

Minutes of Meeting
Springfield Township Planning Commission
December 2, 2014

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 7:05pm, with the following members present: Amanda Helwig, Bob Gutowski, Steve Schagrin, David Sands, George Schaefer, Joseph Devine, Mary Holland and James Mascaro. Robert Dunlop and Commissioner Baird Standish represented the Township. Brandon Rudd represented the Montgomery County Planning Commission (MCPC). PC Member Angela Murray was absent.

Minutes: Minutes of the November 18th, 2014 meeting were read. Motion to approve the minutes made by D. Sands and seconded by M. Holland. All were in favor J. Mascaro abstained. 6-0 Approved

Commissioner Report: Lloyd property, no Commissioners attended the recent Cheltenham meeting. Waiting to hear from Cheltenham who is driving the decision to show their hand.

Old Business

9425 Stenton Ave. Preliminary Subdivision / Land Dev
Erdenheim, PA. 19038

Sam Blake, Owner
Kevin Momenee, P.E.
Steve Schreiner, Arborist

PC Reviewed the December 1st, 2014 letter from the Township Engineer.

Under the Zoning Hearing Board 4. C. Impervious 52% / 48% pervious. The area in the courtyard is not prohibited and will be open space enjoyable to all residents. Developer is seeking a fee in lieu.
Under SALDO. 7. Developer agrees to pay a fee in lieu.

Mary Holland suggested the zoning code be revised for smaller parcels how a fee in lieu is determined.

Motion that the applicant be permitted to pay a fee and lieu for SALDO 7 and ZHB 4.C. and that a note be made that in the future, when PC reviews the ordinance, it be revised to reflect a change for the fee in lieu for smaller size lots. Motion by A. Helwig and seconded by M. Holland.

SALDO 6. Recommendation by B. Gutowski that applicant not be required to extend the cart way width. Motion was seconded by David Sands. All in favor.

SALDO 8. Recommendation by B. Gutowski that the existing landscape plan be approved. Motion seconded by J. Divine. All in favor.

SALDO 9. Recommendation by M. Holland that a waiver be granted seconded by J. Divine. All in favor.

SALDO 10. Recommendation of waiver of street trees by M. Holland seconded by G. Schaefer. All in favor.

Comment by George Schaefer he is opposed to white pines as a buffer because they break easily when they get older. Note to PC, we may want to remove white pines from the approved planting list and substitute in another tree with the approval of staff, preferably an evergreen with the appropriate height.

SALDO 11 / 12 Construction protection plan that arborist reviewed, can have a site specific plan. PC recommends a waiver be granted subject to a specific plan being filed. Motion by B. Gutowski and seconded by A. Helwig. All in favor.

SALDO 13. PC defers to the Board of Commissioners to keep as a private road. Motion by J. Mascaro and seconded by M. Holland. All in favor.

SALDO 14 Will Comply
SALDO 15 Defer to Solicitor

SALDO 16-18 Will Comply

SALDO 19-25 Will Comply (note typo by Township engineer in number 25)

Motion made by S. Schagrin that the submitted plan be recommended for approval with the noted waivers and that the Planning Commission prefers the other plan and that should STEMS approved PLAN A that the Planning Commission would prefer the extra parking in PLAN A. Both plans are acceptable to the Planning Commission. Seconded by J. Devine. All in favor.

New Business

Amendment to Industrial Zoning

The BOC is requesting an industrial zoning change from AA to I for five small tracts of land immediately next to route 309.

Brandon Rudd of the Montgomery County Planning Commission acknowledged that there is a settlement that needs to accommodate a location for a billboard but noted that in Lower Merion they allowed for this administratively to allow for billboards without having to rezone any properties

Rob Dunlop acknowledged that he contacted all the property owners and that they were OK with the zoning change. B. Gutowski asked if he had contacted the neighbors. Rob Dunlop stated that he had contacted the neighbors including LaSalle. He noted that LaSalle would like to have the zoning change on their side so that they could put billboards as well and gain additional revenue but that was not under consideration at this time.

Brandon Rudd noted that this space is targeted for the Cresheim Valley Trail and that PC should take consideration of this when voting on this change of zoning. M. Holland commented that the commissioners will do what they need to do however from a planning position this feels wrong and she will not support it.

Motion to recommend to the Board of Commissioners to adopt the ordinance with the understanding that all landowners are supportive and that the Board of Commissioners considers discussion that they may provide access to the Cresheim Valley Trail or a future trail in the future. Motion made by B. Gutowski and seconded by S. Schagrin.

Discussion

G. Schaefer said that this was not good for planning. He understands that there is a legal issue the township is involved with but it is not our job to deal with the legality of the situation rather look at the situation from a planning perspective.

A. Helwig commented that she thought it was odd that the Hanson's would approve the ability of a large billboard on the rear of a property being developed for residential homes. From a real estate standpoint she could not see the value of multiple landowners having a large billboard directly in their backyard. Also, felt that this type of random zoning change sets a poor precedent.

With discussion complete, the Vote was 5 in Favor and 3 Opposed. Motion carries.

Brandon Rudd of the Montgomery County Planning Commission had an opportunity to review the proposed amendments to the current industrial zoning as well as the introduction of a limited industrial zoning. He provided examples of setbacks of how the new proposed rezoning would leave parcels undevelopable if left unassembled. The limited industrial zoning setbacks are overly restrictive and recommended that the setbacks in the current industrial zoning utilized.

§114 - 12 C 3 B. Rudd from the Montgomery County Planning Commission suggested to strike letter A. Modify pervious amount 70% is okay no need for 40%. Strike B 1 and keep it the same as the current Industrial

§114 - 12 C 5 Yards should be the same as in the current industrial zoning or else properties are undevelopable.

B. Gutowski summarized where the PC was coming to consensus:

- 1.) We are not required to have a limited industrial zone
- 2.) There is a trend amongst developments to adopt limited industrial zoning to create supposed opportunities
- 3.) The difference between industrial and limit industrial are fewer permitted uses while there are some recommendations to broaden the industrial zoning number
- 4.) The question has arisen what does a landowner gained from industrial going to limit industrial uses

Discussion

M. Holland commented that these parcels are abutting heavy industrial why would this change in zoning make any more desirable parcels.

J. Devine section §114 - 121 change no" to "a"

B. Gutowski commented he would take section I and add EEE from Limited Industrial.

S. Schagrin stated he was opposed to a new Limited Industrial Zoning would like to keep EEE from Limited Industrial and move it into the existing Industrial Zoning.

G. Schaefer commented he would prefer we try and address issues within the existing Industrial Zoning as it is. He likes the generic language that would be added to industrial to deal with some issues. Perhaps add add bus language as a special exemption.

J. Mascaro commented why are we bothering to create a Limit Industrial, it seems like busy work.

M. Holland is trying to think about the implications of creating a Limited Industrial by bringing EEE into the Industrial District are we just trying to deal with one specific issue that has arisen and we are putting a sledgehammer to the rest of the property owners?

A. Helwig commented that she was opposed to the Limited Industrial Zoning as well. Changing zoning is not the proper way to deal with enforcement issues that have arisen in the township.

Public comment

Margaret Mary Burke 127 Orlemann Ave. Stated that residents were not aware of the second meeting with the industrial owners. At the first meeting he felt that they did not have enough time to speak. Encouraged the PC

consult other communities who have implemented the Limited Industrial Zoning and see how they have incorporated it. Asked the PC to consider the repercussions deeply of not implementing the Limited Industrial. Feels there is an opportunity to right the wrongs previously committed

Christine Hesser, 127 Orlemann Ave. Feels that EEE needs to be more restrictive regarding lighting, noise and vibrations.

Dennis Jacoby, 139 Orlemann Ave. Stated if you go to the Giuliani property at 5 a.m. You will get a feel for the level of annoyance the neighbors are experiencing. B. Gutowski asked do we have a lighting ordinance. Rob Dunlop replied that the bus depot at the Giuliani tract is currently in violation of their land development plan maybe we need to look at a decibel ordinance or lighting ordinance. Rob Dunlop stated there are still complains about the Giuliani property even before Faust moved his bus depot there. There been many complaints over the years regarding the property.

Fred Hesser 127 Orlemann Ave. Says there are caps on the Tank Carr property and does not want buses running over them. Bill Gordon owner of Tank Carr replied there are no buses on his property anymore the bus depot has moved to the Giuliani Tract.

Dennis Jacoby, 139 Orlemann Ave. Do you still have a lease with a bus company? Bill Gordon replied no I have no lease with any bus company because the township did not approve it and therefore lost a tenant.

Bill Gordon commented he wants to make a living with his property he wants to pay back the loans on the property. Forget the buses. He wants to make sure that he has business opportunities that he can use this property for and limited industrial does not help him. The township is targeting 5 properties just because of the buses. He just wants to continue the use that he has.

B. Gutowski summarized the consensus of the Planning Commission.

1.) That a Limited Industrial District is not beneficial given the conditions in our township but there are changes like in section 1 that the Planning Commission is supportive of. PC are concerned about how setbacks proposed in the Limited Industrial would eliminate development and are overly restrictive uses of those parcels.

2.) In addition, PC recognizes that there is frustration and there is a need to manage through ordinance nuisances that occur in our community.

PC recommends that we retain a single Industrial Zoning and that we make appropriate changes to Section 1. Motion by B. Gutowski and seconded by S. Schagrin. All approved.

Planning Commission further recommends that section 1 needs more appropriate attention to address unintended nuisances and to incorporate EEE in some form from Limited Industrial Zoning. Motion by B. Gutowski and seconded by M. Holland. All approved.

No new business

R. Dunlop reminded the planning mission of the Springfield Township Holiday Party on December 18th at Flourtown Country Club.

Meeting adjourned 9:26 pm. Motion by B. Gutowski and seconded by M. Holland. All were in favor.

Minutes by A. Helwig, Secretary