

MINUTES OF MEETING
SPRINGFIELDTOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
September 4th, 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 6:58 PM, with the following members present: Amanda Helwig, Bob Gutowski, David Sands, Joseph Devine, George Schaefer, Steve Schagrin and Mary Holland. Absent were Angela Murray and James Mascaro. Commissioner Tom Bell represented the Township and Jean Holland represented the Montgomery County Planning Commission (MCPC) this evening.

Minutes: Minutes of the August 21st, 2012 meeting were read. Motion to approve the minutes with minor amendments made by D. Sands and seconded by B. Gutowski. All were in favor. 3 Abstained: A. Helwig, G. Schaefer, and M. Holland because they were not at the last meeting.

Commissioner's Report

The Boorse tract is still under discussion and deliberation. A workshop session is planned for September 10th. The BOC will be voting on September 12th. Discussion followed and the PC Members discussed at length their opposition to the change in zoning with Commissioner Bell.

Old Business

The July 17th, 2012 revised minutes were provided to Chairman B. Gutowski for a final review.

New Business

**27 Bysher Avenue
Subdivision Preliminary / Final Plan Approval**

Dan Helwig, Realtor

The Applicant has previously appeared before the PC. Per a letter dated August 23rd, 2012, submitted by the applicant's engineer, Charles Durkin, all requested items have been addressed per Township Engineers request in a letter dated August 17th, 2012. M. Holland commented that it would have been nice to have a shared driveway to cut down on impervious surface. Mr. Helwig agreed, however that would require a change in zoning. Motion to recommend the Subdivision and Preliminary / Final Land Development to the BOC made by M. Holland and seconded by G. Schaefer. Abstaining; A. Helwig, and J. Devine.

**Flannery Field Land Development
LaSalle College H.S.
8605 Cheltenham Ave., Wyndmoor**

**Anthony Hibbeln, P.E.
Brother James Butler
Mark Gibbons**

Anthony Hibbeln was back to address the PC's concern over the height of new lighting to be installed to illuminate the field. The lighting expert was unable to attend, however Mr. Hibbeln did have an opportunity to meet with him and visit the site. The Applicant presented evidence

that the higher the pole the better ability to expose specific areas affectively to lighting. The newer style light standards are designed to better direct light. The PC's concern was light affecting the neighboring properties. The Applicant presented an illustration showing the placement of the now proposed 60ft poles along the residential property boundary and 70ft poles on the opposite side of the field. This study took into consideration the impacts by foot candles, the illumination from the light poles would have in a no obstruction (no trees) situation off the property lines. Based on the results, the illumination rate along the property line was 1/10 to 4/10 of a foot candle. Mr. Hibbeln explained this is equivalent to a full moon. In essence, in moonlight the lighting would be indistinguishable. It should also be noted that these figures take into consideration the lights being on at their peak brightness. Since the height of the poles exceeds the 50ft nonresidential restriction, the applicant will have to get a variance.

The PC appreciates the applicants' attention and thorough consideration to find a better lighting situation and recommend that the lighting plan be approved.

Comprehensive Plan

The PC continued its review to identify the highest priority items from all Goals in the Comprehensive Plan. From this an Executive Summary will be created.

Goal 1: Land Use

- 1.1, 1.2, 1.6: Highest Priority
- 1.5, 1.8, 1.9: High Priority
- 1.3, 1.4: Medium Priority
- Move 1.7 to Transportation High Priority

Goal 2: Community Facilitates and Municipal Services

- 2.1, 2.4, 2.6: Highest Priority
- 2.10, 2.2, 2.3, 2.7, 2.9, 2.10: High Priority
- 2.5, 2.8: Medium Priority

Goal 3: Natural Resource Protection

- 3.1, 3.5: Highest Priority
- 3.2, 3.7, 3.6, 3.8: High Priority
- 3.3, 3.4: Medium Priority

Goal 4: Historic Resource Protection

- 4.5, 4.6: Highest Priority
- 4.1, 4.2, 4.3: High Priority
- 4.4, 4.7: Medium Priority

Goal 5: Housing

- 5.1, 5.4combined with 5.7: Highest Priority
- 5.3, 5.5, 5.6: High Priority
- 5.2, 5.8: Medium Priority

Goal 6: Transportation

Combined 6.14, 6.15 & 6.13, Combined 6.1 & 6.2, Combined 6.3, 6.5 & 6.6 : Highest Priority

Combined 6.4 & 6.7, Combined 6.8 & 6.17, 6.9: High Priority

6.9, 6.12, 6.16, 6.18, 6.20, 6.22, Combined 6.23 & 6.24: Medium Priority

6.19, 6.10, 6.11, 6.21- Strike

Goals 7: Commercial District Revitalization and Economic Development

New 7.1 (Change “hire” to “create”): Highest Priority

Combined 7.1 & 7.7(add landscape upgrades) & inserted 6.11, Combine 7.9 (take out growth and expansion) with 7.2 (add “create a more pedestrian friendly environment in commercial districts), 7.3, 7.12 Combine 7.4, 7.5& 7.9 : High Priority

Combine 7.10, 7.8, 7.11, 7.6: Medium

Goal 8: Energy and Resource Conservation

8.11, Combine 8.2 & 8.3, 8.1: Highest Priority

Combine 8.6 & 8.4: High Priority

8.5, 8.7, 8.8, 8.9, 8.10: Medium Priority

Goal 9: Sustainability

9.1: Highest Priority

9.4, 9.6: High Priority

9.2, 9.3, 9.5: Medium Priority

Motion to adjourn made by B. Gutowski and seconded by D. Sands. All in favor. Meeting Adjourned at 9:11 pm.

Minutes by A. Helwig, Secretary