

**SPRINGFIELD TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
February 17, 2026**

The Springfield Township Planning Commission met for their regularly scheduled meeting at 7:00 P.M., in the Boardroom of the Springfield Township Administration Building, located at 1510 Paper Mill Road, Wyndmoor, PA 19038. Present at the meeting were Ms. Helwig, Ms. Murray, Mr. Sands, Mr. Harbison and Ms. Pottage. Also in attendance were Commissioner Ratsavong, Commissioner Kirk, Margaux Petruska from Montgomery County Planning Commission and Mark Penecale, Director of Planning & Zoning.

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m.

**Approval of the Minutes:**

The Planning Commission approved the minutes of February 3, 2026, meeting.

**Commissioner's Report:**

Commissioner Ratsavong did not have a report at this time.

**Statement:**

Prior to the start of the presentation on the application for 28 Grove Avenue, Flourtown, PA 19031, Ms. Helwig disclosed that she would be recusing herself from any recommendation on this application. Although she is not involved with the sale of this site, her real estate firm is involved in the transaction of this property.

**New Business:**

The Planning Commission reviewed the subdivision and land development application for the property located at 28 Grove Avenue, Flourtown, PA 19031. The application was submitted by Flourtown Construction, LLC and Daniel McCloy, Robert Wise and the project engineer, Chad W. Brensinger presented the application.

Mr. Brensinger provided an overview of the plan. He stated that each of the proposed new lots conform to the dimensional requirements of the C-Residential District. The plan is to demolish the existing single-family dwelling, subdivide the property into two lots and construct a new single-family dwelling on each of the new parcels. Mr. Brensinger stated that the property would be served by public water and public sewer. Each lot would have two off-street parking stalls and at the request of the Township, onsite stormwater management has been added to each of the two proposed lots.

Mr. Brensinger stated that he has received both of the Township Engineer's review letters as well as the review letter from Montgomery County Planning Commission. He stated that the plans have been revised to address the review comments and the balance of the items are a "Will Comply".

Mr. Harbison asked for additional information on the onsite stormwater management controls, since the applicant stated that it was not required for this application.

Mr. Brensinger stated that the increase in impervious post coverage development would be 123 square feet over both sites. Springfield Township requires onsite stormwater management for any increase of 200 square feet or more. The plan was revised to include seepage beds within the rear yards of each of the proposed new lots. The Township requested that the seepage beds be relocated to the front yards, so that any overflow would drain to the street and not to the rear property lines.

Ms. Helwig asked about the swales within the side yards.

Mr. Brensinger stated that currently 100% of the property is pitched and drains to the rear property line. The design of this plan would have the front half of these properties and the downspouts directed to the seepage beds, with overflow to the street. The swales were added to handle stormwater flows for the rear half of the properties.

Ms. Helwig asked about the proposed new homes.

Mr. McCloy stated that each of the proposed homes would be in the area of 2,500 square feet, 3 bedrooms, 2.5 baths and a garage. The buyer would have the option of adding a rear family room/office area. The proposed homes would be two stories tall. Each lot would be 7,100 square feet or better.

Ms. Sandra McLelland, 32 Grove Avenue stated that she is not in favor of two new homes. Her concerns centered on the lack of open space in the neighborhood, the shortage of available parking, stormwater runoff, congestion and vehicle speeding on the streets.

Ms. McLelland stated that she purchased her home in 2021 and she has spent a considerable amount of money to address the stormwater issues on her property. She asked if the proposed new homes would be rentals or owner occupied. She asked if the side yard setback between her and the proposed new home could be increased from the 8 feet that is proposed to 12 feet.

Mr. McCloy stated that the proposed new homes would be sold, but that once sold, he has no control over what the new owner would do with the property.

Mr. Brensinger stated that the side yard could be increased to 10 feet, but that any more than that would impact the onsite stormwater management design. The applicant agreed to increase the side yard to 10 feet.

A question was raised concerning the existing fence and landscaping between Ms. McLelland's property and what is marked as Lot #1. Mr. McCloy stated that there is currently no plan to remove the existing fence or the landscaping, but in the event that either or both affected the grading along this side yard, they could be removed if located on the development site.

Mr. Bernard Kling, 214 Station Avenue is not in favor of this development. He stated that he believes this development would add to the parking issues on Grove and Weiss Avenues, will cause safety issues for the neighborhood, and will be out of character with the balance of the neighborhood.

Ms. Leigh Ann Schurr, 55 N. College Avenue, is concerned about the safety of the children and the demo of the home. She would like environmental testing done prior to a demo permit being issued. She asked about lead testing and air quality. She stated that she has had health issues from dust and that she wants protection from contamination entering her HVAC system. She claims that speeding is a major issue on Grove Avenue. She stated that the approval of this application puts the children in the neighborhood at risk.

Ms. Melanie McVeagh, 47 College Avenue, stated that she is a 40-year resident and is concerned that the demo of the house will affect the health of her dog. She asked if the State is on-site for the demo of the house. They are not.

Mr. Harbison explained the role of the Planning Commission and the process moving forward for this application. He explained what a "By-Right Application" is and the limitations on the Township with the approval and/or denial of such an application. He explained that an application that complies with the requirements of the zoning ordinance and the subdivision & land development ordinance must be approved. He stated that reasonable conditions could be placed on that approval.

Ms. Helwig asked if there were any additional questions or statements from the Planning Commission and/or those in attendance. There were none. She asked for a motion.

Mr. Sands made a motion to approve the application with the following conditions: 1. The side yard setback be increased from 8 feet to 10 feet in width between Lot #1 and the McLelland property. 2. The applicant be required to submit an environmental study of the structure and that study be submitted with the demolition permit application.

This recommendation to approve the plan as submitted was unanimous with a vote of 4 in favor, 0 in opposition and 1 recusal.

Prior to the close of the meeting, Commissioner Ratsavong fielded questions from the residents in attendance. This question-and-answer period lasted approximately 20 minutes. I did not take notes during this discussion.

There was a motion made to adjourn the meeting. The motion was second, and the meeting was adjourned at 8:57 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted  
Mark A. Penecale  
Director of Planning & Zoning