

**Planning Commission Meeting  
MINUTES**

April 5, 2006

The meeting was called to order at 7:04 p.m. by Chairperson Barbara Lindtner and opened with the *Pledge of Allegiance*.

Members present: Jim Brownlow, Stefanie Campbell, Bobb Carson, Scott Douglas, Walt French, Pete Lamana and Barbara Lindtner. Bob Wynn, engineer, of C. Robert Wynn Associates, was present.

There were a number of residents present.

**Planning Commission Work Session**

There was a lengthy discussion about the *proposed gun/shooting ordinance*, which is a concern to many residents. The following were the highlights of this discussion:

1. Barbara Lindtner suggested that because of the complexity of this issue and the need for careful study before implementing such an ordinance, that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors that this be handled as an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance. The Zoning Ordinance is almost completed and she doesn't feel it is wise to hold up the process of getting the whole Zoning Ordinance in place.
2. Jim Brownlow does not feel that it is necessary to approach the Board about this, as the Board has delegated the responsibility of recommending new Zoning Ordinances to the Planning Commission. He and the other Planning Commission members also feel it is best not to hold up the full Zoning Ordinance, but to deal with this separately as an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance.
3. The Planning Commission requested Charlie Schmehl to come up with a model ordinance as well as getting input from the NRA and other townships. The Recording Secretary will request input from the PSATS Discussion Group about ordinances in place in other Townships that are working well for them.

Pete Lamana discussed the increase in traffic in our Township that will occur as a result of development. He specifically referred to a March 25, 2006, Morning Call article about a large development in Upper Hanover Township (Montgomery County). Pete stated that we routinely waive road improvements because of the rural nature of the Township, but he and other Planning Commission Members feel that there needs to be discussion with our solicitor and the Supervisors about how we can obtain funds from developers to assist the Township in road maintenance and/or improvement.

## Approval of Minutes

Barbara Lindtner **moved**, Pete Lamana **seconded**, that the minutes of the March 1, 2006, Planning Commission meeting be approved as corrected by Bobb Carson. The motion **passed** unanimously.

## Public Comments (Agenda Items) - None

## Confirmed Appointments

**Crossroads Major Subdivision (Old Bethlehem Pike)** – Chris Zentgraff, P.C., attorney, presented on behalf of Castle Development Group, Ltd., applicants. Scott Guidos, Van Cleef Engineering Associates, was also present and participated in the presentation.

There were a number of questions from the Commission about who would maintain the road right-of-way for the road that borders Springfield Township but is actually in Upper Saucon Township—Upper Saucon Township or the residents bordering the road. A definite determination will need to be made about this issue as this plan proceeds in the review process. There was some confusion about the interpretation of Springfield Township's SALDO Section 505.13 which may need clarification from our solicitor.

There was additional lengthy discussion about Palisades School District picking up the children from the six homes that would be located in Springfield Township. Scott Guidos estimated that the time to walk from the six homes to either of the two proposed bus stops would be approximately 15 minutes.

Walt French was concerned about the cost to Palisades School District taxpayers to transport the children from these six homes. Scott Guidos mentioned that these six homes would also be paying real estate taxes.

The Commission requested Walt French to draft a letter to Palisades School District Superintendent, copied to the President of the School Board, requesting that they reply in writing to the Planning Commission about whether the concerns expressed by their former Business Administrator Brenda Bray in her letter to Springfield Township of June 23, 2005, have been resolved to their satisfaction. Mr. Zentgraff and Mr. Guidos requested a copy of any response we receive from Palisades School District.

There was additional lengthy discussion about the David Artman (Van Cleef Surveyor) letter to the Bucks County Planning Commission about the actual boundary lines between the four townships. This letter was sent to BCPC in December 2005 and there has been no response from them to date. Barbara Lindtner felt that Springfield Township should request comment from BCPC about their interpretation of the study done by Dave Artman prior to proceeding with further discussion on this plan. If the boundary lines given by Mr. Artman are not accepted, it would significantly change the layout of the proposed subdivision.

It was noted that an adjustment had been made to the six lots that border the Met-Ed Utility Line so that all the land across the rear of those properties now is part of Lot #13. Scott Guidos also assured the Commission that the large portion of land under the Met-Ed Utility Line would be deed-restricted from any future development.

There was no action taken on this plan, pending resolution of the various issues discussed.

There was discussion about whether our SALDO addresses man-made steep slopes or just existing steep slopes. There was also discussion about the Planning Commission reviewing planning modules during the review process for a subdivision. It was requested that both these items be placed on the April 20 Zoning Revision Meeting Agenda for discussion.

### **Plans to Accept for Review Only**

**Estates of State Route (State Road) – Accepted**

**Mandarino Major Subdivision (Moyer Road) - Accepted**

**New Business - None**

### **Old Business**

The 17th Joint Meeting of the Planning Commission/Board of Supervisors Zoning Revision Team is scheduled for April 20, 2006, at 7:00 p.m.

### **Correspondence**

**Kalatas' Letter re. Springtown Knoll** – The Kalatas are concerned about the hazard they feel exists because there is no fence at the quarry edge. Because the property the Kalatas feel should be fenced does not belong to the developer, it is not their responsibility to erect a fence. The Planning Commission felt that the Township solicitor should respond to the Kalatas about their concerns.

**Mease Engineering Letter re. Rennie/Franklin LLA** – A letter dated April 4, 2006, was received from Mease Engineering indicating that Mr. Franklin had contacted their office and requested that this LLA plan be withdrawn.

### **Public Comments**

**Patrice Ryan** commented on the status of the Rolling Hills Subdivision Plan. She was advised that an extension had been given until July 31, 2006.

Rolling Hills will be notified by letter that their plan will be placed on the July Planning Commission agenda for action.

## Planning Commission Comments

Barbara Lindtner expressed concern about the number of plans that have received final approval and still have not completed the final conditions of their plan. There is a five-year period during which plan conditions can be completed. She was assured that this is carefully tracked by our Township Engineers.

Pete Lamana had some questions about a test well on the Bucks County portion of the Locust Valley Golf Club plan. Peter Centner, a Springfield Township resident who lives near this proposed development, was in attendance at this meeting. He stated that he had received a letter from Del Val saying there was going to be a test well drilled. His concern was if the test well results are satisfactory, but six months to a year later one of their wells goes dry, who would be responsible—the developer or will he, the well owner?

It was pointed out that we have only seen a sketch plan for this project. At this time, the developer is planning no lots in Springfield Township. Additionally, Upper Saucon has evidently denied the plan for an age-restricted development. The developer is now proposing 1-acre lots with individual wells and septic systems, although they would prefer to hook into the Coopersburg Sewer System, which currently cannot accept any new hook ups.

He also expressed concern about the traffic impact from this large development on the area. He lives on Blue Church Road and his home is just over a crest of a hill on the road. He asked if there was any chance to have a *Hidden Driveway* or *Slow Down* sign placed below that hill to slow the traffic down. Barbara Lindtner said that a request would need to be made to the Supervisors for signs needed on a Township Road and/or PennDOT for a State road. Barbara Lindtner suggested that Mr. Centner contact Upper Saucon Township to see if this plan is on an upcoming agenda at their township.

Mr. Centner also suggested that developers use an overhead projector or some other means of projecting plans onto a wall or screen during a meeting so that residents can see what is being discussed.

The Commission discussed changing our SALDO to require electronic plan submissions.

Clark Emann asked what the weight limit was for Knecht Bridge and was told it was 3 tons. He observed a short Palisades bus crossing the Bridge. Barbara Lindtner stated that she sees big tri-axles crossing the bridge. It was suggested that Palisades School District needed to be contacted about the bus and our police should be made aware of over-weight vehicles crossing the bridge. Richard Schilling, Township Manager, will contact our police about this. It was also pointed out that a lot of vehicles are speeding on roads posted with lower speed limits. Rich Schilling will also communicate this to our police.

Bobb Carson asked if the engineer's letter that goes to the Supervisors regarding the plans forwarded to them for recommended approval could contain the actual conditions on any of the plans that must be met before final approval. Presently, an engineer's letter listing those conditions is attached. He suggests the letter to the supervisor actually list the conditions attached to the Planning Commission's recommendation for approval.

Bobb's concern is more with the fact that historically the letter will go into the plan file, and five years from now it may be unclear to someone reading the file exactly what the actual conditions of approval were if they are not all listed in the same letter. Barbara Lindtner gave as an example the Rennie/Franklin LLA plan which did not have all the pertinent legal information attached to it when it was presented.

### **Adjournment**

At 8:55 p.m., Pete Lamana **moved** to adjourn the meeting; Scott Douglas **seconded** the motion. Motion **passed** unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra L. Everitt, Recording Secretary  
Next Meeting: May 3, 2006