Regular Session – 7:30 P.M.

1. Approval of Minutes.

2. Review of a subdivision application for 675 Cathcart Road (S-5-19). This application involves a 2-lot subdivision of approximately 3.0 acres parcel located at 675 Cathcart Road. The property is zoned R-1 Residential Zoning District.

   Comments:
   - See attached memo dated September 25, 2019.

3. Review of a land development application for the Five Points Gulf Parking Lot Expansion (LD-5-19). This land development involves the construction of a new parking lot for automobile repair storage located at 1626 Narcissa Road. The property is zoned R-1 Residential Zoning District.

   Comments:
   - The area designated for the Woodland Canopy Preservation should be identified on the Plan. The outer edge of the preservation area should be provided with tree protection fencing. The tree protection fencing could coincide with the limit of disturbance identified on the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (sheet 2 of 4).
   - Since no light fixtures are identified for the proposed inventory parking area, it is assumed that none will be provided.
   - It is unclear to me whether the inventory parking will be paved. Since this will not be used as conventional parking I would not object to a stone or pervious material (this is subject to review and approval by Jim Blanch). However, if this area is not paved then a perimeter
wood collar should be provided in order to identify the approved area for inventory parking and to prevent the parking area from suffering from unwanted creep.

- The Zoning Hearing Board decision is referred to in the Zoning Chart. However, it is recommended that the entire decision including all conditions be noted on the Improvement Plan.

4. Review Ordinance #4-257 – An ordinance amending the Township’s Zoning Code by amending Article XXX, Section 160-235 [Applications to Zoning Hearing Board] to (1) add a requirement that certain information must be included with any Conditional Use Application; and (2) to remove certain requirements for the submission of plans and other materials as part of Conditional Use Applications.

Comments:

- In addition to the information listed I would suggest language that would permit the supervisors to require that a traffic impact study and architectural renderings of proposed buildings be submitted as part of the application.

5. Review current zoning hearing board applications:

1. ZHB #2199-19 Sentry 660, LLC (350 Sentry Parkway Bidg. 660, Ste. 200) Signage

Comments:

- Please see below comments from memo dated August 12, 2019.

  ➢ On previous applications such as this it has been recommended that the building façade signage be limited to only those tenants that represent the largest occupancy within a particular building. According to the application addendum at #3 this applicant leases 8,000 sf or 51.6% of the total of 15,500 sf of leasable area of building unit 660. So the current applicant meets this test.

  ➢ In addition, back-lit illuminated channel letters is leading edge design and is recommended with the caveat that lighting be extinguished during those periods required under the general sign regulations.

2. ZHB #2201-19 Rafaela Miett (1127 Fairview Ave) Dog Sitting

Comments:

- Please see below comments from memo dated August 12, 2019.
This type of application raises the question of whether the proposed use of "Personal Private Specialized Canine Care" is more akin to a veterinary use than to an accessory use in a residential district. As a first test it is suggested that the applicant for such a use indicate compliance with all standards at Section 160-212 Standards for Home Occupations.

Primary concerns have to do with noise, sanitary impacts, whether or not grooming will be a service provided by the homeowner.

From my point of view, any specialized canine care approved by the Board should be limited to a maximum of one animal at a time. Any greater number would pose a greater potential impact and raise and make enforcement very problematic.

3. ZHB #2212-19  
John McDevitt  
(1110 Diary Lane)  
Accessory Structure  
Comments:

- This is a residential application and typically the Planning Commission remains neutral unless the proposal has a community wide effect.

4. ZHB #2213-19  
720 Penllyn Pike, LLC  
(720 & 730 Penllyn Blue Bell Pike)  
Multiple Relief for 11 Lot Subdivision  
Comments:

- The subject application is split zoned consisting of two properties. The southerly property formerly used for surplus parking for the Boehm's Church is zoned IN — Institutional. The northerly property which consists of about 40% of the application is zoned Residential R-1.

- The property is bounded on three sides by land zoned and developed for R-1 Residential.

- Village Circle, which is the product of a 50 year old zoning challenge, consists of lots ranging from approximately 11,400 sf to approximately 19,600 sf.

- The property between Village Circle and the subject is owned by Edgar David, 740 Penllyn Blue Bell Pike which had special qualities and included the preservation of noteworthy architecture as well as environmentally sensitive open space. That property borders the C – Commercial District and had a yield of 7 lots on over 4.16 acres or a density of less than 2.0 dwelling units per acre.

- It seems to me that the development of the property should be evaluated in the context of the R-1 District, which requires a minimum lot area of 30,000 sf.
• The net site area is only 2.85 acres which yields a proposed density of 2.9 dwelling units per acre. By comparison, this density is two and one half times the density permitted under the Cluster Development Option which for much larger acreage would permit a maximum density of 1.1 dwelling units per acre.

• The proposed dimensional variances required to implement the proposed subdivision of 11 single family lots seem largely unjustified and not related to existing or proposed adjacent development densities.

5. ZHB #2214-19
   Alecia N. Youngblood & Pamela J. Schlender-Youngblood
   (1602 Muhlenburg Drive)

   Comments:

   • This is a residential application and typically the Planning Commission remains neutral unless the proposal has a community wide effect.

6. ZHB #2215-19
   BAT-PA Associates, LP
   (901 W. Butler Pike)

   Comments:

   • This is another fact based application which is difficult to fully evaluate until all the details are provided. For example, outdoor dining has been an obvious trend for other local restaurants which have sought similar relief.

   • It would be helpful to know the number of parking spaces that would be triggered by the application and the anticipated shortfall of available onsite parking to accommodate the use.

   • In the past, it has been suggested that applicants consider the decommissioning of certain indoor seats to accommodate outdoor dining.

   • Also, it would be interesting to know the type of outdoor music proposed (for example live instruments or recorded sound). As with other applications, time limits will be necessary.

6. Review pertinent planning issues.
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Wednesday, September 25, 2019

TO: Jim Blanch

FROM: E. Van Rieker, AICP

CC: Jason Smeland

RE: 675 Cathcart Road (S-5-19)

Jim,

I have reviewed the proposed 2 lot subdivision plan consisting of 10 sheets with a plan origination date of 7-09-2019 and would offer the following comments limited to general planning issues only:

1. It is suggested that the side yard designation for Lot #1 be adjusted to reflect the Tree Canopy Protection Easement. Since this is considered a no-build area the building envelope should exclude the Protection Easement – it generally does with the exception of the aforementioned side yard.

2. A detail on sheet #8 of 10 identifies “sensitive area/tree protection” detail. However, the Construction Improvement Plan at sheet #4 of 10 should also delineate the location of the protection fence which basically should parallel the outer edge of the Tree Canopy Protection Easement for Lot #2 and any additional area on Lot #1 where construction or earth disturbance is contemplated.

3. Please note at sheet #5 that the correct spelling of the Genus for Scarlet Oak is Quercus.

If there questions, do not hesitate to contact me.