

UPPER MERION TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
WORKSHOP MEETING
MARCH 2, 2017

The Board of Supervisors of Upper Merion Township met for a Workshop Meeting on Thursday, March 2, 2017, in the Township Building. The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m., followed by a pledge of allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

Supervisors present were: Greg Waks, Bill Jenaway, and Carole Kenney. Also present were: Dave Kraynik, Township Manager; Sally Slook, Assistant Township Manager; John Walko, Solicitor's Office; Rob Loeper, Township Planner. Supervisor Philips and Supervisor Spott were absent.

CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS:

Chairman Jenaway indicated there were no meetings held prior to this meeting.

DISCUSSIONS:

CONSHOHOCKEN CONSTRUCTION COMPANY SUBDIVISION PLAN, CALEY COURT ESTATES, CALEY & BEIDLER ROADS, 15-LOT SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, 6.634 ACRES, R-2/R-2A, *Plan Expiration: April 25, 2017*

Mr. Rob Loeper, Township Planner, stated this plan has been in front of the Board of Supervisors first as a sketch plan with a prior developer and more recently with this developer. The property comprises 6.6 acres and is primarily R-2 which allows for a 10,000 square foot minimum. There is a portion of the proposed development along Caley Road which is in the R-2A which has a 12,000 square foot minimum.

Based on Board comments about the development from previous meetings, the applicant designed the lots to comply with the minimum lot size per the zoning. The basin will be located at the low point on the property which will be connected with the system and ultimately cross over through the township property into the river. Sidewalks will be installed on all frontages both on the cul-de-sac as well as Caley and Beidler Road. The plan has been in front of the planning commission once and will be returning for another review next week. The letter from Montgomery County did not raise any significant issues. The Township Engineer provided the first review and the applicant indicated they will

comply with all the items. It was noted there are no waivers associated with the plan at this time.

George J. Ozorowski, Esq., Hughes and Kalkbrenner, on behalf of the applicant, stated the applicant was last before the Board of Supervisors at a workshop meeting last August during which the applicant presented an amended subdivision plan removing one lot making it a 15-lot subdivision. He indicated sidewalks and curbs surround the property and Caley Road is being widened to meet the existing Caley Road all the way down to Beidler. It was noted one of the previous issues was the sewer connections. Utilizing the aerial, Mr. Ozorowski pointed out the location of the sewer easement that has been obtained in front of two properties for the sewer running down to Sharon Court.

Mrs. Kenney mentioned a couple of residents from Sharon Court had been in contact with her in the past year or two about problems in their backyards with standing water. She asked if there are specific changes this proposed development will provide to improve the backyard situations. Mr. Ozorowski responded the stormwater situation should improve. He explained the stormwater control management system will consist of a series of swales and underground pipes on all the back lots that will capture the water and transfer it down to the basin.

In response to comments from residents Pat and John Gallagher, the applicant's engineer, Brad Grauel, OTM LLC, described the stormwater system on their side of Sharon Court. He pointed out on the screen an existing culvert system running down from two inlets to West Beidler Road. As part of the site grading there will be a swale constructed down to a stormwater detention basin on the property which will capture all the runoff that currently goes to that point. Mr. Grauel stated that is all part of the developer's responsibility. Additionally, as part of the township's stormwater management ordinance and the DEP NPDES permitting there will be below grade stormwater management systems consisting of chambers designed to capture not only the stormwater runoff from dwellings and the entire impervious surface but to manage and release it through a system of piping going into the system. The applicant is addressing review comments from the township engineer.

Mr. Jenaway asked Mr. Loeper if the units Mr. Grauel described are on the property and therefore are the responsibility of the homeowners association. Mr. Loeper responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Ozorowski indicated there will be a homeowners association created exclusively to maintain the stormwater management system, but will not control anything else.

Mr. Jenaway asked if the roadway proposed to be dedicated as a township roadway will meet cartway requirements for residential streets. Mr.

Loeper responded in the affirmative. He said the way the current code is written, even if it were to be a private road; it would have to be built to meet township requirements.

Mr. Grauel commented the road has been designed to be 30 feet wide which accommodates parking on one side and complies with the township's current requirements.

Mr. Grauel said based upon the township engineer's review of February 3rd, there was a question about parkland. He indicated in order for the applicant to adequately respond to the township engineer's concern, he is assuming the township does not want another park built and it would be a fee in lieu or some type of remuneration. Mr. Loeper responded the ordinance requires a 20% dedication of land. Most developments provide a fee in lieu of dedication which is based on the number of units. He provided the example of a much larger 60-acre subdivision which set aside land for a park and pointed out in this case it makes more sense to have the fee in lieu to make improvements.

Mr. Waks asked if some information could be provided with regard to pricing and was informed the applicant is still working on final costs. It was noted they are looking at a range between \$575 and \$640 depending on the model and emphasized these figures are speculative based on public improvement costs.

Mr. Waks stated he received a letter from a resident who expressed concern about speeding on Beidler Road and asked about the possibility of installing a guardrail. Mr. Ozorowski responded there are limitations on what, if anything, can be done with Beidler Road.

Mr. Jenaway pointed out this is an area with a high number of traffic accidents and as development plans move forward any safety measures taken to enhance public safety would be beneficial to the community.

Patricia Hutchinson, Caley Road, asked what guidelines will be in place during construction to ensure that neighboring residents can expect as minimal disruption as possible. Mr. Grauel responded many policies and procedures are in place and that strict controls exist to address the concerns of nearby residents during this type of project. Mr. Walko pointed out there will also be applicable conditions in the land development agreement with the township.

Ms. Hutchinson asked the hours of operation for construction once the project begins. Mr. Loeper responded, "7 a.m. to 8 p.m."

An unidentified resident asked for clarification about the basin area. Mr. Ozorowski responded the basin area is to be owned and maintained by the HOA.

An unidentified resident asked if the trees behind the cul-de-sac will be

removed. Mr. Ozorowski indicated he did not have a frame of reference to where the trees are located and was unable to respond.

Joe Lazur, Susan Drive, asked about the time frame for the project assuming approval is granted. Mr. Ozorowski responded generally public improvements are put in first and then the project moves accordingly from that point after seeing which homes are sold. As plans are finalized, a website will be created detailing pricing options for the various models.

BPGS CONSTRUCTION DEVELOPMENT PLAN; 260 MALL BOULEVARD.
DEMOLISH EXISTING LA FITNESS CENTER AND CONSTRUCT A 9,970 SF
RESTAURANT. 9.53 ACRES, GC GENERAL COMMERCIAL. *Plan Expiration:*
April 25, 2017

Mr. Loeper discussed the proposal to demolish the four-story LA Fitness building and construct a one-story restaurant on the site. The restaurant has a relatively large footprint due to the design of the restaurant.

Mr. Loeper indicated the first engineering review letter and Montgomery County review letter has been received. The applicant requested three waivers dealing with stormwater pipe size, grading and not providing a traffic impact study. It was noted a traffic impact study was done for an access and the basic traffic generation is similar for both uses. The fitness center produced about 90-95% of the traffic that is generated by the hotel in the peak hour.

John Ambrose, BPGS Construction, provided an overview of J. Alexander's and a PowerPoint was shown. He explained the large footprint of the site is due to the size of the kitchen area and internal refuse storage so that Mall Boulevard is not exposed to dumpsters. Renderings were shown of the proposed building entrance and its orientation to the surrounding area.

Robert Miles, Director of Development, J. Alexander's, characterized the restaurant as an upscale American Grill concept known for its wood-fired cuisine providing customers with the highest possible quality dining experience.

Mr. Waks asked if the restaurant provided outdoor dining. Response: There is a small patio provided as an amenity with soft seating where patrons can have an appetizer or drink. It is not designed as a party bar or full dining area.

Mr. Miles indicated most of their restaurants are four-sided. In deciding on this location in King of Prussia the topography was considered in designing this space to help soften the corner of that intersection.

Mr. Ambrose continued with the PowerPoint presentation and addressed the new parking along the front. He said parking has to be maximized in order to

park the site adequately.

Mr. Ambrose pointed out some of the improvements from an infrastructure perspective. The applicant will install two detention basins which will provide substantial improvements to the stormwater infrastructure on the site.

Mr. Ambrose indicated the development plan will conform to whatever erosion and sediment requirements are dictated by the county and state. It was noted the applicant is proposing trees that will not interfere with the line of sight in exiting the restaurant area. Mr. Ambrose mentioned a suggestion was made that instead of a landscape island the applicant should consider some type of bioretention basin. He said the applicant's engineer determined there is not enough area to collect and demonstrate an adequate amount of positive results from a bioretention basin. Mr. Ambrose indicated if the Board of Supervisors or planning commission would request a bioretention basin, the applicant would consider it.

Mr. Jenaway asked about the square footage available for bioretention. While Mr. Ambrose did not have a specific answer he indicated he would make sure an answer is made available.

Mr. Jenaway mentioned the in-depth discussion at the planning commission regarding the number of parking spots around the restaurant. Mr. Ambrose said the issue is how to direct hotel-related and restaurant drivers. He said the applicant's team went back and forth on designing the placement of the parking footprint and the directionality of the parking signage. He said the best way to manage is a wayfaring signage system. Mr. Ambrose indicated the applicant has some good ideas about how to ensure there is minimal confusion.

Mr. Loeper pointed out prior owners had difficulty with parking as it related to the fitness center. He said they took a portion of the parking, dedicated it for the fitness center and directed people into that area. Mr. Loeper indicated there could be something similar for this situation to designate areas for the different uses.

Mr. Loeper commented the overall site exceeds the parking requirement for all three uses and comes down to the fact everyone wants to park at the front door.

Mr. Waks asked if there is a specific percentage of increase or decrease in impervious. Mr. Jeremy Maziarz, P.E., Chester Valley Engineers, responded there is 4,610 square feet less impervious.

Mr. Ambrose stated the fitness center was about 13,000 square feet and the applicant is below 10,000 square feet.

Mrs. Kenney asked about the number of trees in the front of the parking lot. Mr. Ambrose responded there will be four trees covering and shielding the primary field of parking.

Mr. Waks asked if there is a pre-existing sidewalk, and was provided an affirmative response from one of the applicant's representatives.

Mrs. Kenney asked if two detention basins are sufficient for the stormwater. Mr. Maziarz responded there are none currently on the site which was developed prior to stormwater management. He said what the applicant is proposing is a significant improvement.

Mrs. Kenney asked for clarification about the possible third small basin previously discussed. Utilizing the aerial, Mr. Ambrose pointed out the small area and explained bioretention is just a matter of filtering the material before it gets to the underground. It is not so much a detention basin. A detention basin is detaining water before it is released as well as filtering.

Mrs. Kenney asked if a rain garden would make sense in that small area. Mr. Maziarz responded that is what Mr. Ambrose referred to as a bio filtration area which is a rain garden. There is limited surface area in that island for pretreatment so the benefit will be minimal, but if the Board and planning commission would like the applicant to evaluate that option the applicant would be receptive.

Mrs. Kenney asked about the height of the one-story building, and was informed by one of the applicant's representatives that the highest point on the building is about 20 feet above the finished floor.

Mrs. Kenney asked if the floor is going to be up higher than where it currently is for the fitness building, and received an affirmative response.

JOHNSON DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC. DEVELOPMENT PLAN; S. HENDERSON AND SHOEMAKER ROADS, 4-STORY, 120,000 SF SELF STORAGE BUILDING, 3.34 ACRES, LI-LIMITED INDUSTRIAL, *Plan Expiration: April 25, 2017*

Mr. Loeper provided an overview of the proposed development plan for the vacant property located at South Henderson and Shoemaker Roads. The applicant proposes to build a 4-story Self-Storage building with internal unit access.

Mr. Loeper mentioned the applicant will provide a fair amount of reserve parking; however, they indicated parking for their building is in excess of what is needed.

With regard to sidewalks along Henderson, the plan as currently shown does not provide a sidewalk along Henderson. Mr. Loeper described some of the difficulties with a very large culvert.

Mr. Loeper noted unique stormwater management will achieve the required stormwater reduction.

Matthew Chartrand, P.E., Bohler Engineering, representing the applicant, Johnson Development Associates, stated the proposed development will be located at 550 S. Henderson Road. While the site is currently vacant, it was contemplated for development with an access easement located off of Shoemaker Road. Mr. Chartrand pointed out the location of the proposed driveway.

The 4-story, 120,000 square foot self-storage facility will have a 30,000 square foot footprint with parking facilities located on the north side of the building and reserved parking along the western side of the building. Currently the applicant proposes 22 parking spaces overall.

Mr. Chartrand described how people would enter the building and access the elevator to the storage units. It was noted all units are interior and climate-controlled.

The applicant does not propose any access off of Henderson Road.

Mr. Chartrand indicated there are some grade challenges at this site which slopes significantly from the eastern boundary down to Henderson Road.

The site was formerly a quarry and was filled in when that operation closed down. In order to be able to construct a building, the applicant proposes putting deep piles below that material. From a stormwater management standpoint the applicant proposes taking the roof's water running it through a bio filtration rain garden and then down into injection wells. It was explained as a grab and drain process that skips the upper layer of infiltration and goes straight down from there. The applicant has had preliminary discussions with the Conservation District and DEP relative to that proposal. They felt that was appropriate for this site for two reasons: (1) avoid creating a potential for a sinkhole and (2) taking the water below the fill material so it is not draining through the soil that is there (trash and debris fill).

Mr. Chartrand indicated the overall height of the proposed building is at the 50 foot height limit in this Limited Industrial district and pointed out other site features to conclude his general site overview.

Bailey C. Gaffney, Development Manager, Self-Storage Division, Johnson Development, discussed the security system which will provide cameras on

every floor.

Mr. Chartrand stated all of their client contracts are month to month. Clients are required to have insurance for their unit. It was noted about one third of their users are commercial operators, one third are residential and one third miscellaneous (students or military).

Mr. Loeper mentioned every user will have coded keys to get to the floor of their designated unit. They will not have access to the entire building.

Michael Russo, Regional Director of Development Self-Storage Division, provided the hours of operation and indicated the Self-Storage building will open at 7 a.m. The manager will be on site from 8 a.m. until 6 p.m. and the Self-Storage will close at 9 p.m. No one will be in the building overnight and the building will be locked down until 7 a.m. the next morning. It was noted the building will be have security lighting and be fully alarmed and sprinklered.

Ms. Gaffney commented the average number of parking spaces for in their industry is between 7-10 and to provide 22 is well over what they anticipate. She mentioned there is only one loading access on the Shoemaker elevation.

Mr. Chartrand indicated the applicant is in receipt of review letters from both the township engineer and the county. One of the questions in the engineer's letter concerned the soil/fill which will be kept on the site. If it is not kept on site and hauled off it has to be treated as material that has to go to a specific facility since it cannot be determined as clean fill. There is berming all the way up along the Shoemaker Road portion and around the back of the site to use as much of that material as possible. The berm extends up pretty high and will further screen the building. The berming area will be maintained/mowed.

Mr. Chartrand indicated there is an area along Shoemaker Road with some additional right-of-way. The applicant's property line is set back significantly from the edge of that roadway which he estimated as 40 feet and there is an additional setback from there. Overall the parking and building will be setback significantly from Shoemaker Road.

Mrs. Kenney asked about the total number of units. Ms. Gaffney responded there are 937 units proposed in various sizes.

Mrs. Kenney asked if people typically rent one unit or purchase two, three or four at a time. Ms. Gaffney responded people purchase two to three units at a time and try and consolidate as they go along reducing the number of units.

Mrs. Kenney said the reason for her previous question was to make a parking requirement point in that it would not be 937 users but more like possibly 800.

Mrs. Kenney asked how far the proposed building is from their neighbor to the south. Utilizing the aerial, Mr. Chartrand pointed out the location of the one-story industrial buildings and surrounding features.

Mrs. Kenney asked for additional clarification about the quarry fill and if DEP requires any type of environmental study. Mr. Chartrand responded DEP has done a phase 1 as part of their due diligence and a geotechnical study to characterize the material. He said as previously mentioned there will be a system for the foundation that will get below [the fill]. He did not know if a vapor barrier is required along the foundation but it has been characterized this would be part of the stormwater management review. EPA approval will be needed for the deep wells which will be vetted through that process.

Mrs. Kenney asked if there were any hazardous chemicals. Mr. Loeper responded at the planning commission it was determined the fill was mostly construction material, waste and trash, but not hazardous materials.

Mr. Waks asked what the planning commission had to say about sidewalks. Mr. Chartrand distributed site photos to help everyone visualize the current situation with the guiderail; culvert and the 10-12 foot drop off on the other side of the culvert which, in his view, serve as deterrents to installing a safe sidewalk. He noted other challenges which include the utility pole and large sewer manhole raised above ground level that would further encumber a sidewalk. Mr. Chartrand indicated the applicant met with PennDOT for an initial discussion to try and figure out what can be done along that portion of Henderson Road.

One of the options brought up at the planning commission was the potential to make a diagonal connection behind the guiderail. Mr. Chartrand said while it is not ideal it is something the applicant would consider if the township feels strongly about a pedestrian connection. He mentioned PennDOT informed the applicant the guiderail has to stay constant all the way across that portion and they cannot put a break in the guiderail and allow pedestrians to cut through.

Mr. Waks asked if the applicant would have any objection to having the township reach out to PennDOT for a site meeting to discuss this further and come up with a solution, and it was indicated the applicant has no objection.

Mrs. Kenney pointed out the trees could stop the cars from dropping off [into the culvert]. She also mentioned if the sidewalk could be installed behind the guardrail then the pedestrians are protected as well.

Mr. Kraynik asked Mr. Chartrand to let Mr. Loeper know who they met with at PennDOT so that the township could follow up in scheduling a meeting.

Mr. Jenaway noted the proposed building will be 45 feet high and will change the landscape of the area. He asked Mr. Loeper about the emergency access requirements for a building with these dimensions. Mr. Loeper responded he would have to double check.

Mr. Chartrand noted the building will be fully sprinklered. Mr. Jenaway pointed out even in sprinklered buildings accessibility becomes important when in an emergency situation it is necessary to move equipment or reach someone inside.

UTILITY LICENSE AGREEMENT – EXTENET/GLASGOW

Mr. Christopher H. Schubert, representing ExteNet Systems, provided a brief summary of Node 24 which is now proposed for Leo Ross Park. During the course of the Conditional Use hearing there was confirmation that the property is not owned by the township but is actually leased. The actual underlying property is now owned by Glasgow.

Mr. Schubert in discussions with Glasgow officials and their legal counsel redefined a form that was based upon the township license agreement for the Community Center. The agreement was made more restrictive from the standpoint that either the Township or the property owner on 60-day notice could ask the applicant to leave and terminate the lease.

Mr. Walko indicated he reviewed the document and said it has met all the requirements and expectations for the lease purposes and for the independent utility agreement.

Board Action:

It was moved by Mr. Waks, seconded by Mrs. Kenney, all voting “Aye” to approve the Utility License Agreement for Leo Ross Park. None opposed. Motion approved 3-0.

APPROVE CONDITIONAL USE DECISIONS FOR EXTENET AT THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS: 575 PRINCE FREDERICK STREET, 187 ROSS ROAD, AND 501-533 DARTMOUTH DRIVE. APPROVE DENIAL OF THE USE AT 349 – 509 WEST BEIDLER ROAD

Mr. Walko summarized the remaining four ExteNet applications that came before the Board of Supervisors at Conditional Use hearings. (1) 575 Prince Frederick Street – had some opposition from surrounding residents and was resolved by moving the proposed location 40 feet away and 6 feet back from the driveway. There was no other opposition to this location. (2) Leo Ross Park - conditioned that the licensing agreement be approved. All the other conditions are standard under the DAS ordinance and comply with evidence and testimony

presented. (3) Dartmouth Drive - there was no opposition and no one appeared before the Board of Supervisors to testify against that location, and (4) Beidler Road – withdrawn by the applicant without prejudice and the proper procedure is to deny it as it was withdrawn.

Board Comment:

Mr. Jenaway asked about coverage for the King of Prussia Fire Company at 300 West Beidler Road. Mr. Schubert responded the fire company is already covered with other nodes in that area.

Board Action:

It was moved by Mrs. Kenney, seconded by Mr. Waks, all voting “Aye” to approve the denial of conditional use for 349-509 West Beidler Road. None opposed. Motion to deny: approved 3-0.

Board Action:

It was moved by Mr. Waks, seconded by Mrs. Kenney, all voting “Aye” to approve the conditional use for 501-533 Dartmouth Drive. None opposed. Motion approved 3-0.

Board Action:

It was moved by Mr. Waks, seconded by Mrs. Kenney, all voting “Aye” to approve the conditional use for 187 Ross Road. None opposed. Motion approved 3-0.

Board Action:

It was moved by Mr. Waks, seconded by Mrs. Kenney, to approve the conditional use for 575 Prince Frederick Street. Mrs. Kenney opposed. Motion denied 2-1.

Subsequent to this vote Mr. Waks asked that the matter be tabled so that a further discussion on the matter may take place at the next business meeting. Mr. Walko asked Mr. Schubert if the applicant would be in agreement. Mr. Schubert responded in the affirmative. Mr. Walko asked Mr. Schubert for a letter to that effect.

Board Action:

It was moved by Mr. Waks, seconded by Mrs. Kenney, all voting “Aye” to table the potential approval of conditional use for 575 Prince Frederick Street to the next business meeting on March 16, 2017. None opposed. Motion to table

approved 3-0.

GSK BUILDING 18 DEVELOPMENT PLAN; 893 RIVER ROAD, DEMOLITION OF THE REMAINDER OF BUILDING 30 (DP2016-2 APPROVED 7/21/16 AND CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW 7,100 SF WAREHOUSE BUILDING. HI 258 ACRES *Plan Expiration: May 24, 2017*

Mr. Loeper stated last year the Board of Supervisors approved a plan involving the demolition of two buildings next to Building 40, the Biopfarm Building, along River Road. There was a complete demolition of Building 18 and a partial demolition of Building 30. In its place GSK has under construction a new 60,000 square foot building with a green roof. GSK is proposing the demolition of the rest of the building that was to remain standing and in its place construct a new Building 18 closer to Swedeland Road. Essentially GSK is cleaning up the area down by building 40 with the demolition of the remainder of Building 30 and constructing a new Building 18 which is a 7,000 square foot warehouse next to the new basin at River Road.

GSK is currently looking at the potential of further expansion of Building 40, the Biopfarm.

Mr. Loeper mentioned this is a relatively simple plan and is also an amendment of the plan approved last year and currently under construction. The plan is currently under review by the county and township engineer.

Christopher Poterjoy stated GSK is looking into potentially doing some other work on the site that is not part of this design.

Mr. Jenaway stated this plan is ready to move forward to the next step in the process.

DRAFT ORDINANCE RE: ESTABLISHING THE UPPER MERION TOWNSHIP HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Mr. Jenaway stated the Upper Merion Township Board of Supervisors desires to create an Upper Merion Township Historical Commission to assist with the planning, preservation, and promotion of the Township's significant architectural and historic sites. The Board of Supervisors has determined that the creation of a historic Commission will assist with the proper management, care and control of the Township and its historic resources, and the maintenance of peace, good government, health and welfare of the Township and its citizens.

Most significant are the specific duties the commission would be charged with to undertake. Among these is authorization to the township to allocate funding for historical commission activities. The ordinance also formalizes

activities, provides the opportunity to establish a location to promote and exhibit historical artifacts, and advise the Board of Supervisors during the development process and advise the Zoning Hearing Board in certain matters affecting historic resources.

Mr. Walko stated the ordinance was drafted for a first review and first feedback to see if this is something the Board would like to move forward with and, if so, with the specific purposes or other kinds of constraints on membership in terms of compensation and removal.

Mrs. Kenney commented there are a number of interesting and significant buildings in the township that deserve better stewardship and something like this would provide “teeth” and the ability and power to take action to protect some of the buildings of architectural and historic interest such as the Moore Irwin House.

Mr. Walko commented he is not in favor of an informal level of subcommittee where it is vague as to who answers to whom.

Mr. Jenaway stated one member of the planning commission would be on the historical commission and it would allow for a connection into the Zoning Hearing Board (ZHB) because of their knowledge of due process when something would need to move forward to the ZHB.

Mr. Walko commented if the ZHB had a question regarding architectural resources or historic resources they could be referred [to the commission] for additional information and research.

Mr. Jenaway stated currently there is no mechanism to make that happen. It all used to be under the planning commission, but not with that specific historical focus.

Mr. Jenaway stated one of the things discussed earlier with the Community Center was the opportunity to be able to provide educational aspects in regard to Upper Merion Township now the township has its own facility to do this.

Mrs. Kenney asked what types of reimbursable expenses occur for historical commission members. Mr. Jenaway responded at this point it would be hypothetical, but it could be something that might be of value the township might want to procure or preservation of any asset the township might have. Mr. Waks suggested document preservation. Currently there is no mechanism to allocate any monies if there is something of historic value deserving of protection. Mr. Walko said it could be something smaller such as mileage reimbursement, research or seminars.

Mrs. Kenney asked about staff time and involvement to work with the

historical commission. Mr. Kraynik responded a lot depends on the scope of the duties and projects undertaken by the historical commission. He said his experience in other communities is it requires a significant amount of staff time and depends on the projects undertaken and objectives of the commission.

Mr. Jenaway asked Mr. Kraynik what position the staff liaison had in the township government. Mr. Kraynik responded in his experience it was the township manager and assistant township manager. He said that does not necessarily have to be the case and if and when the Board adopts this ordinance he will decide who is the best staff member.

A discussion followed about commission meeting time options.

Referring to §2.D, Mr. Kraynik suggested striking the second and third sentence (re removal and hearing) since he felt it should consistent with the other citizen boards. Mr. Walko commented there is no requirement in any statute or code that this has to be in the ordinance and the same language could be used consistent with the other citizen boards.

Mr. Walko commented one other consideration to keep in mind is this is purely an advisory board. He said a lot of municipalities have historic boards that serve as historical architectural review boards which hold hearings. Mr. Walko pointed out that is not included in this draft ordinance. He said there is not an existing setup where the commission has any sort of adjudicatory powers. Mr. Kraynik commented in that case they are governed by state law under the Historic Architectural Review Board (HARB).

Mr. Jenaway recalled during a previous discussion Mr. Philips mentioned if there is a question about whether something was historic or not and, if so, the impact it might have if there was a zoning issue, it would allow the ZHB or planning commission to reach out to the commission to do some of that review/research for grants, etc.

Mr. Jenaway stated for the record any member of the King of Prussia Historical Society who is qualified for membership on the historic commission could apply and be considered for membership.

An unidentified member of the audience thought there might be a potential for conflict with both organizations looking at education.

Mrs. Kenney mentioned she is one of the founding members of the King of Prussia Historical Society.

Mr. Jenaway stated the Historical Society could provide the Board of Supervisors with a proposal on how they see themselves working with the proposed historic commission.

Mr. Waks commented it would depend on which direction the historic commission wants to take. He said there are examples of public/private partnerships in the township that are very similar. One example is McKaig Nature Education Center which is owned by the Upper Merion Park and Historical Foundation and a portion owned by Upper Merion Township.

Mrs. Kenney pointed out the benefit of having a historic commission that is more structured and long lasting and not in competition with another organization but working together.

Mr. Walko stated he has the edits with regard to §2.D and §5 change the “of” to an “or” (last sentence...may contract for experts or other consultants...).

Mrs. Kenney said she believes there is a duplication on the third “Whereas.”

Mr. Jenaway asked Mr. Walko to reach out to Mr. Philips and Mrs. Spott to see if they have any further comments.

Mrs. Kenney asked if this should be discussed with the planning commission. Mr. Kraynik responded Mr. Loeper can share it with them and this can be placed on the April business agenda.

APPOINTMENTS TO CITIZEN BOARDS

Board Action:

It was moved by Mr. Waks, seconded by Mrs. Kenney, all voting “Aye” to appoint Zachary Davis to the Environmental Advisory Council and Jonathan Eyer as the young adult member to the Park and Recreation Board. None opposed. Motion approved 3-0.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the Board, it was moved by Mrs. Kenney, seconded by Mr. Waks, all voting “Aye” to adjourn the meeting. None opposed. Motion approved 3-0. Adjournment occurred at 9:42 p.m.

DAVID G. KRAYNIK
SECRETARY-TREASURER/
TOWNSHIP MANAGER

rap
Minutes Approved:
Minutes Entered: