

WORCESTER TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION MEETING
WORCESTER TOWNSHIP COMMUNITY HALL
FAIRVIEW VILLAGE, WORCESTER, PA
Thursday, January 10th, 2013 7:31 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Mr. Gordon Todd at 7:32 P.M.

ATTENDANCE

PRESENT:

Gordon Todd	Chairman
Pat Quigley	Vice Chairman
Doug Rotondo	Secretary (<i>Arrived at 7:35pm</i>)
Chris David	Member
Tiffany M. Loomis	Township Zoning Officer
Matthew Schelly	Township Planning Consultant, Montgomery County Planning Commission

ABSENT:

Anthony R. Sherr Member

1. APPOINTMENT OF PLANNING COMMISSION POSITIONS:

- A motion by Ms. Quigley, seconded by Ms. David for Mr. Todd to serve as the Planning Commission Chairman, was passed unanimously.
- A motion by Mr. Todd, seconded by Ms. David for Ms. Quigley to serve as Planning Commission Vice Chairman, was passed unanimously.
- A motion by Ms. Quigley, seconded by Ms. David for Mr. Rotondo to serve as the Planning Commission Secretary, was passed unanimously.
- Members of the Planning Commission are Ms. Chris David and Mr. Tony Sherr.

2. LIGHTING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT:

Mr. Schelly reviewed his official review letter, dated January 9, 2013 with the WTPC. He noted that the proposed Lighting Ordinance appeared to be comprehensive and contained many well written provisions.

In his review letter, Mr. Schelly raised six questions which he believed should be considered by the WTPC in their review of the proposed ordinance.

His review questions related to compatibility with the Subdivision & Land Development Ordinance need for inclusion of new terms into a definition section, decisions regarding which activities would be allowed to use the lights, whether to restrict the illumination to certain times of the year, and whether there should be an exception to the restriction on recorded music. In addition, he noted that section B(7) should be divided into two paragraphs as it covers two topics.

Ms. Quigley did not favor the creation of additional documentation requirements in the SALDO Ordinance, stating that the new ordinance seems to be very technical and includes details on the required illumination standards and criteria. She was in agreement with the recommendation to add separate definitions. She did not favor the restriction against recorded music vs. live music or the restriction against using lights for practice by all teams, band or cheer squads.

Ms. David agreed with Ms. Quigley's comments and added that the ordinance should be clearer regarding when the field can be illuminated and that Section B(7) should be separated into two paragraphs/numbered items, as well as clearer definitions provided.

Mr. Todd is in agreement with Ms. Quigley and Ms. David's comments in relation to Mr. Schelly's review letter.

Mr. Rotondo wants to know where the ordinance came from. He inquired if the school made a proposal yet to Worcester Township

Mr. Eric Fry, Esq. explained the process that has occurred to date to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Todd inquired as to who was involved in the process.

Mr. Fry answered that Solicitor, Manager, and Supervisors have been directing the process.

Mr. Fry pointed out an inconsistency in the ordinance between Section 150-200 A and Section B(5) regarding the screening of illumination. Section 1500-200A, states that lights shall be screened to not be seen off the premise, whereas the later section allows lights to be screened to the maximum extent possible. Fry recommends the provision for "maximum extent possible."

Additionally, he has an issue with B(4) of the ordinance in how much light is allowed at the property line in measurements of foot candles. Mr. Fry has requested that it changed to 0.5; otherwise the School District will not be able to comply. He stated foot candles are usually measured by the horizontal. He has an issue with limiting the lights to just games and agrees with that professional requirements do not need to be a part of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. He has requested that more music types of music be allowed in ordinance.

Mr. Rotondo asked if the School District was expecting an approved ordinance on 1/16 by the Board of Supervisors and why all of sudden the issue appeared on the agenda.

Mr. Frank Senk, a resident of the Milestone community, commented and addressed on the number of times the kids can actually use the fields during the week and the weekend. Additionally, he addressed hours the field could be used, asking if the times could be extended on Friday and Saturday to 11:00 pm, since there is usually there is an hour lag

time after the game ends. Have a greater opportunity to have Thurs, Fri, and Sat night use nights and have full use.

Ms. Marsha Staples has requested for the Planning Commission to not take a position. There was a technical review due to the Township today and was submitted late.

Ms. Byrne conducted a petition regarding the interests and the concerns about the lighting further explaining that 785 were in support of the installation of the lights. She addressed that there were a few safety and environmental concerns and how it is extremely difficult to control the hours when there is overtime.

Mr. Rotondo inquired as to how many individuals were from Worcester Township. Ms. Burn answered approx 40% are Worcester residents.

Ms. Byrne responded that Lower Providence and Worcester Township both attend the school and is representing the majority.

Dr. Mollick commented on Mr. Rotondo's comments and on the overall process, and is pleased with the results.

Mr. Senk re-commented on how lighting affects the children's moral. He additionally commented on doing business in Worcester Township and how individuals make comments that if you are not from Worcester don't bother doing business in Worcester. He believes sports are important in developing children.

Mr. Dave Kearny commented on the having restrictions that work for the school and for the neighbors. He addressed all the surrounding houses and how they will be affected further explaining there could have been various solutions.

Mr. Todd stated that he has lived in Worcester a long time and that compromises are necessary when issues such as this arise.

Ms. Quigley noted that the primary focus of the public comments were concerns about the timing and intensity of illumination on the property edge. She stated that the Township has been making progress with the different parties and the proposed ordinance goes a long way to addressing the issues.

Mr. Todd stated that time and number of days will be an issue. Mr. Kearny was in agreement.

Mr. Todd stated for the record that the Planning Commission will not be taking formal action. The Planning Commission has agreed to not make a formal recommendation at this time but to include all discussion in the meeting minutes.

3. **SIGN ORDINANCE AMENDMENT:**

Mr. Todd presented the drawings he drafted from Mr. Joseph Gambone's presentation.

The first rendering represents a 30" inch high wall with a 15'6" sign height containing a 64 square foot signage.

The second rendering is a vantage point drawing to determine what signage is more visible.

Ms. Quigley thought the diagram with the sign set back approximately 30 feet and aligned toward the corner was the better placement of the sign for people in cars.

Ms. David is not comfortable with the 16' in height of proposed signage and believes it is too big overall. She defers to the architects on the Planning Commission

Mr. Rotondo inquired if the sign could be incorporated into the wall or be integrated at the midpoint of the arc.

Mr. Todd thinks the signs should be separate.

Ms. David thinks that there are 4 tenant signs proposed for the corner sign with one being changeable.

Mr. Rotondo addressed that the changing signage could make people think that the business has closed when the temporary signage is removed.

Mr. Schelly addressed that entire development was originally meant for offices and retail is now located in the space.

Ms. David stated that most of the building signs are easily readable from the road regarding signage attached to the actual building. Mr. Todd disagrees because the buildings are so far back.

Ms. David readdressed that the signage is too big and cited Mr. Schelly's example of large signage in his presentation that reference a 16' sign listing 4 tenants.

Proportionally was discussed among all members.

Ms. Schelly suggested that you should anticipate 3 tenants per building sign.

Mr. Todd will revise the sign proposal by minimizing the height for next meetings discussion.

Ms. Caughlan suggested a percentage calculation

Mr. Schelly suggested a photograph overlay for next meeting for joint meeting presentation scheduled 2/4/2013.

The Planning Commission agreed that there will be a total of 4 signs with one main shopping center sign at the corner of Rte 73 & 363 and 3 smaller signs, and one for each building.

4. **PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA SCHEDULED FOR JANUARY 24th, 2013:**

- 2845 Potshop Rd: Roman Brothers Subdivision
- Sign Ordinance Amendment
- Joint Meeting Agenda with Board of Supervisors scheduled for February 4th, 2013
- Planning Commission Meeting Agenda scheduled for February 14th, 2013

5. **MINUTES:**

A motion by Ms. David, seconded by Ms. Quigley for the approval of the minutes for the meeting held on December 13th, 2012, was passed unanimously.

6. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Schelly handed out an article on the power of creative place-making.

Dr. Mollick inquired about the email from Mr. John Harris.

Mr. Todd gave the email to Dr. Mollick.

Dr. Mollick inquired if there were more communications between the light community groups & Planning Commission and if the Supervisors discussed the lighting ordinance privately. He then complimented the Planning Commission.

The Planning Commission stated that they had no knowledge of any Board of Supervisors communications.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before this committee the meeting of the Worcester Township Planning Commission was adjourned by Mr. Gordon Todd at 8:59 P.M.

WORCESTER TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
WORCESTER TOWNSHIP COMMUNITY HALL
FAIRVIEW VILLAGE, WORCESTER, PA
Thursday, January 24th, 2013 7:30 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Mr. Gordon Todd at 7:35 P.M.

ATTENDANCE

PRESENT:

Gordon Todd	Chairman
Pat Quigley	Vice Chairman
Chris David	Member
Anthony R. Sherr	Member
Tiffany M. Loomis	Township Zoning Officer
Matthew Schelly	Township Planning Consultant, Montgomery County Planning Commission

ABSENT:

Doug Rotondo	Secretary
--------------	-----------

1. 2845 POTSHOP RD – ROMAN BROTHERS SUBDIVISION:

- PRELIMINARY/ FINAL APPROVAL RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR CONSIDERATION
 - THE PLAN PROPOSES THE SUBDIVISION OF AN 11 ACRE PARCEL INTO 3 LOTS. THE SUBJECT PARCEL HAS FRONTAGE ALONG THE EAST SIDE OF POTSHOP ROAD IN THE AGR ZONING DISTRICT. LOT 1 CONTAINS A SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING, WHICH TAKES ACCESS FROM POTSHOP ROAD. LOTS 2 & 3 WOULD ALSO ACCESS FROM POTSHOP ROAD FROM A SHARED DRIVEWAY. THE LOTS ARE PROPOSED TO BE SERVED BY ON-LOT SEWAGE FACILITIES AND PUBLIC WATER.

Mr. George Stanbridge presented the proposed plan to the Planning Commission on behalf of Peter & Andrew Roman.

Mr. Stanbridge addresses that the barn is not there due to the wall collapsing and how there are a total 3 lots compared to the original 4 lots proposed. He further indicated that the alluvial soil line has been located and addressed.

Mr. Gordon Todd asked how the previous growing greener subdivision was different from this plan. Mr. Stanbridge stated that there were 4 lots and the access drive was re-located.

Ms. Pat Quigley clarified that this is a subdivision plan, not additionally a land development plan.

Mr. Tony Sherr clarified that notes will be placed on the plan to satisfy the Township Engineer's comments.

Mr. Sherr inquired what would be the difference if they used the conservation subdivision. Mr. Matthew Schelly explained that there is an open space option where the open space is preserved and the homes would be on smaller lots.

Mr. Stanbridge considered this option, however could not come up with a plan that was pleasing. He has created and proposed a low density development.

Mr. Todd is in disagreement of putting a dense buffer near the road and does not agree with the regimented look of the trees proposed down the roadway.

Mr. Stanbridge recognizes that the developer will replace any trees that are removed.

Mr. Schelly wanted to express and show the difference between rural character and suburban character.

Ms. Quigley does not feel strongly requiring a conservation subdivision due to the lots being reduced to 3 lots, originally 4 lots were proposed. She is not concerned with the buffers presented and wants the major resources protected that are currently shown.

Mr. Stanbridge is in agreement.

Ms. Chris David inquired if a trail easement was given consideration. Mr. Stanbridge stated he is aware of this option; however the Developer is not considering this option at this time.

Discussion and questions ensued regarding trails.

Inquires were made regarding the current trail plans that are on the books with Montgomery County Planning Commission. Mr. Schelly gave numerous options regarding where the trail could be located.

Ms. Quigley stated that she is not comfortable without the other adjacent property owners being present discussing the location of a possible trail.

Mr. Sherr addressed that a trail may only be requested, however it is not required.

Mr. Schelly clarified that waivers are requested.

Mr. Todd directed the conversation to the Developer.

Mr. Peter Roman has been a resident in the Township for 18 years. He explained that this particular intersection has a very high bank in comparison to the paved road. He clarified that there is hardly anyone ever at Nike Park and how the proposed trail that would go through the property would be towards the back thru the tributary and would be through the wetlands. He and Mr. Andrew Roman are opposed to the trail easement.

Mr. Peter Roman further clarified that when they came in a year ago there were 4 lots and they took the Planning Commission and residents concerns into consideration, which in turn led them to propose a 3 lot subdivision.

Mr. Roman clarified that he is planning to hold onto the 2 building lots for years to come and could see the lots being farmed. Additionally, he and his brother have fixed up the farmhouse.

Ms. Quigley inquired if CKS's concerns could be addressed. Mr. Stanbridge replied yes.

Ms. Caughlan inquired about a preservation conservation easement for the riparian corridor.

Mr. Schelly addressed the waivers and recommended a partial waiver for 130.33.C

Mr. Stanbridge stated he will clarify that it is the 500 ft requirement of which the aerial and conceptual plan satisfy this requirement.

RECOMMENDATION:

A motion by Mr. Todd, seconded by Mr. Sherr, recommending preliminary approval consideration to the Board of Supervisors contingent upon CKS's review dated 12/18/2012, and including a conservation easement along the riparian corridor up to and including Zone 2, was unanimously voted upon.

2. SIGN ORDINANCE AMENDMENT:

- DISCUSSION REGARDING SHOPPING CENTER & COMMERCIAL ZONING DISTRICT(S)
 - RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR CONSIDERATION

Ms. David measured the "Giant" Grocery Store signage off of Rte 202 in Whitpain referencing the size.

Mr. Schelly addressed that the Cedars Country Store signage is 13'.

Mr. Sherr stated that this new rendering has been scaled down and this particular shopping center is unique to Worcester.

There was extensive discussion regarding height. Mr. Schelly is presenting a rendering and a study of the measurements with a different size and orientation at the next joint meeting.

The Planning Commission will discuss the 3 building sign's size at the joint meeting regarding Center Point Shopping Center. Mr. Schelly will be giving a presentation with recommendations.

3. **JOINT MEETING AGENDA HELD WITH THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SCHEDULED FOR FEBRUARY 4TH, 2013:**

- Minutes
- Sign Ordinance Amendment - Invite Joe Gambone
- Lighting Ordinance Amendment

4. **PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA SCHEDULED FOR FEBRUARY 14TH, 2013 MEETING:**

- Minutes
- Sign Ordinance Amendment
- Agenda

5. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:**

A motion by Ms. David, seconded by Ms. Quigley for the approval of the minutes for the meeting held on January 10th, 2013 contingent upon minor corrections, was passed unanimously.

6. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Dr. Mollick inquired about a discussion between the Board of Supervisors and Mr. Todd regarding signage. Dr. Mollick is concerned with the process of how information is communicated with the Planning Commission and the Supervisors.

Dr. Mollick commented on the ordinance amendment process.

Mr. Sherr inquired if there were any other additional comments from Dr. Mollick.

Mr. Todd clarified that the Planning Commission communicates with the Board of Supervisors regarding ordinance amendments including the sign ordinance amendment.

Dr. Mollick inquired as to Mr. Schelly's employment status with Worcester Township.

Discussion and questions ensued regarding the formal recommendation process of MCPC and Worcester Township Planning Commission.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before this committee the meeting of the Worcester Township Planning Commission was adjourned by Mr. Gordon Todd at 9:23 P.M.