

July 9, 2007
Public Hearing
Introductory Local Law entitled
"Sign Law Amendments"
Town of Tuxedo Town Board
Page 1 of 1

Notice of Meeting having been posted, and proof of publication of notice in the *Times Herald Record* having been furnished, a Public Hearing held before the Town Board of the Town of Tuxedo on Monday, July 9, 2007 at the Tuxedo Town Hall, One Temple Drive, Tuxedo, New York, was called to order by Supervisor Peter M. Dolan at 7:39 p.m.

Town Board Members Present: Mr. Peter M. Dolan Supervisor
 Mr. Daniel Castricone Councilperson
 Ms. Francine Rauch Councilperson
 Ms. Andrew Siegel Councilperson

Town Board Members Absent: Ms. Lisa Spivak Councilperson

Other Town Officials Present: Donald G. Nichol, Esq., Town Counsel; Mr. Daniel J. Carlin, Police Chief; Mr. Joseph P. Tripoli, Sr., Highway Superintendent; Mr. David Maikisch, Building Inspector; and Mrs. Elaine M. Laurent, Town Clerk.

The meeting was opened by a pledge of allegiance to the flag.

The purpose of the Public Hearing was to hear comments on an Introductory Local Law #3 of 2007, entitled "Sign Law Amendments."

Councilperson Castricone gave an overview of the revisions contained in the proposed local law.

Councilperson Rauch read aloud the written comments of Mr. George McCathern, member of the Architectural Review Board; a copy of such comments is attached to these Minutes.

Town Clerk Laurent read aloud the written comments of Ms. Dale Mottola, a Town resident; a copy of such comments is attached to these minutes.

Supervisor Dolan asked for any comments from the public.

Mrs. Mary Yrizarry recommended that, in terms of the size of lettering on signs, the Town Board research professional websites to determine what size letters are used on signs on roadways of varying speed limits.

Supervisor Dolan asked for any further comments from the public. There were none.

RESOLVED, motion made by Supervisor Dolan, seconded by Councilperson Castricone, to continue the public hearing to August 13, 2007 at 7:30 p.m. at the Town Hall.

Adopted:	Councilperson Castricone	Aye
	Councilperson McCathern	Aye
	Councilperson Rauch	Aye
	Councilperson Spivak	Absent
	Supervisor Dolan	Aye

The Public Hearing was closed at 7:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine M. Laurent
Town Clerk

PUBLIC HEARING
INTRODUCTORY
LOCAL LAW #3 OF
2007, ENTITLED
"SIGN LAW
AMENDMENTS"

Comments submitted by Dale Mottola, President of Applied Systems Group, for the public hearing on Local Law #3 on July 9, 2007:

The following comments reflect my personal opinion and are not intended to be a statement representing the Tuxedo Chamber of Commerce, since there was not adequate time for the Chamber to prepare comments.

Business signage is not merely a location marker, but is essential to identify and promote a business to passers-by. If businesses are extremely limited in the signage that may be used, it will be impossible to attract new and desired businesses to relocate to Tuxedo. The continued existence of current businesses will be imperiled due to reduced visibility. I strongly urge you to give greater consideration to how your actions impact the viability of Tuxedo's business community.

Regarding signage provisions for multi-business buildings, the proposed dimensions for the nameplates for individual occupant businesses on the main plaza sign of 8" x 42" with 5" letters is not large enough to be visible from any distance. Not only does this eliminate any promotional value of the business name listing, but it is also a safety issue. For customers who are not familiar with the exact location of a business, the lack of long distance readability will cause sudden slow-downs and turns once the customer realizes where he or she needs to turn.

It is certainly not necessary to limit nameplates to this small a size on a plaza sign of 80 sq ft. If the plaza sign is 8' high and 10' wide, there could easily be 10 nameplates sized 12" high by 60" wide (2 signs side by side by 5 vertically). This would leave an area of approximately 3' x 10' for the plaza name. This would provide for letters of 8" or 9". I would strongly encourage you to test size specifications in situ prior to codifying them.

The secondary signs allowed for individual business occupants to be mounted on the building are proposed to be limited to 4 sq ft. As a comparison, the signs over the doors of businesses in the Tuxedo Square Building are 6-8 sq ft. The newer signs have been reviewed/approved by the ARB. Signs that are 50% smaller than these already existing signs will not be large enough to provide for visibility of building occupants. Also, signs of these small dimensions will not look in scale to the larger size of a multi-business building.

As another safety factor, please consider requiring that the main plaza sign should have an additional section mounted on top (not counted in the maximum size of the plaza sign) of a size sufficient to display the building number that is large enough to be readily visible for any emergency service personnel that may be called to the building. I would also suggest that it would enhance safety to include suite numbers along with occupant names on the plaza sign.

Regarding freestanding businesses, the current code allows three signs, each with a maximum size of 54 sq ft. The proposed amendments appear to reduce a business's maximum total signage area from 162 sq ft to 22.75 sq ft, except for certain circumstances (undefined) when the ARB may approve a single 50 sq ft sign. This size limitation does not provide adequate visibility for a business to use its signage to promote its location and identity.

Please take some time to think about how the amendments you ratify can help local businesses remain viable rather than create another strike against their existence.

TO: Councilperson Fran Rauch
FROM: George McCathern
SUBJECT: Proposed Sign Law
DATE: July 9, 2007

There's a new addition in the proposed sign law that at first glance looks like a very minor issue. But upon examination one can see that, if inserted into the sign law, the proposed addition allowing signs to protrude above the lower roof line (as referenced by the Sloatsburg strip mall) could undermine everything that we as a board are trying to accomplish.

First of all, we don't allow flat roof commercial buildings of any kind outside the town center. All buildings of that type are required to have a prescribed pitch to the roof and a minimum of 12" overhand. Any sign allowed to extend above the soffit line would destroy the architectural lines of the new buildings. Different sign sizes, shapes, and colors jutting above the roof line would desecrate the architectural flow of the linear design and greatly affect the overall presentation of the building.

I don't understand why this amendment was ever proposed. It is an arbitrary change that would defeat the purpose of any well-planned sign law.