

**Planning Commission Meeting
MINUTES**

July 6, 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, Walt French, Pete Lamana and Barbara Lindtner. Bryan McAdam, C. Robert Wynn Associates, was present.

Planning Commission Comments

Jim Brownlow noted that Charlie Schmehl will have material out to Members of the Zoning Revision group one week before each meeting. Secondly, all comments and suggestions from residents not part of the official group will be held for discussion until the end of the process at which time these comments and/or questions will be reviewed.

Approval of Minutes

Pete Lamana **moved**, Walt French seconded **seconded**, that the minutes of June 1, 2005, Planning Commission meeting be approved with one correction. Under Friendly Review, Catherine Twomey, four lines from the end of the paragraph, the sentence was corrected to read "They do not plan any new impervious surface *beyond the proposed addition*, so . . ." The motion **passed** unanimously.

Public Comments (Agenda Items) - None

Sketch Plan

Debrigida Major Subdivision (Richlandtown Pike & Gruversville Road) – Mark Reese, Universal Technical, LLC, presented for the applicant, John Debrigida, who was also present. This is the second sketch plan presented for this 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 new design they presented showed 16 one+ acre lots off a slightly lengthened and expanded P-Loop street accessing Gruversville Road. They eliminated the 3 one-acre lots previously on an unattached frontage lot along Gruversville Road. This new arrangement slightly increased the amount of open space preserved.

The actual number of lots will be determined by perc tests which will be conducted once the preliminary sketch plan is suitable to the Commission.

Joe Raynock, a neighbor to the property, pointed out that lots 5 and 7 back up to another larger stream that has water in it all year. Mrs. Raynock further stated that integral to the 60-acres open space are the headwaters of Cooks Creek, which is a designated watershed. She is concerned that the sand mounds and soil disruption on the individual one-acre lots may have a significant impact on the watershed. She also expressed concern that even though a perc might be obtained at the driest time of the year, it is no indication that the soils will be easily managed in a compact development. Mr. Reese assured Mrs. Raynock that they plan to look carefully at the soils on the site. Should there be high water table issues,

they plan to explore alternate systems. Mr. Raynock stated three previous potential buyers for this site have backed out because of poor perc results throughout the property.

The applicant stated he planned to live in this development and thus, was also concerned from a resident’s perspective about the issues under discussion. He hoped to keep this a “development” rather than expanding the lot sizes because there are few developments in Springfield Township and he wants to live in a development where there are friends for his three young children.

The applicant plans to offer the open space to Heritage Conservancy. Mr. Debrigida was not opposed to considering an easement behind lots 7, 8, 9 and 10 for a bridle path which could be utilized by local residents.

Confirmed Appointments

Reed Lane Subdivision – Ed Bender, All County and Associates, Inc., presented for the applicant Middle Bucks Contracting, Inc. Preliminary approval on this plan has been withheld pending satisfactory resolution of the sight distance/speed limit issue on Reed Lane. Since he last appeared before the Commission, the Supervisors approved advertising for a public hearing on adopting a 25-mile per hour speed limit for Reed Lane. (This will take place on August 9, 2005.) The recommended drafting changes have been made to this plan and the only items remaining to be resolved are those normally accomplished after preliminary approval has been granted. Therefore, he requested that the Planning Commission grant preliminary approval on this plan.

Because approval has not been received yet on the Planning Modules and revised plans have not been submitted to our engineer to review the plan changes for completeness, the Planning Commission did not recommend preliminary approval at this time. The applicant will comply with these requests and return to the Planning Commission when these items are complete. An extension has been granted until October 29, 2005.

New Business

Agricultural Security District Applications – The following Springfield Township property owners have requested their properties be included in the Township’s Agricultural Security District:

Ruhle	1706 Hottle Rd	42-9-105 42-9-105-1	66 acres 25 acres
Hottle	1636 Pleasant View Rd	42-9-88 42-9-100	6.432 acres 54.84 acres
Segl	1664 Pleasant View Rd	42-9-101	26 acres
Chilton	1775 Pleasant View Rd	42-9-94 42-9-94-2	12.411 acres 2.98 acres
McIllwain	1879 Pleasant View Rd	42-9-92	49 acres
McGowan	1883 Pleasant View Rd	42-9-94-1	30.61 acres
Soltysiak	2601 Richlandtown Pk	42-9-64	54.67 acres
Opie	1765 State Rd	42-9-122	64.2267 acres
TOTAL:			392.1697 acres

Barbara Lindtner **moved** that the Planning Commission recommend that the Supervisors approve the properties listed for the 8 property owners above for the Agricultural Security District. Pete Lamana **seconded** the motion; it **passed** unanimously.

It was noted that the following plans were received subject to the Township engineer's review for acceptance:

1. Terrence Lloyd Lot-line Adjustment – Township Road
2. Balliet-Kleiner Lot-line Adjustment – Wreccics Road

Old Business

July Zoning Ordinance Planning Meeting – The 10th joint meeting of the Supervisors and Planning Commission will be held on July 21, 2005, at 7:00 p.m.

Correspondence

Callowhill Sketch Plan – The Commission received a letter from Palisades School District dated June 23, 2005, in which some concerns about this project were expressed. The Members instructed the recording secretary to send a letter advising Palisades we received their letter and appreciate their comments, but we cannot comment further at this time because it is only a sketch plan, not a formal subdivision application. A copy of our letter and the Palisades letter will be mailed to the applicant as well.

Reese Subdivision – A letter dated June 30, 2005, was received from Attorney Jim McNamara responding to the Members' question concerning whether an item can be placed on an agenda where the applicant has granted an extension, but where the plan is incomplete and there has been no activity for a period of time. Attorney McNamara stated that the Township is not required to accept an extension. They can reject the extension, schedule the application for a vote, and reject the application itself based on the deficiencies. Within 15 days, the applicant must be notified in writing of the reasons for the rejection.

However, this would still require that the applicant be given sufficient notice that the plan will be considered at a particular meeting. For this reason, the Reese Subdivision plan was not placed on this agenda. Reese will be notified that their plan will be placed on the August 3 agenda for consideration.

Public Comments

Patrice Ryan asked about the status of the Rolling Hills plan. It was noted that the plan was accepted as a preliminary plan and action is required by 8/31/05. There has been no activity by the applicant recently. There were additional comments and concerns expressed about this plan by Mr. and Mrs. Joe Raynock. Specifically, responding to comments about our procedure for assuring that plans that are accepted are complete plans, Jim Brownlow noted that plans will be received by the Township personnel but will be accepted only after a review by the Township engineers for technical completeness.

Mrs. Patricia Raynock asked whether there is a liaison between our Township and the Cooks Creek Conservancy so that proposed development does not adversely affect this watershed. Others also expressed concerns on the same topic evolving from the Debridgida Sketch Plan with 16 new homes adjacent to the Cooks Creek tributaries that was discussed tonight.

Bobb Carson pointed out that the Commission and supervisors are governed by the existing ordinances. They cannot apply standards on developments that are not contained in the ordinances. Any additional standards desired would have to be formally adopted as part of the appropriate ordinance.

Planning Commission Comments

Barbara Lindtner questioned why so many plans remain on the “approved” list (received monthly from the Township engineer) so long without having the plans recorded. It was noted that our Township engineer monitors these plans and sends letters to the applicant when it is close to the expiration of the five-year period permitted for completion of all outstanding plan details. They are told what still needs to be completed prior to plan recordation. There was a discussion about whether a process is in place for notifying an applicant when the 5-year period expires.

Stefanie Campbell will not be able to attend the July 21 joint Supervisors/Planning Commission Zoning Revision Meeting. She asked what the correct procedure is for establishing a historic overlay in our ordinances. Jim Brownlow said that a formal request, identifying the exact area, should be provided to the Township. These suggestions are given to Charlie Schmehl (or to the appropriate consultant) when the ordinance is being revised. Barbara Lindtner suggested that a letter be sent to the Supervisors with copies going to the consultant, the Township attorney, the Planning Commission and the Township Manager.

Pete Lamana mentioned that at the last Supervisors’ meeting, the Supervisors went on record as being opposed to the ACRE initiative. It was noted that the House of Representatives passed this initiative today, but it still needs to go to the Senate for approval.

Adjournment - At 8:30 p.m., Pete Lamana **moved** to adjourn the meeting. Bobb Carson **seconded**; the motion **passed** unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra L. Everitt, Secretary
Next Meeting: August 3, 2005