

**Planning Commission Meeting
MINUTES**

February 2, 2005

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by Jim Brownlow, chairman, and opened with the *Pledge of Allegiance*.

Members present: Jim Brownlow, Scott Douglas, Walt French, Pete Lamana, Barbara Lindtner and Barbara Schmoyer. Absent: Brad Schultz. Bob Wynn, Township Engineer, was present.

Planning Commission Comments: Jim Brownlow raised an issue brought to his attention by Pete Lamana regarding incomplete submissions that have been accepted by the Township for review. He stated there are certain things that are required when a subdivision or land development application is submitted for the submission to be considered “complete.” These items are listed in the Subdivision & Land Development Ordinance booklet. In particular, Reed Lane and Cohen Subdivisions are incomplete, according to the guidelines in our subdivision ordinances. Bob Wynn noted that Reese Major Subdivision, accepted under “New Business,” is also incomplete. He wrote to the applicant advising them of this.

Walt French suggested that whoever is accepting submissions should have a checklist and not accept the plans if they are not complete. The acceptance procedure will be reviewed with the Township Manager, Engineer and Solicitor, and a checklist to guide applicants and Township personnel will be considered.

Pete Lamana commented on the article in the Sunday, January 30, 2005, issue of *The Morning Call* about over development in Forks Township. He indicated that it is important that we be consistent in following the guidelines in our Subdivision Ordinances to prevent this from occurring in Springfield Township.

Approval of Minutes - Scott Douglas requested an additional paragraph be added to the minutes of the January 12, 2005, meeting, including Mr. MacPhee’s comments regarding hydraulic loading. The portion from the taped minutes regarding that topic given here is to be added prior to the last paragraph in the Springtown Country Manor discussion:

In response to concerns about hydraulic loading raised by Scott Douglas, Mr. MacPhee stated that one of the main ideas of a sand mound is that evaporation transpiration will take care of a major part of the water load. If it does not, then the sand mound has not been designed the way it is supposed to be. So, theoretically, you should not get the load that you would get out of an in-ground system. He felt that hydraulic loading of the system from the waste water management design would not be an issue. The rock is stable enough, even with the open cracks/joints that are in it, because the elevation of the site is such that it promotes rapid drainage down to the water table, which is probably 80-90 feet down. The sand mounds are supposed to get most of that water up in the air. He has, on occasion, set monitoring wells to check them to see if they do flood. If they do not, the sand mound is doing what it should be doing. With the normal load from a septic system being about 300-500 gallons a day, he doubted whether the load out of a sand mound exceeds 100 gallons per day. Through the farming cycle, this site has been exposed to different hydraulic loads repeatedly in the past. Before it was in the farming cycle, it had a much lighter hydraulic load. He noted that although he is a geologist, not a hydrologist, he does not feel the impact from the development itself would affect the creeks, assuming that the sand mounds work the way they are supposed to.

With this change being added, Pete Lamana **moved**, Scott Douglas **seconded**, that the minutes of the January 12, 2005, meeting be adopted as changed. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Public Comment on Agenda Items – None

Sketch Plans

Callowhill Sketch Plan – NE corner of Locust Valley Rd & Trolley Bridge Road – Mr. Scott Mill, Van Cleef Engineering Associates, presented for Callowhill Construction. Applicant Piero Corrado, Callowhill Construction, was also present. They requested an informal discussion of this plan, which consists of approximately 107 acres. This plan is unique in that it encompasses four townships and two counties—22 acres in Springfield Township (Bucks County), 38 acres in Upper Saucon (Lehigh County), another 35 in Lower Milford (Lehigh County) and the final 15 in Milford Township (Bucks County). There are three outparcels that are completely contained within this site, the largest parcel is 4+ acres and is owned by Mrs. Connell. The other two are one-acre parcels, one owned by Mr. Cummings and the other owned by Mr. Applebaum.

The site has frontage on Locust Valley Road, in Lehigh County, and Trolley Bridge Road, which is split between Lehigh and Bucks counties. The Springfield portion of the site does not have any public roads running through it. Proposed in the 22+ acres in the DD district of Springfield Township are 6 dwelling units on parcels of approximately 3½ acres each, the smallest being 2½ acres and the largest 6 ½ acres with frontage being on a closed access road that would run adjacent to the Bucks/Lehigh and Upper Saucon/Springfield Township lines.

There are three power lines running through the site, both MetEd and PP&L running through the back portion of the Springfield Township portion. There are approximately 5 acres of woodlands on the site and earth disturbance would be less than the 50% maximum permitted in the DD district.

There are three issues Mr. Mill especially wanted to discuss. The first relates to the lot depth to width ratio of the six proposed lots in Springfield Township. There are negotiations in progress with Mrs. Connell about conveying a portion of the land from the upper edge of the MetEd easement to the back of the complete parcel to her, so that the six Springfield lot lines would then end at the MetEd easement line and the land behind that easement line would belong to Mrs. Connell. If this conveyance occurs, the lot depth to width issue would not be an issue.

The second issue is that the frontage along the closed road cannot run exactly along the county line from Mrs. Connell's property to Lot 3. Essentially, Lots 1 and 2 would have their frontage in Upper Saucon Township while most of the lot area would be in Springfield Township.

The third item is the proposed cul-de-sac length. The proposed roadway is completely in Upper Saucon Township, and would be dedicated to Upper Saucon. Their regulations are a maximum cul-de-sac length of 1,000 lineal feet and a maximum of 25 dwellings permitted off of the cul-de-sac. Springfield's requirements for a cul-de-sac are 500' with 12 dwellings off it. An 800' cul-de-sac is being proposed with a total of 9 dwellings having access off of it—6 in Springfield and 3 in Upper Saucon.

Discussion was opened to the Members. The primary concern was that if the land in the rear portion of Springfield Township is deeded to Mrs. Connell, that the land be deed restricted from further development. Although the land is currently an easement to two utility companies, Mr. Mill felt that deed restriction would be possible. On-lot water and sewer are being proposed for each lot. A 28' curbed road is proposed with a 50' right-of-way.

Because of the complexity of this proposed subdivision, Upper Saucon has requested comments from our Township throughout the review process, beginning with the sketch plan review. Jim Brownlow instructed the secretary to forward minutes to Mr. Pidcock, Upper Saucon Engineer, each time this subdivision is reviewed.

Rolling Hill Estates – Rte 212 & Slifer Valley Road – Attorney Robert Gundlach presented for the applicant, Bob Harrington. A representative from Boucher & James was also present. Mr. Gundlach briefly reviewed the 3 plan sheets submitted to the Township. The shaded areas depict the areas planned for development; the unshaded areas will be preserved as agricultural. Mr. Gundlach then stated that they planned to substantially revise the plan presented this evening in order to preserve a larger, single area of open space.

This site is owned by the Rapp's and was the subject of a prior subdivision application which received final conditional subdivision plan approval for 26 lots in June of 1990. Because this applicant has elected a B-12 option (rather than a B-11 single-family option, which the prior plan was approved for), this plan is being submitted as a new submission, and is not being submitted as an amended version of the approved 1990 plan.

The current plan proposes 36 lots; however Comment #1 of Mr. Wynn's letter indicates the engineering firm used the wrong set of site capacity calculations on this plan. Those site capacity calculations will be revised and on the new plans they will submit to the Township as a sketch plan in March, there will be an increase of the open space from the 29± acres on the present sketch plan up to 50+ acres. The applicant is considering using the Option 1 cluster concept utilizing ½ acre lots, thereby permitting greater areas of open space. If that concept is utilized, the thought is to consolidate 34 – 36 lots near Route 212 and preserve the center of the site and the portion near Slifer Valley Road. Mr. Gundlach senses from our current ordinances that clustering is the preferred option, but he requested the preference of the Commission: keep the homes in one corner and keep the remaining 70% of the site as open space or to lot the tract out.

Following a question about the quality of the soils for agriculture, Mr. Gundlach advised that the better quality of soils in the plan they are considering would be in the preserved open area.

On-site community discharge sewage systems will be proposed with each home having an on-lot tank that drains to a community area within the open space utilizing some type of drip or sand mound system. The Members preferred that the open space area remain at 60 – 70% and that the sand mound be kept separate from the preserved agricultural space. Mr. Gundlach stated they would attempt to comply with these preferences in the sketch plan they will prepare for their next presentation.

The Members also requested that the cluster concept appear more like a village than a development and that the scenic roadway character of Route 212 be preserved. Mr. Gundlach said that with ½ acre lots, this could be challenging to do, but they would study the concept.

Referring to Item 8 of Bob Wynn’s review letter pertaining to street improvements, Mr. Gundlach stated the required road improvements would greatly affect the preservation of the scenic roadway character of the rural streets.

Following questions about road safety issues because of increased traffic, Members were advised that if it was a concern, a full traffic study would be done, roads would be widened, stormwater improvements put in and possibly sidewalks and curbs. This would not give the same scenic vista feel that now exists, but it would provide a safer roadway network. There needs to be a balancing of these two concepts at this time and they will attempt to blend the two—address the safety issues yet maintain as much as possible the scenic vista of the area—prior to the next sketch submission.

Regarding water for these homes, Mr. Gundlach noted that there is public water on Route 212 approximately three-quarters of a mile from the site which they plan to investigate as well as looking into a community system on the site.

Mr. Brownlow opened the floor for comments from residents in attendance.

Bob Fleishman, an adjoining land owner on the Slifer Valley side of the tract whose land is all in open space, pointed out that with the proposed move of the homes to the Route 212 side of the site, it will in effect create a block of 140 acres of open space, much of which is actually being farmed. If the homes are placed on the Slifer Valley side, the continuity of the 140 acres will be destroyed. He already has runoff from the site and if homes are placed there, it will increase this runoff onto his property. His farm is also one of the headwaters of Cooks Creek and ultimately, the runoff will go right into Cooks Creek. Mr. Gundlach noted that the applicant is willing to dedicate or restrict the open space to the Township.

Ken Simmons, who lives at the end of Slifer Valley Road, was active on the Water Board for over 5 years. He stated that questions concerning water and water management are critical issues and this site (being uphill from the water source in Springtown) presents a number of water issues that need to be solved before any talk about plot layout can be constructive.

David Yates, who lives on Peppermint Road, also expressed concern about the water supply for the whole area with the number of homes that are being considered in this development.

Bill Dunlap shared a number of concerns encompassing water, sewerage and primarily the scenic view. He has deed-restricted his own property in order to retain the character of our Township. He encouraged the Commission to do everything they can to preserve what people have moved here to enjoy—the rural character of our Township.

Another neighbor expressed concern over who would maintain the sewage system if there was a failure, etc. She felt it would be better to put nice homes on larger lots that fit into the community and not making it look like a development with all the homes so close together. Barbara Lindtner pointed out that if large lots were used it would make it impossible to maintain a large agricultural area. The neighbor questioned what quality homes were planned for the lots and was advised by the Attorney that the homes planned were large, single family homes ranging in price from about \$500,000 to \$700,000. They will be comparable to the homes in the High Meadows development.

Bobb Carson brought up a historical point regarding the prior subdivision approved for this site. He stated that the plan was a bone of major contention between the Planning Commission and the Supervisors. The Planning Commission unanimously recommended to the supervisors that plotting it out in two-acre lots be rejected. At that time, the Planning Commission felt we needed to preserve a large piece of high quality farmland and that this particular piece of land is a signature view scape in the township which defines the rural character of the Township. For those reasons, the Commission was pushing very hard for a cluster arrangement, hidden as well as could be done, and retaining the open space. The applicant at that time refused to even consider a cluster, abandoned the Planning Commission and went directly to the Supervisors who approved the plan that he presented. The original plan is a very bad plan for many reasons. There are lots that are split by wetlands where people can’t go from one half of their lot to the other while on their own properties.

Barbara Lindtner summarized that she felt the applicant has indicated a willingness to go to the cluster concept and that we should give them the opportunity to redesign the tract and come back again. She hopes that the development can be designed so that if you are driving on Route 212 and look over, it looks like a village. She stated this has been done effectively in other areas of the Northeast, particularly in Rhode Island, Connecticut and Massachusetts.

The applicant agreed to redesign the plan with comments in mind that had been shared from the Commission and from the residents.

Pete Lamana suggested that EAC and the Cooks Creek Watershed Association be involved throughout this plan because of issues relating to Cooks Creek associated with this development. It was determined that both groups would be invited to attend a future meeting so that their counsel could be obtained in the planning stages.

Confirmed Appointments

Reed Lane Subdivision – Because the submission was incomplete, Barbara Lindtner **moved** to table discussion until all required information has been submitted. Pete Lamana **seconded**; motion **passed** unanimously. Mr. Gundlach, Eastburn & Grey, speaking for the applicant, apologized for the incomplete submission and stated they will resubmit the plan with the planning modules and all required plan items and grant whatever extensions may be necessary.

Perfecta Awnings Land Development – Brian Nixon, Engineer, presented for Mr. Pozzuto, the owner and applicant. This property is located on Springfield Street near Route 309. As Phase I, the owner wishes to construct a 4,480 square foot warehouse at the rear of his existing structure. In the future, he plans to construct an adjoining 4,016 square foot warehouse as Phase II of this land development plan. Mr. Pozzuto presently employs 15 people and in the future will probably be adding an additional 5 employees.

Mr. Nixon gave the Members a waiver request letter which had been revised as a result of comments made in Mr. Wynn's January 13 review letter. He stated the waivers are not new but are revisions of the originals. He then requested that he be permitted to go through Mr. Wynn's letter beginning with Item 1.

1. Parking – Applicant feels that parking is more than adequate with 20 spots for present and future employees and another 12 for customers. Bob Wynn indicated that the number of actual employees needs to be documented. Mr. Nixon will comply with that request.
2. Steep Slope Disturbance – The former Reading Railroad line is between this property and Route 309. Naceville Materials is to the North and East of this property. Some excavation will be done on this property to put the proposed warehouses at the same level as existing buildings. They propose to put the excavated material on top of an area to the rear of the property that is considered *steep slope*.

With regard to the waiver requests:

1. Section 513 (sidewalks) in the December 1 waiver letter has been expanded in the letter presented this evening to request waivers from doing any repairs or alterations to Springfield Street, to include Section 505.16, Drainage Improvements and Cartway Reconstruction; Section 506.4A, Street Standards; Section 512, Curbing; and Section 513, Sidewalks (covered in 3.A of Bob Wynn's January 13, 2005, review letter).

Bob Wynn did not feel that this waiver would present a problem.

2. Section 515.2 (landscaping of off-street parking area) in the applicant's December 1 waiver letter remains the same and is covered in 3.B of Bob Wynn's review letter. This waiver request is to replace the 10 evergreen trees that were not installed as part of a previous Land Development approval granted in 2001. This deficiency is noted in Item 10 of Bob Wynn's review letter. Mr. Nixon was not aware that the pine trees required in the original 2001 subdivision were for storm water purposes, not for decorative purposes. Thus, landscaping the parking lot is a separate issue from the 10 evergreens that are required to bring the previous subdivision into compliance. The applicant will plant the evergreen trees to satisfy the original subdivision requirement. The secretary was instructed to check whether the Township has every received the stormwater management and inspection fee of \$1,225 for the prior Land Development waiver project. (Upon checking, this fee was paid to the township in December 2001 and Mr. Nixon was advised of this on 2/3/05.)
3. Section 516 (stormwater management requirements), Item 3.C in Bob Wynn's review letter – This waiver request was based on information in an outdated Stormwater Ordinance book. Plan needs to be revised to comply with requirements of the current Stormwater Management Ordinance.
4. Section 517.1 (excavation and grading), is covered in Item 3.D in Bob Wynn's review letter.

Pete Lamana **moved** that we recommend approval of the waiver for items mentioned in Item 3.A of Bob Wynn's January 13, 2005, review letter pertaining to sidewalks, curbing and street improvements to Springfield Street. Walt French **seconded**; the motion **passed** unanimously.

Pete Lamana **moved** that we recommend approval of the waiver requested in Item 3.B of Bob Wynn's review letter relating to landscaping. After discussion, and pending resolution of several issues still remaining, Pete **withdrew** his motion.

With respect to water and sewer, current water usage is approximately 88 gallons per day. The existing septic system tank is adequate to handle 400 gallons per day and this will be addressed with the health department.

As relating to the detailed water resource study, Mr. Nixon asked that this not be required because of the very small amount of water used. Because this is required in SLDO Section 519, it will be necessary.

Additional discussion and action on this Land Development plan will be held pending compliance with the outstanding items in Bob Wynn's January 13, 2005, review letter.

Brian Lloyd Subdivision – Todd Myers, Cowan Associates, presented for the applicant Brian Lloyd, who was also present. As directed by the Planning Commission Mr. Myers met with Tim Fulmer of Bob Wynn's office at the site on January 14. They reviewed the swale and shoulder improvement that our Engineer would like to see. Mr. Cowan is preparing those plans; his client is willing to comply with the recommendations for roadside swale improvements and replacement of the existing driveway pipe for Lot 1 as noted in Item 1 of Tim Fulmer's January 18, 2005, review letter. Todd was asked to clean up the remaining items and come back in March for approval.

Cohen Subdivision – Mike Carr, Attorney with Eastburn & Gray, opened the presentation for the applicant. Keith Newberry, an engineer from Thomas H. Crews, Inc., made the technical presentation. Mr. Newberry presented copies of the Sewage Facilities Planning Module stamped by the Bucks County Department of Health which was copied for each of the members. Referring to Bob Wynn's review letter of January 14, 2005, Mr. Newberry stated there were a number of "will comply" items and several issues they wished to discuss.

The first and most important issue for discussion is whether or not a special exception will be required for the existing culvert which provides stream crossing for the driveway of Lot 1. Should this be necessary, because of the lengthy process involved in the Zoning Hearing Board process, assuming they can get land development approval, they would prefer to go to the Zoning Hearing Board and get all the necessary permits as a condition of the approval as opposed to a prerequisite.

This is a 3-lot subdivision of 44 acres. The prior subdivision was the Peckham subdivision. The lower lot line of Lot 1 was established in its location to keep the existing culvert that provided access for the farm road within that lot with the thought that it would eventually be used for a driveway. The section that Bob Wynn is referring to in Discussion Item 1.A is Section 509 which states you can cross a stream with a culvert if you obtain a Special Exception approval. Mr. Newberry's contention is that this was previously disturbed and is not a natural resource that was designed to be protected by the area where that road goes through, as described in Section 509 of the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Wynn feels that the applicant needs a Special Exception and a DEP permit for the existing culvert; however, Mr. Newberry suggests that if it has been there for an indeterminate, long period of time, and it doesn't need to change to address any deficiencies and it is deemed satisfactory from a functionality and serviceability standpoint, going through the Special Exception process seems unnecessary. Mr. Wynn suggested that after the applicant has submitted the required calculations, he will take a close look at the culvert and take some digital photographs of the culvert and after review, will determine to what extent any work will be required to the driveway.

Scott Douglas pointed out that on tributaries of Cooks Creek, a semi-enclosed culvert is the environmentally preferred application. He described this as a half-pipe that leaves the bottom open. This type is easier to maintain, plus the ecological functionality of that portion of the stream stays intact.

With regard to a number of comments in Bob Wynn's letter that address the location of natural resources, i.e. flood plains and wetlands margins, Mr. Newberry discussed with Tim Fulmer (Bob Wynn's office) that rather than doing hydraulic/hydrologic/wetland studies, would it be satisfactory for the applicant to create a conservation easement that more than encompasses the areas in question? If so, he would discuss with his client putting as much of the land into a conservation easement as possible and tighten up the building envelopes as much as they can.

Walt French asked if the applicant would be willing to deed restrict these lots from further subdivision. Mr. Newberry will explore this possibility with the Cohens.

Following questions about driveways on the proposed lots, Mr. Newberry stated they wish to take advantage of the terrain and to cause the least amount of disturbance possible.

Referring to the lot line issues raised in Item 3 of Tim Fulmer's January 14, 2005, review letter, the applicant will comply with revising lot lines where possible to be compliant with our ordinances. Waivers will be submitted where adjustment of lot lines is not possible. Again, if deed restriction is possible, there is less concern in granting waivers for lot line anomalies.

Basically, all other issues raised in Tim Fulmer's letters are "will comply" issues. Members pointed out that particular attention needs to be paid to the stormwater runoff issues associated with this property and its proximity to Bodder Road and the creek.

Rather than recommend approval, the Members suggested that because of the number of outstanding issues in this plan, the applicant resolve as many of the issues as possible and return next month for possible approval. Mr. Newberry agreed with their suggestion.

New Business

Reese Major Subdivision – This plan is incomplete in that it was submitted without planning modules or stormwater. Bob Wynn suggested that the Township write a letter to the applicant and his agent(s) advising them it will not be reviewed until all required plan components are submitted.

Draft Text for Revision of High Priority Zoning Ordinances – Minutes of the January 20, 2005, Joint Meeting of the Supervisors/Planning Commission were provided to the Members. Also provided were copies of the revision of the text decided upon at that meeting, as well as draft text for the comprehensive revision of the Zoning Ordinance. These items were received in the Township office on Tuesday, February 1, and Wednesday, February 2 (the morning of this meeting), and thus could not be forwarded to the Members in time for them to review them prior to tonight's meeting.

Jim Brownlow **moved** to recommend this draft on to the Supervisors to advertise and hold hearings on this High Priority Revision.

Bob Wynn pointed out on page 2 of this draft there is a section on watercourse margins. It states now that:

“watercourse margins shall be required that shall extend 125’ from each side of the center of the average water level of a stream”

The Members stated that changes should be made prior to it getting to the Supervisors. Scott Douglas agreed this is hydrologically inaccurate wording, and that measurements should be from the center of the bed of the watercourse. This change will be made in the draft by the Township office prior to the draft being given to the Supervisors next Tuesday, February 8.

Pete Lamana **seconded** the motion; it **passed** unanimously. The secretary questioned whether this motion will require the draft to go to the Supervisors as it is even though the Members have not had an opportunity to read through this revision. Scott Douglas said that if the members have further changes, they should get them to the Township before the Supervisors meeting or show up at the Supervisors meeting with suggested changes.

Public Comments - None

Planning Commission Comments – Barbara Lindtner stated that conservation of agricultural soils needs to be strengthened in our ordinances. Currently, there is nothing in our ordinances that clearly states that agricultural soil needs to be protected as a farmable unit. The Members noted that this is addressed on page 3 of the current High Priority Zoning Amendment draft that was recommended to the Supervisors.

Bob Wynn stated that the wording in the draft is very vague and needs to be strengthened. He suggested that we contact Bedminster and/or East Rockhill to obtain their ordinance wording on this topic. Bedminster has a very strong ordinance; however, it was challenged in court. East Rockhill wrote their ordinance after the legal challenge of Bedminster's ordinance, so theirs might be the preferred one to use. Mrs. Everitt will contact Charlie Schmell and ask that he make this revision before this goes to the Supervisors next Tuesday.

Scott Douglas stated that the Rolling Hills Plan has some major headwater issues. Although he did not bring all of these concerns up during the sketch review, those watercourses are both headwater streams. They are marked as *wetlands* because they are not considered *watercourses*, which is an issue that was alluded to in the discussion tonight. The Cooks Creek Water Shed Association would like to address this issue. This area falls into the Source Water Protection Plan Zone that has been delineated by Spotts, Stevens and McCoy. The first area that it makes sense to map these new headwaters is in the upper Township area around Silver Creek, basically the delineated zone of influence for the source water protection. Scott has a 17-year-old Boy Scout who wants an Eagle Scout project to do. Cooks Creek Water Shed has all the technical things worked out and this can be done with hand-held GPS units. Scott proposes that we begin the mapping process in the Silver Creek area. To begin this process, it will be necessary for the Township to send out a letter similar to the one sent out to the Tohickon Water Shed group property owners to all the property owners in the proposed mapping area advising them there may be people coming on their properties to look at the stream courses and to do a condition survey. Scott will supply the text of the previous letter used and also the names and addresses of the property owners so that this can be done.

He also advised that Lower Saucon is reviewing this at their meeting this evening. Jeff Mease, Zoning Officer, needs to know whether he will be permitted to use a map obtained by this process to enforce zoning regulations. According to Bob Wynn, if the Supervisors adopt the map as “official” and make it a formal appendix to our Zoning Ordinance, it does not need to be adopted by some other body. Bob did indicate that on a case-by-case basis it may need to be “defended,” but no other

“endorsement” is required prior to utilizing it in zoning if we officially adopt the map. Scott asked whether the Members had any concerns about having this young man and a group of his friends go out, with adult supervision, to do this mapping. The letter to residents in the survey area would need to be authorized by the Supervisors and then come from the Township Office on Township letterhead. Jim Brownlow said Scott to consider to bring this about. He could request this to the Supervisors as an individual, but Jim feels it would have more credence if it was recommended to the Supervisors by the Planning Commission.

Scott Douglas **moved** that the Planning Commission recommend to the Supervisors that they authorize the Township to send a letter to notify property owners in the proposed Source Water Protection Area that there will be a resource/condition survey of Cooks Creek in their area. Pete Lamana **seconded**; the motion **passed** unanimously.

Old Business

The fourth meeting of the Joint Zoning Ordinance Revision group will be held on Thursday, February 17, and the public is invited to attend.

Adjournment

At 10:20 p.m., Scott Douglas **moved** to adjourn the meeting. Barbara Lindtner **seconded** the motion; it **passed** unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra L. Everitt
Secretary
Next Meeting: March 2, 2005