

**LOWER PROVIDENCE TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION
MAY 17, 2006 MEETING MINUTES**

1. Call to Order:

A. Chairman Dininny called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Roll Call:

A. The following supervisors and planning commission members were present: Mr. Dininny, Mr. Brown, Mr. DiPaolo, Mrs. Altieri, Mr. Vibbert, Mrs. Satterwhite, Mr. Bodek, Mr. Stemple, and Mrs. Zimmerman.

B. Mr. Sassu, Mr. Schlack and Mr. Kuberski were excused.

C. Mr. Endlich and Mr. Rutledge were absent.

D. Additional attendees included: Mr. Lonnie Manai, Township Engineer, Mr. David Onorato, Township Solicitor, Mr. Joseph Dunbar, Township Manager, and Mr. Michael Siegel, Director of Community Development.

4. Topics for Discussion for this meeting:

A. Rear Lots (see attachments):

1. Mr. Siegel provided documents with an inventory of all lots in the Township that could be subdivided into flag lots.
 - a) For R2, 1.43 acres are required under the proposed ordinance, and 3.73 acres would be required for R1. These are the maximum acres required for two lots. Some of the larger lots may not need to be developed as flag lots.
 - b) Mr. Siegel provided a list of single-family dwelling R2 lots, as some of these are more likely to be developed as flag lots than the vacant parcels.
 - c) Mr. Siegel provided a demonstration of how the GIS system maps out and identifies the parcels.
2. Mr. Dininny asked the group members to provide their thoughts on how many, if any, rear lots should be provided under the proposed ordinance?
 - a) Mr. Stemple commented that landowners should be able to develop their ground, but would like a maximum of one rear lot.
 - b) Mrs. Zimmerman and Mrs. Satterwhite would like a maximum of one rear lot.
 - c) Mr. DiPaolo would prefer that rear lots not be permitted at all.
 - d) Mr. Brown prefers no rear lots, but if they go with one rear lot he would like the minimum lot size to be two acres.
 - e) Mr. Bodek would like to see one rear lot with the minimum acreage requirement set at 200% of the zoning requirement for lot size. Mr. Onorato noted that the lot size would not include the pole for this ordinance.
 - f) Mr. Vibbert also prefers one maximum rear lot, with the minimum acreage requirement set at 1 ½ of the zoning requirement for the lot size.
 - g) Mrs. Altieri asked if the ordinance would be written to indicate only one rear lot? Mr. Onorato stated that it would state no more than one rear lot is permitted, and that the lot size must be 150-200% of the square footage for that zoning district, depending on what the group decides.

3. Mr. Manai noted that there are situations where there is property in the front and a subdivision in the back with perhaps 20 lots. If there were room in the back for an irregular lot, would the group want to prohibit or allow flags off of a street in this scenario?
 - a) Mr. Brown noted that they haven't had this issue because the land in back is typically designated as open space. Mr. Manai noted that there are some situations where you could squeeze in a rear lot.
 - b) Mr. Dunbar noted that they need checks and balances in place between SALDO and ZO.
4. Mr. Onorato asked if there is not a maximum acreage requirement, does the group want to allow some flexibility or not? They could restrict flag lots in the larger developments. This would only allow for one rear lot regardless of subdivision size.
5. The group expressed their interest in permitting one or two rear lots with 1.5 or 200% of the lot required for flags. It was decided that one maximum rear lot with a requirement for 200% of the regular parcel size would be best.
6. **MOTION** – Supervisor Brown made a motion to prepare an ordinance permitting one rear lot at 200% of the zoning district lot area to send to the Board of Supervisors for consideration. Supervisor Altieri seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 9-0.

B. “Clean-Up” Zoning and Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Amendments:

1. Mr. Siegel explained that the previous Township Manager and past Board of Supervisors had instructed him to prepare clean-up ordinances for ZO and SALDO, with the rear lot ordinance being one of the biggest. Several outside planners, Nels Sandberg, Tolsen DeSa, and Charlie Guttenplan have worked on these ordinances and clean up definitions, etc. He is reviewing SALDO and ZO to eliminate those passages that have not been used since 1955 or have become out of date with current standard code. This work has been completed, and he is having Mr. Chambers and Mr. Onorato review the output again. At the next joint meeting, he will provide two sets of ordinances, one with strike-thru lines showing what is being eliminated and why, and the other with those items being added and why.
2. Mr. Dunbar noted that on almost every land development application, the developer asks for a waiver from the requirement to show existing features 200 ft. outside of the property boundary. He asked that language be inserted into the ordinance permitting the submission of aerial photographs in lieu of this, provided the Township Engineer can request additional information as needed.
3. Mr. Manai commented that several townships have used the language at the discretion or request of the Township Engineer.
4. Mr. Siegel already has this change in his document. This item will be the first topic at the next meeting.

C. Proposed Mixed Use Overlay District or Mixed Use Zoning Class within the Industrial Zoning District for the Valley Forge Corporate Center:

1. Mr. Dinny explained that they would like more activity in the business park, and are hoping the use of a mixed-use overlay district will help bring this about. The changes to Rt. 422 will help revitalize the community. These changes are necessary so that the Township can “live off the land” by enticing ratables and jobs into the community, staving off residential tax increases.
2. Mr. Dunbar has been working with State officials on this project, and has several businesses interested in the corporate center.
3. Mr. Onorato explained that there were similar issues in Towamencin when he was a Board member, and explained how they permitted other uses with an overlay to provide for the types of uses they wanted to see in the areas where they wanted them. The overlay district was designed with a synergy to the layout, identifying where hotels, retail uses etc would be

- permitted along with design manuals to create a certain continuity of architecture. He strongly recommends the help of a professional planner who has experience in layout for this project.
4. Mr. Stemple asked how much property was involved in the business park? Mr. Dunbar noted that there is a 40% vacancy rate. Mr. Stemple asked when the Rt. 422 westbound ramp would be installed? Mr. Dunbar provided a quick overview of the Rt. 422 project and timeframe.
 5. Mr. Dininny explained how they needed to identify the types of businesses they want to attract, and need to take a proactive approach to this project.
 6. Mr. Dunbar talked of potential companies that are looking into the business park at this time, and also how the business owners want some type of business association to work with. He commented on the Expo Center wanting to come to Lower Providence, but their need to be up and running in August, and that they are considering a site in Hatfield as well.
 7. Mr. Dininny remarked that a venue similar to the old music fair might also be a good thing to bring revenue to the Township. He discussed ideas regarding a Township Parking Authority should something like the Expo Center come to town, noting it would bring revenue to the Township.
 8. Mr. Stemple asked what types of uses they wanted for this area? Mr. Dunbar would like additional uses that are complimentary to the area. Mr. Stemple asked how you would permit the other uses if the area is zoned Business Park? Mr. Onorato explained that they would create a new overlay district to permit the other uses. This group would decide what uses were acceptable and where they should be permitted, providing a vision for the community.
 9. Mr. Dininny noted that they were not the first community to do this, and they should see what other communities have come up with for these types of projects. He agrees that an outside planner should be brought on board if necessary, and that the business community should also be on board with the idea.
 10. Mrs. Satterwhite commented that they did need a professional to help if they want to move quickly. She would also like to see the inclusion of affordable workforce homes in the area.
 11. Mr. Brown would like the Board to consider bringing the County Planning Commission back on Board. The Township receives a 50% grant from the county to pay for this service. He noted that MCPC has been a great help in the past, and if the Township does not like the planner assigned, they can ask for another one. Mrs. Satterwhite commented that she had requested this at the beginning of the year but the county wouldn't provide someone part time.
 12. There was a discussion of the use of private vs. county planners, the associated costs and how it impacts the budget.
 13. Mr. DiPaolo commented that they have the authority to approve a template for the business park for building envelopes and parking areas on the various lots, and can have that ready to go for when a plan is submitted. Mr. Dunbar commented that they could have the zoning in place too.
 14. Mr. Vibbert does not like the idea of the Township being involved with a parking authority.
 15. Mr. Dunbar discussed various brainstorming ideas they had for the business park. He noted that he met with Septa regarding the installation of additional bus stops and shelters in the business park.
 16. Mr. Onorato commented that the Township already has the road network in place, which helps this plan.
 17. Mr. Dininny noted that if the Board approves the MCPC coming back that is one thing, but if another professional is brought in they need to see who would want to be on the steering committee for this project.

18. Mr. Onorato will bring in information on the process that Towamencin went through for the next meeting, just as an example. Mr. Dininny asked if there was anyone he could bring in to talk to this group about the process? Mr. Onorato will identify several outside planners to come in and meet with the Board.
19. Mr. Dunbar noted that sometimes it is better to use an outside agency to have them dedicated to the project.

D. Topics for discussion in upcoming meetings:

1. Revised Village Commercial Ordinance.
2. Proposed Evansburg Historical District Ordinance.
3. Proposed Stormwater BMP, Erosion Control and Riparian Buffer Ordinance.
4. Updating the Township Comprehensive Plan.
5. Acreage for the R-4 zoning district from 5 acres to 10 acres.
6. Preliminary and Final Plan land development / subdivision approval process.
7. The creation of Private Roads.

E. Advertised Dates for Future Meetings. Dates are:

1. June 20, 2006
2. July 18, 2006
3. August 15, 2006
4. September 19, 2006
5. October 17, 2006

5. Any other business brought before the Joint Board:

- A. Mrs. Nancy McFarland asked why they were holding Towamencin up like a golden globe since their plan has destroyed that community? She commented on the work done, a bridge that goes nowhere, destroying private homes, and the suffering of their businesses.
 1. Mr. Onorato noted that their plan was transportation driven to ensure enough lanes of travel to handle the traffic. They are in the middle of the construction process at this time. The bridge will connect to development on both sides and the transportation network will be complete.
 2. Mr. Dininny stated that they are not holding it up as a model, but just noted that they have gone through the redevelopment process. Lower Providence already has the transportation infrastructure in place.
 3. Mrs. McFarland suggested having the Rt. 422 ramp constructed prior to making these changes, as government money does not always come through. Mr. Dininny explained that they are trying to set a plan for the business park.
- B. Mrs. Kathy Maris requested that the discussion regarding the Evansburg Historical District Ordinance not be brought up until July. She is very interested in this topic and is unable to attend the next meeting. Mr. Dininny agreed to this request.
- C. Mrs. Leslie Bass asked how the Village Commercial issues would be addressed? Mr. Dininny noted that they will probably form a committee to handle that matter but they are not yet ready for that topic.

6. Adjourn

- A. **MOTION** – Mr. Stemple made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mrs. Satterwhite seconded the motion. The motion passed 9-0. The meeting ended at 8:35 p.m.

Next Meeting: June 20, 2006 – Work Session with Board of Supervisors & Planning Commission