

**CONSHOHOCKEN BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**REPORT TO CONSHOHOCKEN BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**PROJECT:** SP-4 Signage Amendment  
**MEETING DATE:** February 11, 2021  
**ZONING:** SP-4 Specially Planned District 4  
**ACTION DATE:** February 11, 2021

**COMMISSION ACTION:** Recommendation of adoption of zoning amendment with recommended clarification to “allocation” under the amendment (with respect to the requirement that 95% of a building be allocated to a single principal user).

**MATERIALS REVIEWED:** The Planning Commission reviewed the following materials:

1. zoning amendment to SP-4 sign regulations
2. review letter of Montgomery County Planning Commission dated February 8, 2021
3. rendering of sample signage under new regulations

**MEETING SUMMARY:**

This is an amendment to the Conshohocken Borough Zoning Ordinance of 2001 (the “Zoning Ordinance”) and specifically to section 27-2205 *Signage Standards* of the Zoning Ordinance’s regulations for the SP-4 *Specially Planned District Four* zoning district. Specifically, the amendment creates a new set of regulations applicable to buildings of 180 feet or more in height where 95% of the building is allocated to a single principal user.

The following members of the Planning Commission were present: Stacy Ellam, Chair, Elizabeth MacNeal, Vice Chair, Judy Smith-Kressley, Member, and Dana MacNeal, Member. Also present for the Borough were Borough Solicitor, Michael Peters, Esquire, and Executive Assistant to the Borough Manager, Brittany Rogers.

Mr. Peters presented the zoning amendment to the planning commission. Mr. Peters explained that the new sign regulations applied very specifically to buildings of a certain height occupied almost entirely by a single principal user. Mr. Peters reviewed representative renderings of signage for the new AmerisourceBergen headquarters, comparing signage under the old regulation and the new. This particular example

demonstrated how the limit on maximum letter height served to ensure appropriate scaling.

Vice Chair MacNeal asked questions regarding readability from neighboring highways, which she understood a principal tenant would desire. Vice Chair MacNeal further expressed concern regarding whether the term “allocated” in the ordinance was vague—in terms of the requirement that 95% of the building be “allocated” to a single principal user. The rest of the planning commission agreed with the concern. Mr. Peters explained that the planning commission could make a recommendation that the term “allocated” be better defined. The planning commission agreed. Finally, Vice Chair MacNeal asked questions regarding sign lighting on the various sides of the building, and Mr. Peters explained how the ordinance addressed lighting, *e.g.* where a residential property/district abuts.

Member Smith-Kressley desired to see a rendering of signage somewhere between that permitted under the existing SP-4 regulations and that proposed. Mr. Peters explained that the renderings were provide by a private entity and were demonstrative only and not prepared at the request of the Borough. Due to the lack of additional renderings, Member Smith-Kressley expressed her concern that issues of readability and proportionality had not been fully vetted.

Chair Ellam questioned how many properties the ordinance amendment applied to. The planning commission reviewed the zoning map, and determined that the ordinance would have limited applicability due to the size of the SP-4 district.

The planning commission voted 3-1 to recommend adoption of the ordinance with the condition that the ordinance’s provisions related to 95% allocation be better clarified.

Member Smith-Kressley voted against the recommendation.