

**MINUTES  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
JULY 26, 2022**

**Attendees/Participants:** Dave Shula, 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), Dave Sander (Township Solicitor's office). Also in attendance, Will Gleckner, Township Assistant Planner.

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

**2. ANNOUNCEMENTS & CORRESPONDENCE**

- Mr. Guttenplan introduced Will Gleckner. He is an Assistant Planner in the Planning & Zoning Department.
- The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for August 9, 2022; there will be no August 23, 2022 meeting.
- Please speak as close to the microphone as possible so that we can hear the recording for the meeting minutes.
- We are going to start bookmarking key documents in the packets going forward.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

- On a motion by Mr. Dambman, seconded by Mr. Doran, the Planning Commission moved to approve the June 14, 2022 meeting minutes as written. Vote 6-0

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

**5. CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATIONS:**

- Review CU #03-22 Café du Coeur c/o Carey Kelman/ 535 Germantown Pike, Lafayette Hill Restaurant, Tearoom or Café (VC-1 District)

Attendees: Rob Lewis, Esquire, from Kaplin Stewart; Carey Kelman, Applicant; Alexis Bentley, Applicant

Mr. Guttenplan gave a brief background: This is an application for a restaurant/tearoom/cafe at 535 Germantown Pike. This is a space within the Shoppers World Shopping Center, previously occupied by a personal service/retail shop known as 'Salon La Blonde'. The applicant wishes to open a coffee shop/tearoom in this space. Restaurants and similar uses are allowed by conditional use in the VC-1 District, in which this property is located.

Mr. Lewis: His clients are the lessees of approximately 1,300 square feet at 535 Germantown Pike. They are proposing to convert that space to a coffee shop/café. There is no intention to have food prepared on site; it will be strictly a coffee shop with pastries, etc. The property is located in the VC-1 District which requires Conditional Use approval [Section 116-290.B.(10)] for any restaurant, tearoom, café, etc. The criteria for Conditional Use are more general and a number of those criteria do not apply to a restaurant use. Conditional Use requires shared parking/shared driveway; they have that there. They believe their use is complimentary to the other uses. Busy time would be morning while other uses are more afternoon busy. The use is compatible with the character of the neighborhood; there is no harmful or detrimental impact to traffic.; they are not proposing any modifications to the parking lot; and it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Kelman: Their motto is to offer a great cup of coffee at a reasonable price. They want to be community partners. They have plans to create an approximate 35 seat café that will be open 7:00 AM –

4:00 PM every day of the week. They plan to service the early morning rush and during the day service the stay-at-home parents, remote workers, neighbors, etc. When possible, they are committed to supporting local businesses, women owned businesses, and small businesses. They had discussions with schools to participate in fundraisers and they are looking at a way to showcase the artwork of students. Pending Township and Montgomery County Health Department approvals, they hope to be up and running by October 15, 2022.

Mr. Dambman asked if it is permitted to sell coffee beans, mugs, etc., retail items. Mr. Guttenplan replied it is fine as long as it is not a retail store within a coffee shop (minor accessor item sales are OK).

Ms. Bentley: With the logo they designed they were thinking they would have mugs and cups for sale; just accessories pertaining to the business.

Planning Commission: Mr. Doran asked if there will be sidewalk seating (Mr. Guttenplan stated this is a sticky issue particularly in that part of the shopping center that would probably create a pedestrian issue); Mr. Quitel thinks it is a great use for the area, but sometimes the shopping center looks empty, what does the market research say about the turnover (Ms. Kelman stated they focused on this area for years they were just waiting for a spot to open. Their focus is the indoor aesthetics to make it really pleasing and to have that coffee shop vibe. Ms. Bentley stated this would be something that they felt would be great for the community and would bring something the shopping center doesn't have.

Motion:

Mr. Shula made a motion to recommend that the Board of Supervisors grant the Conditional Use; seconded by Mr. Doran. Vote 6-0.

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

- Review SLD #14-21 KRE Acquisitions Corp./401 & 433 Washington Street, Conshohocken; Major Land Development Final Plan Review for 598-unit Apartment Complex (Whitemarsh Township portion only)

Attendees: Ed Murphy, Attorney for the project; Jeff DiRomaldo, Project Architect, with Barton Partners; Tom Bauer, Principal Landscape Architect with Melillo-Bauer-Carmen Landscape Architecture; Noah Chrismer, Entitlement Director with KRE

Mr. Guttenplan gave a brief background: The Planning Commission last saw this as a Preliminary Plan at its March 8, 2022 meeting. The Board of Supervisors granted Conditional Preliminary Land Development Plan Approval on April 14, 2022. The Final Plan is consistent with the Preliminary Plan; in addition to responding to reviews from the preliminary plan, additional details concerning the architectural design of the complex, have been provided. The Planning Commission should consider a recommendation for approval of the Final Land Development Plan to the Board of Supervisors, as well as a recommendation for additional waivers identified in the Township Engineer's review of the final plan.

Mr. Murphy: Gave a timeline of when they appeared in front of the various Boards for recommendations and approvals. They are here for a recommendation of Final Plan approval. They are in receipt of various review letters from staff; everything is a "will comply". They have one new waiver that was not discussed, and they will give an update on the architectural tweaks to the plan that have occurred since the Planning Commission last saw it back in March.

Mr. DiRomaldo: He spoke about four architectural design standard comments. They reviewed, responded and resubmitted revised renderings and the comments were found to be compliant with zoning. It was requested they demonstrate compliance with the Zoning Ordinance in the following areas: roof articulation

and roof equipment screening; allowable façade materials; façade variation; and maximum allowable uninterrupted length of façade which is 100 feet.

- Roof articulation and roof equipment screening: all roof equipment is shielded/screened from view through equipment placement on roof; roofline is varied with 3'+ height pop-ups at building corners; 3'-0" overhanging eaves have been added to the Whitemarsh Township building corners.
- Allowable façade materials: the zoning text neither specifies nor excludes metal panels as a façade material. They believe metal panel is a premium façade cladding solution that will provide an elevated product in-line with approved materials such as wood, precast concrete, and glass. The balance of the façade is corrugated metal and used extensively.
- Façade variation: building corners are articulated through pop-ups, step-backs, and material changes; fenestration sizes vary across the façade to provide visual interest; protruding balconies are provided to further break-up façade articulation; 1'-0" recessed bays are included on each façade.
- Maximum uninterrupted length of facade: placed 1' recess so that there is no more than 85' worth of uninterrupted length. They are using these recesses to break down the mass of the building.

Mr. Dambman: what is the green material shown near the open garages (Mr. DiRomaldo responded: they are looking at it as a climbing ivy, it is going to be natural screening. When floods come through, it may need to be reestablished).

Mr. Bauer: Landscape architect: He spoke primarily about the riverfront park. It is truly a public riverfront park. In the center of the site is a 125-footwide corridor, it is a boulevard drive; and down the center is a 30-foot-wide pedestrian tree lined promenade. They want to invite the public to enjoy the riverfront. There are 2 tree lined allees and an open view to the riverfront. They are promoting public access. As you come to the terminus of the 2 allees, there is an overhead bridge, framing the river view. They will connect to riverfront in Conshohocken. The walkway meanders to the east, hopefully to connect to future trails on adjacent properties. In the center as you go through the gateway there is 1 of 3 seating areas. There are 3 different areas of seating opportunities along the waterfront walkway. They have a pallet of landscaping that is quite extensive. There are over 100 shade trees in this area. The overall site of the park is 2.5 acres of which approximately 1.8 acres are in Whitemarsh Township. Within Whitemarsh they have 100 shade trees in excess of requirements, and over 100 evergreen trees, over 400 shrub materials, and 2 seed mix types. Also, there is a fire lane that will be accessible via turf mowed lawn as well as meadow cover. What they have created is an eco-friendly biodiverse sustainable and resilient landscape. The tree sizes vary in size from 3" to 6.5" caliber trees. It will also be a 4-season landscape so there will be coloring all year. He also mentioned that because it is a remediation site that has to be capped, the only vegetation remaining is that just along the bank of the river. Mr. Bauer reviewed renderings.

Mr. Murphy: the only waiver needed is from section 105-53, all others "are will comply." If you look at the provisions of section 105-53.D. but for the fact that the area is in the floodplain it would qualify for dedication; that is the only disqualifying characteristic of the area. Even if the Township chose not to accept it, their intention is still to restrict it so that the public has access; they are not trying to keep it private. So one way or the other they will still honor the spirit of the ordinance by dedicating it to public use. They know if the Planning Commission would say no, a fee of lieu in dedicating the area might be required; what they have done far exceeds the value or the payment of that fee. And they would think for that reason they would ask for the Planning Commission's consideration to support that waiver when they get to the Board of Supervisors level. The quirk is that it is in the floodplain, but they still intend to make sure that it is fully available for the public to use not just the residents in the community.

Mr. Doran: is the screen for the exposed parking part of the landscaping and how quickly does it take hold (Mr. Bauer responded: it is referred to as green screen; it is a mesh material with vines growing; they had a very successful experience with it; it still allows the airflow that is required to vent the garage. In 3-5 years with Boston Ivy, English Ivy, etc. it should have full coverage).

Mr. Shula: asked for clarification on the waiver request (Mr. Murphy responded: it is only the floodplain. The only reason they are disqualified is because the property is located entirely in the floodplain. Otherwise, they would qualify for dedication and there wouldn't be the need for the waiver of the fee in lieu. Regardless of the outcome, they still plan to dedicate & conserve for public use).

Additional Planning Commission Comments:

Mr. Quitel: with regard to the dedication, he wouldn't call it a conservation zone, he would call it a "pretty zone"; nothing is native. It's pretty, but it's not a wildlife zone. It's part of the high end look of the building, it's not a conservation zone.

Mr. Murphy: that is not the standard. The standard is dedicating it to public use. The question is because it is solely in the floodplain, does that disqualify them from meeting that requirement and thus making them pay a fee for which they already done way more than what the fee would have generated in that location.

Mr. Guttenplan: He thinks there are two different requirements going on. There is a zoning ordinance requirement that the riverfront area has to be either offered for dedication or if not acceptable by the Township to have a public access easement over it. Then there is a separate Subdivision & Land Development Ordinance requirement for 10% open space or fee in lieu of. That is what is the potential waivable requirement. The zoning issue is not waivable. They are still required regardless to offer the area along the river to the Township or allow it to be publicly used.

Mr. Quitel: his issue is that there is no movement to "go up" and move back from the river more. They shouldn't be building in the floodplain, but they are and we can't do anything about that.

Mr. Sander: suggested to Mr. Quitel, that it is his option to not recommend granting the waiver of that provision for the fee in lieu. Mr. Sander also commented that he saw in the Colliers July 21, 2022 letter, a request for a waiver from section 105-52. for the 50-foot buffer (In response, Mr. Murphy stated that was addressed at the preliminary plan). Mr. Guttenplan commented they later discovered that the waiver had been granted in the preliminary plan approval and is no longer needed.

Mr. Doran: clarified waiver: as stated you cannot dedicate 10% because 25% is the most that can be in the floodplain.

Mr. Chrismer: in simplest term, were they not in the floodplain, they think they would meet all the criteria to not have to pay a fee in lieu. Because they are 100% in the floodplain that would force them automatically to have to pay a fee in lieu. What they are asking is for a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to waive that requirement in consideration of what they are doing in the area along the waterfront. The investment is in multiples of what the fee in lieu would be. They are asking for consideration there, because they have no other way by the ordinance to get a credit for what they are doing.

Motions

Mr. Doran made a motion that the commission recommend the obligation to pay a fee in lieu be waived; seconded by Mr. Shula. Vote 5-1

Mr. Shula made a motion to recommend for granting final approval; seconded by Mr. Dambman. Vote 4-2

- 
- Review SLD #09-18 601 Washington Street Associates, LP/601 Washington Street, Conshohocken; Major Land Development Preliminary Plan Review for 270-unit Apartment Complex (continuation from 4.26.22 meeting)

Mr. Shula recused himself.

Attendees: Ed Campbell, Attorney for the project; Michael Gonshor, P.G., LSRP, Environmental Consultant from Roux Environmental; Rick Roseberry, P.E., Project Engineer at Colliers Engineering & Design; Mike Buckley, AIA, Architect at JKRP Architects; Chris Garrity, RLA, LEED AP, Landscape Architect at Glackin Thomas Panzak; Sandy Koza, P.E., PTOE, Traffic Engineer at McMahon Associates, Inc.

Mr. Guttenplan gave a brief background: The Planning Commission last reviewed this proposal at your April 26, 2022 meeting. At the conclusion of the review and extensive discussion, the Commission requested that the applicant come back with additional information, specifically the Emergency Evacuation Plan; more information about site's environmental history and remediation, information about preservation and replacement of trees as such relate to environmental issues; a comparison of traffic impact between the 2019 study and the 2022 calculations; and showing plan modifications made in response to the various reviews they received. The applicant is asking for 6 waivers.

Mr. Campbell: The applicant is proposing a 270-unit apartment complex in two separate buildings; the buildings are elevated above parking; there are access points from Washington Street to the riverfront area on both the west and east side of the property; a clubhouse in the middle which provides recreational amenities; the riverfront areas are designed with landscaping and amenities; there is a dog park, gazebo and trail that goes east to west and the access points from Washington Street down to that point; there is also an access point in the middle that comes from the clubhouse down to the extent the clubhouse is available to the public. To meet the nonresidential use requirement in the ordinance, they are obligated to have at least 2,000 square feet of nonresidential use/space on the site; the clubhouse is a component of that.

Mr. Gonshor: One of the significant things they were asked to return and talk about is environmental history on the site and the prior uses. Historically the site was industrial use as much as the waterfront was. The earliest use identified using Sanborn Maps and aerial photographs, indicate that the Site had already been developed for industrial purposes by 1928. In 1928, Frassoni Iron Works occupied the site. Sometime between 1928 and 1950, the subject property came under control of the Philadelphia Steel and Iron Company. In 1981, Oreland Sheet Metal occupied the site. Today, operations currently conducted on the Site include the following: The storage of rowing sculls; the sale of landscaping materials, such as mulch, stone, gravel, sand and top soil, and fire wood in the eastern portion of the site; employee parking; and a floating dock was also present to allow access to the Schuylkill River for sculling purposes.

Environmental Summary: PADEP approved the ACT 2 Remedial Investigation Report, Pathway Elimination Analysis, Cleanup Plan and Final Report for Soil and Groundwater (Combined Report), and associated Combined Report Addenda, April 6, 2021. Soil investigation results showed no soil remediation was required to meet PADEP's Residential Direct Contact Statewide Health Standards. Groundwater investigation included installation and sampling of shallow and deep wells and analyzing samples collected from those wells for volatile organic compounds (VOCs), polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), and RCRA metals. The only constituents analyzed detected in Site groundwater at concentrations exceeding the Residential Used Aquifer Statewide Health Medium-Specific Concentrations (RUA MSCs) in samples collected from the monitoring wells were benzene, MTBE, PCE, TCE, and vinyl chloride. MTBE was not detected at concentrations above its RUA MSC during any attainment sampling events. The ACT 2 Combined Report documented demonstration of attainment with RUS Statewide Health MSCs for benzene, MTBE and vinyl chloride and attainment of Site-Specific Standards for TCE and PCE in groundwater. Groundwater is not currently being used or planned to be used for potable or irrigation purposes - a groundwater use restriction is included in the Site's Environmental Covenant. LNAPL was identified in a very localized area at MW-4. LNAPL was determined to not be causing an adverse impact to dissolved-phase petroleum constituents in groundwater in MW-4.

Clean Up Plan: they are required to have a Site Health and Safety Plan for Construction. A site-specific health and safety plan will be developed and implemented by all Site contractors. From a soil point of view, the soil characterization results showed that there was no exceedances of the Residential Direct Contact or RUA SGW MSCs for soil. As such, no further action was required for Site soil. From a groundwater point of view, the Environmental Covenant precludes use of groundwater beneath the site for any purpose. From a vapor point of view, PCE, TCE, vinyl chloride and benzene have been detected in groundwater beneath the Site at concentrations exceeding Residential vapor intrusion screening values. Therefore, the Environmental Covenant requires that future buildings on Site developed on or below include the installation of appropriate vapor barriers and/or mitigation in accordance with PADEP's Vapor Intrusion Guidance.

Mr. Buckley: presented a power point showing the elevations of the buildings. The ground floor is in the floodplain; the only 3 acceptable uses are parking, storage and building access. He showed and explained the different floors and uses and the building elevations from different views. There is a requirement of 60% or greater of dominant material; their dominant material is Hardie panel at 63%. The proposed parking screening is a perforated metal screening panel; this will be at all of the openings to the garage; this will allow for ventilation; and it is only about 29% open, so you are not really seeing in. A series of renderings were shown.

Mr. Quitel: asked what Hardie panel is made of and if it is as white as it is shown, how white is it going to be in 5 years after it is built (Mr. Buckley responded, it is a fiber cement panel and like most materials, it will require maintenance; it is a high quality, durable material).

Ms. Koza: presented the comparison of the two traffic studies. The original counts were done pre-covid. The main areas where they are seeing some differences are at Cherry and Elm Streets, in terms of the thru vehicles that are going along that street as well as movements that are made to and from Washington Street. Some of them are mainly caused by developments further to the west of the site. That traffic is no longer going thru like it used to in that entire area, and they saw a reduction. They also saw some reduction in the entering and exiting traffic in the morning and afternoon with the residential neighborhood; and a lot of that may be due to more people working from home. Transit ridership is less prevalent, and they noticed the traffic volumes went down near Station Avenue.

Mr. Roseberry: reviewed the 6 requested waivers.

- A. **§105-30.A – STREET STANDARDS.** This waiver is requested to allow a cartway width of less than 36 feet. The northern proposed curb line cannot be moved further due to existing transmission power lines. We also request a waiver from providing a tree zone along Washington Street. Our intent is to match existing installed improvements along Washington Street.
- B. **§105-39A – TREE PRESERVATION, PROTECTION AND REPLACEMENT.** This waiver is requested to meet this requirement by providing a portion of the required trees as shrubs with a minimum size of 24" height at a ratio of six shrubs for one required 3" caliper shade tree for every (2) parking spaces.
- C. **§105-47.K.2 – SIDEWALKS AND PEDESTRIAN PATHS.** This waiver is requested to allow access points to be more than 500 feet apart.
- D. **§105-48.E – STREET TREES.** This waiver is requested to not provide a tree planting zone between the curb and sidewalk along Washington Street. Our intent is to match the existing frontages along Washington Street.
- E. **§105-52 – BUFFER YARDS** This waiver is requested to allow perimeter buffer yards to be less than 50' in width. Buffer landscaping is provided at the intensity that meets the intent of the buffer yard requirements and address the unique characteristics of the site and intent of the Riverfront

Development District.

- F. **RESOLUTION 2004-8 I.B.4.K.** This waiver is requested to permit grading within five feet of the property lines. The proposed river trail will connect to the adjacent properties. The site will be designed to promote no stormwater impacts to adjacent properties.

Mr. Garrity: commented they have not been to the Shade Tree Commission at this point. He then spoke about the landscaping plan. They will be providing a combination of street trees, ornamental trees, and shrubs. They are providing parking lot trees where they can on the site, but they can't plant over some areas where there are subsurface stormwater structures. They will be asking to allow for code permitted substitutions (shrubs etc.). They adjusted the access points on both sides of the project to allow for 15 feet +/- between the property line to the access trails so they can go in with evergreen trees or ornamental trees and flowering shrubs. Towards the south end by river, they have a meandering 10-foot-wide shale trail. The existing trees south of the trail would remain, and new trees will be planted on the other side. There will be seating and a pergola located at the central access where the walkway is coming out of the clubhouse and a public dog park to the northeast.

Mr. Doran: what is adjacent to the parcel along the river and will the trail go through there (Mr. Guttenplan responded, 801 Washington Street, the Boat Club. The trail won't go through there because they haven't pursued their Land Development).

Mr. Doran: asked if they had discussion with 501 Washington Street people (Mr. Campbell responded, yes in the past, but not now). Mr. Guttenplan commented there is currently a submission for 501 Washington Street as a sketch plan for a combination warehouse/office. If they pursue any land development, they would be required to continue the trail.

Mr. Doran: commented they just saw a different presentation with a different landscaping "style". Do we want to encourage a continuity along the riverfront? Do we want a unifying theme? An additional comment was made by a Planning Commission member indicating that a landscaping scheme was looked at in recent riverfront plans for this area.

Mr. Dambman: is there a design standard for the red shale macadam (Ms. Heinrich responded, there is and for the wayfinding signage. Those would be the only two specified components).

Mr. Doran: what about native species. Is there consistency with that? He encourages natives as a priority; we are better off as a community to encourage natives.

Mr. Dambman: there was a comment in a set of prior meeting minutes about the consistency along Washington Street as well; pavement materials, etc.

Mr. Campbell: they don't object to making Washington Street frontage consistent. Nor does he object to looking at the 401 Washington plans, but there are two different codes there and to make it look like that his concern is that that may need additional waivers or relief.

Mr. Quitel: he is a big believer in diversity, he doesn't think the same species have to be used. Now they are getting developments all look the same and are closer to the river than they should be. We are letting buildings happen that really shouldn't. It is all going to get redone periodically because it's going to flood again, and we all know it. It's not us against the developer, it's us against the river. We're not taking a comprehensive approach. Mr. Quitel asked how far they are from the river on the downstream side (in response 204 feet at the closest).

Mr. Roseberry: spoke briefly about the walkway along the river. This could also be considered a park although it's more linear just because of the general shape that they have. On either end you have these

connections of the access points where you have gathering spaces or nodes and seating every 200 +/- feet along that trail. On the north side of the trail, they are building a native (Ernst) seed mix, or more of a natural feeling and the trees provide shade & sunny area variations.

Mr. Quitel: asked if you take what the height restrictions are and not have to give up any units, would you have considered going higher (Mr. Campbell responded, it's not feasible as you add stories; there is a financial impact as the building height increases). Mr. Quitel commented, in the long run someone bears the cost each time you have to get a cleanup when you get an Ida, does that factor into it? (In response, yes).

Mr. Kostyk: asked if they think they will need a similar waiver (§105-53.D.) for a fee in lieu or open space dedication like the previous project (Mr. Campbell responded, for the very same reason as 401/433 Washington to the extent that his client would offer the riverfront park area for dedication; it qualifies in all respects but for the fact it is in the floodplain).

Mr. Quitel: asked what the hardship is for not providing the buffer width (Mr. Campbell responded, in order to design the plan to work efficiently, 50 feet does not work; we think we meet the intent. Mr. Roseberry commented that there is an approximate 20' area on the west and 15' area on the east, each with a 10' sidewalk).

Mr. Doran: asked if they were to get preliminary approval, could they expect to see renderings of the trail at final approval (yes, they would welcome that condition).

Motion

Mr. Dambman made a motion to recommend granting the 7 waivers requested; seconded by Ms. Shaw-Fink. Vote 3-2

Mr. Kostyk made a request to take a look at surrounding area plans to make sure there is some consistency or compatibility. Mr. Campbell responded, if they were to make the next motion and vote to recommend with those waivers, they would welcome as a condition that when final plans are submitted, they will provide renderings and other exhibits to illustrate.

Mr. Quitel made a motion to not recommend preliminary plan approval; no 2<sup>nd</sup>. Motion failed.

Ms. Shaw Fink made a motion to recommend preliminary plan approval; seconded by Mr. Dambman. Vote 4-1

**7. OLD BUSINESS:** None

**8. NEW BUSINESS:**

- Mr. Doran commented in reviewing the materials for the meeting he noticed two extraordinary Traffic Impact Studies and a brief analysis that they are presented with that he does not know how to interpret. There has to be a better way for this Commission to be educated on what the traffic study means. He feels like there should be someone (Township Engineer's Office) to help them navigate that and give a summary. He feels they need to have a little more knowledge or expertise to interrogate or question these conclusions. Ms. Heinrich gave a brief explanation on how traffic study trips are calculated.
- There was a brief discussion concerning the contents of the packet and difficulty locating pertinent documents. Mr. Guttenplan commented we will look at some options and discuss them with Mr. Manuele to see if we can make the packets more usable but still inclusive, that everything is available but it is not the trivial stuff that is taking up most of the packet.

- Mr. Quitel asked to revisit the Riverfront. He commented they are giving the same approvals as they were twenty years ago and not applying the new Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Guttenplan thinks a lot of what Mr. Quitel is saying is in the Comprehensive Plan. What has not yet been done is to amend some of the regulations to be consistent with the policies in the Comprehensive Plan.
- Mr. Dambman commented that David's Bridal and Hines Rowing Center are the only two properties without proposals along the river and that there should be coordination with design standards for street furniture and other features.

**9. PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS COMMENTS:** No other comments.

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

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

- On a motion made by Mr. Doran; seconded by Ms. Shaw-Fink, the meeting was adjourned at 9:40 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 Whitemarsh 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.

