

Meeting Minutes
Lemoyne Planning Commission
Tuesday – June 9, 2009

LPC Members Present: Boyd Howard, Susan West, Dwight Herrmann, Barb Byrem, Thomas Bank

Staff: Robert Ihlein (Borough Manager), Janine Park (*TCRP*)

Visitors: Andy Rebeck (Lamar), Rick Jordan II, Rick Jordan III (L.B. Smith)

Attached or Referenced Exhibits: See attached

The regularly scheduled Lemoyne Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 6:31 pm.

May Meeting Minutes:

Mr. Herrmann motioned to approve the May Meeting Minutes. Mr. Howard seconded. Passed with all in favor.

Signs Ordinance:

Ms. West advised that the Ordinance Committee approved all previous edits and forwarded the ordinance to Mr. Cassidy, Borough Solicitor.

Mr. Howard advised that the Planning Commission still possessed the Signs Ordinance with a few outstanding issues to be determined at tonight's meeting.

At the request of Mr. Herrmann, Mr. Eugene Emrich, a lighting expert with twenty-five years of experience and President of the Central PA chapter of the Illuminating Engineering Society, was at the meeting to help with the numbers and calculations for determining lighting values for the applicable parts of the Signs Ordinance. He distributed several sheets in relation to the discussion.

Regarding the measurement of light, it was discussed that the standard was to measure foot candles of light on a surrounding area rather than emitted light and that this was measured on a horizontal surface.

PennDOT recommends that 0.2FC maximum above ambient measured 250' away from a sign using white light measured on a horizontal surface without obstructions as their standard.

The billboard industry recommends that 0.3FC maximum above ambient measured 250' away from a sign using white light measured on a vertical surface without obstructions as their standard. Mr. Emrich advised that due to the measurement being

taken vertically rather than horizontally, this is actually a more stringent standard than the one listed by PennDOT.

Discussion was to use the 0.3FC standard for the Signs Ordinance. Although there could be argument that this was too bright, that argument was subjective and placed the borough in an awkward position for enforcing the ruling. It was also stated by Mr. Emrich that the difference between 0.2 and 0.3FC was negligible to the human eye.

Mr. Herrmann brought up the Dark Sky Initiative and their recommendation of downlighting on signs vs. uplighting. Discussion was that it would be difficult to single out only sign lighting for this standard without a comprehensive lighting regulation applying to all lighting.

Mr. Bank questioned whether the change rate for EMC should be greater than eight seconds during overnight hours to further limit impact as a change in message would be more likely to draw the eye. Discussion was to keep the eight seconds for all hours.

Mr. Herrmann listed a number of issues he found throughout the ordinance as follows:

- A definition of “directory sign” is needed in the document. Discussion at the meeting revealed that LPC members were taking the wording to mean two different descriptions. A definition describing a listing of businesses for a single property would be added to the document.
- The issue of abandoned signs was brought up again. The outcome of the last meeting where this was discussed stood.
- 1306C refers to a “no impact business” which is not defined in the Sign Ordinance. It was stated that this is defined in the Zoning Ordinance, of which the Sign Ordinance is part.
- 1306G contains no size limit. It was noted that this section was for listing exempt signs and that details were described elsewhere.

Ms. West motioned to approve the Signs Ordinance as edited. Ms. Byrem seconded. All in favor. Ms. West requested that Mr. Howard attend the June 17th Ordinance Committee meeting to field any questions for the Signs Ordinance.

Katkocin Subdivision Plan:

Mr. Joe Katkocin, Property Owner

Mr. Ihlein had previously spoken with Mr. Katkocin regarding his request and suggested that he attend the LPC meeting with a sketch submission to discuss options for his property.

Ms. West noted that the LPC members did not receive plans until the day before the meeting and that the LPC has made several requests that materials for meetings be delivered in a more timely fashion.

Mr. Katkocin owns three properties between Herman Avenue and Peach Street at the

Memorial Park end. He has built a structure on the first property with two rental units and would like to do similarly with the other two properties. Due to the current economic state, financing is difficult to come by. If the properties remain as single lots with two units they would be classified as condominiums and financing is unavailable. If each individual lot is subdivided the units can be classified as town houses and financing is more readily available. Also, Mr. Katkocin had been advised on the availability of sewer to the properties, which turned out to have been misleading and a sewage ejector pump station was required. Additional units would allow the costs of this facility to be spread out.

Mr. Bank brought up the issue that the plans as shown indicate parking for all units would be off the Herman Avenue side of the property. With a subdivision, this would mean that parking for three properties would be on another owner's property and would cause possible problems.

Mr. Howard stated that the minimum size requirements for a lot would not be met if the lots were subdivided. Further examination determined that the lots were below the minimum lot requirement for a single unit each, but that they would be grandfathered for single units due to the pre-existing lot size. However, the current building with two units should not have been allowed to be built.

Ms. West and Mr. Ihlein would research the situation to determine how the permit for the initial structure was approved in conflict to the zoning requirements. Mr. Katkocin provided his contact information and the information for his attorney.

LPC Consistency Review Letters:

Mr. Ihlein presented two letters to be signed by Mr. Howard in the process of seeking grant money for borough projects. One was for the rain garden portion of the Market Street Revitalization project and the other was for the Borough Swimming Pool project. Both issues were reviewed and the LPC was in agreement that the proposed projects were consistent with local land use planning goals and objectives.

Ms. West motioned that the rain garden project was consistent with objectives. Ms. West seconded. Approved.

Mr. Herrmann motioned that the swimming pool project was consistent with objectives. Mr. Howard seconded. Approved.

Other Business:

It was noted that the Cafe Ordinance was approved at last month's meeting. The final edit of the Sign Ordinance would be required for the June 17th Ordinance Committee meeting. Mr. Howard would make the necessary edits and forward the ordinances to Mr. Cassidy for review and note that he was to have them to the Ordinance Committee for the June 17th meeting.

There was a brief discussion of the Stark Property submission. It had been approved at the June Borough Council meeting. It was noted that the requirements went against the recommendations of the LPC in regards to access from Bridgeview Drive. This was reflected in the LPC May Meeting Minutes.

Ms. Byrem motioned to adjourn. Meeting adjourned approximately 9:10 pm.

Minutes prepared by

Thomas Bank

Secretary, Lemoyne Planning Commission

August 12, 2009

FINAL