

East Rockhill Township Planning Commission
Minutes of Meeting – May 10, 2007

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Dean Frankenfield with the following Board members present: Nancy Booz, Anne Fenley, Brenda Sears, Sam Martin, Jim Valletta, Dave Nyman, Township Engineer Steve Baluh, and Township Manager Anne Klepfer. Chairman Frankenfield noted the correspondence listed on the agenda.

The Minutes of April 11, 2007 were approved with amendments suggested by, and on motion by Mr. Nyman, seconded by Nancy Booz; motion carried unanimously.

Old Business

Furmanski Subdivision: Two lots, Three Mile Run Road: The Applicant's Engineering representative Paul Dietz, P.E. of Urwiler & Walter, Inc. of Pipersville, was present asking for consideration of the waiver request letter last revised May 9, 2007, and recommendation for preliminary/final plan approval.

The Planning Commission discussed the following waivers at the previous meeting and is in favor of all of them except for the tree replacement waiver request. Mr. Dietz was directed to count the trees that need to be replaced and come back to the board:

1. US Army Corp of Engineers Jurisdictional Determination
2. Widening of Three Mile Run Road.
3. Providing Curbs along Three Mile Run Road
4. Providing Sidewalks along Three Mile Run Road
5. Replacement of trees on site
6. Providing lighting along public streets.
7. Calculating the existing impervious surfaces on Lot 1 as meadow.

The applicant is now proposing and agreeing to pay, a fee in-lieu-of the replacement trees satisfactory to the Board of Supervisors. The Planning Commission was in favor of this resolution. Nancy Booz moved to recommend approval of the Waivers in the letter of May 9, 2007 and Preliminary/Final Plan Approval subject to the conditions in C. Robert Wynn review letter of May 10, 2007. The motion was seconded by Jim Valletta and approved unanimously.

The Furmanski Planning Module Planning Agency Review was unanimously approved on motion of David Nyman and second by Brenda Sears.

Pettit Preliminary Plan, 9 lots, N. Fifth Street: Attorney John Van Luvanee and Paul Yaskowski of Urwiler and Walter Inc., were present to review this plan and Urwiler and Walter Inc.'s Waiver Request Letter dated January 9, 2007, and the March 1, 2007 C. Robert Wynn Associates' review letter.

Mr. Van Luvanee reviewed the C. Robert Wynn Associates March 1, 2007 letter as follows:

Item No. 1 - The applicant understands and is okay and will comply.

Item No. 2 - The applicant understands and is okay and will comply.

Item No. 3 - Needs some clarification: Type D Buffer yards are required along the farm land tract's outer boundary. Buffer yards should be delineated on the plan and required plantings should be proposed to be installed. Applicant indicates that a fence will be provided as a buffer from the farm parcel. Existing trees and an existing fence are proposed to be maintained as a buffer for the rear of lots 1 - 4. The new fence to delineate the preserved farm tract will be connected into the fence for the basin. Steve Baluh wants the buffer yard to be delineated on the plans. Mr. Baluh and the Planning Commission want the buffer yard to be on the farm side of the road where the fence is going to be erected. The applicant was in agreement.

Item No. 4 – is a work in progress.

Item No. 5 - is a will comply.

Item No. 6 – A conservation easement is suggested on the steep slopes of certain lots. The applicant is willing to comply with this request and suggests that the outside of the back of the building envelope be used for the limits.

Items 7 & 8 refer to waivers that were previously discussed. Of concern is the request for a waiver of the Cul-de-sac length. This item was previously discussed and the applicant believes that the previous consensus with the Planning Commission was that the waiver of length was deemed acceptable due to the unique circumstances and minimal traffic being generated.

Dean questioned the location of the road entrance due to a rise in Fifth Street. Applicant says it is actually the best location to provide the site distance and maintain the riparian buffer that is required. The rise in the road is approximately 250 feet from the proposed entrance road. The applicant is aware that they need a PADOT permit and must satisfy PADOT's requirements. The applicant agreed to provide a sketch showing the adjusted entrance way for Steve Baluh to review.

Item No. 9 – The applicant is requesting a waiver to address the irregular shape of several lots.

Item No. 10 – The applicant requested a waiver of street width, suggesting a 28' cart way with no parking on either side, and posted as same. Only eight houses are on the cul-de-sac and off-street parking is provided. The applicant asked for a waiver. The board is okay with no parking on both sides of the street, with signs posting no parking, due to the small scale of the development and the important natural features on site. The applicant believes parking on one side could still be permitted with 28' street if so desired. The Board prefers, in this circumstance, that no parking restrictions on both sides of the street be required.

Item No. 11 – The applicant is trying to reduce costs. The Township Engineer stated that there are other projects surrounding this one now. Improvements need to be blended and

consistent with those projects. The applicant is willing to comply if a waiver of improvements to Branch Road is considered.

Item No. 12 - Improvements to Branch Road: Applicant is requesting a waiver for Branch Road, and comply with improvements to Fifth Street. David Nyman would like to see cost estimates for all the required improvements including, what they are proposing to do, and what they are asking to be waived. Steve Baluh indicated that a culvert on Branch Road needs replacing; and if anything needs to get done on Branch Road, the storm water improvements should not be waived. The applicant will include this in the cost estimates that will be prepared. The applicant asks the Planning Commission and Board to balance what public improvements will be achieved, versus what happens if the project does not move forward.

Item No.13 - is a “will comply;” however it is designed for worse-case scenario, and they do not believe there will be any infiltration.

Item No.14 - is also a “will comply.”

Item No. 15 - still needs to be worked out with Perkasio Borough Authority.

Item No.16 - is just a comment.

Item No. 17 - is a “will comply.”

Item No. 18 – The applicant asked whether or not the Township wants street lighting. The Planning Commission said it will require street lighting at the intersection, and post lights at the end of driveways. The lights should have an on/off switch.

Item No. 19 - is regarding the fencing along lots 1-4. The existing fence will be examined by Steve Baluh.

Item No. 20 - is a comment from Steve Baluh, P.E., for the applicant to consider and;

Item No. 21 - is something they will agree to do.

Steve Baluh revisited the length of the cul-de-sac and asked if an Emergency Access Drive is possible. The applicant questioned the practicality. Paul Yaskowski discussed the bridle path and thought that might be a good location, but there isn't a direct route to it. The board thought it might help prevent people from using it like a regular access. Paul Yaskowski indicated some issues with grading and loss of pasture to the farm parcel being retained by the owners. Chairman Frankenfield feels strongly that safety and emergency access shouldn't be sacrificed just because of the size of the development. The applicant stated it is theoretically feasible to comply with providing an emergency access; however the riparian corridor will need to be crossed to achieve it. The applicant is still asking for a waiver of this requirement. The Planning Commission is not in favor of it.

Sam Martin commented on the water line and the public good. The water line extension seems to be driving this project. Mr. Martin would like to see the different water route option costs analysis. Is the developer agreeing to the more expensive option for the greater public good?

In summary, the applicant is looking for direction on: Road Improvements to Fifth Street and Branch Roads, the emergency access road, the cul-de-sac length and street width. The Planning Commission would like the applicant to return with a cost analysis before they are willing to make a recommendation on the waiver requests. Steve Baluh suggested these issues be discussed again next month after they come back with the cost estimate information. In the mean time, the infiltration tests can be done. The applicant also reminded the Planning Commission that they voluntarily reduced the number of lots they previously proposed. The applicant will try to resubmit by the third Monday deadline to be back next month.

Chairman Frankenfield noted that the Pettit tract discussion concludes all old and new business. He asked if there was any outstanding business to be discussed. Hearing none, he asked if there was any public comment. The only member of the public still present, Mr. Gerald Harris, had no comments.

Other Business:

The Planning Commission reviewed the Engineer's Summary and identified the plans needing extension letters or action by the Board of Supervisors. Those plans include: Creekside Independent Living, and Furmanski. Nancy Booz moved to recommend the Board of Supervisors deny the Creekside plan unless an extension of time is granted. The motion was seconded by Sam Martin and approved by a vote of 6-0-1; Mr. David Nyman abstaining. The Furmanski plan should be on Board of Supervisors Agenda next Tuesday for approval and should not need an additional extension.

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 PM by motion by Dean Frankenfield, and seconded by Brenda Sears, all in favor.

Respectfully submitted:

Sam Martin
Secretary

Recorded:

Anne W. Klepfer
Township Manager