

**Towamencin Township
Board of Supervisors
Monthly Meeting
July 22, 2026
7:00 PM**

Present:

Joyce F. Snyder, Chair
Vanessa Gaynor, Vice Chair
Kofi Osei, Secretary
Courtney Morgan, Asst. Treasurer/Asst. Secretary

Staff:

David G. Kraynik, Township Manager
Colleen Ehrle, Asst. Township Manager
Mark A. Hosterman, Esq., Township Solicitor
Mary Stover, Township Engineer
Henry Sekawungu, Director of Planning, Zoning & Code Enforcement
Niral Modi, IT Specialist
Tim Troxel, Chief of Police

Via Zoom:

Kristin Warner, Treasurer

Chair Snyder called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm and led the assemblage in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Opening Comments

- This Board meeting is being provided via Zoom for residents unable to attend in person but who wish to view and hear the meeting live remotely. Public comments submitted by 4:30 pm on the day of the meeting will be read at the start of the meeting. For those physically present, public comment will be available at the beginning of the meeting.
- The Board met in Executive Session prior to this meeting to discuss a potential matter of litigation.
- Our Summer Concert Series continues through August 6th. Concerts are free at Fischer's Park. Our next concert is July 30th, featuring the Last Big Band. Concessions are available for purchase at 6 pm; concerts start at 7 pm. Visit the Township website or Facebook for more information.
- A reminder that the next Board of Supervisors meeting will be on August 26, as the August 12th meeting was cancelled.

Emailed Public Comments:

Resident Margie Shellenberger commented on the proposed Sprouts signage, expressing concern that it would face directly toward an over-55 residential neighborhood. She believes it is

inappropriate for commercial signage to face a residential community, especially if it is larger and brighter than permitted. She noted that the shopping center's main entrance is on Allentown Road and believes the signage should be limited to that frontage. She also shared that she moved to Newbury Way to retire and enjoy the neighborhood but is now considering moving because of ongoing development issues affecting the community.

Resident Elena Trepakova asked the Board to consider relocating the Public Works service area in Fischer's Park and restoring the site to a grassy landscape. She explained that she did not anticipate living next to a constant construction zone when she purchased her home. She described the ongoing construction as a nuisance that has disrupted her ability to enjoy her home as a place of peace and comfort. She stated dust and noise prevent her from comfortably opening her windows and expressed concerns that the area could attract rodents and insects. She also noted that children have been playing on the dirt and stone piles, creating a potential safety hazard. She urged the Board to consider not only the administrative aspects but also its impact on nearby residents and to explore reasonable alternatives, including relocating the service area.

In-Person Comments:

Resident Casey Hannings reiterated his previously stated concerns about Freddy Hill Farm. He believed the Board was already familiar with his position. He discussed the prevalence of large, underutilized paved parking areas throughout the Township and neighboring communities, emphasizing the environmental benefits of reducing impervious surfaces. He suggested that replacing excess pavement with trees and green space could help offset environmental impacts while improving the appearance and functionality of these areas.

Resident Lisa Lieb commented on the Comprehensive Plan and expressed concern about traffic. She noted that the Plan reports an average commute time of 27.2 minutes countywide, compared with 29.9 minutes in Towamencin. She believes additional development will increase travel times unless roadway improvements are made. In her view, development is moving forward before the necessary infrastructure is in place, and she feels nothing is being done to improve the Township's road network and traffic flow.

Approval of Minutes

On a motion by Supervisor Gaynor, seconded by Supervisor Osei, the Board approved the July 8th meeting minutes.

Voting Yes: Joyce F. Snyder, Kofi Osei, Vanessa Gaynor, Courtney Morgan
Voting No: N/A
Abstaining: N/A
Absent: N/A
Zoom: Kristin Warner *no response detected

Zoning, Subdivision and Land Development

Conditional Use Hearing: Sprouts Supermarket (PSDC)

The applicant, The Robert Nicoletti Trust, is seeking conditional use approval for a proposed Sprouts grocery store. In addition, the applicant is requesting Conditional Use approval to

modify the signage requirements. Five wall signs along the front of the building facing Allentown Road and one wall sign on the frontage of the building facing Forty Foot Road are being proposed. Solicitor Hosterman conducted the hearing. Leonard Altieri, counsel for the applicant, had no objection to exhibits and presented an offer of proof. Joe Ferrier, CO-CEO of PSDC, was also present. Mr. Altieri reviewed the application and exhibits.

Chair Snyder asked Mary Stover, Township Engineer, if she was satisfied with the proposal. Ms. Stover noted the new proposal covers half of the space that the previous application provided, which was for an entire grocery store section. Therefore, there will be an additional signage request for the remaining portion of property frontage.

Supervisor Osei asked if the number of signs for this application matches what was previously approved. Mr. Altieri was unsure of the number of signs but noted that the total area is approximately twenty square feet larger.

Supervisor Morgan asked whether the proposed signs are consistent with standard Sprouts signs. Mr. Altieri indicated that this is consistent with the national brand book.

Supervisor Osei asked whether there has been consideration of other tenants who may follow. Mr. Altieri indicated there is no concrete decision on that.

Supervisor Gaynor asked for clarification that the proposal comes from the brand book and that it stipulates the number of signs. Mr. Altieri indicated that the design and layout are in the brand book, not the number of signs.

Resident Terry Cooney asked whether the proposed illuminated sign would remain 24 hours a day or operate on a timer. Mr. Altieri responded that the sign would be set to turn off at 11 pm. She asked if the illuminated sign was required under Sprouts' lease. Mr. Altieri explained that, because the property is on a corner, the applicant was seeking additional signage to improve visibility for motorists. She expressed concern that the proposed sign was duplicative, as Sprouts is already identified on an existing sign, and asked whether the company would consider a smaller sign. Mr. Altieri stated he would need to discuss the request with the applicant but noted that the proposed sign reflects what is being requested, given the store's size and location. She asked if future tenants would seek illuminated signage. Mr. Altieri responded that he could not speculate on future tenant requests, but noted conditions could be placed on future signage. She concluded noting the proposed sign exceeds the Township's current code requirements.

Resident Joe Silverman noted that other stores on the property don't have large signage. He feels that everything they offer does not need to be listed. He thinks the timed lights are good. He does not favor the proposed signage and thinks it should be kept simple.

Resident Lisa Lieb asked for clarification regarding the size of the proposed signage. Mr. Altieri stated that the proposed sign would total 378.6 square feet. She then asked how much total signage is permitted for the building and if the proposed signage would reduce the amount available for a future tenant. She expressed concern that the combined signage for both tenants should not exceed the maximum permitted under the ordinance. Solicitor Hosterman explained that each business is typically permitted a specified amount of signage and that a future tenant would likely submit its own signage application. Ms. Stover noted the Township Code generally

permits 35 square feet of signage, but that the Overlay District allows applicants to request additional signage. She also explained that the previously approved supermarket proposal had received approval for increased signage and anticipated that a future tenant would likely seek similar relief. Ms. Lieb would prefer to see signage that is more in line with what is typically permitted and asked that the proposed sign be reduced in size.

Supervisor Osei asked Mr. Ferrier whether he would consider eliminating the proposed building signage. Mr. Ferrier clarified that he had not suggested removing the signage. He explained that each tenant is responsible for requesting the amount of signage it believes is appropriate. However, PSDC chose to support Sprouts' request because it believes a grocery store will serve as an anchor tenant and help attract additional businesses to the shopping center. He noted the proposed signage is set back a considerable distance from nearby residential properties. While acknowledging concerns about nighttime illumination, he stated that he believes Sprouts would turn off the sign when the store closes at 10 pm. Mr. Ferrier emphasized that PSDC views Sprouts as key to jump-starting leasing activity and that the company is committed to maintaining attractive building façades while bringing a grocery store to the shopping center.

Supervisor Osei asked Solicitor Hosterman if approving the proposed signage would obligate the Township to grant similar signage requests from future tenants. Solicitor Hosterman explained that any future tenant seeking additional signage would be required to submit its own application for Board review and approval. Mr. Altieri added that approval of the Sprouts signage would not establish a precedent or automatically permit additional signage requests for other properties.

Solicitor Hosterman asked Mr. Ferrier to clarify; that his understanding was they were requesting signage on Forty Foot Road because they consider it an anchor store. Mr. Ferrier stated no; they are requesting this because Sprouts said they need a sign on Forty Foot Road. He stated that this side experiences the most use and traffic for the center.

Supervisor Gaynor asked for clarification if the future tenant wanted a sign on the Forty-Foot side, what they could request. Solicitor Hosterman explained and noted that they could come to the Board for Conditional Use, which is permitted in the ELO.

Solicitor Hosterman noted that the Board has 45 days to render a decision, or one can be made at this meeting. He stated that all submitted conditions comply with and are applicable to Township ordinances pertaining to signage. He indicated there may be some confusion as to whether the signage would be limited to Sprouts. Mr. Ferrier noted they would leave that up to future tenants to request.

Supervisor Morgan asked about store hours and the timing of the lights on the sign. Mr. Altieri stated that the standard store hours are 7 am to 10 pm and that the proposed hours are set forth in the conditional use order.

Supervisor Warner asked if another tenant comes in, if they would consider swapping the sign on Forty Foot. Mr. Altieri indicated they could not make that decision; it would be up to Sprouts. He stated given the ordinance's language, the Board controls whether another sign can be added.

The Board decided to discuss the request in executive session and render a decision afterward. Solicitor Hosterman closed the hearing, stating that a decision will be made at the next Board of Supervisors meeting on August 26.

Public Hearing: Comprehensive Plan Update

The final draft of the Comprehensive Plan update was provided to the Supervisors by planning consultant Simone Collins. Steps leading up to this hearing included: multiple public meetings, an online public survey, meetings with advisory committees and key personnel. There was a 45-day review period, where the draft plan was forwarded to the Township and County Planning Commissions, the North Penn School District, and our bordering municipalities, where each party had an opportunity to provide public comment. Solicitor Hosterman conducted the hearing. Peter Simone provided a brief overview of the plan's update.

Solicitor Hosterman referenced a memorandum from Henry Sekawungu, Director of Planning, Zoning and Code Enforcement, regarding revisions made in response to comments from the Montgomery County Planning Commission. He stated that he rendered a solicitor's opinion that the changes made pursuant to the memo were not substantial and would not require additional review beyond tonight's hearing. Solicitor Hosterman asked if the Supervisors had comments; noting that a prepared comment was received from Supervisor Warner. Mr. Hosterman read the comment aloud. *The comment has been added to the minutes as an exhibit.*

Supervisor Osei noted that the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission's indicators were discussed at a meeting, where most of the Board wanted to keep them. He is generally pleased with this plan but noted a few items from the 1980's plan and the 2006 Open Space plan that are worth implementing and emphasized the implementation piece is important. Regarding the recommendations from the County and Township Planning Commissions, he is fine with all the County's recommendations and most of the Township's recommendations. He would agree to remove the build-to-rent comment and replace it with exploring a mixed residential cluster for the Freddy Hill parcels. He added, for the Kriebel Road development, it should be left at 150.

Supervisor Gaynor stated the Township Planning Commission recommended an update to the residential development projections (pg. 30) to reflect current development trends. She asked if that would require an additional study to implement. Mr. Simone explained he based the projections on DVRPC's data, which factored Montgomery County's Planning Commission's suggestions. He noted that the recently approved plans could not be accommodated. Supervisor Gaynor agreed to remove the build-to-rent statement, then asked for confirmation that no comments were received from surrounding municipalities or the school district. Mr. Kraynik confirmed that was correct.

Chair Snyder thanked Mr. Simone for his efforts on the Comprehensive Plan update.

Resident Lisa Lieb commented on the Kriebel Road 150 units, instead of the 140 the Planning Commission suggested. She asked if it would be changed. Supervisor Osei indicated he feels it should not be changed; it was a fiscal analysis at 150. It would have to be recalculated, and he does not think it is worth the effort. Ms. Lieb stated that, according to zoning, it is 140. Mr. Simone indicated they have not received Planning comments but believes this is a difference in

projection and what the developer is proposing. Chair Snyder added that it was 140 by-right. Ms. Lieb then inquired about a change to a per-bedroom parking requirement

Resident Joe Silverman commented that he felt Supervisor Warner's dissertation was excellent. He sees no advantage for adding high-density housing to the Township.

Resident Tiffanie Stanton asked for clarification if these are recommendations, how can they be used as the basis for legal zoning and ordinance changes in the future? She stated this is a plan the Board can use for recommendations, but nothing requires them to do so. Mr. Simone responded that the document is advisory only, but municipalities often use their Comprehensive Plan as a reference to show that the Township went through the process, and it is a tool when addressing proposed zoning and ordinance changes. She asked for confirmation that the plan cannot legally change any current procedures; Mr. Simone agreed that it cannot.

Resident Casey Hannings reiterated the demand for the preservation of natural resources, open space, and the environment, as shown in some of plan's surveys. He appreciated the work that went into this. He feels that should be at the forefront of every decision brought before the Township. He encouraged the Board to explore other options for preserving other properties that may be imperiled in the future.

Supervisor Osei commented that the recommendations S22 and M1 both reference Sumneytown, were conflicting, and could be cleaned up. Mr. Simone felt they were complementary and possibly redundant or reinforcing. Chair Snyder felt they should both remain. Mr. Simone provided another example for including both.

Solicitor Hosterman summarized that he believes most of the Board would like to incorporate the Montgomery County Planning Commission's comments into the plan, as well as the Township Planning Commission's recommendations, less the build-to-rent bullet point and the page 30 update. This would allow the plan to be finalized and to move forward with the resolution.

Mr. Kraynik asked if the Board would like to adopt the resolution with those changes.

Consider Adoption of Resolution 26-21: Comprehensive Plan Update

On a motion by Supervisor Osei, seconded by Supervisor Gaynor, the Board approved adopting Resolution 26-21: Comprehensive Plan Update.

Voting Yes: Joyce F. Snyder, Vanessa Gaynor, Kristin Warner, Kofi Osei, Courtney Morgan
Voting No: N/A
Abstaining: N/A
Absent: N/A

Consider Advertising Conditional Use Hearing: Alliance Cancer Specialists (2060 Detwiler Rd)

The applicant, Detwiler Road Holding Company, LCC., is proposing to convert 7,931 sq ft. of the building space within an office building at 2060 Detwiler Road for a professional infusion center. Medical office use is permitted by Conditional Use. The applicant was present.

On a motion by Supervisor Warner, seconded by Supervisor Morgan, the Board approved advertising the Conditional Use Hearing for Alliance Cancer Specialists at 2060 Detwiler Road.

Voting Yes: Joyce F. Snyder, Vanessa Gaynor, Kristin Warner, Kofi Osei, Courtney Morgan
Voting No: N/A
Abstaining: N/A
Absent: N/A

Consider Waiver of Land Development: Accupac

Accupac requested a waiver of land development for their proposed 1,157.7 sq ft. building addition. The applicant proposes constructing a pre-treatment building and a stairway on the property adjacent to Industrial Boulevard, providing a 230-linear-foot buffer. The total proposed impervious area is 1,229.7 SF. The applicant was granted dimensional and use variances by the Zoning Hearing Board, conditioned upon adding the noted 230-linear-foot buffer. Andrew Griffin, Esq., John Anderson, P.E., and Sean Connelly, representatives of the applicant, presented their plan to the Supervisors.

Chair Snyder asked if the lighting would be dark sky compliant. Mr. Anderson acknowledged the issue and that modifications to the lighting are being implemented.

Ms. Stover corrected a comment regarding the referenced in-lieu-of-fee. Mr. Anderson agreed.

Supervisor Gaynor asked the applicant to provide an overview of the buffering requirement. Mr. Anderson reviewed the requirement and the proposed final plan submission.

On a motion by Supervisor Gaynor, seconded by Supervisor Warner, the Board authorized staff to prepare a resolution the Waiver of Land Development for Accupac.

Voting Yes: Joyce F. Snyder, Vanessa Gaynor, Kristin Warner, Kofi Osei, Courtney Morgan
Voting No: N/A
Abstaining: N/A
Absent: N/A

Parking Ordinance Amendment Discussion

Supervisor Osei has reviewed the Township Code regarding required parking and provided recommendations for establishing minimum parking requirements. He made a related presentation to the Planning Commission on July 6. Supervisor Osei indicated that reducing pavement aligns with the Comprehensive Plan, offering examples, adding parking and pavement destroys open space. He made the points that the Township does not enforce current parking requirements and that the current requirements are onerous for good development. His proposal does the following:

- Converts residential parking to a per bedroom requirement for multifamily developments
- Formalizes a shared parking procedure
- Gives the option for a parking demand study as an alternative to listed minimums

He shared the parking standard comparisons with neighboring municipalities – Lansdale Borough, Lower Salford and Montgomery Townships. He sought the other Supervisors' feedback, specifically their thoughts on spaces per dwelling unit.

Supervisor Gaynor asked for clarification on the current space requirement for townhouses and apartments. Supervisor Osei noted it depends on the district. Supervisor Gaynor followed up that it seemed the proposal would potentially increase parking for such dwellings with 2 spots. Supervisor Osei explained the increase.

Supervisor Morgan noted she hesitates due to concerns about what can happen when people have guests over. Supervisor Osei described how the proposal applies to guest parking.

Chair Snyder also sees an issue with limited spaces, drawing on her personal experience, adding she sees both sides of the issue for minimums. She noted Supervisor Osei made good points and appreciated his deep dive of the issue.

Supervisor Morgan asked Supervisor Osei what the Planning Commission's feedback was when he presented to them. He indicated that they were generally supportive but had similar concerns to Supervisor Morgan. They thought 1.5 per bedroom was okay and encouraged the current reserved parking. Supervisor Gaynor asked for an explanation of reserved parking and its enforcement. Solicitor Hosterman explained how the Township retains the ability to enforce additional parking.

Supervisor Morgan asked for clarification on space minimums. Supervisor Osei responded, then asked for the Supervisors thoughts. The Board had a brief discussion about what they considered appropriate, ultimately proposing 1-bedroom = 1.25; 2-bedroom = 2.25, with a maximum of 3 spaces. Supervisor Osei stated he would obtain Planning Commission feedback on those proposed numbers.

Supervisor Warner shared that she attended the Planning Commission meeting and recalled them suggesting, in addition to the reserved parking requirement, engineering the space so it would be considered pervious space, such as stone or grass areas, that could be used as overflow parking when needed. She finds that is a better solution than eliminating it completely, especially for residential property. She's open to reducing some of the commercial parking but has no issue with the current process of businesses approaching the Township for waivers. She feels each request is unique and that creating an ordinance to cover all scenarios would be difficult. She feels no matter what the Township will receive waiver requests. Supervisor Osei said he is open to looking into permeable space. However, he noted that preparing land for permeable space impacts the environment. He noted the Township is granting variances on a case-by-case basis, suggesting applicants go to the Zoning Hearing Board claiming the Township rules are not enforceable. He offered additional rationale why he feels parking requirements need to be changed.

In response to Supervisor Warner's point, Supervisor Gaynor asked Supervisor Osei to review the proposed changes for commercial property. Supervisor Osei responded there are no proposed changes, but rather allowing a parking study as an alternative would address the commercial piece. Supervisor Gaynor clarified that a commercial business would commission a study to determine necessary parking and submit it to the Township for ratification; Supervisor Osei agreed.

Supervisor Morgan noted it makes sense to make the process more efficient, citing the burden of hiring experienced professionals to conduct reviews, which, in her opinion, wastes Township tax dollars and resources. She said that alone would eliminate extra steps. She also likes the reserved parking option and being able to revisit if there is not enough.

Supervisor Gaynor asked if the reserved parking reverts to whatever use the owner would like for that space or remain reserved parking after two years. Solicitor Hosterman indicated it could be for any set period, when that time expires, the developer would conduct a post-study to determine where they land. From his experience, the space typically remains reserved parking even if it is not necessary; that's not to say the owner cannot request a change before the Board. Supervisor Gaynor noted she preferred the Township's ability to enforce keeping the reserved parking.

Supervisor Morgan asked what date would be used to determine the space requirements, referencing concerns for how long a structure may take to fill up to confirm adequate parking. It was suggested there could be an occupancy clause; Solicitor Hosterman said that would be detailed.

Supervisor Gaynor thinks it is important to reduce barriers to getting businesses into the Township and to reduce staff time and taxpayer dollars; having a structured way is an improvement.

Resident Tiffanie Stanton noted she had no issue with the thoughts expressed regarding industrial. However, for residential, she does not feel that ordinances should be drafted based on personal experiences, opinions, needs, or wants. She suggested that data is available and that these decisions should be based on actual data, which she did not see in the presentation. She feels it is very important to consider visitor parking when making these decisions. She also suggested that they consider that developments being built will most likely not have street parking available nearby.

Resident Lisa Lieb agreed that free spaces need to be available for visitors. She shared a personal experience of living in a townhome that did not offer enough parking. She stressed the importance of extra parking, echoing the comment about street parking, noting there is none.

Supervisor Warner added this is a community people move to for Turnpike access, therefore most need a car. The more bedrooms, the more likely the need for additional space, even if it is not used in the early years while families grow. She feels for this reason the Township is slightly unique.

New Business

Warrant List

The July warrant list, totaling \$1,406,585.61, was presented for approval. On a motion by Supervisor Warner, seconded by Supervisor Gaynor, the Board approved the warrant list.

Voting Yes: Joyce F. Snyder, Vanessa Gaynor, Kristin Warner, Kofi Osei, Courtney Morgan
Voting No: N/A
Abstaining: N/A
Absent: N/A

Consider Proposal for Repair Services to Arneth House

Last fall the Arneth house, located at 2380 Kriebel Road, sustained structural damage to the basement foundation wall and deck due to a vehicular accident. An insurance claim was opened. The Township sought three proposals for repair/restoration services. Staff recommended the proposal by McCarthy Masonry & Concrete, Inc. for \$23,760, considering it was a recommended contractor by the insurance trust and had the most comprehensive work scope among the three estimates. The proposed cost will be covered by insurance, minus the \$1,000 deductible.

On a motion by Supervisor Morgan, seconded by Supervisor Gaynor, the Board approved the proposal for repair services to Arneth House.

Voting Yes: Joyce F. Snyder, Vanessa Gaynor, Kristin Warner, Kofi Osei, Courtney Morgan
Voting No: N/A
Abstaining: N/A
Absent: N/A

Consider Proposal for Demolition Services to Arneth Barn

In late May, the metal roof structure of the barn, adjacent to the Arneth house, was reported to be loose. Considering its age (100 year estimate) and significant wear, Township staff requested a structural engineer to assess the barn's condition. The report indicated that the wood frame structure is in critical condition and unsafe for occupancy and storage, with a recommendation for demolition. Township received three quotes to demolish the barn structure and recommends the proposal from Giuliani and Sons for a cost of \$17,300.

On a motion by Supervisor Osei, seconded by Supervisor Gaynor, the Board approved the proposal for demolition services to the Arneth Barn.

Voting Yes: Joyce F. Snyder, Vanessa Gaynor, Kristin Warner, Kofi Osei, Courtney Morgan
Voting No: N/A
Abstaining: N/A
Absent: N/A

Supervisor Osei noted that he reviewed Fischer's Park Master Plan, which identified issues in 1998 and 2009. He wanted to make the point that historic preservation costs money and planning, and that if the Township is not going to commit those dollars, it is safer to demolish.

Police Department Overnight Training Request

Chief Troxel has requested approval for four officers to attend the PA State Police Crash Reconstruction Seminar in Mount Pocono from September 21 to 24. The training program is held annually as update and refresher training for accident reconstructionists. The officers attending are certified accident reconstructionists, members of the North Penn Regional Crash Team, and the primary investigators of all serious crashes in Towamencin and the North Penn region. The cost of the training will be covered under the police department's 2026 training budget.

On a motion by Supervisor Wawrner, seconded by Supervisor Gaynor, the Board approved the Police Department's overnight training request.

Voting Yes: Joyce F. Snyder, Vanessa Gaynor, Kristin Warner, Kofi Osei, Courtney Morgan
Voting No: N/A
Abstaining: N/A
Absent: N/A

There being no additional business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Colleen Ehrle', written in black ink.

Colleen Ehrle
Assistant Township Manager

The submitted plan by Simone Collins is well thought out, thorough and professionally presented. I am not criticizing the whole of it. The Surveys, Market analysis and many of the suggestions are great tools for us to utilize. Much time, effort and expertise on their part went into this document. For that I thank them. Where ideas are subjective. I do want to offer an alternative perspective. Two most concern me.

1. Higher density in return for open space. In another vein, private space decreased in exchange for more open public space.
2. Affordability. I'd like to add perspective to this pervading concern.

Firstly, pockets of denser living already exist, and new ones have recently been approved. I share the alarm of many that too much density, and in every new development will alter the balance of every type of home we currently have. My counter is private space is also open space and has many community benefits. Having a yard big or small is the reason for Suburbs versus city. I share the concern for our environment and prefer to change hearts and minds to the ideas of landscaping with more natives and noninvasive ground covers vs. solid lawn over eliminating the idea of yards. Personal space boosts happiness to individuals and families. It allows a place where entertainment, creativity and hobbies can be done without infringing on others. Personal space allows children and pets to play while more easily supervised. People tend to plant

roots, grow families and contribute to their communities in a positive way where they are happy. Cottage industries that benefit the greater community (such as honey, eggs, fruits, vegetables, flowers and herbs) come from our yards and gardens. In the past we built smaller homes that allowed outdoor space on smaller lots. Smaller homes can be very smartly designed to allow larger, more modern living. We should seek some of this versus density everywhere there is space to build.

Secondly, no planning is void of affordability concerns. I am as shocked and dismayed as the next person with modern home prices. As I write this, I have three 20 something children and more than a dozen nieces and nephews all at or close to the age of leaving their family home in search of their independence. All within our tri-county area and with a desire to own a home. I have great concern for their ability to achieve consistency with my generation let alone my desire for them to exceed the levels of past generations.

Cost increases can be attributed to many factors. One is the demand for increased size and modern amenities. Environmental and land development requirements also increase the cost of building. Rising construction supply prices and labor is still another. The problem is multifaceted with no easy solutions. I don't believe higher density will solve the complexity of affordability. One Township cannot take the whole on and should not at the expense of the quality of life for the residents who already live here.

I'd like to address the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC) Indicators of Potential Disadvantage section

beginning page 23. Labeling any area as a disadvantage to affordability overlooks the history of how the value of the homes within were achieved. It ignores the context of homeowners who worked to invest and reinvest over a long period. I respectfully question whether this index accurately evaluates affordability. Most of the homes in the whole of our township were built and acquired in a time when costs were greater than half what they are today. This analysis potentially penalizes current residents who worked and sacrificed for their homes and their community. Rising home values do not exist in isolation. They have occurred along with rising costs and interest rates. Many residents are only “house rich” with cash flow in a lesser category. They cannot afford to reap the better values they achieved over time repairing and improving their neighborhoods. It is unfair to label neighborhoods as inaccessible because its residents chose to sacrifice and invest their limited resources of time and earnings over the long haul. Home ownership, investment and reinvestment in one’s community should be applauded and sought not penalized. I asked that the DVRPC analysis be removed, prior to the final plan, on the basis that it did not consider the historical context of the improved values over time. I do not agree with the conclusions made in this faulty analysis.

Communities are made of individuals, each of us distinct and unique including our history and perspectives. A perfect plan that meets every individual’s needs and desires is impossible. First, because resources are limited and second, every single one of us envisions a unique utopia. Good governance seeks balance and

compromise of our competing interests. We should strive for proportional open space vs density vs private space vs cost.

Smart, creative planning can help us to modernize while keeping true to the rural history of the land we in this community call home. Growth / development must be allowed but I ask, with caution, to maintain the balance we have now.

I respectfully submit my perspective alongside this comprehensive Plan in the year of America 250. May our country continue to thrive through the hiccups and challenges and may Towamencin Township grow responsibly, smartly and happily.

Sincerely,

Kristin Warner,

Supervisor, Treasurer and Citizen