

UPPER MERION TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
WORKSHOP MEETING
February 15, 2018

ORIGINAL

The Board of Supervisors of Upper Merion Township met for a Workshop Meeting on Thursday, February 15, 2018, in the Township Building. The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m., followed by a pledge of allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

Supervisors present were: Greg Philips, Greg Waks, Bill Jenaway, and Carole Kenney. Also present were: Dave Kraynik, Township Manager; Joe McGrory, Township Solicitor and Rob Loeper, Township Planner. Supervisor Spott was absent.

CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS:

Chairman Philips asked for a moment of silence for the 17 victims of the Florida school shooting and indicated the flags are flying at half-staff at the request of the President.

DISCUSSIONS:

SEPTA KING OF PRUSSIA RAIL UPDATE

Ms. Liz Smith, Manager, Long Range Planning, SEPTA, provided an update on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) released on October 27, 2017, the public hearings as well as next steps in the process. It was noted the DEIS recommended Peco Turnpike First Avenue as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA); the comment period for that document ran through December 4, 2017. Additional highlights as follows:

- Three federally required public hearings were held to receive comments on the DEIS in November 2017. During that comment period there were public information sessions at a couple of venues throughout the area.
- A community working group for the project was held as well as a neighborhood meeting with Valley Forge Homes and Brandywine Village.
- Four project committee meetings were held, 29,000 postcards were mailed, 1,500 newsletters and 6,000 flyers were distributed, local newspaper ads published and posting on social media and email. As a result of those efforts a total of 279 stakeholder and public comments were received during that public comment period. There were 24 comments received directly from government agencies.

- Two petitions were received – one petition in non-support of the project as well as the petition from the Valley Forge Homes neighborhood stating their support of the north/south design option for the alignment. Three resolutions of support were received from Montgomery County, Norristown Borough and Greater Valley Forge TMA.
- Of the 279 stakeholder and public comments more than half expressed support for the project citing things as transportation benefits, land use benefits, economic benefits, environmental benefits as well as financial benefits.
- Less than a quarter of total comments expressed opposition, commonly citing lack of benefits for local residents, environmental impacts of the project and the overall cost.
- A variety of other comments included support of a different alternative, some that supported or opposed one of the design options, comments on the final Environmental Impact Statement and design issues, comments on public outreach methods, and general questions about the project.

As a result of hearing clear support for the recommended locally preferred alternative as well as support from Valley Forge Homes and Brandywine Village for the north/south design option SEPTA's Board unanimously adopted the recommended LPA with the north/south design option at SEPTA's January 25th Board meeting.

Ms. Smith indicated SEPTA can now begin the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) process which will focus solely on the Locally Preferred alternative. It was noted tweaks to the alternative can still be made going forward.

Ms. Smith indicated SEPTA will soon hire a consultant to begin work on a 20-year financial plan in spring of 2018 and will be releasing a Request for Proposal for a design team to take this project up to 30% design. It is currently at 3% which is a very conceptual level of design.

The FEIS will be completed in late 2019 at which time SEPTA would apply to enter the Federal Transit Administration's New Starts Program.

The FEIS will consider only the selected LPA and examine that alternative in much greater detail. Ms. Smith indicated the FEIS will commit to very specific minimization and mitigation measures to reduce impact in response to the substantial comments received during the DEIS public comment period. That document will be running parallel to the 30% design effort.

Ms. Smith assured SEPTA's community outreach will continue in a manner similar to what was done during the DEIS as well as monthly core stakeholder meetings with the Township, the Montgomery County, Greater Valley Forge TMA, Business Improvement District and Delaware Valley Regional

Planning Commission (DVRPC).

Mr. Philips asked for clarification about the 20-year financial plan. Ms. Smith responded that is a federally required document which looks at a 20-year horizon not just how this project would be funded, on a capital, construction and operating basis. This financial document will also look at SEPTA as a whole with all the capital and operating commitments to ensure that over the next 20 years adding this project to the SEPTA system will not impact overall capital plans and the state of repair backlog to their operating budget in any negative way. The goal of the 20-year financial plan is to have a very clear picture of SEPTA's fiscal health and a clear formula for how the project will be funded.

Mr. Philips asked if the 20-year financial plan also includes impacts on the local community for policing and maintaining security at these sites. Mr. Smith responded that document would not contain that information and noted SEPTA intends to include the policing and security impacts in the FEIS.

For the benefit of the audience in attendance, Mr. Philips asked for clarification about the Request for Proposal for the 30% design. Ms. Smith responded when a project is at 30% design preliminary engineering will provide a good idea of what is involved with the project. There will be a lot of work done with regard to geotechnical analysis, geotechnical engineering; operating plans, bus plans and station locations will be finalized which will be based on a very detailed survey.

Mr. Waks asked if ongoing maintenance and operations will be included in the financial plan. Ms. Smith responded in the affirmative and indicated the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requires that SEPTA not only determine how they are going to fund ongoing operations and maintenance of the line for at least the next 20 years, but how that will be accomplished in the context of funding operations and required maintenance for their entire system.

Mr. Waks commented during the second phase of the expansion of the DC Metro, before the red and green lines were open the DC Metro provided maps of their system indicating where the stations were presently located and where it would go in the future. Mr. Waks pointed out while it took decades to build that expansion; it provided commuters with a sense of what the future would look like. He said he would like to see something similar going forward with a potential for this line going up Route 422 which would address some significant traffic problems in Upper Merion Township. Ms. Smith responded, "Absolutely." She indicated this would fit in with the long term vision of where SEPTA wants this line to go in phases with this being Phase 1. Ms. Smith said they have tried to engineer the alignment in a way so it can continue up 422 which is in line with comments SEPTA has received not only from Upper Merion Township, but from neighboring areas and other stakeholders.

Mr. Waks stated by phasing the rail line up 422 it would prevent people from driving into Upper Merion to board trains. Ms. Smith expressed agreement.

Mr. Philips asked if SEPTA would provide a guarantee that this is just Phase 1 of a multi-phase plan to take the rail line up 422. Ms. Smith responded a guarantee would not be possible until the funding is dedicated. She indicated SEPTA currently does not have its own long-range plan. Ms. Smith said SEPTA relies on the DVRPC for their long-range plan. She indicated SEPTA would hope to embark soon on their own long-range plan and it would be very important to show those types of lines on a map.

Mr. Jenaway mentioned the cost impacts associated with sidewalks, ramps, parking areas, etc. and asked if the final FEIS would quantify what the total potential cost to the taxpayer might be. Ms. Smith responded the DVRPC is currently compiling a station area planning study and is looking at each of the five station areas and will make very specific recommendations as to sidewalk connections, trail connections, etc. and a cost estimate associated with each station. Ms. Smith indicated she has asked DVRPC to include information in their study about potential funding sources, including grant opportunities to help fund multi-modal connections and improvements.

Mr. Jenaway expressed concern about the proposed Henderson Road facility and the impact on traffic in that already traffic-challenged area. He asked if there are plans for a traffic impact study. Ms. Smith responded in the affirmative. She said SEPTA will be required to mitigate all of their traffic impacts and cannot make traffic any worse than it is today without the project. The traffic study will be provided during the next phase and part of the Request for Proposal for 30% design will include a traffic engineering consultant to do that work.

Mr. Jenaway emphasized the last data (approximately two years ago) from DVRPC indicates of the four directions coming into Upper Merion Township the traffic volume from Philadelphia was the least of the four traffic patterns. He pointed out there is more traffic coming from Route 422 into Upper Merion. Mr. Jenaway said while the new rail line may help some workers from Philadelphia getting to Upper Merion or some from Upper Merion into Philadelphia, it will not have a significant impact with the current cross township traffic issues or traffic coming from the northwest. Mr. Jenaway stated the traffic impact study needs to evaluate this and asked if SEPTA is considering anything going east-west. Ms. Smith said SEPTA can certainly work with the township to address some of those concerns during the traffic impact study. She said SEPTA would be willing to study more than just their five station locations if this information would be helpful.

Mrs. Kenney stated while it is encouraging to hear a discussion about Phase 1 going up the 422 corridor, she indicated her disappointment there is nothing officially being contemplated about Phase 2. Ms. Smith responded that

is the reason SEPTA wants to have its own long-range plan because DVRPC has to be fiscally constrained since their long-range plan has to be entirely funded. SEPTA would like to be able to show what their vision is decades from now.

Mrs. Kenney asked how certain it is that the 50% funding from the Federal Government will be available and what source is providing the remaining 50% funding. Ms. Smith responded the New Starts program was fully funded last year and at this point nothing has changed within the program. She said the 20-year financial plan will address how the remaining 50% funding would be achieved. It was noted to enter the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) New Starts Program it will be necessary to have 30% of the 50% committed. If local funds are not identified FTA will not allow entrance into the program.

Mrs. Kenney asked for examples of public or private financial resources. Ms. Smith indicated that is not known yet since this is a new era of transportation funding.

Mr. Philips asked what happens to the plans if it is not possible to obtain the 30% funding to enter the program. Ms. Smith responded they are placed "on the shelf." Once the currently earmarked funds are expended, SEPTA's financial consultant will figure out what makes the most sense in moving forward with design; however, it was noted SEPTA would have the consultant draw up a "Plan B" if those federal funds are not available.

With regard to FTA regulations, Mr. Jenaway asked for clarification if there would be a requirement to establish a Transit Oriented Development (TOD) if a station were to be built in that area. Ms. Smith responded she will obtain a definitive answer to that question directly from FTA.

Mr. Philips emphasized how important it is to find out if a TOD requirement is or is not part of the regulations.

Mrs. Kenney commented this Board of Supervisors is not in favor of rezoning for higher density for the SEPTA project. Ms. Smith responded the FTA cannot mandate rezoning. She said if the zoning is not dense enough to meet the threshold requirements, FTA can deny entry into the program and it would impact SEPTA's ability to obtain federal funds for the project. It was noted at the end of the 30% design when SEPTA requests entry into the New Starts Program and meets all the criteria for New Starts SEPTA would be granted entry into the program at that point and finish engineering within the program. At this point in the process FTA and SEPTA have jointly approved the environmental work for the project, but FTA has certainly not given SEPTA the go ahead to build or fund.

GLASGOW TRACT

Richard McBride, Esquire, representing the property owner, stated the Glasgow Tract has frontage on US 202 just below Henderson Road, some frontage on North Henderson Road, but no frontage in the area of Prince Frederick Street behind the Target store.

Mr. McBride indicated the property for the proposed development plan was rezoned R-3A in 2006. At that time JPI had a plan under review for a total of 379 units. The property allows six units per developable acre which is 79 acres when certain environmentally sensitive areas are net out.

Mr. McBride said it was brought to the applicant's attention about a desire to have a connector road boulevard that did not have future houses that would connect from Prince Frederick Street behind Target and wind its way down to Saulin Boulevard at the intersection with US 202.

The applicant is proposing to construct a boulevard from US 202. It was noted Glasgow, Inc. owns ground fronting US 202 between US 202 and a portion of ground zoned HI. Glasgow will be providing that ground for a dedicated roadway from US 202 which will wind through the site and end a relatively short distance from North Henderson.

Mr. McBride indicated in the subsequent years the township in its 209 studies continues to identify the site as being developed for 379 units. He said the proposal calls for 281 units with an emphasis on single family homes in the middle. It was noted the only relief sought when the applicant comes in with fully engineered plans would be if the applicant is committing to the boulevard in the configuration. Mr. McBride indicated there may be SALDO waivers in terms of street radii. He said everything would have to clear with the fire marshal so the road would handle any size truck.

Mr. McBride indicated the site is for single family detached units requiring a minimum 10,000 square foot lot. He said there would be no direct connection to North Henderson Road. An emergency access would connect the villages so that traffic would not be impeded at the end of the boulevard. Mr. McBride noted there would be no connection onto Ross Road and this plan would have the same component as the JPI plan for a small improved township park which would be reconstructed up to current standards, slightly larger than the current park and shifted to the right.

Referring to the aerial visual of the plan Mr. McBride pointed out Subdivision Area 1 along the perimeter where there are two areas with encroachments from existing properties in that vicinity. When the rezoning occurred, they were not included in the enhanced zoning. Mr. McBride believes they were going to be offered by the prior owner to those owners and that is

being honored with the applicant's plan as well and it is not being shown as part of the development of subdivision Area 1. Mr. McBride indicated the applicant would provide 90% of the boulevard as part of the development. The applicant plans to return in the normal course with a formal land development subdivision application.

Mr. Philips asked if the applicant has considered the amount of excavation necessary in the proposed location for the new Leo M. Ross Park in such a topologically challenged area. Mr. McBride responded the pump station to serve the site will have to be more internalized to the site.

Mr. Philips engaged Mr. McBride in a dialog about the current pumping station which is servicing all of Ross Road.

Mr. Philips asked for more information about the large green area in the middle of the plan. Mr. McBride provided some background and indicated this site was a filtration basin for Bethlehem Steel. Bethlehem Steel had a limestone mining operation on the other side of the road which was washed and discharged onto this site and filtered down to the river. He indicated it is not a matter of having environmental concerns since it was a finer silt and would not have structural capabilities. Mr. McBride said the EPA undertook a study 15-20 years ago of Superfund and other sites in the area and cleared this site of having any considerations.

Mr. Philips asked if the applicant is still looking at 55 and over housing. Mr. McBride responded in the negative and indicated it would be standard zoning.

Mr. Philips asked if there is a price point for the single family homes and/or townhouses. Mr. McBride responded singles would be mid to upper 5's and townhouses low to mid 4's. He noted it would be difficult to say what prices are going to be 18 months forward.

Mr. Philips asked if there is any desire for the applicant to provide some affordable housing as part of this development. Mr. McBride responded it is not currently being considered.

Mrs. Kenney asked if the single detached and townhomes will be multi-story or if any of them would be one-story ranch houses. Mr. McBride responded the housing will be traditional two-story, single family homes and townhouses.

Mrs. Kenney commented there would be a significant market for one-story houses. Mr. McBride responded the market will dictate what gets built, but at present the density has been reduced and the lot sizes increased and it would be a matter of the building permit process.

Mrs. Kenney encouraged the applicant's consideration for single family homes. Mr. McBride commented many of the two-story products have first floor masters and the second floor is more for visitors.

Mr. Waks asked about the overall percentage of the parcel that will remain undeveloped and open space. Mr. McBride said there is a minimum requirement of 20% open space and the applicant's plan exceeds that requirement somewhere in the 30% range. He pointed out there are areas of the site that are impacted by wetlands with a significant pond to the left which will be retained. He estimated there would be about 65% coverage.

Mr. Waks indicated he assumes the ownership of the new Ross Road Park will be transferred to the township. Mr. McBride responded the \$1 a year lease would be removed and would be dedicated to the township with improvements.

Mr. Waks asked what would happen to the large green space abutting the townhomes and single family homes. Mr. McBride responded that will be a passive open space area.

Mr. Waks asked if the developer would retain ownership rights or have it transferred to the township. Mr. McBride responded it would go to the Homeowner's Association, but "any open space in the first instance would be offered to the township if it cared to accept same."

Mr. Waks pointed out there is a pond, green open space and the Ross Road Park and asked if any thought has been given for a trail to connect all three of these features together. Mr. McBride responded, "That is certainly not a problem." He said when the applicant advances from sketch to full planning the demand for today is to make everything pedestrian friendly and there is no reason not to do that.

Mr. Waks asked about the next steps the applicant will take. Mr. McBride responded although the applicant is confident the locations showing foundations can be accepted, there will be extensive geotechnical done to be certain. After that has been established the applicant will get into engineering and return to the Board of Supervisors once the plan has been reviewed by the township engineer and planning commission.

Mr. Waks asked if the applicant has reached out to the Ross Road residents and those living on the abutting streets. Mr. McBride responded in the negative.

Mr. Waks advised the applicant to be in touch with the residents in the neighborhood and pointed out this is a standard Board of Supervisors request for anyone who coming forward with a development plan in a neighborhood.

Mr. Waks mentioned none of the current Board of Supervisors were serving at the time the JPI plan was considered in 2006. He recalled the residents at that time were unhappy mainly because they were not included in the design plan process. Mr. Waks recommended when reaching out to the residents to include information about some type of trail connector from the new Ross Road Park to the green space and onto the pond. He also suggested contacting the Park and Recreation department about connecting all these trail amenities to the Chester Valley Trail Extension the township is now coordinating with the county.

Utilizing the aerial, Mr. Loeper pointed out the location where the Chester Valley Trail will extend along the property line.

Mr. Waks reiterated it would make sense to find a way to have Ross Road Park, the green area, and the existing pond connect with the Chester Valley Trail Extension. Mr. McBride responded he will coordinate with the planning staff and park and recreation department regarding the trails and reach out to the neighbors.

Mr. Jenaway asked about the average lot size for a single family home. Mr. McBride responded the single family homes exceed the 10,000 square foot minimum lot size.

Mr. Jenaway asked for clarification about the single exit and entrance coming in from US 202 at Saulin Boulevard. Mr. McBride indicated as you get to the end of the boulevard where there is a cluster of townhouses, the cul-de-sac in that community has an emergency connector to the other community providing passage for emergency vehicles. He said the boulevard itself will be constructed to whatever the township directs - probably 36 feet because it will ultimately take heavy truck traffic if it is to be extended to Prince Frederick. Mr. McBride indicated there should never be a blockage issue with that road since it will not be a typical residential road and none of the dwelling units back onto it.

Mr. Jenaway stated the experience in this township has been that those type roadways have never been maintained very well. He said the applicant will have to figure out how the road will be maintained over time or who is going to be responsible for the common property there.

Mr. Jenaway expressed disappointment the applicant is not considering bringing the boulevard all the way out. He pointed out getting the boulevard to a blocked area does not help Upper Merion Township. If the boulevard was brought all the way out that eliminates the need for the emergency driveway and distributes the traffic better. If the King of Prussia Rail Extension goes in it would be a big help to have that roadway all the way out. Mr. McBride responded the private developer is not in a position either in terms of land acquisition or funding.

Mr. Philips asked if the applicant has had a chance to talk to the property owner who expressed willingness to sell the parcel that would enable completion of the road. Mr. McBride responded in the negative. Mr. Philips encouraged the applicant to have that discussion since it might change the applicant's plan at that intersection.

Mr. Jenaway followed up on Mrs. Kenney's comments regarding a 55 and over community which the applicant initially referenced during an earlier concept plan. He stated the township needs 55 and over housing and not the kind of density and occupancy that is now being proposed. Mr. McBride responded this would require a change in zoning. He confirmed he would reach out to the neighbors and the aforementioned property owner interested in selling a parcel.

Mrs. Kenney pointed out it would not be necessary to have a change in zoning for one-story homes since it would not necessarily have to be 55-plus, but it would be very advantageous to people who either have disability or others who would benefit from one-story housing.

Mr. Philips stated the supervisors are continually thinking about the sustainability of this township and have heard on a number of occasions the older population would like to stay in the township and age in place but cannot because they do not have the resources to stay. Mr. Philips asked Mr. McBride to go back to his client and make a good faith effort to make some changes to the concept plan that would help make some of that happen.

WORKHORSE BREWING DEVELOPMENT PLAN: KING MANOR DRIVE,
RENOVATION OF 50,000 SF OF WAREHOUSE SPACE INTO BREWERY AND
TASTING ROOM AND CONSTRUCTION OF 132 NEW PARKING SPACES,
7.16 ACRES, HI

Mr. Loeper stated Workhouse Brewing has submitted a development plan for an older industrial property located at 250 King Manor Drive (corner of King Manor and Crooked Lane). There is a recreational facility at the rear portion of the 7-acre property zoned HI. Workhouse Brewing proposes taking approximately 50,000 square feet in the front part of the 121,000 square feet of the building for a brewery operation, a warehouse, and tasting room.

Mr. Loeper indicated the applicant proposes additional parking on the frontage of the property and has been before the Zoning Hearing Board to obtain necessary zoning relief.

Utilizing the aerial, Mr. Loeper pointed out the existing impervious surface and the current configuration of the building where there are loading docks for tractor trailers.

The plan has been reviewed by the township engineer and is now ready for consideration.

Mr. Loeper indicated the applicant has met on several occasions with planning staff to discuss the brewing operation and indicated it will have a normal sanitary sewer.

Peter Fineberg, CEO of Workhouse Brewery, described the brewing operation and how the tasting room works. He indicated this will be a King of Prussia brewery making original beer for distribution in the Philadelphia area. As part of the brewery there will be a 5,000 square foot tasting room where people can come in and sample the various beers. The tasting room and production area will require extra parking capacity.

Mr. Loeper asked about the tasting room hours and limitations imposed by the state. Mr. Fineberg responded the state permit allows the brewery to be open until 12 a.m., but this brewery would be open Tuesday through Sunday from 12 p.m. or 2 p.m. until 10 p.m. or 11 p.m. As part of the brewery license Workhouse would be allowed to sell any distilled products made in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Philips asked if this brewery concept would be considered a micro-brewery or a full production brewery. Mr. Fineberg responded this would not be a restaurant, but a full production brewery that is being built to produce a quantity of beer that would be increased as demand arises.

Mr. Philips asked for additional clarification about tours. Mr. Fineberg responded people will be able to take tours, sample the beers and have community and charitable events. He pointed out Workhorse is not a national corporation, but rather locals who want to create a local presence and make something special.

Mr. Philips asked if the loading docks are going to change. Mr. Fineberg responded the loading docks will remain the same.

Mr. Philips asked if there will be any conflict with those coming for the tastings and the deliveries. Mr. Fineberg responded in the negative and said all the people will be coming in at the corner and the loading docks are in the rear mostly coming in the morning and early afternoon. Deliveries will not be made during evening hours or busier times of the day.

In addition to the different types of beer, Mr. Philips asked if Workhorse will brew anything like birch beer. Mr. Fineberg responded there is no plan to brew soft drinks on site at this point. He said if something comes their way and it is a good idea they might definitely do that.

Mr. Philips asked for clarification about the environmental aspects of their

process. Mr. Fineberg responded they are working with the planning staff regarding pre-treatment; all the water will be treated before release within limits and in accordance with township requirements.

Mrs. Kenney asked about the length of the average visit to the brewery. Mr. Fineberg responded they want to provide different activities in the brewery so that it is not just limited to beer tasting but offer such things as games, ability to connect laptops, or have a cup of coffee. It would not be limited to just tasting beer. It was noted they will not have food per se, although they do plan on having food trucks. One of the requirements from the state is they will have to supply such things as pretzels and bar food.

Mrs. Kenney asked if there would be a fee for the tastings. Mr. Fineberg responded in the affirmative. He said there will be a fee for the beer, but no fee for tours.

Mrs. Kenney asked how the Workhorse concept is different than going to a bar and how over imbibing handled. Mr. Fineberg responded a bar is a totally separate license from the State of Pennsylvania. He noted a bar is allowed to serve alcohol made outside of Pennsylvania. With regard to over imbibing, Mr. Fineberg said Workhorse will monitor what people drink and make sure patrons drink responsibly.

Mr. Waks asked about the size of the event space. Mr. Fineberg responded the event space is approximately 1,500 square feet.

Mr. Waks asked if the Workhorse opening is still anticipated this coming spring. Mr. Fineberg responded they are looking at a June opening.

Mr. Jenaway asked for an example of the kinds of Pennsylvania products that will be sold. Mr. Fineberg responded they will also offer wine from local Pennsylvania vineyards. While Workhorse is allowed to sell hard liquor, they have not decided whether to do this as yet. Right now they are focusing on beer.

Mrs. Kenney asked if beer will be sold by six pack and by the case. Mr. Fineberg responded in the affirmative. He said they will be selling kegs for distribution by their trucks in the area.

PARK RIDGE HOTEL DEVELOPMENT, LP DEVELOPMENT PLAN, 480 N. GULPH ROAD. CONSTRUCTION OF FREESTANDING 120 UNIT HOTEL. PLAN APPROVAL PART OF 2010 PLAN WHICH REDUCED THE NUMBER OF ROOMS IN THE EXISTING HOTEL, 8.5 ACRES, SM. *Plan Expiration: 2/28/18*

Mr. Loeper stated when the Park Ridge Hotel was rebranded in 2010 extensive work was done and the hotel was reconfigured reducing the number of guest rooms. As part of that approval an agreement was made that at some

point in the future the applicant could come forward and add the 120 rooms back onto the site.

Utilizing the aerial, Mr. Loeper pointed out the various aspects of the surrounding property. He indicated the applicant is proposing a freestanding five-story 78,000 square foot hotel with 120 rooms.

The parking will be contained on the site. In addition, overflow parking is available on the other side of the turnpike which now is mostly empty. The overflow parking was planned at a time the applicant was intending to greatly expand the ballrooms, meeting/ convention space of the existing hotel, however, the expansion did not occur.

Based on conversations planning staff have had with the applicant this will be a completely different type of hotel brand. It was noted any use of off sight parking would be for event parking and would be confined to valet parking.

Mr. Loeper stated the plan has gone through most of the reviews and is in good standing to move forward.

Denise Yarnoff, representing the applicant, discussed the plan in more detail with regard to the brand and concept. She indicated the applicant proposes a 120 room Element Hotel, an extended stay all-suites type of hotel, with no event space. It offers a continental breakfast area and it has its own pool. For those wishing to use a full scale restaurant the Sheraton Hotel would be available. Ms. Yarnoff indicated the site has more than the ordinance-required parking and off-site parking provides an additional 122 parking spaces by valet that is only used for events at the main Sheraton.

Mr. Philips asked if it is correct the applicant has a shared parking arrangement with the Sheraton. Ms. Yarnoff responded it would be shared and have totaled the parking for both uses and there are 17 more spaces than required.

Mr. Philips asked for clarification about the valet parking. Ms. Yarnoff responded the valet is only used when there is a large event at the Sheraton, otherwise, there is no need for valet parking. People who are coming to the Element Hotel will park most likely right in front of the building.

Mr. Loeper commented the parking is based on the total room count of the two hotels as one entity so that it complies with the parking. It is not that one takes parking from the other.

Mr. Philips asked if there is security in the other parking lot. Ms. Yarnoff responded the valet staff are taking cars back and forth and it is only during events. Another representative of the applicant indicated there is 24/7 security

on the property.

Mrs. Kenney asked for clarification about the ownership of the entire property. Mr. Loeper responded the property is under single ownership. A representative of the applicant indicated it is a Starwood franchise which has been bought out by Marriott.

Mr. McGrory asked if this development plan is ready for a resolution. Mr. Loeper responded in the affirmative.

MAO ZHU ZENG SUBDIVISION PLAN, 155 HUGHES ROAD. RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION 2-LOTS, 1 EXISTING DWELLING, 3.15 ACRES, R-1A. Plan Expiration: 2/28/18

Mr. Loeper stated several years ago the code was revised to allow flag lots in the R-1 and R-1A Districts as conditional uses with a time limitation indicating the building permit must be obtained within a year. It is possible to obtain an extension for another year. This subdivision plan would be applicable and a conditional use hearing would be necessary.

The applicant at this time is proposing to subdivide the 3-acre site at 155 Hughes Road, but has no plans to build at this point in time. Mr. Loeper explained some of the complications that would occur in approving a subdivision, recording a plan, and creating a new lot at the present time since there are no plans to build.

Mr. Loeper indicated the plan has been approved by the planning commission and reviewed by the township engineer. The basic two-lot subdivision proposed for the 3.15 acre lot meets all zoning requirements for the flag lot. There is an existing dwelling on the rear of the property (Lot #2) which is 1.99 acres and the new Lot #1 in front is 1 acre.

A discussion followed regarding the complications created by the expiration requirement for building.

Mao Zhu Zang, owner of 155 Hughes Road, explained the reasons why she applied for subdivision, but is not trying to build anything at this time.

A discussion followed during which suggestions were offered on how to proceed with the current constraints of the time limitation. The emphasis was made that ultimately it is the applicant's decision on how to proceed.

FRANCIS E. SCHULTZ, JR. DEVELOPMENT PLAN, 541 FLINT HILL ROAD, CONSTRUCTION OF A 40,000 SF ONE-STORY BUILDING FOR RECREATIONAL USE AND WAREHOUSING AND PAVED PARKING FOR 116 VEHICLES AND A LOADING AREA, LI-LIMITED INDUSTRIAL, 7.11 ACRES. Plan Expiration 2/28/18

Mr. Loeper stated the applicant is proposing a 40,000 square foot building for recreational use and warehouse space in the Limited Industrial (LI) District. There will be three users, two of which would be for recreation and the other would be warehouse space for Mr. Schultz. The site is currently part of the Jamison yards.

The township engineer reviewed the plan and is satisfied with the plan at this point in time. Sewer capacity needs to be determined as well as the calculation of a traffic impact fee.

The site currently is basically impervious; primarily crushed stone. The site will be cleaned up; there will be fencing along the perimeter. Stormwater improvements are part of this land development.

The applicant has requested some waivers most of which are deal with certain aspects of the subdivision plan.

Mr. Philips asked if 541 Flint Hill Road will be redesignated by the Post Office. Mr. Loeper responded in the affirmative and said it will have a Hertzog address.

Mr. Philips inquired about a certain area he observed on the plan. Mr. Loeper responded that it is a loading dock and loading area.

Mr. Philips asked if this plan is in a position for a resolution. Mr. Loeper responded in the affirmative.

BRANDYWINE PROPERTIES: 500 N. GULPH ROAD, BUILDING MODIFICATIONS RESULTING IN APPROXIMATELY 2,000 SF OF ADDITIONAL OFFICE SPACE, ONE LEVEL PARKING DECK, SM DISTRICT, 4.5 ACRES. Plan Expiration 4/28/18

Mr. Loeper stated the building is currently owned by Brandywine and is currently vacant. The applicant is proposing building modifications to update the building to today's standards and bring the parking into compliance. Utilizing the aerial, Mr. Loeper pointed out the various aspects of the plan including the parking deck. The building was built in the late 1970's during the energy crisis with an emphasis in providing shading from the sun on the south, east and west façades. The building modifications will result in an increase of approximately 2,000 square feet

The Zoning Hearing Board has issued a favorable decision involving some setbacks along the Turnpike.

A rendering was shown indicating the outline of the building, some of the parking underneath, the parking deck and the garage as seen from North Gulph Road. It was noted the current façade would be replaced with an updated flat façade.

Mr. Jenaway commented he drove by the site yesterday and noticed a lot of ongoing construction. He asked what is happening at the site now. Michele Flowers, Development Manager representing Brandywine, responded they have a building permit and have started some work on the interior. She explained it is a totally different project separate from the parking structure.

Mr. Jenaway expressed concern over the aesthetics of the visuals/renderings provided.

Mr. Philips asked if this would continue to be an office building. Ms. Flowers responded this will remain an office building and indicated there will be amenity spaces for kitchenettes, areas the tenants can congregate, and balconies overlooking the park.

Mr. Philips asked if there would be any coffee shops or restaurants. Ms. Flowers responded in the negative and indicated it would be a typical office building environment where there is a place to get coffee, heat up food in a microware, but not a service deli or coffee shop.

Mr. Philips asked if the applicant intends to soften the hard white walls of the parking structure. Ms. Flowers responded in the affirmative. She said the rendering is not the best indication of what the garage will look like since it will contain some architectural features and color variations to soften the look. They are also trying to figure out a way to create the entrance area into the garage to be more of an architectural feature.

Mr. Philips asked if any thought has been given to landscaping the exterior walls with ivy. Ms. Flowers responded she is not sure there is an opportunity to do this since it is just a single deck. She said the applicant will remain mindful of the aesthetics and does not want the parking structure to diminish the aesthetics of the building.

Another representative of the applicant indicated there will be additional landscaping along the perimeter adjacent to the turnpike parcel, along the frontage, islands on the interior and in the outdoor seating area adjacent to the building.

Ms. Flowers indicated they are still designing the front entrance of the building. In addition, there is an outdoor amenity to buffer that space from North Gulph Road. The landscaping plan is still in the conceptual phases but definitely under consideration and important to the applicant as well as the future tenants.

Mr. Philips asked if Brandywine owns the building. Ms. Flowers responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Philips asked if there is blue neon lighting is around the top of the building. Ms. Flowers responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Philips asked if there is any intent in the architectural design to do more with the night lighting/uplighting. Ms. Flowers said they are currently not considering such features. She noted they are speaking to a full building user that is trying to seek out some opportunity to do something in that area. Ms. Flowers said in the meantime, the blue lighting will remain unless the full building user is able to something else.

REALEN VALLEY FORGE GREENES VR-8 HANOVER APARTMENTS

Mr. Paul Fry, Manager, Realen Properties, reviewed the status of the various Hanover projects, and discussed Hanover 3 their latest and next project at the Village at Valley Forge.

Mr. Philips asked if there is a way to get Hanover to build the price of their parking into the rental.

A discussion followed during which the supervisors emphasized the many ongoing parking complaints they receive. They urged Mr. Fry to consider parking complaints they receive. They urged Mr. Fry to consider parking as an amenity and have the price of parking built in so it is not an option.

Mr. Fry stated he will talk to all the different managers and owners about the parking issue and suggested they come in for a workshop session to discuss in further detail.

APPOINTMENT OF BOARD OF COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE (BCA) MEMBER

Board Action:

It was moved by Mr. Philips, seconded by Mr. Jenaway, all voting "Aye" to appoint C. Brett Montick as a member of the Board of Community Assistance. None opposed. Motion approved 4-0.

From the public:

Mr. Herbert Baiersdorfer, Gypsy Lane, discussed his issue with a neighbor's ditch. The township engineer and township staff have been working proactively with Mr. Baiersdorfer on these issues.

ADJOURNMENT:

Board Action:

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 9:12 p.m.



DAVID G. KRAYNIK
SECRETARY-TREASURER/
TOWNSHIP MANAGER

rap

Minutes Approved: 3/22/18

Minutes Entered: 3/22/18