

---

---

**WHITEMARSH TOWNSHIP**

---

---

**TO:** PLANNING COMMISSION  
**FROM:** Charles L. Guttenplan, AICP, Director of Planning and Zoning  
**SUBJECT:** MATERIAL FOR APRIL 14, 2026 MEETING



**DATE:** APRIL 9, 2026

**CC:** Vincent Manuele, BOS Liaison  
          Krista Heinrich, PE, Township Engineer  
          Tim Konetchy, MCPC Planner Liaison  
          Craig T. McAnally., Township Manager  
          Dave Sander, Esq., Township Solicitor

---

In addition to the minutes from the March 10, 2026 meeting, we have two agenda items for the April 14<sup>th</sup> meeting.

The first agenda item is a discussion by Tim Konetchy, AICP. He will continue our previous discussion concerning shared access arrangements, primarily focusing on the Village Commercial District. In your packet, there is a memo from him discussing how to strengthen shared access requirements in this district; attached to that memo is a copy of the VC District with proposed text changes to implement his recommendations for discussion.

The second agenda item is an informational presentation by the Hankin Group for a proposed development concept, the 'Village at Fort Washington'. This would be a mixed use project along Bethlehem Pike, adjacent to the SEPTA rail station. There are a few plans in your packet to show the location and concept; additional detail will be provided at the meeting. No action is requested of the Commission; it is on the agenda for the Commission to learn about the proposal and provide feedback on the concept.

If you have any questions prior to the Planning Commission meeting, please feel free to get in touch with me by e-mail ([cguttenplan@whitemarshtwp.org](mailto:cguttenplan@whitemarshtwp.org)). If any member is unable to attend the meeting, please send an e-mail to Aaron Kostyk ([aekostyk@gmail.com](mailto:aekostyk@gmail.com)) and copy me. I look forward to seeing you all at the meeting.

Enclosures

**WHITEMARSH TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING (IN-PERSON)  
AGENDA  
APRIL 14, 2026  
6:30 PM**

BUSHONG \_\_\_ GLANTZ PATCHEN \_\_\_ KOSTYK \_\_\_ QUITEL \_\_\_ SHAW-FINK \_\_\_ SHULA \_\_\_ NORBECK \_\_\_  
MANUELE (BOS) \_\_\_ GUTTENPLAN (Staff) \_\_\_ HEINRICH (Engineer) \_\_\_ SANDER (Solicitor) \_\_\_

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

**2. ANNOUNCEMENTS & CORRESPONDENCE**

- All speakers are requested to speak directly into the microphones.
- 2025 Montgomery Awards – Call for Entries
- Take the Community-Wide Survey to help shape the future of Recreation, Parks, Open Space, Greenways and Trails in Whitemarsh Township
- Comprehensive Recreation Plan Visioning Meeting on April 16, 2026 at 6:30 PM in the Township Building

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- March 10, 2026

**4. ZONING HEARING BOARD APPEALS (None)**

**5. CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATIONS**

**6. SUBDIVISION &/OR LAND DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS (None)**

**7. OLD BUSINESS**

- Continued Discussion of the Off-Street Parking & VC Shared Access Requirements—Tim Konetchy, AICP from MCPC

**8. NEW BUSINESS**

- Informational presentation by the Hankin Group; 'Village at Fort Washington'; Proposed Mixed-Use project along Bethlehem Pike, adjacent to the SEPTA rail station

**9. PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER COMMENTS**

**10. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

TENTATIVE AGENDA NEXT MEETING; May 12, 2026

SLD# 07-25 Quaker Park Redevelopment; Sketch Plan for Mixed-Use Development; 1001 E Hector Street

---

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION INFORMATION

1. Public meetings of the Commission shall follow a prescribed agenda, which will be available to the general public no later than the Friday preceding the meeting.
  2. If members of the public wish the Commission to address a specific item at a public meeting, a written request to the Staff Liaison shall be submitted at least one week before the meeting. The written request shall specify the item or items the individual desires to be addressed.
  3. The Commission may consider other matters for the agenda as they see fit.
  4. The Commission will entertain Public Comment at the conclusion of the discussion of the item and prior to specific action on the item during the meeting, at the discretion of the Chair. Individuals must advise the Chair of their desire to offer such comment.
  5. A Public Comment period will be provided at the conclusion of a meeting for input on any new subject.
  6. The Commission Chair shall preside over Public Comments and may within their discretion:
    - a. Recognize individuals wishing to offer comment.
    - b. Require identification of such persons.
    - c. Allocate total available Public Comment time among all individuals wishing to comment.
    - d. Allocate up to a five (5) minute maximum for each individual to offer Public Comment at a meeting, Township Staff shall time comments and shall announce, "one minute remaining" and "time expired" to the Chair.
    - e. Rule out of order scandalous, impertinent and redundant comment or any comment the discernible purpose of which is to disrupt or prevent the conduct of the business of the meeting including the questioning of, or polling of, or debating with, individual members of the Commission.
-



**MONTGOMERY  
COUNTY, PA**  
PLANNING COMMISSION

# MONTGOMERY AWARDS

EXCELLENCE IN PLANNING AND DESIGN

## Call For Entries

### 2026 Montgomery Awards

We invite you to submit a nomination for a 2026 Montgomery Award! The Montgomery Awards Program is a prestigious annual program that promotes outstanding design, innovative planning, environmental stewardship, and leadership and advocacy in Montgomery County. Since 1967, we have presented 251 awards that acknowledge the exceptional vision and commitment of communities, organizations, and professionals. All of our winners have enhanced our communities and contributed significantly to our great county.

We welcome you to become part of this distinguished legacy by submitting a nomination for a 2026 Montgomery Award. We are looking for the best in planning, design, environmental stewardship, and advocacy in Montgomery County. Nominate a land development project for a Montgomery Award or a person or organization with significant contributions to advancing planning in Montgomery County for a Charles J. Tornetta Planning Advocate Award, which is given in honor of Charlie Tornetta, who inspired planning excellence and served Montgomery County for over half of his life as a leader and member of the Montgomery County Planning Commission Board.

We are again partnering with the Montgomery County Conservation District to offer an Environmental Stewardship Award as part of the Montgomery Awards Program. Nominate a project, completed in the past three years, that exemplifies the practices of environmental stewardship and conservation for water and soil quality.

All entries may be submitted online or by mail. The deadline for nominations is the end of day on **May 29, 2026**.

<https://www.montgomerycountypa.gov/1498/Project-Eligibility-Award-Criteria>

# WHITEMARSH TOWNSHIP



*Help shape the Future of Recreation, Parks, Open Space, Greenways and Trails in Whitemarsh Township*

*We need your voice!*

Your input matters and will help shape the **Comprehensive Recreation, Parks, Open Space, Greenways, and Trails Plan**. We want to hear from you!

## Take the Community-Wide Survey

Open from March 26, 2026 to May 1, 2026



Scan the QR Code or  
complete the survey online at:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/J56WLN5>



The survey takes approximately 10 minutes to complete



For more information: contact Whitemarsh Township  
616 Germantown Pike, Lafayette Hill, PA 19444

<https://www.whitemarshtwp.org/643/Comprehensive-Recreation-Parks-Open-Spac>

*This project is funded in part by a grant from the PA Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR)*

# Comprehensive Recreation, Parks, Open Space, Greenways and Trails Plan (CRPOSGTP)

## 2026 TIMELINE - MEETINGS

**Note: This timeline is fluid and will continue to be updated with both information from meetings/events that took place and post upcoming meetings/events.**

- **COMPLETED: Project Steering Committee “Kick-Off” Meeting** – held Tuesday, January 20<sup>th</sup> at the Koontz Park Building, Exercise Room "A". This was a Project Steering Committee working session and not a public meeting.
  - [1-20-26 Steering Committee Kickoff Meeting Agenda](#)
  - [1-20-26 Steering Committee Meeting Minutes](#)
  - [Plan Purpose, Goals and Objectives](#)
  - [CRPOSGT Work Schedule - Timeline](#)
  
- **CRPOSGTP Community-Wide Survey** – Thursday, March 26<sup>th</sup> to Friday, May 1<sup>st</sup> – All residents are strongly encouraged to complete the Community-Wide Survey which will be promoted and advertised with link to survey through Township outlets including the Website, Whitemarsh Weekly, Whitemarsh Living, Parks and Recreation E-Blasts, and the Corner LED Sign at Germantown Pike and Joshua Road. The survey will also be available in paper format at the Whitemarsh Township Parks and Recreation Department (2391 Harts Lane, Lafayette Hill, PA 19444) and the Whitemarsh Township Administration Building – Zoning Department (616 Germantown Pike, Lafayette Hill, PA, 19444).  
At the conclusion of the survey, the data will be compiled and analyzed and utilized in the development of the final Plan document. Implementation of the community survey in this manner will enable solicitation of opinions from a statistically significant portion of the Township population, and from community members who may not be able to attend in-person public outreach events. All data retrieved from the Survey will be attached as an appendix to the final Plan document.
  
- **Project Steering Committee Meeting** - Tuesday, April 14<sup>th</sup> at 7:00pm via Zoom. This is a Project Steering Committee working session and NOT a public meeting.
  
- **Public Visioning Meeting** – Will be held on Thursday, April 16<sup>th</sup> from 6:30pm to 8:00pm at the Whitemarsh Township Administration Building – Large Meeting Room (616 Germantown Pike, Lafayette Hill, PA, 19444).  
All public are welcome and encouraged to attend. The [Public Visioning Meeting](#) will be utilizing the nominative group technique for the purposes of soliciting public input and gathering community consensus regarding the Comprehensive Recreation, Parks, Open Space Plan, Greenways, and Trails Plan. This process involves dividing attendees into several groups, with each individual in each group having the opportunity to provide their response to several strategically posed questions. All responses are documented, and then group members are able to ‘vote’ for the responses they feel most closely align with their opinions relating to the plan in process. During this exercise, we often find community consensus forming around themes, which can then be incorporated into the Plan’s goals and objectives. All individual responses and voting results will be incorporated into an appendix in the final narrative Plan.

**WHITEMARSH TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING (IN-PERSON)  
MEETING MINUTES  
March 10, 2026  
6:30 PM**

**Attendees/Participants:** Carmen Bushong, Scott Quitel, Elizabeth Shaw-Fink, Donald Norbeck, Dave Shula (Vice Chair), Krista Heinrich (Township Engineer), Charlie Guttenplan (Director of Planning and Zoning), Dave Sanders (Solicitor's Office), Vince Manuele (BOS Liaison), Samantha Zrillo (Township Planner), Timothy Konetchy (MCPC)

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER** Vice Chair Shula called the meeting to order at 6:32 PM.

**2. ANNOUNCEMENTS & CORRESPONDENCE**

- Mr. Guttenplan reminded everyone to speak directly into the microphone.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- February 10, 2026

On the bottom of page 2, Mr. Shula stated that he did not second the motion because he was chairing the meeting. Mr. Norbeck seconded the motion.

Mr. Norbeck made a motion to approve the minutes as corrected, Ms. Bushong seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

**4. ZONING HEARING BOARD APPEALS** (None)

**5. CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATIONS**

- CU #02-26 Lafayette Hill Shopping Center, LLC; 428 Germantown Pike; Conditional Use for a Smoothie & Bowl Restaurant

Ms. Colleen McGrath, attorney for the applicant, explained that the proposed business would be located in a well-known strip shopping center at the corner of Joshua Road and Germantown Pike. According to tax property records, the property is used as a strip mall with a variety of tenants, including several restaurants, a poke bowl shop, and a Wawa nearby. The property owner also controls the corner parcel that provides ingress and egress through a driveway onto Edmonds Road. Ms. McGrath noted that a lease has been secured between Lafayette Hill LLC and the property owner for the Boostin' Bowls location. The specific unit is a corner space adjacent to a pet grooming business and an insurance office. Ms. McGrath indicated that the business would likely see most of its activity during afternoon and evening hours, which should complement the primarily daytime operations of neighboring tenants and help balance parking demand. The site includes parking in front of the unit, additional parking in the rear, and some on-street parking. Ms. McGrath also noted that the end unit has previously been used as a Born to Run and, most recently, as a nail salon.

She described the proposed interior layout, explaining that the space has been cleared following the removal of the former nail salon fixtures. The proposed floor plan includes limited seating, primarily intended as a small waiting area, along with designated ordering and pickup windows. She noted that the business is intended to function primarily as a grab-and-go operation rather than a traditional sit-down restaurant. A 3D rendering of the interior was also presented to illustrate the layout. Because the use is expected to involve brief customer visits rather than extended dining, she stated that only a small number of patrons would be present at any given time and that parking demand is not expected to increase significantly. She also presented the proposed menu and indicated that the use would be consistent with the existing mix of businesses within the shopping center and is not anticipated to have any adverse impact.

Ms. McGrath noted that the previous nail salon would have required employees to work directly with customers for extended periods of time whereas the proposed business would instead operate with one or two employees. It would serve a steady flow of customers picking up orders.

A Commission member asked Ms. McGrath if they had any plans to utilize the outdoor seating. Ms. McGrath replied that they probably won't be using outdoor seating. A Commission member asked if they plan to rehab the entire store front, Ms. McGrath replied that she wasn't sure and wasn't aware of any other uses. She commented that she'd relay it to them.

Another Commission member asked about the street parking and if it would extend to the back or not. Ms. McGrath noted that although she wasn't sure about parking, she knows there's a preference for street parking because it's quick for people to get up and go. Mr. Guttenplan mentioned that the end of the parking lot (where the Conditional Use will reside) is a lot less busy than the other end, and that they couldn't technically count the on street as parking. A Commission member noted that the parking in the back of the building could be used and taken advantage of with new business arriving. Mr. Guttenplan replied that the lease requires employees to park in the back.

Scott Quitell made a motion to recommend the approval for the conditional use. Mr. Norbeck seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

## **6. SUBDIVISION &/OR LAND DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS (none)**

### **7. OLD BUSINESS**

- Continued Discussion of the Conservation Design Overlay District, Off-Street Parking & VC Shared Access Requirements—Tim Konetchy, AICP from MCPC

Mr. Konetchy explains that he will begin by reviewing current conditions and updates in the CDO District, then shift focus to off-street parking and begin a broader discussion on shared access and shared parking. He notes that encouraging shared parking is a goal for the Township, particularly for shopping centers and key commercial corridors, similar to a previously discussed application. He then summarized the high-level goals and vision identified in the previous meeting regarding the CDO. A primary focus is connectivity—specifically pedestrian connections, ecological and habitat linkages, and connections between open spaces. The intent is to avoid isolated developments, such as subdivisions with their own parks but no sidewalks or access to other nearby open spaces, despite the Township having a significant amount of preserved and protected land. Ensuring these linkages is important.

Mr. Konetchy emphasized that open space should be high-quality, functional, usable, and environmentally valuable. Rather than simply providing lawn areas for passive recreation, the goal is to preserve and incorporate natural features such as forests, steep slopes, and riparian areas. These spaces should still be usable, though their design may vary by site—for example, incorporating trails instead of traditional active recreation areas like playgrounds.

He also highlighted the importance of recognizing development interests and market realities, acknowledging that housing development is driven by economic factors. Regulations should therefore remain reasonable and not overly restrictive. Along those lines, standards should be clear, objective, and easy to administer so that all users interpret them consistently, avoiding ambiguity seen in some existing regulations, including those related to parking.

Lastly, he noted that the framework should be scalable, functioning effectively across a wide range of development sizes—from a few homes on small acreage to much larger developments. This

may involve creating different subcategories or “mini districts,” though that can be addressed later. He then asked if there are any additional high-level goals or considerations the group would like to keep in mind moving forward.

A Commission member asked whether there is an existing series of maps or a formal trail plan for the Township, specifically a walking or biking network plan. They note that certain roads, such as Germantown Pike and Ridge Pike, are not pedestrian-friendly, making it difficult and unsafe—for example, for students trying to walk to the high school. The Commission member also suggested that, in addition to mapping ecological and habitat areas, the Township should also have maps showing existing and proposed trails. They pointed out that these two elements are connected, as trails often pass through or alongside smaller habitat areas, enhancing both accessibility and environmental awareness. They also emphasized that overall walkability and bike ability throughout the Township remain challenging, describing navigation for pedestrians and cyclists as currently inconvenient and not user-friendly.

Mr. Konetchy responded that there is a significant amount of mapping information from sources such as the DVRPC and Montgomery County, both of which provide maps showing existing and proposed trails. However, he noted that a trail map was not included in the materials prepared for this meeting and added that it is something he can put together moving forward.

A Commission member commented that from a planning perspective, it is important to align these ideas with existing and proposed conditions to understand how everything fits together, since connectivity is the ultimate goal. They emphasized that while ecological considerations are important—and they often advocate for plants and wildlife—it is equally important to ensure that people can safely access these areas.

Ms. Heinrich mentioned the Township is currently in the process of developing a combined Open Space, Recreation, Trails, and Greenways Plan. They added that this effort is being supported by a grant and has only recently begun.

Mr. Konetchy agreed with the Commission member, adding that the DVRPC also provides a “bicycle level of traffic stress” map. He explained that this type of map evaluates how comfortable or stressful roadways are for cyclists—for example, roads with high speed limits or no shoulders are considered high-stress, while quieter side streets are lower-stress and more suitable for biking. He noted that roads like Germantown Pike would likely be classified as high-stress, while smaller streets such as Edmonds would be lower-stress. He concluded that this type of analysis is important and should be considered moving forward.

A Commission member commented that the proposal is a strong and clear statement of intent but suggested incorporating measurable outcomes. They recommend identifying specific metrics—such as increases in open space, improvements in connectivity, or the percentage of previously disconnected trails that become linked—to demonstrate the tangible impact of the legislative changes. They emphasized that having quantifiable results would help show how these modifications produce real benefits for the community.

Mr. Konetchy agreed that measurable outcomes should be clearly defined and incorporated as requirements, suggesting that this type of analysis and inventory could be prominently displayed—such as on a cover page—to demonstrate impact. He thanked the commission member and that he is noting the feedback. He then shifted to revisiting the site capacity calculations for CDO. He explained that under the current ordinance, certain environmental features are excluded from gross acreage when calculating allowable dwelling units. These include all floodways, half of floodplains,

most wetlands, most slopes over 25%, and a portion of slopes up to 25%. He noted that this approach is already consistent with the Township's recent steep slope regulations. Under the OSCO draft, however, a more stringent approach is proposed, requiring 100% of those features—plus riparian areas—to be preserved as common open space, along with half of all woodland areas.

Mr. Konetchy explained that he mapped these features for analysis and distributed limited printed copies. He described the first map, which shows parcels across applicable zoning districts (A through AAAA), with hatched areas representing open space. These open space areas come from a recent County GIS project that consolidated data from multiple sources, including the County Open Space Planner and Parks and Recreation, to create a comprehensive and authoritative dataset. He noted that these areas are believed to be preserved or protected, likely through easements, and therefore unlikely to be developed in the future. He observed that a significant portion of the district is already covered by such open space, reducing developable land.

He then described another map layer showing environmental constraints: floodplains (in purple), floodplain soils (in lighter pink, also part of the floodplain conservation overlay), riparian corridors (shown in green), and surface waters (in blue). He noted that some features overlap—for example, surface waters and riparian corridors may fall within floodplain or floodway areas.

He then discussed a map showing tree canopy coverage based on data from the USGS National Land Cover Database. He cautioned that while it reflects canopy extent, it does not indicate the quality of the woodland—it could represent anything from invasive or low-quality vegetation to high-quality, mature forest.

A Commission member asked Mr. Konetchy what data source he used to map the steep slopes. They specifically asked where the slopes were derived from LiDAR contour data, possibly processed using mapping software (referred to as PASDA).

Mr. Konetchy replied that the mapping was completed by a member of the County's GIS staff. He explained that they used LiDAR data to generate the slopes, which would provide the highest level of accuracy available. He added that a staff member had to create new data based on two-foot contour intervals, consistent with how the Township defines and evaluates steep slopes.

Mr. Konetchy noted that he did not personally have access to the GIS permissions, so the slope analysis was likely completed as a spatial analysis by staff. He encouraged the Commission to review and reflect on the maps provided as the process moves forward. He added that with improved weather, he and colleagues plan to visit existing developments in the field to evaluate what has worked well and what has not, comparing real-world conditions to site plans. This will help inform a critique of recent projects before moving into draft preparation.

He explained that the next step will be testing different site capacity calculation methods, including comparing the current approach with the OSCO draft and a county model that incorporates additional constraints such as high water tables and shallow bedrock. The goal is to determine which method is most effective, then use that as a foundation for refining design details. Mr. Konetchy noted that mock site plan testing will come later, with involvement from landscape architects and urban designers from the Montgomery County Planning Commission.

He then shifted to off-street parking. He explained that in 2021, the Township significantly amended its off-street parking and loading regulations, generally reducing required parking for many land uses. After several years of implementation, some areas for improvement have been identified, such as missing use categories and the need for clearer language.

Focusing on Section 116-184, which outlines parking requirements (typically described as spaces per square foot), Mr. Konetchy explained that new clarifying language has been added to better define how gross floor area should be calculated. Rather than using the entire building footprint, the revision accounts for spaces like storage areas, hallways, and bathrooms that do not directly generate parking demand. This clarification is important because roughly half of the parking requirements are based on floor area, making consistency and accuracy essential.

Mr. Guttenplan explained that the proposal is rooted in policy. While the ordinance currently requires parking to be calculated based on total gross floor area, that approach includes spaces that do not realistically generate parking demand. To avoid excessive parking and unnecessary impervious coverage, the proposal allows certain non-convertible areas—such as mechanical rooms, restrooms, and stair towers—to be excluded from calculations. He noted that spaces like storage rooms or hallways could potentially be converted into usable areas in the future, but truly fixed spaces are unlikely to change without major reconstruction, so excluding them is practical. He added that this reflects what is already being done in practice, even though it is not clearly stated in the ordinance, and the goal is to formally codify it.

Mr. Guttenplan also addressed a second issue: reinstating a provision that allows the zoning officer to determine the most appropriate parking requirement when specific land use is not listed. He explained that this provision existed in a previous version of the ordinance but was inadvertently removed during the most recent update. Since new or unlisted uses will always arise, he emphasized the need to restore this flexibility, and noted that the proposal includes adding that language back in.

Mr. Konetchy explained that most zoning ordinances include a provision allowing flexibility for unlisted use because situations like this come up frequently, and parking requirements are too important to leave undefined. He then introduced several proposed amendments to specific parking requirements. First, he noted that veterinary offices and hospitals are not currently listed in the ordinance. The proposal would group them with similar uses, such as animal boarding and dog daycare, and slightly reduce the parking requirement from one space per 200 square feet to one space per 300 square feet. He explained that this adjustment was informed by data from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Parking Generation Manual, which suggests a rate of about 2.8 spaces per 1,000 square feet at peak demand. He added that, considering the revised method for calculating gross floor area—excluding non-convertible spaces—a slightly higher requirement in practice may still align with ITE standards.

Mr. Konetchy also discussed auto dealerships, which are currently not listed in the parking requirements section. To address this, staff reviewed a recent local example and “reverse-engineered” an appropriate parking ratio based on that real-world case, using it to inform the proposed requirement.

A Commission member asked for clarification on the proposed parking requirement for auto dealerships, specifically whether the calculation applies only to customer and visitor parking, or if it also includes the inventory of vehicles being displayed or stored on-site.

Mr. Konetchy explained that the proposed parking requirement for auto dealerships is broken down by different functional areas. It includes one space per 250 square feet of display floor area (for indoor vehicle display and customer interaction), one space per 250 square feet of office space, and one space per 500 square feet of storage and maintenance areas, which accounts for service

operations. He also added a requirement of one parking space per vehicle for sale on the lot, ensuring that outdoor inventory is accounted for.

In response to a question about employee parking, Mr. Konetchy noted that it is not specifically listed as a separate category but is assumed to be included within the office and floor area calculations. He added that this could be revisited if the Commission feels a more explicit standard is necessary.

Another Commission member asked whether real-world examples within the Township will be used to validate these requirements, emphasizing the importance of ensuring that the proposed numbers are reasonable and do not place an undue burden on applicants. Mr. Konetchy responded that he can review a recent dealership application to see if there is data on anticipated employees and determine whether the proposed parking ratios align or create any issues.

Mr. Konetchy then moved on to proposed changes for industrial uses. Currently, all types—light industry, heavy industry, warehousing, and storage—are grouped together. The proposal would split these into two categories: (1) manufacturing, processing, and production, and (2) warehousing, storage, and distribution. He explained that, based on trip generation data, manufacturing typically requires about twice as much parking as warehousing because it involves more employees actively working on-site, whereas modern warehouses often rely heavily on automation and fewer workers. However, warehouses generate significant truck traffic, so the proposal introduces a new requirement for truck parking—set at approximately one-half truck space per 1,000 square feet—separate from loading docks, to accommodate queued vehicles.

Next, he discussed monasteries and convents, proposing to reduce the parking requirement from one space per two residents to one per four residents. He noted that while this is a niche use not specifically covered in standard data, comparable group living uses suggest that one space per four residents is more appropriate.

Mr. Konetchy then addressed parks, recreation facilities, and community centers. The proposed update adds a standard for outdoor-only or outdoor-focused facilities, which were not previously addressed. The new approach would require one parking space per four patrons based on occupancy, particularly for use without buildings or defined gross floor area, such as outdoor ranges or similar facilities.

A Commission member raised concern about the proposed parking standard for parks and recreation facilities, noting that some existing parks do not currently have many parking spaces despite hosting events. They caution against creating requirements that exceed what these parks can realistically accommodate. They suggested using smaller parks, like Koontz Park, as real-world examples to ensure the standards are reasonable and aligned with actual conditions.

Mr. Konetchy asked which parks would serve as good benchmarks, and the member reiterated Koontz Park as a useful example due to its size and mixed-use nature. He then moved on to additional parking amendments. He introduced personal service shops as a newly defined use, proposing parking requirements based on the number of employees and service chairs, with a fallback of one space per 300 square feet when those metrics do not apply. He noted this is consistent with similar uses like microbreweries. For schools, Mr. Konetchy explained that the proposal reorganizes the existing parking requirements into a single, more user-friendly section without changing the actual standards. He then outlined several minor technical updates, including adding citations to clarify references within the ordinance, allowing flexibility in the required 10-foot parking setback from structures if approved by the Fire Marshal to reflect current practice, and referencing the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance for parking space dimensions.

Mr. Konetchy next discussed new sections, including off-site parking (Section 166-185), which is revised for clarity to explicitly allow the Zoning Hearing Board to waive up to 75% of required parking for shared-use arrangements, simplifying previously confusing language. He also introduced off-street loading (Section 186), which establishes clear requirements where none previously existed, stating that any use receiving or sending deliveries more than once per week must provide an off-street loading area, and that each loading dock must have its own dedicated space to prevent circulation issues.

A Commission member then raised a question as to whether the loading requirement would apply to all types of deliveries, including small-scale services such as food delivery apps like Uber Eats, expressing concern that the standard may be too broad in its current form. Mr. Konetchy confirmed that the threshold is triggered by more than one delivery per week and clarified that the loading space dimensions referenced in the ordinance are designed to accommodate larger vehicles of approximately 35 feet, rather than small passenger or delivery cars.

The Commission member responded with concern that the provision, as written, could either overburden smaller businesses that lack the physical capacity to accommodate large loading areas, or alternatively, impose standards intended for large trucks onto much smaller delivery vehicles. The member suggested that the ordinance should distinguish between different classes of vehicles in order to avoid unintended consequences for smaller operations.

Mr. Konetchy agreed that further exploration of the vehicle classification issue would be worthwhile, suggesting that the ordinance might specify cargo vans and larger as a threshold, and indicated that the language would be revisited to determine what approach makes the most sense. He then moved on to the final item, noting that the special events section is a minor change. The revision simply removes subsection D, which had stated that special events may occur no more than once every six months, and relocates that language to the introduction, as it was felt that the provision more appropriately serves to define what constitutes a special event rather than function as a standalone subsection.

Mr. Konetchy introduced the final item as the beginning of a discussion on shared access and shared parking standards. He explained that shared access reduces the number of curb cuts, which in turn reduces potential conflict between vehicles as well as between vehicles and pedestrians. By consolidating access points rather than interrupting the streetscape every 50 to 100 feet, pedestrians benefit from a greater sense of safety and comfort. With that in mind, he said, the Township envisions the Village Commercial Districts and the Transit-Friendly Design Overlay Districts as having shared access driveways and, ideally, shared parking agreements, acknowledging that lot lines are somewhat arbitrary and that people will naturally park where convenient, potentially allowing them to visit multiple destinations in one stop.

Mr. Konetchy noted that the current regulations fall short in both districts. The VC district requires shared parking for conditional use but includes ways to opt out, while the TDO only recommends it with an option to require it through the conditional use process. In either case, the standards are not particularly strong or detailed, making enforcement difficult. He pointed to Germantown Pike as an area where shared access could have a meaningful impact, noting that eliminating even a single driveway could free up space for green infrastructure, trees, or amenities like outdoor seating.

With that context, Mr. Konetchy outlined the key questions the Commission should consider so that he can return the following month with one or possibly two draft approaches aimed at mid-year adoption. He asked whether shared driveways should always be required in the VC and TDO districts, or whether certain circumstances — such as physical site conditions, spacing constraints, or use types might justify exceptions. He also raised the question of whether shared access should

be mandatory in all cases or incentivized through bonuses such as additional dwelling units or other site design flexibilities, noting that the VC district currently offers a 10% impervious surface bonus for shared access and parking, though this creates an inconsistency given that it is effectively required for conditional uses anyway. Finally, he asked whether, if mandatory, there should be a defined exemption pathway or whether property owners should always be required to seek a variance. He closed by inviting any high-level input from the Commission, including examples from other communities or areas within the Township where shared parking is working well.

Mr. Guttenplan offered context on the history of shared access efforts in the Township, noting that despite being a strong priority when the VC district was written, it has yielded only one or two successes over more than 15 years, largely due to an exemption that allows conditional use conversions to bypass the requirement. He referenced the recent discussion around three nearby properties on Germantown Pike as an example of how significant access alignment can be. He added that the TDO, rather than strengthening the standard, may have actually weakened it. Mr. Guttenplan emphasized that shared access has long been an important goal for the Township and that, given its track record, the time has come to make a clear decision on whether to make the requirement more enforceable or keep it optional.

A Commission member stated that shared access should simply be made a hard requirement, noting that to the extent it is appropriate, new development should be held to it. The members expressed interest in reviewing a list of potential incentives but cautioned against giving too much away for compliance. They raised the example of a recent development on Germantown Pike, questioning whether the Commission would be willing to relax density standards as a trade-off for fewer access points and better protection of the pedestrian experience along the corridor.

Another Commission member offered two examples from the Germantown and Butler area, noting that one redevelopment where the same owner controlled both properties resulted in a shared parking lot and building, while a nearby conversion of a dwelling with added rear units next to a car repair shop represented a missed opportunity for shared access.

Mr. Konetchy acknowledged the positive example and indicated he would look to it for ideas and inspiration. He then wrapped up the presentation, thanking the Commission for their time and expressing confidence that the Township is on track for a mid-year adoption, with five to six items substantially ready to move forward.

A Commission member closed by thanking Mr. Konetchy for the quality of the presentation, noting that the clear logic and thorough preparation made the Commission's decision-making considerably easier.

## **8. NEW BUSINESS**

## **9. PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER COMMENTS**

Mr. Quitel took a moment to thank everyone for their efforts on a recent Schuylkill River campaign for "River of the Year", noting that while the vote was ultimately lost, the gap had narrowed significantly in the final stretch with support from several organizations, and that the outcome had been closer than expected.

## **10. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS (none)**

## **11. ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. Shaw-Fink made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Bushong seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0. Meeting adjourned 7:32 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.

DRAFT

**MONTGOMERY COUNTY  
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**

Jamila H. Winder, Chair  
Neil K. Makhija, Vice Chair  
Thomas DiBello, Commissioner  
  
www.montgomerycountypa.gov



**Montgomery County  
Planning Commission**  
Montgomery County • PO Box 311  
Norristown, PA 19404-0311  
  
610-278-3722  
planning@montgomerycountypa.gov  
  
Scott France, AICP

April 9, 2026

**SUBJECT:** Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendments to Promote Shared Access

**TO:** Charles L. Guttenplan, AICP, Director of Planning & Zoning/Zoning Officer;  
Sam Zrillo, AICP, Township Planner;  
Whitemarsh Township Planning Commission

**FROM:** Tim Konetchy, AICP, Senior Community Planner

**INTRODUCTION**

Last month, the Planning Commission was provided with a brief overview of existing zoning requirements related to shared access in the Village Commercial (VC) Districts and Transit-Friendly Design Overlay (TDO) District. The Township would like to encourage the provision of shared access to reduce curb cuts, lower risks for pedestrians and drivers by clearly indicating entry and exit points, create efficiencies in parking and access, and generally improving safety. With these factors in mind, the Planning Commission was asked to consider the following questions:

- Should driveways in these zoning districts always be shared, or are there cases where shared access or parking isn't suitable? Alternatively, when is shared access or parking essential?
- Would it be better to encourage shared access or parking by offering incentives? Or should it be mandatory?
- Should there be a process to allow exemptions from this requirement?

After reviewing existing regulations and discussing the intent of the regulations, it was determined that ordinance revisions are necessary to ensure that shared access is accommodated wherever possible within the identified zoning districts. The primary goal of these revisions is to promote shared access, as this works to reduce the number of curb cuts and driveways along these key commercial corridors. On the other hand, shared parking generally refers to off-site parking arrangements, which are addressed elsewhere within the Zoning Ordinance (§ 116-185. Off-site parking spaces).

Below, you will find a summary of current shared access regulations in the TDO and VC districts, along with comments on enforcement issues and ambiguities. Then, in the following section, an introduction to the proposed text amendments is provided. A redline draft of the VC district is provided as an attachment to this document (21 pages). Should the Planning Commission support the draft regulations, these standards may be modified and integrated into the TDO district as well.

## EXISTING REGULATIONS WITH COMMENTARY

The relevant regulations from the TDO and VC districts are provided below, along with brief commentary noted in [blue text](#). The existing regulations are intended to require shared facilities in the VC and TDO; however, enforcing the requirements has been difficult due to vague language and the ability to get out of the requirements under certain circumstances.

### Transit-Friendly Design Overlay District

Section 116-320.H.(3). Off-street parking and multi-modal connectivity. Joint or shared access drives.

- (a) *To promote more efficient traffic flow and traffic safety and minimize the number of curbcuts, every effort shall be made to provide shared means of ingress and egress to developed and developing properties.*
- (b) *Where deemed necessary and appropriate, shared access drives and/or cross-easement agreements may be required for rear access lanes to adjacent properties which minimize curbcuts along the primary roadway.*

➔ Shared parking and access facilities are recommended but are only required when “deemed necessary and appropriate” to allow for rear-access to neighboring properties. Because all uses within this district are permitted by right, it appears that this would be considered as part of the Subdivision and Land Development Review process.

### Village Commercial Districts

Section 116-291.A.(4). Conditions of approval for all uses. Driveways, parking areas/parking structures and traffic circulation patterns shall be designed as shared facilities whenever feasible. The design of these elements shall create a unified site plan between lots. The goal is to gain parking efficiencies, reduce the number of access points and improve internal and external vehicular circulation patterns. Driveways on parcels with a lot area five acres or greater shall be no closer than 100 feet to any adjacent residential use.

➔ Shared parking and access facilities are required “whenever feasible.” Though there is no specific explanation of factors that could make providing shared access infeasible.

Section 116-291.A.(7)(a)[1]. Conditions of approval for all uses. No parking shall be permitted between the street line and the front principal building plane unless an existing building prevents the applicant from meeting the parking requirements to the rear and side of a principal building, and the applicant demonstrates that parking between the street line and the front principal building plane is the only option after a bona fide attempt has been made to secure a shared parking arrangement with an adjacent or nearby property.

➔ Shared parking and access requirements may be waived, and parking may be allowed between the street line and the front building façade, only “after a bona fide attempt has been made to secure a shared parking arrangement with an adjacent or nearby property.” A “bona fide attempt” is not defined, which can make enforcement difficult.

*Section 116-292.A. Conditions of approval for all conditional uses. Shared driveways and parking. Notwithstanding the provisions of § 116-291A(7), all conditional uses shall have either a shared driveway with an adjacent property or shared parking or both; provided, however, that if a permitted or conditional use is being converted to a new conditional use, this requirement shall not apply.*

- Shared parking and access requirements apply to all conditional uses, except when one conditional use is converted to another conditional use. It is unclear why the regulation was designed with this caveat.

*Section 116-294. Dimensional and coverage standards. Maximum impervious coverage if provisions are made for shared parking with shared driveways to adjacent properties that are concurrently zoned VC-1, VC-2, VC-3 or VC-4 for a use permitted by right, or optional public space requirements are met per § 116-297*

- Bonus of an additional 10% maximum impervious coverage is granted when shared access and parking is provided. Although this may be an attractive bonus, one of the benefits of shared parking and access is a potential *reduction* in necessary impervious from paving. Therefore, the bonus granted is proposed to be amended in the draft.

## DRAFT REGULATIONS WITH COMMENTARY

Given that the Township wishes to continue to require shared access provisions in the VC, the most appropriate approach is to strengthen existing regulations. MCPC has prepared draft amendments to the VC district that provide for additional detail and specificity for shared access requirements and standards. Because shared access can be difficult to establish, the revisions seek to establish strong incentives for shared access. The specific provisions of the draft will be presented and discussed at the upcoming Township Planning Commission meeting.

A full redline draft of proposed amendments is attached to this document (21 pages).

## CONCLUSION

The Planning Commission is asked to consider if the draft standards provided include enough detail or, in the alternative, if they are overly prescriptive regarding the provision of shared access. Please review the draft standards and come to the meeting with any questions, comments, or recommendations. Should the Planning Commission support the proposed amendments, they will be integrated into the proposed midyear zoning amendment package.

ARTICLE XXXVIII  
Village Commercial District (VC)  
[Added 9-25-2008 by Ord. No. 863; amended 1-28-2010 by Ord. No. 893; 12-22-2011 by  
Ord. No. 912]

Key: Proposed Text  
~~Text proposed for deletion~~

**§ 116-288. Legislative intent.**

It is the intent of the Village Commercial District (VC) to permit the development or redevelopment of land for limited commercial, office and residential uses, while preserving and restoring the distinct architectural character of historic areas of Whitmarsh Township. In addition, the specific intent of this article is as follows:

- A. To provide areas to accommodate nonresidential uses which do not generate large volumes of traffic, which minimize adverse impacts on abutting residential properties and which maintain or improve the visual character and architectural scale of existing development.
- B. To prohibit development of strip-type, highway-oriented commercial uses which create traffic hazards and congestion because they generate higher traffic volumes and require multiple individual curb cuts.
- C. To provide regulating standards which are necessary to encourage orderly, well-planned development and to ensure the compatibility of development with the character of the district and the surrounding areas.
- D. Provide incentives for building restorations of existing historic structures or buildings built prior to 1940.
- E. Use building scale, building orientation and landscaping to establish or preserve community identity.
- F. Encourage the retention, rehabilitation, and reuse of existing historic structure(s) or building(s) built prior to 1940.
- G. That new buildings or building additions and restorations have an architectural scale and character commensurate with the existing pre-1940 architecture of the area.
- H. Encourage bicycle- and pedestrian-accessible developments, reflecting a village center rather than auto-oriented commercial strip development.
- I. Provide incentives that encourage shared access points, parking areas and public spaces.
- J. Protect, to the greatest extent possible, the natural features of the district, including the open spaces, steep slopes and large trees.
- K. To provide a distinction for those areas where only less intensive uses are appropriate and those areas where more permissive uses may be allowed, through the creation of subdistricts to be known as "VC-1," "VC-2" and "VC-3."
- L. Implement the Comprehensive Plan.

- M. To create a subdistrict known as VC-4 which promotes the development of an internalized, destination style of commercial center in accordance with the design guidelines and intent of the Village Commercial District on tracts of land 15 acres and larger. **[Added 12-5-2013 by Ord. No. 931]**

**§ 116-289. Applicability. [Amended 12-5-2013 by Ord. No. 931]**

The regulations, requirements, and restrictions set forth in this article are mandatory and subdivision/land development applications within the VC-1, VC-2, VC-3, and VC-4 Zoning Districts shall comply with the requirements of this article, as well as the corresponding VC Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SLDO) sections.

**§ 116-290. Use regulations.**

- A. A building may be erected, altered or used and a lot or premises may be used for any of the following purposes and no other in VC-1, VC-2, VC-3 and VC-4: **[Amended 12-5-2013 by Ord. No. 931]**

- (1) Single-family detached residence.
- (2) Two-family residence.
- (3) Multifamily conversion; no more than four units.
- (4) Family child day-care home.
- (5) Library or museum.
- (6) Antique store.
- (7) Bed-and-breakfast.
- (8) Place of worship.
- (9) Live/work units for artisans, professionals and service providers. **[Amended 11-14-2024 by Ord. No. 1044]**
- (10) Business or professional office and insurance agencies.
- (11) Music, dance, art or martial arts studio or school of similar uses.

- A.1. A building or buildings may be erected, altered or used and a lot or premises may be used for any of the following purposes and no other in VC-4: **[Added 12-5-2013 by Ord. No. 931]**

- (1) Retail.
- (2) Retail for food and beverage.
- (3) Bakery.
- (4) Restaurant, tearoom, cafe, confectionary, or similar establishment producing and serving food and beverages to be sold at retail on the premises.
- (5) Outdoor dining in accordance with the requirements of § 116-290B(11).

- (6) Bank or financial institution.
  - (7) Medical office.
  - (8) Catering.
- B. The following uses may be permitted as conditional uses in VC-1, VC-2, and VC-3, provided they meet the requirements of § 116-37, Conditional use procedures, as well as the conditions listed in § 116-291, Conditions of approval for all uses, and § 116-292, Conditions of approval for all conditional uses: **[Amended 10-25-2018 by Ord. No. 988; 10-10-2019 by Ord. No. 997]**
- (1) Townhomes, apartments, and condominiums.
  - (2) Child day-care center.
  - (3) School-age care.
  - (4) Group child day-care home.
  - (5) Multifamily conversion; with over four units but no more than eight residential units.
  - (6) Multiple buildings on the same property, meeting permitted use or conditional use standards.
  - (7) Club, fraternal organization or lodge.
  - (8) Educational, religious, or philanthropic use.
  - (9) Buildings containing permitted uses when in excess of maximum building footprint in accordance with § 116-294 herein.
  - (10) Restaurant, tearoom, cafe, confectionery, bakery, or similar establishment producing and serving food and beverages to be sold at retail on the premises. In the case of VC-2, floor space devoted to patron use shall not exceed 2,000 square feet. For VC-3, see Subsections D and E of this section, below.
  - (11) Outdoor dining.
    - (a) Adequate sidewalk area shall be provided for proper circulation.
    - (b) The outdoor area shall not remove required parking areas.
    - (c) Additional parking shall be provided for the outdoor seating area in accordance with the requirements of this chapter.
    - (d) The outdoor area shall be lit to the satisfaction of the Township Engineer.
- B.1. The following uses may be permitted as conditional uses in VC-4, provided that they meet the requirements of § 116-37, Conditional use procedures, as well as the conditions listed in § 116-291, Conditions of approval for all uses, and § 116-292, Conditions of approval for all conditional uses: **[Added 12-5-2013 by Ord. No. 931]**

- (1) Personal service shops dealing directly with retail customers, including the following and similar uses: barbershop, beauty parlor, dry cleaner (provided no flammable liquids are used), spa, or tailor shop. **[Amended 10-25-2018 by Ord. No. 988]**
  - (2) Drive-through in accordance with the requirements of § 116-290E(5)(a) through (f).
- C. The following uses may be permitted as additional conditional uses in the VC-1 subdistrict only, provided they meet the requirements of § 116-37, Conditional use procedures, as well as the conditions listed in § 116-291, Conditions of approval for all uses, and § 116-292 Conditions of approval for all conditional uses:
- (1) Retail, maximum building size of 10,000 square feet.
  - (2) Personal service shops dealing directly with retail customers, including the following and similar uses: barbershop, beauty parlor, dry cleaner (provided no flammable liquids are used), spa, or tailor shop. **[Amended 10-25-2018 by Ord. No. 988]**
  - (3) Medical/dental office.
  - (4) Bank or financial institution.
- D. The following uses may be allowed as additional permitted uses in the VC-3 subdistrict, provided such uses meet the requirements listed in § 116-291, Conditions of approval for all uses:
- (1) Retail, maximum building size of 10,000 square feet.
  - (2) Personal service shops dealing directly with retail customers, including the following and similar uses: barbershop, beauty parlor, dry cleaner (provided no flammable liquids are used), spa, or tailor shop. **[Amended 10-25-2018 by Ord. No. 988]**
  - (3) Medical/dental office, maximum building footprint of 6,000 square feet.
  - (4) Bank or financial institution.
  - (5) Restaurant, tearoom, cafe, confectionery, bakery, or similar establishment producing and serving food and beverages to be sold at retail on the premises, provided the floor space devoted to patron use shall not exceed 2,000 square feet.
- E. The following uses may be permitted as additional conditional uses in the VC-3 subdistrict only, provided such uses meet the requirements of § 116-37, Conditional use procedures; the conditions listed in § 116-291, Conditions of approval for all uses; § 116-292, Conditions of approval for all conditional uses; and the specific requirements enumerated herein:
- (1) Carpentry, cabinetmaking, furniture or upholstery shop, electrician shop, metalworking, blacksmith, tinsmith, paint or paperhanger shop, or similar trades shop, provided that:
    - (a) Tractor-trailer trucks are not required on a regular basis to pick up or deliver goods.
    - (b) All operations are confined to an enclosed building.
    - (c) There is no outside storage.

- (d) The building containing said use(s) maintains a retail appearance along the street(s) upon which it fronts.
- (2) Medical/dental office, clinic with a maximum building footprint of 12,000 square feet.
- (3) Restaurant, tearoom, cafe, confectionery, bakery, or similar establishment producing and serving food and beverages to be sold at retail on the premises, whose floor space devoted to patron use exceeds 2,000 square feet.
- (4) Specialty vehicle service facilities, including but not limited to, auto upholstery shop, sound system installation, or similar use, provided that:
  - (a) Tractor-trailer trucks are not required on a regular basis to pick up or deliver goods.
  - (b) All operations are confined to an enclosed building.
  - (c) There is no outside storage.
  - (d) There is no recurring noise audible off site.
  - (e) The operation does not require garage doors to remain open during the normal operation of the facility.
  - (f) The building containing said use(s) maintains a retail appearance along the street(s) upon which it fronts.
- (5) Drive-through windows for permitted banks and retail uses, provided that:
  - (a) A transportation impact study is submitted in accordance with the applicable standards of § 105-21B(9) of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.
  - (b) The drive-through window shall not require the installation of any additional access driveways to existing roads.
  - (c) The drive-through window shall be located behind the building or otherwise shielded from view from an abutting street. On a corner lot, the drive-through window shall be shielded from view, at a minimum, from the abutting street on which the primary building facade is located, that being the street which the Village Commercial District parallels, not an intersecting (side) street.
  - (d) The traffic and vehicle stacking area for the drive-through window shall not conflict with internal site circulation or block access to any parking spaces, with stacking for an appropriate number of vehicles as determined by the transportation impact study.
  - (e) When a drive-through window is located adjacent to a residential use or district, a decorative fence shall be installed, with landscaping provided on the outside (residential side) of the fence; adequate area shall be provided to allow for maintenance of the landscaping.
  - (f) A drive-through window shall not constitute the sole access for a use; the use must have at least one pedestrian entrance.

- (g) A drive-through window shall not be allowed for any restaurant, tearoom, cafe, confectionery, bakery, or similar establishment producing and serving food and beverages to be sold at retail on the premises.
- F. Accessory uses and structures shall be in accordance with § 116-24 and shall include the following additional uses and structures by conditional use:
  - (1) Structured parking.
    - (a) All parking structures shall be subject to review by appropriate Township officials regarding designs for safety, traffic flow, and aesthetics.
    - (b) Architectural appearance.
      - [1] A parking structure must use the dominant exterior materials of the buildings with which it is associated and be of a similar vernacular style.
      - [2] Exterior materials shall effectively and attractively obscure the view to the interior of all parking decks.
      - [3] Parking structures shall be designed such that sloping circulation bays are internal to the structure and not expressed in the exterior treatment of the parking structure.
      - [4] Any use allowed in this district is encouraged to be integrated into any portion of the ground level facing the public street.
    - (c) Parking structure dimensions.
      - [1] A freestanding parking structure shall be permitted, provided the structure is considered a building for purposes of computation of building coverage and all other dimensional requirements in accordance with §§ 116-294 and 116-295 of this district; provided, however, parking structures shall be located to the side or rear of principal buildings when not part of the building.
      - [2] In no event shall the building height be increased beyond what is allowed in this district by the use of structured parking.
- G. A nonconforming structure may be permitted to be expanded in the VC District without relief from the Zoning Hearing Board from the provisions of § 116-194B(1) or from the VC District setback requirements, provided that parking, landscaping, applicable public space requirements, impervious coverage limitations, and all required setbacks from residential uses or districts are met. This exemption from Zoning Hearing Board approval shall not be applicable to parcels with a lot area of five acres or greater.
- H. For any parcel with a lot area of five acres or greater, the following additional uses shall be permitted as conditional uses within the VC-1 or VC-3 subdistricts, subject to meeting the requirements of § 116-37 Conditional use procedures, as well as the conditions listed within § 116-291, Conditions of approval for all uses, and § 116-292, Conditions of approval for all conditional uses:

- (1) Indoor recreation facility, including fitness center, health club, and racquet club.
- (2) Assisted-living facility.
- (3) Nursing home.
- (4) Theater for the performing arts, excluding movie theater
- (5) Hotel.

**§ 116-291. Conditions of approval for all uses.**

A. General standards. These standards shall apply to all permitted and conditional uses in the VC-1, VC-2, VC-3, and VC-4 Districts unless otherwise noted: **[Amended 3-28-2013 by Ord. No. 925; 12-5-2013 by Ord. No. 931]**

- (1) All uses shall be served by public water and sewer service. The Board of Supervisors may, upon recommendation of the Township Engineer that on-site septic and water is satisfactory, allow on-site facilities for historic buildings as described in § 116-288D herein.
- (2) All utility lines serving all uses shall be placed underground from the edge of the right-of-way to the place of service. The Board of Supervisors may, upon recommendation of the Township Engineer that underground utilities would be disruptive to the site, allow them to remain above ground for historic buildings.
- (3) Drive-through windows are prohibited for all uses within the district except as permitted in VC-4 or as specified in § 116-290E(5) herein. **[Amended 12-5-2013 by Ord. No. 931]**

**(4) Shared Access.**

(a) **Intent.** Driveways, parking areas/parking structures and traffic circulation patterns are encouraged to ~~shall~~ be designed as shared facilities whenever feasible. ~~The design of these elements shall create a unified site plan between lots.~~ The goal of shared access is to gain parking efficiencies, reduce the number of access points and improve internal and external vehicular circulation patterns. ~~Driveways on parcels with a lot area five acres or greater shall be no closer than 100 feet to any adjacent residential use.~~

**(b) Applicability and bonus provision.**

[1] All conditional uses shall provide shared access in accordance with the requirements of this section and § 116-292.A.

[2] All other permitted uses may voluntarily provide shared access in order to qualify for the bonus provisions established herein. When shared access is voluntarily granted in accordance with this section, the allowable building coverage shall be increased by 10% in accordance with § 116-294, and the maximum permissible residential density shall be increased to 10 dwelling units per acre pursuant to § 116-292.D.

**(c) Shared access agreement required.**

- [1] Shared access agreements shall be granted to all abutting VC-zoned properties. The shared access agreement shall provide access from each lot subject to the agreement to a shared access driveway and through any parking area, access aisle, or internal circulation drive necessary to ensure the efficient movement of vehicles between parking areas on abutting lots.
  - [2] When two or more abutting lots share an access driveway, the shared driveway shall serve as the primary means of access, and all other existing driveways on the affected lots within 300 feet shall then be removed. A shared access driveway may be located entirely on one lot or be split across a common lot line.
  - [3] Shared access agreements and maintenance agreements or other suitable legal mechanisms shall be submitted to the Township Solicitor for review and approval prior to permit issuance.
- (5) The Board of Supervisors may, by conditional use, reduce the total amount of required parking, provided the applicant demonstrates that the number of Code-required parking spaces exceeds the actual development needs given the proposed use or mix of uses and/or varied peak activity times. The amount of reduction permitted by the Board of Supervisors shall be based upon a recommendation by the Township Engineer who shall recommend a specific percentage reduction upon review and interpretation of appropriate information provided by the applicant from the latest edition of "Parking Generation" published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers or based upon a review and interpretation of other evidence for a reduction of parking prepared by a qualified professional. If a parking reduction is approved based upon the provisions of this subsection, a conditional use for parking between the street line and, the front principal building plane, under Subsection A(7) of this section, shall not be permitted. **Nothing herein shall be construed to limit an applicant from seeking a special exception to provide off-site parking spaces in compliance with § 116-185.**
- (6) If parking between the street line and the front principal building plane is otherwise permitted by virtue of the requirements of the VC District, relief from the Zoning Hearing Board from the provisions of Article XXVI, § 116-24E(3)(a), shall not be required, regardless of the proposed use(s).
- (7) Parking.
- (a) Parking for parcels with a lot area up to five acres.
    - [1] No parking shall be permitted between the street line and the front principal building plane unless an existing building prevents the applicant from meeting the parking requirements to the rear and side of a principal building, and the applicant demonstrates that parking between the street line and the front principal building plane is the only option after a bona fide attempt has been made to secure a shared parking arrangement with an adjacent or nearby property.
    - [2] In such case, a maximum of 25% of the parking may be placed between the street line and the front principal building plane as a conditional use, provided that the applicant installs a decorative wall or fence between the parking area and the ultimate right-of-way line.

- [3] Said fence shall not be chain link and shall be between 30 and 42 inches in height. Low evergreen landscaping may be used to soften the appearance of the fence or wall from the street. Openings in the fence or wall no more than four feet in width are permitted for drainage or pedestrian access.
  - [4] A minimum of 50% of the required parking shall be placed between the rear lot line and the rear principal building plane; any remaining parking may be located between a side lot line(s) and the respective side principal building plane(s).
- (b) Parking for parcels with a lot area of five acres or greater:
- [1] Parking between the street line and the front principal building plane is limited to a maximum of 25% of the total parking; provided, however, a conditional use shall not be required.
  - [2] The decorative wall or fence as stipulated herein shall be required to screen parking areas from adjacent roadways.
  - [3] Low evergreen landscaping to soften the appearance between the wall and the street is required.
- (8) Notwithstanding the building height provisions noted in the table Building Dimensions, Location and Setback Standards, § 116-295, no portion of a building located within 45 feet of an existing one- or two-family dwelling in a residential zoning district shall be permitted to exceed 35 feet in height; provided, however, that for parcels with a lot area of five acres or greater, said forty-five-foot distance shall be increased to 65 feet.
- (9) Curb cuts. Each lot shall have no more than one curb cut per street frontage for a two-way driveway for vehicular access. If sufficient room is not available for one two-way driveway, the Board of Supervisors may approve two curb cuts, subject to PennDOT approval where required. Driveway width shall be in accordance with § 105-38B of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. For development on a parcel with a lot area of five acres or greater, access points shall be limited to a maximum of two per street frontage.
- (10) The minimum land area necessary to qualify for the VC-4 District shall be 15 contiguous acres, which may consist of an assemblage of smaller tracts. **[Added 12-5-2013 by Ord. No. 931]**
- B. Building design. Within the VC-1, VC-2, and VC-3, the following requirements shall apply to all new and rehabilitated structures and, to the extent practicable, to all other structures except as may be modified in accordance with Subsection B(6) herein. **[Amended 12-5-2013 by Ord. No. 931]**
- (1) Placement and access. A building's public access points shall be articulated and visible from the main roadway.
    - (a) Main building entrances shall be located along the frontage of the main roadway.
    - (b) Building entrances shall incorporate arcades, roofs, porches, alcoves and/or awnings that protect pedestrians from the sun and rain.
    - (c) If the building has frontage on more than one street, the building shall provide, at a minimum, public access points oriented towards both streets, or a single access

point to the corner where the two streets intersect.

- (d) All buildings must be placed to encourage continuous uninterrupted pedestrian accessways that link windows, doorways and open spaces.
  - (e) Additional side or rear access is encouraged.
- (2) Facades. A building's primary front facade shall be located along the main roadway frontage and designed with clear windows, public access points and signage.
- (a) Multistory buildings shall articulate the line between the ground and upper levels with a cornice, canopy, balcony, arcade, or other visual device.
  - (b) The ground floor of the primary front facade(s) shall contain a minimum of 20% windows with a maximum of 60%; windows shall not be tinted unless for purposes of energy conservation nor shall they be of reflective glass.
  - (c) Blank walls are not permitted along the main roadway.
  - (d) Blank walls, if visible from a right-of-way or accessway, shall be articulated by two or more of the following:
    - [1] Details in masonry courses;
    - [2] The provision of blank window openings trimmed w/frames, sill and lintels;
    - [3] If the building is occupied by a commercial use, recessed or projecting display window cases.
  - (e) Upper stories of a primary front facade, except those floors used for residential purposes, shall contain a minimum of 20% windows with a maximum of 40%; windows shall not be tinted unless for purposes of energy conservation nor shall they be of reflective glass. To the extent possible, upper story windows shall be vertically aligned with the location of windows and doors on the ground level, including storefront or display windows.
  - (f) Required window areas must be designed to allow views into working areas or lobbies, pedestrian entrances, or merchandise display areas; windows shall not be tinted unless for purposes of energy conservation nor shall they be of reflective glass.
  - (g) The facade treatment of walls facing residential uses or residential zoning districts shall be similar to the primary front facade.
- (3) Massing. The mass of a building or buildings shall be deemphasized in a variety of ways, including the use of projecting and recessed elements such as porches, windows and roof dormers. The intent is to reduce the apparent overall bulk and volume of a structure, to enhance visual quality and contribute to human-scale development. Such breaks in the facades and roof lines shall occur not less frequently than every 100 feet. Building length: Multiple buildings fronting on the main roadway shall vary in building length. The maximum building length shall not exceed 120 feet, for those buildings on parcels with a lot area less than five acres or 150 feet for those buildings on parcels with a lot area of five acres or greater.
- (a) Building facade width: The primary building facade along the main roadway shall

not exceed 75 feet in length, for buildings on parcels with a lot area of less than five acres. The primary building facade along the main roadway shall not exceed 100 feet in length, for buildings on parcels with a lot area of five acres or greater.

- (b) All principal buildings shall relate in scale, massing and style to the surrounding buildings.
- (c) For buildings on parcels with a lot area five acres or greater:
  - [1] Architectural style shall be designed to avoid the massive scale and uniform and impersonal appearance of a big-box structure through the use of such elements as facade ornamentation, building offsets, window treatments, variations in rooflines, entry treatments, and upgraded building materials. Focus should be primarily on variation in spaces among groups of buildings to avoid creating a walled corridor of long, unbroken rows of buildings along a setback, or a monotonous pattern of buildings across a site. There shall be no uninterrupted length of facade that exceeds 100 feet. Building facades greater than 100 feet in length, including separate buildings that are attached shall incorporate one or more architectural feature over 20% of that facade.
  - [2] For buildings with a footprint greater than 15,000 square feet, the building must be designed to appear as multiple buildings.
- (4) Materials. Exterior wall material may be a combination of brick with a consistent or complementary shape, color and texture as found within the adjacent neighborhood, architectural or real stone, stucco, concrete and/or wood siding.
  - (a) Windows shall have detailed mullions and shutters with hardware when these architectural features are employed.
  - (b) The following building materials are prohibited: exterior insulation and finishing systems (EFIS), aluminum or vinyl siding; white, tan or painted brick; T-111 or similar plywood siding.
  - (c) Except on rear walls, not visible from any public way, all forms of visible concrete masonry units shall be prohibited.
  - (d) Existing buildings built before 1940 can be restored to their original conditions or surfaced with brick or stone with wood trim and details.
  - (e) All exposed concrete walls shall be stuccoed or painted. Painted concrete block may not exceed 36 inches in height above the ground.
  - (f) For buildings on parcels with a lot area five acres or greater, materials shall comply with the requirements in § 116-283A(2) of this chapter, regulating dominant building materials in the Riverfront Redevelopment District.
- (5) Roof design. The roof shall be designed with either overhanging eaves or cornices on all sides extending a minimum of 12 inches beyond the building wall.
  - (a) A variety of ridge heights and/or dormers, masonry-finished chimneys and cupolas shall be included in the design of the buildings.
  - (b) Roofing materials shall vary on buildings to feature porches, cupolas, or bay

windows.

[1] Roofing materials may include fiberglass architectural shingles that represent slate or wood, natural slate, shakes, shingle (either wood or asphalt composite), standing seam metal roofs and metal formed to resemble standing seams. Specifically prohibited are white, tan, or blue shingles, red clay tiles, and corrugated plastic or metal.

[2] Fascias, dormers and gables or similar architectural features shall be employed to provide visual interest.

- (c) Flat roof surfaces shall be prohibited on one-story buildings.
  - (d) Flat roofs may be used on buildings of two or more stories. In these instances, all visibly exposed walls shall have articulated cornices and parapets that project horizontally from the vertical building wall plane. Architectural features that serve a function and add visual interest to roofs shall be included in the design of such buildings.
  - (e) All rooftop mechanical equipment, including antennas, shall be screened visually and acoustically through the use of parapets. Such screening shall be integral to the architectural design of the building.
  - (f) Any roof-mounted solar panel installations shall comply with all applicable requirements and procedures set forth in § 116-33.4 of this chapter. The design of such installations shall be consistent with the roof design criteria of Subsections B(5)(a) through (e) herein to the extent practical without compromising the effectiveness of the proposed installation. The Township Engineer shall review any proposed solar installation to confirm that it is an effective means of utilizing solar energy, in compliance with § 116-33.4B(2) of this chapter.
- (6) The Board of Supervisors, by conditional use, upon consideration of recommendations from the Township Planning Commission, may permit minor modifications to the building design requirements contained in this district, provided that the applicant satisfactorily demonstrates compliance with the following criteria:
- (a) The intent of the Village Commercial District and applicable subdistricts is respected.
  - (b) The character of the building will be similar to that which would result from the building being developed/rehabilitated in strict compliance with the building design requirements.
  - (c) The modification represents the least modification required to accommodate the proposed use(s).
- (7) Additional design standards:
- (a) All ground-mounted exposed HVAC units or other utility equipment shall be screened from view. This shall be done through the use of masonry walls and landscaping.
  - (b) Trash Enclosures shall be located in areas convenient for on-site use and accessible for collection. They shall be screened through the use of masonry walls,

landscaping, or similar measures approved by the Board of Supervisors. In no case shall any portion of a trash enclosure be closer than a distance equal to the applicable minimum required building side/rear yard as prescribed in § 116-295 herein from a residential use or district.

B.1. Building design for VC-4. The following requirements shall apply to all new and rehabilitated structures and, to the extent practicable, to all other structures except as may be modified in accordance with Subsection B(6) herein: **[Added 12-5-2013 by Ord. No. 931]**

- (1) Placement and access.
  - (a) Building entrances shall incorporate arcades, roofs, porches, alcoves and/or awnings that protect pedestrians from the sun and rain.
  - (b) All buildings must be placed to encourage continuous uninterrupted pedestrian accessways that link windows, doorways and open spaces.
  - (c) Additional side or rear access is encouraged.
- (2) The maximum building area, for a single building, permitted in VC-4 is 70,000 square feet; provided, however, that no one tenant shall occupy a space greater than 20,000 square feet.
- (3) Facades.
  - (a) Multistory buildings shall articulate the line between the ground and upper levels with a cornice, canopy, balcony, arcade, or other visual device.
  - (b) Blank walls are not permitted.
  - (c) The facade treatment of walls facing residential uses or residential zoning districts shall be similar to the primary front facade.
- (4) Massing. The mass of a building or buildings shall be deemphasized in a variety of ways, including the use of projecting and recessed elements such as porches, windows and roof dormers. The intent is to reduce the apparent overall bulk and volume of a structure, to enhance visual quality and contribute to human-scale development. Such breaks in the facades and roof lines shall occur not less frequently than every 100 feet.
- (5) Building length. Multiple buildings fronting on the main roadway shall vary in building length.
  - (a) For buildings on parcels with a lot area 15 acres or greater:

[1] Architectural style shall be designed to avoid the massive scale and uniform and impersonal appearance of a big-box structure through the use of such elements as facade ornamentation, building offsets, window treatments, variations in rooflines, entry treatments, and upgraded building materials. Focus should be primarily on variation in spaces among groups of buildings to avoid creating a walled corridor of long, unbroken rows of buildings along a setback or a monotonous pattern of buildings across a site. There shall be no uninterrupted length of facade that exceeds 130 feet. Building facades greater than 200 feet in length, including separate buildings that are attached, shall incorporate one or more architectural features over 20% of that facade.

[2] For buildings with a footprint greater than 40,000 square feet, the building must be designed to appear as multiple buildings.

- (6) Materials. Exterior wall material may be a combination of brick with a consistent or complementary shape, color and texture as found within the adjacent neighborhood, architectural or real stone, split face block, stucco, concrete and/or wood siding, and glass.
- (a) The following building materials are prohibited: exterior insulation and finishing systems (EIFS), aluminum or vinyl siding; white, tan or painted brick; T-111 or similar plywood siding.
- (b) Existing buildings built before 1940 can be restored to their original conditions or surfaced with brick or stone with wood trim and details.
- (c) All exposed concrete walls shall be stuccoed or painted. Painted concrete block may not exceed 36 inches in height above the ground.
- C. Buffers and landscaping. All buffers shall be prescribed in accordance with Subdivision and Land Use Ordinance § 105-52; provided, however, that the width of the buffers shall be based upon the required setbacks as prescribed in § 116-295. On any parcel with a lot area of five acres or greater, a buffer yard of Class B shall be installed adjacent to all surrounding parcels, regardless of the buffer yard class that might otherwise be required pursuant to Table 1 as cross-referenced in said § 105-52. Decorative fences may be incorporated into a required buffer, provided that an appropriate amount of landscaping shall be placed on the outside of the fence abutting adjacent properties; gates or openings in the fence shall be provided to allow for proper maintenance of the landscaping. If necessary, easements shall be provided on adjacent properties for said maintenance. The amount and type of landscaping provided in any buffer may differ from that prescribed in the Subdivision and Land Use Ordinance, § 105-52, if recommended by the Township Shade Tree Commission and approved by the Board of Supervisors.
- D. Lighting. Streetlighting shall be of a design approved by the Board of Supervisors. All other site lighting shall meet the following requirements: **[Added 10-25-2018 by Ord. No. 988]**
- (1) The incident light spill-off at the development boundaries shall not exceed 0.10 footcandle at any point along off-street areas and 0.30 footcandle along public or private roadways. In addition, the illumination level shall be no more than 0.30 footcandle measured at any point at a height of five feet above grade.
- (2) All lighting shall be aimed, located, designed, fitted and maintained so as not to present a hazard to drivers or pedestrians by impairing their ability to safely traverse streets and sidewalks/pedestrian facilities and so as not to create a nuisance by projecting or reflecting light onto a neighboring property.
- (3) Glare control onto neighboring properties and onto any public or private thoroughfare, including parking areas, shall be achieved through the use of such means as cutoff fixtures, shields and baffles and appropriate application of fixture mounting height, wattage, aiming angle and placement as approved by the Township. Vegetative screens may be required as a secondary means for controlling glare in appropriate situations. The plant composition of all vegetative screens shall be approved by the Board of Supervisors based upon recommendation by the Shade Tree Commission.

- (4) Light fixtures within 50 feet of any residentially zoned or residentially used property may not exceed a mounting height of 16 feet.

**§ 116-292. Conditions of approval for all conditional uses.**

All conditional uses shall comply with the following standards. The conditions in this section are additive to those in § 116-291; provided, however, that in the event of conflict with § 116-291, these conditions shall apply.

- A. Shared ~~access driveways and parking. Notwithstanding the provisions of § 116-291A(7), all~~ conditional uses shall ~~provide have~~ shared access driveway ~~with an adjacent property or~~ in accordance with the requirements of § 116-291.A.(4). ~~shared parking or both; provided, however, that if a permitted or conditional use is being converted to a new conditional use, this requirement shall not apply.~~
- B. Buffers and landscaping. In addition to the requirements contained in § 116-291C herein, for all required landscaping and buffers required for any conditional use, deciduous trees shall be a minimum of 2.5 inches in caliper and evergreen trees shall be planted at a size of six to eight feet in height.
- C. All parking areas shall have at least one tree of 2.5 inches minimum caliper for every five parking spaces in single bays and two trees of 2.5 inches minimum caliper for every 10 parking spaces in double bays. A combination of deciduous and evergreen shrubs shall also be included within parking lot islands.
- D. The maximum density for townhomes, apartments and/or condominiums shall be eight dwelling units per acre; ~~however, the maximum density may be increased to 10 dwelling units per acre when shared access is provided in accordance with subsection A. above.~~ For a mixed-use development, the density shall be computed on the area of that portion of the site used for the residential development and its associated uses (including, but not limited to, parking, recreational facilities and the like). In the case of mixed-use buildings, the maximum number of dwelling units shall be reduced proportionally, based upon the proportion of the building(s) used for nonresidential purposes. (For example, with a single mixed-use building, 1/3 of which is used for nonresidential purposes, the maximum number of allowable units shall be reduced by 1/3.)
- E. The maximum density for nursing homes and assisted-living facilities shall be 10 dwelling units per acre. In order to compute density for these uses, every three beds shall be deemed to be the equivalent of one dwelling unit.

**§ 116-293. Retention and adaptive reuse of historic structures.**

- A. For historic structures as described in § 116-288D herein. If the requirements of this section are in conflict with § 116-291B herein, this section shall take precedence.
- (1) Retention and use of existing principal and accessory buildings (including barns) constructed prior to 1940.
- (a) The proposed development shall retain and use the existing principal building(s) and barn(s), or portions thereof, built before 1940 on the lot and shall retain the general appearance, character and types of building materials of the front and side facades of the existing building, existing front and side porches and window

openings.

- (b) Expansion shall be permitted only to the sides and rear of the existing principal building and not toward a street frontage. Building expansion may not go in front of the existing building line unless to replace an original building element, as documented by historical photographs or drawings.
  - (c) Expansion to the side shall conform in general appearance, scale, and building materials to the front facade of the existing building.
  - (d) Expansion to the rear shall conform in scale to the existing building.
  - (e) Rooflines shall be similar or complimentary to those of the existing building.
- (2) Historic buildings from elsewhere are encouraged to be relocated to this district. The Board of Supervisors may, upon recommendation from the Township Planning Commission, allow exterior materials and building style to be modified for such a building relocation to this district.
- B. For a parcel with a lot area of five acres or greater and/or a parcel in the VC-3 subdistrict, the Board of Supervisors may allow minor modifications to the requirements in Subsection A herein by conditional use, upon consideration of recommendations from the Township Planning Commission, provided compliance with the following criteria is demonstrated:
- (1) The intent of the Village Commercial District is respected.
  - (2) Without the requested modification, it would not be possible to preserve the building.
  - (3) The essential character of the building as seen from the fronting street(s) is not altered.
  - (4) The modification represents the least modification necessary to accommodate the proposed use(s) and preserve the building.

**§ 116-294. Dimensional and coverage standards. [Amended 3-28-2013 by Ord. No. 925; 12-5-2013 by Ord. No. 931]**

Dimensional and coverage standards for all VC-1, VC-2, VC-3, and VC-4 uses shall be in compliance with the following:

| <b>Dimensional and Coverage Standards</b>   | <b>Permitted Uses</b>   | <b>Conditional Uses</b>   | <b>Sites 5 Acres to 15 Acres</b>                                | <b>Sites 15 Acres or Greater</b>                                |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Maximum nonresidential building footprint for new construction only                                  | 6,000 square feet   | 8,000 square feet, except for retail, in which a maximum of 10,000 square feet is permitted | 30,000 square feet  | 70,000 square feet  |
| 2. Maximum residential building footprint for new construction only                                     | 4,000 square feet   | 8,000 square feet   | 15,000 square feet  | 15,000 square feet  |
| 3. Maximum building footprint for a pre-1940 building with additions                                    | 8,000 square feet   | 10,000 square feet  | 10,000 square feet  | 10,000 square feet  |
| 4. Maximum building height  | 3 stories, provided the building height does not exceed 42 feet | 3 stories, provided the building height does not exceed 42 feet                             | 3 stories, provided the building height does not exceed 42 feet | 3 stories, provided the building height does not exceed 50 feet |
| 5. Maximum building front facade width  | 75 feet   | 75 feet   | 100 feet  | 130 feet  |
| 6. Maximum building coverage  | 30%   | 40%   | 40%   | 40%   |
| 7. Maximum building coverage if the requirements for shared access are met pursuant to § 116-291.A.(4). | 40%   | 40%   | 50%   | 50%   |
| 78. Maximum impervious coverage   | 50% (65% for nonresidential VC-3 uses)                          | 65%   | 65%   | 65%   |

|  |          |          |          |          |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 89. Maximum impervious coverage if <del>provisions* are made for shared parking with shared driveways to adjacent properties that are concurrently zoned VC-1, VC-2, VC-3 or VC-4 for a use permitted by right, or</del> optional public space requirements are met <del>per</del> pursuant to § 116-297 | 60%      | 75%      | 75%      | 75%      |
| 109. Minimum vegetated open space, trees or landscaping* <span style="color: red;">■</span>  | 50%      | 35%      | 35%      | 35%      |
| 110. Minimum lot width at building setback line  | 100 feet | 100 feet | 250 feet | 500feet  |
| 112. Minimum street frontage   | 50 feet  | 50 feet  | 100 feet | 500 feet |
| 123. Minimum building separation   | 15 feet  | 15 feet  | 25 feet  | 25 feet  |

NOTES:

~~\* "Provisions" shall be interpreted as the construction of shared parking and driveways or the provision of optional public spaces; if adjacent parcel does not have any nearby parking or driveway, aisles and easements that would facilitate shared parking and driveways when the adjacent parcel is further developed must be provided.~~

\* ■ Said percentages may be reduced commensurate with any increase in impervious coverage permitted by Standard No. ~~8~~ 7 for nonresidential VC-3 permitted uses, by Standard No. ~~9~~ 8 in this section, or by conditional use in accordance with the provisions of § 116-297 herein.

**§ 116-295. Building dimensions, location and setback standards. [Added 12-5-2013 by Ord. No. 931]**

Building dimensions, location and setback standards shall be as follows:

| <b>Lot Area</b>                    | <b>Front Yard Requirements</b>   | <b>Side/Rear Yard Requirements</b>  |
|------------------------------------|--|---|
| Less than 2 acres                  | A minimum of 50% and a maximum of 90% of the building facade(s) shall be located 10 feet from the ultimate right-of-way, with the remaining facade setback further.  | If/when adjacent to a residentially zoned and/or used property, the minimum setback shall be 25 feet. In all other cases, minimum side/rear yard setbacks shall be five feet. |
| 2 acres to 5 acres (not inclusive) | A minimum of 40% and a maximum of 80% of the building facade(s) shall be located 10 feet from the ultimate right-of-way, with the remaining facade set back further. | If/when adjacent to a residentially zoned and/or used property, the minimum setback shall be 35 feet. In all other cases, minimum side/rear yard setbacks shall be five feet. |
| 5 acres to 15 acres                | A minimum of 30% and a maximum of 70% of the building facade(s) shall be located 15 feet from the ultimate right-of-way, with the remaining facade set back further  | If/when adjacent to a residentially zoned and/or used property, the minimum setback shall be 45 feet. In all other cases, minimum side/rear yard setbacks shall be 15 feet.   |
| 15 acres or greater                | Building facades shall be located a minimum of 35 feet from the ultimate right-of-way and 15 feet from an internal private roadway.                                  | If/when adjacent to a residentially zoned and/or used property, the minimum setback shall be 45 feet. In all other cases, minimum side/rear yard setbacks shall be 15 feet.   |

**§ 116-296. Parking setbacks.**

The following setback requirements shall apply for parking spaces and aisleways:

- A. There shall be no minimum side or rear yard parking setback for a parcel(s) being developed in accordance with these standards if that parcel is adjacent to a nonresidentially zoned and/or used property.
- B. When a property being developed in accordance with these standards is adjacent to a residentially zoned and/or used property, there shall be a minimum parking setback of 20 feet from the residential property line.
- C. If any parking is along the right-of-way, the parking setback shall be 10 feet from the ultimate right-of-way.
- D. Notwithstanding the requirements of § 116-184F, parking shall be set back a minimum of 10 feet from any principal structure, with a possible reduction to as little as seven feet, based upon the type of construction of said structure, with the approval of the Fire Marshal. This area shall be used for pedestrian accessways and planting beds. **[Amended 3-28-2013 by Ord. No. 925]**

**§ 116-297. Public space requirements.**

- A. The Board of Supervisors may, by conditional use, approve up to a ten-percent increase in the impervious cover permitted on a parcel if the applicant creates public space along a public right-of-way. Such space shall be landscaped and/or hardscaped pursuant to the following:
  - (1) The public space shall be offered for dedication to the Township.
  - (2) All items provided are to be weatherproof, low maintenance, and vandal-resistant. Whether dedicated to the Township or not, the space and the items located in it are to be maintained by the property owner(s).
  - (3) The area of the public space shall not count toward the requirements of this article for open space.
  - (4) To qualify as a public space, the area must contain at least 500 square feet, have a minimum of 25 feet of public street frontage, and contain at least three of the following items. Signs giving credit to the donor may be permitted in accordance with applicable sections of § 116-207.1:
    - (a) Historic identification markers, signs or monuments.
    - (b) Benches.
    - (c) Kiosk for public notices.
    - (d) Fountain, or water feature.
    - (e) Public art.
    - (f) Clock tower.
- B. The street furniture, such as receptacles, benches, bollards, etc., shall be of a style approved

by the Board of Supervisors.

**§ 116-298. Signs.**

Signs in a VC District shall be regulated in accordance with § 116-207.1 and Article XXVIII of the Zoning Ordinance of the Whitmarsh Township Code, as amended.

DRAFT

# Existing Conditions Analysis



# Proposed Concept Analysis



# Concept Plan



SCALE: 1" = 50'-0"

## UNIT TABULATION

| LEVEL | ST | 1 BD  | 2 BD  | TOTAL |
|-------|----|-------|-------|-------|
| 4     | 5  | 25    | 11    | 41    |
| 3     | 5  | 26    | 12    | 43    |
| 2     | 5  | 26    | 12    | 43    |
| 1     | 3  | 23    | 6     | 32    |
|       | 18 | 100   | 41    | 159   |
|       |    | 11.3% | 62.9% | 25.8% |

### Program Information

Commercial Space: 5,026 LSF (16 Spaces)  
 Dentist Office: 3,167 LSF (20 Spaces)  
 Lobby/Amenity Space: 9,440 GSF

### Parking Information

Provided: 249 Spaces Initial Construction  
 302 Spaces (Full Build Out +55)

Commercial: 36 Spaces  
 Initial Residential: 213 Spaces (1.34 Spaces / Unit)  
 Full Residential: 266 Spaces (1.67 Spaces / Unit)



SCALE: 1" = 80'-0"