

**LOWER PROVIDENCE TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MAY 27, 2009 MEETING MINUTES**

---

**1. Call to Order:**

A. Chairman Schlack called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

**2. Pledge of Allegiance**

**3. Roll Call:**

A. The following planning commission members were present: Mr. Brooke, Mr. Endlich, Mr. Kuberski, Mr. Rutledge, Mrs. Satterwhite, Mr. Schlack, Mr. Stemple, and Ms. Zimmerman.

B. Mr. Bodek was absent.

C. Additional attendees included: Mr. Ken O'Brien, McMahon Associates, 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, and for April 22, 2009:

1. **MOTION** – Mr. Stemple made a motion to approve the April 22, 2009 meeting minutes. Mr. Brooke seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 5-0-3. Mr. Endlich, Mrs. Satterwhite, and Ms. Zimmerman abstained from the vote because they did not attend that meeting.
2. **MOTION** – Ms. Zimmerman made a motion to approve the March 25, 2009 meeting minutes. Mr. Stemple seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0-2. Mr. Endlich and Mr. Kuberski abstained from the vote, as they did not attend that meeting.

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

A. None

**6. Other Business:**

A. Old Business – None

B. New Business – Update to Traffic Impact Fee Study, Roadway Sufficiency Analysis and Transportation Capital Improvement Plan:

1. Mr. O'Brien provided a summary of the Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) ordinance and its' proposed changes
2. The Township's currently adopted Act 209 TIF ordinance has been in place since 2001. The Township and members from the TIF Committee have been working on updates to the ordinance for the past several months.
3. Once piece of the Act 209 study, which was adopted in September 2008, is the Land Use Assumptions Report (LUAR), which projects development within the Township. The LUAR recommended changing the boundaries in the two transportation service areas (TSA). The existing Act 209 includes a boundary, which generally follows Pinetown Road and Sunnyside Avenue. The new boundary, as defined in the LUAR, has a boundary that is in the approximate vicinity of Egypt Road. The new boundary creates TSA1, which is the northern part of the Township, and TSA2, which is the southern part of the Township.
4. The next steps in the process include defining the Roadway Sufficiency Analysis (RSA) to analyze traffic, and the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) that lists improvements and costs included in the study (Exhibit T3). These changes are included in this evening's hearing.
5. The RSA provides an analysis of the existing traffic counts during the PM peak hour of service, completed in 2007, and an analysis of existing conditions. Each intersection is graded

- on its' current level of service from A to F. This is identified on page 14 of the study, where the preferred level of service shows acceptable operating conditions throughout the Township.
- a) For signalized intersections the level of service is "E" or better for all movements, and "D" or better overall.
  - b) For unsignalized intersections, the level of service is "D" for all movements.
  - c) Based on this grading system, 17 intersections do not meet the established criteria under existing conditions. Improvements are proposed for 8 of these intersections. At the remaining nine locations, improvements are either not feasible or signals are not yet warranted to improve conditions. This is shown in Figure 5 in the study. The Township, County and PennDOT are responsible for funding these improvements, not development.
6. Future conditions that effect traffic are either pass-thru or development related.
- a) Pass-thru traffic comes from areas surrounding the Township, and is not developed within each service area.
  - b) Development conditions come from development, which is expected to occur on top of background growth.
  - c) Based on the preferred level of service mentioned under existing conditions and accounting for improvements already warranted under existing conditions, 20 intersections effected by pass-thru traffic do not meet the service criteria. (See Figure 6) Of these, improvements are proposed for 14 intersections. At the remaining six locations, improvements are either not feasible or signals are not yet warranted to improve conditions, therefore the preferred level of service is not possible at these intersections. The Township, County and PennDOT are also responsible for funding these types of improvements, not development.
  - d) When development is added to each service area, it is expected to add 724 new trips to TSA1 (above Egypt Road) and 1,147 trips to TSA2 (below Egypt Road.)
  - e) The study projects future development traffic volumes through the area intersections and analyses them to see how they will operate. (See Figure 12) Based on the previously identified preferred level of service under existing conditions, 17 intersections do not meet the service criteria. Improvements are proposed for 10 of these intersections, with improvements at the remaining 7 intersections not feasible or not yet warranted to improve conditions.
  - f) Improvements to these intersections are the responsibility of developers and PennDOT, with the cost of these improvements establishing the impact fee. The cost includes a 50% credit to the impact fee because of PennDOT's responsibility.
7. A change in this draft of the study from the original draft listed some improvements to programmed improvements, meaning they will be constructed from monies other than collected impact fee funds. This would be federal money from grants, earmarks, or developers. These include a connector roadway from Norris Hall Lane across Trooper Road to Egypt Road, just west of the existing Rittenhouse Road intersection. This also ties into Adams Avenue, and realigns the Crawford Road approach at Park Avenue to intersect directly opposite from Eagleville Road. This change was done through consultation with some members of the TIF Committee and some members of the Valley Forge Corporate Center Redevelopment Committee to address concerns that the fees in the draft study, along with other Township fees, would discourage development within the Township, particularly given the current economic climate.
8. The next step in this process is to review the CIP, which contains a list of proposed improvements and a schedule of their related costs. This is found in Table 15 of the study.

- a) For TSA1, the total cost of improvements is \$13.7 million. This includes \$6 million for PennDOT, \$6 million for the Township, \$400,000 for the County, and \$1.3 million for new development.
- b) For TSA2, the total cost of improvements is almost \$4 million. This includes \$1.3 million for PennDOT, \$2 million for the Township, and \$500,000 for new development.
- c) The associated TIF is as follows:

<b>TSA:</b>	<b>Current TIF:</b>	<b>Draft TIF:</b>	<b>New Proposed TIF:</b>
TSA1	\$1,994	\$3,888	\$1,822
TSA2	\$667	\$2,559	\$413

- d) The TIF is calculated on the projected number of trips at the PM peak hour times the traffic impact fee.
9. Mr. Rutledge asked if this was just a presentation or if the PC needed to approve this plan?
    - a) Mr. Siegel noted that the PC needed to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. The current TIF is higher because a lot of the intersections have already been improved over the past few years. The proposed TIF is to encourage redevelopment in the Valley Forge Corporate Center and they want to keep tax ratables in place.
  10. Ms. Zimmerman questioned some of the data on plan's legends. Mr. O'Brien explained that the item she referenced indicated that future development would install the traffic improvements at Pinetown and Egypt Roads. Mr. Siegel commented that a plan for that parcel would be forthcoming in the near future.
  11. Mr. Rutledge asked if this meant some of the improvements in the plan might never be installed even though they were on the plan? He specifically questioned the installation of Shannondell Boulevard.
    - a) Mr. Siegel explained that Shannondell Boulevard was listed on the original traffic improvement plan and that has not changed.
    - b) Mrs. Satterwhite asked if that road would ever be constructed?
    - c) Mr. Siegel explained that no more building permits would be issued for Shannondell until the road was installed. They are within 50-60 units of reaching their current capacity.
    - d) Ms. Zimmerman asked if the Township wanted that road? Mr. Siegel indicated they did.
    - e) Ms. Holland commented that when they are at 1,000 units, the road must be installed.
    - f) Ms. Zimmerman asked if it was a gated community? Mr. Siegel remarked that it is gated but the road is on the outside of the gate. Additionally, PennDOT wants more improvements to Park Avenue in that vicinity.
  12. Mr. Rutledge asked why the intersection of Church Road and Ridge Pike did not warrant a traffic signal? Mr. O'Brien explained that under the law, they must use specific peak hour traffic counts to determine the warrants. While the signal may be warranted at other times of day, they must have a certain amount of traffic on the main and side streets to meet the criteria when the counts are being taken.
  13. Mr. Stemple noted that the TIF Committee tried to work out a solution to reduce the TIF and bring in new business for the Valley Forge Corporate Center. McMahon did a great job to help them in this effort and he hopes it will bring in new business for the Township.
  14. Mr. O'Brien reviewed the original draft TIF again. Mr. Siegel noted that in Tampa and Phoenix they recently deferred their TIF to encourage new business. Lower Providence is near the top of the high cost areas for development and they are trying to reduce that.
  15. **MOTION** – Mr. Stemple made a motion to accept the proposed Act 209 Study as presented by Mr. O'Brien. Mr. Endlich seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 8-0.

C. Comments:

1. There were no comments from the public at this time.

**7. Adjourn**

- A. **MOTION** – Mr. Stemple made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Endlich seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 8-0. The meeting ended at 8:05 p.m.

**Next Meeting:** June 24, 2009 – Regular Meeting