

February 25, 2008  
Township Building

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission was held tonight in the Township Administration Building. The following members were present: Ms. Farrell, Messrs. Cross, Greenberg and Winneberger. Also present were: David M. Lynch, Director of Engineering, Zoning & Inspections, Carmen G. Reitano, Assistant to the Director of Engineering, Zoning & Inspections, Ms. Jean Holland, Montco Planning and David Harrower, Observer.

1. Upon motion of Mr. Winneberger, seconded by Ms. Farrell, it is recommend that the minutes of the January 28, 2008 be accepted as presented.
2. The following appeals to be discussed at the March 11, 2008 Zoning Hearing Board meeting were discussed as this time:

APPEAL NO. 3258 (Continued) – Appeal of the Jewish Federation of Greater Philadelphia, owner of premises known as 103 Lafayette Avenue, Elkins Park, PA (a/k/a CTRERP Block 35, Unit 28) from the Decision of Zoning Officer for the following Zoning Relief in order to construct a Single Family Residence thereon (said premises being within the Class R-4 Residence District):

- a. 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. Special Exceptions in accordance with CCS 295-168., as follows:
    1. Pursuant to CCS 295-168.B. for Sanitary Sewers and Stormwater Management Facilities.
    2. Pursuant to CCS 295-168.C. for underground utility transmission lines.
  - ii. Variances from CCS 295-169., as follows:
    1. From CCS 295-169.A.(1) for the residence, retaining walls and landscaping.
    2. From CCS 295-169 A.(2) for the driveway.
    3. From CCS 295-169 A.(3) for the filling or removal of topsoil associated with the foregoing.
    4. From CCS 295-169.B. for the inclusion of areas with a terrain gradient of 25% or more within any of the required yard areas.

APPEAL NO. 3260 (Continued) – Appeal of the Jewish Federation of Greater Philadelphia, owner of premises known as 105 Lafayette Avenue, Elkins Park, PA (a/k/a CTRERP Block 35, Unit 8) from the Decision of Zoning Officer for the following Zoning Relief in order to construct a Single Family Residence thereon (said premises being with the Class R-4 Residence District):

- a. Zoning Relief from the rules and regulations of the Steep Slope Slope Conservation District as outlined in Article XXII of the Cheltenham Code, as follows:
  - i. Special Exceptions in accordance with CCS 295-168., as follows:
    1. Pursuant to CCS 295-168.B. for Sanitary Sewers and Stormwater Management Facilities.
    2. Pursuant to CCS 295-168.C. for underground utility transmission lines.
  - ii. Variances from CCS 295-169., as follows:
    1. From CCS 295-169.A.(1) for the residence, retaining walls and landscaping.
    2. From CCS 295-169 A.(2) for the driveway.
    3. From CCS 295-169 A.(3) for the filling or removal of topsoil associated with the foregoing.
    4. From CCS 295-169.B. for the inclusion of areas with a terrain gradient of 25% or more within any of the required yard areas.

Appeals Numbers 3258 and 3260 were discussed at this time as they are part of the same proposed development of two single family dwellings.

Mr. Lynch stated these applications were presented at the January 14, 2008 ZHB meeting and continued to the March 10, 2008 ZHB. At this time, Mr. Lynch stated, the Applicant's attorney has submitted a letter requesting a continuance to the May 12, 2008 ZHB meeting.

Mr. Lynch presented plans of the proposed project and stated this parcel was gifted to the Jewish Federation of Philadelphia. The structures meet all the dimensional requirements, but Zoning Relief for steep slopes is required. The residents have concerns regarding the drainage.

Mr. Cross stated many residents appeared at the December 17, 2007 Planning Commission meeting and voiced their opposition to the proposed project.

Upon motion of Mr. Winneberger, seconded by Ms. Farrell, the Commission reiterates its previous recommendation of denial for Appeal Nos. 3258 and Appeal No. 3260.

APPEAL NO. 3261 (Continued) – Appeal of 1347 Associates, L.P., owner of premises known as 1347 West Cheltenham Avenue, LaMott, PA, from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for the following Zoning Relief in order to use the first floor of the premises for retail purposes and the second floor for offices:

- a. A finding that the provision of zero percent Green Space instead of the 13% Green Space (4159 SF) as required by CCS 295-132. is a legal non-conforming use of the premises.
- b. In the alternative to a., above, a variance from the rules and regulations of the Class C- Commercial and Business District as outlined in CCS 295-132. for said non-conformity.
- c. A finding that the provision of a zero width Buffer Area along the C-4/R-7 Zoning Districts boundary line instead of the 23.5' wide Buffer Area as required by CCS 295-133. is a legal non-conforming use of the premises.
- d. In the alternative to c., above, a variance from the rules and regulations of the Class C-4 Commercial and Business District as outlined in CCS 295-133. for said non-conformity.
- e. Zoning Relief from the rules and regulations of “Parking and Loading” as outlined in CCS 295-221. as follows:
  - i. A finding that the provision of a zero width aisle between the northwest property line and the westmost row of parking instead of the 24' width aisle required by CCS 295-221.C.2.c. is a legal non-conforming use of the premises.
  - ii. In the alternative to e.i. above, a variance from CCS 295-221.C.2.c. for said non-conformity.
  - iii. A finding that the provision of a 13' wide aisle between the central and eastmost rows of parking instead of the 24' wide aisle required by CCS 295-221.C.2.c. is a legal non-conforming use of the premises.
  - iv. In the alternative to e.iii., above, a variance from CCS 295-21.C.2.c. for said non-conformity.
  - v. A finding that the provision of a 17' wide aisle between the rear row of parking and the other parking rows instead of the 24' wide aisle required by CCS 295-221.C.2.c.
  - vi. In the alternative to e.v., above, a variance from CCS 295-221.C.2.c. for said non-conformity.
  - vii. From CCS 295-221.D. for the provision of 50 parking spaces instead of the required 71 parking spaces.

Mr. Lynch stated this application was presented at the January 28, 2008 Planning Commission meeting and the February 11, 2008 ZHB meeting. The ZHB continued this application and directed the Applicant to research how the existing non-conforming parking field configuration came about. Additional information on the two parcels was

researched and indicated the parking was approved by the ZHB approximately six years ago. Some parking will be reconfigured and the Building and Zoning Committee recommended approval. The Building and Zoning Committee at its February 5, 2008 meeting recommended approval of this appeal application with no change in the existing parking field layout.

Upon motion of Mr. Greenberg, seconded by Ms. Farrell, the Commission reiterates its previous recommendation and takes no action but strongly recommends that the Zoning Hearing Board require the Applicant to reconfigure the parking lot in order to bring it into dimensional conformity and that it accepts a lesser amount of required parking spaces.

APPEAL NO. 3263 – Appeal of Stacey Wyman and David Cromley, owners of premises known as 540 Twickenham Road, Glenside, PA from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for a variance from the rules and regulation of the Class R-4 Residence District as outlined in CCS 295-39.B.(1) for a lesser side yard setback of 5±' instead of the minimum required 10' for a 8' x 14' shed.

Mr. Lynch presented plans of the proposed project and stated this property is located on Twickenham Road, south of Lindley Road. The applicant is proposing to construct a 8' x 14' shed and is requesting Zoning Relief for a lesser side yard setback.

Upon motion of Mr. Greenberg, seconded by Ms. Farrell, the Commission takes no action.

APPEAL NO. 3264 – Appeal of Cricket Communications, Inc., prospective tenant at 8480 Limekiln Pike, Wyncote, PA (a/k/a “Building C” @ Towers of Wyncote; and as CTRERP Block 146, Unit 22) from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for the following Zoning Relief in order to install and operate a wireless communication facility on the roof of “Building C”:

- a. Variances from the rules and regulations of the Class C-1 Commercial District as outlined in Article XV of Chapter 295 of the Cheltenham Code, as follows:
  - i. From CCS 295-98. for the wireless communication facility use of the premises instead of one of the permitted enumerated uses.

- ii. From CCS 295-104. for a height of 162.5± feet Above Grade Level (“A.G.L.”) instead of the maximum permitted 120' A.G.L. for the telecommunication antennas.

Mr. Richard Lemenowicz, Esq., and a representative from Cricket Communications, Inc., were present to discuss this Application and stated that the Applicant is intending to co-locate three antennas and two cabinets at this site. He stated that this company is licensed by the FCC. The proposed antennas and cabinets are no larger than those presently existing at the site. Illustrations of the proposed antennas were presented. The cabinets are 7' H x 30' W x 30' D.

Upon motion of Mr. Winneberger, seconded by Ms. Farrell, the Commission takes no action.

APPEAL NO. 3265 – Appeal of Cricket Communications, Inc., prospective tenant at 7900 Old York Road, PA (a/k/a “Elkins Park House”), from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for the following Zoning Relief in order to install and operate a wireless communication facility on the roof of the Elkins Park House:

- a. Variances from the rules and regulations of the Class M-3 Multiple Dwelling and Office District as outlined in Article XIV of Chapter 295 of the Cheltenham Code, as follows:
  - i. From CCS 295-89. for the wireless communication facility use of the premises instead of one of the permitted enumerated uses.
  - ii. From CCS 295-95. for a height of 114± feet Above Grade Level (“A.G.L.”) instead of the maximum permitted 85' A.G.L. for the telecommunication antennas.

Mr. Richard Lemenowicz, Esq., and a representative from Cricket Communications, Inc., were present to discuss this Application.

Mr. Lemenowicz presented an illustration of the proposed antennas. He stated the plan has been revised since submitted, as the antennas will not be placed on the roof of the penthouse, but below the roofline on the facade. Mr. Lynch advised the Applicant that revised plans will need to be submitted, but since the antennas will be lower than originally submitted, the Appeal will not need to be re-advertised.

Mr. Lemenowicz stated the antennas will protrude approximately 6 inches from the façade of the building. It was suggested that the antennas be painted to match the façade. Upon motion of Ms. Winneberger, seconded by Ms. Farrell, the Commission takes no action subject to the Applicant submitting revised plans and the antennas and cabinet being painted to match the building's facade.

APPEAL NO. 3268 – Appeal of Chris and Dana Howard, owners of premises known as 353 Bent Road, Wyncote, PA, from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for the following Zoning Relief in order to erect fencing on the premises (said premises being within the Class R-3 Residence District):

- a. Variances from the rules and regulations of “Fence and Walls” as outlined in CCS 295-223. for the following noted fencing instead of the permitted 4', 50% open fencing within the required front yard setback area along Church Road:
  - i. For 3±' of solid, 6' high wood picket style fencing along the west property line at the west end of Fence “1”.
  - ii. For 160±' of 50% open, 5' high, wood picket fencing (Fence “1”) parallel to Church Road; Fence “1” being offset from 47' northeasterly from the Church Road R/W line.
  - iii. For 3±' of >50% open, 5' high estate style fencing at the east end of Fence “1” perpendicular to Church Road.

No representatives were present to discuss this Application.

Mr. Lynch presented plans of the proposed fencing and stated this property is at the corner of Bent Road and Church Road and is located within the Wyncote Historic District. The applicant has received BHAR approval. The Applicant is requesting Zoning Relief as noted.

A resident was concerned regarding the sight distance to Church Road but after reviewing the plans had no objection.

Upon motion of Ms. Farrell, seconded by Mr. Greenberg, the Commission takes no action.

APPEAL NO. 3269 – Appeal of Daniel Ogborn, owner of premises known as 329 Laurel Avenue, Cheltenham, PA, from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for a variance from the rules and regulations of “Yard Regulations” as outlined in CCS 295-220.C. for a rear

yard setback of 3.5±' instead of the minimum required 15' for a new 16' x 10' shed. (Said premises being within the Class R-8 Residence District.)

Mr. Ogborn, owner, was present to discuss this Application.

Mr. Lynch presented plans of the proposed project and stated there is currently a 9' x 8' shed at this site, which will be removed and replaced with a 16' x 10'. Mr. Ogborn stated it does not appear that the neighbors object to the proposed shed.

Upon motion of Mr. Winneberger, seconded by Ms. Farrell, the Commission takes no action.

APPEAL NO. 3270 – Appeal of Gail Luciani, owner of premises known as 900 Church Road, Wyncote, PA, from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for the following Zoning Relief in order to make the following additions to the premises: a 9' x 12.5' mud room and a 13' x 12.5' covered patio:

- a. A variance from the rules and regulations of the Class R-3 Residence District as outlined in CCS 295-24.A.(1) for a lesser front yard setback of 39±' instead of the minimum required 50' for the two additions.
- b. In the alternative, a variance from the rules and regulations of “Non-conforming Uses” as outlined in CCS 295-227.K. for expansion of a non-conforming residential structure.
- c. Variances from the rules and regulations of the “Steep Slope Conservation District” as outlined in Article XXII of Chapter 295 of the Cheltenham Code, as follows:
  - a. From CCS 295-169.A.(1) for the replacement sidewalk running northwesterly from the covered patio.
  - b. From CCS 295-169.A.(3) for filling or removal of topsoil associated with the replacement sidewalk.

Mr. Lance Kramer, Architect, was present to discuss this Application. Mr. Lynch presented plans of the proposed project and stated there is essentially no legal buildable area on the lot. The property has two frontages and the existing house is non-conforming. The existing roof will be extended and an EP Henry sidewalk constructed from the covered patio. Photos of the property were also presented.

Upon motion of Mr. Winneberger, seconded by Ms. Farrell, the Commission takes no action.

APPEAL NO. 3271 – Appeal of Greg and Ellyn Hill, owners of premises known as 8350 Fisher Road, Elkins Park, PA, from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for the following Zoning Relief in order to construct a 1000± SF addition to the premises and a 77' x 52' asphalt pad (for sports purposes):

- a. Variance from the rules and regulations of the Class R-4 Residence District as outlined in CCS 295-39.C. for a lesser rear yard setback of 3±' for the asphalt pad.
- b. Zoning Relief from the rules and regulations of the “Steep Slope Conservation District” as outlined in Article XXII of Chapter 295 of the Cheltenham Code, as follows:
  - i. Special Exception in accordance with CCS 295-168.B., as follows:
    1. Pursuant to CCS 295-168.B. for the drywell
    2. Pursuant to CCS 295-168.C. for underground utility transmission lines.
  - ii. Variances from CCS 295-169., as follows:
    1. From CCS 295-169.A.(1) for the addition and asphalt pad.
    2. From CCS 295-169.A.(3) for the filling or removal of topsoil associated with the above.

Mr. Hill, Applicant, was present to discuss this Application and stated the plans have since been modified. He stated the dimensions of the basketball court have been decreased, creating less of an impact on the property.

Upon motion of Mr. Winneberger, seconded by Ms. Farrell, the Commission takes no action, conditioned upon the applicant submitting revised plans.

3. Cheltenham Township Development Application No. 08-01: Record Plan Lubin & Walsh Subdivision – 7656 New Second Street was discussed at this time.

Mr. Peter Friedman, Attorney, and Mr. Gary Tilford, were present to discuss this Application.

Mr. Lynch stated this is a three lot subdivision. The Applicant previously applied for and received Zoning Relief for a four lot subdivision. As the Township was concerned with steep slope impacts, it appealed the ZHB’s Decision to the Montgomery County Court of Common Pleas and had the ZHB’s Decision overturned. Subsequently the Township and the Applicant entered into a stipulated settlement for a three lot subdivision.

There is an existing drainage channel on proposed Lot 3; the area around the drainage channel has flooded several times.

Mr. Lynch noted that there is no 100 Year Fema Flood Plain mapped for this area; however, Mr. Lynch is requesting that the 100 Year Flood Plain be determined for the drainage channel and that the finished first floor elevation for the proposed residence on Lot 3 be a minimum of one foot above the 100 Year Flood Plan elevation at the residence location.

Mr. Friedman stated these are three very large lots, Lot 1 containing the existing residence. Single family dwellings, approximately 2800 SF each, will be constructed on Lots 2 and 3. One home will be located on New Second Street and one home will be located on Coventry Avenue. There will be a new driveway on New Second Street, which will require PennDOT approval. Lot 3 will have an entrance onto Coventry Avenue.

Regarding sewer hook-ups, Mr. Lynch advised Mr. Friedman that the Township is under a sanitary sewer moratorium, and presently it may not be possible to connect to the sanitary sewer. He did stress this is not a reason for denial of this Application and stated it is the goal of the Township to be able to release EDUs by the end of this year.

Upon motion for Mr. Winneberger, seconded by Mr. Greenberg, it is recommended that Cheltenham Township Development Application No. 08-01: Record Plan Lubin & Walsh Subdivision – 7656 New Second Street be approved contingent upon the finished floor being one foot above the 100 Year Flood Plain and the proper notations pertaining to the Sewer Moratorium be noted on the Record Plan.

4. Cheltenham Township Development Application No. 08-03 Record Plan Melrose Court Apartments Proposed Parking Field - 7340 Old York Road was discussed.

Mr. Jack Leapson, Engineer, and Mr. Ed Brown, Applicant, were present to discuss this Application.

Mr. Lynch presented plans and stated this property is at the corner of Old York Road and Willow Avenue. Currently there is inadequate parking for the number of apartment units at the site and the Applicant is proposing to enter into a long term agreement with the neighbor for the leasing of parking spaces. The Applicant is proposing to plant four trees and thin out scrub trees.

Mr. Lynch suggested that the Applicant request a waiver in order to reduce the parking aisle width to 22', in order to reduce impervious area, downsize Stormwater Management Facilities and increase Green Area/Landscaping.

The parking aisle between the two properties was also discussed and it was recommended that it be reduced from 25' wide to 15', and the parking space, at the entrance from Willow Avenue, be eliminated.

In response to a question posed by Mr. Lynch, it was stated that Mr. Ahn, adjacent property owner, was contacted in order to ascertain if additional parking spaces could be obtained from his property.

Mr. Lynch stated that the owners of properties on which improvements are being made must sign Owner Acknowledgement Notations.

Upon motion of Ms. Farrell, seconded by Mr. Winneberger, it is recommended that Cheltenham Township Development Application No. 08-03 Record Plan Melrose Court Apartments Proposed Parking Field - 7340 Old York Road be approved contingent upon the removal of the one parking space entering from Willow Avenue and the reduction of parking aisle widths as much as possible.

5. Cheltenham Township Development Application No. 07-15: Record Plan Kirk and Matthew Watkins Subdivision – 426 Greenwood Avenue was discussed.

Mr. Kirk Watkins, owner, Mr. Jay Ochroch, Attorney and Mr. Hal Lichtman, Architect were present to discuss this Application.

Mr. Lynch presented plans of the proposed three lot subdivision. He stated there is an existing residence and the Applicant is proposing to construct two, single family dwellings on a private street. The initial plan indicates a driveway is located on Greenwood Avenue, south of Barker Road. This driveway is intended to be the Applicants' private street and will be increased in width. The initial plan calls for a modified cul-de-sac with storm infiltration trenches; this has since been revised and there will now be stone seepage beds, sized for the 125% of the 100 Year Storm runoff volume.

Mr. Lynch noted that residents are concerned about drainage, flooding and traffic impact.

Mr. Lynch noted that the property has two (2) curb cuts on Greenwood Avenue; one on the western side of the property (closest to Church Road) and the other on the eastern side of the property (closest to Glenside Avenue). The western curb cut is used by the Applicant for his driveway and is the curb cut for the proposed private street; the eastern curb cut is currently not used.

Mr. Lynch stated that he and Mr. Kastenhuber met with five (5) PennDOT representatives on Thursday, February 21, 2008, to discuss access for the proposed subdivision. After taking some measurements and observing site lines, the PennDOT officials determined that either driveway location could be used to access the subdivision provided trees and portions of the existing stone wall were removed within the required clear site triangle. However, it is Mr. Lynch's and Mr. Kastenhuber's position that the eastern curb cut would provide a safer access point.

Mr. Lynch stated the properties meet all the dimensional requirements for Zoning. There are no steep slope issues, although he stated he does have concerns and is requesting that an enlarged grading layout be presented to substantiate this.

Mr. Lynch stated the Police Department has reviewed the plans and stated if PennDOT is satisfied, then they have no concerns.

Mr. Lynch read Mr. Moonblatt's concerns (see attached). These concerns include the width and configuration of the driveways, overhanging trees and the bridge structures, as these concerns might hinder the access of fire trucks in case of an emergency. Mr.

Moonblatt also is recommending that a hydrant be installed at the end of the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Lichtman stated this property is a three and a half acre lot, zoned R3, and that the immediate downstream properties along Greenwood Place are zoned R-4. The proposed lots will be in excess of one acre and will be served by a private street.

Mr. Lichtman stated that two site plans have been submitted for the proposed subdivision: the initial plan which employs a minimalist approach to site development which tries to minimize site impacts and a second plan which conforms more closely with the Subdivision Code requirements and which has more severe site impacts. In both designs seepage beds, designed to hold 125% of the 100 Year Storm runoff volume, are being used to reduce post-development runoff from the site below the pre-development runoff.

Mr. Lichtman stated he feels the initial plan is a better plan, as it impacts the site least.

Mr. Lichtman questioned the Fire Marshal's comments regarding the driveway, as the driveway has been in existence for 50 years and there has never been an issue. He stated that, most if not all, of the concerns of the Fire Marshal can be addressed.

Mr. Kirk Watkins stated he will contact Mr. Moonblatt regarding residential fire protection, sprinklering the houses, removing dead trees and the trimming of the

remaining trees in order to clear the height for fire apparatus. Tree replacement has been calculated and also dead trees will be noted on the plans. It was stated that 15% of all trees, 6" dbh or greater, can be removed without replacement. Any tree in excess of the 15% must be replaced on a one for one basis.

Mr. Lichtman stated he does not understand Mr. Moonblatt's concern regarding the widths of the two (2) bridges as it has never been an issue. Mr. Lichtman stated that, in subsequent discussions with PennDOT, it was stated that connecting both curb cuts ("U" shaped driveway) and using one for entrance only and the other for exit only would be a safer design option; the Applicant is considering this.

Mr. Lichtman stated there are no steep slope issues as they have been addressed. The private road slope has been designed to be 6% or less. During discussion it was ascertained that there is no steep slope requirement for driveways. The width of the existing driveway is 10' to 12' at its narrowest point.

A resident inquired as to where will the snow be piled after a storm. Mr. Lichtman stated there will be a Home Owners Association to address that concern in addition to sewer laterals and utility maintenance.

Ms. Farrell inquired if the culverts will remain as they exist, and was informed they will remain as is in order to not infringe on the wetlands.

Mr. Watkins stated he will provide sprinkler protection for the houses and provide the Township revised enlarged grading plans. The entrance will be revised to an "S" configuration and he will do whatever PennDOT requires.

It was stated the property is not in the Historic District but is in an historic area and it is the intention to maintain as much of the stone wall and pillars as possible.

Mr. Michael Love, 10 Walt Lane, inquired as to where the high water line is located and the size of the area of a previous lake formed during a storm event. He informed the

Commission that there previously had been a pond on the property, and that there was a fire on the property and the fire trucks did not pass over the bridge because of safety concerns. He also stated his concern regarding water runoff and that eight perc tests were performed in December. The neighbors are concerned because the proposed Stormwater Management will not take into consideration the current problems. It was stated that the ground water will recharge, allowing water runoff to be stored in the ground. He stated the perc tests were performed during a drought. The validity of percolation test performed during the Fall and Winter months was also questioned.

A petition, and research pertaining to the application, is attached to these minutes at the request of Ms. Barnhardt. Residents also voiced concern regarding the lack of a traffic study being performed, water runoff and the flow of water over-saturating the soil. It was stated there have been numerous traffic accidents at this location. The telephone pole has been severely nicked, a crossing guard had been struck by a vehicle and that position has since been eliminated from that site. Also concern for the school children was expressed.

Barker Road and Deaver Road are downhill roads and have visibility issues.

Mr. Cross stated there is an existing driveway, and inquired as to what the concern will be for two additional houses.

It was stated the intersection will be severely impacted, cars will be parked on neighboring streets and the character of the neighborhood will be compromised.

It was stated the Applicant is asking for many waivers and the Fire Marshal said the location is unsafe.

Mr. Lichtman stated the houses will each have a two car garage.

Mr. Lynch inquired if a traffic study is to be performed; Mr. Lichtman stated he will refer the matter back to PennDOT.

A discussion ensued regarding the perc test and Mr. Lynch explained the method of performing the test, the sizing and climate conditions and stated that valid perc tests could be made during this time period.

Mr. Cross asked Mr. Lynch if he was confident that the proposed stormwater management control measures meet Code. Mr. Lynch stated conceptually they are only required to maintain the pre-development flow rate off the site and that the Applicants have agreed to construct seepage beds for the existing house, proposed houses and driveways and private street that are sized to accept 125% of the 100 Year Storm runoff volume; this exceeds Code Requirements.

Ms. Farrell inquired as to the Township's requirements regarding escrow. Mr. Lynch stated the Township requires a Development Escrow Agreement, Maintenance Escrow of 10% to be held for 18 months after final acceptance of the work and an Inspection Escrow. He stated all seepage beds will be inspected from start to finish.

Mr. Lynch stated currently there is a sewer moratorium in Cheltenham Township and that building permits for the two new houses will not be issued until the Township is permitted to do so by DEP.

The existing residence and proposed new residences will be connected via duplex grinder pumps and force mains to the existing sanitary sewer in Greenwood Avenue.

It was stated there will be a holding tank of 1000 gallon capacity which will hold approximately four (4) days of sewage.

Mr. Lynch asked Mr. Hilbush, Engineer, if the force main (sewer) would be attached to the bridge or run under the creek. Mr. Hilbush stated that the sewer would be run under the creek.

Mr. Lichtman again informed the residents that the Applicants are not requesting zoning variances, just waivers for the land development process. He explained the process and stated that the lots meet the dimensional requirement of the Code and the Board of Commissioners can either grant or deny the requested waivers.

Another concern is that the sidewalks along Greenwood Avenue are not in good condition and not shoveled after snow storms.

Residents expressed concern in the event the developers ceased development of the houses in midstream or the Applicants sell the parcels after receiving the necessary approvals.

Mr. Lynch noted that, before an approved Record Plan can be recorded, the following procedures must be followed:

- a. The Record Plan must be revised to comply with all the Conditions and Notes of the amended Director's Report.
- b. All non-plan Conditions of the amended Director's Report must be complied with.
- c. The various Subdivision and Land Development Agreements must be prepared by the Township Solicitor and executed.
- d. The various escrow accounts must be set up and fully funded.

Until the above is done, the Record Plan cannot be recorded and the two (2) new lots cannot be sold as they legally do not exist.

Once the Plan is recorded, the Applicant has the right to sell the new lots.

If the Applicant fails to complete the required site improvements, the Township has the right to take the development escrow (subject to property legal proceedings) and complete the site improvements.

A resident also stated that the trees are used as a method of stormwater management.

Recently two residents had six trees removed and additional flooding has occurred.

Mr. Barnhart, 340 Rices Mill Road, requested a more robust traffic study in order to ascertain the effect of the additional traffic will have on the neighboring streets.

He stated that the sight distance existing right out of Barker Road is obstructed.

Mr. Love inquired if the floodplain has been determined and has concern regarding a four day sewage tank.

Mr. Lynch asked the Applicant if he would consider providing a 100 Year Flood Plain analysis and traffic study. Mr. Ochroch stated PennDOT has never heard of a traffic study being required for the construction of two houses.

Mr. Lynch asked the Applicant if he would consider requesting a continuance; Mr. Ochroch stated he will have a response in 24 hours.

Mr. Hasser, 432 Greenwood Avenue, expressed concern with noise pollution.

At this time Mr. Ochroch requested a Continuance and also requested that this item be eliminated from the Shade Tree Advisory Commission meeting of February 28, 2008 and the Public Works Meeting of March 11, 2008

Mr. Winneberger, with the concurrence of the other Planning Commission members present, stated that the Planning Commission has the following concerns with this Application and requests the Applicant to address these concerns:

- a. Verify if the size of the seepage beds are adequate.
- b. Locate seepage beds outside of the 100 Year Flood Plan.
- c. Investigate impact of long driveway on flooding.
- d. A Traffic Study be performed and the traffic issues addressed, including sight distance.
- e. A single site design must be submitted for consideration.
- f. The best way to enter/exit site must be utilized.
- g. The concerns of the Fire Marshal must be addressed.
- h. Resolve the proper width of the private road, especially over the bridges.
- i. Determine 100 Year Flood Plan and show on the plans.
- j. The potential dynamics of flooding be included in the stormwater analysis.
- k. Residential sprinklers be a condition of any possible approval.
- l. The residence finish floor elevations must be noted on the Plans and must be a minimum of one foot above the 100 Year Flood Plan elevation at the location of the residence.
- m. A minimum of a 1000 gallon holding tank will be underground and not located in the flood plain.
- n. The structural integrity of the bridges must be evaluated. (The bridges must be able to support loadings from trash trucks, moving vans, fire engines, etc.)

Upon motion of Mr. Winneberger, seconded by Ms. Farrell, it is recommended that Cheltenham Township Development Application No. 07-15: Record Plan Kirk and Matthew Watkins Subdivision – 426 Greenwood Avenue be tabled subject to the Applicant providing the Township with a letter requesting a continuance; in the event a

letter requesting a continuance is not received, it is recommended that this Application be denied.

6. At this time the proposed Age Restricted Housing Overlay District Ordinance was discussed.

Mr. Lynch informed the Commission that there will be a Public Hearing on Tuesday, February 26, 2008, for review and consideration by the Board of Commissioners for adoption. He stated that approximately 45 parcels in the Township meet the necessary requirements.

Ms. Farrell stated that on Page 5, Maximum Density, should read 20 Units per Acre of GTA for the 5 – 8.0 Acres, and 30 Units per Acre of GTA for acreage above 8 acres.

Upon motion of Mr. Winneberger, seconded by Ms. Farrell, it is recommended that the Age Restricted Overlay District Ordinance be adopted with the following change:

On Page 5, Maximum Density read 20 Units per Acre of GTA for 5 – 8.0 Acres and 30 Units per Acre of GTA for acreage above 8 acres.

7. Upon motion of Mr. Winneberger, seconded by Mr. Greenberg, the meeting adjourned.

David G. Kraynik  
Township Manager

Per: Emma Wetzel