

**Minutes from the  
DOYLESTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION  
Work Session Meeting**

February 18, 2016

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission Work Session Meeting was held at 5:00 p.m., Thursday, February 18, 2016 in the Doylestown Township Municipal Building, 425 Wells Road, Doylestown, PA. Members of the Planning Commission in attendance included Chairman; Judy Hendrixson, Vice Chairman; Thomas Kelso and member Ed Harvey. Others in attendance included Township Manager; Stephanie J. Mason, Code Enforcement Director; Sinclair Salisbury, Township Planning Consultant; Judy Stern Goldstein and Ms. Stacey J. Yoder, AICP.

**Absent: Edward Redfield and George Lowenstein**

**Absent: Board of Supervisor Liaison; Richard F. Colello. In his absence, Supervisor; Ken Snyder was present.**

**Chapter 175 – Zoning:**

Upon reviewing the sign ordinance, Code Enforcement Director; Sinclair Salisbury commented many sign sizes have increased and questioned if it was deemed necessary. Ms. Mason responded; the size increase was not deemed necessary, but a response from previous discussions between the commission. Mr. Kelso suggested to provide square footage overall, including temporary and permanent signs. Mr. Salisbury indicated if you provide a total square foot for a property which previously had permanent signs issued and then request a temporary sign, a percentage of how much a sign was used will need to be determined. He suggested to list a section showing what is allowed for temporary and permanent signs separately. Mr. Kelso noted; currently temporary signs are written as permanent with no restrictions.

Mr. Salisbury commented if the temporary signs will be allowed to be permanent, a permanent sign should be allowed. Ms. Hendrixson agreed the temporary and permanent signs should be kept separate. If permanent signs begin to allow the square footage to grow, it will result in too many signs on display.

Upon a discussion regarding how the temporary and permanent signs can be controlled, Ms. Stern Goldstein indicated businesses look at signs differently and the ordinance will have to be looked at differently pertaining to square footage, because it will begin to cause limitations. Ms. Hendrixson added; the number and duration of temporary and permanent signs should be viewed, such as with development signs. Ms. Mason indicated signs along the highways within the right of way, such as the Route 202 parkway should also be regulated. Ms. Stern Goldstein noted; signage along any highway right of way is not permitted by both the township and Penn Dot. Mr. Kelso questioned if there is a penalty stated in the ordinance for violators. Ms. Mason answered; the ordinance states a fine up to \$1,000 will be charged, depending upon the decision of the judge.

**Definitions:**

Ms. Stern Goldstein indicated many of the definitions were removed because they no longer apply to the content of the ordinance.

Mr. Kelso noted; the explanation of the definition of temporary signs purpose should be revised. Ms. Stern Goldstein revised the ordinance to state, temporary signs shall be removed after the purpose has been served.

Pertaining to sound, Mr. Salisbury questioned; if electronic message also references pump up televisions. Ms. Stern Goldstein clarified; the township ordinance does not allow sound as a sign. However, sound can be used if it's 50 decibels off the premises. A television cannot be placed on the sidewalk, because it will be a part of the public right of way. If the television is placed in a shopping center as a sign, it's considered private property so they are within their property line.

Mr. Salisbury noted televisions located off site commercial advertising on mini billboards is not permitted and is covered under the sign ordinance. Ms. Stern Goldstein indicated a television off site for commercial use is not considered a sign. It will be considered info-tainment. Mr. Kelso suggested to address the issue under the definition section of the ordinance. He also suggested to have the definition of a mural reviewed. Mr. Salisbury agreed and clarified a mural is the total face or lettering.

**Page Four – § 175-106 \ Definitions:**

Mr. Salisbury noted Nits is mentioned in the ordinance. Ms. Stern Goldstein explained; the reference of Nits appears in the ordinance. However, the brightness is determined by the 0.3 foot candles above the ambient light. The Nits represents a separate regulation in addition and it's how the calibration is completed. It's also used as a guideline for the manufacturers. The foot candles are used for the compliance. Mr. Salisbury recommends to remove Nits from the ordinance, because the calibration is no longer in use. The ordinance was revised to remove the reference of Nits.

**Page Six - § 175-107 \ Prohibited signs:**

Mr. Salisbury referenced Section K and asked why would the township be exempt from signs or any guide, stay or attachment there to erected, placed, painted, or maintained by any person. The PA Crime Statue, section 6503 does not permit placing or the attachment of anything to a utility pole. He doesn't believe the township should be exempt. Ms. Stern Goldstein explained; the exemption is to provide the township with the ability to do what they can do within the law. Mr. Salisbury suggested to remove the exempt section. Ms. Hendrixson agreed. Ms. Mason indicated at times, the township will need to place signs on trails and fences, such as "Do Not Enter". Ms. Stern Goldstein added; the zoning ordinance does not provide the ability for anyone to break the law. The commission agreed to have the exemption remain.

**Page Eight - § 175-108. Exempt signs:**

Mr. Salisbury suggested on Section H for governmental signs be revised to by exterior shielded down lights focused on the sign instead of illuminated by exterior lights focus on a sign. Ms. Stern Goldstein recommended not to limit the township, especially with police and emergency services. Mr. Salisbury disagreed, and preferred the township comply with the same regulations as residents are expected to. Ms. Hendrixson suggested to add the word "shielded". Mr. Salisbury noted the wording is listed in two sections as SALDO and Zoning. Upon reviewing the ordinance definitions, the commission agreed to keep the definition as illuminated by exterior lights focus on a sign.

**Page Eleven - § 175-109. General sign regulations:**

Mr. Salisbury referenced Section F-1 and suggested to add all neighboring properties to the light sources to illuminate signs. Ms. Stern Goldstein noted the paragraph states adjacent properties at the end of the paragraph.

**Page 12 – Area of sign:**

Mr. Salisbury noted the reference of X and Y on the diagram is not mentioned in the text. Ms. Stern Goldstein clarified; the letters are to provide a generic notation of the size of the sign.

**Page 21 - § 175-111.G.6 \ Regulations by sign type:**

Mr. Salisbury noted to have the work “Nits” removed as previously agreed.

**Page 18 - § 175-110 \ Regulations by sign type:**

Mr. Salisbury questioned why the 8-foot height requirement is not met for wall signs under Section A. He noted the paragraph doesn’t make sense, because the section of governing heights was removed. Mr. Salisbury explained; the ADA allows a minimum of 4 inches to stick out. Anything over 4 inches will need to have a minimum of 80 inches’ clearance. He suggested to revised the section as “no portion of a wall sign lower than 80 inches may project more than 4 inches from the building wall”. The commission agreed to the reinstate the paragraph as originally written as mounted less than 8 feet above the finished grade.

**Page 19 - § 175-110 \ Regulations by sign type:**

Mr. Salisbury noted; the notation of 8 feet above the finished grade will need to be added to Section 5; sign height and C; projecting signs.

**Page 22 - § 175-110 \ Regulations by sign type:**

Under Section 7; Permit Requirements, Mr. Salisbury questioned with the permit issued for one year, is the sign considered permanent. Ms. Stern Goldstein indicated signs posted at Delaware Valley University or Doylestown Hospital are found not to be objectionable. Ms. Mason added; both DVU and the hospital addressed the Zoning Hearing Board to receive relief for their poles and banners. Mr. Kelso suggested to have a temporary use in the ordinance. The temporary use will be construction sites and the signs can be removed once the occupancy permit is issued. This will provide a beginning and end with the township providing definition.

Upon a discussion regarding the best option of what use can be defined, Mr. Kelso suggested to consider the overall site, such as with Toll Brothers under SALDO. The poles and banners can be added to SALDO and addressed as part of a development sign. Ms. Mason questioned how will a vacant lot be viewed. Mr. Kelso suggested to address as an overlay with the construction use. The commission agreed to update the ordinance and define poles and banners as a temporary use in the zoning ordinance, covered under SALDO. The use can reference under the sign ordinance and without content. Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned what constitute construction use. Ms. Kelso answered; once a construction permit is received. The temporary signs will be sized at 4 square feet.

**Page 22 - § 175-111 \ Signs in Residential Districts (R-1a, R-1, R-2, R-2a, R-2b, and R-4)**

Under Section 7A; The section for street signage will be deleted and note, if a sign is requested to be placed on a pole a permit will be required. With a type of temporary sign being deleted, an applicant will need to meet with the

Zoning Hearing Board to request relief. Mr. Salisbury clarified; the issue is not the pole sign, but the permit being issue annually. The time period should be regulated as with other temporary signs.

**Page 23 - § 175-111 \ Signs in Residential Districts (R-1a, R-1, R-2, R-2a, R-2b, and R-4)**

Under Section 1C; Permanent Sign Height – Mr. Kelso question should the height be 8 feet per dwelling unit. The ordinance was revised to read 6 feet for all other residential uses for both permanent and temporary signs.

The Commission agreed to schedule the next Work Session on Monday, February 22, 2016 at 7:00pm

**Adjournment:**

Hearing no further business, the February 18, 2016 Doylestown Township Planning Commission Work Session was adjourned at 6:34 p.m.