

Springfield Township Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes 2 June 2021

Chairperson Dawn Nicholson called the meeting to order at 7:01 PM with Commission members Karen Bedics, Bobb Carson, Jay Fuggiti, Brian Hague and Angela Kelly in attendance. Also in attendance were Jason Wager, Tim Fulmer, Scott McNair, Scott Mease and Deborah Pfeiffer.

Sheetz Land Development Plan Review – Mr. Mease represented Mr. Sheetz who was not in attendance due to a broken leg. He presented an overview of the project explaining that it was a 7.4 acre property that for the past several years, has been used for a commercial logging/firewood business. The Township is now attempting to bring the owner into compliance with our ordinances by taking one of two approaches:

1. Land Development
2. Storm water Management Plan

The applicant selected the land development option and was presenting those plans this evening.

Mr. McNair explained that Mr. Sheetz had received several notices of violations approximately two to three years ago for stormwater, SALDO and zoning violations. He had begun to comply but then stopped and has since expanded the operation. He was required to move a driveway which he had established on railroad property and he complied with that requirement. He never submitted a land development plan until tonight's meeting. Mr. McNair stated that the Township was merely seeking compliance.

The Commission then reviewed Mr. Fulmer's findings and recommendations, which were enumerated in his letter of 5/26/21.

1. This item confirmed Mr. McNair's comments and Mr. Mease indicated they were submitting the land development plan as required.
2. Item two questioned classifying the use of this property as G3 (Contractor Services). As there appears to be manufacturing or processing of raw materials taking place, it was questioned if G6 would be more appropriate. The owner needs to explain the type of operations that are and will be taking place on the property so that the proper classification can be established.
3. There is a proposed retention basin (pond) within the riparian buffer area. This may be permitted as a conditional use as it is permitted in the minimal disturbance zone. Mr. Mease indicated they will submit a request for a conditional use for this storm water facility. It is not known if there presently are or were wetlands on the property prior to previous land disturbance but the soils in the area are indicative of wetlands. Mr. Fulmer recommended a wetlands study be conducted to determine if there are or were wetlands on the property as they exist on adjacent properties and a water course does run through the property. The Commission members agreed this should be done. Ms. Nicholson indicated that we have a plan showing how the property was and how it is now but we need a plan to show what it is intended to look like in the future.
4. Mr. Fulmer indicated that appropriate buffers need to be established and shown on the plan. Mr. Carson indicated that trees which were removed when the drive to the back of

the property was created, on SEPTA property, should be replaced. Several members agreed that permanent fencing needs to be established separating the rail trail from this commercial property for safety reasons.

5. Item five deals with previous encroachments on neighboring properties. The plan indicates stone placed on the adjacent property will be removed and the area seeded with grass. There is also an issue of previous grading. Mr. Mease stated that Mr. Metzger, who owns the aggrieved property, indicated he did not care about the encroachments. It was suggested Mr. Sheetz get this in writing if it were the case. The other area of encroachment is along the rail trail. Commission members agreed this former driveway must be put back to its original condition with fencing, berms and trees which will completely block further use as a driveway.
6. Comment six dealt with storm water. A plan had been previously submitted but since that time, a new driveway on the property has been added creating more impervious surface. Mr. Fulmer was satisfied that the original plan was still adequate. Two storm water facilities are being proposed, the one in the minimum disturbance area and one in the northeast corner. The one in the minimum disturbance area will need conditional approval. Ms. Nicholson questioned if we needed a 300 foot minimum setback as the rail trail is considered a linear park. Mr. McNair indicated that was a requirement only for a quarry. It was noted that neither the well nor the drain field were shown on the plan and must be added to the plan.
7. Mr. Mease indicated that they would comply with items seven through eleven.

The current timeline for action on the plan, based on its date of submission, is the end of July. Mr. Mease indicated that they would grant an extension so the Planning Commission has more time to review the proposal.

20 May 2021 minutes - The minutes were reviewed and approved following a motion by Mr. Carson and a second by Mr. Hague.

Other Business –

Mr. Wager indicated that Mr. Hopkins had not completed the RFP for the Comprehensive Plan but that it would be provided to us by June 4th.

Ms. Bedics asked about a date for the proposed joint meeting with the EAC. Mr. Wager will approach the EAC regarding this matter and get potential dates for a meeting.

Business being concluded, Ms. Nicholson adjourned the meeting at 9:14 PM.