

MUNICIPALITY OF MONROEVILLE

PLANNING COMMISSION

JULY 19, 2023

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Leonard Bertoni.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND MOMENT OF SILENCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited and a moment of silence was observed.

ROLL CALL

The Recording Secretary, Sharon McIndoe, called roll and the following were present: Leonard Bertoni, Bruce Walker, Paula Montgomery, Ronald Massung, P. Lorraine Lewis-Burke, Terry Segelson and Paul Whealdon. Mrs. Lawrence was absent.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There being no corrections, additions or deletions to the minutes of June 21, 2023, a motion was duly made by Mr. Massung to approve them, as submitted, and Mr. Walker seconded it. Upon a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

CONDITIONAL USE 23-5-C

RT22 MTWP, LLC

The applicant is requesting Conditional Use Approval to install a billboard pursuant to Monroeville Zoning Ordinance, No. 1443, as amended, Section 307.14, Billboards. The property is located along William Penn Highway, Tax Parcel 743-J-297, in the C-2, Business/Commercial Zoning District.

Mr. J. J. Richardson legal counsel for the applicant from Bernstein and Berkley, came forward with Mr. Patrick Wolfington and Mr. Tim Earle, the principles of Wolfgate, Devco, LLC. Mr. Richardson explained this application is requesting conditional use approval of a billboard. He reported this was reviewed and there were no zoning issues and no variances are needed.

Mr. Earle came forward to give a brief overview of the application. He reported the sign proposed is a 150 square foot LED sign with two faces one on each side. He explained the total head of the structure is 24 feet and the sign faces are 10 feet tall by 15 feet long, the sign is set back 10 feet from the right-of-way on William Penn Highway and 15 feet from the two side yards.

Mr. Bertoni inquired how the applicant wants to move forward with erecting the sign without causing any blockage and disturbance to the existing signs. Mr. Earle explained the height of the sign is 24 feet and their sign is a 10-foot tall face with approximately two feet of apron below the sign face which gives 12 foot of clearance under the structure. He explained anyone traveling along William Penn Highway in either direction can see under the actual sign face to see the Planet Fitness pylon along with

the other signage. Mr. Bertoni suggested the measurements will need to be confirmed because Ordinance No. 1443, Section 307.14, states, no billboard or outdoor advertising structures shall be erected in such a manner as to block the view from the road, street or driveway of any existing business sign. He explained other than looking at exactly where it would be placed, they seem to already have the setback as far as possible. Mr. Earle agreed. He explained the parcel is triangular in shape and there is nothing else that can be placed there. He stated the sign is shown on the plan and he could draw a sight line from the sign. He pointed out the Planet Fitness Sign and William Penn Highway and stated with the 10-foot setback the sign is not in the visibility of the pylon.

Mr. Whealdon inquired whether he has a diagram that shows a view down the road and Mr. Earle answered negatively. Mr. Whealdon pointed out the grass triangle on a photograph and the location of the proposed sign 24 feet high and Mr. Earle agreed. Mr. Whealdon reported the planning commission is concerned the proposed billboard will block the Planet Fitness sign traveling westbound on Route 22 and the Mattress Firm Sign traveling eastbound. Mr. Earle stated from the roadway and looking at it, the proposed sign will not impede the visibility of that sign from a car traveling down the roadway.

Mrs. Montgomery questioned whether he was saying it would not block it at any point. Mr. Earle stated there are other obstructions in the way that would block the Planet Fitness Sign. Mrs. Montgomery inquired when traveling down the road whether that billboard does not obstruct the Planet Fitness Sign at all. Mr. Earle answered there is a clear view for a good period of travel time on William Penn Highway. Mrs. Montgomery asserted there would be a period that the sign would be obstructed and Mr. Earle was uncertain how far back she was referring. Mrs. Montgomery was concerned that at any point it would restrict viewing the sign. Mr. Earle pointed out the ordinance does not stipulate that at any point, anywhere on any roadway any blockage. He suggested it would block it if it were two feet next to it without any visibility.

Mr. Whealdon suggested drawing a straight line between the proposed sign and the existing sign and from a certain point back to the proposed sign would block it at some point. Further discussion ensued concerning the visibility of the sign. Mr. Whealdon felt a diagram or rendering to help understand the location of the proposed sign in relationship to the other signs. He stated the proposed billboard is between two existing signs so it would be beneficial to have a diagram east and west showing the proposed billboard with the existing signs. Mr. Earle asserted they could have it prepared for council to produce the evidence that they would conform to that.

Mr. Massung inquired about the number of vehicles on that roadway a day and Mr. Whealdon answered thousands.

Mr. Segelson inquired whether some of that sign is available for the other out parcels in the area and Mr. Whealdon answered affirmatively.

Mrs. Montgomery referred to the existing billboard on the parking lot and Mr. Whealdon indicated those are not considered billboards, they are considered on-premise signs. Mrs. Montgomery asserted the proposed billboard is right in front of it. Mr. Whealdon explained at some point driving down Route 22 the billboard will block the existing signs but they will come back into view. Mrs. Montgomery was concerned because of the proximity between the two signs is close and she felt it would block them.

Mr. Earle asserted it has been reviewed because they have the same concerns that the other signs would block their sign. He stated those other signs do not block their sign. Mr. Whealdon mentioned how the other signs would block the proposed billboard at some point and Mr. Earle stated it does. He mentioned 350 feet and stated there is a clear sight line from there. Mr. Whealdon pointed out in the photograph where the one sign partially blocks the sign from the angle the picture was taken. He reported it is an issue that needs to be reviewed because the businesses on Route 22 are tight. Mr. Earl indicated they can provide more exhibits for the public hearing.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Walker duly made a motion to deny Conditional Use Application No. 23-5-C and Mrs. Lewis-Burke seconded it. Upon a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, at this time, Mr. Massung duly made a motion to adjourn at 7:46 p.m. and Mr. Walker seconded it. Upon a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Leonard Bertoni,  
Chairman

LB/sam