



**JENKINTOWN PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**July 16th, 2019**  
**6:30pm-8:30pm**  
**700 Summit Avenue, Jenkintown Pennsylvania**

**DRAFT MEETING MINUTES**

**Attendance**

Members Present: Gabriel Lerman – Chairperson, Phil Zimmerman – Secretary, Jon McCandlish, Lucinda Bartley, Alison Danilak, Glen Morris  
Members Absent: Joe Hentz,  
Others Present: George Locke – Borough Manager, Marley Bice – Montgomery County Planner, Deborra Sines-Pancoe

**Reports**

Planning Commission meeting minutes from June were approved.

**New Business**

**Review of Proposed Ordinance #2019 – 4.**

The Planning Commission (PC) considered proposed Ordinance #2019-4 that would extend requirements regarding current historic resource inventory to apply to buildings located within the Gateway Commercial District. The language would make proposed demolition of inventory listed buildings within the Gateway Commercial District an action to be reviewed by Borough Council. George Locke summarized the proposed ordinance in the context of current code language.

Mr. Lerman motioned for a PC recommendation of Borough Council (BC) approval for Ordinance #2019-4. Mr. McCandlish seconded the motion. The PC recommended BC approval with all in favor.

**Ongoing Business**

**Zoning Review Update: Implementation of 2035 Comprehensive Plan, Local Historic Resource Process, SALDO Updates**

Montgomery County Planner Marley Bice presented her recommendations for updates/revisions to the existing Borough Zoning Ordinance based on the goals of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan and previous discussions with the PC. She focused her recommendations and the subsequent discussion on three aspects: the addition of accessory dwelling units to residential districts, expansion of Jenkintown's commitment to historic preservation and the development of the Borough's town center district.

**Accessory Dwelling Units**

Ms. Bice outlined her recommendation to include the construction or conversion of structures to serve as accessory dwelling units within residential districts. She clarified the definition of an accessory dwelling unit as a detached structure with independent kitchen and dedicated entrance, separate from a primary residence but sharing the same property. Ms. Bice discussed with the PC the various ways in which these types of structures could be permitted and regulated under revised zoning code; including limiting use to family and extended family vs. rental for supplementary income.

Ms. Danilak inquired about the possible use of accessory dwelling units for short-term rental units; Airbnbs. Mr. Locke explained that current state legislation is working to regulate such uses. The PC

expressed concern that a pervasion of un-checked short-term rental use would create a negative impact in the community.

Mr. Morris asked about the use of accessory dwelling units (ADU) as rentals for students or visiting professors. Ms. Bice confirmed that this could be a permitted use depending upon how the language of ordinance revisions was created.

Mr. Locke clarified that the inclusion of ADUs as permitted within the residential zoning overlay would be different than allowing multi-family buildings to be built in residential districts. He further stated that the later would constitute a change to Borough zoning, and that a revision to allow ADU's would be achieved through a Borough ordinance.

Mr. McCandlish asked the PC to consider the end goal of the proposed recommendation, stating that the addition of ADU's would fill a desire of the community to construct "in-law suites" and that any potential "back-door" path to expanding multi-family units within the Borough would be regulated through thoughtful creation of the related ordinance. Mr. Lerman agreed, stating that the proposal seemed a benefit to community members.

Mr. McCandlish inquired about recent interest or building permit application inquiries regarding the construction of ADUs in the Borough. Mr. Locke confirmed that he has experienced an increased demand and expanded in saying that many elderly parents are seeking to move back into close proximity of their children.

Borough council president Deborra Sines-Pancoe made the point that past trends in Jenkintown residential housing had prioritized the preservation of the Borough's larger single-single family homes, which have now become difficult to maintain by many of the now aging residents.

The PC suggesting further consideration of the proposed ordinance recommendations, including further definition of potential uses and limitation of ADUs within the residential overlay.

#### Historic Preservation

Ms. Bice presented her recommendations for strengthening the Borough's approach to Historic Preservation as related to recent PC discussions and the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. Her recommendations included the creation of a formal historic district and formation of a HARB, clarifying the existing historic preservation requirements and definitions within Borough code, and the creation of bonus incentives to encourage historic preservation sensitive development.

Ms. Bice discussed an option to enact a delay period prior to any proposed demolition of historic structures within the Borough. She explained that such a measure could slow the development process and discourage developers in seek of an "easy project". She recommended that the PC consider codifying a review or delay process as an initial step in strengthening current Borough historic preservation measures.

Mr. McCandlish reiterated the importance of bringing more specificity to the definitions of listed or protected historical structures and bringing more clarity to the level of demolition proposed that would trigger review.

Ms. Bartley inquired about the current review process. Mr. Locke confirmed that the Design Review Board (DRB) would review any proposed modifications to a structure, historically significant or not, and that any demolition of listed historic structures would be put through the DRB review by default.

Mr. McCandlish stated that although the DRB would review any proposal by default under current zoning code requirements, it may be advantageous for the DRB or another reviewing body be specifically identified as stewards for the Borough's historic fabric. He clarified that he had suggested the creation of a HARB in previous meetings as a vehicle for strengthening review oversight and stewardship. Ms. Bice suggested that the DRB could also act in the capacity of a HARB and that the review of development proposals related to historic properties could be more explicitly tied to the review authority of the DRB.

Ms. Bice stated that she has been in contact with Cory Kegerise, the Community Preservation Coordinator for the Eastern Region at the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, and that he

would be attending the next PC meeting to further discuss strategies for historic preservation within the Borough.

#### Town Center District

Ms. Bice discussed her recommendations regarding strategies for encouraging successful and healthy development of the Borough's town center. She offered several minor updates to the existing code as well as a few more expansive revisions that included increasing the number of allowable "by-right" apartment units for related zoned parcels, defining allowable street facing uses in downtown commercial properties, strengthening streetscape standards, and updating FAR bonus provisions.

In the context of increased apartment units within the Borough, the PC discussed the perception that increased units would create a burden on the School through an increase in families renting apartments with school age children. Mr. McCandlish and Ms. Danilak stated that the proportion of growth that would be generated through the revisions being discussed related to town center development would likely have minimal impact or burden on the school. Ms. Bice and the PC generally agreed with this position.

Ms. Sines-Pancoe expressed concern that expanded downtown apartment development would generate a parking need that would conflict with the parking needs of the Borough's commercial tenants. Mr. McCandlish conveyed that regulated street parking should mitigate this concern and that lot parking will alleviate the need for additional parking. He further stated that the Borough had the unique opportunity to approach successful downtown development through a minimized approach to parking. He reiterated that this strategy would align with the Borough's desire to create a more walkable and pedestrian friendly community.

Mr. McCandlish suggested that the PC consider recommendations for revised Floor Area Requirement (FAR) bonus incentive. He stated that in alignment with the goals of the comprehensive plan, sustainability focused bonus incentives that prioritized the integration of renewable energy use, pervious paving, greenspace development, responsible stormwater management and implementation of LEED standards should be created.

Ms. Bice suggested that current FAR bonus incentive values be reviewed and possibly revised, making the values slightly less; challenging developers to "work harder" for associated potential floor area increases.

Ms. Bices recommended that the PC more clearly define acceptable uses for downtown, street-facing commercial tenants; encouraging more active and pedestrian engaging uses as opposed to more typical, in-active office or business uses. Ms. Pancoe-Sines inquired about whether ground level offices are truly less desirable. Ms. Bice confirmed that more active uses are integral to successful town center development, citing Lower Marion and Ardmore as municipalities employing a similar strategy.

Mr. McCandlish noted that some office spaces could be consider active. Ms. Danilak agreed and urged the PC to consider a mix of active commercial and office uses.

Ms. Bice committed to updating her suggested zoning revisions base upon PC comments/concerns and agreed to re-present her recommendations to the PC for consideration at a future meeting.

#### **Leedom St./Greenwood Ave.: Public Art Review**

Mr. Locke asked the PC to review a public art proposal for a wall mural to be located at the intersection of Leedom Street and Greenwood Ave. The design consisted of a large painting depicting a set of butterfly wings with which pedestrians could stand in front of and interact with. The applicant (JYA) also submitted precedent imagery of projects with similar subject matter. Mr. Locke ask that the PC to provide general comments to Borough Council as they were set to review the proposal in a coming meeting. The PC agreed that the project would bring value to the Borough and appreciated the fun and interactive qualities of the proposed design. The PC conveyed their general approval and requested that they be able to review the final proposed design.