

Gerald DeLong called the Regular Meeting of the Franconia Township Planning Commission to order at 7:01 p.m. on Wednesday, July 5, 2006. Planning Commission Members present included Robert Flosdorf, Douglas Worley, Keith Kneipp, Bob Yothers, and Kyle Koffel. Township Manager, Kevin D. Bayer, Assistant Township Manager Jamie P. Worman, Assistant Township Engineer Cynthia Van Hise, and Nathan Walker from County Planning were also present for this meeting. Kerrin Musselman was absent. (Excused)

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Worley made a motion to approve the minutes from the June 5, 2006 Regular Planning Commission Meeting. Mr. Yothers seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

## **SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT**

### **OLD BUSINESS**

#### *Hendricks Land Development – Godshall Road (#06-04)*

No action was taken on this proposal. Revisions have not been submitted for review.

#### *Reinford Subdivision- Godshall Road (#07-05)*

No action was taken on this proposal. Revisions have not been submitted for review.

#### *Windy Heights Subdivision-Keller Creamery Road (#11-05)*

No action was taken on this proposal. Revisions were submitted June 26<sup>th</sup>, 2006 and are being reviewed at this time.

#### *Todd Walker Subdivision – Mininger Road (#12-05)*

No action was taken on this proposal. Revisions not yet submitted for review.

#### *Donald & Linda Hagey Subdivision – Schoolhouse Road (#16-05)*

No action was taken on this proposal. Revisions have not been submitted for review.

#### *The Weimer Group Land Development- Rte. 113 & Schoolhouse Rd. (#03-06)*

Zach Ranstead of Stout Tacconelli & Associates was present to discuss this application. Mr. Wimmer, the applicant, was also present. Mr. Ranstead gave an overview of the proposed project. He explained that the applicant was looking to relocate his insurance business from Elroy Road to

the corner of Schoolhouse Road and Route 113. The applicant had received a zoning hearing board approval to permit an office use in a residential district. Mr. Ranstead went on to explain that the applicant intended on converting the house to an office and also install the necessary parking and stormwater facilities. He mentioned that the septic system on the site had been tested and approved and they would be continuing its use. He also mentioned that they are proposing to widen the driveway with no relocation. Mr. Ranstead then addressed the Metz Engineers and SC Engineer review letters. Mr. Ranstead started with the SC Engineers' letter, which mainly dealt with only the sewer. Mr. Ranstead assured the commission that he would be able to provide all the required information that dealt with the septic system. If the information did not support an on-lot system then they would look to tie into public sewer via a grinder pump into Peter Becker's line. Mr. Ranstead then addressed the Metz letter. He mentioned that he will need to request a few waivers in conjunction with this application. Mr. Ranstead started out with the comments regarding road improvements. He agreed with the commission that it would be wise to wait for the review from PennDot to see what they are looking for on Schoolhouse Road and the intersection of Route 113. He explained that his applicant did not want to get involved with improving the intersection and installing a new traffic signal as they feel this project will have minimal traffic impacts. Mr. Delong questioned the parking area and asked how many spaces they would need. Mr. Wimmer replied that they were providing 13 spaces so that they don't have the issue of not enough parking. Mr. Delong then asked if they could fit the parking spaces in with the location of the septic system. Mr. Ranstead replied that they felt they could fit the parking in but if not they would reconfigure the lot or look into public sewer options. Mr. Delong commented that he felt they should tie into public sewer since it was so close to the site. Mr. Delong then commented on the curb and sidewalk and he reminded the group that at one time there was an easement through Peter Becker for the future sidewalk and curbing along Schoolhouse Road and that he felt curbing should definitely be required for this project. Mr. Delong then asked Mr. Ranstead if he had been aware of this agreement that existed with Peter Becker. Mr. Ranstead replied that he knew there was an easement presumably for sidewalk. Mr. Delong asked about the shed on the property. Mr. Ranstead replied that they would be shifting the shed so that it was within the required setbacks. Mr. Ranstead then touched on the landscaping issues. He stated that they would be seeking some relief of the landscape requirements. He assured the group that the landscape architect would make sure that what was proposed would be the maximum that could fit on the site. He then passed out a picture of the site so that the members could see the existing buffer. Mr. Worley questioned if the buffering was on their property or the neighbors. Mr. Ranstead replied that it was on the neighbors. Mr. Delong

questioned whether they would be requesting signage as well. Mr. Ranstead said they would request signage in compliance with the code. Mr. DeLong asked what was proposed for runoff. Mr. Ranstead replied that they were trying to address runoff by expanding the Peter Becker Community basin. They approached Peter Becker about the basin and they were reluctant to have them alter the basin. Therefore, they created a seepage stone bed that is hydraulically linked to the Peter Becker basin. He explained that they are still using the basin but in a less intrusive way that they are agreeable to. Mr. Kneipp then asked about curbing along the driveway. Mr. Ranstead replied that there is curbing but that they are putting in a curb cut to drain the water. Mr. DeLong then asked about the right-of-way line and commented that the line should match Peter Becker. Mr. Ranstead explained that if they give up that much right of way they would be creating a non-conforming lot. Mr. Baver replied that it would not create a non-conforming lot because it is needed for the township. He stated that at the direction of the township solicitor he has been advised that that cannot push the lot into non-conformity. Mr. Baver also mentioned that the additional right of way was a condition agreed to at the zoning hearing. Ms. Van Hise asked if the existing driveway would be removed when it's widened. Mr. Ranstead replied that it would be removed. Mr. Walker then quickly went over his review letter. He mentioned the parking lot setbacks. He suggested that the adjacent districts be considered, and if they have to reconfigure the parking area it they should consider at least a 20-foot setback. Mr. Walker then mentioned that sidewalks in that area are consistent with the open space plan. Mr. Ranstead then touched on a few more items in the review. He reiterated that he did not intend to do any redesign of the basin at Peter Becker as they would not be in favor of that. Mr. Kneipp asked if the township would need proof that Peter Becker was okay with this. Ms. Van Hise replied that yes they would need something in writing and an easement would be required. No further discussion took place.

*J.I. Welding & Mechanical Land Development- Hagey Road (#04-06)*

Ms. Susan Rice of Stout Tacconelli and Associates was present to discuss this application. She gave a brief overview of the project. She explained that the applicants are currently renting space on Forman Road and are looking to relocate to a building they would own. The proposed project is located on Hagey Road and they would be constructing a shop area and office building along with the associated parking and stormwater facilities. An on-site holding tank was proposed with the intention of tying into public sewer when available. Ms. Rice then went through the Metz review letter. Ms. Rice stated that the applicant was not proposing any curbing at the site. She mentioned that the driveway and employee parking area would be paved and the area in the rear would be a

stone parking lot. Mr. Landis explained that the curb was not needed for stormwater and that the stone area was just for staging the trucks. Ms. Rice then addressed the comment pertaining to the truck turning. She explained that the applicant did not need the trucks to back up to the building and that the company was currently operating at less than 100 feet and it works fine. She then explained that they are currently working to obtain a drainage easement from the neighbor and would be providing a swale for the stormwater management. Ms. Rice then addressed the landscaping item that requested the adjacent uses be considered in order to determine the required buffer. Ms. Rice explained that they believed all the uses were industrial and that the buffer proposed is what is required for the site. Ms. Van Hise agreed. Ms. Rice then mentioned that they would be seeking a waiver for the sidewalk in front of the site. Mr. Worley questioned how many trucks would be accessing the site. Mr. Landis replied that there would be very few trucks, which was why he was not concerned with the trucks backing up to the building. He also explained that the back parking area would be for loading and unloading. Mr. Koffel then questioned the township's approach to a stone lot. Mr. Baver replied that he would check but that he felt they had been consistent with not permitting the stone lot for permanent use. Mr. Landis reiterated that the stone lot would not be a pull through. Mr. Delong questioned whether any of it would be paved. Ms. Rice replied that there were areas that would be paved. Mr. Delong then questioned the curb. Ms. Rice confirmed that there is no curbing proposed on the entire site. Mr. Landis then explained that they were trying to keep costs down and would be agreeable to installing the curb later. Mr. Kneipp questioned if the trucks pulled stones out when they left. Mr. Landis replied that they did not. Mr. Baver mentioned that C&C was required to curb. Mr. Walker then stated that he was concerned with the stone. He asked what confines the stone and whether it would expand out of that designated area. Mr. Walker suggested some type of landscaping be installed around the edge if the paving was waived in that area. Mr. Worley agreed and felt that there should be curbed at least along the radius to define the driveway. Ms. Rice agreed that they could do that.

*Ken Taggart Subdivision- 521 Cowpath Road (#05-06)*

Ms. Christine Sarver of Kaplin Stewart and Mr. Marty Eustace of Eustace Engineers were present to discuss this application. Ms. Sarver explained that the applicant was proposing a 7-lot subdivision of a 5-acre parcel located on Cowpath Road. Mr. Eustace then addressed the Metz review letter that he had received. He started by explaining that the converted barn and garage on the property would be removed and the farmhouse would remain. He mentioned that the lots would be located off of a cul-de-sac road. He then stated that most of the letter was technical and could be handled by staff.

He then addressed the sidewalk item. He explained that item three states that it is required that the entire frontage of the property be sidewalked. He mentioned that this would include a pedestrian bridge and extension of the culvert. He explained that in order to accomplish this they would need a permanent easement because there is not enough room. He went on to say that they would also need approval from PennDot and be required to have a hydraulic study completed. He requested to talk about this with the engineer when they meet to go over the project. He suggested that maybe the funds could be given with the work being done in the future. Mr. Walker mentioned that sidewalk there would complete the connection needed. Mr. Eustace asked the commission how they would feel about money in lieu of doing the improvements at this time. Mr. Delong replied that that would be okay since we have to wait for PennDot. Ms. Van Hise then asked if there would be a homeowners association or would the road be offered for dedication to the township. Mr. Eustace replied that it would be offered to the township. Ms. Van Hise questioned the length of the cul-de-sac. Mr. Walker replied that it was 190 feet. Mr. Bayer stated that 250 feet is usually the minimum because of liquid fuels funding. Mr. Walker then mentioned that there needs to be a grass buffer between the road and the sidewalk and it needs to be proposed along Cowpath Road. Mr. Eustace explained that they had to meet the existing curb line. He suggested pulling the face out further. Ms. Van Hise replied that the township is consistent with the distance from the centerline and that additional right of way may be needed. Mr. Walker asked if a trail was proposed. Mr. Bayer replied that a trail easement already existed. Ms. Van Hise commented that the trail easement needed to be labeled on the plan. Mr. Flosdorf stated that the location of the trail didn't make sense and asked if it could be moved. Mr. Bayer replied that it could definitely be considered. Mr. Kneipp suggested the relocation be at the top of the bulb and tie into the sidewalk. Mr. Bayer agreed and stated that that would relieve the culvert extension issue for now. No further discussion took place.

#### *Knittel Minor Subdivision (#06-06)*

Mr. Paul Hartley of Mease Engineers was present to discuss this application. He gave an overview of the project explaining that the applicant was proposing a minor subdivision of her property located at 821 Rising Sun Road. The property is located in the RR district. He reported that a conditional use application had been submitted. He then explained that the intent is to consolidate the small parcel into the larger parcel and then subdivide off a flag lot. Mr. Hartley addressed the memo issued by Metz Engineers. He addressed item number one which was a primary concern about the total acreage of the property. He explained that he was in the process of sorting the

discrepancy out with the county. He mentioned that a survey of the property had been completed and he saw no reason why this issue would not get resolved. He then went on to discuss the item of developable acreage. He explained that after netting out the features required there doesn't appear to be enough acreage left for the subdivision and suggested a lot line adjustment be considered. Mr. Bayer replied that the solicitor advised him that the lot line adjustment was not a possibility and would still be viewed as a subdivision. Mr. Bayer then stated that there may be a need to go before the zoning hearing board for relief because the constraints are not self inflicted. Ms. Knittel asked why if she owned 4 acres and only needed 2 acres to subdivide what difference it made where that 2 acres was located. Mr. Bayer explained the definition of developable acreage. Mr. Bayer offered to sit with the solicitor and review this application. Mr. Worley questioned whether they could have on-site water and public sewer. Mr. Bayer said they could and that public water was not coming to the area. Mr. Walker questioned a trail proposal through the stream corridor. Mr. Bayer replied that he didn't think that would work because of the easements that would be needed that he didn't feel we could obtain. No further discussion took place.

#### **New Business**

##### *Potter & Hawley Minor Subdivision (Lot Line Adjustment)- Heatherfield Drive & Cherry Lane (#07-06)*

Mr. Hawley was present to discuss this application. He explained that the Potter's approached him and asked him to sell them a piece of his property so that they could add it to their property. Mr. Hawley agreed and they had the plans prepared. Mr. Walker mentioned that the township doesn't currently own the right of way on Cherry Lane and this might be an opportunity to obtain that. Mr. Bayer explained to Mr. Hawley that Mr. Walker was suggesting that the right of way be offered to the township so they would have it for any future improvements that might be done along Cherry Lane. Mr. Hawley replied that he would talk to his decedents about that. Mr. Kneipp pointed out that the seal on the plans needed to be changed. Mr. Delong asked for a motion to formally accept the plans and give conditional preliminary/final approval to the application. Mr. Worley made a motion and Mr. Koffel seconded it. The motion passed unanimously.

##### *Miriam Halteman Minor Subdivision- Halteman Road (#08-06)*

Mr. Greg Pavlovitz, an attorney for Miriam Halteman, was present to discuss this application. He gave an overview of the project stating that it is a minor 2-lot subdivision of her parcel located on Halteman Road. A flag lot is proposed with public water and private sewer. He stated that a

conditional use application had been submitted but a hearing had not yet been scheduled. He also mentioned that the road curve and deeds had been sent to the solicitor Joseph Kuhls, supporting that they have full frontage. Mr. Worley asked how many houses would be accessed off the shared driveway. Mr. Pavlovitz replied that there would be two more houses off of the driveway. Mr. Walker mentioned that a waiver was needed for individual access to each lot. Mr. Delong asked for a motion to formally accept the application. Mr. Kneipp made a motion to formally accept the application. Mr. Worley seconded it. The motion passed. No further discussion took place.

*Reformed Baptist Church Subdivision- 644 Allentown Road (#09-06)*

An application was submitted to the township for a 3-lot subdivision located at 644 Allentown Road in the Rural Resource Zoning District. Mr. Yothers made a motion to formally accept the application. Mr. Flosdorf seconded the motion. The motion passed. No further discussion took place.

**ZONING HEARING BOARD APPLICATIONS**

Mr. Baver reported that the Anita Pitock Zoning Hearing had been continued and is scheduled for July 10, 2006.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Ms. Worman informed the group that there had been minor revisions to the proposed zoning ordinance amendments and she distributed the corrected documents. Mr. Walker mentioned that he had circulated a draft review letter regarding the amendments for everyone to review.

**NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING**

The next scheduled Planning Commission meeting is **Monday, August 7, 2006** at 7:00 p.m.

There was no further business discussed at the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 7:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jamie P. Worman, Assistant Manager