

Conduct @ public meetings (excerpted from Township Resolution 92-2): To ensure that all business is efficiently conducted and all public input is fairly considered:

- The period allotted for public comment shall be 30 minutes total.
- Each speaker shall be allotted 5 minutes for his presentation or questions.

(This Resolution in its entirety is posted on the bulletin board of the Administration Building meeting room.)

**Springfield Township, Bucks County**  
2320 Township Road · Quakertown, PA 18951

---

**Planning Commission Meeting**  
**MINUTES**

**June 2, 2004**

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by Chairman Jim Brownlow. He opened with a moment of silence in honor of those who gave their lives on D-Day 60 years ago, followed by the *Pledge of Allegiance*.

All Committee members were present: Jim Brownlow, Walter French, Pete Lamana, Barbara Lindtner, Barbara Schmoyer, Brad Schultz and Nancy Young. Township Engineer Bob Wynn was also present.

The members held a brief work session.

- Pete Lamana commented that Resolution 92.2 (posted in its entirety on the Township bulletin board), passed in 1996 by the Board of Supervisors, covers conduct of participants at all Township meetings and is the guide by which all meetings are conducted.
- Jim Brownlow advised that the members are proceeding with the ordinance review and he will give a time schedule at the next meeting.

Brad Schultz **moved**, Barbara Schmoyer **seconded**, to adopt the minutes of the May 5, 2004, meeting after several minor word changes were made. The motion was **adopted**.

**Friendly Review – Kendikian Property, Zion Hill** (approximate 4.9 acre lot on Cherry Road) Attorney Ed Wild, for the applicant *Prime Building Group*, requested an informal review by the members of the proposed subdivision plan(s) for the Kendikian property. Attending with Attorney Wild were: Kirk Clauss of Schlosser & Clauss, Consulting Engineers, Inc.; and Gary Lucas, Prime Building Group.

Members were provided with two sketch plans representing possible subdivision options. The lot is primarily in the VR district but a portion is in the RR district. The preferred option would develop the property into 3 lots—1 of 2 acres, 1 of 1.3 acres and the third lot 1.6 acres (approximate acreage). The concern with this option is whether the configuration of flag lots meets zoning requirements or whether it would need a variance because of the flag configuration in the VR district.

The second sketch represents a bi-right plan which would meet the terms of the ordinance and wouldn't require any zoning relief. This plan includes a 500' cul-de-sac and 5 lots. This plan is less desirable because the lots are smaller and would require a cul-de-sac which the township would need to maintain.

Either configuration would utilize on-lot wells and public sewer.

Member input/concerns/suggestions:

- 2<sup>nd</sup> sketch (with 5 lots & cul-de-sac) includes ½ acre lots; minimum in VR is ¾ acre.
- Milford Township should be consulted because back property line is adjacent to Milford Township.
- An ordinance provision is in place that after 1976 you cannot subdivide a property into more than 4 lots without creating an internal road.
- Cul-de-sac is Township's responsibility to maintain but a common shared driveway would be the homeowners' mutual responsibility.
- Township solicitor would need to review and approve Township's ability to require necessary upkeep/repair of common driveway.
- Communication to neighboring parcel owners was not made prior to this presentation but would need to take place at the appropriate time.

**Summary:** Attorney Wild requested from the members a summarization of recommendations and how to proceed. In response, they stated they prefer the single, shared driveway instead of a cul-de-sac and three larger lots. The questions that require research prior to application to the Zoning Board for variances are:

1. Milford Township zoning requirements
2. How the lot was originally formed.

The issues that may require variances are:

1. Use of flag lots in VR district
2. Whether it would be considered a separate tier on the lot bordering 42-3-36-3 on the right
3. Ordinance provision requiring you cannot subdivide a property after 1976 into more than 4 lots without creating an internal road (not applicable if 3-lot plan is pursued.
4. Internal road issue

### **Confirmed Appointment**

Newman Lot Line Adjustment – Scott Mease, Mease Engineering, was the presenter. Mrs. Newman was not present.

Introduction: The owner of the Newman property, approximately 25 acres in size, fronting along Harrow Road (which is Route 412) and School Road, is interested in selling a portion of her land to two of her neighbors—TP 42-22-116 (would go from 2.1 to 3.5 acres) and TP 42-22-94-2 (would go from 2.1 to 3.1 acres). This proposal involves conveyance of property from one parcel to another without the creation of new lots.

After a careful review of the proposed adjustment, the members felt that more information would be helpful on future plans for the remaining Newman property. Specifically, if the TP 42-22-116

was increased as proposed, the members suggested a deed restriction be placed on the remaining 20 acres of the Newman property to prevent future subdivision.

It was noted that numbering should be clarified between plan notes (TMP # 42-22-9-2) and plan labels (TMP #42-22-94-2).

The chairman summarized that no action would be taken on this issue without additional feedback from the applicant regarding the questions raised.

There was no new business.

### **Correspondence**

**Robert Rufe Request for Waiver of Land Development** – This is an inadequate submission because Mr. Rufe did not fill out a formal zoning board application for Waiver of Land Development. Mr. Rufe will be contacted and advised that he needs to complete a zoning application and take the issue before the Zoning Board. Until this is accomplished, this is not an active submission and therefore is not recognized as such. If he needs further help or information, he may contact the Township office.

### **Public Comment**

Marian Stonebeck – She was recently at a meeting where the speaker reminded them that because Pennsylvania is a commonwealth, all the townships and municipalities are responsible—with only a few exceptions—for making the rules and ordinances to protect the citizens. The chairman noted that the court system, by adjudicating cases, sets precedent rules that often override township and municipality ordinances and rules.

Pete Lamana – He attended a biannual public picnic at Silver Creek and was able to gain good insights about township matters from a number of township residents in attendance.

### **Adjournment**

Pete Lamana **moved** to adjourn the meeting at 8:10 p.m. Nancy Young seconded and the motion was adopted unanimously.

Next Meeting: July 7

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra L. Everitt