

MINUTES OF MEETING
SPRINGFIELDTOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
March 6, 2012

The Springfield Township Planning Commission (PC) held its semi-monthly meeting on the date noted above. Chairman Bob Gutowski called the meeting to order at 6:59 PM, with the following members present: Amanda Helwig, Mary Holland, David Sands, Bob Gutowski, Angela Murray, James Mascaro, Joseph Devine and Steve Schagrin. Rob Dunlop Staff Liaison represented the Township and Jean Holland represented the Montgomery County Planning Commission (MCPC) this evening. Commissioner James Dailey and George Schaefer were absent.

Minutes: Minutes of the February 21st, 2012 meeting were read. Motion to approve the minutes made by S. Schagrin and seconded by D. Sands. Abstaining were A. Murray and J. Mascaro. Minutes approved unanimously.

New Business

**505-507 Auburn Ave., Wyndmoor
Subdivision / Land Development**

Steven Kline, R.A.

The Applicant presented a subdivision / land development plan which alters the plans previously approved by the Board of Commissioners on 8/10/2011. On the new plans, lot #1 (newly created lot) will be 81' in width compared to 100' width on the previous plan. Lot #2 (existing dwelling at 507 Auburn Ave) will be 114' in width compared to 95' on the plans approved last year.

Applicant is seeking to move the lot line in order to accommodate moving the garage that was proposed to be located at the rear of 507 Auburn Ave to the front of the lot and to be attached to the existing dwelling. This will cut down on impervious surface, and a new circular driveway would be created in the front of the property.

The Applicant reviewed the Township Engineer's Letter dated February 27th, 2012 with the PC and had the following comments:

Under Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Comments

- 1.) Applicant presented revised Landscape Plan. Chairman B. Gutowski pointed out that a line of Pin oaks was now proposed along Lot #1. Pin Oaks are not desirable, they are planted every 20' and truly need 40'. R. Dunlop to provide Applicant with a draft of the Approved Planting List for the Township.
- 2.) Waiver previously obtained.
- 3.) Waiver previously obtained.
- 4.) Will Comply
- 5.) Will Comply
- 6.) Waiver previously obtained.
- 7.) Applicant is now shy of 2 trees to be in compliance with previously granted Waiver. PC requested if 2 trees could be placed on Lot #2. Applicant's contention is that the ratio is the same considering the new lot size and was opposed to the adding additional trees to the other lot.
- 8.) Waiver previously obtained.
- 9.) Will Comply
- 10.) Will Comply
- 11.) Applicant agreed to a blanket easement in lieu of the 15ft easement which was not feasible.
- 12.) Will Comply

Miscellaneous Comments

- 13.) Will Comply
- 14.) Will Comply
- 15.) Will Comply
- 16.) Will Comply
- 17.) Will Comply
- 18.) Will Comply
- 19.) Will Comply (will use 6" pipe)
- 20.) Will Comply
- 21.) Will Comply
- 22.) Will Comply
- 23.) Will Comply
- 24.) Will Comply
- 25.) Will Comply
- 26.) Will Comply

Public Comments:

Herb Rubenstein Esq., who represents the neighbors at 500,501, and 511 Auburn Avenue addressed the PC. First, Mr. Rubenstein questioned if this was a new Subdivision since the agreed upon subdivision from last summer had not been recorded. There are substantial enough changes to consider; movement of driveways, the new proximity of Lot #1 to the McKenna property, removal of an agreed upon seepage pit, changes in landscaping etc. In his professional opinion, because the Applicant did not post financial security in 90 days, he feels the Land Development that was given is null and void. He also stressed that the neighbors worked long and hard and expended a significant amount of money to reach an acceptable compromise with the developer and that for the Applicant to come back without reaching out to the neighbors was not in the spirit of compromise initially agreed to.

503 Auburn Avenue Laura McKenna Reiterated that the neighbors had worked very hard to get to a place where they had a plan that they could all sleep at night. She was upset that the Applicant, could come back, without consulting the neighbors, and act like this was a simple moving of a lot line. These are two very different lots than what were agreed to. She asked the PC to look back at the July 29th, 2011 letter and to remember what was decided upon.

500 Auburn Avenue Arthrup Scibelli Is not happy with the proposed new plans which direct the driveways towards his front yard. Questioned if there was some legally binding agreement made with the neighbor to the right of 507 Auburn Ave that prompted this change. S. Kline said there was no agreement with the neighbor. Mr. Scibelli's wife commented that she noted that the neighbor next to 507 Auburn was not present.

511 Auburn Avenue Thomas Greenwood Reiterated that Auburn Avenue has huge storm water issues. Was angry that time, money and faith was put into a negotiation that he felt had reached an acceptable compromise. They negotiated once; they do not want to negotiate again. This new lot will be the second smallest lot on the street and not in conformity.

PC Comments:

- 1.) There is a question as to whether this is a Lot Line Change to an Approved Subdivision Plan or
- 2.) A New Land Development Plan subject to new waiver requests.

Discussion:

The PC discussed the public comments and reiterated to the Applicant their previously stated concerns; that the newly presented Landscape Plan was not reviewed, that the house proximity to the neighbor had changed, that there was less land subject to storm water management, and that the neighbors input was not taken into consideration with the proposed changes. J. Mascaro commented that the Storm Water Management Plan that was submitted is still within the requirements of the zoning code, still by right. M. Holland relayed to the public that the residents need to appeal to the BOC that lots need to be larger in Wyndmoor to prevent development like this. She acknowledged this is a by-right request and although permissible she would recommend to the BOC not to approve a lot line change and ask that the prior agreement be honored which is a better subdivision for the neighborhood. A. Murray said she would like to see the Applicants request be tabled, and that the Applicant go back to the neighbors and their council to come up with a plan supported by one and all before the PC will consider making recommendations to the BOC.

In Discussion, B. Gutowski asked the neighbors and the applicant their position on this idea. The Applicant responded he wanted recommendations and waivers tonight. Mr. Scibelli responded that they felt they already had expended enough time and money into a compromise and did not want to go any further. However, Herb Rubenstein, did stand up and say he was authorized by his clients to continue negotiations.

- A. Motion by A. Murray to table the Applicants request, and request the Applicant go back to the neighbors to compromise on a plan supported by one and all in the same spirit we saw in the previous plan before the PC will consider making recommendations to the BOC. Seconded by J. Devine. All Approved. None Opposed.

Comprehensive Plan

J. Holland presented the final Emerging Trends and Critical Issues Document and asked for a motion to approve them. Motion by A. Murray and seconded by D. Sands to approve the ETCI and recommend them to the BOC.

J. Holland to prepare a new schedule for the Comprehensive Plan process. All PC Members to send their Chapter 3 Revisions to J. Holland.

Motion to adjourn by J. Mascaro and seconded by A. Murray. All in Favor. Meeting adjourned 9:12 pm.

Minutes by A. Helwig, Secretary