



JENKINTOWN BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION

Tuesday, August 21st, 2020

6:30pm-8:30pm

700 Summit Avenue, Jenkintown Pennsylvania

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Attendance

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

Members Absent: Alison Danilak, Joe Hentz

Others Present: George Locke – Borough Manager, Marley Bice – Montgomery County Planner, Deborra Sines-Pancoe – Borough Council President

Reports

Planning Commission meeting minutes from August were approved.

Ongoing Business

Zoning Ordinance Language Revisions: Fences

Mr. Locke stated that no further action was required of the Planning Commission (PC) and that their recommendation is ready to move forward to Borough Council (BC).

SALDO Review Update

Ms. Bice summarized work that she and Ms. Danilak had worked on together to revise SALDO Purpose Statement language. She reiterated that they had reviewed sample language from adjacent or pertinent municipalities as well as Montco model language and had generated an outline of potential language revisions for the Borough. Below is a summary of the PC review of each item in the draft outline:

- Item A - Mr. McCandlish agreed with recommended language revisions, specifically to expand upon the word “ensuring” to include the language “coordinated development”.
- Item “C” – Recommended language not necessary as Comprehensive plan itself guides future amendments; PC agrees that current language is acceptable.
- Item “D” – Mr. McCandlish expressed that new language should prioritize the pedestrian and the pedestrian experience, as well as connectivity to existing fabric. He conveyed the importance of this passage in establishing a tone for addressing development borders with the community and conveying the specific goals of the Borough. He specifically recommended move pedestrian related language to the front of the statement, ahead of

- vehicular references. Ms. Bartley reiterated that tone of item “D” should prioritize both bikes and pedestrians
- Item “E” – Ms. Bartley conveyed her preference of the term “stormwater management” over “stormwater drainage” as it related to this passage.
 - Item “F” – The PC discussed whether this passage could be omitted and initially agrees that this could be. After further discussion, Ms. Bartley and Mr. Leman inquire whether it may be needed in cases of future large development. Mr. McCandlish pointed out that the subject may or may not be further addressed in subsequent SALDO body revisions, and that any front-end language revisions may want to be held until future revisions are better understood. The PC agreed to leave the passage untouched until its applicability is better understood.
 - Item “G” – Ms. Bice confirmed that she is reviewing this item further to see if it’s actually necessary. She reiterated its intent to address a need for consistency across municipal services and public services. MrMcCandlish agreed that he wasn’t sure what having this language accomplishes, although stated that having it seems like a betterment.
 - Item “H” – The PC agreed that this would be another item that wouldn’t hurt to keep in Purpose Statement, although it only may apply to a minimal portion of the Borough. Ms. Bice confirmed that in addition to language within the Purpose Statement, the Borough does have specific floodplain restrictions in our zoning code, per FEMA. Mr. McCandlish recommended that the language be bolstered to include the general “prevention of harm” in addition to the prevention of “endangerment of life or property”. Ms. Bartley stated that the language be modified to further prevent the aggravation of negative stormwater effects created by a development itself. The PC further discussed how to include language that requires sustainable and responsible management of stormwater to prevent harmful flooding.
 - Item “K” – Mr. McCandlish recommended that the language be expanded to include carbon, construction waste, water and other sustainability goals from the Comp plan and to be reiterated in body revisions to the SALDO.
 - Item “M” – The PC discussed the addition of language reiterating the benefits of health and wellness pertaining to preservation of open spaces. Ms. Bartley recommended considering language that would include sidewalks and other areas designated for parking for use as open spaces or places for recreation.
 - Item “N” – Ms. Bice reiterated that the language is not meant just to preserve but actually better the natural conditions of a development.
 - Item “O” – The PC agreed that this section did not seem to be appropriate considering goals of the Borough. Members further discussed the relationship of this section to proposed language for section “b” and agreed that this would be more appropriate and in keeping goals of the community.
 - Item “b” – Mr. McCandlish recommended the use of the language “complement and enhance” in lieu of “respect/conform” within this section. He also stated the importance of this section in conveying the Borough’s historic and pedestrian priorities and reiterating they’re precedence within new developments.
 - Item “P” – Mr. McCandlish suggested a more specific and explicit term or phrase in lieu of the term buffer. Ms. Bice clarified that buffer is defined later in the SALDO, and that the PC would have further opportunity to clarify this intent in later sections.

The PC agreed that preliminary edits would be made to the draft Purpose Statement and circulated as revised draft for further review by Ms. Danilak, Ms. Bice and by the PC in the next meeting. Ms. Bice agreed to continue researching outstanding items discussed during the meeting, and compile/draft

discussed revisions for the next meeting. She also suggested the framework for these meetings continue to be to review the existing language and proposed revisions with finalization items in the following meeting.

Ms. Bice reviewed her schedule of SALDO Phase I review/discussion items for the coming months throughout the rest of the year and next. The PC discussed the specific schedule for reviewing and recommending SALDO revisions, in the context of Ms. Bice's schedule and necessary BC review and approval periods. The PC agreed to begin review of the next sections in October with September set aside to complete Purpose Statement revisions.

Northern Gateway and TOD Project Coordination

Ms. Bice summarized work completed by her team since the last PC meeting, stating that PC comments had been addressed and that they are recommending a two-pronged approach to addressing the Northern Gateway and TOD projects.

- Initial effort would be to refine the design for a localized gateway project of limited scope and area ahead of broader TOD study.
- A subsequent effort would include developing a more broad site masterplan and TOD overlay, looking at existing conditions and community fabric and engage multiple interested parties - septa, Abington, etc, to evaluate TOD potential for site.

Ms. Bice reviewed overall goals for both efforts, including a draft timeline. She surmised that a draft TOD plan could be ready for review in March with a final plan by May. Mr. McCandlish inquired whether a draft could be reviewable by other entities/partners by April, suggesting that the PC should finalize internal review/revisions by then. The PC also discussed including BC members at certain points for input prior to finalization of any plan in April. (Possibly September/March to include BC members)

Ms. Bartley asked for clarify as to the goals for the projects and the two-pronged approach. Ms. Bice reiterated that the TOD would be used to identify opportunities for the gateway site and as an opportunity to apply Jenkintown goals, promote connectivity, create points of increased density at transit zones and preserve/enhance the fabric of the greater site.

Ms. Bice reiterated that Abington is interested in coordinating with the Borough on TOD plans for the site and area in general. Ms. Bartley pointed out that physical connections the businesses in Abington could be strengthened through this effort. PC discusses and agrees.

Ms. Bice reviewed localized gateway design concepts with the PC and suggested working through interim designs for the northern gateway project.

The PC discussed expanding the sidewalk and including a bench and/or covered bus shelter. Ms. Bice stated that these modifications may be outside of the limited scope of the project.

Ms. Bartley agreed with the continuation of globe light aesthetic. Mr. McCandlish further suggested the inclusion of more globe lights, or additional lighting at the corner. Ms. Bice stated that this may not be possible to associated costs and also in an effort to match the southern gateway's single globe light.

Mr. McCandlish stated his preference of the larger "super-graphic" gateway sign, although recommended limiting the content to the name of the town only. He also suggested that the sign be lit and mentioned

the 30th St Station sign as an example. He agreed that banners could be included but would be secondary to the larger sign, creating a desirable hierarchy.

Ms. Bartley inquired if something like this could be installed or if there would still be a concern with right-of-way restrictions. Ms. Bice agreed that the placement of the project would need to be considered in respect to the right-of-way, although she thought that the right-of-way restrictions would not apply. The PC further discussed right-of-way restrictions in respect to lighting elements as well.

Ms. Bartley inquired if the localized gateway project wouldn't want to be more temporary, considering the future plans for the site related to possible TOD. She suggested saving some of the more impactful and costly elements for a future phase when the site is more fully developed. Mr. McCandlish recommended that the localized project be designed with TOD plans in mind and suggested not holding off on a larger, more impactful design. The PC subsequently discussed this element as a possible catalyst for future development.

The PC discussed the goals and vision for this project and recognized that these things may need to be further clarified. The PC recommended to Ms. Bice that the localized gateway design be considered alongside of and more integrated with greater TOD opportunities.