EAST NORRITON TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 17, 2015

A meeting of the East Norriton Township Planning Commission was held at the East Norriton Township Building, 2501 Stanbridge Street in East Norriton, Pennsylvania on Wednesday, June, 17, 2015. The meeting was called to order at 7:01pm. Attending were Planning Commission members Robert Schottmiller, John Kolb, Kevin McDevitt, George Kennedy, and Kandy Heckman. Zoning Officer, Bryan Bortnichak was also in attendance.

1. Approve Minutes of the March 18, 2015 Planning Commission Meeting:

Chairman Schottmiller requested a correction to the meeting minutes and made a motion to approve the amended minutes of the Planning Commission's March 18, 2015 meeting. Ms. Heckman seconded the motion and the motion passed 5-0.

2. Weis Conceptual Gasoline Sales Plan, 25 West Germantown Pike:

Present: *Craig Lewis, Applicant's Attorney*
Jack O'Hara, Weis Markets Vice President of Real Estate
Mark Curcio, Stoltz Management
Bill Swanick, Applicant's Engineer
Timothy Snyder, Weis Markets Senior Manager of Architecture

Mr. Curcio made reference to his prior appearance before the Planning Commission and noted that he brought with him Tim Snyder from Weis Markets who may be better able to answer some of the Planning Commission members' questions in regard to the operational concerns raised during his initial appearance. Mr. Curcio reiterated Stoltz Management's desire to keep Weis as an anchor tenant in the shopping center and explained that providing fuel pumps in conjunction with Weis rewards program is integral to achieving a long term lease with Weis.

Mr. Lewis discussed competition that Weis has from other supermarkets and noted that they plan to implement gasoline sales as part of their customer loyalty program. Mr. Lewis acknowledged that the use is permitted by special exception of the Zoning Hearing Board and that the construction of a gasoline island would result in the loss of some parking spaces that would require a variance from the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Swanick reviewed the conceptual site plan noting that one gas island canopy is proposed that would provide six gasoline pumps with a kiosk for a pump attendant. Mr. Swanick also reviewed a truck turning template plan and discussed various entrances and exits by which fuel delivery trucks could enter and exit the site. Mr. Swanick noted the location of the proposed underground fuel tanks and the proposed offloading zone and indicated that the plan would not result in any increase in impervious coverage on the site. Mr. Swanick acknowledged that there are storm water management facilities in the area where the gasoline pumps and tanks are

proposed and that further engineering will be necessary to ensure that those facilities are not affected by the proposed work.

Mr. Schottmiller expressed a concern about the loss of 20 or more parking spaces noting that the former Staples tenant space is currently vacant. Mr. Schottmiller asked about the impact on parking if the former staples tenant space is again rented. Mr. Curcio noted that Stoltz Management has a lease for a specialized sporting goods user to take that space. Mr. Lewis acknowledged the loss of parking spaces and Mr. Swanick noted that there would be a loss of approximately 30 parking spaces.

Mr. Schottmiller pointed out the proposed U-turn movement for gasoline delivery trucks on the truck turning template. Mr. Swanick explained that gasoline deliveries would be done during off hours and that there would be approximately three to four deliveries per week.

Mr. Schottmiller noted that he has taken photos of the spaces in the vicinity of the proposed gasoline pumps being used. Mr. Curcio noted that mostly Weis employees park there and that they could be instructed to park elsewhere on the property to free up spaces for customers. Mr. McDevitt opined that it is challenging to get employees to park where they are directed to park.

Mr. Snyder explained that Weis has employee parking procedures in place and noted that Weis would be willing to stripe portions of the parking lot to identify employee parking.

Mr. McDevitt made reference to the existing right turn entrance closest to Germantown Pike into the lower parking lot area where the gasoline pumps are proposed and expressed concern about the difficulty with vehicle exiting that driveway today. Mr. McDevitt indicated that the situation would be made even more difficult if more vehicles are using that entrance/exit to access the fuel pumps. Mr. Curcio explained that the entrance would be moved slightly further away from Germantown Pike as a result of the proposed construction.

In response to concerns expressed by Ms. Heckman for the route that fuel delivery vehicles would have to take to enter and exit the site, Mr. Lewis noted that they have looked at points of entrance and exit for fuel delivery trucks to the entire site and that they engineer would be able to provide truck turning templates for each of those entrance and exit points and routes through the site.

Mr. Kennedy noted that the loss of parking spaces and increased traffic to the site were main concerns when Mr. Curcio initially appeared before the Planning Commission and that they are still valid concerns today. Mr. Kolb opined that the loss of 39 parking spaces plus and additional eight parking spaces for fuel deliveries is significant. He expressed a desire to see the parking calculations for the entire site before he would have any level of comfort with recommending that the Zoning Hearing Board grant any parking variance.

Mr. Lewis noted that they will take a more detailed look at parking on the site and return to the Planning Commission with further information.

Mr. Kolb expressed a concern about tanks leaking in proximity to the storm water management facilities. Mr. Swanick noted that the tanks would be double walled and that Weis maintains a contract with North Ridge Group for responding to environmental emergencies in addition to spill materials that are housed in the kiosk.

In response to an inquiry from Mr. Kolb about additional vehicle trips being generated by the gasoline pump installation Mr. Snyder noted that the construction would likely not generate more trips as most of the patrons who use the gasoline pumps are existing Weis customers.

3. <u>St. Titus Subdivision, 3000 Keenwood Road:</u>

Present: *Father Len, St. Titus Church*
Gene Brazil, Applicant's Attorney
John Reilley, Applicant's Attorney

Mr. Brazil reviewed the subdivision application noting that there are proposed easements on the plan for access, parking and utilities including a sanitary sewer lateral. Mr. Brazil noted that a small addition is proposed on the former convent that is already nonconforming in regard to the front yard setback.

Mr. Reilley explained that the total site consists of approximately 14 acres and that the subdivision would result in two parcels, designated as Parcel A and Parcel B, with Parcel A having an area of approximately 10.4 acres and Parcel B 2.9 acres. The current St. Titus Church and former school along with the former convent would be on Parcel A while Parcel B would contain the current rectory and church administrative offices. Mr. Reilley noted that the church would renovate the former convent as living quarters for Father Len and that the church offices would be relocated to the school. Mr. Reilley reviewed the points of ingress and egress for vehicles entering the properties and noted that the number of parking spaces provided exceeds that required by the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Schottmiller inquired about where the proposed property line was drawn between Parcel A and Parcel B and asked why some parking spaces were not included on Parcel B. Mr. Brazil explained that doing so would have given rise to a zoning issue related to a required parking setback from a property line. Mr. Brazil noted that the purchaser of the property will be seeking a special exception related to shared parking.

Mr. Kolb asked about how comments made in the Township's Sewer Engineer's letter would be addressed. Mr. Reilley stated that he feels that some of the comments are premature. Mr. Bortnichak noted that East Norriton Township requires a video inspection of the sanitary sewer laterals upon resale and that the comments would have to be addressed at that time so it is appropriate for the comments to appear in the Sewer Engineer's letter. Mr. Reilley noted that all comments from the Township's Engineer, Remington Vernick & Beach have been satisfactorily addressed.

Mr. Schottmiller asked if all of the zoning issues raised by Mr. Bortnichak had been addressed. Mr. Reilley noted that they have been with the exception of a request for zoning relief to permit shared parking between the two proposed Parcels.

Mr. Kolb asked if employees or visitors of Parcel B would have access through Parcel A to Scenic Road. Mr. Reilley explained that there is no proposed access easement, but that the issue would have to be worked out among the property owners.

Mr. Richard Shirk of 419 Norriton Drive expressed concerns about additional traffic and about Laurel House being located on Parcel B in addition to safety of children. He noted that the former St. Titus school generated traffic only in the mornings and afternoons but not throughout the day.

Mr. Keith Glodek of 2919 Scenic Road questioned additional sewer flows from the property. Mr. Reilley noted that five proposed apartments would generate much less sanitary flow than the rectory and convent and school did when they were in operation. Mr. Glodek also expressed concern about traffic on Scenic Road. Father Len offered to keep the access gate to Scenic Road locked at all times except during Sunday Mass.

Ms. Eileen Hess of 3007 Keenwood Road expressed concern about how much more traffic would be generated.

Mr. Schottmiller explained that the matter before the Planning Commission is the subdivision of the property and that issues related to the use of the property by Laurel House would be discussed later in the meeting.

Mr. Schottmiller called for a motion. Mr. Kolb made a motion to recommend approval of the subdivision application to the Board of Supervisors pending compliance with all comments in the Township Consultant review letters. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kennedy and the motion passed 5-0.

4. <u>ZHB Case #2015-5 – 407 West Germantown Pike:</u>

Present: Rosemary Fatnassi, Applicant

Ms. Fatnassi expressed her desire to operate a hair salon at 407 West Germantown Pike. She noted that she would work about 35 hours per week and that she would be open four days per week.

A discussion ensued regarding the granting of a similar variance for the property at 409 W. Germantown Pike for a hair salon. Ms. Fatnassi acknowledged that she is aware of the other salon but that she has a following of clients and that she is not concerned about competition. She advised that she would have two chairs and no more than four cars there at any time – two cars for her and one employee and two cars for two clients.

Mr. Schottmiller acknowledged that there is sufficient parking on the property as it was formerly occupied by Dr. Morano.

Mr. Schottmiller called for a motion. A motion was made by Mr. McDevitt to recommend approval of the variance request to the Zoning Hearing Board. Ms. Heckman seconded the motion and the motion passed 5-0.

5. ZHB Case #2015-6, 10 Tanglewood Court:

Present: *Kaitlin Micelli, Applicant's Attorney*
Carol Oliver, Devereux, Vice-President of Operations
Laurie McLaughlin, Devereux General Counsel

Ms. Micelli noted that Devereux is seeking special exception to operate a group home at 10 Tanglewood Court. The home has four bedrooms and would be occupied by four women between the ages of 30 and 50. Ms. Micelli noted that the women work during the day and noted that Devereux will meet all of the conditions pursuant to the criteria set forth in the zoning ordinance for a special exception to have a group home in the AR – Residential zoning district.

Ms. Oliver explained that Devereux operates 42 group homes in 13 states and that they serve a population that ranges in ages from children through adults. She reiterated that this home would be for four women who need help with activities such as food preparation and money management. Ms. Oliver noted that there would be 24-hour supervision of the clients when they are in the home. She added that their goal is to promote as much independent living as is possible.

Mr. Schottmiller inquired about transportation services that would be provided. Ms. Oliver explained that either a car or minivan would be provided. In response to a question from Mr. Schottmiller about 24 hour staff on the property, Ms. Oliver noted that staff would be present in the home any time one or more of the clients are present. She added that if a client stays home sick from work, a staff member would remain at the home with the client. Ms. Micelli reiterated that Devereux intends to comply fully with the special exception requirements that are specified in the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Kolb asked if any full time maintenance staff would be on site. Ms. Oliver explained that while maintenance staff would not be on site, they do have maintenance staff who are available to respond around the clock, seven days per week. Ms. Oliver acknowledged that the above ground swimming pool that is installed on the property today would be removed.

In response to a question from Mr. Kolb, Ms. Oliver noted that two staff members would be present during the evening hours when the clients are home and awake, and that one staff member would be present during overnight hours while the clients are sleeping. Ms. Oliver added that staff are required to perform checks on the clients every 15 minutes during overnight hours and that they are not permitted to sleep while they are working.

Ms. Micelli noted that all staff members undergo FBI background checks and other criminal background checks.

Ms. Heckman asked if Devereux operates any other group homes in the Township. Ms. Oliver noted that they do not operate any in East Norriton Township. Ms. Heckman asked if the PA Department of Public Welfare has ever issued any citations to Devereux. Ms. Oliver noted that Devereux agencies have noted minor violations such as giving medication late or failing to sign and date paperwork, but that they have not been cited for any significant violations by such agencies.

Mr. McDevitt asked about the ability to move cars around in the driveway in the event of an emergency. Ms. Oliver noted that vehicles could be moved as necessary but that it would be no different than any other family home.

Marialice Land of 3110 Lena Lane expressed concerns about her 13 year old child and the effect that the group home will have on the residential community.

Beth Labella of 16 Tanglewood Court noted that she bought a single family dwelling in a residential neighborhood and that she is concerned about traffic flow, property values and the safety of her children.

Iva Ferrell of 2924 Tanglewood Lane noted that they have lived here for 24 years and that they have a second grade child at home. They are concerned about the addition of a group home into a neighborhood of families. Ms. Farrell also expressed concern about the aesthetics of the neighborhood, additional traffic and insufficient parking. Ms. Micelli noted that the driveway is already sized to accommodate five parking spaces and that the house has a two-car garage. Ms. Farrell advised that there is very little traffic on their street and this will add to it and detract from the neighborhood. Ms. Oliver noted that there would be visitors to the residents of the group home as there might be for any other home on the street.

Hank Leipert of 2918 Tanglewood Lane state that the neighborhood is very quiet and that there are no busses or public transportation near this home. Mr. Leipert stated that this is not the kind of neighborhood that you put that type of facility. Mr. Leipert noted that he pays taxes to live in a neighborhood of single family dwellings and that the group home doesn't belong there.

Darleen Smith of 14 Tanglewood Court noted that she has an in-ground pool and that she is concerned about safety and property values. Ms. Smith stated that the group home would diminish property values.

Tom Cunnane of 2929 Tanglewood Lane noted that his property abuts the proposed group home and that zoning and land use should not be changed but for a compelling reason. Mr. Cunnane added that this house was expanded 10 to 15 years ago and that there is no need to grant any additional relief. Mr. Cunnane stated that he is totally against the group home.

Mr. Jim Glodek of 12 Tanglewood Lane asked about public notification requirements for changing the zoning of the property. Mr. Kolb noted that this is not a rezoning hearing. Mr.

Schottmiller explained that the Planning Commission's role in this matter is to make a recommendation to the Township's Zoning Hearing Board who will render a decision on Devereux's request. Mr. Glodek stated that he is concerned about dropping property values.

Mr. Ken Christovich of 2937 Tanglewood Lane questioned the driveway that extends beyond the north facing wall of the structure and discussed the driveway and driveway entrance at the street and his concern about too many vehicles being parked on the property. In response to a question from Mr. Kolb, Mr. Bortnichak noted that while the Zoning Ordinance requires a certain number of off street parking spaces, there is no requirement for vehicular circulation as there is no requirement for vehicular circulation for other single family dwellings. In response to a question from Mr. Christovich about the turnover rate of clients, Ms. Oliver noted that this would be a permanent home for four women who would reside there until they are deceased. She noted that it will not be a transitional home and that they do not anticipate making any adaptations for ADA. Mr. Christovich asked if any of the four women suffer from depression. Ms. Micelli noted that they will not be discussing such matters. Mr. Christovich questioned where supervisory staff would be in the home. Ms. Oliver noted that it would depend on the staff members' duties. Mr. Christovich concluded noting that he is concerned with the change to a community of 42 homes that are owner-occupied and the effect on the market value of the properties. Mr. Christovich added that this is an inappropriate use for the neighborhood and asked Devereux to find another place to go.

Mr. Keith Glodek of 2914 Scenic Road asked if there is a lights out time or can the clients be up all night. Ms. Oliver explained that bed time is typically 9:00pm or 10:00pm.

Ms. Ann Marie Topieniak of 3108 Lena Lane stated that she is not happy about a group home, that she pays taxes and that people who don't take their medications are dangerous.

Mr. Robert King of 14 Tanglewood Court asked if the applicant would want this near their home. Ms. Oliver noted that she lives near a group home and it is not disruptive or poorly kept and that it does not detract from her neighborhood.

Mr. Bryce Budd of 2927 Tanglewood Lane stated that he does not want a group home near his house he is concerned with upkeep and safety. Mr. Budd noted that this is an invasion of the neighborhood.

Ms. Oliver offered to meet with the neighbors.

Mr. Jim Glodek of 12 Tanglewood Court noted that everyone is against the group home.

Mr. Schottmiller called for a motion. A motion was made by Mr. Kennedy to recommend that the Zoning Hearing Board deny the special exception request. Mr. McDevitt seconded the motion. Ms. Micelli asked for justification for the motion that was made and seconded. Mr. Schottmiller stated that he believes that the Planning Commission is here to speak for the greater community. Mr. McDevitt expressed concern with existing group homes, parking, ambulances and general issues with other group homes. Mr. Kennedy spoke to the ground swell of opposition by the residents and the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Kennedy also expressed

concern for diminishing property values and the safety of the neighborhood. Mr. Schottmiller called for a vote and the motion passed 5-0.

6. ZHB Case #2015-7 – 3000 Keenwood Road:

Present: *Amee Farrell, Applicant's Attorney*
Beth Sturman, Executive Director, Laurel House
Jenny Boyer, Senior Director of Housing, Laurel House

Ms. Farrell reviewed the proposed St. Titus subdivision again and explained that Laurel House intends to use the building on Parcel B and expand the building or build a separate building on Parcel B from which they will operate their administrative offices and a domestic abuse shelter which will be relocated from Norristown. Mr. Farrell explained that Laure House is seeking a use variance to operate a domestic abuse shelter and a special exception to permit shared parking. She noted than an easement over 28 parking spaces on Parcel A would be used by Laurel House and that a long-term solution involves Laurel House further developing Parcel B and locating their own parking lot on that property. Ms. Farrell also noted that they are seeking a dimensional variance to construct a small sunroom addition on the future rectory. Ms. Farrell outlined a two-step process if the relief sought is approved noting that either the shelter or the administrative offices would move first from Norristown. The determining factor will be a feasibility study that has not yet been performed.

Ms. Sturman explained that Laurel House serves people who are at risk for domestic violence and offers services that benefit the community. Ms. Sturman stated that Laurel House has about 20 full-time employees with no more than 12 employees on site at any one time and that their shelter in Norristown can house a maximum of 27 people in nine rooms. Ms. Sturman advised that the shelter proposed at this site would have 12 rooms and be capable of housing a maximum of 36 people. Ms. Sturman indicated that they never double up families and that she anticipates 26 or 27 people to be in the shelter at most times including adults and children. Ms. Sturman added that most of the children who accompany adults in the shelter are of a very young age and that Laurel House prefers to find teens alternate housing. In regard to the length of stay, Ms. Sturman noted that most participants stay for 30 to 45 days and that Laurel House attempts to find alternative housing within 45 days. Ms. Sturman explained that two staff members are always present overnight, that there is a 9:00pm curfew and that there is a strict policy prohibiting visitors for which no exceptions are made. Ms. Sturman noted that the living arrangement provides for a communal kitchen and that no food is permitted in the rooms. Ms. Sturman stressed that Laurel House wants to remain as inconspicuous as possible and that the only signage would be a small sign over the doorbell.

Ms. Farrell discussed the ingress and egress to and from the site via Keenwood Road noting that very few of the people residing in the shelter would have vehicles with them. Ms. Farrell referred to other permitted uses in the Institutional zoning district such as hospitals, schools and clinics and made reference to the less intensive use of the site that would result if Laurel House were to occupy the property.

In response to a question from Mr. Kolb about relocating just the administrative offices, Ms. Sturman explained that it is Laurel House's goal to locate both their offices and the shelter at one site.

Mr. Schottmiller referred to a presentation made by Laurel House to the Planning Commission last year when they considered purchasing the St. Paul's Church site at East Johnson Highway and New Hope Street and explained that he thought the St. Paul's property was better for Laurel House due to the availability of public transportation. Mr. Schottmiller noted his familiarity with the rectory on the St. Titus property and asked how Laurel House will fit 12 rooms in addition to administrative offices into the building.

Ms. Farrell stated that the architect would ultimately determine the number of rooms in the shelter and that they would comply with the requirements of the building code.

Ms. Schottmiller asked if the residents work during the day. Ms. Sturman explained that the residents will continue to work if it is safe for them to do so, but that many come with young children and it is often difficult for them to sustain employment.

In response to a question from Mr. Kennedy, Ms. Sturman explained that Laurel House served 192 people last year in their shelter including children. She noted that their capacity is 27 and that the shelter is typically full at 20 or 21 clients.

Mr. Kennedy noted that the proposed location is remote from any public transportation. Ms. Sturman stated that Laurel House has anticipated the need for a small vehicle to transport clients to appointments.

Ms. Farrell stated that the property is already zoned Institutional and that many institutional uses that are allowed would have a much greater impact on traffic. She stated that most women in the shelter are not making many vehicle trips, but that they are busy getting back on their feet and tending to legal matters.

Mr. Kolb stated that the presence of 20 clients and 20-plus employees will create more traffic than the school did when it was open. Mr. Schottmiller stated that he would like to see the gate to Scenic Road closed except for Sunday Mass.

Ms. Marilyn VanBuren of 3013 Keenwood Road asked if an abuser could find out if a victim of domestic violence is staying at the shelter. Ms. Sturman noted that in 10 years Laurel House has had a problem with one abuser and explained that Laurel House networks with other shelters throughout the state to move local women away to other locations.

Mr. Ken Christovich of 2939 Tanglewood Lane asked if the children of clients residing in the shelter would be considered homeless and if the Norristown Area School District would be impacted by the children's presence. Ms. Boyer explained that most of the children are not of school age and most of those who are of school age attend school at their origin district.

Mr. Keith Glodek of 2919 Scenic Road asked about clients being moved into the shelter overnight due to emergency circumstances. Ms. Boyer noted that it is unusual to have a client come to the shelter during overnight hours. In response to a question from Mr. Glodek about the presence of children with special needs, Ms. Boyer noted that most of the children are very young and that the prevalence of special needs children would be no different than that of the general population. Ms. Sturman noted that they intend to fence the property. Ms. Boyer added that children are not permitted to be outside without their mother being present. Mr. Glodek stated that he would rather see townhouses constructed on the property.

Mr. Richard Shirk of 419 Norriton Drive noted what he perceives to be a piecemeal approach to selling the property and noted that the church has failed its parishioners. Mr. Shirk stated that the proposed use of the property belongs in a state park but not in his neighborhood and expressed concern for falling property values.

Mr. Pius Nark of 2935 Keenwood Road asked Father Len to rezone the property and noted that he would rather have a group home than Laurel House. Mr. Nark added that Laurel House is a good organization, but that he does not want it in his neighborhood.

Mr. Richard Hess of 3007 Keenwood Road stated that this would make it harder for him to sell his house and asked if the residents are allowed out during the day. Ms. Boyer responded that not only do the residents typically not want to be outside for safety reasons, but that they are busy trying to figure out how not to be homeless. Mr. Hess noted that with the use of social media, it is easy for people to find out where Laurel House will be located. Mr. Hess added that Laurel House should build elsewhere.

Mr. Jim Glodek of 2919 Scenic Road noted that he has been there for 50 years and that he was affected by the scenic park office site when it was developed. Mr. Glodek noted that the neighborhood will again be affected and that he is concerned about the loss of property values.

Mr. Pius Nark of 2935 Keenwood Road asked if the Township could purchase the property. Mr. Schottmiller explained that that would have to be done by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Howard Kinsey of 2926 Scenic Road advised that Scenic Road would be the access path for anyone who walks to get a bus on Germantown Pike and stated that he does not want Laurel House there.

Mr. Larry O'Reilly of 3009 Keenwood Road stated that he has the same concerns that the other residents have expressed and that he does not want Laurel House at this property.

Mr. Schottmiller discussed residential uses that could be proposed for the property and the impact, including traffic that residential uses could have on the immediate neighborhood.

Mr. Schottmiller made a motion to recommend that the Zoning Hearing Board not grant the requested relief. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kennedy and the motion passed 5-0.

7. ZHB Case #2015-8 – 502 West Germantown Pike:

Present: *Michael Valenza, Applicant*
Carl Weiner, Applicant's Attorney

Mr. Weiner explained that the site consists of a two-story office building that was approved and constructed for office use. Mr. Weiner noted that a new parking ordinance was enacted that had an adverse impact on the building due to a higher parking ratio for medical office users.

Mr. Weiner stated that the parking requirements today call for 45 parking spaces instead of the 38 spaces that are provided and added that the proposed doctor's practice that would occupy the second floor would have maximum need for parking during the evening hours and Saturdays.

Mr. Bortnichak expressed concern about how the applicant determined that 45 parking spaces would be required noting that the record plan for the property that was submitted with the zoning application would call for additional parking spaces in excess of 45 based on the current parking ratios for the intended uses. Mr. Valenza noted that he used figures from an as-built plan and discounted the areas of the stairwells and elevator shaft.

Mr. Valenza agreed to meet with Mr. Bortnichak to reconcile the perceived difference in floor area.

Mr. Schottmiller called for a motion to recommend that the Zoning Hearing Board approve of the requested parking variance. The motion was seconded by Ms. Heckman and passed 5-0.

8. Adjournment:

Ms. Heckman made a motion to adjourn. The motion was second by Mr. Kolb and passed 5-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Schottmiller

Chairman Robert Schottmiller
East Norriton Township Planning Commission

Bryan Bortnichak
Zoning Officer