WORCESTER TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION MEETING
WORCESTER TOWNSHIP COMMUNITY HALL
FAIRVIEW VILLAGE, WORCESTER, PA
THURSDAY, JULY 14th, 2011 7:30 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Mr. Gordon Todd at 7:31 P.M.

ATTENDANCE

PRESENT:

Gordon Todd	Chairman
Pat Quigley	Vice Chairman
Paul Ziegler	Secretary
Robert Hayes	Member
Doug Rotondo	Member
Matthew Schelly	Township Planning Consultant, Montgomery County Planning Commission

ABSENT:

None

GUESTS:

Ms. Susan Caughlan: Overhill Dr Resident
Mr. Richard DeLello: Stony Creek Rd Resident
Mr. Charles Venezia: Germantown Pk Resident
Ms. Julie Pacaro: Locust Dr Resident
Mr. Anthony Pacaro: Locust Dr Resident

1. **ZONING AMENDMENT DISCUSSION:**

- SIGNAGE

The Planning Commission discussed creating a bullet point list of proposed language changes to be presented to the Board of Supervisors at their joint meeting scheduled for August 1st, 2011. Mr. Matthew Schelly passed out 2 handouts showing exact measurements for Center Point Shopping Center & Cedars Country Store current signage.

Mr. Gordon Todd was thinking of recommending that shopping center signage be allowed a maximum total of 60 square feet. The first 40 square feet would be strictly for the complex signage, and then the additional 20 square feet left over would be used for moveable letter board signage. Mr. Robert Hayes is concerned that the movable letter board signage would look tacky. Ms. Pat Quigley would like to see the moveable portion of the signage be made mandatory.

Mr. Todd re-addressed that posts that are less than 6"inches x 6" inches in width are to not be incorporated into the sign square footage calculation.

Ms. Susan Caughlan inquired as to where temporary signage can go regarding shopping centers and then proposed balloon signage as an alternative.

Ms. Pat Quigley further reiterated that she would like temporary signage to be part of the main section of the signage.

Flip frame signage was proposed as an option as part of the on-going discussion regarding signage in the shopping center and commercially zoned districts.

Mr. Todd would like to limit signage located in the commercially zoned district to one sign and inhabit the ability of flip frame signage. Mr. Schelly handed out an aerial of Center Point Village.

There was discussion amongst the Planning Commission Members that signage be allowed in the ultimate right-of-way, however restitution if the road is ever widened would not be allowed. Ultimately there would be a waiver clause.

Questions and discussion ensued.

2. **VILLAGE PLANNING:**

- FAIRVIEW VILLAGE PLANNING

Mr. Gordon Todd opened the discussion to the public. Ms. Caughlan stated that lot size needs to be differentiated from the use of the land.

Mr. Charles Venezia inquired as to how setbacks are being determined for businesses within residential limits. He further explained that many of the lots near his property are extremely narrow in nature. Mr. Todd replied that there is a lot of open space behind the homes located in the rear yards.

Mr. Venezia would like to see low impact commercial uses located within the residential limits (i.e. offices).

Mr. Robert Hayes would like to hear from everyone located in the Fairview Village Planning District radius as to where the overlay district lines should reside.

Mr. Todd and Ms. Quigley further explained that there would have to be differentiation between the permitted uses (i.e. define clinic, medical office, bed & breakfast, etc...)

Mr. Doug Rotondo is fifty/fifty (50/50) between the two opinions.

Mr. Richard DeLello would like to hear from more of the residents as to their opinions.

Mr. Schelly explained various options and that the current R-100 Zoning does not have a historic preservation clause. Mr. Doug Rotondo further explained the example of the old carriage house that was torn down before the Rite Aid building was built and that it is necessary for a historic ordinance to be enacted.

Mr. Todd does not think that the bed & breakfast idea is a viable option. He is more in favor for creating overlay language for individuals that buy older homes, don't have the financial means at the time to fix the home, however give them the ability to build a shop/ low impact business in the back to create income, and then from those earning enable the property owner to fix up their home.

Mr. Paul Ziegler is fifty/fifty (50/50) between the two opinions as well. He believes there is an obligation to satisfy the needs of the current residents by holding a public meeting to gain further feedback and then in addition plan for the future. By holding a forum there will be different opinions discussed and from that point the overlay ideas and language can become more detailed.

Mr. Venezia is concerned with the here and now and keeping the integrity of his property and surrounding properties in their current state.

An overall outline was discussed regarding presenting draft language and main concepts. Questions and discussion ensued.

3. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:**
A motion by Mr. Doug Rotondo for approval of the minutes for the meeting held on June 23rd, 2011 contingent upon grammatical changes being made, seconded by Mr. Robert Hayes, was passed unanimously.

4. **PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING HELD ON JULY 28th, 2011:**
The Planning Commission shall be discussing approval consideration for preliminary/ final plan recommendation to the Board of Supervisors regarding the DePhillippo Land Development Plan located at 1074 Grange Avenue, the Planning Commission minutes drafted for the July 14th, 2011 meeting, the Planning Commission agenda for the joint meeting held with the Board of Supervisors scheduled for August 1st, 2011, the Planning Commission work session meeting scheduled for August 11th, 2011, zoning amendment language regarding signage, and village planning for Fairview Village.

5. **MERIT BADGE PROJECT**
Mr. Anthony Pacaro is completing a merit badge project for his Boy Scout Troop and had a few questions for the Planning commission.

He inquired as to what kind of historic ordinances Worcester Township has. The Planning Commission replied, none. Mr. Rotondo further explained that municipalities in Chester County are far more forthright to prohibit historical sites from being demolished and that Worcester Township needs a similar ordinance.

Mr. Pacaro asked if a building were to be demolished what he could do to prohibit the building from being destroyed. Mr. Ziegler answered to contact all local politicians, state representatives, and head up the latter. Also, he further explained to put all requests to political officials in writing. Ms. Caughlan further commented that it is important to create an environment for the property owner where they will work with the Township and not against the Township.

6. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
Mr. Richard DeLello asked Mr. Schelly what is done with the overages now in Montgomery County's current contract. Mr. Schelly stated that the Montgomery County does not get paid for overtime/ overages.

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 8:52 P.M.

WORCESTER TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
WORCESTER TOWNSHIP COMMUNITY HALL
FAIRVIEW VILLAGE, WORCESTER, PA
THURSDAY, JULY 28th, 2011 7:30 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER
The regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Mr. Gordon Todd at 7:31 P.M.

ATTENDANCE

PRESENT:

Gordon Todd	Chairman
Pat Quigley	Vice Chairman
Paul Ziegler	Secretary
Doug Rotondo	Member
Matthew Schelly	Township Planning Consultant, Montgomery County Planning Commission

ABSENT:

Robert Hayes	Member

GUESTS:

Mr. Joseph J. Nolan, P.E.: Township Engineer
Mr. Anthony Hibbeln, P.E.: Hibbeln Engineering – Representative for 1074 Grange Ave Land Development Plan
Mr. Domenic DePhillippo: Grange Ave Resident
Mrs. Margaret DePhillippo: Grange Ave Resident
Mr. Christopher Drummond: Anvil Dr Resident
Mr. Philip Burke: Grange Ave Resident
Mr. Richard DeLello: Stony Creek Rd Resident
Mr. Charles Venezia: Germantown Pk Resident

1. **DEPHILLIPPO LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN:**
   - PRELIMINARY/ FINAL PLAN APPROVAL FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

     Mr. Anthony Hibbeln, P.E. presented the revised land development plan to the Planning Commission. The land development plan proposed the construction of a 12' feet by 20'feet temporary enclosure on the subject property. This land development plan is being submitted in order to comply with the Zoning Hearing Board Decision (99-3) dated June 22, 1999, regarding the subject property and the uses of the property. Mr. Hibbeln further explained that in addition to what is on the plan more trees and vegetation has been added throughout the property.

     Mr. Doug Rotondo inquired as to why it is proposed as a temporary structure opposed to a permanent structure. Mr. DePhillippo stated that at some point the proposed structure would be removed once there is no use for it.

     Ms. Pat Quigley inquired as to what the height is. Mr. Hibbeln replied 10' feet to 12' feet.

     Mr. Matt Schelly addressed the riparian corridor. Montgomery County would like to see native plants instead of grass.

Mr. Paul Ziegler inquired if the shed is being used for winter storage. Mr. Hibbeln stated no. Mr. DePhillippo stated at some point the shed will be removed once there is no use for it.

Mr. DePhillippo addressed that he does not mow past the stream. Ms. Quigley stated that there is evasive species inhabiting that space and bamboo has been planted.

Mr. Joseph Nolan, P.E. stated that anything can be planted if it is not a required buffer. He additionally requested that a statement be added to the plans that wetlands are not present to address the County's comment.

Mr. Nolan recommended strongly that no building permit be obtained until compliance is obtained with impervious coverage and further explained CKS's review item #2 regarding an adequate buffer regarding the requirements set forth by SALDO. He went on to explain that the Planning Commission may recommend more buffering if need be. Ms. Quigley further inquired about buffering.

Mr. Todd stated that there is additional planting that is not represented on the plan.

Mr. Hibbeln further explained that twelve (12) new spruce trees have been planted. Mr. Nolan inquired as to why the trees are not on the plan. Ms. Quigley further went on to ask if the applicant can determine if they currently meet the definition of Worcester's screening buffer, and if so, to show that calculation on a revised plan.

Ms. Quigley requested to have the buffer calculation verified due to the twelve (12) new spruce trees being planted.

Mr. Hibbeln explained that there is an opaque fence that is 6' high acting as buffer between the property and Ms. Susan Koch's property.

Ms. Quigley inquired about the buffering line regarding the entire property line. Mr. Nolan went on to explain that this being a new application and that today's buffering requirements and standards apply. The current buffer was required by the 1999 ZHB decision and order not by SALDO.

Mr. Hibbeln stated it is onerous to apply the SALDO buffering standards. Mr. Nolan explained that the Chapter 130 applies and all standards must be met unless a waiver is granted.

Mr. Ziegler stated that he would like to see the applicant meet the screening requirements for the adjacent property owner(s) benefit.

Mr. Todd stated that he agrees that the buffer should be installed due to the situation, however it will cost more to plant the required plantings that to install the temporary structure.

Mr. Nolan stated that there is not a provision in our zoning code that permits a temporary structure.

Ms. Quigley requested that the applicant evaluate the existing buffering to the current standards outlined in Chapter 130.

Mr. Drummond stated that he would like his interests to be protected and referenced the 2003 court hearing. He commented on the applicants existing garage, equipment, and the overall use of the property.

Mr. Todd asked Mr. Nolan to further explain the appeal referenced by Mr. Drummond.

Mr. Nolan stated there was a variance by estoppels granted by the courts. The zoning hearing board decision and order from 1999 does not require the equipment to be stored in the garage.

Mr. DeLello asked if it is the interpretation of the Township that this property does not currently required a variance.

Mr. Nolan stated yes. Mr. Todd further explained that the filing of the land development plan is a requirement of the decision and order rendered in 1999.

Mr. Drummond had questions regarding the bamboo that has been planted on the applicant's property. He stated that if the bamboo is not removed, that is currently travelling into his property, it will start killing the back of his woods and trees that are adjacent to the applicant's property. He has requested that the bamboo be removed.

Mr. Burke referenced the zoning hearing board decision from 1999 regarding the equipment being stored outside. The property is currently zoned R175 and not AGR as originally stated. Mr. Burke is correct regarding the proper zoning district classification for the property.

Mr. Hibbeln verified that 336 square feet and a height of 10' feet to 12' feet is the total area and height of the structure.

Mr. Ziegler would like to address the buffer on all sides of the property.

Ms. Quigley re-addressed the screening buffer and requested the applicant perform an audit / assessment of the current buffer. She is not comfortable with providing an approval recommendation until this information is provided.

Mr. Hibbeln inquired about being scheduled for the August 11th, 2011 Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Burke addressed condition #11 of the zoning hearing board decision rendered in 1999 regarding the four (4) trees that were planted. He stated that if this were addressed over ten (10) years ago the adjacent property owners would not be here this evening.

Mr. DeLello is concerned about the Planning Commission having not walked the applicant's property. He feels they should walk the site before making a decision. Ms. Quigley addressed that the permission of the property owner is needed.

Mr. Nolan also stated that permission from the property owner is needed and that the township has been denied access in the past by the applicant to investigate the property.

Mr. Todd is extremely concerned about the bamboo. He requested to walk the property and Mr. DePhillippo stated that would be fine.

Mr. Todd recommended tabling the matter until the next scheduled meeting, August 11, 2011. He stated that that a site visit should be scheduled and the tabulation report be submitted before then. The Planning Commission, Mr. Hibbeln, and the applicant agreed to the recommendation.

Discussion and questions ensued.

2. **ZONING AMENDMENT DISCUSSION:**

- SIGNAGE

  Mr. Todd handed out a signage informational packet. He addressed definitions and many issues within the sign ordinance specifically relating to the commercial & shopping center zoning.

  Mr. DeLello verified what was being said in how to calculate signage.

Mr. DeLello addressed that part of having multiple signs is to identify the property for individuals traveling so there are not visibility issues. He referenced Sunny Brook Estates regarding the three existing entrances.

Mr. Todd stated that Sunny Brook Estates does not have as much connection with Worcester Township due to it bordering Whitpain Township.

Mr. Ziegler inquired as to why Mr. DeLello wants a signage installed at Sunny Brook Estates. Mr. DeLello replied that people cannot find the development, for directional capabilities, and the sense of community.

Mr. DeLello has an issue with the proposed width that is allowable regarding 6" x 6" in the overall calculation of sign area. He stated this would not allow a stone structure.

Mr. Ziegler asked Mr. DeLello if the residents of Sunny Brook Estates want a sign at each entrance. Mr. DeLello stated that they do and are looking to install something visually appealing in order identify the property.

Mr. Schelly stated that signs installed in developments for the community add value. He inquired as to what entrance does not have the ability to have a sign at this current time. Mr. DeLello stated and explained that the entrance off of Morris Rd does not have the ability to have a sign by-right.

Questions and discussion ensued.

3. **VILLAGE PLANNING - FAIRVIEW VILLAGE PLANNING:**
Mr. Gordon Todd tabled the discussion until the next scheduled Planning Commission held.

4. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:**
A motion by Ms. Pat Quigley for approval of the minutes for the meeting held on July 14th, 2011 contingent upon grammatical changes being made, seconded by Mr. Paul Ziegler, was passed unanimously.

5. **PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING HELD ON JULY 28th, 2011:**
The Planning Commission shall be discussing village planning for Fairview Village, zoning amendment language regarding signage, approval consideration for the minutes drafted for the July 28th, 2011 meeting, and the agenda for the August 25th, 2011 meeting.

6. **PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA FOR NEXT JOINT MEETING HELD WITH THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON AUGUST 1st, 2011:**
The Planning Commission shall be discussing with the Board of Supervisors approval consideration for the minutes drafted for the February 7th, 2011 meeting, zoning amendment language regarding signage, and village planning.

7. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
None

8. **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 9:40 P.M.