

**LOWER PROVIDENCE TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
JANUARY 27, 2010 MEETING MINUTES**

1. Call to Order:

A. Mr. Schlack called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Roll Call:

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

B. Additional attendees included: Mr. Chris DiPaolo, Board of Supervisors Liaison, and Mr. Nathaniel Dysard, Project Manager.

4. Reorganization of Planning Commission:

A. Mr. Schlack turned the meeting over to Ms. Zimmerman to begin the reorganization for 2010. Ms. Zimmerman requested nominations for Chairman of the Planning Commission.

1. **MOTION** – Mrs. Satterwhite made a motion to appoint Mr. Schlack as Chairman of the Planning Commission (PC). Mr. Brooke seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 9-0.

B. Ms. Zimmerman turned the meeting over to Mr. Schlack. Chairman Schlack requested nominations for Vice Chairman of the PC.

1. **MOTION** – Mrs. Satterwhite made a motion to appoint Mr. Comroe as Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission (PC). There was no second for the motion. The motion *died*.

2. **MOTION** – Ms. Zimmerman made a motion to appoint Mr. Endlich as Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission (PC). Mr. Brooke seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 9-0.

5. Approval of Planning Commission Previous Meeting Minutes:

A. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for November 18, 2009:

1. Chairman Schlack stated that the PC has not received the minutes to review therefore no vote is necessary.

6. Subdivision and Land Development Reviews:

A. None.

7. Other Business:

A. Old Business –

1. None

B. New Business –

1. Mr. Dysard requested that all Planners complete the Statement of Interest sheets and fill out the contact information sheet.

2. Discussion on the Montgomery County Planner and the Township Engineer's attendance at PC meetings:

a) Mr. Endlich asked Mr. DiPaolo if the Township is charged the same amount when the Montgomery County Planning Commission (MCPC) Planner is not in attendance at a PC meeting?

b) Mr. DiPaolo explained that the contract with the MCPC is flexible and basically provides a set amount of hours of service. This contract is up for renewal and the Board of Supervisors (BOS) would like input from the PC regarding if they want the County Planner at every meeting or just for special projects so they can gauge what the budget

should be. Mr. DiPaolo noted that the Planners might want the County Planner to work on a special project such as revising the Comprehensive Plan.

- c) Ms. Zimmerman asked if the MCPC contract hours would be needed to work on the Comprehensive Plan this year? Mr. DiPaolo remarked that the Comprehensive Plan is dated and should be revisited. There are other issues such as the DEP's proposed solution to groundwater contamination along Level Road and Ridge Pike, where they recommend going to public water. There are many issues related to addressing the DEP recommendation, and the Township has not looked at this yet.
 - d) Chairman Schlack noted that there would not be many large land development applications coming in during the next year so the County Planner would not be needed for every meeting.
 - e) Ms. Zimmerman concurred with this but suggested having the Township Engineer present for all land development matters as the PC relies on him for matters regarding interpretation of ordinances. Mr. Schlack liked this approach noting the Township Engineer can provide technical responses and interpretation.
 - f) Mr. Comroe suggested that Mr. Dysard contact Mr. Schlack when plans are going to be on the agenda so that the Chairman can determine if the County Planner or Township Engineer should be present at a meeting. Mr. Kuberski remarked that any of the planners should be able to contact Mr. Dysard with that recommendation.
 - g) Mr. DiPaolo stated that there is no problem using the County Planner or Township Engineer as needed, the BOS just wanted input from the PC prior to making any decisions.
 - h) Mrs. LaPenta stated that she has been a Civil Engineer for over 22 years and is capable of reviewing land development plans. She offered to look over the plans but noted that she does not know the ordinances thoroughly.
 - i) It was noted that the Township Engineer knows the Township inside and out and is thoroughly knowledgeable of the ordinances.
 - j) The Planners decided they would use the services of the County Planner and the Township Engineer on an as needed basis.
 - k) Mr. DiPaolo explained some of the budgetary concerns they have in this economy, and reiterated that the PC should use the County Planner and/or Township Engineer when they have a need to do so.
 - l) There was no public comment during the discussion or action taken for this item.
3. Mr. Dysard remarked that to date there was a very light slate of projects for 2010. Shannondell Phase III will be coming in within the next few months.
4. Mr. Comroe had several comments:
- a) Mr. Comroe noted that there were no minutes posted on the Township web site for the PC meetings since July 2009. Mr. Dysard will look into this.
 - b) Mr. Comroe explained that the PC and BOS used to hold a joint meeting once a year where the BOS would provide their vision for the Township from a planning perspective. Mr. Comroe suggested that this type of a meeting be scheduled for 2010.
 - c) Mr. Comroe stated that when he was previously on the PC, they were issued picture identification cards. These were for identification purposes when going to sites to review plans. Mr. Comroe recommended restarting the use of these ID cards. Mr. Schlack commented that was a good idea.
5. Mr. DiPaolo explained that Mrs. Eckman was in a training session this evening and apologized for not being in attendance. Mrs. Eckman asked that he express her thanks to the Planners for

serving on this board, indicating they have her full support. Mr. DiPaolo noted that if plans come in and have a lot of issues, he urged the PC to deny or table them.

- a) Mr. Schlack commented that this PC readily tables plans that have too many issues, and they want applicants to prove their hardship when asking for waivers.
 - b) Mr. DiPaolo remarked that the PC is the first and best line of defense. He urged the PC to make sure plans were clean and not feel the need to push them through.
 - c) Mr. Brooke commented he can only recall one plan where he thought they should have stopped it, but it was at one of his first meetings. The plan came in with three waivers listed but they ended up asking for 14 waivers. He would not let such a plan go through today.
 - d) Mr. DiPaolo stated that the BOS wants to know of any ideas the PC has for corrections or changes to ordinances, so please pass along your ideas.
6. Mrs. LaPenta asked how the review process worked with the PC, and the Planners provided an overview of the process for her.
- a) Mrs. LaPenta questioned how issues on a plan were addressed?
 - (1) Ms. Zimmerman explained that the PC is just an advisory board but they make recommendations to the BOS.
 - (2) Mr. Kuberski noted that they get all the comments on the record, and the minutes go to the BOS.
 - (3) Mr. Schlack remarked that they could make a condition part of a motion too. Ms. Zimmerman explained that it was then up to the BOS to decide if they want to follow through on that condition.
 - (4) Mr. Schlack commented that they have a great group on the PC, and they do a good job.

C. Comments:

1. There was no public comment during this meeting.

8. Adjourn

- A. **MOTION** – Mr. Brooke made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Endlich seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 9-0. The meeting ended at 8:15 p.m.

Next Meeting: February 24, 2010