

August 4, 2010  
Curtis Hall

A regular meeting of the **BUILDING AND ZONING COMMITTEE** was held tonight, Michael J. Swavola, Chairman, presiding. Members present were Commissioners Hampton, Haywood, Portner and Sharkey. Staff present were Joseph Bagley, Wisler Pearlstine LLC; Bryan T. Havir, Assistant Township Manager; David M. Lynch, Director of Engineering, Zoning & Inspections; Ruth Littner Shaw, Main Street Manager; and David G. Kraynik, Township Manager. A Public Attendance List is attached.

Mr. Swavola called the meeting to order.

1. The Committee reviewed the Zoning Hearing Board (ZHB) Agendas for August 9 and August 17, 2010, as follows:

Appeal No. 3336 (Continued and amended) – Appeal of Matrix Ashbourne Associates, L.P., owner of premises known at 1100 Ashbourne Road, Cheltenham, PA (a/k/a “Ashbourne Country Club”), from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for Zoning Relief in order to develop the Premises into a 226 Unit Development consisting of a minimum of seventy (70) Single-Family Residences and a maximum of one hundred and fifty six (156) Carriage Homes. In addition, an area containing approximately 1.25 acres has been set aside for a future clubhouse and swimming pool. The premises is within the Class R-1 Residence District.

The following Zoning Relief is required:

- a. A Variance from the rules and regulations of the “Floodplain District” as outlined in CCS 295-156. so as to allow construction of portions of Stormwater Management Basins # 2C, # 2D and # 2E and replacement of the existing 8” T.C. Sanitary Sewer Line (if required) within the 100 Year Floodplain Area.
- b. Zoning Relief from the rules and regulations of the “Steep Slope Conservation District” as outlined in Article XXII of the Cheltenham Code, as follows:
  - i. An Appeal from the determination of the Zoning Officer and/or Township Engineer pursuant to CCS 295-164.B.2. regarding man-made steep slopes.
  - ii. From CCS 295-167. for the construction of free-standing structures, building and retaining walls, internal accessways, driveways, parking areas, swimming pools, sanitary sewers, stormwater management facilities, other underground utilities and landscaping.
  - iii. A Determination that the Lines and Grades Plans submitted with

- the Application substantially conforms with the Lines and Grade Plan(s) requirements set forth in CCS 295-168.
- iv. In the alternative to, b.ii, above, a Variance from CCS 295-168. for not submitting plans conforming to the stated Lines and Grades Plan(s) requirements.
  - c. A Determination that the number of parking spaces shown on the Applicant's plans are not in excess of the maximum permitted under CCS 295-221.F.
  - d. In the alternative to c., above, a Variance from the rules and regulations of "Parking and Loading" as outlined in CCS 295-221.F., for a greater amount of parking of 631 parking spaces instead of the maximum permitted 120% of the required parking spaces which equals 491 parking spaces.
  - e. Zoning Relief from the rules and regulations of the "Age Restricted Overlay District" as outlined in Article XXXIII of Chapter 295 of the Cheltenham Code, as follows:
    - i. A Special Exception in accordance with CCS 295-242.B.1 for the Age Restricted Development.
    - ii. A Special Exception in accordance with CCS 295-242.B.3 for a Clubhouse with common areas and meeting rooms, indoor and outdoor recreational facilities and maintenance and security facilities.
    - iii. A Special Exception in accordance with CCS 295-242.B.3 for a swimming pool for the residents of the Age Restricted Community only.
    - iv. A Variance from CCS 243.B.8.a. to permit sanitary sewer facilities (if required) and Stormwater Management Basins #2C, #2D and #2E within the floodplain.
    - v. A Variance from CCS 295-243.B.8.d. to permit development within areas having a slope of 15% or greater.
    - vi. A Variance from CCS 295-243.B.8.e. to permit sanitary sewer Facilities (if required) and Stormwater Management Basins #1A, #2C and #2E within the Riparian Buffer Areas.
  - f. A Variance from the entirety of the rules and regulations of the "Preservation Overlay District" as outlined in Article XXIV of Chapter 295 of the Cheltenham Code.
  - g. In the alternative to f., above, an interpretation that the rules and regulations of the "Preservation Overlay District, as outlined in Article XXIV of Chapter 295 of the Cheltenham Code are not applicable due to the provisions of the last sentence of CCS 295-241.

Mr. Lynch reported that this appeal is now being heard by the Zoning Hearing Board (ZHB). Since the ZHB would not permit a member of Township Staff to present the documentation regarding steep slope issues that the Committee had requested, the report was submitted to the ZHB by the Township Solicitor.

There was no new action for the Committee to take on this appeal. Mr. Swavola suggested that Matrix representatives be invited to the September 1, 2010 Committee meeting to discuss the merits of walking trails and recreation space dedicated to the public.

Appeal No. 3376: Appeal of Gregg Moritz, Owner of Premises known as 1006 Melrose Avenue, Elkins Park, PA 19027, from the decision of the Zoning Officer for the following Zoning Relief in order to add a 16' x 16' deck to the rear of the premises:

- a. Variances from the Rules and Regulations of the Class R-4 Residence District as outlined in Article VII of Chapter 295 of the Cheltenham Code, as follows:
  - i. From CCS 295-38 for a greater building area of 25.16% instead of the maximum permitted 20%.
  - ii. From CCS 295-39.B. (2) a zero foot width side yard setback instead of the minimum required 20' from the southeast property line.
- b. In the alternative to a. ii, above, a variance from the Rules and Regulations of "Non-conforming Uses" as outlined in CCS 295-227.K. for expansion of the Non-conforming structure.

Mr. Moritz was present. Mr. Lynch reviewed the appeal. Mr. Moritz stated that in accordance with the Planning Commission's recommendations, he has revised his plan to show more detailed information.

Upon motion of Mr. Swavola, and unanimously approved by the Committee, the Township Engineer was directed to advise the Zoning Hearing Board that the Committee takes no action on this appeal.

Appeal No. 3377: Appeal of Terry Stern, owner of premises known as 914 Stratford Avenue, Melrose Park, PA 19027, from the decision of the Zoning Officer for the following Zoning Relief in order to construct a 22' W x 30' L, 2 car garage in the rear of the Premises:

- a. Variances from the Rules and Regulations of the Class R-4 Residence District as outlined in Article VII of Chapter 295 of the Cheltenham Code, as follows:
  - i. From CCS 295-39. A. (1) for a lesser front yard setback of 3.75 ± instead of the minimum permitted 40' from the Moseley Avenue frontage of the Premises.
  - ii. From CCS 295-39.B. (1) for a lesser side yard setback of 5' instead of the minimum permitted 10' from the Southeast property line.

Mr. Lynch reviewed the appeal, including a description of the garage, and he reported that there will be the same offset and distance as the current garage. The new garage is in line with the old garage.

Upon motion of Mr. Swavola, and unanimously approved by the Committee, the Township Engineer was directed to advise the Zoning Hearing Board that the Committee takes no action on this appeal.

Appeal No. 3378: Appeal of Sheri Reed and Alan Bush, Owners of Premises known as 605 Arbor Road, Cheltenham, PA 19012, from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for the following Zoning Relief:

- a. Variances from the Rules and Regulations of "Fences and Walls" as outlined in CCS 295-223. for solid fencing higher than the permitted 4' high, 50% open fencing within the required front yard setback along the Walden Road frontage of the premises, as follows:
  - i. For 48 ± LF of proposed 6' high, solid wood fence (7.25' to 8' high including retaining wall).
  - ii. For 67 ± LF of proposed 6' high, solid wood fence.
- b. A Variance from the Rules and Regulations of the Class R-5 Residence District as outlined in CCS 295-46.A. (1) for a lesser front yard setback of 14.67' for a proposed gazebo instead of the minimum permitted 40'.

Mr. Lynch reviewed the application. The Committee discussed the Planning Commission's recommendation for denial of said appeal. Mr. Lynch reported that the applicant had started work without a permit. In response to a question from Mr. Portner, Mr. Lynch reported that the fence is too high.

Upon motion of Mr. McKeown, and unanimously approved by the Committee, the Township Engineer was directed to advise the Zoning Hearing Board that the Committee recommends that relief on this appeal be denied.

Appeal No. 3379: Appeal of Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority (SEPTA), prospective tenant at premises known as 2450 Shoppers Lane, Wyncote, PA 19095 (a/k/a Cheltenham Mall), from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for the following Zoning Relief in order to utilize approximately 24,000 S.F. of existing parking area at the northern corner of Cheltenham Mall as a Temporary Bus Loop while SEPTA reconstructs the existing

Bus Loop at the corner of the intersection of Cheltenham Avenue and Ogontz Avenue; the Temporary Bus Loop will be in operation for a maximum of 15 months starting October 1, 2010:

- a. Zoning Relief from the Rules and Regulations of the Class C-2 Commercial and Business District as outlined in Article XVI of Chapter 295 of the Cheltenham Code, as follows:
  - i. A Variance from CCS 295-108. for the Temporary Bus Loop instead of one of the enumerated permitted uses.
  - ii. In the alternative to a.i., above, a determination that the Temporary Bus Loop is an accessory use to the Cheltenham Mall and thus permitted in accordance with CCS 295-108.K.

Mr. Michael DiCamillo represented SEPTA. He reviewed the following: the reason for the temporary loop, other locations that were considered, location at the northwest side of Cheltenham Square Mall; why this location is the best location, the function of the bus route; clarified that it will not be a "depot"; existing parking at the location; proposed parking; configuration, bus movement; ingress/egress; location of a new Stop Sign; lighting; bus shelters; restrooms for drivers; new striping of roadway and walkway. Mr. Camillo stated that even though SEPTA is requesting this loop for a 15-month period, it is anticipated that it will only be needed for 8-months, and the area would then be restored to its original state.

Extensive discussion ensued. In response to questions from Mr. Swavola, about the number of buses, Mr. DiCamillo stated that the maximum number of buses would be 9 at 10-minutes per day but the average would be 5-6 buses. There would be 6 buses for about 90% of the day and peak periods would generate about 7-9 buses.

Mr. McKeown inquired about a buffer area for the neighbors to help control pollution and emissions as well as provide privacy and the other locations that were considered for this loop. Mr. DiCamillo stated that the nearest home is 300' away. The bus schedules would follow standard operating procedures, and he felt there would be a minimization of pollution.

Considerations were given to the area at the intersection of Washington Lane and Cheltenham Avenue but the mall owners are renovating and did not want buses, and the Littleton Diner on

the Philadelphia side had ingress/egress unsuitable for buses. Mr. Sharkey was concerned about bus motors running in the winter months and asked about using the parking area next to Home Depot. Mr. DiCamillo responded that said area is too far from Shoppers Lane and would be a logistical nightmare.

Mr. Haywood inquired about SEPTA's plans for the following: traffic and pedestrian congestion; provisions for pedestrian safety; access for people to get to Shop Rite; buffering of sound and visibility for the neighbors and a sense of what people will see; trash collection; hours of operation; and security.

Mr. DiCamillo stated that SEPTA feels that there will be a minimal affect on traffic. Pedestrian access to Shop Rite will remain the same, many of the bus customers will be transfer riders, there will be one (1) ADA compliant crosswalk that takes people to the other walkways, and he stated that this will not be 'bringing in' a lot of people, a crosswalk will be added to Shop Rite, this loop will be a 24-hour operation, he reviewed the hours of operation, number of buses, and the number of buses during the night. Regarding visibility to neighbors, Mr. DiCamillo presented photos of the area and reviewed the wooded tree area and retaining wall that is 10' high.

Mr. Sharkey questioned the adequacy of the tree buffer area in winter months when there will be no leaves. Regarding trash pickup, Mr. DiCamillo stated that trash would be collected once per day. For security, there will be a bus supervisor on duty 16-hours per day, and coverage for the remainder of the hours is being considered.

Other comments included Mr. Bagley asking if there would be diesel buses. Mr. DiCamillo stated that there are some hybrids but he could not guarantee what buses will be used. Mr. Haywood asked that SEPTA meet with the neighbors. Mr. Swavola questioned the ability of the buses to make turns and buffering the site from the neighbors.

There were comments from the public:

McKinley Lennox, 7753 Clements Road, stated that this is the most dangerous area in the Township; people cross the street when traffic is turning from Cheltenham Avenue and Ogontz Avenue exceeding the speed limit; it is unsafe; Route 309 and Shoppers Lane is dangerous, and he once had an accident with a speeding motorist; people cannot cross the street due to cars turning corners and speeding; abundance of motorcycles; cars exceeding the speed limit; the 20 mph speed limit on Shoppers Lane and the Stop Signs at Target are currently ignored. He is a roadrunner and walks 70,000 steps a week and walks this area. Mr. Lennox said it was unsafe for pedestrian traffic at Shoppers Lane and Route 309 North, and the addition of these buses would make the area more unsafe, especially in conjunction with speeding traffic. The Stop Sign at the mall is on private property, and motorists are not compelled to stop.

Alan Goldman, stated that he supports public transportation but the traffic is dangerous in this area. Shoppers Lane off of Ogontz Avenue is dangerous especially in the right lane and buses will add to the problem, and only constant shoppers who are familiar with the area know to get into the far right lane. There are two turn lanes from Ogontz Avenue and people do not realize that it does not continue all the way down Shoppers Lane and you have to be aware in the right lane that people are going to jump in waiting for the Stop Sign. Buses will obstruct the upcoming Stop Sign and unfamiliar motorists will cause accidents. People exiting the bus to go to Shop Rite will be endangered because human nature will make them take the shortest way, which will be to cut across. The homes adjacent to the area are visible and one can see right into their yards. Now there will be a lot of people late at night, and this will add to the potential of going onto residents' yards. He felt the noise level should be addressed.

Joseph Lewis, 1408 Wistar Lane, was concerned about pollution, noise and safety. SEPTA should look elsewhere, it is a high crime area, SEPTA refuses to have extra security and cameras, the area is dangerous and congested, Chili's was suppose to replace the parking spaces and never did it, Chick Fil-A is taking up a lot of parking spaces, and now SEPTA wants to use up more of the parking spaces. The neighbors want this appeal denied.

Diane Williams, 1812 Beech Avenue, asked that SEPTA's report be added to the Township's website and minutes for public view. She was told that the Township had every intent to do so. She noted that SEPTA has inferred that "typically" the buses do not stay for a long time and asked that SEPTA define "typical". She felt it was a negative that nine (9) buses would be there during peak hours. She asked about liability for the Township if someone is injured or killed since the Township is a party to this. Mr. Bagley responded that if this appeal is approved, the Zoning Hearing Board is approving it, not the Township, and he would not comment on any specific questions about hypothetical situations based on supposition as Ms. Williams asked. According to Mr. Bagley, this would be opining about liability in a vacuum. He stated that, in general, the Township is immune. Ms. Williams asked what happens if SEPTA violates any relief given. Mr. Bagley stated that the Township can take legal action, and it would be up to the courts to levy penalties on violations of a zoning decision. It was her opinion that people are speeding, it is a high crime area, buses will bring more traffic and more people

looking into residents' homes, and SEPTA is not addressing this issue. We should not be selective on how we apply the rules and regulations.

Olga McHugh, 127 Hewett Road, stated that it was her experience there was a problem making a turn off of Route 309 onto Shoppers Lane. The paint striping has faded and needed to be repainted.

Delores Wingo, 1421 Thornberry Road, was concerned about the loop's affect on property values. Nobody wants a truck stop in their backyard. The area is already congested, Shop Rite's parking lot is congested, and there is heavy traffic 24/7. She was concerned that it could be permanent. There is heavy traffic coming off of Rt. 309. Two (2) lanes go into Shoppers Lane. The traffic light allows only for three (3) cars to turn at one time. If one does not live in the area, they cannot be aware of the problems with the second lane. This loop is unfair and putting nine (9) buses in a small area is unfair to the neighbors and a danger to people. She asked that this appeal be denied because it is inappropriate for the neighborhood.

In response to question from Mr. Swavola regarding residents' concerns, Mr. DiCamillo stated that "typical" means set bus schedules are will be adhered to and that nine (9) buses are expected during peak morning and evening hours. He is not anticipating any more buses than this number. Mr. DiCamillo stated that about 15%-20% of the buses are articulated.

Mr. Swavola felt that the Township did not have a good handle on pedestrian traffic to Shop Rite. Residents are concerned about the safety for pedestrians and traffic speed. Mr. DiCamillo stated that SEPTA wants to give pedestrians the most direct route to Shop Rite but there is no real path, and this would be difficult. The lanes between parking spaces may have to be used, and it will be necessary for pedestrians to walk through the parking lot.

Mr. Haywood asked if any member of the public lives on Wistar Drive closest to Route 309 and on Green Valley Road close to the mall. Mr. Lewis stated that many neighbors were on vacation. Mr. Lewis felt that SEPTA should have an escrow account to take care of any neighbors' problems and give them protection.

Mr. DiCamillo reviewed SEPTA's plans for the loop at Cheltenham and Ogontz.

Mr. Portner stated that he understood neighbors' concerns and heard the problems but he wished the Police Department's Highway Safety Unit to review this appeal as it relates to the

residents' claims regarding additional bus traffic, pedestrian crosswalks, safety, crime, and other neighbors' concerns, and for it to provide data and statistics that address the neighbors' claims. He would like the Police Department's data to include crime, accident and other statistics compared to the remainder of the Township. Mr. Portner asked to see how this neighborhood stacks up to the rest of the community in this respect. He felt this information was important not just for this appeal but as general information.

Mr. Haywood felt any decision should be based on facts. Crime and auto accident statistics needed to be reviewed. It was his opinion that research was needed to determine how the buses would increase the accident rate and to crime. Mr. Haywood felt that the current accident rate cannot predict future accidents. He felt that the proposed pedestrian crossing on Shoppers Lane was actually safer than the current path when pedestrians have to cross Route 309.

Mr. Swavola requested that Highway Safety perform a traffic count and accident data and make a recommendation regarding Shoppers Lane, and whether the presence of the buses poses a safety issue. Traffic has changed recently especially in light of the new Target store. Pedestrian safety is a factor. He asked SEPTA to provide a solution for the pedestrian safety issue to/from Shop Rite. Walking through car traffic is not desirable. Two (2) lanes merging on Shoppers Lane into one (1) lane is a concern, and he felt that Highway Safety should research the feasibility of this and if there might be an alternative. Mr. Swavola asked if the loop could be relocated. Mr. DiCamillo responded that the other sites are not large enough. Mr. Swavola suggested that perhaps ingress/egress of passengers can be done elsewhere. Mr. DiCamillo responded that the big issue was transfer passengers, and this is the most convenient spot to wait for the next bus. Mr. DiCamillo explained that stopping on Shoppers Lane for buses could be a problem.

Mr. McKeown requested a buffer for the neighbors. He stated that there was a need for an alternative crossing across Shoppers Lane to Shop Rite.

There was further discussion about buses turning in/out of Shoppers Lane, a pedestrian path to Shop Rite, the exiting of bus passengers, bus turning, crime, pedestrian safety, and a possible shelter. Mr. Haywood said a meeting between the mall, SEPTA and neighbors would be beneficial.

Upon motion of Mr. Haywood, and unanimously approved by the Committee, the Township Engineer was directed to advise the Zoning Hearing Board that the Committee takes no action on this appeal but if relief is granted, it be granted upon SEPTA providing sound and visual buffering between the proposed parking spaces and the homes. The Committee recommends that the Zoning Hearing Board review and consider data and statistics as provided by the Police Department's Highway Safety Unit. Said data should include an analysis of current and projected accidents for the area; crime statistics compared to the rest of the Township; render an opinion as to how this temporary bus loop would or would not contribute to any future problems, consider current pedestrian paths, an alternative for pedestrians getting to Shop Rite, striping and traffic patterns along Shoppers Lane in light of the additional bus traffic. The Committee directed the Township Solicitor to attend the August 17, 2010 meeting of the Zoning Hearing Board and present for the record the Highway Safety Unit's analysis.

2. Ms. Reed and Ms. Bush, applicants for Appeal No. 3378 were present. They arrived late to the meeting because they had the wrong time. They felt the height of the fence as stated in the appeal was incorrect and the grade was not raised.

They were advised to ask the ZHB for a continuance to submit corrected and more detailed plans. The applicants were unsure of the zoning process, and Mr. Swavola explained it to them.

3. Upon motion of Mr. Sharkey, and unanimously approved by the Committee, the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes dated July 26, 2010 were received.

4. Upon motion of Mr. McKeown, and unanimously approved by the Committee, the Ad Hoc Zoning Committee Meeting Minutes dated July 13, 2010 were received

5. The Committee reviewed and approved recommendations of the Economic Development Task Force for issuance of Certificates of Appropriateness as follows:

Upon motion of Mr. McKeown, and unanimously approved by the Committee, Certificates of Appropriateness were issued to the following businesses:

Pita Pocket, 582 Township Line Road, for a sign  
State Farm, 12 E. Glenside Avenue, for an awning sign  
Stitchers' Dream, 219 S. Easton Road, for a sign  
The Blue Comet, 106 S. Easton Road, for painting and a sign  
The Game Junkie, 111 S. Easton Road, for a sign

6. The Committee discussed a possible new Age-Restricted (AR) Housing Overlay District Ordinance. Kenneth Amey, the Township's land planning consultant was present. It was Mr. Amey's opinion that the Township's main considerations should include which properties should be considered appropriate for inclusion in any proposed Ordinance, density, how an AR Ordinance should preserve the Preservation Overlay District, possible stricter requirements for developments that are included in the AR Ordinance, frontage on state roads, minimum acreage of 5-acre parcels, differentiating standards for townhomes and multi-family homes, setbacks.

Mr. Haywood felt it was important for the Township to decide how it wanted to address multi-storey buildings.

Mr. Swavola was concerned about the following: whether or not there was a market for age-restricted housing in the Township; a market analysis of the viability of age-restricted housing in the Township might be necessary; high rise buildings; decreased tax revenues; the need for retail components. Mr. Swavola felt that the specter of a tall building in a residential

neighborhood was worse than it actually is, and he noted the successful location of the Coventry House in Melrose Park. He felt there should be an inducement to developers to build taller buildings.

Mr. Sharkey was concerned that a developer could start a development as age-restricted and then ask for a zoning change if the age-restricted development was not selling.

Mr. McKeown questioned whether or not senior citizens would remain in a Township that has high taxes and whether AR communities would be feasible in Cheltenham. Mr. Amey stated that there are desirable aspects of the Township for which people are willing to pay.

There was extensive discussion about the following: various conceptual ideas about AR housing from the Commissioners, current market for AR housing, types of housing, i.e. high rise vs. townhomes, the cycling of AR housing, financing and lending. Mr. Amey informed the Committee that in today's economy, banks will not lend to developers of age-restricted communities unless the developer can prove that the units are selling. There is a market but it is not moving due to the general state of real estate. Seniors cannot sell their primary home to move into an AR community. It was Mr. Amey's opinion that in the long-run, there is a market for AR housing.

In response to a question from Mr. Swavola, Mr. Amey stated that outside the City of Philadelphia, there are no tax incentives to live in a high rise building in an AR community. In response to a question from Mr. Bagley, Mr. Amey reported that Montgomery Township gave concessions to a developer of an AR community because the developer reduced his development by 35%, and the Township allowed the removal of a portion of its AR Ordinance.

Due to the lateness of the hour, the Committee decided to table further discussion about a possible Age-Restricted Overlay District.

7. Upon motion of Mr. Portner, and unanimously approved by the Committee, the Report of the Building Inspector for July, 2010, was received.

8. Under New Business: Mr. Bagley updated the Committee on a recently passed state statute that extends building permits, land development approvals, agreements to 2013 and has a provision that allows the Township to charge developers, homeowners, and property owners when they ask for verifications from the Township of their extensions to 2013.

Mr. Bagley suggested that the Commissioners consider a Resolution amending its fee schedule.

The Committee unanimously agreed to authorize the Township Solicitor to draft a Resolution adopting certain fees in accordance with the state's Permit Extension Act.

9. Under Citizens' Forum:

Olga McHugh, 127 Hewett Road, asked for information clarifying the role of the Ad Hoc Zoning Committee, was concerned about any discussion regarding the Wyncote/Jenkintown Train Station, and the mixed-use discussion as it pertains to said train station as discussed by said committee. She was told that said committee was formed to re-write the Township's Zoning Ordinance, all members are Township residents, except for the Township Engineer, and are members of the Economic Development Task Force and Planning Commission. The committee meets on the second Tuesday of each month at 6 p.m. at the Township Building, that a definition of mixed-use has not yet been defined and is still being developed.

There being no further business, upon motion of Mr. Sharkey, and unanimously approved by the Committee, the meeting was adjourned.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David G. Kraynik,  
Township Manager

per Anna Marie Felix



**PUBLIC ATTENDANCE LIST**  
**Public Affairs Committee, 7:30 p.m.**  
**Public Safety Committee, 7:45 p.m.**  
**Building and Zoning Committee, 8:00 p.m.**  
**Wednesday, August 4, 2010**  
**Curtis Hall**

NAME (Please Print)	ADDRESS	E-MAIL and/or TELEPHONE
ALAN COHEN	334 RIVERBIRCH C. E P 19027	
DAVID KRATZER	7913 PARK AVE	MAIN STREET DESIGN COMMITTEE
JOYCE LEWIS	1408 WISTAR DR WYNCOTE 19095	
WILLIAM JOHNSON	1445 WISTAR DR. WYNCOTE, 19095	
PET MILLER	1234 MARKET ST 10th fl. SEPTA	pmiller@septa.org
PAUL CRAIG	7740 WASHINGTON ELKIS OR/ 19037	
MIKE DICAMILLO	1234 MARKET ST. 12th fl Phila PA 19107 SEPTA	mdicamillo@septa.org
MARK SIMON	306 BOYD RD CHELTERHAM, PA	



**PUBLIC ATTENDANCE LIST**  
**Public Affairs Committee, 7:30 p.m.**  
**Public Safety Committee, 7:45 p.m.**  
**Building and Zoning Committee, 8:00 p.m.**  
**Wednesday, August 4, 2010**  
**Curtis Hall**

NAME (Please Print)	ADDRESS	E-MAIL and/or TELEPHONE
ERIK MORITZ	1006 MELROSE	
Andrew Bardley	1234 Market st Phila PA	abardley@septa.org
Tom & Olga McHugh	127 Hewett Rd Wyncote	
IAN GARDONSON	8306 MBW 2nd ST E.P	schable@ cun-cast-mbvw
PAUL APPEZZELLA	8210 JEWELTOWN RD. KILKIL	
Debra Marberger	131 Tookany	
SABINA Gradone	8264 Thomson Rd	
Cynthia Weaver	101 Tookany Creek Pkwy	

