

**Planning Commission Meeting
MINUTES**

February 3, 2010

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

Members present were: Bobb Carson, Scott Douglas, Bruce Fritchman, Pete Lamana, and Curtis Reiss.

Absent: Robert Ritter and John Chilton

Rich Schilling, Township Manager; Bob Wynn, Township Engineer; Scott MacNair, Township Solicitor and Heather DiSario, Recording Secretary, were also present.

Reorganization

a. Appoint temporary chairman – Pete Lamana **moved** to appoint Curtis Reiss as Temporary Chairman. Scott Douglas **seconded**; the motion **carried**.

b. Nominate/Appoint Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Secretary – Pete Lamana **moved** to appoint Bruce Fritchman as Chairman. There were no other nominations. Bobb Carson **seconded**; the motion **carried**.

Scott Douglas **moved** to nominate Bobb Carson as Vice Chairman. There were no other nominations. Pete Lamana **seconded**; Bobb Carson **abstained**; the motion **carried**.

Pete Lamana **moved** to nominate Scott Douglas as Secretary. There were no other nominations. Bruce Fritchman **seconded**; the motion **carried**.

Approval of Minutes

Scott Douglas **moved** to approve the January 5, 2010 minutes as amended. Bobb Carson **seconded**; the motion **carried**.

Public Comments (Agenda Items)

Karen Bedics stated that the EAC and the Board of Supervisors are need of guidelines for well monitoring. Direction is being sought as to what will happen if something is found and how often the wells should be monitored. The matter will be taken up during Planning Commission Comments & Project Reports.

Sketch Plans

Confirmed Appointments

a. Sutch Tract- Richlandtown Pike- Action required by 2-28-10 – Jason Smeland, Lenape Valley Engineering, presented for the applicant, Luanne Sutch, who was also present. The 6 acre property is proposed to be subdivided to have a twin dwelling constructed on 1 acre (Lot 1) and the remaining 5 acres to be left with the existing dwelling (Lot 2). Mr. Smeland explained that they propose to use the existing driveway to serve both lots. The applicant does not wish at this time to deed restrict the 5-acre property, therefore, a possible future subdivision plan was provided to the Township. Mr. Smeland reviewed the 1/18/2010 Township Engineer's review letter. Additional waiver requests handed out at the meeting could not be discussed due to procedures.

Item 3 regarding the waiver from Section 504 - Mr. Smeland explained that in this case, there is no option unless a new road is built. Mr. Carson noted that if Lot 1 is created and subsequently an internal road is constructed, the lot will need to front on the internal road.

Mr. Carson stated that the configuration of Lot 1 on the possible future subdivision plan has not changed. The proposed future development takes Lot 2 divides it up, and leaves Lot 1 as an orphan. The plan does not meet the requirements of the ordinance because the applicant has not laid out a coherent subdivision plan of the entire existing property.

Item 3B concerning a waiver for road widening, curbs and sidewalks - Mr. Carson feels that sidewalks are appropriate because the property is in a zoned village residential area and because of pedestrian safety along Richlandtown Pike. Mr. Carson stated he would not vote in favor of the waiver.

Mr. Wynn noted that the dwelling is in the way of the sidewalk and PennDOT would not allow a sidewalk in their right of way without a curb.

Mr. Fritchman observed that if the remaining part of the property (Lot 2) would not be further developed, not much pedestrian traffic would be generated and therefore he could support the waiver request. If Lot 2 is to be further developed, however, there is the possibility of significant pedestrian traffic generation and, in that case, he would also support the sidewalk requirement.

Mr. Douglas indicated that he is concerned with storm water runoff by adding more impervious surface (as sidewalk) but understands the safety concern.

Mr. Smeland feels that unless the Township perceives that the area is to become a high pedestrian traffic area there should not be an issue with the sidewalks.

There was a lengthy discussion about the plan of future subdivision not meeting the requirements of the ordinance. Mr. Carson stated he would like to see a plan that shows future development of the entire property that has optimal positioning of the roadway, internal sidewalks, and lots front on the internal road. Mr. Smeland stated he cannot present a plan that meets the Township's subdivision ordinance. He explained that the applicant would be willing to entertain to deed restrict the property if the Township would allow two driveways accesses to Richlandtown Pike for the two lots. The Planning Commission members did not concur. In conclusion, the Commission stated that a plan needs to be presented that meets the requirements of the ordinance, and the property could be subdivided without a waiver.

Discussion continued on the list of waiver requests:

Item C regarding plan scale waiver – the Commission agreed to support the waiver request.

Lot to depth ratio waiver request D – if other issues can be resolved, the Commission agreed to support the waiver request.

Waiver request E regarding storm water management maintenance - Mr. Wynn stated he is ok with the proposal. The Planning Commission agreed.

Other elements of the 1/18/2010 Township Engineer's review letter were discussed:

Site access as referred to in Item 4 is a "will comply", according to Mr. Smeland;

Item 5 regarding the note on the plan about condominium arrangement is a "will comply";

Item 6 referring to a front elevation view is a "will comply";

Item 7 regarding storm water management is a "will comply";

Item 8 regarding centralized well supply- it was suggested to the applicant to have separate wells for the two units;

Item 9 regarding sewage disposal system - the planning module has been forwarded to the Township. It was suggested to the applicant to add a note to the plan regarding the location of the future reserve septic system area;

Item 10 regarding erosion and sediment control is a "will comply";

Item 11 referring to ultimate right of way is a "will comply";

Item 12 regarding property monumentation is a "will comply";

Item 13 regarding the financial security agreement is a "will comply";

Item 14 regarding the record plan is a "will comply";

Item 15 regarding the engineering/drafting details is a "will comply".

An extension was received through May 31, 2010.

Plans to Accept for Review Only – None

New Business – None

Old Business – Actions Regarding Pending Plans

Correspondence – None

Public Comments - None

Planning Commission Comments & Project Reports-

Karen Bedics stated that the EAC has been tasked with doing the well monitoring in the Township. The committee needed to know how often, what they are monitoring for, and what the Township would do if any problems were found. There was a lengthy discussion regarding monitoring wells. Mr. Douglas suggested developing a monitoring program and deciding what it is they are looking for. He suggested meeting with Mr. Littlefield or a professional to who can interpret the collected data, should any abnormal observations arise. It was suggested that the wells be monitored four times a year for water level, to the nearest inch.

At 9:10 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,



Heather DiSario
Recording Secretary

Next meeting: Wednesday, March 3, 2010

