

UPPER MERION TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
WORKSHOP MEETING
NOVEMBER 5, 2015

The Board of Supervisors of Upper Merion Township met for a Workshop Meeting on Thursday, November 5, 2015, in the Township Building. The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m., followed by a pledge of allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

Supervisors present were: Greg Waks, Erika Spott, Bill Jenaway and Carole Kenney. Also present were: Dave Kraynik, Township Manager; Sally Slook, Assistant Township Manager; Joseph McGrory, Township Solicitor; Rob Loeper, Township Planner; Chief of Police Tom Nolan; John Waters, Director, Safety/Codes Enforcement and Chief Fire Marshal; Dan Russell, Director Park and Recreation. Supervisor Greg Philips was absent.

CHAIRPERSON'S COMMENTS:

Chairperson Spott stated an Executive Session was held prior to this workshop meeting to discuss litigation.

DISCUSSIONS:

DISCUSS DRAFT ORDINANCE RE: VEHICLES PARKING ON NON-PAVED SURFACES

Mr. Kraynik stated the draft ordinance restricting parking on non-paved grass surfaces was prompted by a number of complaints regarding people parking on grass areas in their front and side yards. Currently people can park in these areas for 17 hours. The draft ordinance would eliminate the 17-hour provision altogether thereby making it illegal to park on all grass surfaces and non-paved areas. Because of some comments and questions raised by some citizens in the community further discussion is needed to determine if additional modification is warranted for the draft ordinance.

Mr. Waks noted there have been some exceptions considered as part of the draft ordinance for social occasions (with permit) and snow emergencies and he believes there should be another broader exception. He offered the example of certain streets (mostly state roads) in the township where there is no street parking.

Mr. Jenaway provided another example of contractors who may bring their vehicle home and keep it off the road on grass during the course of a weekend or

longer than an 8-hour period of time.

Mrs. Spott asked for clarification about commercial vehicles parking on public streets. Police Chief Tom Nolan responded the prohibition depends on the size of the vehicle.

A discussion followed about the treatment of various types of trucks, including trucks with trailers.

Mrs. Spott commented on the deterioration occurring in some of our neighborhoods because of parking on grass areas.

Assuming there is no street parking, Mr. Jenaway said contractors are looking for guidance if they need to obtain a permit to put blacktop down, if there is a standard type of base that will be established or if pavers would be an option.

A discussion followed during which the following comments were made:

- Mr. Waks said he is more concerned about making sure it is clear that people who live on roads without street parking who have no other option because of limited or no driveway space are clearly exempt from this ordinance.
- Mr. Jenaway indicated some of the properties created this problem when they took what was an enclosed garage and made it into additional living space.
- Mrs. Spott said the supervisors still feel the need and importance of an ordinance that prohibits parking on the grass with some limited narrowly drawn exceptions. She agreed with the guidance provided by the Solicitor at the last workshop to eliminate the 17-hour rule for starters and if the problem does not resolve once the 17-hour rule goes away all the other issues can be revisited.

An additional discussion followed about various scenarios that could occur with off street parking.

Mr. McGrory pointed out the ordinance would be a fluid document and can be revisited if issues come up on a consistent basis. He said all that is being done is eliminating the 17-hour rule, with the three exceptions.

Mrs. Kenney asked if gravel is considered as non-paved. Mr. McGrory responded under today's ordinance it is not permitted since it is not a paved surface. He said with every ordinance there is some discretion to enforce.

Chief Nolan pointed out in some areas of the township there are a lot of hilly driveways where residents will have a gravel portion and park at the bottom of the hill on nights when it is going to snow.

Mr. McGrory said he has the direction needed to proceed.

A discussion followed about the timing of placing the ordinance on the business meeting agenda.

An unidentified woman asked about enforcement of the new ordinance and was told safety and codes enforcement personnel will follow up and if it is not rectified the citation will be presented to a judge and it is more likely the evidence will be better accepted because the rule would be different.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN TOWNSHIP AND SCHOOL DISTRICT FOR THE TOWNSHIP TO TAKE OVER THE SCHOOL DISTRICT'S "CONSORTIUM OF THE ARTS" THEATRE PROGRAM

Dan Russell, Director, Park and Recreation, stated the Upper Merion Area School District approached the township recently about the idea of taking over their "Consortium of the Arts" program. He introduced the two co-directors of the program, Cheryl Tepe and Danielle Williams, and mentioned that several parents were in the audience.

Mr. Russell indicated the Consortium of the Arts which has been ongoing is a full service five-week (half-day) theatre program for students (grades 5 thru 12) during the summer months. He said this is a unique opportunity for the Park and Recreation Department to give students another option in the summer to get involved with the performing arts and it fits in well with the new Community Center activities.

After speaking with Dr. John Toleno, Upper Merion Area School District Superintendent and Mike Keeley, Business Administrator, Mr. Russell stated the school district has approximately \$70,000 left in the account which they would be willing to transfer to the township. They also promised the township full use of their auditorium and facilities at no charge to continue the program's ongoing relationship with the school district. Dr. Toleno and Mr. Keeley are also open to accomplish this with an agreement providing for the revenue transfer and the option to continue running the program at their facility at no cost. It was noted the cost of operating the program is approximately \$43,000 which would cover one or two summers. While the Consortium lost some revenue the past couple of years, Mr. Russell expressed confidence if the Park and Recreation Department took it over and implemented their marketing strategies and abilities to work with the parents in the community the numbers would get back to not only break-even but become a revenue generating program for the department.

Mr. Russell pointed out in the past the Park and Recreation Department has absorbed the school district's adult education program and their parenting center. He said this is another program that will fit nicely into the Park and Recreation Department's repertoire of activities in our community and recommended that the Board of Supervisors move forward with the program.

The co-directors of the program offered additional comments. Highlights as follows:

- The program is funded primarily through tuition. While the program has lost money the past couple of years it was strictly a function of lower enrollment. In addition they lost the support of two other districts.
- Aside from the theater they have a full scale musical theater production. There is also a band, orchestra, sculpture and art class development and creative writing for kids.

Mrs. Spott asked about the other districts that were formerly involved with the program. Response: The other two districts formerly involved with the program were Colonial and Norristown School Districts.

Mr. McGrory asked for clarification about the entity that has the money. Response: basically it is in the school district bank account and earmarked for the Consortium of the Arts in a separate account.

A discussion followed about why the school district believes the Park and Recreation Department would be better suited to run this program.

Mrs. Kenney and Mr. Jenaway mentioned that their children participated in the Consortium for the Arts.

Mrs. Kenney asked if the Park and Recreation Department would be assuming not only the theater, but all the programs. Mr. Russell responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Jenaway mentioned discussions that were held as part of the Community Center activities about the need to broaden art oriented opportunities, art shows and activities of that nature. He said this program is right in line with what was discussed with the Park and Recreation Board.

Mr. Waks agreed this makes a lot of sense with the community center coming on line in a few months.

Mr. Kraynik stated once an agreement is worked out this matter will be placed on the Consent Agenda for consideration, possibly for the December business meeting. .

A group of parents was in attendance supporting the program.

Mr. Jenaway commented the community center will provide a venue to display the creative talents of the youth in Upper Merion Township.

PRESENTATION BY MONTGOMERY COUNTY ON TWO (2) NEW PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATION TOWERS

John Corcoran, Director, Public Safety, Montgomery County, introduced Josh Stein, First Assistant Deputy Solicitor at Montgomery County Solicitor's Office, Michael Stokes, Assistant Director, Montgomery County Planning Commission and Richard Lohwasser, Assistant Director, Technical Services, Public Safety, Montgomery County.

Mr. Corcoran discussed the plan for the \$36.4 million emergency radio system upgrade which will improve the safety of residents and the police, fire and EMS who serve them. The project involves adding 10 new antenna sites to the 20 existing ones that will improve the radio coverage and signal strength for the first responders in the County.

Utilizing the aerial, Mr. Corcoran pointed out the locations of the existing and proposed towers on the map. He called attention to the Trout Run sewage treatment plant where the proposed tower would be located behind the salt shed off of Mancill Mill Road. Mr. Corcoran also indicated where that tower would be in relationship to Valley Forge Towers a little more than a quarter of a mile away.

Mr. Jenaway asked at what heights the tower would be visible. Mr. Corcoran responded it would be at least from the 6th floor up. It was noted there would never be a full view because trees obscure most of that area.

Mr. Corcoran indicated he and Mike Stokes were on top of the North Tower the other day with the group that manages the property to inform them of what is planned to enhance public safety. He indicated the difference in the view is not going to be dramatic.

Mrs. Kenney asked if a rendering is available of what the view would look like. Mr. Corcoran responded they are scheduled to go to the Zoning Hearing Board next month and will provide the members with a photo shopped illustration of what the tower would look like in this particular setting.

Mr. Corcoran indicated the Trout Run tower will be a 180 foot lattice tower with two antennas mounted at the top which will extend another 19 feet above for a total height of 199 feet. He described the proposed equipment shelter and the 9 by 4 foot concrete pad for the emergency backup propane generator.

Mr. McGrory asked why the tower is not monopole. Mr. Corcoran responded it is because of the height. He said a monopole would have to have a much bigger base.

Mr. McGrory asked for clarification on how high they want to go. Mr. Corcoran responded a total of 199 feet (180 for the tower and an additional 19 feet for antennas that are mounted at the top).

Fire Marshal John Waters asked if the tower would require a beacon on top. Mr. Corcoran responded in the negative. He said any structure taller than 200 feet is subject to FAA starts lighting requirements.

Mr. Corcoran indicated plans for Trout Run were presented to the Upper Merion Municipal Sewer Authority on July 15, 2014 and just recently on August 18, 2015 a slightly modified set of those plans was presented to the Authority. In addition, he and Mr. Lohwasser met with 15-20 residents of the Valley Forge Towers on July 23, 2014 for an informational session and responded to questions. On July 24, 2014, Mr. Corcoran met with a resident on Mancill Mill Road to inform him of the county's plans. On October 7, 2015 Mr. Corcoran and several other representatives of the county met again with six residents of the Valley Forge Towers for another informational session. At this session one of the attendees expressed concerns that the tower would interfere with his view. He was in the process of purchasing one of the condo units. Another individual expressed concerns about radiation emissions from the equipment. Mr. Corcoran indicated he mailed the resident copies of a study performed by a county consultant on existing towers showing that the radiation at ground level is negligible from these towers. The study also indicated even at the same elevations where the equipment is at a distance of just six feet away it is well below maximum permissible levels as defined by the FCC.

Mr. Corcoran discussed the existing 90 foot tower at 310 Hughes Road which the State Police has been operating for several decades. He pointed out even without foliage it is difficult to see. Extensive community outreach was done last summer given this tower's location in a residential neighborhood. Mr. Corcoran met with about a dozen residents in one of their homes. Another public meeting was held in the Township Building on September 23, 2014 for anyone who was unable to attend the meeting at the resident's home. A notice was sent out to the Gulph Mills Civic Association and two households attended that second session. On September 29, 2015 another informational meeting was held at the Township Building for the residents of Hughes Road Area. Although a notice was sent to approximately 70 households and the Gulph Mills Civic Association, none of the residents attended the informational session on September 29th. Mr. Corcoran indicated he had a lengthy email exchange with one resident who is opposed to the tower on Hughes Road.

Mr. Corcoran outlined what the county proposes to do at Hughes Road. Utilizing the aerial he pointed out the existing tower plus smaller tower on a telephone pole. The lattice tower is proposed 50 feet away. He indicated the shelter would be 27 by 12 feet and the additional 10 feet is needed for the State Police radio equipment; there will be two propane backup generators on 4 by 9 foot pads.

Mr. Waters asked how long the backup generators are designed to last if power was lost. Mr. Lohwasser responded 3 to 4 days [in extreme cold] and 4 to 4 ½ days with the temperature as it is now.

Mr. McGrory asked about the height of this tower. Mr. Corcoran responded it is the same height – 180 feet with antennas that extend up to 199 feet.

With regard to the equipment boxes, Mr. McGrory brought up the distinction of having housing for the equipment boxes which bring land development into play or just having equipment boxes. Mr. Corcoran mentioned there are security issues and they would want to house the equipment.

Mrs. Kenney asked who owns the land. Mr. Corcoran responded the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania owns the land.

Mr. Corcoran described what the tower and equipment shelter would look like. He provided a photo simulation where they photo shopped one of the towers into the site at Hughes Road to show what the tower would look like at that location. Mr. Corcoran indicated what the radio coverage would be without the proposed Trout Run and Hughes Road towers. He demonstrated where the areas were without 95% coverage and said there would be a little more than a quarter of the township would not have 95% reliability without the towers.

Mr. Waks asked about the coverage where it is not 95%. Mr. Corcoran did not have that information readily available. Mr. Waks said the Zoning Hearing Board would ask that question. Mr. Corcoran responded he did not know if they would be able to go to every location in the township and measure reliability as it would involve a very extensive amount of manpower. Mr. Waks suggested going to two or three random locations to determine the current reliability percentages. Mr. Corcoran indicated he would talk to their consultants and see what they can come up with.

In looking at one of the maps, Mr. Jenaway observed it would seem to have a direct correlation to the density of call volume for police, EMS and fire, particularly the upper end of the township. Mr. Waters agreed.

Mr. Waters commented his biggest concern right now concerning coverage is there are a couple of sections in the township is where it is zero and

these dead zones are the most troublesome.

Mr. Jenaway commented he was trying to point out that some of the more critical areas with a lot of activity are currently under 95%. Mr. Waters agreed.

One of the Montgomery County representatives indicated Upper Merion is currently slated to purchase approximately \$1.5 million worth of radio equipment under the financing plan being offered by the county. He said their goal is to make sure that new equipment operates at peak efficiency and with the best radio coverage that can be provided with the least disruption possible.

Mr. Corcoran pointed out Hughes Road is the highest point in the township. It was noted that is why the state police have been there for so many years.

With regard to the Hughes Road tower, Mr. Jenaway asked if there would be perimeter security and if so what that would be. Mr. Corcoran responded it would be a chain link fence.

Mr. Robert Kenna, Hughes Road, expressed concern about the height of the tower.

Mr. Waks asked about the difference between the effectiveness of a 120 foot, 150 foot, and a 199 foot tower. Response: as you go down you lose coverage. For the county's purposes they only require 150 feet, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania requires 180 feet (with the antennas it goes up to 199 feet). It was pointed out the county does not have much control and the State Police require the higher height for public safety.

Mr. Waks said he understands the higher the tower the more effective it is and suggested the county officials should be prepared to provide a more specific answer with regard to the effectiveness of the 150 foot tower as opposed to the 200 foot tower.

Mr. Chris Pazarus, a general realtor on behalf of Mr. Robert Kenna, commented that, in his view, the tower would have an adverse impact on property value.

Cynthia Horniak, real estate broker, asked if there is any other place the tower could be placed. Mr. Corcoran responded this is the highest point in the county and that is why the tower is there now and why it is the ideal spot for a tower.

An unidentified resident expressed concern over the height of the tower.

Mr. McGrory stated at the Zoning Hearing Board the county will need to

show more solid evidence on why the height is needed and why it could not go somewhere else and why it has to be a new tower at this site.

Mr. Kraynik asked about the tower on top of 251 DeKalb (the old Marque Apartments). Mr. Lohwasser responded it is currently on and the county was told to vacate the building. If the Marque tower would be turned off now, without the two new towers, most of the township would have no coverage. One of the county representatives stated he will have this information for their Zoning Hearing Board presentation.

Mr. Jenaway asked if there are any other areas in the county where there are high value homes in relative close proximity to a proposed or existing tower. Mr. Lohwasser responded there is one in Gladwyne.

Mr. McGrory stated the issue before this Board does not involve land development; it involves the sewer authority's land and their negotiating a lease with the county. The other property is owned by the state. The county needs to appear before the Zoning Hearing Board to get the relief they need to build each of these towers and at that point this board would either oppose, support or stay neutral. He pointed out even if this Board were to stay neutral, the county is going to look for the support of the emergency service personnel to testify that the towers are needed and that is going to be a principal part of their case. Mr. McGrory said the Board needs to entertain some discussion as to what direction the supervisors are leaning at this time so that the county knows how to proceed with the case.

Mr. Waks commented he believes that in only extremely rare circumstances should the Board of Supervisors weigh in on Zoning Hearing Board matters. He said the county should make its case before the Zoning Hearing Board and be prepared to present the case and answer questions that were presented at this workshop meeting.

Mrs. Spott stated the question is does better public safety in an area counterbalance what some might believe to be diminution in value. She pointed out if you do not have a fire hydrant or fire station nearby insurance rates go up and it is not as desirable a home for this reason.

Mrs. Kenney commented she is thinking in terms of the greater good and the greater good is for increased safety and response times for response teams.

Mrs. Spott pointed out it is a fair question to ask how high the tower has to be.

One of the Montgomery County representatives indicated the issue for the county is the state does not have to allow them to build the tower. He said the

county tried to expand this tower ten years ago without success.

Mrs. Spott asked about the minimum height to meet the standard.

Mr. Waks pointed out one of the towers will be in his backyard and he acknowledges there will be a public safety improvement. While he would like the height to come down he said he has a broad principle of not getting too involved in recommendations to the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Jenaway said he does not believe the supervisors should be involved in giving an opinion on this. He said the number one role of the Board of Supervisors is to provide a safe community for the general public. He said a number of issues were brought up at this meeting that the county team needs to take back and make sure they work on because these are valid questions that will be addressed at the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Jenaway indicated that having worked in these areas on fire calls over the years, if you do not have communication your own lives are in jeopardy and the people you are there to protect are less served. He said it is necessary to have a communication system that works, but it does not necessarily mean it has to be 180 feet high.

Mr. McGrory asked if the Board would have any objection to staff testifying on behalf of the county that they need this for safety reasons since the supervisors are leaning to not taking a position with the Zoning Hearing Board. He said this would be a compelling part of the testimony.

Mr. Jenaway suggested the phrase should be that the staff can testify that the need exists for public safety for Upper Merion's police, fire and ambulance.

Mr. Waks commented there are also members of township staff who are involved in EMS and township residents and they may on their own want to comment.

The supervisors had no objection to staff providing relevant testimony before the Zoning Hearing Board.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN: 750 MOORE ROAD/O'NEILL PROPERTIES (PLAN AMENDMENT); 248 UNIT APARTMENTS; 5.1 ACRES KPMU DISTRICT; AMENDMENT INCLUDES CHANGES TO PARKING AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

Mr. Rob Loeper, Township Planner, stated 750 Moore Road is located at the intersection of Moore Road and 8th Avenue. He provided a brief synopsis of what has happened with this development plan over the years. The plan has undergone a series of amendments dating back to 2002 at which time it was planned to demolish the existing building and build an office building. In 2003, an extended stay hotel was proposed and in 2004, 2008 and 2011 there were

amendments to that plan primarily related to conditions.

The current plan amendment is based primarily on the fact that because of the time lapse the NPDES permit for stormwater management has expired and all the DEP rules have changed. The applicant is now redesigning stormwater. In addition, two amendments have been made to the code in 2014 and 2015 one of which specifically addressing this property. The 2014 ordinance allowed a multi-family development in the SM District under certain conditions including that it be located on two roads, have approximately 5 acres and 1.35 parking spaces per unit. Subsequently the property was rezoned to the King of Prussia Mixed Use District. Most recently the parking ordinance was changed for multi-family to one unit per bedroom regardless of the total number of units.

Mr. Loeper explained this plan is basically the same development, same building, (E-shaped building) with parking under the building. The plan calls for 248 units most of which will be one-bedroom units and 88 units will have two bedrooms. The total building coverage is 267,000 square feet. The applicant is proposing 335 spaces which would meet the code requirement under the 2014 ordinance.

In addition to the underground basin which is located to the east, what were primarily swales along the front and rear of the property are now by a retention basin and most, if not all, of the surface parking will be porous paving.

Ed Campbell, representing O'Neill Properties, stated in the early 2000's his client received approvals for an extended stay apartment but has not been able to develop it until now.

Mr. Campbell noted it is still the same shaped building although the footprint of the building is smaller and there is less impervious coverage and a more sophisticated, improved stormwater management system.

Mr. Campbell indicated he spoke with Mr. Loeper about a request for a waiver. He said there is a requirement in the code that the applicant as part of the plan demonstrate all retaining walls. There is a retaining wall proposed, but it is actually integral to the structure. The architectural structural engineering is not done yet so they would propose to come in for a building permit and the structural integrity of that retaining wall be submitted to the township engineers for review and approval.

Mr. McGrory suggested a deferral until such time as a building permit is issued instead of a waiver. Mr. Campbell indicated that would be fine.

Mr. Campbell indicated there are some comments in the review letter about open space which he believes are misplaced in some respects because they refer to commercial requirements in relation to open space and park and

recreation.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN: MIRABELLA INVESTMENT PROPERTIES, LP; 7510 VANDENBURG; REDEVELOPMENT OF PROPERTY WITH 4 BUILDINGS, 311 APARTMENT UNITS AND 1,500 SF OF NON-RESIDENTIAL USE. 19.29 ACRES, KPMU DISTRICT

Mr. Loeper said this is another plan the Board has seen several times this year. Most recently the Board approved the conditional use under the new King of Prussia Mixed Use zoning district. The Township Engineer has just submitted the first review letter and staff is working through some of the issues with the applicant. One question that needs resolution is in the approval of the conditional use. There was a reference to the fact that the trail that completely goes around the property would be available to the public. One of the questions was whether that trail will satisfy in lieu of a more traditional sidewalk. Utilizing the aerial, Mr. Loeper pointed out the trail route connecting to Heuser Park and following along Vandenburg Road. He indicated there would be connections made to the transit on West Valley Forge Road, but it would not be a traditional sidewalk in that the sidewalk will run along the edge of the road.

There was a discussion about the location of certain sidewalks and crosswalks.

Mr. Waks asked if there is any agreement with Manor Care to install sidewalks. Mr. Loeper responded he would look into that and get back to Mr. Waks.

Mrs. Kenney asked for additional details about the composition of the trail. Response: it will be of a pervious material that can be maintained and performs well.

DISCUSSION OF PARKING STUDY FOR KORMAN COMMUNITIES DEVELOPMENT PLAN: S. GODDARD BOULEVARD & NORTH GULPH ROAD (to date plan not formally submitted)

Mr. Loeper stated when the agreement was written for the Village at Valley Forge in 2005 different parking standards were created for different parts of the Village. He indicated the core of the Village which was going to have a combination of commercial and residential use had a different parking standard for residential than the northern portion which was primarily going to be residential only. Subsequently, the township code was changed to one per bedroom; however, what was in the original settlement agreement was different. There is also a provision in the settlement agreement that does allow the applicant to present a shared parking study to the supervisors to demonstrate that the parking they are proposing is adequate. The applicant elected to do the

parking study.

Mr. McGrory asked if the parking study came in at one per bedroom. Mr. David Della Porta responded it was slightly over. He indicated this is a partnership he will be doing with Korman Communities for a luxury multi-family which will be a primarily furnished corporate suites with excellent relationships with a lot of big companies. He wanted to make sure the Board understood this threshold parking issue before coming in with a plan. The proposed plan calls for 276 units and with the bedroom mix under the new ordinance 395 parking spaces would be required. The plan which will soon be presented will have 402 parking spaces. The settlement agreement with that criterion would have required 466 spaces. Mr. Della Porta indicated the shared parking study revealed the same thing as the Vandenburg proposal, i.e., too much parking for this type of product, particularly in the Town Center environment. Mr. Della Porta said it is his hope the Board of Supervisors will accept the proposed 402 figure which the settlement agreement allows to be done.

Mr. McGrory asked for clarification about the corporate meetings. Mr. Della Porta responded there are companies that will take a number of suites and do training sessions/ conferences in the common areas. Mr. McGrory asked if this has been factored into the parking calculations. Mr. Della Porta responded they are the only people staying there. While they could have an outside speaker, there are no guest spaces. He said he has not seen that need when he researched their other communities and parking requirements for the business that they do.

Mr. Jenaway commented his experience for a retreat or some type of conference is that everyone would get their own room and in this case it would be a mini apartment. He said it would only involve dealing with one car per unit and many of those would come without their own vehicle.

Mr. McGrory asked if Mr. Loeper had a chance to review the parking study. Mr. Loeper responded he has read it and it is a fairly standard study.

Mr. Jenaway asked if demand would be increased to the point that it creates any additional congestion on Gulph Road. Mr. Della Porta responded a traffic study was not done so he could not answer that. He said he does not think it is anything additional to what has already been in terms of the master plan for the whole building.

Mr. Waks asked how many of the 276 units would be reserved for corporate housing. Mr. Della Porta responded typically it is approximately half in their communities. There is no fixed number and it can fluctuate.

Mr. Waks recommended this be made clear when they come before the

Board of Supervisors at a business meeting. Mr. Della Porta responded the Korman representatives will manage this and answer any further questions.

Mrs. Kenney asked since the number of parking spaces is being reduced if that would also reduce the impervious. Mr. Della Porta responded since the parking is almost entirely underneath the building it does not reduce impervious but it does help in that it is a two-level underground parking garage. He said this will enable them to reduce the lower level garage fairly significantly so it will be less disturbance.

Mrs. Kenney asked about the size of the spaces. Mr. Loeper responded whatever the standard is in the settlement agreement would apply.

DEMOLITION OF BUILDING ON TOWNSHIP GROUNDS

Mr. Kraynik discussed issues related to a structurally compromised house within 20 feet of the soon to be constructed Skate Park. He has recommended that the house be demolished. Staff obtained two demolition prices and both are in the \$14,000 range. This would have to be bid based on threshold. A third quote could be obtained and it could go out to bid once the Board approves.

Mr. John Waters, Director, Safety/Codes Enforcement, shared his findings with the Board regarding this house which has been recommended for demolition for several years.

During the discussion that followed it was pointed out there is no real historical significance associated with the building according to the Pennsylvania Historical Museum Commission.

Mr. Kraynik said he would need authority from the Board in order to proceed to put it in the capital budget for next year so that demolition can occur in spring 2016.

Mr. Jenaway mentioned that he looked at the house recently and it is not only deteriorated but would become an attractive nuisance if allowed to remain once the skate park opens.

The supervisors agreed to place the necessary funding in the budget for next year.

From the public:

Mr. William Keatley, Hamlin Circle, discussed FEMA's flood plain map revisions, the issues he has with FEMA, and was provided with guidance on how to proceed.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the Board, it was moved by Mr. Jenaway, seconded by Mr. Waks, all voting "Aye" to adjourn the meeting. None opposed. Motion approved 4-0. Adjournment occurred at 10:46 p.m.

DAVID G. KRAYNIK
SECRETARY-TREASURER/
TOWNSHIP MANAGER

rap
Minutes Approved:
Minutes Entered: