

WORCESTER TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPREVISORS & PLANNING COMMISSION JOINT MEETING
WORCESTER TOWNSHIP COMMUNITY HALL
FAIRVIEW VILLAGE, WORCESTER, PA
MONDAY, AUGUST 1st, 2011 8:00 A.M.

CALL TO ORDER

The regularly scheduled joint meeting of the Board of Supervisors & Planning Commission was called to order by Mr. Arthur Bustard at 8:01 A.M.

ATTENDANCE

PRESENT:

Arthur Bustard	Chairman: Board of Supervisors
Susan Caughlan	Vice Chairman: Board of Supervisors
Steve Quigley	Member: Board of Supervisors
David R. Burman	Township Manager
James J. Garrity, Esq.	Township Solicitor
Gordon Todd	Chairman: Planning Commission
Pat Quigley	Vice Chairman: Planning Commission
Robert Hayes	Member: Planning Commission
Matthew Schelly	Township Planning Consultant, Montgomery County Planning Commission

ABSENT:

Eunice Kriebel	Township Assistant Manager/ Treasurer
Joseph J. Nolan, P.E.	Township Engineer
Paul Ziegler	Secretary: Planning Commission
Doug Rotondo	Member: Planning Commission

1. APPROVAL OF JOINT MEETING MINUTES:

A motion by Mr. Gordon Todd for approval of the minutes for the joint meeting held on February 7th, 2011, seconded by Ms. Susan Caughlan, contingent upon minor grammar and language changes to be made, was passed unanimously.

2. ZONING AMENDMENT DISCUSSION:

• **SIGNAGE**

Mr. Todd addressed that the Planning Commission's goal is to define the area of a sign due to the current ordinance being confusing. The Planning Commission created a new definition to include a distinction between building mounted signs and free standing signs.

Ms. Caughlan commented on the specific language to be used to define how the area of signage may be defined and that the graphic provided is helpful in understanding how to calculate signage.

Mr. Bustard inquired as to at what height of the signage is the area calculation taken from. Mr. Todd referred to the graphic visual provided.

Mr. Todd addressed neighborhood signage. Currently the code allows walls and solid fencing located in the front yard up to 30 inches. He suggested that neighborhood signage be located on these structures as a form of identification.

Ms. Caughlan inquired if this may also be utilized and allowable for businesses. Mr. Todd stated that he does not have an issue with a business taking this approach for advertising purposes.

Ms. Caughlan commented on the difference between a wall mounted sign and building mounted sign. Mr. Todd clarified further by stating that a business should be able to have a wall mounted sign within the parameters provided.

Mr. Todd then addressed interior signage regarding commercially zoned districts. The Planning Commission is recommending that indoor illuminated signage be allowed with limitations.

Ms. Caughlan inquired as to if an illuminated interior sign that would cover half the panel of a window viewable for street side view would be permissible. Mr. Todd replied that this would be excessive and that limitations would have to be provided as to the percentage that would be allowable.

Ms. Caughlan further inquired as to what kind of interior internal illumination may be allowed. Mr. Todd clarified that the Planning Commission would like to start with neon internal illuminated signage for indoor signage. Ms. Pat Quigley agreed with this approach.

Mr. Quigley inquired as to what the difference is between an LED lit sign located outside off the road and having a flat screen television inside a business establishment located in the window and/or in the business that can be seen from roadside view. He inquired as to what is the distinction between indoor & outdoor signage.

Mr. Bustard and Mr. Todd both replied that the current ordinance does not strictly control indoor signage.

Ms. Quigley further clarified that it would be based on the intent of the signage proposed and installed and how it is viewed from roadside view.

Mr. Quigley & Mr. Bustard inquired as to the calculation of sign area represented on the graphic provided. Mr. Todd further explained how the area of signage is calculated and how the individual will have a square footage maximum allowance.

Mr. Todd clarified that the definition for an off-premise sign is exactly the same as the definition for billboard signage in the proposed recommended changes by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Todd addressed business complex signage located in the commercially zoned districts and offering more flexible signage options for business owners regarding shared business signage.

Mr. Todd addressed signage located within the ultimate right of way and proposed signage language that would allow such signage. Discussion and questions ensued.

3. VILLAGE PLANNING:

• **CEDARS VILLAGE PLANNING PRESENTATION**

Mr. Todd requested that the Board of Supervisors release the draft ordinance for public review.

Mr. Bustard further clarified that this request and recommendation from the Planning Commission was based off of the last joint meeting discussion on Cedar's Village Planning Overlay Ordinance held on February 7th, 2011.

Mr. Todd confirmed that the recommendation and request is based on the context of that meeting.

Ms. Caughlan explained that proposed ordinances get posted on the Township's website for review before being officially advertised.

Ms. Caughlan requested that the Township Engineer review the impervious coverage ratio to building coverage ratio to access if the limits are realistic and attainable.

Mr. Bustard addressed obtaining information from Towamencin Township regarding edu's.

Mr. Quigley addressed sewage capacity.

Mr. Richard DeLello commented on Cedars Village Planning Overlay Ordinance and internally illuminated signage.

Mr. Todd re-addressed neighborhood signage in how the current code allows 1 sign per entrance. The Planning Commission recommends that 1 sign per community be allowed and not per entrance.

The draft cedars village overlay ordinance shall be posted on the Township website for the public to review.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT:

None

5. ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before this joint committee, the meeting of the Worcester Township Board of Supervisors & Planning Commission was adjourned by Mr. Arthur Bustard, at 8:52 A.M.

WORCESTER TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING
WORCESTER TOWNSHIP COMMUNITY HALL
FAIRVIEW VILLAGE, WORCESTER, PA
THURSDAY, AUGUST 11th, 2011 7:30 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Ms. Pat Quigley at 7:34 P.M.

ATTENDANCE

PRESENT:

Pat Quigley	Acting Chairman & Vice Chairman
Robert Hayes	Acting Vice Chairman & Member
Matthew Schelly	Township Planning Consultant, Montgomery County Planning Commission

ABSENT:

Gordon Todd	Chairman
Paul Ziegler	Secretary
Doug Rotondo	Member

GUESTS:

Ms. Susan Caughlan: Overhill Dr Resident
Mr. and Mrs. Michael Petrecz: Germantown Pk Resident
Mr. Richard DeLello: Stony Creek Rd Resident
Mr. Charles Venezia: Germantown Pk Resident

1. **3205 & 3207 GERMANTOWN PK REGARDING FAIRVIEW VILLAGE OVERLAY ORDINANCE:**
Mr. Michael Petrecz presented his letter which requested for his properties located at 3205 & 3207 Germantown Pike to be included in the Fairview Village Overlay Ordinance designation area.

Ms. Pat Quigley explained the proposed Fairview Village Overlay Ordinance and pointed out that the current overlay boundary did not extend to his property.

Mr. Michael Petrecz requested to be added to the outreach roster that the Township uses to contact residents.

Discussion and questions ensued.

2. **FAIRVIEW VILLAGE:**
Mr. Matthew Schelly would like to focus on the central core of Fairview Village Planning the next time the Planning Commission meets.

Ms. Quigley inquired what materials could be sent ahead of time since there is not a quorum this evening.

Mr. Schelly discussed the analysis regarding the yield plan and how many homes are needed to support the businesses that would be implemented in the propose Fairview Village Overlay Ordinance.

Mr. Charles Venezia commented on the overlay map. He is concerned about vacancies in the area; whether it is vacant land or vacant buildings and with the high density of the residential area that he is a part of that directly affects him and his neighbors.

Discussion and questions ensued.

3. **CEDAR VILLAGE OVERLAY ORDINANCE:**

Mr. Schelly handed out the latest and greatest proposed draft ordinance. He specifically addressed transferable development rights and suggested that this be an entire separate ARTICLE in and of itself.

Discussion and questions ensued.

4. **SIGNAGE:**

Mr. Schelly brought examples of the trade center signage. He stated that this sign is the least readable out of all the signage.

Discussion and questions ensued.

5. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:**

Tabled.

6. **PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA FOR AUGUST 25, 2011 MEETING:**

The Planning Commission shall be discussing 2750 Morris Rd for preliminary/ final approval recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, Village Planning, final recommendations regarding zoning amendment language for signage, approval consideration for the minutes drafted for the July 28th, 2011 & August 11th, 2011, and the agenda for the September 22nd, 2011 meeting.

7. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Richard DeLello commented on internally illuminated signage. He feels that this issue should be specifically addressed and that these kinds of signs offer less light pollution than other types of externally lit signs. He further commented on the Cedars Village planning proposed ordinance.

Mr. Venezia commented that internally lit signs create less light pollution than spot lights & over hanging lights.

Ms. Pat Quigley explained that the basis for the long held position of non-internally illuminated signs was the goal of protecting the rural and historical character.

Mr. Robert Hayes agreed that the Township's position on non-illuminated signs was not based on light pollution concerns but on preserving the rural character of the Township.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before this committee, the meeting of the Worcester Township Planning Commission was adjourned by Ms. Quigley, at 8:49 P.M.