

**MINUTES  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
JUNE 14, 2022**

**Attendees/Participants:** Dave Shula, Sherri Glantz Patchen, Robert Dambman, Aaron Kostyk, Patrick Doran, Elizabeth Shaw-Fink, Scott Quitel, Charlie Guttenplan, AICP, Director of Planning & Zoning, Krista Heinrich (Township Engineer), Vince Manuele (BOS Liaison), Kailie Melchior (Township Solicitor's office)

**1. CALL TO ORDER:** 7:00 PM by Chair Kostyk

**2. ANNOUNCEMENTS & CORRESPONDENCE:**

- E-mail on everyone's desk related to SLD#01-22 – 931 Spring Mill Avenue Associates, LLC
- There is a modification to the summer schedule. The Planning Commission will be meeting once a month instead of twice a month through August. There will be no June 28<sup>th</sup> meeting and the Planning Commission will only meet on July 26<sup>th</sup> and August 9<sup>th</sup>.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

- Mr. Shula asked about the plan phases listed in the April 12, 2022 minutes for 5/15 E. Germantown Pike. Mr. Guttenplan clarified that the minutes were correct.
- On a motion by Ms. Glantz Patchen, seconded by Mr. Shula, the Planning Commission moved to approve the April 12, 2022 meeting minutes as written. Vote 4-0-3 (Mr. Kostyk, Mr. Dambman and Mr. Doran abstained, not present at that meeting)
- On a motion by Mr. Doran, seconded by Ms. Glantz Patchen, the Planning Commission moved to approve the May 24, 2022 meeting minutes as written. Vote 5-0-2. (Mr. Shula and Mr. Quitel abstained, not present at that meeting)

**4. ZONING HEARING BOARD APPEALS:** None

**5. CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATIONS:**

- Review CU#02-22 Anne Judge, Anne Judge Aesthetics, LLC / 454 Germantown Pike, Lafayette Hill Medical Office – Aesthetics Practice

Attendees: Scott Rothman, Esquire, Legal Representative; Anne Judge, the applicant

Mr. Guttenplan gave a brief background: There are two buildings on this site. The applicant is proposing to lease the rear building on the site. This is being reviewed as a medical office (not personal service) based on the definitions in the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant is a certified registered nurse practitioner.

Mr. Rothman: the applicant has a written lease with the owner of the building, 454 Germantown Associates LLC, conditioned upon receiving Conditional Use approval. The applicant is seeking conditional use approval to allow medical use under Section 116-290.C.(3) of the Zoning Ordinance. There are 5 parking spaces that are specifically designated for the rear building; this use is an out-patient medical office for Aesthetics, including injectables (Botox), laser hair removal, peeling, micro needling, and fractional remodeling; medical offices are allowed by conditional use in the VC-1 District, in which this property is located.

Ms. Judge commented she has been a nurse for 20 years, she is a board-certified nurse practitioner, and has been doing aesthetics for 3 years. She currently has a location in Manayunk, she has a lot of clientele in the area. She feels the business would fit in with the area. There is a dental office, primary care office, nail salon, and Temple/Jefferson.

Planning Commission:

What was the business in the front (it was John P. McCarthy & Co. an Accounting Firm, it's up for rent now); number of employees (1 employee, a licensed esthetician, to do facials); there will be 5 dedicated parking spaces for this specific business, is that all they feel is needed (if both Ms. Judge and the employee are there it would be 2 employees and their 2 clients for a total of 4); is there shared parking (yes, additional shared parking is available if needed – a total of 27 shared spaces); Mr. Guttenplan stated that under the latest parking amendment, 5 spaces are actually what is required. What are the hours and will the Manayunk business continue (right now the hours are 8am-8pm but she plans to cut down to 9am-5pm; and the other office will close); what is the reason for moving to this location (about 80% of her clients are from the Lafayette Hill/Plymouth Meeting area and the other location does not have great parking).

Suzanne Ianniello: a resident of the Township for 15 years, and employee at the subject business was introduced; she feels this is a great place to live and build a business. This is a good location for their clients and has better access.

Motion:

Mr. Doran moved to recommend approval of the Conditional Use application; seconded by Ms. Glantz Patchen. Vote 7-0

At the conclusion it was noted that the Public Hearing in front of the Board of Supervisors will be on Thursday, July 14<sup>th</sup>

## **6. SUBDIVISION &/OR LAND DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS:**

- Review SLD #01-22 931 Spring Mill Avenue Associates, LLC ('Westy' Project) / 927-931 Spring Mill Avenue, Conshohocken; Major Land Development Final Plan Review for 3-story, 20-unit Apartment Building plus 1 Twin Dwelling Unit

Attendees: John Anderson, Cornerstone Consulting; Chuck Borkowski, Applicant

Mr. Guttenplan gave a brief background: The Planning Commission last saw this as a Preliminary Plan at its March 22, 2022 meeting. The applicant is proposing a 3-story, 20-unit apartment building with parking beneath; this proposal also includes one additional dwelling unit at 927 Spring Mill Avenue, one-half of a twin residence. The Preliminary Plan was conditionally approved by the Board of Supervisors on April 14, 2022. The Final Plan is consistent with the Preliminary Plan and design. There were some modifications to address some of the recommendations from the various reviews. As a result of that there were two minor waivers that were not done at the time of the preliminary plan and one that needs to be modified as a result of final plan review.

Ms. Heinrich briefly described what those additional waivers and modified waiver are. The first one is a waiver to allow an aerial photograph to be used in the plan set to show the existing features within 500 feet of the site.; the second one is a waiver to allow a tree zone less than five (5) in width. The area between the legal right-of-way on both Spring Mill Avenue and Lime Street is approximately 9.6 feet. The required width of the sidewalk is five (5) feet in width resulting in a 4.6 feet wide planting area; and the third is a waiver that was granted as part of the Preliminary approval to permit 22 foot-wide, one-way aisles for 90-degree parking. The plan has been modified to maintain the 22-foot-wide turning area within the parking along the south

side of the building, however, the required columns for the building structure will reduce the one-way aisle width to 20 feet at the column locations.

Using a short PowerPoint, Mr. Anderson discussed the highlights of the plan revisions: After Preliminary Plan Approval, they went further in depth with the design of the actual structure of the building. All the parking is now contained under the building; parking around perimeter was eliminated, the only thing exposed is the access aisle which is a one-way movement out. They are providing all the required parking, 32 spaces for the actual building itself, 2 additional parking spaces for the twin structure and 2 EV spaces. As noted in the previous presentation there are 6 spaces that will be stackable spaces, and that gets them to the required 34 parking spaces.

As indicated by Ms. Heinrich they are asking for 3 additional waivers: to allow an aerial photo to be used instead of showing features within 500 feet; to allow a tree zone less than 5 feet, to provide 5-foot-wide sidewalk and approx. 4.6-foot-wide tree zone; and to modify the approved waiver to reduce the one-way aisle width to 20 feet for the required columns for the building structure.

Schematics were displayed of the ground floor level showing the parking layout, the structure and main entrance off of Lime Street with the elevator and stairwell and a second form of egress at the back. The next level up is an arrangement of 1- and 2-bedrooms apartments with a generous community space. Mr. Borkowski stated they are still revising the designs into 1-, 2- & 3-bedroom apartments. He believes there will be 7- 1 bedroom, 5- 3 bedroom, 8- 2 bedroom apartments. Mr. Anderson stated the third level is more detailed on where the community space was, it's just adding some additional locker areas. It is a nice arrangement of apartments; the apartments are generous and large for an apartment building of this size. Elevations of the front, sides and rear of the building were shown.

Planning Commission:

Will there be garage doors to enter and exit (may have a garage door on the Lime Street Side. No garage door on South Side, it will be all open); clarification on the number of stackable spaces (6 spaces will be stackable spaces (accommodating 12 vehicles); will not need to back out of space to allow another to park in the elevated space); it looks like the only way this works is with 5 cars parked, wouldn't work with 6 spaces since it needs to shuffle cars around (there are so many variations, we are still trying to pick a manufacturer that works with the architecture, and so it will be semi-automated); Spot #25, handicap spot, is only 8 feet wide (ADA requires 8-foot-wide space with 8-foot-wide access aisle, that space is designed in accordance with ADA regulations); Mr. Dambman saw in the packet that bike parking was recommended (Mr. Anderson doesn't recall if they actually addressed any additional aesthetics or pedestrian features for the site. He stated that Mr. Guttenplan indicated a possibility would be providing bike racks or spaces. Mr. Anderson acknowledged they could accommodate that or seating around the pedestrian access if the Planning Commission would like that); Rooftop amenities, was that considered (what was discussed was providing Green Roof areas – we are working with our stormwater management design, and structural engineer to work through that. Mr. Borkowski stated they would like to do something; there will be a "feature," they are just going through every means to see what it could be. He can say there will be "an element" of green roof design. We've heard a lot of horror stories, so they are in the process of researching companies to see who can do it); if this is final plan review, are we ready to approve? When will you think you'll have something? Mr. Manuele asked if this will be resolved by the time they get to the Board of Supervisors because the BOS is going to want to know what direction they are going (before they come to the BOS they will have the answers they need); how about the bike racks (bike racks would definitely be provided, interior to the site or along the perimeter); Going back to the roof: the roof is not for recreational or community use. If there is a green roof element, it is just for rainwater (residents would not be accessing the roof. It would be for a better, green, environmentally friendly roof. Looking into it, there is no plan right now for resident access). Mr. Anderson stated that would change the design and may violate the zoning ordinance. If they were to provide rooftop access, they would come back to the Planning Commission. It is for stormwater/green benefit only. Mr. Quitel suggested that they commit to a stormwater based green roof system and then if they are going to make a change they should have to come back. It

sounds like they are committed to maximizing the green roof. Mr. Doran asked the applicant if this is something he wants for his residents, to have access to the roof? (at the moment no, but he does he think it would be a nice enhancement); Mr. Quitel would strongly advise the BOS to not approve something without a plan (for the green roof) that they can comment on. Ms. Glantz Patchen commented she thinks they are OK that there is not tenant access, but if that were to change, would it need to come back (Mr. Guttenplan replied it really depends on how big of a change, they would have to see what the changes are); Mr. Quitel commented it is not a minor tweak, if they make it so like 6 residents could go up there and hang out, it is a major change. Mr. Guttenplan stated he doesn't know that he agrees, the Planning Commission doesn't actually approve architecture; it is provided more for information. If a proposal meets the zoning/dimensional regulations and building size is unchanged, why would it need to come back. Mr. Manuele stated they are trying to forecast the future and develop a solution for something that may not happen. He suggested they take this offline, let the applicant investigate a solution and once they have that solution they can determine and analyze all these issues. Mr. Kostyk stated it sounds like the applicant is open to working to get some kind of proposal in terms of what direction they want to go for the BOS to consider. Mr. Anderson stated they are looking to implement something into the roof design to aid in the stormwater calculations. They indicated earlier in the meeting to Mr. Manuele that they won't come before the BOS without a plan they would present that they could then approve. He thinks that may be the compromise at this point. On another point, Mr. Shula added that he would like the planting strip (tree zone width) maximized to the extent practicable.

Motions:

Mr. Doran made a motion to approve the 3 requested waivers; seconded by Mr. Shula. Vote 7-0

Mr. Doran made a motion to recommended approval of the final plan and recommend the Board of Supervisors approve the plan as presented with the condition that the Board will be presented with a description of the roof usage for a green roof and bike friendly accommodations; seconded by Ms. Glantz Patchen Vote 7-0

**7. OLD BUSINESS:** None

**8. NEW BUSINESS:** None

**9. PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS COMMENTS:**

- Mr. Dambman wanted to clarify there is no 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting in June. The next meeting is July 26 and then August 9<sup>th</sup>. (Confirmed.)

**10. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** None

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

- On a motion made by Ms. Glantz Patchen; seconded by Mr. Shula, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Charles L. Guttenplan, AICP, Director of Planning & Zoning

The Planning Commission is appointed as an advisory group to the Board of Supervisors and the Zoning Hearing Board with respect to comprehensive land use planning, existing land use, and various land use and zoning applications in Whitmarsh Township. No formal decisions are rendered by the Planning Commission. Formal decisions are rendered by the Board of Supervisors or Zoning Hearing Board, as prescribed by law, based on the type of application.

