

**COLLEGEVILLE BOROUGH  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
MAY 20, 2021 VIA ZOOM**

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Thomas Gamble.

Roll Call: Chair, Thomas Gamble, Dean Miller, Alex Tweedie, Richard Wallace, Charles Faulkner

Absent: Shannon Spencer, Josh Macel

Others Present: Engineer, David Leh, Solicitor Dan Grieser, Planner Mike Lowrey and Manager Tamara Twardowski

Approval of Minutes: MOTION by A. Tweedie with some grammatical corrects to approve the minutes of April 15, 2021 meeting, second by C. Faulkner. Motion approved

NEW BUSINESS:

**Central Perkiomen Valley Regional Planning Commission** – Valerie Beckius gave an overview of items discussed at the meeting.

**Collegeville Car Wash** – Glen Kelczewski

The applicant has revised the sketch plan based on comments received by the Planning Commission in March, and have removed the building addition and adding some improvements to the vacuum areas. The zoning ordinance does not allow a non-conforming use onto an adjacent lot; the applicant will either apply for a variance or combine the properties into one parcel. The applicant intends to apply for a variance for impervious coverage, and not maintaining the 35' stream corridor setback. The applicant understand that they would not be able to do any improvements to the property without variances due to the flood plain.

Comments from the Planning Commission:

- T. Gamble stated that there needs to be some stormwater remediation/filtration especially if the impervious surface will be increased.
- This is an improvement over the previous plan.
- The standard for a variance is the most de-minimus relief needed. A. Tweedie thinks that circulation could be improved and the vacuum stations could added and still reduce some of the impervious that the applicant is showing.
- The plan does not allow for any street trees, A. Tweedie noted that if the width of right turn lane is reduced, the sidewalk could be pushed forward into the right of way and allow for some green space and street trees. He feels the applicant should work with PennDot to see if that can be done.
- Are the current vacuums being removed, if so, can that impervious be removed and more green space added?

- C. Faulkner, D. Miller, and R. Wallace all echoes A. Tweedie's comments.
- T. Gamble recommended trying to shift the improvements to allow for the greatest buffer for the stream corridor as possible.
- A. Tweedie offered a potential representation of how the impervious surface could potentially be reduced.

**360 Eight Ave** – Chris Yohn, PE and Dan Kelly were present

C. Yohn gave an overview of the proposed two-lot subdivision. The 2<sup>nd</sup> lot would be a flag lot and relief was granted by the Zoning Hearing Board to allow the flag lot. The developer has not done stormwater plans as that would be done by the future owner of the lot based on the improvements they would want to build. The applicant has done preliminary testing for BMP sites.

Comments from Planning Commission

- A. Tweedie asked if the driveway met the required setback, as it seems close. The Borough does not have a required setback. D. Kelly replied that the placement of the driveway was set with input from the adjacent property owner to retain as much existing vegetation as possible.

Motion to recommend approval of the minor subdivision for the creation of one additional lot for at 360 Eight Ave subject to compliance with the May 11<sup>th</sup> engineer review letter and May 19<sup>th</sup> MCPC review letter and recommend approval of partial waivers 600-53 B 3 a. and 600-53 B 5 outlining landscaping requirements, seconded by Charles Faulkner. Motion approved.

### **Historic Properties Ordinance**

D. Greiser offered explained that this ordinance is actually a three-part ordinance; it creates the commission, sets the zoning requirements, and sets for SALDO requirements. A. Tweedie recommended that it may be best if Borough Council creates the Commission and that way the Commission could also have input on the Zoning and SALDO changes. The question for the Planning Commission boils down to – does the Planning Commission want to make the rules for someone else to enforce, or should the enforcing body, the Historical Commission have input on the rules/vision.

MOTION by A. Tweedie to approve the part of the Ordinance that creates the create the Historical Commission as a standalone, outside of Zoning,, amend it by the MCPC's review, and recommend that the new Historical Commission review the amended ordinance, seconded by R. Wallace. Motion approved.

### **Sign Ordinance**

Questions from the Commission

- What are snipe signs – snipe sign generally are signs on telephone poles, fences, at corner's etc. that are advertising signs and have nothing to do with the property they are on.
- Do we have to allow off premise (billboard) signs? Yes, it must be allowed for in a zoning district.
- Are we addressing political signs? Any signs in the right of way or Borough Property can be removed. Signs on private property are considered personal expression and political signs are very tough to address. Unless something is a traffic hazard or has profanity, unfortunate, they are allowed. It is also difficult to address the size of political signs.
- Is the Borough exempt from this ordinance? Yes, the Borough is exempt from all zoning ordinances should it chose to exempt itself.
- A. Tweedie has some technical comments he is going to send directly to the solicitor.
- A. Tweedie asked if there is a better way to calculate size of the sign rather than just drawing a rectangular box around the sign.
- What is the normal size of the temporary signs, they are limited to 3 square feet. Normally they are 18"x24".
- There was discussion on the non-conformity regulations and architectural concerns.

**The meeting adjourned at 8:33 p.m.**