

Gerald DeLong called the Regular Meeting of the Franconia Township Planning Commission to order at 7:01 p.m. on Wednesday, September 6, 2006. Planning Commission Members present included Robert Flosdorf, Keith Kneipp, Bob Yothers, Kerrin Musselman and Kyle Koffel. Assistant Township Manager Jamie P. Worman, Assistant Township Engineer Cynthia Van Hise, and Nathan Walker from County Planning were also present for this meeting. Doug Worley was absent. (Excused)

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Kneipp made a motion to approve the minutes from the August 7, 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. Ms. Worman informed the group that revised plans were submitted on August 25<sup>th</sup>, 2006. However, they were missing the stormwater reports so reviews had not yet started.

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

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

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

Cheryleen Strothers of Cowan Associates and Don Hagey were present to discuss this application. Ms. Strothers gave a brief overview of the project. She summarized the project by stating that the intention at this point is to prepare the lots and put the road in for future use. She then addressed the Metz Review letter dated August 31<sup>st</sup>, 2006. She mentioned that they would comply with the majority of the items. However, there were a few issues that they would need to discuss. Ms. Strothers stated that the main issue with the project is the stormwater management. She explained that the basin is designed to reduce the runoff but the comment in the letter indicates it should be set up as a best management practice (BMP). She went onto explain that the basin they are proposing at this point is a temporary basin and to set it up as a BMP seemed unnecessary. Mr. Hagey added

that he was concerned that following the BMP would require him to install a wetland basin that they would have to maintain only to replace it in the future with two basins. Mr. Delong questioned if there was a natural swale there. Ms. Strothers replied that it was a natural swale and there is no wetland there. She also added that they have an easement covering it and a note will be added to the plans indicating this. Ms. Van Hise then informed the board that the issue here was part of the new stormwater ordinance that was mandated by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and adopted by the township that requires that you provide for water quality and quantity in your stormwater management designs. Ms. Strothers replied that the volume issue can be handled in other ways but it's the quality issue that has the applicant concerned. Mr. Yothers asked if enlarging the basin would fix the problem. Ms. Van Hise replied that it would fix the volume issue but the water quality would need to be addressed in another way. Ms. Strothers explained that they were trying to comply with the intent of the ordinance. Mr. Delong asked if they knew when lot 1 would be developed. Mr. Hagey replied that they did not know at this point. Ms. Van Hise reminded the group that the project must also be submitted to PennDot. Ms. Strothers replied that they have not yet submitted to PennDot. Ms. Van Hise mentioned that it might be best to see a preliminary review from PennDot before giving any type of approval. Mr. Hagey restated that he was concerned about creating a wetland. Ms. Van Hise replied that she felt the ordinance could be met without creating a wetland. Ms. Strothers then asked to go through the waivers to get some feedback on which requests were supported by the commission. Mr. Hagey then voiced another concern which was water and sewer. He would like to coordinate installing the lines for this project when the lines are installed in Schoolhouse Road if possible. Ms. Strothers continued through the waivers. There were no issues with the waivers presented. Mr. Delong asked Ms. Strothers if coming back in once a review from PennDot was received was acceptable. She replied it was and asked that Ms. Van Hise provide a letter to accompany their submission. Ms. Van Hise agreed. No further discussion took place on this application.

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

Mr. Zach Ranstead of Stout, Tacconelli and Associates was present to discuss this application. He gave a brief update that they were currently making application to PennDot and would be back in once they received a response. No further discussion took place.

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

Mr. Zach Ranstead of Stout, Tacconelli and Associates was present to discuss this application. He was filling in for Susan Rice who could not make the meeting. Mr. Ranstead gave a brief overview of the project. He reported that revisions to the project had been made and he addressed the Metz review letter dated August 31<sup>st</sup>, 2006. He stated that the applicant will comply with all the review comments. He reported that the applicant had submitted to the conservation district. Ms. Van Hise asked if they had received a review back from the conservation district. Mr. Ranstead replied that they had not. Mr. Ranstead then reviewed the waiver and asked for feedback from the commission as to where they stood on the requests. Ms. Ranstead explained that they were seeking a waiver from sidewalks and curbing. The curbing waiver is a partial request. He explained that in the parking area they would a grass area between the parking space and basin which was a BMP and it was better not to have curbing in this area. He then reviewed the proposed stone parking area in the rear of the building and reported that they were seeking a waiver from paving this area. Mr. Delong asked the commission if there were any issues with the waivers requested. The group agreed that they were okay with the sidewalk and curbing requests but were unsure about the stone parking area. Mr. Yothers suggested that the group defer the request to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Flosdorf asked if the stone parking lot became a problem could there be some arrangement to have it paved later. Ms. Van Hise replied that that could be a condition of approval and a note could be placed on the plan indicating this. Ms. Van Hise then explained that Susan Rice is currently working with the conservation district to get resolution on the infiltration issues out at the site. She then went onto say that the plans were good but that the stormwater issues need to be resolved before they would support an approval. No further discussion took place.

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

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

Knittel Minor Subdivision (#06-06)

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

Miriam Halteman Minor Subdivision (#08-06)

Mr. Scott Camburn of Urwiler and Walter Inc., and Mr. Greg Pavlovitz, Esquire were present to discuss this application. They presented the plan that had been formally accepted at the July 5<sup>th</sup>, 2006 Planning Commission Meeting. They explained they had gone through the required conditional use hearing on August 21<sup>st</sup>, 2006 and had received approval. They went through the items that resulted from the hearing and stated that they had not yet received the formal decisions with the conditions. Ms. Worman asked Mr. Camburn if revisions to the plan had been submitted to the township. He replied that they had not because the formal decision had not yet been issued. Ms. Worman explained to both men that conditional use approval did not mean land development/subdivision approval. She explained that the commission had only formally accepted the plans in July. Everything was then put on hold while it went through the conditional use hearing. Now that it received approval the plans should be revised, resubmitted and then will undergo the normal review and planning procedures. Mr. Pavlovitz questioned the point of that being that this was an issue for a different board and that they already had the approval. Mr. Delong replied that the commission had not seen the plans and now they are before them telling them about all these conditions with nothing in writing and nothing indicated on the plans. Mr. Flosdorf continued that they were asking for approval based on here say. Mr. Camburn and Mr. Pavlovitz maintained that they were led to believe that the plans were being reviewed and that the conditional use would not have delayed that process. Ms. Worman explained that the conditional use was similar to the zoning hearing board. When an application comes in the commission would review it and then determine that it needs to go before the zoning hearing board. The zoning hearing board would then rule on the plan and the plan would be revised and resubmitted and the land development/subdivision process would pick up from that point. Mr. Camburn then quickly reviewed the plan. He mentioned that it was a 2-lot subdivision creating a flag lot that will be accessed off of a shared driveway. The house will remain on lot 1 and a lot 2 will be available for the construction of a single-family dwelling. There would be a private well and septic. Mr. Walker stated that he had a question about the floodplain and he asked Ms. Van Hise if she had looked at that. Ms. Van Hise replied that she had not reviewed the plans because of the conditional use and had intended on doing so after the hearing. Mr. Walker then mentioned that a waiver request would be needed for the access. Mr. Camburn replied that a waiver was not needed because they were carrying the easement. Mr. Delong clarified that what they had there was 4 houses and the township requires a 25 foot access for each house. He then asked if there was an existing easement. Mr. Camburn replied that yes there was an existing easement. Mr. Delong continued explaining that the easement needs to be added to

the plans and then finished by stating that the plans need to come back in before the commission when revised. The group agreed. No further discussion took place on this application.

Reformed Baptist Church Subdivision (#09-06)

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

Earl Moyer Tract Subdivision (#10-06)

Mr. Andy Schlosser from Schlosser and Clauss was present to discuss this application. Mr. Schlosser quickly reviewed the plan. He stated that the property was located at the intersection of Hunsicker Road and Keller Creamery Road. The applicant is proposing to break off a 4-acre parcel. Mr. Schlosser then explained that the main parcel is currently being considered for farmland preservation. He then reported that the applicant was going to reconsider his lot size and come back before the commission at a later date. No further discussion took place

Hopewell Christian Land Development (#11-06)

No one was present to discuss this application. Ms. Worman explained to the commission that the plans for this project were formally accepted at the August meeting. However, it was discovered after the meeting that the plans were missing two sheets and the stormwater reports had not been submitted. Therefore, the reviews have not begun on this project and will not start until a complete submission is delivered to the township. Ms. Worman then informed the group that a waiver of the 90-day time limitation was needed for the following projects: Donald & Linda Hagey Subdivision, Miriam Halteman Subdivision, and the Reformed Baptist Church Subdivision. Mr. Kneipp made a motion to deny the plans if a waiver of the time limitation were not received. Mr. Musselman seconded the motion. The motion passed

**New Business**

There was no new business brought before the commission.

**ZONING HEARING BOARD APPLICATIONS**

Ms. Worman reported that the application that had been submitted by Tim and Dana Wilson to permit an in-law suite at their property located at 101 Line Drive had been approved.

Ms. Worman then reported that Sharon Mininger had submitted an application to the Zoning Hearing Board for a variance on the use of the property located at 78 Hatfield Pike. She would like to purchase the property for a veterinarian clinic. She would also be seeking lot size and parking area relief. The hearing is scheduled for September 11, 2006.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Ms. Worman asked if anyone was interested in attending the two classes that are being offered for planning and zoning. Mr. Flosdorf mentioned that the one class began that evening. Mr. Kneipp mentioned that he would like to attend but was having difficulty arranging it with his work schedule. Ms. Worman then announced that the Earlington 3M Component had been advertised and was available for review and comment at the township building.

#### **NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING**

The next scheduled Planning Commission meeting is **Monday, October 2, 2006** at 7:00 p.m.

There was no further business discussed at the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 8:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jamie P. Worman, Assistant Manager