

**July 27, 2009
Township Building**

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission was held tonight in the Township Administration Building. The following members were present: Messrs. Cross, Leighton, Goldfarb, Gordon 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. Hannah Mazzaccaro, Montgomery County Planning and David Harrower, Observer.

1. Acceptance of the minutes for the June 29, 2009 meeting

Mr. Cross determined that the minutes would be accepted at the next meeting in order to give the members more time.

2. Review of Zoning Hearing Board (“ZHB”) Agenda for August 10, 2009.

Appeal No. 3303: (Continued) – Appeal of York Road Realty Co., L.P. for the following Zoning Relief at the following locations:

- A. Premises owned by York Road Realty Co., L.P. known as 8116 Old York Road, Elkins Park, PA (a/k/a 8116 Church Road, or (“The Old York Road Skating Rink”) or Cheltenham Township Real Estate Registry Parcel (“CTRERP”) Block 174, Unit 054) (hereinafter referred to as “Rink Lot”);
- B. Premises owned by the Philadelphia Electric Company known as landlocked lot adjoining 8116 Old York Road (a/k/a CTRERP Block 174 Unit 056) (hereinafter referred to as “PECO Lot”); and
- C. Premises owned by the Township of Cheltenham known as (“Wall Park”) a/k/a CTRERP Block 174, Units 001 and 002) (hereinafter referred to as “Wall Park”) for the following improvements:

AA. On Rink Lot

- 1. A modification of the Decision under ZHB Appeal No. 2968 so as to eliminate the following Conditions (both as to Rink Lot and PECO Lot):

Condition (3)

The access driveway proposed to be installed on the Proposed Parking Area as depicted on Exhibit A-10 shall be limited to the minimum necessary width to allow the dropping-off of handicapped persons from motor vehicles and the associated vehicular turn-around space, all as approved by the Township Engineer in accordance with generally accepted engineering principals; and

Condition (4)

There shall be no parking of vehicles or trailers on the Property and/or the PECO Property including, without limitation, within the Proposed Parking Area. The Proposed Parking Area shall be used only for the purposes set forth in Condition No. 3 above.

2. A Variance from the rules and regulations of the Class C-3 Commercial and Business District as outlined in CCS 295-117. for expansion of the non-conforming skating rink facility by construction of a parking field and associated improvements, installation of two (2) storage units and installation of one (1) storage trailer.
3. A Variance from the rules and regulations of the Class C-3 Commercial and Business District as outlined in CCS 295-121.A. for the following front yard setbacks instead of the minimum required 15'.
 - a. For two (2), 8'W x 40'L storage containers with a zero front yard setback.
 - b. For the storage trailer with a 6'± front yard setback.
4. A Special Exception in accordance with the rules and regulations of the "Steep Slope Conservation District" as outlined in CCS 295-168.B. and C. for any storm sewers and/or underground utility lines associated with the construction of the parking field.
5. Variances from the rules and regulations of the "Steep Slope Conservation District" as outlined in CCS 295-169. as follows:
 - a. From CCS 295-169.A.(1) for construction of storage trailer, retaining walls, sidewalk and landscaping.
 - b. From CCS 295-169.A.(2) for construction of the parking field.
 - c. From CCS 295-169.A.(3) for filling or removal of topsoil required for the construction of aforesaid improvements.
 - d. From CCS 295-169.B. to permit areas with slopes of 25% or greater within any of the required yard areas.
6. A determination as to the required amount of on-site parking.

7. A Variance from the rules and regulations of “Fences and Walls” as outlined in CCS 295-223. for 3'± of 6' high, chain link fencing within the required front yard setback area along the SEPTA R/W line instead of the maximum permitted 4' high fencing.

BB. On PECO Lot

1. A Variance from the rules and regulations of the Class C-3 Commercial and Business District as outlined in CCS 295-117. for the use of a parking field for the non-conforming skating rink and installation of the storage trailer instead of any of the enumerated permitted uses.
2. A Variance from the rules and regulations of the Class C-3 Commercial and Business District as outlined in CCS 295-121.A. for a lesser front yard setback of 7'± instead of the minimum required 15' for the storage trailer.
3. Variances from the rules and regulations of the “Steep Slope Conservation District” as outlined in CCS 295-169. as follows:
 - a. From CCS 295-169.A.(1) for construction of storage trailer, retaining walls, sidewalk and landscaping.
 - b. From CCS 295-169.A.(2) for construction of the parking area.
 - c. From CCS 295-169.A.(3) for filling or removal of topsoil required for the construction of aforesaid improvements.
 - d. From CCS 295-169.B. to permit areas with slopes of 25% or greater within any of the required yard areas.
4. A Variance from the rules and regulations of “Fences and Walls” as outlined in CCS 295-223. for 15' of 6' high, chain link fencing within the required front yard setback area along the SEPTA R/W instead of the maximum permitted 4' high fencing.

CC. On Wall Park (said premises being within the Class R1 Residence District)

1. A Variance from the rules and regulations of “Signs” as outlined in CCS 295-197.A. for 25.5± S.F., 10' high, double sided, free-standing billboard advertising the “Old York Road Ice Rink” instead of one of the enumerated permitted sign types.

Mr. Cross moved that the previous Planning Commission motion of no action be reaffirmed. Mr. Goldfarb seconded the motion.

APPEAL NO. 3328: (Amended) Appeal of Fairfield Wyncote LLC, Owner of premises known as 8440, 8460, 8470, and 8480 Limekiln Pike, Wyncote, PA (a\k\ a “ The Towers at Wyncote” Apartment Complex), from the discussion of the Zoning Officer for the following zoning relief for existing non conforming signage as noted below (said premises being within the Class C-1 Commercial Zoning District):

A. 8440 Limekiln Pike (Clubhouse/Leasing Office and Fitness Center)

1. Variances from the rules and regulations of “Signs” as outlined in Article XXV of Chapter 295 of the Cheltenham Code, as follows:
 - a. From CCS 295-197.C.(1) (a) for the following free-standing signage on the North side of Limekiln Pike which is in excess of the permitted one (1) free standing sign per single use of property, as follows:
 - i. Proposed Sign A North of Limekiln Pike Entrance at 7.08’W x 18’H (127.50 SF), 20’ ± High.
 - ii. Proposed Sign B just North of Limekiln Pike Entrance (no dimensions given) (Replaces Sign 5).
 - iii. Proposed Sign C just South of Limekiln Pike Entrance (no dimensions given)
 - iv. Proposed Sign D 360 ±’ Southerly Limekiln Pike Entrance at 5’W x 10’H: (50 SF), 12± ’ High (Replaces existing Sign 7).
 - b. From CCS 295-196.A.(3) for Directional Sign 3K at entrance drive to Clubhouse/Leasing Office having a sign area of 15 SF (6’Wx2.5’H) instead of the maximum permitted 4 SF.

B. 8460 Limekiln Pike (Building No. 1)

1. Variances from The Rules and Regulations of “Signs” as outlined in Article XXV of Chapter 295 of the Cheltenham Code, as follows:
 - a. From CCS 295-196.A.(3) for the following directional signs which sign areas exceed the maximum permitted 4 SF:
 - i. Sign 3F on south side main accessway at 2.5’W x 3’H: 7.5 SF
 - ii. Proposed Sign E on North side main accessway at 4’W x 6’H: (24 SF) (Replaces existing Sign 3G).
 - iii. Sign 3H at main entrance Building No. 1 at 2’W x 2.5’H: 5 SF
 - iv. Sign 3I at main entrance Building No. 1 at 2’W x 2.5’H: 5 SF
 - v. Sign 3L at Limekiln Pike Guard House at 2.75’W x 3.08’H: 8.48 SF
 - vi. Sign 3M at Limekiln Pike Guard House at 2.75’W x 2’H : 5.5 SF
 - b. From CCS 295-197.C.(1) (a) for the following parallel wall signage in excess of the permitted one (1) parallel wall sign per signage use of property:
 - i. Sign 10 at Limekiln Pike Guard House at 6.17’W x 3’ H : 18.5 SF
 - ii. Sign 11 at Building No. 1 main entrance at 16.38’ W x 4.33 H: 70.92 SF

- c. From CCS 295-196.A. (12) (h) for Temporary Sign 14 (5'Wx4'H:20 SF) at Building No. 1 main entrance drive-thru attached to balcony above having been in place longer than the permitted 30 days.

C. 8470 Limekiln Pike (Building No. 2)

1. Variances from the rules and regulations of "Signs" as outlined CCS 295-196.A.(3) for the following directional signs which sign areas exceed the maximum permitted 4 SF:
 - a. Sign 3D on south side main accessway at 2.5'W x 3'H: 7.5 SF
 - b. Sign 3E on north side main accessway at 2.67'W x 4.04'H :10.78 SF
 - c. Proposed Sign F on north side main accessway: 2.67'W x 4'H:10.67 SF

D. 8480 Limekiln Pike (Building No. 3)

2. Variances from the Rules and Regulations of "Signs: as outlined in Article XXV of Chapter 295 of the Cheltenham Code, as follows:
 - a. From CCS 295-196.A.(3) for the following directional sign which sign areas exceed the maximum permit of 4 SF:
 - i. Sign 3A on south side of main accessway at 2.5'Wx3'H: 7.5 SF
 - ii. Sign 3B on south side of main accessway at 2.5'Wx3'H: 7.5 SF
 - iii. Proposed Sign G on North side main accessway at 2.67'W x 4' H: 10.67 SF
 - c. From CCS 295-197.C.(1) (a) for Freestanding Sign 8 (11.58'W x 4.46'H: 51.65 SF) at Easton Road Entrance having a greater sign area of 51.65 SF instead of the maximum permitted 50 SF.

Mr. Lynch noted that a Notice of Violation was issued because of the number of signage and illegal banners at Building 3. These banners were removed along with the temporary sign at Primo Bacio Restaurante Italiano.

Attorney, Michael Yanoff, was present to discuss the matter and handed out plans showing signage which included seven major signs and pictures.

Discussion ensued regarding the size and lighting of the signs. Mr. Yanoff said the signs had been there for years and were tastefully done.

Mr. Ben Barnes, representing the Towers, was present and answered questions about the lighting of the large retail signs.

Mr. Winneberger made a motion to take no action. Mr. Golfarb seconded the motion.

APPEAL NO. 3336 – Appeal of Matrix Ashbourne Associates, L.P., owner of premises known as 1100 Ashbourne Road, Cheltenham, PA (a/k/a "Ashbourne Country Club"), from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for Zoning Relief in order to subdivide the premises into two (2) lots: an Age

Restricted Development lot consisting of 88.657± acres and an Apartment Complex lot consisting of 15.836± acres and develop the two lots as follows:

- A. The Age Restricted Development will consist of 103 building lots. Depending upon market demand, Applicant will construct one (1) of three (3) housing units on each of these building lots, namely:

- (1) An Estate Home (One (1) dwelling unit per building lot); or,
- (2) Two (2) single family homes with a 19' wide side yard area between each home (Two (2) dwelling units per building lot); or
- (3) Carriage Homes (Three (3) dwelling units per building lot).

The total number of dwelling units for the Age Restricted Development will vary from 103 dwelling units to 309 dwelling units depending upon market demand.

- B. The Apartment Complex lot will consist of eleven (11) buildings with 16 apartments per building: 176 units total. The Apartments will be either one or two bedroom units. The Apartment Complex lot will have a separate entrance off of Jenkintown Road. Amenities will include a clubhouse, pool and landscaped seating area.

The total number of dwelling units being proposed will vary from 279 to 485 depending on market demand.

The following Zoning Relief is required:

1. Age Restricted Development lot
 - a. A Variance from the rules and regulations of the "Floodplain Conservation District" as outlined in CCS 295-156. so as to allow construction or development within the floodplain area.
 - b. Variances from the rules and regulations of the "Steep Slope Conservation District" as outlined in Article XXII of the Cheltenham Code, as follows:
 - i. 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 and other underground utilities.
 - ii. From CCS 295-168. for not submitting plans conforming to the stated Lines and Grades Plan(s) requirements.
 - c. Variances from the rules and regulations of "Parking and Loading" as outlined in CCS 295-221, as follows:
 - i. From CCS 295-221.C.(2)(c) for a lesser aisle width of 22' instead of the minimum required 24'.
 - ii. From CCS 295-221.F. for a greater amount of parking of 1287 parking spaces instead of the maximum permitted 120% of the required parking spaces which equals 633 parking spaces.

- d. 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 Variance from CCS 295-242.A. so as to allow the lot to be configured under the Pennsylvania Uniform Communities Act.
 - ii. A Special Exception in accordance with CCS 295-242.B. for the Age Restricted Development (with clubhouse and associated recreation).
 - iii. A Variance from CCS 295-243.B.8.d. to permit development within reas having a slope of 15% or greater.
 - iv. A Variance from CCS 295-243.B.8.e. to permit stormwater management facilities within Riparian Buffer areas.
 - v. A Variance from CCS 295-244. for a front yard setback of 50' instead of the minimum required 100'.
 - vi. A Variance from CCS 295-244. for a minimum distance between buildings of 18.5' instead of the minimum required 30'.
- e. 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.

2. Apartment Complex lot

- a. Variances from the rules and regulations of the Class R-1 Residence District as outlined in Article III of Chapter 295 of the Cheltenham Code, as follows:
 - i. From CCS 295-07. for the Apartment Complex use (including clubhouse and pool) instead of one of the enumerated permitted uses.
 - ii. From CCS 295-09. for a greater building area of 13.1% instead of the maximum permitted 10%.
 - iii. From CCS 295-10.A. for a lesser front yard setback along Ashbourne Road of 50' and along Jenkintown Road of 51.7' instead of the minimum required 75'.
 - iv. From CCS 295-10.C. for a lesser rear yard setback of 32.3' instead of the minimum required 50'.
- b. A Variance from the rules and regulations of the “Floodplain Conservation District” as outlined in CCS 295-156. so as to allow construction or development within the floodplain area.
- c. Variances from the rules and regulations of the “Steep Slope Conservation District” as outlined in Article XXII of the Cheltenham Code, as follows:
 - i. 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 and other underground utilities.
 - ii. From CCS 295-168. for not submitting plans conforming to the stated Lines and Grades Plan(s) requirements.
- d. 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 352 parking spaces instead of the maximum permitted 120% of the required parking spaces which equals 317 parking spaces.

- e. A Determination of whether or not the rules and regulations of the “Age Restricted Overlay District” as outlined in Article XXXIII of Chapter 295 of the Cheltenham Code apply to the Apartment Complex Development.
- f. If a Determination is made that the rules and regulations of the “Age Restricted Overlay District” do apply to the Apartment Complex Development, then Variances from the following:
 - i. From CCS 295-243.B.8.d. to permit development within areas having a slope of 15% or greater.
 - ii. From CCS 295-243.B.8.e. to permit storm water management facilities within Riparian Buffer Areas.
 - iii. From CCS 295-244. for a front yard setback of 50' instead of the minimum required 100'.
- g. 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.

The Mr. Don Epstein, architect and attorney, Peter Friedman were present to discuss the project to answer neighbors’ concerns for the Appeal that would be heard at the ZHB on September 14. Mr. Cross mentioned that at last month’s meeting, denial was recommended.

Discussion ensued with Mr. Lynch mentioning that a list was provided of the most asked questions.

Many questions were asked and answered with the neighbors stating that they planned to bring in legal and land advisors.

Ms. Natalie Hursky questioned the R1 zoning classification regarding the number of houses and the acreage allowable and maintaining open space.

Further discussion ensued with Mr. Lynch answered questions regarding the cluster option and wetlands.

The previous position of the board was reaffirmed. Mr. Winneberger made a motion for denial. Mr. Goldfarb seconded the motion.

APPEAL NO. 3340 – Appeal of Clearwire, prospective tenant at 7900 Old York Road, Elkins Park, PA, from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for the following Zoning Relief to install and operate two 2'-0" M.W. Dish Telecommunication Antennas on the west utility penthouse:

- 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 two (2) telecommunication antennas instead of one of the enumerated permitted uses.
 - ii. From CCS 295-95. for a height of 114.0' A.G.L. instead of the maximum permitted 85'.

APPEAL NO. 3341 – Appeal of Randal S. and Florence E. Wachsmuth, owners of premises known as 8228 Marion Road, Elkins Park, PA, from the decision of the Zoning Officer for the following Zoning Relief in order to construct a 16'W x 28.33'L addition to the front of the residence:

- a. Zoning Relief 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. A variance from CCS 295-39.A.(1) for a lesser front yard setback of 16.33' instead of the minimum required 40'.
 - ii. A variance from CCS 295-39.B.(1) for lesser side yard setback of 8.67' from the northwest property line instead of the minimum required 10' for the Addition (the existing residence has a minimum side yard setback of 7.17' from the northwest property line.).
 - iii. A variance from CCS 295-38. for a greater Building Area of 24.3% instead of the maximum permitted 20%.
 - iv. In the alternative to Items a.i., a.ii. and a.iii., above, special exceptions in accordance with CCS 295-41. for the following:
 1. From CCS 295-39.A.(1) for the lesser front yard setback of 16.33'.
 2. From CCS 295-39.B.(1) for the lesser side yard setback of 8.67'.
 3. From CCS 295-38. for the greater Building Area of 24.3%.

Mr. Lynch discussed the appeal for a telecommunications antenna. He mentioned that it should be painted to match and if it could be seen that it must be painted to the color "City Lights".

APPEAL NO. 3344 – Appeal of Sprint, Prospective Tenant at premises known as 60 E. Township Line Road, Elkins Park, PA 19027 (a/k/a "Moss Rehab-Einstein Elkins Park") for the following Zoning Relief from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for the installation and operation of One (1) 1'-0" Diameter M.W. Dish Antenna on existing Sprint antenna array and One (1) coax line (1/2") to existing equipment ("T-Antenna") on the roof of the main building:

- a. Variances from the rules and regulation of the Class R-4 Residence District as outlined in Article VII of Chapter 295 of the Cheltenham Code, as follows:
 - i. From CCS 295-36. for the installation and operation of the T-Antenna instead of one of the permitted enumerated uses.
 - ii. From CCS 295-40. for T-Antenna of 80.5' above grade level instead of the maximum permitted 40'.

Mr. Lynch discussed the proposal to put a dish on an existing tower. A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Gordon made a motion to take no action. Mr. Goldfarb seconded the motion.

APPEAL NO. 3345 – Appeal of Stephen and Christine Niezgoda, Owners of Premises known as 636 Woodland Avenue Cheltenham, PA 19012, from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for the following Zoning Relief for addition of a 7’X14’ deck to the rear of the house:

- b. Variances from the rules and regulation of the Class R-5 Residence District as outlined in Article VII of Chapter 295 of the Cheltenham Code, as follows:
 - iii. From CCS 295-43. for expansion of a legal nonconforming structure (the house is a single family semi-detached dwelling (a\k\ a “Twin”) and is not a permitted use in the R-5 Zoning District.).
 - iv. From CCS 295-46.B. (2) for a lesser side yard setback of 10.95’ on the Northeast side of the deck instead of the minimum required 20’; the existing side yard setback to the house is 10.95’.
 - v. From CCS 295-46.B. (2) for a lesser side yard setback of zero feet on the Southwest side of the deck instead of the minimum required 20’.

Stephen and Christine Niezgoda, owners of the premises, were present to discuss the addition of a deck to be added to the rear of their twin house.

Discussion ensued with Mr. Winneberger discussing the size of the deck.

Mr. Reitano mentioned being aware of the fire codes.

Mr. Gordon made a motion to take no action. Mr. Goldfarb seconded the motion.

APPEAL NO. 3346 – Appeal of Aldi, Tenant of Premises known as 8200 Ogontz Avenue, Wyncote PA, 19095 from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for a variance from the Rules and Regulations of “Signs” as outlined in CCS 295-197.C.(2)(b)[1] for a third parallel wall sign (on Ogontz Avenue side of building; 1.5’H x 14.23’W (21.35 SF) parallel wall sign; text “Food Market”) instead of the maximum permitted two (2) signs per tenant space. (Said Premises being with the Class C-2 Commercial and Business District.):

Discussion ensued regarding signage for the Aldi Food Stores.

Mr. Winneberger discussed the size of the signage with Mr. Cross showing a picture of the sign.

Mr. Goldfarb made a motion to take no action. Mr. Goldfarb seconded the motion.

APPEAL NO. 3347 – Appeal of Chick-Fil-A, Inc, Prospective Tenant at premises known as 2385 W. Cheltenham Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19150 (a\k\ a “Cheltenham Square Mall”, “Cheltenham Mall”, or 2421 Cheltenham Avenue), from the decision of the Zoning Officer the following signage (said premises being within the Class C-2 Commercial and Business District):

- a. Variances from the Rules and Regulations of “Signs” as outlined in Article XXV of Chapter 295 of the Cheltenham Code, as follows:
 - i. From CCS 295-197.C.(2)(a) for a fifth freestanding/monument sign (Sign 1: 4’ H x 10’W (40 S.F.) 7’ High,) on the W. Cheltenham Avenue frontage of

- the premises instead of the Four (4) free-standing/monument signs permitted per the Decision for ZHB Appeal No 3236 .
- ii. From CCS 295-197.C.(2)(b)[1], as follows:
1. For a 3.33' H x 2.5 W (8.33 SF) 4.25' High Pre-Menu Board (Sign 3) instead of one of the permitted enumerated sign types.
 2. For a 4' H x 5.46' W (21.84 SF), 4.83' High Drive Thru Menu Board (Sign 4) instead of one of the permitted enumerated sign types.
 3. For a 8.16' H x 12.05' W (98.33 SF) parallel Wall Sign (Sign 5) on the Southwest façade of the building instead of the maximum permitted 39 SF Sign.
 4. For four (4) parallel Wall Signs (Signs 5, 6, 7 and 8) instead of the maximum permitted two (2) Parallel Wall Signs.

Signage for a proposed Chick-Fil-A store, for a Prospective Tenant, for Cheltenham Square Mall was discussed.

Mr. John Martino, Engineer, representative of Chick-Fil-A, showed the sign rendering and answered questions.

Discussion ensued regarding various signage on the proposed building.

Mr. Scott Thigpen, Development Manager, for Chick-Fil-A was also present to answer questions about the signage.

Mr. Lynch discussed changeable signage and asked if could be turned off at night. Mr. Martin stated that it could be turned off.

Further discussion ensued.

Mr. Cross stated that they tried to discourage animated signs in the Township.

Mr. Thigpen agreed that to get rid of the changeable portion of the signage as a condition for approval by the Committee.

Mr. Gordon recommended that the Committee take to action. Mr. Winneberger seconded the motion.

3. Review of Cheltenham Township Development Application No. 09-04: Record Plan Glenside Elementary School Replacement-400 Harrison Avenue.

Mr. Lynch stated that the building would be entirely removed.

Mr. G. Glenn Harris and Ms. Sheri Lamphere from Renew Design Group were present to discuss the project.

Discussion ensued regarding parent drop off, grading, sanitary sewers. Mr. Lynch mentioned that there was a recommendation report from Commissioner, John Norris. He also stated that the fire marshal will be making recommendations.

Mr. Cross questioned the School Board review of the project.

Mr. Harris stated that the plans would be presented at the School Board meeting and to the Township Staff. He stated that adjustments could be made.

Ms. Mazzaccaro discussed the stabilization of turf, the drop off area, contouring the slope, underground retention basins and extensive site work.

Discussion ensued regarding parking spaces and flow motion of buses and cars with care for the children's safety.

Mr. Lynch discussed controlling the site for storm water management and maintaining the system.

Mr. Reitano said that the mature trees are never put near the playground so that limbs and branches do not hurt the children.

Discussion ensued regarding the traffic pattern for children, sidewalks and landscaping.

Mr. Harris said that they would incorporate the changes as discussed and noted on the plans.

He stated that they attempted to install landscaping close to the neighbors for their benefit.

Ms. Lamphere mentioned that they tried to save the trees.

Mr. Reitano said that it would be necessary for parents to assist children for their safety.

Further discussion ensued regarding staff parking and bike racks

Mr. Cohen questioned if there would be a fence on top of the retaining wall.

Mr. Harris said that there would be a fence according to manufacturer's minimum heights.

Mr. Harrower questioned saving the plans from the school for historical purposes.

Mr. Lynch recapped his discussion:

- Storm water management
- Elements of rain gardens
- Underground storm water

Mr. Cross recapped his discussion:

- Drop off of children and reducing double loaded drop off to single loaded drop off

Concerns about elevation
Bike racks

Mr. Leighton talked about signage for parent parking.

Mr. Gordon talked about traffic flow.

Mr. Winneberger discussed the need for two lanes for egress.

Ms. Lamphere spoke of the need for fire truck exit

Ms. Mazzaccaro talked about adding signage at the drop off spot.

Mr. Cross spoke about more trees on the site that would be clear of the playground, extending fencing before the bus loop and bike racks.

Discussion ensued regarding various changes made on the plan.

Mr. Winneberger made a motion to approve subject to conditions. Mr. Goldfarb seconded the motion.

4. Old Business

None.

5. New Business

None

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 P.M.

David G. Kraynik
Township Manager

Per: Marie Henger