



**JENKINTOWN PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**August 21st, 2018**  
**6:30pm-8:30pm**  
**700 Summit Avenue, Jenkintown Pennsylvania**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Attendance**

Members Present: Gabriel Lerman - Chairman, Phil Zimmerman - Secretary, John Krebs, Emily Wicks

Members Absent: Joe Hentz, Glenn Morris, Jon McCandlish

Others Present: George Locke – Borough Manager, Deborra Sines-Pancoe – Borough Council President

**Public Comment**

See Below.

**Reports**

July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018 Planning Commission (PC) meeting minutes were approved.

PC Chairman Gabe Lerman met with the Montgomery County Planning Department and SEPTA regarding the planned renovations to the Jenkintown train station. He expressed the Borough's interest in continuing ongoing communication and collaboration regarding the development of the plans. Council President Deborra Sines-Pancoe expressed the Borough's interest in the train station's continued use by a commercial or retail tenant. She suggested that the Borough reach out to Cheltenham Township to better understand a similar use of historic buildings at the Elkins Park Station.

**New Business**

**Sub-Division Land Development (SALDO) Presentation – 610 Summit Ave**

The team for the 610 Summit Ave development, including representatives from Roizman Properties (RP) and relevant consultants/subconsultants presented to the Planning Commission (PC) as part of the project's Sub-Division Land Development review. The team began their presentation by reiterating that the project had been through Borough Zoning Board review and had been granted all zoning approvals necessary to proceed. They then proceeded to briefly describe the project in detail, including an introduction to the project's site plan, site access and circulation, and plans for landscaping and utilities. The PC was then given the opportunity to ask questions and request clarification.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for an additional description of a small planting strip and the possibility of including street trees between the sidewalk and the street at the front of the property. RP stated that the strip had been made as wide as possible to accommodate both plantings and an adequate sidewalk width. They also made it clear that street trees would not be possible at this location due to obstructing overhead utilities. RP stated that they would provide further detail regarding plantings at this location.

The PC inquired about emergency vehicle access to the site. The developer stated that access and circulation for emergency vehicles would be the same as for all traffic on site, and that all proper clearances and radiuses would be met in the final plan.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for a summary of new and existing impervious cover for the site in comparison to existing site pervious, in addition to a detailed description of any on-site stormwater mitigation strategies that would be part of the project. RP responded that the pervious cover for the site will be reduced by 20% as part of the current plan. They also confirmed that an under-paving water retention system had

been included as part of the project to slow the release of stormwater from the site into the municipality stormwater system. RP stated that there are no further plans for any “green”, on-site stormwater strategies.

PC Chairman Lerman asked whether the parking would be shared between the residents and the commercial customers, and if/how parking for each use might be independently designated. RP responded that all parking would be shared and that no parking would be dedicated specifically to accommodate the proposed commercial uses for the building.

The PC inquired about the location of a street-side transformer, that had been shown in the current plan as being screened by fencing along the front sidewalk. The developer responded that the transformer’s location had been dictated by the utility company and that street access from Summit Ave would be required. The PC made it clear that the location/arrangement of the transformer and fencing was not desirable. The PC asked that RP consider either; 1) pushing the transformer/fencing further back toward the rear parking lot to include more street-side, screening plantings for the transformer/fencing or 2) locating the transformer in a vented pit with vegetated views back through to the rear of the site.

Mr. Zimmerman asked the developer to describe the trash collection strategy for the project. The developer clarified that both trash and recycling would be collected weekly by a private trash collection company independently contracted by RP. Trash would be collected by residents/tenants in a utility room at the east of the site, and then would be wheeled in large trash bins to the street for collection.

Mr. Zimmerman asked that the developer give more detail into the project’s site lighting strategy. RP clarified all fixture locations and lighting levels by showing a lighting study that had been performed to ensure proper illumination of exterior spaces. The developer stated that all pole mounted site lighting would utilize full cut-off fixtures to minimize site generated light pollution. RP also stated that 10’ tall perimeter plantings would screen fixture glare from adjacent residents. The PC recommended that in addition to pole-mounted fixtures, all garage and building mounted fixtures should be full cut-off to ensure that no additional building or building-mounted fixtures contribute to light pollution generated by the project.

The PC asked RP if any outdoor seating or benches had been considered as part of the project’s current site plan. RP stated that none were currently included but would be added to the project as residents began to occupy the building/site as would be typical of past RP developments.

Mr. Krebs inquired about resident and commercial loading for the project. The developer clarified that no dedicated loading areas had been provided for commercial tenants, and that none would be expected to be required based on the types of tenants that the developer expects to accommodate. RP further explained that resident loading/unloading – including move-in and move-out – would be accommodated through the main lobby and elevators. RP stated that they would have some control over all loading activities to protect their building from damage. PC Chairman Lerman asked how the developer could ensure that their commercial tenants wouldn’t require dedicated accommodations for loading/unloading and requested that the developer consider planning for the likelihood of future tenants that would require greater loading capacity.

Ms Wicks asked if any additional accommodations for accessibility had been considered given that the project would be serving a community of residents that would likely have a greater need for accessibility. RP stated that no additional accessibility accommodations were being considered over and above those required by code and the municipality.

The PC asked about the common wall between the existing property to be demolished and the Borough Hall building, and specifically the new exterior treatment of that wall once exposed. RP stated that one option might be to clad the exterior surface in stucco but that further development was needed and that more information would need to be provided at future meetings.

Mr. Krebs asked RP to describe what makes the development proposal that they are bringing to Jenkintown special or unique. He further asked what if any lessons learned from previous projects were being implemented for this project. RP stated that their development plans had worked with a constrained site to include all the items required to make such a project acceptable for the Borough and successful, including complete parking accommodations, copious amounts of adjacent green spaces, large units, accommodations for resident amenities, and pleasing building massing and design. RP

stated that when compared to previous projects, they believe this project is unique in that it better caters to their residents' needs.

As part of the project SALDO review, the RP team reviewed with the PC responses to a previous zoning application review letter. RP reviewed each question and response, many of which RP had responded that they would be willing to comply with the Borough's comments/requests.

Item #7 regarding sidewalk width was brought up as an area of concern by the PC, as a narrowing of the main front sidewalk would limit the pedestrian experience on the site and hinder walk-ability. RP stated that the project attempts to balance sidewalk width with accommodations for a street-side planting strip and that the 5.8' wide sidewalk was adequate for pedestrians crossing the site.

Item #53 regarding the Borough's suggested removal of an existing crosswalk serving the site was identified as an item for further discussion. RP stated that by maintaining this crosswalk, they maintain increased pedestrian access to the site, and would therefore prefer to keep it in place. The Borough has suggested its removal as it adds to a confluence of vehicular and pedestrian pathways that could be confusing and dangerous as the site is developed for the project. RP stated that with proper updated marking/safety signage, they feel maintaining the existing crosswalk wouldn't create any dangerous conditions.

**Public Question/Comment:**

There was a public request for further clarification of project parking and site/building entrances. RP clarified that some parking would be located under the building but open to adjacent properties, and some would be open surface parking. They described the vehicle and pedestrian entries to the site as being adjacent but somewhat independently defined, and then pointed out entrance points to the building.

A resident asked that local/seasonal plantings be considered to liven the public, street-side face of the project. RP asked for the name of local planting specialist to be passed along to them so that these types of plantings/planting arrangements could be integrated.

A Borough resident reiterated the importance of the building currently located on the property, the Salem Baptist Church of Jenkintown, and its historical significance and connection to Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. They further expressed interest in being included by the Borough and developer as plans for a marker or memorial garden be developed and reviewed. RP stated that they would be interested in including the public in planning for this element and would continue open communication with the Borough and Borough residents regarding this item. Borough residents further stated that they would like to integrate a bench into the memorial element.

A resident asked about the feasibility of burying the overhead utility lines along Summit Ave so that street trees could be integrated into the project. The developer stated that this could be considered but would be at the Borough's expense and likely cost prohibitive. Another resident inquired about the overhead lines' proximity to the building and whether there was adequate clearance given to the utilities. RP stated that this would be something that would be confirmed by the utility company but that they were unaware that any clearance issues existed.

A resident asked if there were plans to integrate crash or over-run protection in parking areas to prevent cars from damaging adjacent properties. RP clarified that all parking areas would be fully curbed and surrounded by fencing and tall plantings. They further stated that bollards would be installed to protect pedestrian areas adjacent to drive lanes and parking.

A Borough resident inquired whether the current parking plan met the Borough's zoning parking requirements and suggested that the current count was short of the requirement by 5 spaces. The Borough solicitor explained that as part of the conditional use proceedings, an interpretation of the zoning requirement had been accepted that would allow the proposed parking count to be considered adequate in fulfilling zoning required parking counts for the project. The resident furthermore requested that RP show column locations in the under-building parking plans to demonstrate that no proposed parking spaces would be impacted or lost due to building structure.

## **Ongoing Business**

### **Community Historic Resource Inventory Review – Status Update**

Mr. Zimmerman summarized progress of the community historic resource inventory review, stating that several PC members had recently met to survey properties currently included on the list. The PC also identified additional buildings that they suggest should be added to the list or given more stringent designations. Mr. Locke confirmed that no special designations existed for historic church properties in the Borough and that he didn't see any reason why they shouldn't be added to the list as well. The PC will provide an updated list of properties to Borough Council for review and adoptions as soon as possible.

### **2035 Comprehensive Plan - Status Update**

PC Chairman Lerman stated that 2035 Comprehensive Plan had been adopted with only minor revisions by Borough Council in the July meeting. He reiterated that Montgomery County Planner Marley Bice had offered to assist in bringing initiatives identified in the plan before the PC or Borough Council for review or implementation.

### **93 York Road Development – Status Update**

Borough Manager George Locke updated the PC regarding development plans for a property at 93 York Road. He stated that the property's developer had indicated that they would like to go before the Zoning Hearing Board as soon as September to begin the process of seeking zoning relief in the plans for their project. Mr. Locke also noted that a plan review is currently underway and there is some question as to zoning parking requirements and the developer's interpretation those requirements. The project is to include ground level retail (food service) and 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floor apartments.