

March 24, 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, Gordon, 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 Mr. Gordon, it is recommended that the minutes of the February 25, 2008 be accepted as presented.

2. The following appeals to be discussed at the April 14, 2008 Zoning Hearing Board meeting were discussed as this time:

APPEAL NO. 3264 (Continued) – 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. Lynch presented plans of the proposed telecommunication facility and stated it is to be located on the roof of Building C. This proposal was presented at the February 25, 2008 Planning Commission meeting at which time the Commission took no action. The Applicant requested a Continuance at the March 10, 2008 ZHB meeting to the April 14,

2008 ZHB meeting. The antennas will be 162.5 feet Above Grade Level and the

Township has a stand alone Telecommunications Ordinance.

Upon motion of Mr. Winneberger, seconded by Ms. Farrell, the Commission reiterates its previous recommendation of no action.

APPEAL NO. 3265 (Amended and Continued) – 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 102 feet Above Grade Level (“A.G.L.”) instead of the maximum permitted 85' A.G.L. for the telecommunication antennas.

Mr. Lynch presented plans of the proposed telecommunication facility and stated this application was presented at the February 25, 2008 Planning Commission meeting, at which time the Commission took no action with a condition. The Applicant requested a Continuance at the March 10, 2008 ZHB meeting to the April 14, 2008 ZHB meeting. Since the previous submission the Applicant amended its application and intends to install the antenna on the side of the building instead of on the top of the penthouse.

Upon motion of Mr. Winneberger, seconded by Ms. Farrell, the Commission reiterates its previous recommendation of no action, subject to the antennas and cabinet being painted to match the building’s façade.

APPEAL NO. 3274 – Appeal of Metro PCS, LLC, 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 123± feet Above Grade Level (“A.G.L.”) instead of the maximum permitted 85' A.G.L. for the telecommunication antennas.

Mr. Nicholas Cuce, Attorney, was present to discuss this Application. A plan of the proposed installation of the telecommunication facility was presented. It was stated that this provider negotiated for the installation of the antenna on the penthouse with the Elkins Park House prior to Crickett Communications, Inc. The antenna will be approximately 122 feet Above Grade Level, and seven feet above the penthouse.

Upon motion of Mr. Greenberg, seconded by Ms. Farrell, the Commission takes no action subject to the Applicant painting the antennas sky blue.

APPEAL NO. 3272 – Appeal of Keystone Outdoor Advertising Company, Inc., equitable owner of a triangular tract of land situated at south quadrant of intersection of Old Limekiln Pike with Ogontz Avenue (a/k/a CTRERP Block 146, Unit 016), from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for the following Zoning Relief in order to construct and operate a 50' high, 14' W x 48' L (672 SF), double-faced free-standing billboard sign on the premises:

- a. Variances from the rules and regulations of the Class C-4 Commercial and Business District as outlined in Article XVIII of Chapter 295 of the Cheltenham Code, as follows:
 - i. From CCS 295-127. for the “Billboard” use of the premises instead of one of the permitted enumerated uses.
 - ii. From CCS 295-132. for a 36±' wide driveway instead of the maximum permitted 20'.
- b. A Variance from the rules and regulations of “Signs” as outlined in CCS 295-197.C. for the “Billboard” sign instead of one of the permitted enumerated sign types.

Mr. Peter Friedman, Attorney, and Mr. Joseph Felice, Applicant, were present to discuss this Application and stated the Applicant is requesting Zoning Relief to construct and operate a double faced billboard sign. Mr. Friedman stated that this parcel is located at the intersection of Old Limekiln Pike an Ogontz Avenue and consist of approximately

9200 SF of gross area. After the required amount of parking spaces is allotted, a de minimis amount of buildable area will remain.

Mr. Friedman stated the Applicant is requesting a 50' high sign so as not to obstruct other signage in the area. The sign will not advertise adult subject matter, liquor or smoking. The Township will be offered the sign for advertisement, free of charge, if the sign is not in use, or a small portion at the bottom of the sign can be used by the Township. The billboard will be externally illuminated and the property will be completely landscaped with trees around the base of the support pylon. In response to Mr. Lynch the Applicant stated that he would plant a landscape berm and seasonal plantings.

Billboard signage is only permitted in a G Zoning District and is not permitted in a C4 Zoning District.

Mr. Cross stated that the proposed billboard was too large for this location.

In response to a question posed by Mr. Lynch, the Applicant agreed that he would accept a condition to any Grant of Zoning Relief, a prohibition against advertisements on adult subject matter, liquor and/or smoking.

A photo of the proposed signage was presented and Mr. Winneberger stated the sign is too high and not appropriate, as this area is a gateway to the Township.

It was stated that the building envelope is less than 3000 SF. Mr. Felice stated the size of an expressway billboard is 20' x 60' and the normal size of a billboard is 14' x 48'. A discussion ensued and it was ascertained that the size of the sign could be lowered by 10'.

Upon motion of Mr. Winneberger, seconded by Ms Farrell, it is recommended that Appeal No. 3272 be denied due to its size and location.

APPEAL NO. 3273 – Appeal of Melrose Court Investors LP, owner of premises known as 7340 Old York Road, LaMott, PA (a/k/a “Melrose Court Apartments, (hereinafter “Lot 1”), and 1330 Willow Avenue Associated, LLC, owner of 1330 Willow Avenue, LaMott, PA, (hereinafter “Lot 2”), from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for the following

Zoning Relief in order to construct and operate a 32 space parking field, 10 spaces of which are to be on Lot 1 and 22 spaces of which are to be on Lot 2, said parking field to straddle the Lot 1/Lot 2 common line; the purpose of the parking field is to provide off-street parking spaces for Lot 1 (both premises being within the Class R-7 Residence District);

A. For Lot 1:

1. A Special Exception in accordance with the rules and regulations of “Non-conforming Uses” as outlined in CCS 295-227.C. for the expansion of the non-conforming multi-family use of the premises.
3. In the alternative to A.1., above, a Variance from the rules and regulations of the Class R-7 Residence District as outlined in CCS 295-57. for a parking field for a multi-family use instead of one of the permitted enumerated uses.

B. For Lot 2:

1. A Variance from the rules and regulations of the Class R-7 Residence District as outlined in CCS 295-57. for a parking field for a multi-family use instead of one of the permitted enumerated uses.

Mr. Lynch stated that Cheltenham Township Development Application No. 08-03 Record Plan Melrose Court Apartment Proposed Parking Field 7340 Old York Road relevant to this Appeal was presented at the February 25, 2007 Planning Commission meeting, at which time approval was recommended with conditions requiring Zoning Relief for lesser parking spaces. Vehicular traffic will access the complex at 1330 Willow Avenue.

The Fire Marshal has not submitted any comments.

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

APPEAL NO. 3275 – Petition of Drew and Robin Nagele, owners of premises known as 410 Lodges Lane, Elkins Park, PA, from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for a Special Exception in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Class R-4 Residence District as outlined in CCS 295-39.A.(2) for a lesser front yard setback of 18' from the Chapel Road frontage of the premises instead of the minimum required 40' for a 32' x 14' in-ground swimming pool.

Mr. & Mrs. Nagele, owners, were present to discuss this Application. It was stated that this property consists of three front yards and the Applicant is requesting Zoning Relief for a lesser front yard on Chapel Road in order to construct an in-ground swimming pool. Upon motion of Mr. Winneberger, seconded by Ms. Farrell, the Commission takes no action.

APPEAL NO. 3276 – Appeal of Allan Perry, owner of premises known as 8255 New Second Street, Elkins Park, PA, from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for a Variance from the rules and regulations of “Fences and Walls” as outlined in CCS 295-223. for 70±' of 5'-8" high, solid fence within the required front yard setback area along the Marvin Road frontage of the premises instead of the permitted 4' high, 50% open fencing (said premises being within the Class R-4 Residence District).

Mr. Allan Perry, owner, was present to discuss this Application. Photos of the existing fence were presented and it was stated that it is the intention to replace a deteriorating fence with a similar, lower fence. The top of the proposed fencing will be lattice, thereby creating more opening than the existing fence. As the Applicant did not have a picture of the proposed fence, Mr. Cross recommended that one be obtained prior to the Zoning Hearing Board meeting. The reason for the closed fence is to contain a dog and also for security purposes.

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

APPEAL NO. 3278 – Appeal of Premier Financial Group, owner of premises known as 119 S. Easton Road, Glenside, PA, from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for the following Zoning Relief in order to install the following awnings with signage thereon:

- A. For Awning No. 1: Mounted over front entrance of building: 40" H x 10' W x 12'-3" Deep; with text “Premier Financial Group...119...” (23± SF) on front face and text “Premier Financial Group” (4.5 SF each; 9 SF total) on both sides:
 - 1. 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 2'-9" (±) instead of the required 15'
 - 2. Variances from the rules and regulations of “Signs” as outlined in CCS 295-197.C.(1)(b) as follows:

- a. For three (3) awning signs instead of the maximum permitted two signs per street frontage.
 - b. For awning signage area of 32± S.F. instead of the maximum permitted 10 S.F.
- B. For Awning No. 2: Mounted over rear entrance to building: 30" H x 8'-1" W x 3' Deep; front text to be determined (4 SF); side text to be determined on one side (4.5 SF):
1. A Variance from the rules and regulations of "Signs" as outlined in CCS 295-197.C.(1)(b) for an awning sign on the rear of the building instead of no permitted signage.

A representative from Premier Financial Group was present to discuss this Application.

Mr. Lynch presented a rendering of the signage and stated the Applicant is proposing awnings, with signage, one in the front of the building and one in the rear of the building.

Mr. Lynch stated the Ordinance limited the amount of signage to 10 SF and the applicant is proposing signage of 32 SF. The Economic Development Task Force reviewed this proposal and recommended approval.

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

APPEAL NO. 3280 – Appeal of Dana Hillerby, owner of premises known as 105 Carroll Avenue, Glenside, 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.A. for a second driveway, varying in width from 15' at the curblineline to 20' at the proposed garage (700 SF), on the premises' Brooke Road frontage instead of the permitted one, 18' wide driveway (said premises being within the Class R-5 Residence District.).

Mr. Hillerby, Applicant, was present to discuss this Application.

Mr. Lynch stated this property is at the corner of Brooke Road and Carroll Avenue.

A rendering of the proposed project was presented and Mr. Lynch stated Zoning Relief is not necessary for the structure, but is necessary for the proposed second driveway.

During discussion it was ascertained that the existing driveway will remain and there is no proposed walkway from the garage to the house.

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

APPEAL NO. 3281 – Appeal of His Eminence Justin Rigali, Archbishop of Philadelphia and his Successors, Archdiocese of Philadelphia, owner of premises known as 7631 and 7633 Waters Road and 120 Hilldale Road, Cheltenham, PA (a/k/a “St. Joseph’s Church), from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for the following Zoning Relief in order to subdivide the premises into two lots; Lot 1 being the Church Lot at 6.821± acres, and Lot 2 containing the existing Convent, 7633 Waters Road, at 0.835± acres (said premises being within the Class R-5 Residence District):

- a. A Variance from the rules and regulations of “Parking and Loading” as outlined in CCS 295-221.D. for a lesser amount of two (2) parking spaces on Lot 2 instead of the minimum required 11 spaces for the Convent.

Father Harrison, Pastor of St. Joseph’s Parish, Mr. Peter Friedman, Attorney, and Mr. John Reilley, Engineer, were present to discuss this Application.

This parish has been in existence since 1953. A second structure on the parcel has been occupied for the past nine months by a semi-cloister order of nuns, who have expressed interest in purchasing the building. He stated this order of nuns does not leave the premises or have guests, their purpose in life is to pray.

The Applicant is proposing to subdivide this property into two parcels.

Zoning Relief is also required for parking spaces for lesser parking spaces than the required 11 spaces.

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

3. Mr. Cross stated that the Building & Zoning Committee approved the formation of a three member sub-committee of the Planning Commission, to meet with members of the Economic Development Task Force in order to expedite revisions to the current Zoning Code. He stated he approached Mr. Gordon and Ms. Farrell who have agreed to be members of the sub-committee.

Mr. Cross stated he will confer with members of the Economic Development Task Force and Planning Commission in order to ascertain a suitable time for all.

During discussion it was stated that evenings, beginning at approximately 5 PM –

5:30 PM, would be preferred. Mr. Gordon stated he would not be available on Thursdays.

4. At this time Cheltenham Township Development Application No. 08-02: Record Plan Record Plan 21-23 E. Glenside Avenue Proposed Parking Field was discussed.

Dr. Kim, Applicant, was present to discuss this Application.

Mr. Lynch stated the Applicant previously received Zoning Relief, relevant for this land development. The Zoning Relief was granted with the following Conditions:

- a. That the proposed improvements be constructed in substantial conformity with the plans submitted to the Zoning Hearing Board and the presentation made to the Zoning Hearing Board at the hearings on this Appeal.
- b. That a parking area for at least six (6) cars be constructed at the rear of the Property.
- c. That a Land Development Plan on the proposed parking area and associated site improvements be submitted to the Township for its review and approval.
- d. That the proposed work conform to the requirements of the Township's Stormwater Management Ordinance (Ord. No. 2066-4).
- e. That all existing and/or future exterior HVAC Units on the Property be shielded with appropriate sound baffling materials, as approved by the Township Engineer, if the sound emanating therefrom is objectionable to the neighbors.
- f. That trash pick-up from the Property be scheduled for a minimum of twice a week with documentation thereon submitted to the Township Engineer annually.
- g. That the trash dumpster area be fully enclosed within either slatted chain link fencing or solid fencing with a self-closing, self-latching gate.
- h. That an Odor Control System be installed on the restaurant HVAC systems to eliminate restaurant cooking odors to the maximum practicable extent.

Mr. Lynch informed the Commission he issued a Notice of Violation to the owners of these properties for noise pollution relating to two existing HVAC units. He has been informed by Dr. Kim that a sound baffling enclosure will be constructed around the equipment.

Mr. Lynch stated the existing driveway is a 12'-8'± wide, clear path between properties.

All parking spaces will be on Dr. Kim's property, the existing driveway is adequate but

an access easement agreement between the two property owners will be necessary. There are no buffer requirements.

Upon motion of Mr. Winneberger, seconded by Ms. Farrell, it is recommended that

Cheltenham Township Development Application No. 08-02: Record Plan 21-23 E.

Glenside Avenue Proposed Parking Field be approved with the following conditions:

- a. That the proposed improvements be constructed in substantial conformity with the plans submitted to the Zoning Hearing Board and the presentation made to the Zoning Hearing Board at the hearings on this Appeal.
 - b. That a parking area for at least six (6) cars be constructed at the rear of the Property.
 - c. That the proposed work conforms to the requirements of the Township's Stormwater Management Ordinance (Ord. No. 2066-4).
 - d. That all existing and/or future exterior HVAC Units on the Property be shielded with appropriate sound baffling materials, as approved by the Township Engineer, if the sound emanating therefrom is objectionable to the neighbors.
 - e. That trash pick-up from the Property be scheduled for a minimum of twice a week with documentation thereon submitted to the Township Engineer annually.
 - f. That the trash dumpster area be fully enclosed within either slatted chain link fencing or solid fencing with a self-closing, self-latching gate.
 - g. That an Odor Control System be installed on the restaurant HVAC systems to eliminate restaurant cooking odors to the maximum practicable extent.
 - h. That an Access Easement Agreement between the two property owners be obtained.
5. Cheltenham Township Development Application No. 08-04: Record Plan Elkins Park Garden Apartments – HVAC Units – 8000 High School Road was discussed.

Mr. Lynch presented plans of the proposed HVAC Units and informed the Commission that this property recently changed ownership and the current owners are upgrading the property and installing central HVAC Units for the units.

Mr. Cross expressed concern that the sound emanating from the units might be a nuisance to the tenants.

Mr. Lynch stated he can modify a note on the plans addressing sound pollution to include protection for tenants.

Mr. Winneberger stated the sound would be self contained, as the units are to be located within the interior of the complex.

A discussion ensued as to whether noise decibels should be used as a measurement to determine if the noise is a nuisance.

The Commission also expressed concern with the trees and recommended that the landscaping be evaluated by the Shade Tree Advisory Commission.

Upon motion of Mr. Winneberger, seconded by Mr. Gordon, it is recommended that Cheltenham Township Development Application No. 08-04: Record Plan Elkins Park Garden Apartments – HVAC Units – 8000 High School Road be approved contingent upon the following:

- a. That the standard HVAC Noise Note be modified to address the tenants of Elkins Park Garden Apartments
 - b. That the Shade Tree Advisory Commission evaluate the landscaping.
6. Cheltenham Township Development Application No. 07-15: Record Plan Kirk and Matthew Watkins Subdivision – 426 Greenwood Avenue was discussed at this time.

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

Mr. Lynch stated no revised plans have been received as of this date. He stated that at the February 25, 2008 meeting this Application was tabled and the Applicant was requested to submit a Traffic Study, 100 Year Flood Elevation Study and a complete inventory of the trees.

Mr. Lichtman stated the final Traffic Study report will be delivered to the Township Building by Thursday, March 27, 2008 (**Traffic Study submitted on March 27, 2008 just prior to STAC meeting**), the Flood Plain Study will not be completed until just prior to the Public Works Committee meeting, and a complete inventory of the trees will

be presented at the Shade Tree Advisory Commission meeting on Thursday, March 27, 2008 (**Tree Inventory submitted to STAC on March 27, 2008**).

Mr. Lichtman read a summary draft of the traffic study which recommends that the eastern curb cut would be more feasible for an access point.

A summary of the Montco Planning review was read and it recommended approval of the initial submission plan.

In response to a question posed regarding stormwater management, Mr. Lichtman stated that the size of the seepage beds are adequate, and he was under the impression that it was reviewed by Mr. Lynch; Mr. Lynch stated that, at this time, he has not reviewed the sizing of the seepage beds.

Mr. Lynch stated his concern regarding the initial submission is that Stormwater Management was not addressed for Lot 1, and inquired if the Applicant would consider addressing all impervious areas on this lot. Mr. Lichtman stated that the Applicant would consider this request.

Mr. Lynch inquired if it can be assumed that the entrance will be redesigned to include the north curb cut as part of the driveway improvements; Mr. Lichtman replied "yes".

A discussion ensued regarding the 100 Year Flood Plain study and Mr. Lynch stated if it is necessary for engineers to access adjacent properties, the Applicant must receive permission from the relevant owners.

Ms. Emily Barnhart, 12 Greenwood Place, stated that if three adjacent neighbors are involved with the flood plain study, the Township should bear responsibility for the study.

Mr. Lynch stated he will review the study and the Township has the right to hire an independent firm to perform and/or review the study.

Ms. Barnhart stated the Applicant was to have the revised plans and the pertinent studies presented at this meeting, and since none have been presented the Commission should recommend denial of this Application. In response to a question inquiring if the pond will be included in the study, Mr. Lichtman responded no.

Mr. Lichtman stated he will forward information regarding times and what if anything is required from the adjacent properties owners regarding the engineers potentially accessing their properties. It was stated that the purpose of entering these properties would be to perform a study of the topography of the site, drainage, slopes and elevations.

Regarding the concerns of the Fire Marshal, Mr. Lichtman and Mr. Watkins have had a meeting with the Fire Marshal and stated that the new residences will be fully sprinklered and access will be provided to Lot 3. Regarding the crossover of the two culverts it was stated that the one is wide enough and the other will have the stone wall removed, relocated and rebuilt in order to widen the road. The Fire Marshal will be requested to provide Mr. Lynch with his final comments pertaining to this application.

Calculations to determine the amount of weight the culverts can handle must be submitted. Mr. Watkins stated that during renovations overloaded dumpsters crossed the culvert and he will provide the information gathered from the dumpster company's records.

Mr. Harrower stated that nature of a traffic study is to provide the volume of vehicular traffic for a particular location.

Regarding a damaged light pole discussed at the previous Planning Commission meeting, Mr. Lynch inquired if the Applicant would consider moving the pole onto his property.

Mr. Lichtman stated that the pole is under the jurisdiction of PECO.

It was stated the stone wall will be opened as required and the remaining wall repaired.

The piers on side walls will be removed and driveway widened.

Mr. Cross inquired what recourse the Township has if this issue does not get resolved tonight. Mr. Lynch stated the Applicant requested a Continuance to the April 15, 2008 Board of Commissioners meeting. The Public Works Committee must act on this submission at its April 8, 2008 meeting unless a continuance is requested.

Mr. Lichtman stated the Applicant is requesting that a decision be made as to which plan the Township prefers.

Mr. Winneberger and Ms. Farrell stated they have concerns with the lack of a traffic study, and they do not know which plan is being proposed as two plans have been submitted.

Mr. Lynch stated the flood study is a request and not required by Township Code.

Mr. Lichtman stated that a traffic study is not normally requested by the Township for a three lot subdivision.

Mr. Lynch stated he received a complaint that a number of trees have been removed from the property.

Mr. Watkins stated no trees have been removed since he last contacted Mr. Lynch and advised him of his intention to remove the trees. He also stated that trees 6" dbh or less, and overgrown brush had been removed at the recommendation of an Arborist. Mr.

Lichtman stated that the actual gauge used to measure the trees was 5 ½".

Regarding the 100 Year Flood Plain, Ms. Barnhart stated that the level needs to be established and the amount of money spent by the Applicant should not be a factor. She also stated that the traffic study is a factor, in that no approval has been received by PennDOT and there is no proof that a Highway Occupancy Permit has been submitted.

Ms. Barnhart also stated that no comments have been received from the Fire Marshal.

Regarding the proposed private road, it was stated that weight of one dumpster going over the culvert once, is not a valid test, and the width of the road has not been met.

Also, of concern is the safety of the neighbors' houses with seepage bed located under the driveway, and that the water runoff from the existing house should be taken into consideration. A Stormwater Management Analysis for All Hallows Episcopal Church was distributed, see attached. She also stated there have been instances where Robinson Park has been under water.

Mr. Arnold Zaslow, 430 Greenwood Avenue, inquired if the traffic study is complete why the Township has not received a final copy. Mr. Lichtman stated the request was only submitted a couple of weeks ago and takes time to gather the information. Mr. Zaslow inquired as to how accurate the results of this study will be because due to construction during that time period left hand turns could not be made onto Greenwood Avenue from Route 309 and the traffic would have been lighter.

Another resident stated that it is not the just number of cars traveling that road, but the dangerous situation for those vehicles accessing and exiting the driveways along Barker Road.

Mr. Watkins stated that Mr. Lynch was present when PennDOT visited the property and they stated both driveways met the sight requirements.

Mr. Cross inquired if there was an affidavit from PennDOT with their findings.

Mr. Lynch stated a condition for approval will be that the Applicant receives a Highway Occupancy Permit from PennDOT.

Ms. Stephanie Wietecha, 13 Greenwood Place, stated she spoke and recorded the conversation with Mr. Aviccoli, District Permits Manager with PennDOT, and was advised that the Applicant just recently applied for a Highway Occupancy Permit for

Greenwood Avenue and no decision has been rendered. She stated that Mr. Avicoli advised her that recommendations by PennDOT are to be addressed prior to the next site visit.

Ms. Wietcha presented photos indicating that this is a dangerous intersection as there is a blind curve and cars hydroplane. Mr. Cross stated the Committee is aware that this is a problem intersection.

Pictures were also presented indicating that this is a steep property with a creek traversing it. Ms. Wietcha stated all photos were taken from the road or adjacent properties.

Mr. Lichtman stated he is aware of the sensitivity of the project, and that it contains a 32' wide driveway and a 125% of the 100 year flood plain design is being required.

PennDOT requirements will be met and the fire hydrant was not a requirement from the Fire Marshal, but a recommendation. He suggested that Mr. Lynch request a review letter from the Fire Marshal. Plan 1 will include waivers for sidewalks on both sides of the street, topography of the site and within 400' of the site and width of the culvert.

Regarding the flood level, it was stated that there is no FEMA Flood Plain that covers this property.

Mr. Zaslow stated he is confused as he is not certain exactly what is being proposed and which driveway will be utilized. He stated three property owners will need to permit access onto their properties for the relevant studies.

Mr. Lichtman stated the study will need to be completed in order to determine what is being proposed.

Mr. Watkins stated that Plan 1 for this project was presented to the Township in December 2007, and Plan 2 is based upon Mr. Lynch's comments. This property is actually 85 feet over the FEMA Flood Plain for the Tookany Creek. Seepage Beds and Stormwater Management will be addressed.

A resident stated that Deaver Road and Barker Road is a speed enforced zone, school crossing area and is a dangerous intersection. It was also stated that Greenwood Avenue from Deaver Road to Barker Road has experienced a significant amount of flooding.

Mr. Winneberger stated fourteen points of concern were raised at the last Planning Commission meeting and there is still no resolution on the traffic or flooding analysis.

Mr. Farrell stated she would feel relatively comfortable if the traffic study was addressed.

Mr. Cross stated the Commission may not get all the answers for any development but the Applicant went well beyond of what is required by the Township for what is being proposed. The information requested will be reviewed by the Public Works Committee.

Mr. Cross stated the Applicant has been forthright and addressed concerns regarding stormwater management, the Fire Marshal, and structural stability of the culverts; he feels confident that the Applicant will address all concerns raised by the neighbors.

Mr. Greenberg stated that two studies were requested and have not been received

Mr. Lichtman stated the Stream Study is not complete, the flood plain is complete and the traffic study is complete and a summary draft was read earlier at this meeting.

Mr. Lynch explained the Stream Study is a 100 Flood Plain Analysis, and stated this property is not within a FEMA 100 Flood Plain.

Mr. Lichtman stated that the "Stream Study" was required to ensure that the proposed dwellings, seepage beds and sewage holding tanks were outside of the 100 Year Flood Plain and to set the first floor elevation of the proposed dwellings above the 100 Year Flood Plain elevation.

A discussion ensued as to the review of this land development and if it should be delegated to Mr. Lynch.

Mr. Lynch stated that if changes on the plan are determined to be more than de minimus, the Applicant will need to request a continuance.

Ms. Holland stated the County reviewed Plan 1 and has no concerns. Plan 2 was not reviewed by the County, but it is her opinion that Plan 1 is significantly more environmentally sensitive.

Mr. Gordon stated he is not concerned that the Traffic Study has not been submitted, but does feel the Stormwater Management Analysis is crucial. It is his opinion that the Township Engineer is the most knowledgeable to address any concerns.

Mr. Lynch stated the Applicant has agreed to take into consideration stormwater runoff from the existing house, even though it is not mandatory.

Upon motion of Mr. Greenberg, seconded by Mr. Gordon, it is recommended that Cheltenham Township Development Application No. 07-15: Record Plan Kirk and Matthew Watkins Subdivision – 426 Greenwood Avenue be approved contingent upon:

1. That the site design shown on Plan 1 be the project site design.
2. That the following concerns expressed at the February 25, 2008 Planning Commission be addressed:
 - a. Verify if the size of the seepage beds are adequate.
 - b. Locate seepage beds outside of the 100 Year Flood Plain.
 - 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 Plain 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 Plain elevation at the location of the residence.
 - m. A minimum of a 1000 gallon sewage holding tank be required 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.)
3. That the Fire Department's concerns be addressed
 4. That the Applicant submit a traffic study
 5. That relative to the stream study, in the event there are changes in the plan, Mr. Lynch is to make a determination if changes are major or minor. In the event there are minor changes, it will be handled by him. In the event there are major changes to the plan, the plan will be returned to the Planning Commission for review.
 6. A structural evaluation of the culverts be performed.
 7. Due diligence be placed on all other structures.
 8. That the impervious area runoff on Lot 1 be handled appropriately and included in the storm water analysis.

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

David G. Kraynik
Township Manager

Per: Emma Wetzel