

**Planning Commission Meeting
MINUTES**

August 2, 2006

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairperson Barbara Lindtner and opened with the *Pledge of Allegiance*.

Members present: Jim Brownlow, Stefanie Campbell, Bobb Carson, Scott Douglas, Pete Lamana and Barbara Lindtner. (Absent: Walt French) Bob Wynn, township engineer, and Terry Clemons, township solicitor, were also present.

Approval of Minutes

After minor corrections were made by Bobb Carson, Pete Lamana **moved** to approve as corrected the minutes of the June 7, 2006, meeting. Scott Douglas **seconded**; the motion **passed** unanimously. (The July 7, 2006, meeting was cancelled.)

Planning Commission Work Session - None

Public Comments on Agenda Items

Sue Papciak asked for clarification about when to make comments on an agenda item. She will reserve her comments until the item is discussed later in the meeting.

Sketch Plans

Starr Sketch Plan (Funk's Mill Road) – Scott Mease, Mease Engineering P.C., presented for the applicant, Clifford Starr, who was not able to be present.

This 42 +/- acre property, located on the north side of Funk's Mill Road in the WS (Watershed) District, was Lot 1 of a 2-lot minor subdivision that was approved in 2001 by Springfield Township. The current owner of Lot 1 would like to do a 2-lot minor subdivision, dividing the 42 acres into a 35-acre and a 7-acre lot. He would retain and continue to reside on Lot 1. Lot 2 would be a new building lot. There was a condition placed on the original subdivision stating that should there be any future subdivision of either lot, the owner would be responsible for road improvements along the entire frontage of the property, not only TMP 42-17-50, but also TMP 42-17-49.

Referring to the Wynn review letter dated June 26, 2006, Scott Mease indicated that the items identified by Bryan McAdam would be addressed. However, Mr. Starr is presenting this sketch plan primarily to determine what the Township would require for improvement on Funk's Mill Road, currently an 18' stone road.

Bryan McAdam stated he did not think, based on prior decisions made during his time as our engineer, that we would require full improvements; however, the previous subdivision condition stated that full improvements would be required if a future subdivision took place on the property.

Pete Lamana stated that approximately nine years ago, the Township wanted to oil and chip Funk's Mill Road and the neighbors turned out in opposition to this. For that reason, the Board did not proceed with their plans. Pete feels this same problem would occur if the Township would require road improvements now on Funk's Mill Road.

Scott Douglas noted that because of the steep slopes containing mature hardwoods on the property, and because it contains numerous tributaries which lead directly to Cook's Creek, we need to exercise care about what we permit on the property. He has particular concerns about storm water issues on this property with regard to how much land will be cleared and how storm water will be handled. Storm water will come right onto Funk's Mill Road and from there, cross the some neighbors' properties and then go directly into Cook's Creek. He is certain these neighbors would be very proactive about the storm water issue as it impacts them.

It was the consensus of the Members that apart from a deed restriction on Lot 1 against further subdivision, the applicant would be required to pay for full road improvements, even though the improvements might not be made at the present time. Also, when the plan is presented as a subdivision, it would be helpful to have all the details on the plan—driveway location, cost estimates for full road improvements, if Mr. Starr is willing to further deed restrict Lot 1, etc.

Bettler Sketch Plan (Reed Lane) – Evan Pelligrino, Urwiler & Walter, presented for the applicant, John Bettler. This 8+ acre property, located in the RP (Resource Protection) District is proposed to be subdivided into three single family lots. The property is unique in that it crosses two municipalities—Haycock and Springfield Townships—and because Reed Lane is not a through street. The applicant wants direction concerning lot lines following municipal boundaries and what road improvements would be required for Reed Lane. They have also contacted Haycock Township and have a review letter from them.

Barbara Lindtner feels that this property will not permit a 3-lot subdivision. One of the lots does not follow the Township boundary line and thus creates a nonconforming lot. In addition, neither Lot 2 or 3 contains the 3-acre minimum required in the RP District in Springfield Township. Bobb Carson summarized that if the applicant would create a new lot line between the proposed lots that doesn't cross Township lines, the plan would be more acceptable.

Another concern has to do with Reed Lane's designation as what appears to be a "paper" street (referenced in deeds and shown in County Tax Mapping, but not containing a physical roadway). After some discussion among the members, Barbara Lindtner summarized that if the applicant proposed this plan as one lot in Springfield Township with a change in the boundary to follow the municipal line, a driveway could come off to Reed Lane and a new through road or cul-de-sac would not have to be created. The engineer agreed that this was the direction he felt would work best. It is unclear from this plan or the information provided whether Reed Lane is, in whole or in part, a public road. This information will be required before any decision can be made regarding road improvements.

Posh Sketch Plans #1 & 2 (Hottle Road) – Evan Pelligrino, Urwiler & Walter, presented for the applicant, Paul Soult. This 39.4+ acre site in the AD (Agricultural District) was previously considered for subdivision by Paul Mondschein. At that time, there were several concerns about how the remaining portion of the tract would be developed, and these sketches address those requests for plans regarding future subdivision. The current two sketch plans propose division of the property into building lots for Use B11-b, single family detached dwellings.

Bobb Carson noted that because this property is in the Agricultural Zoning District and is over ten acres, a farm lot would be required as part of the subdivision and soil testing will be required. In addition, because there are more than 5 lots proposed, all of the lots will need to access the internal road to comply with our ordinance. Lot 1 currently accesses onto Hottle Road.

Hottle Road will definitely require a number of road improvements, including widening, drainage improvements, etc., to accommodate this subdivision. In its current state, it does not conform to Township standards.

Scott Douglas questioned Bryan McAdam about the flag lots off the cul-de-sac as shown on both these sketches. Bryan does not see any problem for the Township associated with this, as the Township would only be responsible for maintenance of the cul-de-sac, not the private driveways. From a planning perspective, it is not the best design, but is undoubtedly being proposed to maximize density.

Confirmed Appointments

Cohen Subdivision (Lehnenberg & Bodder Roads) – No one was present to represent this plan. (This plan was placed on the agenda in error by the Township. The applicants were not aware it would be on the agenda.)

Barbara Lindtner stated that action on this plan is required by 8/31/06. She mentioned that a lot-line adjustment had been done on this plan in January or February of 2006. She further stated that there has been no activity since the review letter issued by Wynn Associates in January 2005. Because of the Planning Commission rule regarding denying plans that go one year with no activity (this plan was submitted one year, eight months ago), Barbara suggested we recommend denial and that the applicants resubmit the plan.

After some discussion, Pete Lamana **moved** that the denial of the plan be recommended because there has been no action on the plan for over a year, thus representing lack of due diligence to respond to the January 14, 2005, review letter issued by Tim Fulmer, Township Engineer. Scott Douglas **seconded**; the motion was **approved** unanimously.

Schanbacher Waiver for 2nd Dwelling (Povenski Road – Lot 42-4-138) – The Schanbacher's presented for themselves. Barbara Lindtner acknowledged receipt of an informative letter from the Schanbachers and thanked them for providing the information. Referring to Bryan McAdam's May 18, 2006, review letter about this waiver request, Barbara asked if the family had any questions for the engineer regarding his letter. They indicated they understood the letter and they felt they had addressed the issues he had outlined in the letter.

The waiver request letter from the Schanbachers Barbara Lindtner received was copied and given to each member of the Planning Commission.

The applicants are requesting permission to place a second single family dwelling on their 8.6 acre parcel within the RP (Resource Protection) Zoning District. The dwelling would access Povenski Road via a new driveway. The existing dwelling will remain. Both lots will be served by separate on-lot wells and sanitary sewage disposal systems.

Barbara Lindtner was confused about the process involved in the *Waiver Request for a Second Dwelling* on one property. Judith Shanbacher stated that the reason they had applied for a *Waiver Request for a Second Dwelling* rather than proceed with a minor subdivision was because they do not ever intend to sell any of their property. Their daughter will be living in the second dwelling and they are living in the home currently on the property.

Terry Clemons referenced Section 400 of the Zoning Ordinance which states that except for certain zoning districts (VC, VR, HC and PI), only one principal dwelling is permitted on any property, parcel, lot, etc. There is one use, H1, which pertains to an in-law apartment, which must be attached to an existing residence and cannot exceed 600 square feet. Because these same conditions also are contained in the proposed revised Zoning Ordinance, Terry feels that this request would require approval from the Zoning Hearing Board. He added that in Section 401.C. of the new Ordinance, it states that in Residential Districts, no more than one principal dwelling is permitted on a lot except for cell towers or an agricultural building combined with the main use. Terry asked for clarification as to whether the RP is considered a residential district and was advised it is.

Terry mentioned that Bryan McAdam understood that this had been permitted in the past by the Township. Further, Terry stated that he had just been given a copy of the Township Fee Schedule which included a fee listing of \$200 for an application for a *Waiver Request for a Second Dwelling*. He is confused because the actual Ordinance does not appear to support this. Scott Mease stated that in the Subdivision Ordinance, there is a definition of Land Development which includes a second dwelling on a lot. He further stated that this had been permitted on a property 4 – 5 years ago on the Wachs Property on Route 412. Terry feels that this is a mistake in the Subdivision Ordinance; the Zoning Ordinance supersedes the Subdivision Ordinance.

The applicant questioned why it cannot be done in their situation when it was done for another tract years ago. Barbara does not have the details of the prior plan Scott Mease is referring to and therefore, does not know the specifics of why approval was granted. She does feel, however, that our Zoning Ordinance is clear as to what should be permitted and that the Zoning Hearing Board, not the Planning Commission, is the correct agency to grant relief for their waiver request. If that relief is granted, they would still need to return to the Planning Commission to deal with issues relating to the land development.

Bobb Carson indicated he did not feel that this would receive a favorable response from the Zoning Hearing Board, as the reason they are presenting is financial hardship and this is not a justifiable reason for granting permission. He feels that the easiest way to accomplish what they are trying to do is to subdivide the lot.

Sue Papciak, a neighbor, expressed concern about the placement of the well and sand mound for the proposed new dwelling on the Schanbacher property. She said there are already eight wells and septic systems in a small rectangular cluster near this proposed new dwelling site. Each of the eight homes is on 3 acre+ lots, but the homes on those properties are in a small cluster. She stated that the water supply currently is limited to between 2 and 6 gallons per minute and they have already run out of water. It is for this reason that they are concerned about the well placement for the proposed new dwelling. Mrs. Schanbacher noted that Mrs. Papciak was also interested in placing a second dwelling on her own property. Barbara Lindtner stated that Mrs. Papciak should stay in touch with the process, and as an adjacent neighbor, she would be notified if the Schanbachers were going to go before the Zoning Hearing Board, and she could raise her concerns at that hearing.

Thornwood Builders Subdivision (Quarry Road) – Ed Wild, attorney, and Scott Mease, Mease Engineering, P.C., presented for the applicant. Referring to the Township Engineer’s review letter dated June 27, 2006, Comment 1, Barbara Lindtner asked if Scott Mease had identified and noted the size of mature trees in the area of the proposed driveway, as the Planning Commission had requested at the time of the initial plan review. Scott indicated that his office had located a woods trail (not shown on the original plan submitted) which runs through the access area on either side of the property line. They located all the neighbor’s individual trees closest to the property line and then made modifications to the shared driveway so that it is at least 15’ from any of the neighbor’s trees for its entire length. Three-quarters of the proposed driveway runs along the woods trail where no trees exist. There are 35 trees shown on the current plan that were not on before and the driveway design was adjusted somewhat to maintain the 15’ isolation distance from any of the neighbor’s trees.

In addition, the access entrance was widened at Quarry Road and the driveway entrance was pulled away from the property line, thus eliminating one waiver request. The trees to be eliminated will be marked along with the caliber of each tree. Scott noted that our ordinance permits removal of 20% of woodlands and they are proposing approximately 9% woodlands removal. Bobb and Barbara pointed out that they are concerned not only with the percentage of trees to be cleared, but with the caliber and the number of trees of that caliber proposed to be removed.

Barbara Lindtner expressed a concern with the waiver request in Comment 2.B. which does not include deed restriction that had been discussed at the last presentation. Attorney Wild said that deed restriction had been discussed with the applicant, but that it has not been shown at this time. When the subdivision is revised and approval is near, he stated that the Members can anticipate the applicant will agree to deed restrict the lots.

Referring to Comment 3 pertaining to sight distance for the proposed driveway being based on a 35 MPH speed limit, there was a lengthy discussion about the current speed on Quarry Road. Because certain sections of the road are currently posted at 25 MPH, it was suggested that the applicant request of the Board of Supervisors all of Quarry Road be posted at 25 MPH. If the road was posted at that speed limit, the sight distances currently shown on the plan at the driveway entrance would be adequate. Terry Clemons stated that if the speed for Quarry Road is covered by an ordinance, another ordinance will be required to change it.

Referring to Comment 4 regarding Sewage Facilities Planning Modules with on-site testing information, Barbara Lindtner asked for the status of this issue. Scott Mease indicated soil probes

have been performed for the initial five lots planned and each of the 2 new lots currently proposed has two tested areas which have been signed off on by the Bucks County Health Department. Following preliminary plan approval, perc testing will be completed.

Scott Mease indicated Comments 5 – 8 are all “will comply.” Attorney Wild anticipates that Comment 9 will also be a “will comply,” in that Lot 2 will not access directly onto Quarry Road, except through the shared driveway. However, they will not commit definitively to compliance with Comment 9 until issues related to Comment 1 are resolved. Attorney Wild concluded that Comments 10 – 13 are also “will comply.”

Gary Zuby, a neighbor on the south side of Lot 1, again expressed concern about Lot 2 accessing Quarry Road using the narrow flag strip bordering his property. Attorney Wild assured him there would be a guarantee in the way of a declaration creating a negative covenant that would prohibit Lot 2 from accessing Quarry Road using that narrow strip bordering his property. Mr. Zuby indicated the previous owner had marked trees within that strip to be cut down and he wanted to be certain that the new owner would not place a driveway on that narrow strip. Bobb Carson read for Mr. Zuby Comment 9 from the township engineer’s June 27 review letter. In that comment, the applicant agreed that Lot 2 must access Quarry Road via the access easement and the shared driveway.

No action was taken on this plan, pending resolution of the issues relating to Comment 1 regarding the driveway, tree removal, etc. Barbara Lindtner stated that when this issue is resolved, it is likely that the plan will receive preliminary approval. Scott Mease issued an extension for this plan until September 30.

Sartori 3-Lot Subdivision (Hunter Road) – Scott Mease, Mease Engineering, presented for the applicants. This parcel is located at the northwest intersection of Hunter Road with Route 412. Most of the issues relating to the plan were cleared when it was last reviewed by the Commission. A major item that needed to be resolved was that a Special Exception was needed for the shared driveway for Lots 2 and 3 to cross over a watercourse margin. This Special Exception was granted by the Zoning Hearing Board and there were no conditions placed upon the approval.

Barbara Lindtner questioned Note #9 on Sheet 1 of the plan which deed restricts Lot 1, 2 and 3 from further subdivision with the exception of lot line adjustments where no new lot is created. Terry suggested changing the wording to “deed restrict Lot 1, 2 and 3 from further subdivision,” and leave off the portion regarding “with the exception of lot line adjustments where no new lot is created.” Scott Mease noted they will comply with that suggestion and Note #9 on Sheet 1 will be changed to reflect that wording.

Referring to Comment 2 of the July 24, 2006, township engineer’s review letter, Scott Mease stated they have submitted a letter to the Township requesting that the speed limit for Hunter Road be reduced to 25 MPH and that it be posted as such. Bobb Carson also suggested that *Hidden Driveway* signs may be needed. Bryan McAdam asked if that determination could be made after the driveway is constructed. Bobb asked that the option for posting *Hidden Driveway* signs be kept open pending Bryan’s final recommendation after the driveway is completed.

The waivers associated with this plan were previously approved. Barbara Lindtner **moved** to recommend that preliminary conditional approval be granted based upon completion of items

listed in the June 27 and July 24, 2006, township engineer's review letters. Bobb Carson **seconded**; the motion **passed** unanimously.

The Commission took a break from 9:30 – 9:45 p.m.

Mandarino 9-Lot Subdivision (Moyer Road) – Attorney Ed Wild, Benner and Wild; and Scott Mease, Mease Engineering, presented for the applicant. Attorney Wild requested that there be some discussion on the farmland lot issue. Lot 9 is 23.6 net acres with a 22.6 acre open space area which excludes the buildable area and the detention base area. The farmland area on the lot is 22.4 acres. An additional acre and a half includes the road right of way, the detention basin area and the building lot.

Barbara Lindtner and Bobb Carson summarized that the intention when the farmland lot was created was for a farmer, who had a farm house on his property, to do a small cluster of houses on some portion of his property, get some money out of his land for developing a portion of his property, and keep the remainder as open space. It was not to include as shown on the proposed plan for Lot 9, a new dwelling as a flag lot to a proposed subdivision.

Attorney Wild suggested that discussion begin with Comment 3 of Bryan McAdam's review letter, which he read, and from there, transfer to his (Attorney Wild's) letter dated May 15, 2006. He reviewed that the Farmland Lot was implemented in Springfield's Ordinance 129. Attorney Wild stated that Ordinance 129 provides that the Farmland Lot may include one dwelling unit and agricultural buildings. It does not specify that this must be an existing dwelling. He further stated that the proposed new dwelling is not within the required calculations for the Farmland Lot. That is, the calculations required for a Farmland Lot are satisfied *exclusive* of the dwelling unit. Specifically, the dwelling unit is not within the 'open space' required for a farm lot.

Terry Clemons stated that he looks at this plan a little differently. He stated that a farm lot must be laid out so that it can be utilized and farmed. He wonders what the neighbors around the cul-de-sac shown on this plan are going to say when "Farmer John" rolls down the cul-de-sac with his combine, rolls up into the Lot 9 building area where he has his barn and his 8 cattle. If the applicant wanted to persuade someone that this really is a meaningful farm lot, wouldn't the building lot be separated from the cluster development area? Terry does see the interpretation problem as outlined by Attorney Wild in his May 15 letter, but does not feel that the farm lot shown on Lot 9 is laid out in a fashion that any farmer is ever going to use it for farming. If he did, he would immediately have eight neighbors angry at him for driving up the cul-de-sac with his farm equipment. Scott Mease indicated that our ordinance requires that each lot must access from an internal road, and this subdivision was designed as it is to meet the criteria of our ordinance. He noted that if there was an 'existing' farm on that lot, it would have a driveway independent of the road for the cluster subdivision.

Terry asked whether the Commission did not want to come to an agreement as to whether a farm house dwelling—new or existing—on a farmland lot that would help to attain what the original intent of the Farmland Lot ordinance was would be acceptable. This could require some restructuring of the ordinances for the farmland lot provision to be workable, i.e., an entrance not going through the cluster, etc. There would need to be some restrictions to ensure that the property would be marketed as a farm, not a large lot for a 'McMansion.' Attorney Wild added that when he read Ordinance 129, he did not have the benefit of the Members' thinking as to what the

purpose of a farm lot was, which he had gained from discussion at this meeting. In his experience, having a large lot that isn't occupied has some deficits that would interfere with it being used as an active farming enterprise.

Barbara asked for a consensus from the Members about whether they would be agreeable to a 'new' dwelling and related accessory buildings being built on a farmland lot.

- Stephanie: Yes
- Jim: Yes, as compromise as part of the bigger picture; has concerns about other issues with this plan
- Bobb: Yes, in general, No for this plan. Bobb feels it will be impossible to guarantee that someone who farms the property will live in the dwelling. Bobb agrees there is room for argument regarding wording in current Ordinance 129
- Scott: Yes, as part of the bigger picture; No, for this plan
- Pete: Yes, he agrees with our solicitor
- Barbara: Yes, as part of the bigger picture. Has some concern about other issues relating to this plan.

Scott stated that the future layout of this property is going to be affected by the answer to the farmland lot question. Terry Clemons added that the plan layout is also going to be impacted by the comments concerning Natural Resources Protection Standards. In particular, he noted Comment 4 of the April 12, 2006, township engineer's review letter where Bryan states that "Sheet 5 of the plan identifies areas of proposed disturbance for each lot, but the disturbed areas do not account for the entire lot. Lots 1 thru 4, and 6, indicate areas of no disturbance; however, for one acre lots, it is not practical to consider yard areas to be undisturbed, as they will most likely be converted from meadow to lawn"

Scott has a major issue with the natural resources inventory that was done on this site. Springfield and Lower Saucon Townships did an evaluation of the Silver Creek Watershed as part of a Source Water Protection Plan. Referring to the Contour Map (Sheet 2 of 7) for this plan, in the eastern side of the site, there is an obvious drainage way that is visible on the contours. This is actually a headwater stream of Cooks Creek which seeps from the ground and flows on a regular basis out to the road and then down the road and joins Cooks Creek. This stream is not mapped on the resource inventory, nor are the hydric soils and the wetlands that are all throughout this area. This unmapped area runs right through where the cluster development is proposed. There is a 125' margin required on either side of a stream, and Scott does not see how the cluster can be placed where it is now proposed.

Bobb Carson also requested that a copy of the *Carbonate Geology Report* be made available to the Members. Bryan McAdam's review letter stated that a copy of the current subdivision plan should be forwarded to the Township Geologist for review and recommendation. Scott Mease will forward these items to Kent Littlefield. Sandy Everitt will provide a copy of the *Carbonate Geology Report* to each Member.

An extension to October 31 was provided by the applicant. No action was taken on this plan.

Crossroads Major Subdivision (Locust Valley & Trolley Bridge Roads) – Scott Guidos, Van Cleef Engineering Associates, presented for the applicant, Piero Corrado, who was also present.

This is a four township, two county development on a 107+ acre tract with 33 homes proposed. 8 of those homes are located in Springfield Township. Referring to the township engineer's June 7, 2006, review letter, Barbara Lindtner had a question about Comment 1 relating to site/lot layout comments. Ms. O'Connell was present at this meeting and Scott Guidos indicated that she had agreed to consolidate the unusable sliver fronting her property into her parcel, thus eliminating future maintenance/access issues.

Referring to Comment 1.B, the applicant has a letter from Palisades School District indicating they will provide bus service to the homes located in Springfield Township.

Comments 2 & 3 are related to the Board of Assessment. Mr. Guidos presented a May 5, 2006, letter from the Bucks County Board of Assessment which basically states that they will accept whatever resolution is reached between the townships as to the correct dividing line between Springfield and Milford Townships and will revise their records accordingly.

Relating to Comment 4 regarding Planning Modules, the Township will give the Planning Modules to the Township Engineer for their review.

The Water Resources Study referenced in Comment 5 was submitted June 30, 2006, by Van Cleef Engineering. Bryan's review letter was written June 7, prior to when they received the Water Resources Study.

Ms. O'Connell is concerned about the future buyer of Lot 1, which is next to her property, taking issue with her having horses, running farm equipment, etc. She was assured that the individual buying Lot 1 would be forewarned that they were moving next to an active horse farm with normal farm activities. Bobb Carson stated that because agriculture is a permitted use, it is also a protected use. A buyer could have nothing to say if the activity taking place on her property is a permitted use.

Scott Douglas **moved**, Pete Lamana **seconded** that we recommend that the waiver from Section 504.2.K, Lot Depth-to-Width Ratios be granted; the motion **passed** unanimously.

Pete Lamana **moved** that we recommend that preliminary approval be granted, conditioned upon completion of the items listed in the June 7, 2006, review letter from Bryan McAdam, township engineer. Jim Brownlow **seconded**; the motion **passed** unanimously.

Plans to Accept for Review Only - None

New Business

Road Improvements – Referring to the Bob Wynn letter of June 14, 2006, Barbara Lindtner stated she liked the West Rockhill Township policy for contributions in-lieu-of road improvements which sets forth a contribution of \$3,000 per proposed lot plus 50% of the construction costs of waived road improvements for each lineal foot of frontage in excess of two hundred lineal feet (200 lf) calculated for each individual proposed lot. West Rockhill actually lists the construction costs per lineal foot for curbing, sidewalk and cartway widening. The suggestion was made not to list the costs per lineal foot to be paid in the resolution, but to have the current rate for such costs provided by our engineer. There was also a suggestion that the \$3,000

fee be reviewed annually and revised to keep pace with inflation in road construction costs. The funds would be kept in a Highway Improvement Fund.

After discussion, Barbara Lindtner **moved** that we ask Terry Clemens to prepare a Resolution similar to West Rockhill Township's Resolution and forward it with a letter to the Board of Supervisors containing a recommendation from the Planning Commission that they review this as a policy issue and adopt it. Pete Lamana **seconded**; the motion **passed** unanimously.

Old Business

Joint Zoning Revision Meeting - The 20th meeting of the Joint Planning Commission/Board of Supervisors Zoning Ordinance Revision Committee will be a Public Meeting at the Springtown Fire Department Social Hall on August 3, 2006, at 6:30 p.m. Light refreshments will be available from 6:30 to 7:00 p.m. so that the public will have an opportunity to view the draft Zoning Ordinance prior to the meeting. The meeting will begin at 7:00 p.m. and will hopefully conclude with a motion to pass the Draft Zoning Ordinance on to the Board of Supervisors for them to accept at their August 8 meeting.

Correspondence - None

Public Comments

Patrice Ryan asked if there was any further movement regarding Rolling Hills Subdivision. She was advised there was none; an extension was in place until December 31, 2006.

Planning Commission Comments

Bobb Carson stated that the Wastewater Committee, consisting of Bobb, Stefanie Campbell, Peter Sleeman and Bill Boyle, has begun to meet. They are reviewing the Township's Comprehensive Plan, the new Zoning Ordinance and our current Act 537 Wastewater and Treatment Facilities Plan. They are meeting the second Tuesday and the fourth Thursday of each month in the small meeting room downstairs in the Township Building. These are public meetings open to anyone who wishes to attend. The next meeting is on August 8 and will be the only meeting in August. Two monthly meetings will begin in September. They plan to issue a report to the Supervisors by the end of 2006.

Adjournment

At 11:27 p.m., Scott Douglas **moved** that the meeting be adjourned. Barbara Lindtner **seconded**; the motion **passed** unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra L. Everitt
Recording Secretary
Next meeting: September 6, 2006 – 7:00 p.m.