

The Planning Commission ("PC") meeting was held tonight. The following Planning Commission members were present: Messrs. Cross, DiBeneditto, Gordon, Greenberg, Leighton, and Winneberger. Also present was ex-officio member Laughlin. Staff present was Carmen Reitano, Assistant to Director of Engineering, Zoning & Inspections.

**1. Acceptance of the minutes of the October 22, 2012 Meeting.**

The minutes of October 22, 2012 were accepted without comment. Mr. Winneberger made the motion and it was seconded by Mr. Gordon.

**2. Review of Zoning Hearing Board Agenda for December 10, 2012.**

**APPEAL NO 3455** – Appeal of Young Suk Jeon, owner of premises known as 560 E. Church Road, Elkins Park, PA, from the Decision of the Zoning Officer for the following Zoning Relief in order to allow a 21% expansion of an existing facility in a Class C-4 Commercial and Business District.

- a. A Special Exception in accordance with Article XXIX of Chapter 295 of the Cheltenham Code as follows:
  - i. A Special Exception in accordance with CCS 295-227B. for an existing nonconforming building.
  - ii. A Special Exception in accordance with CCS 295-227C.(2), an addition to a nonconforming building not to exceed 25% of original building.
  - iii. A Special Exception in accordance with CCS 295-227C.(3) for a nonconforming use not to increase the number of employees by more than 25%.
- b. In the alternative to a. i, ii, iii, above, a Variance from CCS 295-133 for a lesser buffer area 0" instead of the required 8'.

Mr. Reitano discussed the Nail Salon which is set back along the Church Road Street frontage. He stated that it was in the C4 Zoning District and had the advantage of being adjacent to a public parking lot.

Mr. Reitano introduced the Application and called on Mr. Hal Lichtman, the Architect for the applicant, to discuss the proposed project in detail.

Discussion ensued regarding the parking spaces indicated on the photo and the fact that two public parking spaces could also be used.

Mr. Lichtman described the existing stone retaining wall located along the property line as having an eight foot (8') grade differential between the two properties. He also stated that it was the intent to repair the retaining wall as a part of this project.

Mr. Lichtman presented two schemes for review by commission members.

In response to questions raised about each one of the proposed schemes, Mr. Lichtman described the preferred scheme to include a roof deck that would bring additional light and ventilation to the adjacent property. The applicant would also be able to use the roof deck as an open space; they do not want to enclose this deck.

Mr. Cross stated that this scheme (Scheme No. 1) was better than Scheme No. 2 and it would bring light and add flavor to this property.

Mr. Cross asked if the Township Staff had a chance to review this application and visit the site.

Mr. Reitano said that he had inspected the building when they completed their building upgrade and that the space was tight at that time. He discussed the ownership of the wall. He said that part of the conditions should include that the retaining wall be restored.

Discussion ensued regarding the parking situation and confirmation of the size of the parking spaces indicated on the exhibit. The parking size was indicted to be 9' wide x 18' long for each of the two parking spaces.

Mr. Laughlin also discussed the parking along with Mr. Cross discussing the greening of the old parking lot.

Mr. Greenberg discussed esoteric upgrades.

Mr. Cross talked about stone over brick for the exterior wall finishes.

Mr. Winneberger asked if the owners would be updating the signage and Mr. Lichtman said no.

Mr. Leighton talked about the doors on the side. Mr. Lichtman said there was a canopy over the door.

Mr. Laughlin asked if a larger vehicle was parked in the spaces in the front of the building, would any portion of the vehicle infringe on the sidewalk? Mr. Lichtman said there was room for the vehicle and it would not restrict the sidewalk.

As previously discussed, that there would be no wheel stops and there would be room for a car to pull forward, discussion ensued that the retaining wall was fixed to the curb and would remain fixed.

Mr. Cross discussed storm water drainage for the property.

Mr. Lichtman agreed to the elimination of the asphalt and install a small seepage bed to handle the storm water run off.

It was noted the 420 square foot addition should be considered in the storm water impervious area calculations.

Mr. Reitano discussed if air conditioning equipment is to be installed, it will be controlled by a permit and a sound test conducted by the Township. Sound baffling would be required to be installed if it is determined there is excessive noise.

Mr. Lichtman said there are existing condensers on the ground. If one additional was necessary, then it would be handled by a permit.

Mr. Laughlin stated that he was not in favor of having the condensing unit on the ground floor and if one additional one was necessary, then it would be installed on the second floor.

Mr. DiBeneditto talked about the owner of the adjacent side porch. He also discussed the potential for turning over the roof top deck in the future and keeping the sight line of the adjacent property with a window well. He felt they should go with Scheme No. 1 and approach the neighbor to make it acceptable.

The Commission discussed recommended conditions to be considered for this application:

1. The existing stone and paved area on the side yard be removed and turned into a green area.
2. The Township Engineer should make a determination if a seepage bed is required and that it be made a part of the application.
3. Repair and restore existing stone retaining wall as required subject to Township Engineer's inspection.
4. If any additional HVAC equipment is required for this expansion, than it should be planned for installation on the second level and not on grade.

The applicant's representative agreed to these conditions.

Mr. Cross made a motion to take no action. Mr. Winneberger seconded the motion. Motion was approved subject to the conditions being accepted as noted above.

**3. Old Business**

Discussion ensued regarding term members interested in continuing on the Planning Commission and members needed for other committees.

**4. New Business**

None.

**5. Adjournment**

Mr. Winneberger made a motion for adjournment. Mr. Gordon seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 8:00 P.M.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Bryan T. Havir  
Acting Township Manager

Per Marie Henger