

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING HELD ON DECEMBER 10, 1968

The Board of Supervisors of College Township met in the Municipal Building on December 10, 1968 at 7:30 p.m. Two supervisors -- Weaver and Williams were present. In the absence of Chairman Levine, Mr. Williams acted as Chairman Protem.

The minutes of the regular meeting of November 19th were read and approved.

Treasurer's Report The supervisors approved payment of bills in the amount of \$5,856.22, leaving a balance of \$31,090.42.

The Board has received recommendations from the Planning Commission regarding the State College Bypass and the Benner Pike Relocation. These recommendations will be tabled till the next meeting to allow the supervisors to study them.

The supervisors approved a resolution designating the County Planning Commission as the agency empowered to act as the area-wide planning agency with the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The Board accepted with regret the resignation of Warner A. Eliot from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Williams read the street name changes approved for the College Township. Changes are as follows:

Ann Street (Lemont) to Henszey Street
Centre Ave., (Trailer Park) to Mobile Avenue
Fairway Drive (Dalevue) to Greenbriar ~~Avenue~~ Drive
Irvin Avenue (Lemont) to Mulberry Lane
Railroad Avenue (Lemont)
Maple Street (Lemont) to Shady Drive
Nittany Drive (Panorama Village) to Panorama Drive
Walnut Lane (Lemont) to Limerock Terrace
Walnut Circle (Dalevue) to Mayberry Lane
Mountain Street (Lemont) to Mount Nittany Street

These changes will become effective on January 1, 1969

Sign Ordinance - A large number of residents were present at the hearing on the above ordinance. Mr. Delbert McQuade, representing the Centre County Vacationland Council and several outdoor advertising agencies, stated that his clients were opposed to the Sign Ordinance. He stated that the proposed use of roadside turnoffs for display purposes would be an inadequate substitute for advertising signs. He felt that such areas would present problems of administration and maintenance, that it would be difficult to provide adequate space for all who might want to use them, and that such a turnoff area would constitute a traffic hazard. He indicated that the ordinance might be held illegal by the courts. He believed the business community does not approve of the ordinance.

Mr. Wallace Lloyd supporting the ordinance stated that Mr. McQuade had magnified the difficulties involved in setting up roadside turnoff areas, as places to supply information regarding services and facilities. He stated that it would actually afford an opportunity for all businesses to be listed including those who could not afford large advertising signs. He felt that there was no traffic hazard involved in using the turnoff for display purposes, certainly no more than that involved in roadside business which no one has suggested eliminating. He stated that the state of Vermont was in the process of eliminating billboards and installing Sign Plazas in the roadside rests, these plazas to be maintained by the Highway Department. He felt that the countryside around State College needed to be protected by this ordinance from a further proliferation of outdoor advertising signs.

Mr. Patrick Grace, who stated he was a member of several conservation groups spoke in favor of the sign ordinance and deplored the unsightly proliferation of signs along the routes into State College. He presented two photographs of sign along these entrance routes.

Mr. Robert Lang felt that every business should have the right to advertise itself and that this right would be curtailed by the ordinance.

Mr. McQuade disagreed with Mr. Lloyd on the effectiveness of the Vermont law.

Mr. Charles Mong presented in writing a number of suggestions for changes in the ordinance presented by the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. John A. Dutton presented a letter supporting the sign ordinance and spoke briefly in its support.

Mr. Nelson, a businessman supported the Chamber of Commerce' suggestions for changes. He felt the Ordinance would be hard on local businesses. He stated that every time he changed a temporary sign it would cost him money. Mr. Dutton explained that under Section 8.03 of the proposed ordinance, it would not be necessary for him to pay for each temporary sign, but only for the initial permit.

Mr. Peter Shapiro stated that he felt the majority of townspeople were in favor of the sign ordinance, that the average citizen liked an uncluttered environment. Limiting advertising signs to commercial and industrial areas would not in any way do anything to improve the cluttered areas through which residents as well as tourists have to drive now. Local communities should enact their own controlling legislation rather than be tied to any federal program enacted by Congress, which is besieged by lobbies more powerful than those we have locally.

In further clarification of the proposed sign ordinance, Mr. Lloyd stated as long as a sign is not attached to the window of a business, no permit is required and the number of signs of this type on one premise is not regulated.

Mr. and Mrs. H. C. Dalton and Mr. Dave Westby supported the sign ordinance vigorously.

Mr. Dan Stearns said that his experience as Zoning Officer for the township convinced him that some kind of sign ordinance was needed, which was detailed and which spelled out the regulations. He was not sure such a restrictive ordinance was needed. In the case of roadside rests, for display of signs, he was not sure where they could be placed under the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Henry Irwin, who was a representative of the advertising industry, also supported the idea of limiting advertising signs to commercial and industrial areas, which he claimed would represent only a small area of the township. He was opposed to the present ordinance.

Sy Barash supported the changes recommended by the local Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. William P. Campbell, representing the Centre County Vacationland Council, composed of industries related to the tourist business, stressed the importance of tourism as an industry in the United States and as a source of income to local communities. He stated his opposition to the proposed sign ordinance, as being too restrictive, and he felt the recommendations made by the vacationland council were not included in the ordinance.

Mr. Dalton stated that representatives of the advertising industry have made it appear as if all businessmen were going to be hurt by the sign ordinance; however, only the sign and outdoor advertising industry would suffer as a result. He felt local businessmen had an important stake in keeping the roads and the area as attractive as possible to promote tourist travel and to encourage local growth.

Supporters of the advertising business raised questions of the constitutionality of the proposed ordinance while supporters of the sign ordinance listed local communities which have stringent sign controls which have presumably withstood the court tests. The example of the state of Hawaii which has excluded outdoor advertising for a number of years was cited.

Mr. Robert Maxwell felt that we should be primarily concerned with the problem of controlling unsightly signs in our own local area, to preserve as much as possible the uniqueness and beauty of the area. Any decisions regarding signs on national highways under the Beautification Act would not necessarily reflect the wishes of the local people or meet local needs.

Also speaking in favor of the sign ordinance was Mrs. Jan Shapiro, Mrs. Muriel Gibbons, Barbara Grayson and Mr. Kreitzberg.

Rodger Granlund of the Planning Commission and Chairman of the Regional Planning Commission, stated that the regional body had worked on the sign ordinance for two years, that many hearings had been held, that businessmen and the sign industry had been consulted for their recommendations. He added that the ordinance had been changed to reflect some of these recommendations. Rather than a negative effect on the businessmen, he felt that the ordinance might have a positive effect because more people might be attracted to the area. None of the proposed changes suggested tonight were new; they were the same as those previously presented to the regional body.

There being no further discussion, the Board stated that they would take no action tonight, but would act on the ordinance at the January or February meeting.

The question of parking in the lane in front of the Nittany Mall Building was again raised by several residents. Mr. Williams stated that the Fire Marshall was concerned about keeping the lane open and had been trying to work out some way of enforcing "no parking" regulations with Nittany Mall. It is not clear at this time whether the township policeman can enforce parking regulations on the Nittany Mall, which is private property. The Board will follow up this matter.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted.

Lester M. Williams