NORTH FAYETTE TOWNSHIP
ZONING HEARING BOARD

THURSDAY, JULY 23, 2015
7:30 P.M.

The meeting was called to order with Mr. George Bartha presiding.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

George Bartha, Chairman
Chip McCarthy, Vice Chairman
Jim Bruni, Member
Tim Bish, Solicitor
Cheryl Cherico, Secretary

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

John Scott, Alternate Member

OTHERS PRESENT:

Rosalie Devereaux, 7381 Steubenville Pike
Francine Hauldren, 240 Beacon Dr., Weirton, WV
John Kreutzman, 7411 Steubenville Pike
Ed Bashioum, 7402 Steubenville Pike
Bonnie Haspel, 1511 Hollowtree Dr., Pittsburgh
Terri Gonzalez, 7365 Steubenville Pike
Tim Lucas, Crossroads United Methodist Church
Laura Ludwig, Community Development Director
Pittsburgh Reporting Service Reporter

ADMINISTRATIVE:

Mr. Bartha asked the Board for a motion on the minutes from the June 25, 2015, meeting.

> **A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. CHIP McCARTHY, SECONDED BY Mr. JIM BRUNI, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 25, 2015, MEETING. MOTION CARRIED.**

Mr. Bartha announced that prior to this meeting, the Board held an executive session to receive advice of the Solicitor.

Mr. Bartha asked the court reporter to swear in witnesses and any members of the public wishing to comment during the hearing.

The Court Reporter swore in the witnesses.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Crossroads United Methodist Church Sign Variance request.

   Crossroads United Methodist Church is requesting a variance from the maximum number of business identification ground signs restriction of Section 27-1007.1.A and Table 27-11 of Chapter 27 of the North Fayette Township Code of Ordinances, Zoning, as amended, in order to permit the installation of two (2) additional business identification ground signs for "Crossroads United Methodist Church" on property located at 1000 Crossroads Drive, Oakdale, PA 15071 in the B-2 General Business and PRD Planned Residential Development Overlay Districts, currently designated as Allegheny County Block/Lot No. 496-B-3.

Mr. Bartha said notice of tonight's hearing was advertised and the subject property posted pursuant to the requirements of the PA Municipalities Planning Code.

Mr. Bartha entered Exhibits 1 through 15 referenced on the Exhibit List into the record of this hearing. He asked the Court Reporter to insert those exhibits into the transcript as if the Exhibit List was read into the Record.

Exhibits Entered at July 23, 2015 Hearing:

1. Chapter 27 of the North Fayette Township Code of Ordinances, Zoning, as amended.

2. Application to Zoning Hearing Board dated June 23, 2015.

3. Deed dated March 28, 1995 between The Western Pennsylvania Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church (Grantor) and Crossroads United Methodist Church (Grantee) recorded with the Allegheny County Department of Real Estate at Deed Book Volume 9432, Page 280.

4. Deed dated September 11, 2008 between John T. Cheesebrough III and Gregory L. Cheesebrough, Co-Executors of the Estate of Esther L. Cheesebrough, deceased (Grantor) and Crossroads United Methodist Church (Grantee) recorded with the Allegheny County Department of Real Estate at Deed Book Volume 13732, Page 171.

5. Deed dated December 21, 2009 between Dominick Bovalina, Frank Bovalina, Rose Ann Dugas, and Teresa Bovalina, now known as Teresa B. Christy (Grantors) and Crossroads United Methodist Church (Grantee) recorded with the Allegheny County Department of Real Estate at Deed Book Volume 14140, Page 557.

6. Photograph (undated) illustrating the design of a sign constructed for the applicant.

7. Grading Plan dated January 12, 2012 and prepared by J.R. Gales & Associates, Inc., illustrating the location and dimensions of the existing building and associated parking located on the subject property.

8. Sign Plan dated July 20, 2015 prepared by SpeedPro Imaging, providing dimensions and details on the proposed signs.

9. Allegheny County Property Assessment Office webpage dated June 29, 2015 for property designated as Allegheny County Block/Lot No. 496-B-3 and providing aerial map showing parcel boundaries with subject property highlighted (4 pages).

10. Public Notice and Proof of Publication for tonight's public hearing.

11. Letter from Board Secretary dated July 9, 2015 to Crossroads United Methodist Church regarding notice of hearing.

12. Letter from Board Secretary dated July 9, 2015 to neighboring property owners regarding notice of hearing (10 letters).

13. Photographs of Notice Postings.

14. Hand-marked Google Map provided by applicant which shows proposed location of sign along Route 22/30.

15. Photograph taken by Township showing current sign on the subject property along with hand-marked reference to sign dimensions.

16. Google map street view of McKee Road (submitted during hearing).

Mr. Bartha asked a representative to approach the Board and state their case. He asked whenever anyone wanted to speak this evening if they would please stand and state and spell their name for the accuracy of the court reporter's record.

Mr. Lucas approached the Board and said he was sent on behalf of the church. He said the church wants to install two additional signs to provide visibility for people that are driving down McKee Road from Steubenville Pike and also those coming from Route 22/30. He said currently there is one ground sign on the edge of their driveway and they would like to add a second ground sign with the same dimensions and same materials on the opposite side of the driveway so people turning from Steubenville Pike are able to recognize what the structure and building is. He said they would also like to install a 6' by 20' ground sign that would be visible from Route 22/30 because people driving down Route 22/30 on their way to Weirton aren't sure what the building is and why it is there.

Mr. Bartha said they are asking for two additional ground signs.

Mr. Lucas said yes.

Mr. Bartha said one would be out by Route 22/30 and one on McKee Road near where the existing sign is located.

Mr. Lucas said yes, the McKee Road sign would be on the opposite side of the driveway. He said the driveway sign they have now is only visible if someone is driving down McKee Road to Steubenville Pike.

Mr. Bartha said it would be across the entrance of Crossroads Drive off McKee Road.

Mr. Lucas said yes, with the same dimensions, same materials, same landscaping.

Mr. McCarthy said there would be nothing actually on Steubenville Pike; the signage would be staying on McKee Road.

Mr. Lucas said yes. He said the larger sign would be kind of at the edge of their property and would be visible from Route 22/30.

Mr. Bruni asked if the Route 22/30 sign would be the exact same type of sign with the same materials as what is currently at the entrance to the church.

Mr. Lucas said it would be a little bit different. She said the only thing they would have on the larger sign would be the website address.

Mr. Bruni asked if the sign would be lit.

Mr. Lucas said he would hope so at least at night if that would be possible.

Mr. McCarthy asked how big the one on McKee Road would be.

Mr. Lucas said it would be the same size as the existing sign so it would be 78” wide by 62” high.

Mr. Bartha said he believed Mr. Lucas stated already that the sign by Route 22/30 would be 6’ by 20’.

Mr. Lucas said yes.

Mr. McCarthy asked if he knew exactly where the one facing Route 22/30 would be located.

Mr. Lucas said he has a picture of the site.

Mr. Bish said that has been marked as Exhibit 14 for the record.

Mr. Lucas approached the Board and pointed to the picture and the location of where the sign would be. He said he wasn't sure how far away from Route 22/30 it needed to be, either 100' or 125'.

Ms. Ludwig said it would need to be 100'. She said the bufferyard is 100' and nothing would be allowed to be in the bufferyard.

Mr. Lucas said there are trees there now and they aren't going to touch any of those trees.

Mr. Bartha asked if that was Exhibit 14 that he was pointing to.

Mr. Bish said yes, it was Exhibit 14 and Mr. Lucas was pointing to the star in the middle of the graded area.

Mr. Lucas said that was correct for the 6' high by 20' ground sign.

Mr. McCarthy asked how high off the ground the sign would be.

Mr. Lucas said it would be 6' high total.

Mr. McCarthy asked if the sign was going to be right on the ground.

Mr. Lucas said he believed it was going to be on some kind of poles similar to the existing sign, but it wouldn't exceed 6' in height.

Mr. McCarthy asked if he had any sign plans.

Mr. Lucas said the only thing the sign company provided them with was the actual logo.

Mr. Bish said that was marked as Exhibit 8, the SpeedPro Imaging sign plan.

Mr. Bartha said for clarification on Exhibit 14 at the top, it shows the existing sign on the left hand side of the road with the new sign, basically an identical sign, on the right hand side of the road at the entrance to Crossroads.

Mr. Lucas said yes.

Mr. Bruni said Mr. Lucas mentioned the sign on Route 22/30 would be illuminated. He asked if it would have lights shining on the sign or if it would be internally lit.

Mr. Lucas said he wasn't sure.

Mr. Bish asked if the sign on Route 22/30 would have two faces or just one.

Mr. Lucas said it would have just one.

Mr. Bish asked if the sign on McKee Road would also have just one face.

Mr. Lucas said yes. He showed the Board a map depicting a street view of McKee Road with the existing sign.

Mr. Bruni asked if that was an exhibit.

Mr. Bish said no, but they could enter it.

Mr. McCarthy said that was an old picture.

Mr. Bruni asked if this is what the sign looks like now.

Mr. Lucas said yes, it looks exactly like that except for the bottom part was extended to the poles. He said it has the worship times listed, or the physical times that they gather listed.

Mr. Bish asked if there was ever a sign on Steubenville Pike.

Mr. Lucas said not that he was aware. He said he had only been around for six years.

Mr. Bartha asked if they could enter this map into the record so the previous conversation could be referenced to it.

Mr. Bish entered a Google map street view of McKee Road as Exhibit No. 16.

Mr. Lucas said they extended the bottom part of the sign all the way to the poles so that is what he meant by this is what the sign looks like now.

Mr. McCarthy said he was referring to Exhibit No. 15.

Mr. Bish said yes, the photos of the existing sign are Exhibit No. 15.

Mr. Bartha said Exhibit No. 15 shows it as a pole sign and not a ground sign, correct?

Mr. Bish said yes. He said a ground sign under the Zoning Ordinance has to have a foundation.

Mr. Lucas said such as cement, concrete, brick, something like that.

Mr. Bish said correct. He said the definition in Section 27-1402 is Ground sign - a sign that is affixed to the ground by means of a permanent foundation other than a freestanding frame, mast or pole and a pole sign is a sign erected and maintained on a free-standing frame, mast or pole. He said the Zoning Ordinance only permits one ground sign or pole sign per property. He said if they want a pole sign, they would need to go to the Board of Supervisors for conditional use approval. He said the Board needs clarification on whether they are proposing pole signs or ground signs because the application materials proposed ground signs but what the Board is seeing from pictures of the existing sign on McKee Road, Exhibit 15 is a pole sign.

Mr. Lucas asked if it was possible to do the exact same sign but put the foundation in place, or would that still be considered a pole sign. He said they would do whatever they need to do.

Mr. Bish said the most recent one that he could recall was the Lutheran Church sign on Steubenville Pike and they came in with a sign on two poles and thought that was a ground sign. He said the Board explained to them it was a pole sign, which was probably five years ago in 2010. He said they then put a base to the sign plan and the Zoning Hearing Board put a condition on approval that the Township would approve the type of base that would be used. He said that was done to ensure it was a permanent foundation.

Mr. Bartha said if he understood the question, Mr. Lucas was asking if he could turn a sign like that into a ground sign if they put a base on it.

Mr. Bish said yes.

Mr. Lucas said so long as it would be approved material.

Mr. Bish said yes.

Mr. Lucas asked if it would be possible to do the same to the sign that would be visible from Route 22/30.

Mr. Bish said correct.

Mr. Bartha said so long as it has a base then it could be considered a ground sign. If it is free-standing on poles, it is obviously a pole sign. He said the applicant asked for two ground signs on the application. He said if they would take the one on McKee Road and put a base on it then it would become a ground sign. The same with the one on Route 22/30 if it was put on a base acceptable to the Township then it would also become a ground sign. He said then, they would have two ground signs and that is what the applicant asked for tonight.

Mr. Bish said that was correct.

Mr. Bartha said usually submitted as evidence are drawings or pictorial representation of the final product. He said they have a picture of the proposed wording, but not the actual signs. He asked if they would need the sign company to provide the Board with additional documentation.

Mr. Bish said yes, and he could show the applicant what the Lutheran Church provided in 2010 as an example. He said this was Exhibit 10 from that hearing showing where the poles go down and they put the base between the poles. He showed the applicant Lutheran Church's Exhibit 9 which was the original submittal of a pole sign. He said placing the base between the poles made it a ground sign.

Mr. Lucas said okay.

Mr. Bish said the Lutheran Church actually provided two different designs of what the base could look like and that is when the Zoning Hearing Board said they didn't really have a preference as long as the design was acceptable to the Township. He said that was then made a condition of the variance.

Mr. Bartha said the Board would ask for a pictorial representation of both of the ground signs with a base similar to what Mr. Bish just showed him.

Mr. Bish said the difficulty for the Board is approving something without having those details. Usually, he said as part of the decision if the Board approves a variance states that the decision is based on the design details.

Mr. Bartha said as one of the Exhibits submitted as part the record.

Mr. Bish said exactly, so everyone is on the same page as what has been approved by the Zoning Hearing Board. He said he would not recommend the Board take action tonight without details like that.

Mr. Lucas said he understood.

Mr. Bartha said when they have a situation like this where they need more information after tonight's hearing, the Board can continue this hearing for 45 days which means it would come back to the August meeting and the applicant would have that additional time to submit the required information. He said it would come back in a month and the Board would have the additional Exhibits to examine in order to make a decision. He asked the solicitor if that was correct.

Mr. Bish said yes, that was correct.

Mr. Lucas said okay.

Mr. Bruni said he would like to request that they also receive information on how the sign along Route 22/30 would be illuminated. He said it didn't seem like anything was close by but he wanted to make sure that the light would not affect any homes or property in the area.

Mr. McCarthy asked if they were just envisioning up lights directed at the sign.

Mr. Bruni said that would be what he would assume.

Mr. Bartha said that should be part of the description of the final sign. He said if the sign would be internally illuminated then the Board wouldn't have a concern. If the sign would be external, then lights would be shining and sometimes by design, it would shine onto a neighbor's house or cause a problem with the highway. He said the Board just needs to understand the intention on how it is to be lighted and from what direction, internal or external. He said they are asking for a proposal on the illumination to also be submitted.

Mr. Lucas said he understands.

Mr. Bish said in addition to that, the Zoning Ordinance requires that ground signs be landscaped kind of like what they have done with landscaping around the current sign. He said generally the Board would condition a variance approval on the landscape complying with the Township Ordinance.

Mr. Lucas asked if that was for both signs.

Mr. Bish said yes.

Ms. Ludwig said if Mr. Lucas needed more examples, the Township could probably provide him with some from previous ground signs that have been issued. She said it could be sketched out showing that mulch was going to be located here and there would be this many bushes here, etc.

Mr. Lucas said that shouldn't be a problem now that he knows what additional information he needs to provide to the Board.

Mr. Bartha asked if the Board had any further questions.

Mr. Bish said the next meeting would be Aug. 27, 2015, at 7:30 p.m. and that would need to be made part of the motion if the Board decides to continue the public hearing.

Mr. Bartha asked if Mr. Lucas had anything further to add.

Mr. Lucas said no, he just needed to gather some more information. He thanked the Board for their time.

Mr. Bartha asked if the Township had any comments or questions.

Ms. Ludwig said yes. She asked if the current sign was illuminated in any way.

Mr. Lucas said no, not that he was aware.

Ms. Ludwig said she didn't think so. She asked if that existing sign would remain as such and the new sign would mirror that and not be illuminated either. She said just the Route 22/30 sign would be illuminated.

Mr. Lucas said that was correct. He said the Route 22/30 sign would be far enough away that it would not be visible if it wasn't illuminated.

Ms. Ludwig said she did have one other comment that might be opening up a can. Ground sign maximum sign size the Township allows is 120 square according to Table 27-11.

Mr. Bish said that was correct.

Ms. Ludwig said a wall sign maximum sign size is 200 square foot. She said if their proposed sign along Route 22/30 is 6' x 20' that is already at 120 square foot.

Mr. Bish said yes, it would be 120.

Ms. Ludwig asked if they would need to amend their application to also add in the variance for the square footage or do they want to come back and lower that square footage.

Mr. Bish said they are requesting additional signs so if the Board grants the variance then . . .

Ms. Ludwig said each sign could be 120 square foot.

Mr. Bish said yes.

Mr. Bartha said at this time if anyone else in the public wanted to comment on tonight's application now would be the time. He asked that they please stand and state their name for the record.

Ms. Devereaux said she would like to see the exhibit of where the sign on Route 22/30 is going to go.

Mr. Bartha asked her to step forward to look at it.

Ms. Devereaux said she believed they would all like to see it.

Mr. Bartha invited anyone in the audience that was interested to step forward.

Ms. Devereaux said she was okay with the one on McKee Road, but wanted to see the other sign's location.

Mr. Bartha asked what Exhibit that was.

Mr. Bish said that was Exhibit 14.

Mr. Bartha pointed on Exhibit 14 to the existing sign and the existing entrance to the church. He pointed out the location of the property and where the sign would be located on the Exhibit.

Ms. Devereaux said it was going to be pretty far up on the hill.

Several people started speaking at the same time.

Mr. McCarthy said if anyone wanted to speak, they need to state their name and speak one at a time.

The Court Reporter said she needed to be able to hear.

Mr. Bish said the Court Reporter was taking down their comments so she needed to be able to hear and identify who was speaking.

Ms. Devereaux said this was really up on the hill because she believed the church was way over here (she pointed to Exhibit 14).

Mr. Bish said he believed it was up on the plateau.

Mr. Lucas said yes, the area that is gravel.

Ms. Devereaux asked if they could get a copy of Exhibit 14.

Mr. Bartha said they could certainly provide them with a copy.

Ms. Devereaux said that answered her question other than how it would be illuminated, but they don't know that yet.

Mr. Bartha said that was correct and it was part of what the Board was asking for with the additional information.

Mr. Bashioum said he didn't know how they could have a public meeting without really having visual aids and everything. He said he didn't understand because they don't have any drawings to show the exact location of the sign just a Google map. He asked if that was proper.

Mr. Bish said the Board has the documents that were submitted into the record.

Mr. Bashioum said the public was blind.

Mr. Bish said maybe that was something to ask the applicant for next time if they could have better visual aids.

Mr. Bashioum said this is a public meeting and the only ones that know what is going on are the ones sitting up there (referring to the Board).

Mr. Bartha said he wanted to clarify that. He said anything that has been entered into the record tonight, the audience is free to come up and examine as Ms. Devereaux and a few others did. He said this is an open public hearing, all of the records and anything entered at the meeting tonight would be public record for anyone to come up and look at. He said he would be glad to show Mr. Bashioum and if anyone would like copies, they could be made.

Mr. Bashioum said he thought there would be more illustrations and be larger in size.

Mr. Bartha said it is not a requirement to have large size visual aids for the meeting. He said Mr. Lucas met the application requirements by providing the documents as Exhibits attached to the application for the record for tonight.

Mr. Bashioum asked if there were any signs going on Steubenville Pike.

Mr. Bartha said his understanding was that there are no signs to be on Steubenville Pike. He asked Mr. Lucas if that was correct.

Mr. Lucas said that was correct.

Mr. Bashioum said then he only had to worry about the illumination of the other sign.

Mr. Bartha said the only illuminated sign as Ms. Ludwig identified for the Board would be the one by Route 22/30.

Mr. Bashioum asked the height of that sign.

Mr. Bartha said the height of that sign would be 6'.

Mr. Bashioum asked if it would be on a pole that would make it higher than 6'.

Mr. Bartha said he could answer that question after they submit a more detailed drawing in the future if they choose to do that.

Mr. Bashioum said there isn't much detail here.

Mr. Bartha said that was correct. He said there were some questions tonight that were not answered and the applicant would be given the opportunity to provide more information for everyone.

Mr. Kreutzman asked if he could approach the Board to look at the big sign that would be on Route 22/30.

Mr. Bartha said yes, please.

Mr. Kreutzman said if he understands correctly, this sign would be on the edge of the gravel plateau that is there. He said he didn't know what the requirements are as far as the stability of the soil or anything like that, but he witnessed how they didn't really crush the rock under this plateau. He said he didn't know if that was a concern or something the Board would need to look at for putting a foundational sign there. He said not that there is anybody there that could get hurt, but the point being that he would imagine the ground should be stable where they intend to put the sign. If it would fall over, lights could be shining in somebody's eyes as they were driving down the highway and cause an accident. He said he knows it is a little far-fetched but something they should consider when proposing how they are going to put that sign in that location.

Ms. Ludwig said she wanted to comment on this. When the church built their addition, they had what is called an NPDES Permit from the Allegheny County Conservation District for the site concerning erosion and sedimentation control during construction. In order to get released from

the permit, they had to file a Notice of Termination (NOT) with the conservation district. The conservation district then comes out and verifies that the site has been destabilized such as where the stormwater pond is located near that gravel area. She said that gravel area was part of the discussion and part of that review and they did get approval to get that NOT released from the conservation district which means that they did achieve stabilization per the requirements.

Mr. Bartha said so, the county has verified that the area where this is proposed is stabilized.

Ms. Ludwig said yes, she was present with the county's technician during that inspected.

Mr. Bartha said to answer the question just raised, the county has ensured the area where the proposed ground sign on Route 22/30 is to be placed would be stable for a ground sign.

Ms. Ludwig said whatever happens at the continued hearing next month once they would get any approvals from the Zoning Hearing Board, the applicant would still need to apply for the actual sign permit for the signs through the Township's Building Department. At that point in time, Mike Saville or Bob Derosky, whoever would be assigned to it, would review that application and go over those types of details. She said she would think whatever footers are required would suffice because this isn't a huge building they are putting in that location. She said the bottom line is that the specs that the Zoning Hearing Board is requiring would also need to be submitted for the sign permit and they would be reviewed at that time as well.

Mr. Kreutzman said he understands that the county conservation district released the permit but what is the definition of stability. He said obviously, they aren't building a building.

Ms. Ludwig said there are certain vegetation levels that need to be achieved so the slopes around the pond and slopes around the hillsides are stable. She said there were a couple of inspections where further stabilization had to be done before the permit could be released on that site in particular. She said at that time, they either needed to reseed it or bring in more gravel to stabilize it. She said they chose to bring in more gravel to stabilize it. She said she could get the actual percentages but didn't know them right off the top of her head. She believed it was 70 percent vegetation in order to get the NOT released.

Mr. Bartha said to summarize Ms. Ludwig's answers to both questions, the county has agreed that the site is satisfactory from their viewpoint for additional use. He said through the application process and the building process there would be a township inspector verifying that what they are doing would be stable and sufficient not to cause any concerns about the sign falling and lighting falling.

Ms. Ludwig said the Township reviews the sign permit application and then would go out and issue a certificate of compliance once it was installed. She said they would be able to see if there were any obvious issues at that time. She said they aren't going to ask for a soils report for a sign only because that level of detail is not typically something that would be required.

Mr. Kreutzman asked if that was something that is a public record, a soil stability study for properties that are developed.

Ms. Ludwig said yes, as long as the Township has it on file. She said that was not always a requirement, it is a new requirement. She said depending on when a building was constructed and when it went through land development, yes, it could be on file.

Mr. Kreutzman said he was supposed to get one for Crossroads, but didn't get it.

Ms. Ludwig said okay. She asked if he had turned in a Right To Know Request Form to the Township for it.

Mr. Kreutzman said it was a verbal agreement between Crossroads and the neighbors concerning the hillside. He said he was just curious if it was a public record that they could request.

Ms. Ludwig said yes. She said just to clarify in regards to the conservation district and their release of the NOT and approving that Crossroads was done, it is not so much that they can go and build another building on that site per se, but just that the site has been stabilized.

Mr. Bartha thanked Ms. Ludwig for the clarification.

Mr. Kreutzman said he remembered when someone was going to put a tent up by Tonidale. For the variance, he said they had to meet three requirements. He asked if they have to show that hardship for a sign?

Mr. Bish said they have to satisfy the requirements of the Municipalities Planning Code.

Mr. Kreutzman said if they don't have a sign on Route 22/30 if that created a hardship by not having one.

Mr. Bish said that is up to the applicant to prove the five criteria which are on the variance application form.

Mr. Kreutzman asked if the application was completed to the Board's satisfaction.

Mr. Bish said the applicant's obligation during the hearing process is to satisfy those requirements. He said what he was saying was that those criteria are listed on the application form so the applicant would be aware of those requirements and know what they have to prove.

Mr. Kreutzman said okay.

Ms. Haspel asked if there was an example of the exhibit the Board was talking about where there was a pole sign and then it was converted to a ground sign.

Mr. Bish said that was at Resurrection Lutheran Church on Steubenville Pike. He said he has a copy from the Zoning Hearing Board's legal file, but he didn't have any extras. He said someone from the Township could make a copy for her.

Mr. Bartha asked if there were any further questions or comments from the public.

There were none.

Mr. Bartha asked if there were any questions or comments from anyone. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to continue the Public Hearing for Crossroads United Methodist Church to the Aug. 27, 2015, hearing at 7:30 p.m. to allow the applicant time to submit additional information that was requested tonight.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. JIM BRUNI, SECONDED BY Mr. CHIP McCARTHY, AND CARRIED, TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR CROSSROADS UNITED METHODIST CHURCH SIGN VARIANCE REQUEST TO THE AUG. 27, 2015, HEARING AT 7:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:	**CHIP McCARTHY**	**YES**
	JIM BRUNI	**YES**
	GEORGE BARTHA	**YES**

Mr. Bartha said tonight's hearing has been continued and the applicant was asked if he could submit the additional requested information two weeks prior to that meeting to allow the Board time to review the documents.

Mr. Bish said anything submitted by the applicant could be reviewed by members of the public at the Township office.

Mr. McCarthy asked if the Township had ever received sign plans from SpeedPro Imaging in the past.

Ms. Ludwig said the name sounded familiar, but she could check with the building inspector.

Mr. McCarthy said if the company wasn't familiar with what type of plans they needed to provide, they could call the Township.

Ms. Ludwig said she did have a detailed list of the items that were needed that she could email the applicant.

Mr. Lucas said he appreciated that.

2. Solicitor File Transfer

Motion to authorize the transfer of Zoning Hearing Board files from Babst Calland to Dillon McCandless pursuant to the letter from Timothy J. Bish dated July 17, 2015, and to authorize the Board Chairman to execute the documentation to effectuate the same.

Mr. Bartha asked for a motion on the transfer.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. CHIP McCARTHY, SECONDED BY Mr. JIM BRUNI, AND CARRIED, TO AUTHORIZE THE TRANSFER OF ZONING HEARING BOARD FILES FROM BABST CALLAND TO DILLON McCANDLESS PURSUANT TO THE LETTER FROM TIMOTHY J. BISH DATED JULY 17, 2015, AND TO AUTHORIZE THE BOARD CHAIRMAN TO EXECUTE THE DOCUMENTATION TO EFFECTUATE THE SAME.

ROLL CALL:	**CHIP McCARTHY**	**YES**
	JIM BRUNI	**YES**
	GEORGE BARTHA	**YES**

COMMENTS:

Mr. Bartha asked if anyone had any comments or questions about anything.

There were none.

ADJOURNMENT:

A MOTION WAS MADE BY Mr. CHIP McCARTHY, SECONDED BY Mr. JIM BRUNI, AND CARRIED, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:11 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Cherico
Zoning Hearing Board Secretary