

**Planning Commission Meeting  
MINUTES**

June 1, 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, Stefanie Campbell, Bobb Carson, Scott Douglas, Walt French, Pete Lamana and Barbara Lindtner. Bryan McAdam, C. Robert Wynn Associates, was present.

**Planning Commission Comments:** None

**Approval of Minutes** – Scott Douglas **moved**, Bobb Carson **seconded**, that the minutes of May 4, 2005, Planning Commission meeting be approved with one typographical correction. The motion **passed** unanimously.

**Public Comments (Agenda Items):** None

**Friendly Review:**

**Catherine Twomey (4099 Rte 212, Riegelsville)** – Todd Myers, Cowan Associates, Inc., presented for Mr. and Mrs. Twomey. The Twomeys (TMP 42-17-115) are expecting their third child and need to put an addition on the west side of their small Cape Cod home but have a very small 75' x 330' property which will not permit them to do this. Their neighbors' (Mr. and Mrs. Neeld - TMP 42-17-114) property is 2.6 acres. Both lots are in the Agricultural District. The Twomeys wish to purchase a 50' portion of land from the Neelds which runs from the new Route 212 to the old Route 212 (approximately 17,000 square feet) to enable them to build the addition. To do this, they will be moving land from one non-conforming lot to another non-conforming lot, which will require the Twomeys to go before the Zoning Hearing Board for a variance. They are requesting the input of the Planning Commission for any other issues they would need to address before they go to the expense of taking this to the Zoning Hearing Board. For example, they will be asking for waivers from curbs, sidewalks, street lights, etc. They do not plan any new impervious surface, so stormwater management should not be required. The Planning Commission did not feel there would be any problem with what was being requested if the Zoning Hearing Board granted the variance they would need.

**Sketch Plan**

**Debrigida Major Subdivision (Richlandtown Pike & Gruversville Road) - Dean Renninger, Gilmore & Associates, Inc.**, presented for the applicant, John Debrigida, who was also present. This is a 59-acre property, of which a large portion is wooded. Mr. Debrigida wants to subdivide this property (Rural Residential district) utilizing the B12 Single-family Cluster III design. The design they presented showed 13 one+-acre lots off a P-Loop street accessing Gruversville Road, as well as 3 additional one-acre lots on an unattached frontage lot along Gruversville Road. All lots would have on-lot water and sewer.

Bobb Carson pointed out that for subdivisions of 5 or more lots, all lots must be on internal streets, not on existing roads. For that reason, the 3 isolated lots would need to be reconfigured onto the internal road, or the yield would need to decrease to how many lots could be on the internal road. The Members felt that with all the lots pulled into the center of the wooded tract, the rural character of this area would be maintained and most of the development would not be visible from either Gruversville Road or Richlandtown Pike. The open space would most likely be dedicated to the Township or maintained by a Homeowner's Association. The applicant will rework the design and come before the Commission again at a later time.

## Confirmed Appointments

**Sienicki Subdivision (Mink Road)** – Scott Mease, Mease Engineering, PC, presented for the applicants Paul and Robert Sienicki, who were not present. This plan was originally presented as a lot-line adjustment. At the direction of our engineer it was redesigned to bring it into compliance with the major subdivision requirements. There are currently three adjoining tax parcels: one is one-half acre, another 5 ½ acres, and the third is 22 acres. The majority of the properties are wooded.

The applicant would like to adjust the property lines to make the half-acre lot just under 8 acres, increase the 5½ acre lot to 10 acres; thus decreasing the 22-acre lot to about 10 acres. Currently, Lot 2 is the only parcel with development on it. Lots 1 and 3 are proposed as lots for single-family dwellings.

A lengthy discussion among Members and neighbors followed on sand mound locations, building placements, storm water issues, etc. Scott Mease will work with the applicants on some of the issues identified and, on behalf of the applicants, Scott Mease granted an extension for this plan to October 12, 2005.

**Solomon Asser Subdivision (Lehnenberg Road)** – Todd Myers, Cowan Associates, Inc., presented for the applicant. This plan was tabled at the January 2005 meeting pending receipt of planning modules from the Bucks County Health Department. These have now been approved and are on file. The waivers requested were approved at the September 1, 2004, meeting. Bryan McAdam stated that outstanding plan issues are minor.

Walt French **moved** that preliminary/final approval be recommended subject to completion of outstanding items as contained within the January 26, 2005, engineering review letter. Scott Douglas **seconded**. Barbara Lindtner voted **no**; Bobb Carson and Stefanie Campbell **abstained** (they are new on the Commission and have never seen this plan); Walt, Jim, Scott and Pete voted **yes**; the motion **passed**.

**Thornton Land Development (Mine Road)** – Troy and Lisa Thornton presented final items needed and requested final approval for their plan.

Barbara Lindtner **moved** that we recommend final approval conditioned upon completion of the outstanding items in the May 24, 2005, engineering review letter. Scott Douglas **seconded**; the motion **passed** unanimously.

It was noted that **Reese Subdivision** had requested to be removed from the agenda in order to continue work on plan deficiencies. They granted an extension for this plan until August 10, 2005. A discussion followed about when the Commission could take action upon an incomplete plan showing no activity. Jim Brownlow stated, for those new on the Commission, that when a plan is one year old with nothing submitted for the Members to review, the Commission could move to deny it as an incomplete plan. This timetable was set approximately 3 years ago.

Barbara Lindtner requested that we ask our solicitor for the proper legal procedure for denying a plan that is not on the agenda and no representatives are present for that plan. She asked, “Can we recommend denial of a plan even though we received an extension from the applicant? Can we request that an applicant be placed on the agenda in order to take action to deny it as an incomplete plan, specifically, Reese Subdivision?” Bryan McAdam questioned how long is too long for no activity by an applicant on a plan.

If the solicitor says that the plan can be denied, the secretary was instructed to call the applicant for Reese Subdivision and see if the plan was ready to be placed on the agenda. If not, she is to advise them that the Commission has requested that they be placed on the July 6 agenda for discussion.

Extensions were also received from Cohen (to October 12, 2005), and Mondschein (to September 14, 2005).

## Old Business

**Prime Properties (Cherry Road)** – This group received a denial from the Zoning Hearing Board for variances to permit a 3-lot subdivision without an internal road. They were denied and are appealing this decision. They offered a 2-lot subdivision plan as a possibility to resolve the appeal and their attorney requested that our solicitor, Attorney Jim McNamara, get input from the Planning Commission as to whether this proposed 2-lot subdivision would provide a basis for a settlement agreement.

This request was discussed at the May Planning Commission meeting. There was an unresolved question as to whether this number would bring the total number of lots up to five that had been subdivided from these parcels, thus requiring that an internal road would be needed. Jeff Mease researched this and his findings were that the current proposal for a 2-lot subdivision would bring the total number of lots to 4, as apply to Section 516 of our Zoning Ordinance, thus the internal road requirement would not apply to this 2-lot subdivision.

Bobb Carson noted that both proposed lots are flag lots and flag lots are not permitted in the Village Residential District, and Lot 1 of the proposed lots does not meet the frontage requirements.

Bobb Carson **moved** that the Commission draft a letter for Jim McNamara to share with their attorney stating that:

1. This appears to be a self-inflicted hardship. It appears the applicant can meet the requirements of the Ordinance by using an internal road,
2. Flaglots are not permitted in the Village Residential District at all, and
3. We are encouraging higher density and we are not looking for large lots in the Village Residential District.

Jim Brownlow **seconded** the motion; it **passed** unanimously. This letter will go to Barbara Smith, Township Manager, to forward to Jim McNamara.

**June Zoning Ordinance Revision Meeting** – Because a number of Members could not be present at the scheduled June 16 Zoning Revision Meeting, alternate dates of June 30 (first choice) or June 29 (second choice) will be submitted to Charlie Schmehl of Urban Research and Development. Whichever date he can make will be advertised and communicated to the Members.

## Correspondence

**5/12/05 Cahill Associates Letter re: Inter-Municipal re-write of the Stormwater and Land Development Ordinances** – The Supervisors received a letter from Cahill indicating that Chuck Halderman contacted them requesting they submit a proposal to prepare updated stormwater regulations for Springfield and possibly neighboring municipalities Durham and Lower Saucon. The Supervisors referred that letter to the Planning Commission for comment and/or action.

Jim Brownlow stated that although stormwater management is critically important, he feels it is equally important that we not split our attention from the process we are currently involved in—rewriting the Zoning Ordinances. Jim feels this should be tabled until we are prepared to address stormwater issue.

It was noted that this project would have to be put out for bids because it would cost over \$6,000. This bid process would take several months. It was also recommended to look into grants available, such as are being used for the Zoning Revision.

Bryan McAdam suggested that some time be spent in determining exactly what areas are weak and what we want to fix before this is put out to consultants in the bid process. Our current SALDO was revised in 2002 and is fairly current.

Bobb Carson also questioned whether it might not be wise to wait until DEP revises their stormwater management plan (this DEP revision is currently underway) and then change ours to be in accordance with their revised SALDO.

Barbara Lindtner asked whether our own engineers could not just update our current SALDO instead of totally rewriting them. Bryan said this would be possible and that they will be keeping very current with DEP's rewriting process.

Bryan McAdam also feels that if there are inadequacies noted in certain subdivisions as pertains to our existing SALDO, it is important that they, our engineers, be certain that existing stormwater ordinances are being adhered to by developers.

The Commission did not feel action is necessary at this time on this issue.

### **Public Comments**

**Mrs. Joyce White (Supervisor of Upper Saucon Township)** – She requested information on how our Planning Commission feels about the proposed age-restricted community proposed for Springfield/Upper Saucon Townships in the Locust Valley Golf Club area.

Our Members indicated we are in approval of this development, as this is the Development District in our Township, and we are in favor of an age-restricted community in that area of the Township. There are water/sewer questions that exist for our portion of the development that have yet to be resolved.

It was Mrs. White's desire that we: 1. Write a letter to the Authority requesting that we would like water/sewer extended to our portion of the development, and 2. That we request a combined meeting with the Upper Saucon Supervisors to further discuss this entire issue. Barbara Smith, Springfield Township Manager, will be asked to contact the Upper Saucon Township Manager to try to set up a mutually agreeable time for this meeting.

**Adjournment** - At 9:45 p.m., Scott Douglas **moved** to adjourn the meeting. Pete Lamana **seconded**; the motion **passed** unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra L. Everitt, Secretary  
Next Meeting: July 6, 2005