

**LOWER PROVIDENCE TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
APRIL 26, 2017 MEETING MINUTES**

**1) Call to Order**

A) Chairman Comroe called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**2) Roll Call:**

- A) The following board members were in attendance: Mr. Michael Comroe, Ms. Kristina O'Donnell, Mr. Mark Kuberski, Mr. William Brooke, Mr. Harold Baird, and Ms. Ginny Kricun.  
B) Also in attendance: Mr. Mike Mrozinski, Director of Community Development; Mr. Tim Woodrow, Township Engineer; Mr. Peter Nelson, Township Solicitor; Mr. Casey Moore, Traffic Engineer; Marley Brice, MCPC Planner and Ms. Jill Zimmerman, Board of Supervisor Liaison.

**3) Meeting Minutes:**

- A) Approval of Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of February 22, 2017 and March 22, 2017.  
i) **MOTION:** Ms. O'Donnell made a motion to move the minutes of February 22, 2017 into the record. Mr. Brooke seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 5-1 with Mr. Baird abstaining.  
ii) **MOTION:** Mr. Brooke made a motion to move the minutes of March 22, 2017 into the record. Ms. O'Donnell seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 6-0.

**4) Old Business:**

- A) LD-16-07 – Providence Place Senior Living – 4000 Ridge Pike (Collegeville Inn) – 160 residential units and common areas – preliminary land development.  
i) Tom Keenan, on behalf of the applicant, reviewed the land development request and the steps the applicant has taken to meet and exceed all requirements as well as assuage the concerns of the community.  
ii) Mr. Comroe asked if the applicant will be addressing the issue with left hand turns off of Pechins Mill Road. Mr. Adam Brower, Lead Engineer for the project, said they would. Mr. Comroe confirmed that residents will be permitted to come through the property to make the left-hand turn. Discussion was held regarding access and traffic issues.  
iii) Ms. O'Donnell asked for clarification of the Comitta Associates concerns. Mr. Brower said they can provide the critical impact information and noted that for the most part, they are keeping out of sensitive areas. He did note a large sycamore tree on the property that will not be able to be saved.  
iv) Ms. O'Donnell asked if the information provided by the applicant as acceptable to the Township staff. Mr. Woodrow stated that staff has spent a lot of time with the applicant and that the issues of his greatest concerns have been addressed. He said that he did have some concerns regarding the visual impact of the wall but said that has been addressed. Mr. Brower said that over and above the landscaping on the current set of plans they are adding more trees that will help mask the wall  
v) Mr. Moore said he has been working with applicant and their engineers and they've been very cooperative and it is now down to engineering details. He said the applicant will comply to the review letters and staff is very pleased with how the project is coming along.  
vi) Ms. Brice said that she has looked over Maggie's letter and most items have been addressed. She said there had been some concern about additional plantings but that seems like it has been addressed.

vii) Ms. Kricun asked about parking not being in front of the building. Mr. Brower explained the changes in the current plans and why the new parking configuration addresses the Township's concerns while still fulfilling their needs. Discussion was held regarding the parking exit.

viii) Waiver Requests:

- (1) Section 123-18-A.2g – request to not identify species of the trees to be removed
  - (a) **MOTION:** Mr. Brooke made a motion to grant a waiver from Section 123-18-A.2g. Ms. O'Donnell seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 6-0
- (2) Section 123-31.F – request to not require Pechins Mill Road to be widened to provide a 26 Foot Wide Cartway.
  - (a) Ms. O'Donnell asked for clarification saying that she was under the understanding that the applicant had stated that this would be 26 feet. Mr. Brower said that the new part of the road will be 26 feet wide. He explained how this waiver was dependent on the curbing waiver but that to the south, the waiver would need to be granted. Mr. Woodrow said this is, essentially, a partial waiver. Mr. Moore said that he is fine with the waiver request.
  - (b) **MOTION:** Mr. Brooke Made a motion to grant a waiver from Section 123-31.F. Mr. Kuberski seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 6-0.
- (3) Section 123-32 – request to not require vertical curbing and storm sewer improvements for Pechins Mill Road.
  - (a) **MOTION:** Ms. O'Donnell made a motion to grant a waiver from Section 123-32. Mr. Baird seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 6-0.
- (4) Section 123-33 – request to not require sidewalk along Pechins Mill Road.
  - (a) Mr. Brooke said that he would like to see a sidewalk Pechins Mill Road from Ridge Pike to the back entrance. Mr. Brower said that, in lieu of that, they would have a trail along the Perkiomen and they tie into the sidewalk system to Pechins Mill. He said they are not encouraging residents to walk Pechins Mill Road. Ms. Kricun asked about workers who may use public transportation. Mr. Brower explained where the bus stop was located and measures being taken to provide for their safety, including adding a crosswalk. Ms. O'Donnell asked if a sidewalk would impact stormwater as cubing would. Mr. Brower said that can be designed around.
    - (i) Mr. Moore said that the road is currently 14 feet and will be widened by 9 feet. He said that at that width paired with the low traffic on Pechins Mill and the access proposed, staff did not think this was an issue. Mr. Moore said they felt it was important to get the crossing in place.
  - (b) **MOTION:** Mr. Brooke made a motion to not grant a waiver from Section 123-33. Mr. Baird seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 4-2.
- (5) Section 123-36.F – request to allow the access drive at Ridge Pike to be greater than 24 feet wide to allow turning movements from the driveway.
  - (a) **MOTION:** Ms. O'Donnell made a motion to grant a waiver from Section 123-36.F. Mr. Brooke seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 6-0.
- (6) Section 123-35.B – request to not require a centerline radius of 150 feet and 100-foot tangent length on the realigned Pechins Mill Road.
  - (a) Mr. Moore said that current design will be tweaked to get to as close to that as possible but do not feel they can quite get there. They do feel it can still operate safely with these configurations.

- (b) **MOTION:** Mr. Brooke made a motion to grant a waiver from Section 123-35.B. Ms. Kricun seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 6-0.
- ix) Ms. Kricun asked if the road could be public domain if used by public. Solicitor Nelson said that the applicant is granting a license that does not grant the public any rights and can be revoked. He said that the applicant's insurer can change this arrangement if they feel it is a liability. The applicant's attorney said that they will assume this risk as they are trying to accommodate residents.
- x) **MOTION:** Ms. O'Donnell made a motion to approve preliminary land development for Providence Place Senior Living. Mr. Brooke seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 6-0.
- B) S-17-01 1418 Gertrude Street – 1148 Gertrude – Tree lot subdivision – Single family detached house – preliminary/final subdivision plan.
- i) Rob Beers, Barry Issett & Associates, reviewed the request.
- ii) Mr. Woodrow said that this is a rural area and this proposal is creating two new building lots on the parcel. He did question as to whether there was any merit to widening the road for emergency services/access or delivery trucks.
- (1) Mr. Baird said that he has living in that area for years and there is not an issue with traffic. He said this is an issue of subdivision of a lot so applicant can live on one lot and sell the other. Mr. Baird said it would be up to the developer who may want to build on the other lot to meet any development requirements. Ms. O'Donnell agreed and said that residents would not want a road widening. Mr. Mrozinski said that he has spoken with the Fire Marshall who does not see the need for improvements due to the low volume on the road.
- iii) **MOTION:** Mr. Baird made a motion to grant the preliminary/final subdivision plan. Ms. Kricun seconded the motion.
- (1) Ms. Brice had questions regarding the auxiliary structures on the site and if they meet the required setbacks. Mr. Beers said they are in compliance and he would add dimensions to the plan.
- The motion *passed* 6-0.
- C) S-17-02 – Gambone Family Subdivision – 2711 and 2725 Woodland Avenue – Nine lot Subdivision - Single-family detached houses – preliminary subdivision plan.
- i) Andrew Laird, of the law firm of King Laird, reviewed the request.
- ii) Susan Rice, the applicant will comply with most review letters with the exception of four waiver requests. She reviewed the items that will require relief.
- (1) Ms. O'Donnell expressed concerns about the landscaping proposal. Ms. Rice said that street trees are also being proposed. Ms. O'Donnell also said the proposal essentially creates a new front yard for existing residents and she expressed concerns as to how this will impact setbacks, potentially causing a hardship to existing residents. Mr. Woodrow agreed and said there may be some creative ways to solve this and will speak with staff. Discussion was held regarding setbacks. Ms. O'Donnell stated she will not approve the plan if this results in a front yard replacing a rear yard. Ms. Rice said she will work with staff to come up with a solution to this issue.
- iii) Ms. Rice reviewed the stormwater plan for the site. Discussion was held regarding the impact of water in the area and neighbors' concerns. She noted that the owner of Lot #1 will be required to maintain the basin. Ms. Rice they are ready to submit their NPDES permits and feel comfortable with their stormwater management plan.
- iv) Ms. Rice reviewed the waiver requests.

- (1) Ms. O'Donnell questioned the ability for emergency access. Ms. Rice said the Fire Marshall has stated he has no concerns regarding egress.
  - (2) Ms. Rice asked if she would need a waiver for the location of street trees in relation to the right-of-way. Mr. Woodrow said that he did not believe a waiver was needed.
- v) Audience Comments:
- (1) Marian Schaeffer, Tomstock Road, expressed confused about the storm drain. Ms. Rice explained that the storm sewer runs all along under the road and there are grates along road with a new grate at the intersection that will be connecting underground.
  - (2) Tony Copa, Clearfield Ave., said that his concerns were regarding water run-off but it sounds like plans are well in hand to keep the run-off moving. He asked if final drawings have been submitted. Mr. Woodrow said that final drawing that shows continuance of the swale will be in a revised plan submission. He said he feels positive about the subdivision.
  - (3) Lou Marcalena asked if the elevation of road in conjunction with his property would be higher or lower and, if it is higher, will there be an issue with runoff. Ms. Rice said there are inlets in the proposed road and the road is curved so water will not go over the curb. Mr. Woodrow said the road is about the same elevation as property. Ms. Rice clarified the location of the channel. Mr. Marcalena said he has been neighbors with the Gambone's for years and is in support of.
  - (4) Louis Spezzia, Clearfield, also a neighbor and feel subdivision will be positive. He expressed concerns about the elevation forcing water onto his property and how the additional water will stress the stormwater and sewer systems in the Township. Mr. Woodrow said they want to make sure not to push water onto your property and the plan will show that all the water in the back of all these properties will be directed down to the stormwater basin.
  - (5) Joe Santor, Woodland Ave, wanted to know what he would see out of his front window. Ms. Rice said he would see a shallow landscaped basin and a berm. He asked if here would be standing water in the basin. Ms. Rice said water would not be there for long. She noted that the permit requires that some standing water sift through and gets absorbed back into the ground. Ms. O'Donnell said this is a detention basin rather than a retention basin. Mr. Santor asked if there would be a stop sign on Woodland. Ms. Rice said that the recommendation was to not to have stop sign on Woodland but there will have a crosswalk and sign identifying that traffic does not stop.
  - (6) Carmen [name unintelligible], asked what pollutants would need to be dispersed during the basin drainage process. Mr. Woodrow said lawn fertilizers; herbicides and things you spray on the lawn would be considered pollutants.
  - (7) Ms. Kricun stated she would like to see a more detailed plan of the project.
  - (8) Barbara Beth, Tomstock Road, When road comes out of Woodland it will be along a property that is a group home. She asked if the reservoir will be protected so children don't fall in. Ms. O'Donnell said it will be shallow and naturalized. Ms. Rice said there is a fence proposed. Mr. Woodrow explained that the trend for this type of basin is to make them a more naturalized area rather than industrial in appearance. Ms. Rice explained that in the worst case scenario at the very end of the basin it could be 3 feet deep but DEP is requiring a larger surface area which mitigates that. Ms. Beth asked if homeowners could put fence around it the basin. Mr. Nelson said that the Township enters into an agreement with the property owner that requires the owner to maintain the property as designed.



- They may not be able to install a fence. He said the Township will check to make sure that it is maintained. Discussion was held regarding the stormwater conditions in the area.
- vi) Ms. Kricun asked if a Home Owner's Association (HOA) is planned for development. Ms. Rice said there was not.
  - vii) Mr. Brooke asked if there was any other consideration to moving the stormwater basin to middle of the property to split the ownership between all homeowners rather than just having one owner responsible. The applicant's attorney said they may enter into a discussion to create a HOA and make this basin a common area and maintained by an HOA.
  - viii) Mr. Moore said that their review letter stated they felt it important to extend the sidewalk along Woodland Avenue. He also commented on their desire to see the existing road widened. He said that since it was a cul-de-sac it was up the pleasure of the Board to decide as to whether to require a 28-foot width.
  - ix) Ms. Brice said that comments had been addressed but noted that Ms. Dobbs had mentioned sidewalks, ensuring a crosswalk across Woodland as well as ADA ramps in the sidewalk.
  - x) Waiver Requests:
    - (1) Section 123-33 – requiring a sidewalk be installed along all existing or proposed public streets.
      - (a) **MOTION:** Ms. O'Donnell made a motion to grant a waiver for Section 123-33 for the west side of Road A, provided the applicant pay a fee in lieu of to the Township for future sidewalks. Ms. Kricun
        - (i) Mr. Brooke asked for clarification of the recommendation to increase the cartway width. Mr. Moore discussed where the sidewalk waiver would be sought.
    - The motion *passed* 6-0.
    - (b) Discussion was held regarding sidewalk waivers in the area.
    - (c) **MOTION:** Mr. Brooke made a motion to deny the waiver for Section 123-33 for Woodland Avenue. Ms. O'Donnell seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 6-0.
    - (2) Section 123-34E – requiring intersections for feeders to be no less than 400 feet.
      - (a) **MOTION:** Ms. O'Donnell made a motion to grant a waiver for Section 123-34E. Mr. Brooke seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 6-0.
    - (3) Section 123-39.E – requiring lots which are excessively deep in relation to width to be avoided.
      - (a) **MOTION:** Mr. Brooke made a motion to grant a waiver for Section 123-39.E. Mr. Baird seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 6-0.
  - xi) Mr. Baird asked what was the determination on the Road A as far as it abuts up against the adjoining property. Mr. Woodrow said this was an issue they needed to work on and have heard the Planning Commission that this needs to be further resolved.
  - xii) Mr. Comroe said this was submitted as a preliminary/final plan. Ms. O'Donnell asked for clarification for what they applicant is seeking. Ms. Rice said they will submit revised plans and come back before the Planning Commission.
    - (1) In response to a resident, discussion was held regarding sidewalks in the area.

## 5) Motion to Adjourn:

- A) **MOTION:** Ms. Kricun made a motion to adjourn. Ms. O'Donnell seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0. The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

**Next Meeting:** May 24, 2017

