads the applicant is only allowed to have one wall sign and no other signage.

Ms. Zerbe answered they many only have directional signs and a free standing sign.

Mr. Emery questioned if they could have glass signage.

Mr. Kessler explained these are professional facilities not a shopping center so there will not be glass signage.

Mr. Dowling questioned what will happen when lot 4 is developed.

Mr. Kessler answered lot 4 will have one sign for each tenant per the ordinance.

Mr. Dowling noted his concern that there will be to many signs.

Mr. Wakefield questioned the neighboring properties.

Mr. Kessler answered Sheetz to the South, Weis and Centric Bank across the street, to the rear a creek and trees, and to the North is one house is several football fields away.

Mr. Murphy questioned if the vet is a regular vet or is it a specialty vet that someone will be looking for.

Mr. Kessler answered it is a surgical veterinary clinic that regular veterinary offices will refer patients to.

Mr. Murphy noted patients could be coming there for just one for a procedure and not returning.

Mr. Kessler answered yes and explained that is the vets concern.

Mr. Dowling questioned if there were any further questions by the Board.

No response was heard.

Mr. Dowling questioned if anyone from the audience wished to be heard.

Ms. Jarnagin-Blaylock spoke in favor of the proposed signage. She explained that she has had to take her vet to an emergency vet and under that stress it can be difficult to located where you need to go.

Mr. Dowling questioned if Ms. Jarnagin-Blaylock would use her GPS.

Ms. Jarnagin-Blaylock answered that in their experience using the GPS they made a wrong turn.

Mr. Dowling questioned if the Township had a position.

Ms. Zerbe answered no.

Mr. Dowling questioned Ms. Zerbe that the variance is only for the sign on the rear of the building.

Ms. Zerbe answered the sign can be placed on the front or the back but he would only get one on the front or one on the back.

Mr. Kessler suggested that the motion be separated into two steps. The first steps would be the directional signs to go from 2x2 to 2x6. The second step would be for additional sign on the building. He noted two signs per tenant with two tenants in lot two and three tenants in lot three.

Mr. Dowling questioned the address on the building.

Mr. Kessler answered the addresses will be 2360 and 2380 Colonial Road, noting to an issue that the GPS shows it as 4220 Linglestown Road.

Mr. Dowling questioned if any member of the Board wished to make a motion on the request for a docket 1455.

Mr. Dowling motioned to take in the order as suggested, to first to approve the increase the directional signs from 2x2 to 2x6.

Mr. Sirb seconded the motion.

Mr. Dowling requested Mr. Wakefield to conduct a roll call vote: Mr. Reeder, aye; Mr. Murphy, aye; Mr. Sirb, aye; Mr. Emery, aye; Mr. Dowling, aye.

Mr. Dowling motioned to approve the request of an additional sign on the rear of the building.

Mr. Sirb questioned that they are voting only on an additional sign not the size of the sign.

Mr. Kessler answered he will follow the ordinance for the allowable size of the sign. He noted they signs will match the current day care.

Mr. Sirb motioned to approve the motion with the condition stated by Mr. Kessler, not to exceed two tenants in building two and not to exceed three tenants in building three.

Mr. Kessler noted the signs will comply with the sign ordinance.

Mr. Wakefield suggested to a condition to the location of the wall signs.

Mr. Kessler noted he would specify that the signs would be from the plans submitted and one tenant would not have more than one front and one rear wall sign.

Mr. Sirb motioned to approve the motion with the conditions stated.

Mr. Reeder seconded the motion.

Mr. Dowling requested Mr. Wakefield to conduct a roll call vote: Mr. Reeder, aye; Mr. Murphy, aye; Mr. Sirb, aye; Mr. Emery, aye; Mr. Dowling, no.

Mr. Dowling noted the application has been granted.

This hearing ended at 8:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kristi Focht

Kristi Focht, Recording Secretary