

Warrington Township Planning Commission Minutes for March 4, 2010 Meeting

The regular meeting of the Warrington Township Planning Commission was held at 7:37pm on March 4, 2010 at the Township Building located at 852 Easton Road, Warrington, PA 18976. The members present were as follows:

Douglas E. Skinner	Chairman
Shirley Yannich	Absent
Steven Tiberio	Secretary
Frank Gonser	Member
Dick Wieland	Carrolle Engineering
Michael Mrozinski	Director of Planning and Development

2. Call to Order/ Pledge of Allegiance:

The meeting opened with the Pledge of Allegiance

3. Public Comments:

Michael Kelly, 135 Muirfield Dr

Mr. Kelly asked if Warrington Township followed PA State Act 247 in regards to zoning. The commission and Mr. Wieland explained that Act 247 is the authority and process used to develop zoning ordinances, not the details of the ordinances. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors then use the ordinances to guide the planning and development of the township.

Mr. Kelly asked the process that is followed for any project, TEVA in particular in this instance, to gain approval in the township. Mr. Mrozinski provided Mr. Kelly with the procedure sheet showing the steps all projects must follow in Warrington Township.

Mr. Kelly asked what happened to the village vision, as stated in the 2006 Comprehensive Plan, for the area now being considered for TEVA. Mr. Skinner stated that no zoning changes were done at the time of the adoption of the comprehensive plan due to the variety of opinions on what direction they would like to see for the Eureka area.

Bill Sansom, 108 Green Ash Lane

Mr. Sansom asked if we knew yet or when we might know if blasting was going to be required for the Lingo project. He was assured that there would be notification for the neighbors if blasting was necessary, but it was not yet known if it would be necessary.

Brenda Boxer, ___ Stump Rd

Mrs. Boxer stated that even after all the township inspections and permits were paid for, their house had been partially built on another person's property and they had to obtain an easement. This was several years ago, but she wanted to know how this had happened.

4. New Business:

4.1 Review Cardamone Sketch Plan 825 Stump Rd, adjacent to Pickertown Rd

Bob Showalter, from Showalter & Associates Engineering, was present this evening with the applicant, Mr. Cardamone. This sketch plan takes 2 ten acre parcels and makes 9 new residential parcels while maintaining Mr. Cardamone's home and business on separate parcels. All the new lots will be an acre or more. A new road off Pickertown Rd will have 5 parcels including the 5 acre parcel necessary for the landscaping business. The road will be the required 24 ft non-curved for a road in the township, but the cul-de-sac at the end is not currently 100 ft across. This was done to avoid as much paving as possible. There will be 2 flag lots each with a minimum of 50 ft frontage on the road as required by ordinance. Lots # 7 and 8 are out of the set back for the stream. Lots #5 and 6 take access off of Pickertown Rd, but their curb cut is shared and the drives separate just outside of the right of way. This curb cut is also very close to lining up with Stump Rd. This way there is only two new curb cut onto Pickertown rather than three. There will be three new cuts onto Stump Rd.

The plan already includes replacing the culvert under Pickertown Rd. with a larger, 18 inch pipe to help the storm water issue. An infiltration basin on south side of the new road will be installed to provide added storm water management and open space for the development.

No sidewalks or curbing are planned at this time.

Mr. Cardamone commented that due to previous zoning changes, he feels he is being penalized. He could have gotten more density with the previous PRD zoning than the current RA zoning.

It was discussed that a waiver for the cul-de-sac size was unlikely. To compensate for the additional paving, an island could be added in the cul-de-sac to add green.

Items to be reviews for the next submission:

- Perimeter path/ sidewalks

- Stormwater management

- Curbing, including it on Pickertown Rd, but possible not on Stump Rd.

- Cul-de-sac, enlarge to allow for emergency vehicles to turn around

Mr. Wieland suggested they take a closer look at the infiltration basin planned. Due to the magnitude of the storm water issues, an infiltration basin may not be enough.

Brenda Bosser, Stump Rd

Ms. Bosser believes people should be able to develop their property as they see fit. She believes this to be a good plan and she will grant any easements needed if necessary.

Melanie Eble, 926 Stump Rd

Ms. Eble stated that Mr. Cardamone has kept the neighbors well informed of his intentions and believes this to be a respectful job developing his property.

She also does not want to see sidewalks in this area. They will do whatever is necessary to avoid having to have them installed. It would be better to focus on the stormwater issues rather than

sidewalks.

Bill Sansom, 108 Green Ash Lane

Mr. Sansom sees the storm water improvements as a vast improvement and commends Mr. Cardamone on this plan

4.2 Discussion of Annual Goals and Objectives of the Planning Commission

The mission statement was acceptable to all members present.

The goals for this year were listed as follows:

- Update 307 Ordinances

- Review the TDR applications

- Update the land use for the corridor overlay and CBD District

- Set design standards

- Support the efforts of the Historic commission

- Encourage pedestrian access

- Encourage BMP storm water management practices and alternative energy uses.

These were also approved by all members present.

4.3 Discussion of Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance 22§ 330 – Corridor Overlay Reviews.

There was discussion concerning the review of proposals for signage and architectural changes within the Corridor Overlay. There was discussion of one particular proposal that may have been subsequently withdrawn.

4.4 Discussion of Zoning Ordinances Amendment concerning height standards and open space

Items 4 and 5 regarding the open space was discussed. It was a simple matter of moving a point from one section to another to make the ordinance easier to read and more organized. With a motion by Mr. Tiberio and seconded by Mr. Gonser, the Planning Commission voted to recommend to the Warrington Township Board of Supervisors the revisions to sections 855 and 856 as written. The motion passed with a vote of 3-0.

Item 1 regarding the height restriction for section 1105 for commercial uses was discussed. With a motion by Mr. Tiberio and seconded by Mr. Gonser, the Planning Commission voted to recommend to the Warrington Township Board of Supervisors that the maximum height restriction for Commercial 2 be stated to match that of the Commercial 1 district in section 1005. The motion passed with a vote of 3-0.

Item 2 and 3 deal with the height restrictions in the PI 1 and PI 2 districts. The planned restrictions were stated as 55 ft. This was discussed as being a reasonable height with the allowance of 10 ft for facades and other non occupied/decorative above the 55 ft limit. The addition of making up to 65 ft a conditional usage was also discussed, but no conditions were decided at this time.

Mike Kelly, 135 Muirfield Rd

Mr. Kelly asked if it would not be preferable to set these limits to protect the residents. It was

explained that not only would this not be a benefit to the residents in that if it was passed they would then be allowed 10ft more than their last submission which was 45ft closest to his home.

An opinion was offered that making a change now would also open the township up to legal action which if they won would then allow them to build as they chose.

After discussion it was deemed that it would not be prudent to set standards or make any changes to the zoning for these districts with plans already in the process of being reviewed by the township. With a motion by Mr. Tiberio and seconded by Mr. Gonser, the Planning Commission voted to recommend to the Warrington Township Board of Supervisors the revisions to sections 1205 and 1305 as written regarding the height restrictions in the PI1 and PI2 zoning districts. The motion DID NOT pass with a vote of 0-3.

5. Old Business

5.1 Discussion of Zoning Ordinances 27 Part 15A – Town Center Zoning

This matter was deferred due to the lateness of the hour

6. Approval of Minutes:

6.1 January 7, 2010

On a motion made by Mr. Skinner, seconded by Mr. Gonser, the Warrington Township Planning Commission voted to approve the minutes of January 7, 2010. This motion passed by a vote of 3-0.

7. Posting of Minutes:

7.1 February 4, 2010

On a motion made by Mr. Skinner, seconded by Mr. Tiberio, the Warrington Township Planning Commission voted to post the minutes of February 4, 2010. This motion passed by a vote of 3-0.

7. Adjournment:

With no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 10:20, with a motion by Mr. Tiberio, and seconded by Mr. Gonser, with a vote of 3-0

Recorder: Amy Organeck