The meeting of the Derry Township Design Advisory Board was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairwoman Pam Moore in the Meeting Room of the Derry Township Municipal Complex, 600 Clearwater Road, Hershey, PA.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Pam Moore, Chairwoman; Jennifer Harnden, Vice Chairwoman; Susan Cort, Secretary; Joyce St. John; Ted Herman

Members Absent: Brian O'Day

Also Present: Brandon Williams, Assistant Director of Community Development; Chuck Emerick, Director of Community Development

Public attendance: Dave Bowser; Michelle He; Erin Himmelberger, LSC Design; Bob Fox, Remax

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion made by Member Herman, seconded by Secretary Cort, and a unanimous vote, the minutes of the April 18, 2016 meeting were approved as presented.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Consideration of exterior renovations to the building located at 14 East Chocolate Avenue and related temporary construction signage (The Hershey Company; DAB #376)

Brandon Williams reported that the aspects of this project that are to be considered by the Design Advisory Board include door and window replacement (the door replacement is limited to the exterior balcony doors on the second, third, and fifth floors; two below-grade entrance doors; and two courtyard doors; and the window replacement involves the entire building) and a 8' x 4' temporary construction sign that will be very similar to the signs that were in place during the 19 East Chocolate Avenue renovations. Chris Brown of Derck & Edson also reviewed the proposal, and he had no comments.

Secretary Cort commended the applicant for addressing this necessary repair work.

Motion

Member St. John made a motion that the Design Advisory Board issue a Recommendation of Appropriateness for the proposal as presented. Secretary Cort seconded the motion, which was passed by a majority vote (Vice Chairwoman Harnden recused herself).

B. Consideration of demolition of existing dwelling and construction of a new building and associated improvements for a day spa at 102 Reese Avenue (Fengxian He, DAB #378)

Building materials and design specifications

Brandon Williams reported that in 2009, the Design Review Board approved a proposal for this property involving the demolition of the existing dwelling and the construction of a 2-story office building with a limestone and brick façade. The current project proposes sandstone on the exterior of the first floor of the proposed building. Mr. Williams noted that this is a point of discussion because limestone and brownstone are more prevalent in the Chocolate Avenue Preservation Overlay district. Chris Brown of Derck & Edson reviewed the proposal and did not have any comments regarding the façade of the building.

Mr. Williams noted that the applicant sought relief from the Zoning Hearing Board regarding minimum lot width, minimum yard areas, maximum impervious coverage, minimum vegetative coverage, minimum off-street parking spaces, maximum floor area ratio, setbacks for a freestanding sign relative to the public right-of-way, and mixed-use densities. The Zoning Hearing Board heard the case at their May 18th meeting and will render a decision at their June 15, 2016 meeting.

Mr. Williams stated that vinyl siding with a textured finish is proposed for the second floor of the proposed building. Architectural shingles are proposed for the roof; however, Mr. Williams noted that most of the buildings in this area have three-tab roofing shingles.

In response to a question from Member Herman, Dave Bowser (representing the applicant) stated that the sandstone will be different shades of brown. He thought it made more sense to propose a brown-colored building in Hershey rather than the red brick building that was proposed in 2009.

Member St. John commented that she likes the limestone better but does not think it needs to be a requirement for the proposed building. Member Herman agreed and stated that this property is on the fringe of the downtown area; therefore, in his opinion, as long as the building is attractive, it is not as critical that the materials of the building match what is in the core of the downtown area.

Member St. John agreed with Mr. Williams that the roofing shingles should be flat, three-tab shingles to match the roofs of the nearby buildings.

Site layout

Mr. Williams explained the proposed parking layout. Landscaping is shown along the West Chocolate Avenue frontage of the property but it is within the right-of-way so it is likely that the landscaping will not be able to be planted. Mr. Williams noted that a land development plan will be necessary for the demolition of the residential building and the construction of the commercial building, and a landscaping plan will be required as part of the land development plan; therefore, the landscaping aspect of this project would have to come back to the Design Advisory Board for approval at a later date.

Motion on site layout and building design

Member Herman made a motion that the Design Advisory Board issue a Recommendation of Appropriateness for the site layout and building design aspects of the proposal, as presented, with the stipulation that three-tab roofing shingles be used instead of architectural shingles. Member St. John seconded the motion, which was passed unanimously.

Signage

Mr. Williams noted that signs are proposed. The wall sign on the south elevation of the building (facing West Chocolate Avenue) is proposed to be on the second story façade wall and Mr. Brown of Derck & Edson has recommended that the sign be moved down to the lower façade wall. Mr. Williams stated that because the applicant does not have a final design for the signs yet, they will have to return to the Design Advisory Board for approval at a later date. Mr. Williams stated that Mr. Brown also suggested that a projecting sign could be used instead of the wall sign that is proposed for the east elevation of the building (facing Hockersville Road).

Member St. John asked if Mr. Brown thought the proposed freestanding sign would be visible enough for people driving by the property. Mr. Williams responded that with the wall sign proposed for the south elevation of the building, Township staff and Mr. Brown thought that adequate visibility could be accomplished.

Mr. Williams commented that the Zoning Hearing Board expressed concern that the location of the proposed freestanding sign at the intersection of Hockersville Road and Reese Avenue might impact sight distance for drivers. Mr. Williams does not think the Zoning Hearing Board will grant the relief for the freestanding sign, but if they do, the Design Advisory Board can review a final design for the sign at a future meeting. Mr. Bowser stated that if the applicant is granted the relief for the freestanding sign, he does not think they will need the sign on the east end of the building.

Regarding lighting for the signage, the applicant has provided lighting details and Mr. Williams does not have any issues with the lighting proposed for the signage; however, since the Design Advisory Board guidelines recommend that lighting should be understated, Mr. Williams suggested that the applicant use decorative, low intensity lighting fixtures, such as gooseneck lighting, instead of the floodlights that are currently proposed.

Member Herman questioned if there is a restriction of the total sign area allowed for the property. Mr. Williams explained that because the property has greater than 300 linear feet of street frontage, any wall signs or projecting signs would be exempt from the total maximum sign area of 100 square feet. The freestanding sign cannot exceed more than 20 square feet.

Member Herman is concerned that there are too many signs proposed and the property will look cluttered. He would prefer to keep the nice appearance of the proposed building without having an excessive amount of signage.

Lighting

Mr. Williams stated that the design of the lighting is generally consistent with the guidelines for the district.

Landscaping

Mr. Williams explained that the landscaping design will be part of the land development plan and when the applicant brings back the final design for signage and lighting, the landscaping will be included.

Mr. Williams summarized the Design Advisory Board's comments regarding signage and lighting as follows:

- The applicant should not propose 3 or 4 signs if they only need 2 signs for sufficient visibility.
- Gooseneck lighting should be used to illuminate the wall sign.
- The Board finds the materials and general designs of the signs to be acceptable but would prefer that the applicant fine-tune the details of the locations of the wall signage.
- If the Zoning Hearing Board grants the requested relief for the freestanding sign, the applicant must provide a final design for the Design Advisory Board's approval at a future meeting.
- The applicant shall provide a couple of different details for the projecting sign suggested by Mr. Brown, and if the projecting sign does not work with the

design of the building, the applicant shall provide an alternate design including the wall sign on the Hockersville Road frontage.

Amendment to motion on site layout and building design

Member Herman amended his earlier motion to also stipulate that the applicant must return to the Board at a future meeting for approval of the final signage, lighting, and landscaping designs. Chairwoman Moore seconded the motion, which was passed unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS	
None.	
ADJOURNMENT	
The meeting adjourned at 6:51 p.m.	
Chairwoman	