

Jerry Delong called the Regular Meeting of the Franconia Township Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, April 5, 2010. Planning Commission Members present included Doug Worley, Keith Kneipp, Robert Yothers, Kerrin Musselman, and Patricia Alderfer. Township Manager Kevin D. Baver, Assistant Township Manager Jamie P. Worman, Township Engineer Cindy Van Hise, P.E., and Jean Holland from the Montgomery County Planning Commission were in attendance. Planning Commission member Kyle Koffel was absent from the meeting. (Excused)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Worley made a motion to approve the minutes from the March 1st, 2010 regular meeting. Mr. Musselman seconded the motion. The motion passed.

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT

OLD BUSINESS

Ken Taggart Subdivision- 521 Cowpath Road (#05-06)

Ms. Worman informed the board that she had included in the minutes a summary of the aging policy discussed at the March meeting. She asked if everyone agreed that she captured the terms of the policy correctly. The commission agreed that it was correctly depicted in the minutes. That being said, Mr. Worley made a motion to authorize Ms. Worman to send a letter of notification on behalf of the commission to the applicant that the project will be before the board in 60 days for action. Mr. Musselman seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Leidy's Church Land Development – Leidy Road & W. Cherry Lane (#03-09)

No action or discussion took place on this application.

Kapusta Lot Line Adjustment- 935 Landis Road (#01-10)

Mr. Richard Kapusta was present to discuss this application. Mr. Kapusta gave an overview of the proposed lot line adjustment and a brief history of the property. He explained that there is a paper road listed on the plans that was there for access to the rear

lot which Mr. Kapusta owns. He explained that he has gotten together with the other two lot owners that are included in the proposed adjustment and they would like to have the paper road vacated and the lot lines adjusted according to the submitted plan. Mr. Kapusta noted that the 4 properties that front Alycia Lane reference the paper street in their deeds and therefore, would need to be notified of a vacation. Mr. Kapusta continued that the challenge is determining the best way to go about the paper road vacation and the adjusting of the lot lines. Ms. Worman suggested she check with the solicitor to find out how he would advise going about a road vacation. She mentioned that a Board of Supervisors work session was scheduled for the upcoming Friday and it could be discussed at that meeting. Mr. Kapusta then mentioned that he was unclear about what he should be offering for dedication through his plan. Ms. Van Hise, P.E. informed him that he needed to offer the area to be conveyed to the two other property owners. Mr. Kapusta then added that there were minor cleanup items remaining on the plans. Mr. Kapusta then questioned comment #9; he felt the comment was incorrect. Ms. Van Hise, P.E. replied that the comment pertained to vacating the property back to the correct unit. She continued that the issue is that it is double-labeled on each sheet so removing the label from page 1 would fix that issue. Mr. Kapusta agreed. Ms. Van Hise, P.E. concluded that a few details needed to be explained and reviewed by the solicitor. No further discussion took place on this application.

The Pizza Box Land Development – 402 Morwood Road (#02-10)

Ms. Cynthia Smith of Horizon Engineers was present to discuss this application along with the applicant Joe Genova. Ms. Smith gave an overview of the proposed project stating that the plan was to redevelop an existing dwelling located at 402 Morwood Road. She explained that the residence would be converted to a mixed-use allowing for a restaurant on the first floor and an apartment on the second. She added that the applicant received the required variances from the Zoning Hearing Board which mainly pertained to setbacks. She also noted that a conditional use approval is also required for this plan and an application for such was submitted to the Township but a hearing date was not yet determined. She then addressed the Metz Engineers letter dated March 29th, 2010. She began by stating that the applicant will comply with the majority of the items listed in the

letter. However, she had a few items she wished to review. She began by informing the group that there would be a slight modification to the plans in regards to the location of the walk-in freezer. The applicant still needs setback relief for the new location but is considering moving the freezer to the other side of the kitchen and removing the walkway. The building would not be increased in length. Ms. Smith added that she intends on discussing the item with the Zoning Hearing Board Solicitor. If it poses an issue to the decision previously rendered then they would not alter the plans. Ms. Smith then reviewed the waivers. She explained that the applicant is seeking waivers from including features within 200 feet of the site (partial), landscaping items including a screening buffer along Allentown Road which would require the shrubs be placed in the right-of-way and street trees as there is not enough room to meet the requirement. She also added that the applicant is seeking relief from parking space size and is proposing spaces that are 9 x 18 instead of 10 x 20. She also noted that a waiver will be sought for parking aisle width as well for the area near the barn; the aisle would be condensed to 20 feet instead of the required 25 feet. Ms. Smith then added that the applicant is seeking a deferral of sidewalks along both Allentown Road and Morwood Road, and a waiver of curbing along both roads and edges of parking areas so that they can retain the existing grading, drainage, and retaining wall.

Mr. Delong commented that he felt the curbing, especially in the parking areas, was necessary. He then asked where the stormwater runoff would be directed, adding that there is much more impervious surface proposed than is there today. Ms. Smith replied that the runoff will be a sheet flow and continue to operate as it does today. Mr. Delong then asked what the purpose was for keeping the barn as it seems to him that there would be much more space on the site if the barn was removed. He questioned whether a trash truck could get through to the dumpster in an aisle width of only 20 feet. Ms. Smith replied that they would have to demonstrate that the truck would fit and added that the trash truck would not come through during normal hours of operation. Mr. Worley questioned the sheet flow of the runoff. Ms. Smith indicated on the plans how the sheet flow works and explained that it will not be a concentrated flow and that it meets code. Mr. Delong commented that it seems like a lot of development on a small parcel

especially with the parking space sizes. Mr. Worley added that the size is usually allowed for a minimal use site. Ms. Smith replied that they could go to wider spaces and possibly not increase the length. Mr. Kneipp asked if there was reserved parking for the apartment. Ms. Smith replied that there is a requirement for one space for the apartment and that will be provided. However, the applicant has plans to live in the apartment. Mr. Delong suggested the barn be eliminated to open up the site. Mr. Musselman added that he agreed that the barn should be removed and that he felt there should be curbing to define the access into the site. Ms. Worman informed the group that the project had not yet received a review from PennDot and that they would most likely speak to the entrance configuration. Mr. Worley commented that for safety reasons he also felt the entrance should be curbed. Mr. Kneipp suggested that the street plantings that do not fit in the designated location be relocated to the other side of the site to beef up the buffer between the site and the neighbors. Ms. Smith replied that they are proposing a fence with a screening element so there is a visual barrier and headlights can be blocked. She commented that they do not need a high intensity buffer and may seek to use the fence to serve as a portion of the screening requirements. Mr. Delong then asked about overflow parking. Ms. Smith replied that the only location for overflow parking would be in the area of the barn. She questioned what the requirement was for overflow parking and how such was triggered. Ms. Van Hise, P.E. replied that overflow parking was triggered when parking occurs on streets and in other locations that it is not readily permitted. She cited the YMCA as a prime example. Ms. Holland, Montgomery County Planning Commission, questioned the barn's use and whether it has any type of architectural significance. Ms. Smith replied that the barn is used for storage. Ms. Smith then noted that a traffic study will be conducted and that they are interested in working with PennDot and the Township to see what would be necessary. She then noted that they intend to remove the existing pavement and replace it so it meets commercial specifications. Ms. Van Hise, P.E. added that the applicant should keep in mind that this board can require additional items above and beyond what PennDot requires. Ms. Van Hise, P.E. questioned whether there were any concerns with the driveway movements. Ms. Smith replied that potentially not allowing left turns onto Allentown Road is being considered. Ms. Smith concluded that she had nothing further to review. Ms. Van Hise,

P.E. asked the commission if they wanted to comment on the landscaping in the right-of-way. Mr. Delong replied that the commission wanted to hold off and think about it. Ms. Van Hise, P.E. then mentioned that there are 2 existing retaining walls, the one on Allentown Road is an integral part of the site what do they plan to do with the one on Morwood Road. Ms. Smith replied that both walls are to remain. Mr. Kneipp asked what size delivery trucks will typically come into the site. Mr. Joe Genova, applicant, replied that the deliveries are provided to the site based on the size. If it is a small site there is a small delivery truck assigned. Ms. Van Hise, P.E. added that the max size truck needs to be added to the plans.

Mr. Kenneth Bishop of 410 Morwood Road addressed the commission. He stated that he lives adjacent to the property and that he thinks that there has been a major lack of communication in relation to this project. He said he was surprised to learn of the plan and he cannot understand why the Township is preserving land all around the area but yet there is little regard for this barn located on the property. He questioned why the neighbors weren't asked what they think and whether they would like to see the barn come down. He added that the neighbors should be asked about the safety issues they see while trying to pull out of their driveways. He asked what the alternatives are; maybe possibly have only one entrance on Allentown Road. He also stated that sidewalks should be installed as you're going to have kids walking down from the pinball parlor. He also added that the neighbors should be consulted about the buffering as well. Mr. Worley responded that one of the reasons the commission would like to see the entrances curbed is so that it is visible but he is not sure moving the entrance down would resolve the issue of removing the barn. Mr. Delong suggested that everyone wait and see what PennDot says and then take their comments and other concerns and go from there. Ms. Van Hise, P.E. reminded everyone that a permit is required and that the Township is concerned about the same things the residents are concerned with as is PennDot. She also added that the barn is not listed on any type of historic register. Mr. Nick Braccio of 403 Morwood Road stated that his concern is moving the entrance away from the light. He noted that he felt if it was further down the hill it would be more appropriate. He explained that the Morwood Road driveway only allows one car length to the intersection

and then you might get rear-ended. He asked if it could be changed even if PennDot says differently. Ms. Van Hise, P.E. replied that the Township can be stricter than what PennDot suggests. Mr. Braccio questioned how many spots were currently proposed for parking and how many would be lost. Ms. Smith replied there are 19 spots proposed and they would maybe lose three. Mr. Braccio then asked about moving parking spaces against the house. Ms. Smith replied that they would lose more if they did that. Ms. Van Hise, P.E., added that the fire code would not permit it. Mr. Herb Georgiadias, the property owner, questioned Mr. Braccio regarding safety and the issues he encounters with people using the post office. Mr. Braccio replied that there was an accident out front the previous week. Mr. Georgiadias questioned what was safer, a lot with 19 spaces or the post office with 3 spaces out front. Mr. Bishop replied that the post office has been there for 150 years. Ms. Holland added additional comments pertaining to the screening. She suggested that the shrubs be of a height that will make them effective right away and that the applicant consider a rain garden of some type in addition to the sheet flow for stormwater runoff. No further discussion took place on this application.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business to discuss.

ZONING HEARING BOARD APPLICATIONS

Ms. Worman reported that a revised application was submitted to the Zoning Hearing Board by Kerry Hallman and Nikola Kurtin to permit a food trailer at 589 Lower Road. She reminded the commission that this application had come in previously and was formally opposed by the Board of Supervisors. She continued that it was her understanding that the application had not been modified. She added that the hearing is tentatively scheduled for May 10th, 2010.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Brigidi was present to present his grading plan to the commission. He was represented by his engineer, Michael Kissinger of Pennoni Associates. Mr. Kissinger

gave a brief overview of the proposed plan and the property. He mentioned that the subject parcel is a small vacant property located on Hatfield Pike. The owner and applicant is looking to obtain a grading permit to allow for the installation of a 4,000 square-foot pre-fabricated building/warehouse structure. He added that the applicant had already submitted an application to PennDot for a minimal use driveway permit. Ms. Van Hise, P.E. informed the commission that she and Township staff met with the applicant and discussed the proposed plans. She continued that she would do a full review of the grading plans and the landscaping plans and then issue her comments and if agreeable issue a grading permit. Mr. Musselman questioned whether Mr. Brigidi's business would be there and if so how many employees he had. Mr. Brigidi replied that his business would be there and that he has one employee. Mr. Worley and Mr. DeLong questioned their plans for stormwater runoff. Mr. Kissinger replied that there are a series of swales that run through the property but don't function correctly. Therefore, they are proposed to add vegetative swales and convey the runoff. Mr. Kissinger added that they are not proposing any retention. Mr. Kissinger added that the applicant will be grading for sidewalk for future installation. Mr. Kneipp questioned the existing encroachment of the neighbor's driveway onto the site. Mr. Brigidi replied that he was not planning on pressing that issue with the neighbor. Ms. Van Hise, P.E. suggested the encroachment be cleaned up by way of a formal easement. Ms. Worman asked what the plan was for sewer. Mr. Kissinger replied that no sewer was proposed at the current time. He continued that the applicant would hook up to public sewer or water if needed in the future. Ms. Van Hise, P.E. commented that there will be a note to that effect added to the plan. No further discussion took place.

Ms. Worman informed the commission that the Montgomery County Planning Commission was offering a planning series program. She instructed the members to let her know if they were interested in attending. Patricia Alderfer will attend the course. Ms. Worman then notified the board that they received information that Montgomery County was updating their comprehensive plan. A list of the changes was sent to each municipality for review. She informed the group that the changes were available for review if anyone was interested.

NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING

The next scheduled Planning Commission meeting is Monday, May 3, 2010 at 7:00 p.m. There was no further business discussed at the meeting. Mr. Worley made a motion which was seconded by Mr. Kneipp to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 8:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jamie P. Worman, Assistant Township Manager