

**LOWER PROVIDENCE TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
APRIL 22, 2009 MEETING MINUTES**

---

**1. Call to Order:**

A. Chairman Schlack called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:32 p.m.

**2. Pledge of Allegiance**

**3. Roll Call:**

A. The following planning commission members were present: Mr. Bodek, Mr. Brooke, Mr. Kuberski, Mr. Rutledge, and Mr. Schlack.

B. Mr. Endlich, Mrs. Satterwhite, Mr. Stemple, and Ms. Zimmerman were absent.

C. Additional attendees included: Ms. Jean Holland, Montgomery County Planning Commission, Mrs. Marie Altieri, Board of Supervisors Liaison, and Mr. Michael Siegel, Director of Community Development.

**4. Approval of Planning Commission Previous Meeting Minutes:**

A. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for March 25, 2009:

1. This item was tabled until the next meeting, because several of the PC members would abstain from the vote, as they were not in attendance at the March meeting.

**5. Subdivision and Land Development Reviews:**

A. S-07-11 3481 Germantown Pike Major Land Development – Preliminary Plan:

1. Mr. Matt Williams of Hettrick Engineering was present to discuss the plan, along with Mr. Fred Epstein, the owner.
2. Mr. Williams addressed the review letter comments.
  - a) He noted there were no comments relating to the Chambers Associates review.
  - b) For the Suburban Lighting review, Mr. Williams noted they will comply with the items listed, and he will forward additional information to Mr. Smith.
  - c) Mr. Williams has spoken with Mr. O'Brien at McMahan Associates regarding the traffic comments. He will set up a meeting with Mr. Siegel, Mr. O'Brien and himself to discuss the intersection at Germantown Pike.
    - (1) Mr. Siegel suggested that someone from the County also be included in this meeting. He noted that there were post development issues with drainage at a day care constructed on Germantown Pike, and he wants to address these types of issues up front.
    - (2) Mr. Williams noted that there were comments on the McMahan review regarding the number of parking spaces. Mr. Epstein explained that he is running the business out of the existing building, but sees his business expanding with more contract management work in the future. He wants to install more spaces in now, while it is cheaper, for anticipated future expansion.
    - (3) Mr. Williams noted that maybe they would not have to construct the spaces now, but they would identify them on the plan for future expansion. He commented that they do need the aisle to go all around the building, so that would be paved now.
    - (4) Supervisor Altieri questioned the type of anticipated growth for this business, and asked if they were still going to have a consumer showroom as previously discussed? Mr. Epstein explained that he is doing a lot of contract management in the tri-state area, and has a lot more contractors coming on site. He has decided to forgo the

showroom at this time because of similar businesses in the area. He does not think the showroom would be profitable, and will put materials and equipment in the building.

3. Supervisor Altieri asked what type of building would be constructed?
  - a) Mr. Epstein indicated they would construct an aesthetically pleasing building.
  - b) Mr. Siegel asked if they could try to match construction of the existing house, and if they could provide an architectural rendering of what they are proposing?
  - c) Mr. Epstein commented that the cost for an architectural rendering is a lot and he does not want to do that if the plan is not approved. He can provide photos of buildings similar to what he has in mind for the site. He is thinking of using a stone and stucco façade on the building.
  - d) Ms. Holland suggested they also consider faux dormers for the design.
4. Chairman Schlack asked how the applicant's relationship with Worcester was? Mr. Williams indicated that it was better. He noted that the line shown on the plan is the agreed upon property line.
  - a) Mr. Schlack asked if the NPDS permit was secured? Mr. Williams explained this was reviewed and is technically sufficient. The 537-plan module needs approval prior to issuing the NPDS permit.
  - b) Mr. Schlack asked how this works with two Townships involved? Mr. Siegel indicated that they could make this a condition of approval, that the applicant must have an approved plan from Worcester to receive approval from Lower Providence.
5. Supervisor Altieri asked if the traffic was one-way into the property from Germantown Pike, and two-way on North Grange? Mr. Williams affirmed this.
6. Chairman Schlack asked how the traffic plan was coming along?
  - a) Mr. Williams indicated that they were revising the traffic impact per McMahon's comments. They are providing curbing and storm sewer improvements on Germantown. Per the Board's request they are doing what was done across the street. A storm inlet fell in, so they are fixing that. They will install the curb and storm inlet but will not widen the road.
  - b) Mr. Bodek is concerned with full left and right turning movements onto Germantown Pike so close to the intersection. Mr. Siegel noted that they might require this to be a right-in and right-out entrance.
  - c) Mr. Kuberski noted that the Lower Providence Police Department also expressed concern with regard to this turning movement.
  - d) Mr. Williams noted that they have the required PennDOT site distance at this entrance. He asked if there have been accidents at the electrical store? Mr. Kuberski indicated that there appears to have been some type of problem at that intersection.
  - e) Mr. Siegel noted that while this is a County road, they recommend that this movement be looked at from a safety perspective. Ms. Holland also expressed concern.
  - f) Mr. Williams indicated that he would sit down with the County to discuss this turning movement.
7. Chairman Schlack recommended that they table any further action on this plan until the specifics were worked out on traffic issues. Mr. Kuberski concurred.
8. Ms. Holland asked if they wanted to discuss the parking spaces?
  - a) Mr. Siegel suggested the possible use of pervious paving. Mr. Williams noted that would not be work well as the perk tests have not been good on site.
  - b) Supervisor Altieri asked why they need 47 parking spaces? Mr. Williams explained he has designed the site to address stormwater for maximum pervious paving.

- c) Mr. Brooke asked why there was no landscaping in the parking areas? Mr. Williams referred to Sheet 9 of the plan, which showed the landscaping plan.
  - d) Mr. Kuberski questioned existing trees on the previous plan? Mr. Williams explained these were removed because they needed the space, but he has to revise the plan for the new parking spaces to reflect this change.
  - e) Mr. Schlack asked where they were going to store the equipment, and why they needed all of this parking? Mr. Epstein indicated that the equipment would all fit in the building. He reiterated that he is just putting the parking in now to address any future expansion. He noted that if he sold this, perhaps a different business would also need more parking.
  - f) Mr. Williams commented that it is cheaper to build the parking lot now.
  - g) Mr. Schlack noted that this was a lot of parking for a landscaping business. Mr. Epstein indicated that he has 20 employees right now.
  - h) Mrs. Altieri asked if the paved area was a way to provide organized parking spaces for the employees? Mr. Epstein indicated that it was.
  - i) Ms. Holland noted that it was important to screen the cars from the street with landscaping.
  - j) Mr. Siegel asked if they would remove the fence as soon as possible? Mr. Epstein indicated they would.
  - k) Mr. Siegel suggested the use of grass pavers on a temporary basis if they go with another use and want to expand parking at a later time. Mr. Williams asked if he meant to pave close to the building and use grass pavers further away? Mr. Siegel affirmed this.
9. Ms. Holland noted that the landscaping plan needed to be revised.
10. **MOTION** – Mr. Bodek made a motion to table the application, request a 90-day extension from the applicant, and have the applicant work out traffic details with McMahon Associates, the Township and the County to develop specific plans for Germantown Pike. Mr. Kuberski seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 5-0.
11. There was no public comment on this matter.

## 6. Other Business:

A. Old Business – None

B. New Business –

- 1. Mr. Siegel noted that at the last Board of Supervisors meeting he was directed to work with Mr. Onorato on a clean-up ordinance for the Township. He has been gathering items for this ordinance for the past few years, and will present it to the PC in May or June.
- 2. Mr. Siegel commented that a new stormwater and riparian buffer ordinance would be release in the next 4-6 months from the DEP. All Townships' will be required to put this into effect, so they will probably be reviewing this as well.
- 3. Mr. Rutledge questioned the curbing relating to this evening's application. Mr. Siegel indicated he would ask the applicant to bring curbing to the driveway, but he needs to look at the contours. The County does not want curbs on roads like Germantown Pike. They view lack of curbs as an aid for stormwater runoff.
- 4. Ms. Holland noted that the County doesn't object to curbs, and they do not have plans to widen Germantown Pike west of Rt. 363.
- 5. Mr. Siegel noted that open swales are now a BMP under the DEP.

C. Comments:

- 1. There were no further comments at this time.

## 7. Adjourn

A. **MOTION** – Mr. Bodek made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Kuberski seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 5-0. The meeting ended at 8:12 p.m.

**Next Meeting:** May 27, 2009 – Regular Meeting