



**JENKINTOWN PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**September 17th, 2019**  
**6:30pm-8:30pm**  
**700 Summit Avenue, Jenkintown Pennsylvania**

**DRAFT MEETING MINUTES**

**Attendance**

Members Present: Gabriel Lerman – Chairperson, Phil Zimmerman – Secretary, Jon McCandlish, Glen Morris

Members Absent: Lucinda Bartley, Alison Danilak, Joe Hentz

Others Present: George Locke – Borough Manager, Marley Bice – Montgomery County Planner, Deborra Sines-Pancoe – Borough Council President, Kieran Farrell - Borough Councilperson, Patrick Hitchens – Borough Solicitor

**Reports**

Planning Commission meeting minutes from August were approved.

**New Business**

**610 York Road: T-Mobile Antenna Request**

The Planning Commission (PC) was made aware of a likely forthcoming conditional use request by T-Mobile to expand upon an existing antenna array located on a property at 610 York Road. The proposal would require replacement of existing equipment with upgraded, larger equipment. The flagpole currently serving as the mount for the existing equipment would subsequently need to be reinforced.

Mr. Hitchens acknowledged that although the PC would not need to make any recommendations at the September meeting, he would suggest a recommendation for approval based on precedent set by previous, recent PC approvals of similar requests.

**93 York: Conditional Use and Land Development Review**

Representatives of Jenkintown Commons Limited Partnership of Bryn Mawr, PA came before the PC seeking land development review and conditional use approval regarding re-development of a property located at 93 York Road. The project had been previously granted variances to include residential apartment use in addition to the waiving of multiple dimensional non-conformities. The project required a conditional use approval for the inclusion of a proposed drive through component to a potential restaurant tenant. The owner/consultant team presented details of the project; including a review of existing vs. proposed conditions, site circulation, building entries and proposed apartment/retail tenant units.

Mr. Morris asked the applicants to describe how waste management had been planned for. The owner confirmed that the current location of dumpsters on the property would be maintained, and that an enclosure with a gate would be provided.

The PC inquired about site lighting and the applicant confirmed that all proposed lighting was to be pole mounted, full cut-off, LED fixtures, mounted at 24'.

The PC asked the owner to elaborate on the proposed design for site circulation, and how it differed from current conditions existing on the site. The team described one-way and two-way traffic lanes, as well as parking layouts and sidewalks. They stated that site entries/exits would utilize existing curb cuts and that no new cuts would be added as part of the proposal.

The PC asked about how Borough parking requirements had been addressed in the project. Ms. Bice further inquired whether the developer had pursued shared parking opportunities to reduce the number of required parking spaces. The developer stated that parking requirements had been met exactly and that any reduction in the current parking allotment would not be preferred, even if relief from Borough requirements were offered.

The PC inquired about site landscaping, specifically regarding a planted buffer between the front parking lot and York Road as well as the inclusion of street trees. The owner stated that landscape plans had not yet been fully developed, but that street trees were not currently being planned for and would not be preferred. They further stated that street trees would limit storefront visibility and devalue the marketability of commercial and retail tenants. Members of the PC expressed their opposition to this notion, stating that this wouldn't necessarily be the case and that the addition of street trees would be a value add to the project and its potential tenants. The PC further stated the importance of street trees to the pedestrian experience of the project, and strongly advised the applicant to consider including trees.

Ms. Bice suggested that the planted buffer between the existing sidewalk and the road be increased by moving the sidewalk back towards the building and parking area. The owner responded that this wouldn't be feasible in that the sidewalk was a functional existing condition that would be prohibitively costly to replace. They further stated that existing site utilities running beneath the sidewalk would be impacted if the sidewalk were to be reconfigured. They did agree that damaged portions of the sidewalk would be repaired as necessary during completion of the project.

Mr. Hitchens asked that the PC and developer team consider the language being used within the project proposal clarifying the bounds for conditional use of a drive through. He suggested that the language be changed from "fast food drive-through" to "coffee shop drive-through", stating that the later would be more in-line with the proposed possible tenant and a definition that the Borough would likely find more acceptable regarding the proposed conditional use. The developer clarified that although they only had tacit commitment from the coffee shop tenant, the success of the project depended on that tenant's inclusion. They agreed to change the language of their proposal regarding the project's conditional use for a drive-through to be more specific to the proposed tenant.

Ms. Farrell asked the developer to describe the quality of the proposed residential units, to confirm her understanding that the units would be "high-end". The owner confirmed the proposed luxury quality of the units, and further clarified that although not explicit the likely target tenant market would be younger, single and without children.

Mr. Lerman asked about retail tenant loading areas. The owner stated that due to the layout of the project, no dedicated loading areas were currently planned for.

Mr. McCandlish stated the importance of considering the design of the building in the round, with the development of thoughtful building elevations from all sides. He elaborated that careful design consideration of all building elevations was necessary because the building would not only be highly visible from York Road, but also from the neighboring single-family residences. The developer agreed with the importance of the recommendation.

Ms. Bice asked if the project had been subject to Fire Marshall review, pertaining to emergency vehicle access. The owner stated that it had been reviewed and approved.

Ms. Bice inquired about project site stormwater management. The project team summarized the planned strategies, including onsite underground stormwater retention system, surface rain gardens and an overall reduction of impervious surface materials. They stated that generally, site stormwater conditions would be improved over those of the existing site.

The PC suggested that a crosswalk, striping or designated pedestrian area be developed between the main, rear parking area and the building, prioritizing pedestrian access to retail spaces and the residential tenant lobby.

The PC summarized several conditions to their recommendation for approval to Borough Council (BC), including:

- further development of project landscaping plans and the inclusion of street trees

- further consideration of site waste management
- improvements to pedestrian access from parking areas
- revising language from “fast food drive-through” to “coffee shop drive-through”

With these conditions, the PC motioned to and were all in favor of recommending project conditional use and land use development approval by BC.

## **Ongoing Business**

### **Comp Plan, Zoning Review and SALDO Review Updates**

Ms. Bice presented updates to previous PC discussions regarding proposed comp plan, zoning and SALDO review revisions.

She stated that she was in the process of creating a list of similar regional municipalities from which to draw sample zoning language and requirements. She further stated that she would include municipalities that would provide example historic district ordinance structure and language. Ms. Bice also confirmed that Cory Kegerise, Community Preservation Coordinator, was also in the process of reviewing relevant sample municipality historic district ordinance language.

Ms. Bice relayed to the PC that her team was also in the process of researching buildings currently listed on and proposed additions to the Borough historic resource inventory, to compare against criteria of potential proposed historic district ordinance language. She stated that she hoped to have completed by the end of the year a matrix of listed properties, their historic significance and their applicability to designation under possible proposed ordinance language.

Mr. McCandlish inquired how the PC might move forward with action to begin protecting previously proposed additions to the Borough’s historic resource inventory. He surmised that by limiting the recommendation to approve possible list additions to only include properties to be categorized as Historic and Landmark, the PC and BC would have a logical proposal to protect these currently unlisted properties under a clearer criterion of historic significance.

Mr. Locke and Mr. Hitchens confirmed that letters of notification to owners of affected properties had been distributed as a courtesy and that no further action would need to be taken prior to a PC vote to recommend BC approval of the list revisions.

The PC asked attending representatives of BC if this strategy made sense and if BC would be amenable to receiving a PC recommendation for approval based on limited criteria for listed properties (Historic and Landmark only). Ms. Farrell and Ms. Sines-Pancoe thought that this approach made sense and the BC would accept the basis of the PC recommendation.

Mr. McCandlish agreed to prepare a recommendation package for BC consideration including an updated list based on limited criteria as well as descriptions of why each building would fall into the categories of either Historic or Landmark.

Ms. Bice discussed previous recommendations for updated language related to modifications to FAR bonuses. She reiterated her proposed revisions to allow FAR bonuses for green building initiatives, inclusion of public art and transit improvements. She also reiterated the recommendation to reduce FAR bonus values so that applicants would have to meet multiple requirements to attain the full FAR incentive. She asked the PC to review her recommendations and be prepared to discuss implementing them as appropriate in a coming PC meeting.