

# Warrington Township Planning Commission

## Minutes for June 20, 2013 Meeting

The regular meeting of the Warrington Township Planning Commission was held at 7:32 pm. June 20, 2013 at the Township Building located at 852 Easton Road, Warrington, PA 18976. The members present were as follows:

Fred Gaines	Chairperson
Dennis Gordon	Vice-Chair
Madeline Sturm	Secretary
Ted Piotrowicz	Absent
Ben Redd	Member
Richard Rycharski	Member
Vince Evans	Member
Tom Gockowski	Carroll Engineering
Roy Rieder	Codes, Inspections, and Emergency Services

### **1 & 2 Call to Order/ Pledge of Allegiance:**

The meeting opened with the Pledge of Allegiance

### **3. Public Comment**

#### **Gwen Walton, 2830 Bristol Rd, Historic Commission**

Illg Barn – updated report from historical committee’s visit and report from the barn expert. There was a list of questions raised from their inquiries to obtain the barn. She was looking for direction and answers in the hopes of saving this building.

#### **Fran McGee, 507 Plymouth Ct - Open Space Committee**

Ms. McGee said that it is a Township initiative to improve the entrance to the Lower Nike Park, which is hardly noticeable. It was suggested that the open space money be used to acquire the lots adjacent to the entrance onto Folly Rd that are currently part of this project.

### **4. Old Business – None**

### **5. New Business**

a. Review and, if appropriate, recommend preliminary plan approval for Pischechk Minor Subdivision – 2371 Lower Barness Rd.

The Property owner and Nick Rose, Protract Engineering, were present this evening for this application for The lot is large enough for two parcels based on the zoning but they requested a variance for the buffering in the side yards. There are already 30 buffers between the properties.

No construction is currently proposed, but potential building footprints have been shown for planning purposes.

This is a 20,000 sq. ft. lot with public water and sewer available. The reviews letters from the county was received dated June 5 and the Carroll Engineering letter was received and dated June 14

Carroll Engineering Review 6/14/13

All items were will comply with comments and waivers.

The existing house will be non-conforming with the lot line change, but is to be removed. The Planning Commission felt it should be removed prior to the issuance of any further permits for this property.

Zoning relief has already been granted for the 30ft. side buffers requirement. The rear and front buffers of 50 and 30 ft. respectively are provided.

Trees were for the subdivision plan, but are for the construction phase. All items in regards to the building phase will be removed.

There was discussion regarding the timing of storm water management plan submission. The applicant said that the complete storm water Management plan was to be submitted with the building permits application since this plan is for the subdivision of the lot only. The Planning Commission suggested that it would be better to have a more detailed storm water plan submitted at this time with planning for the maximum potential impervious coverage.

Storm water facilities should be designed for the maximums and then it would not be necessary at building, maybe more defined at that time. Take the maximums and submit a plan. It could be stated as a note that the existing structure must be removed before any new building occurs

Susan Landis, 2395 Lower Barness Rd

Ms. Landis voiced storm water management concerns; she said that a storm water plan had been promised. They already have flooding problems. There were some questions regarding the flow of water as shown on the plans. Mr. Rycharski said that the grading shows it is not going onto her land. It is required that the applicant not add to the water problem. She was concerned that she would not have any means of recourse if the problem is made worse after the construction.

Brian Webb, WGB Building group

There is nothing in the proposed footprints that would add to the storm water problems. Prior to the issuance of a permit, the applicant will need to get a plot plan, create test pits and a rain garden may be used. Mr. Webb suggested that the lot be demolished, the soil analyzed, and a contingent storm water management plan to qualify for a building permit.

A storm water management plan must show that the water is to be contained on the property. A separate plan will be needed for each property.

A motion was made by Mr. Rycharski, seconded by Mr. Redd, to recommend to the Board of Supervisors preliminary and final plan approval for the Pischechk minor subdivision with the following conditions:

- Compliance with the Carroll Engineering letter of 6/14/2013
- Applicant has agreed to notify the neighbors when any further applications are submitted
- Notes on drawings
- Demolition of the existing structure must be complete before the issuance of any further permits

The motion passed 6-0

Mr. Redd – yes                      Mr. Gordon – yes              Mr. Gaines – yes

Ms. Sturm – yes                      Mr. Rycharski - yes              Mr. Evans - yes

## 6. Subcommittee Reports - none

## 7. Approval of Minutes

### a. April 18, 2013

On a motion made by Mr. Gaines, seconded by Mr. Redd, the Warrington Township Planning Commission voted to post the minutes of May 2, 2013. This motion passed by a vote of 5-0-1.

Mr. Redd – yes                      Mr. Gordon – yes              Mr. Gaines – yes  
Ms. Sturm – Abstain              Mr. Rycharski - yes          Mr. Evans - yes

## 8. Posting of Minutes

### a. May 2, 2013

On a motion made by Mr. Gaines, seconded by Mr. Redd, the Warrington Township Planning Commission voted to post the minutes of May 2, 2013. This motion passed by a vote of 6-0.

Mr. Redd – yes                      Mr. Gordon – yes              Mr. Gaines – yes  
Ms. Sturm – yes                      Mr. Rycharski - yes          Mr. Evans - yes

## 9. Forward Agenda Items

## 10. Adjournment

Mr. Gaines adjourned the meeting at 8:30 for a workshop session on the Gateway district.

### Workshop -Warrington Business Gateway Overlay

There was discussion regarding the purpose and intent of the Gateway Overlay ordinance

Goals of the overlay:

Shared access

Sidewalks

Bike paths/multiuse path (through county)

Conditional uses: how are they applied needs to be reviewed/

No new special exceptions, but all existing will be allowed.

Ken Bassion, 2539 Bristol Rd

Mr. Bassion questioned how the zoning changes/ corridor changes would help him with the issues he has with the property and his family. He stated that his siblings did not agree on how the property was being used. He was told it would give them more options for the property for dispensation. He was also advised to notify staff of any activities he considered to be violations of code.

Lynn Bush, Bucks County Planning Commission

Overlay – 5 affected districts. The uses were defined well, but the language can be improved.to meet the goals more effectively

Concerns:

- Would like to see the before and after overlay affects laid out
- Unintended consequences of allowing for conditional uses
- Standards for design – tighten standards from other ordinances to define
- Open space/ pedestrian amenities need to be defined better

It was asked there are any current county or municipal initiatives, grants, or loans available. New low interest loans are just now being structured. They can be used for revitalizing old sites and to develop a new business.

Tree planting grant are now being awarded. These are going to municipalities, not developers  
PADOT grant for red light camera grants are becoming available for transportation items

Ms. Bush said a separate path would be much more useable than incorporating it with 611.

There was extended discussion regarding what our current vision and where we want the township to be in the future to help move this ordinance along. The vision may differ for different areas

Supervisor Yannich spoke and explained that in 2004 a corridor plan 3 was commissioned and presented by Pennoni, but never implemented or voted on. It was divided into 3 sections. The next concept was to divide the corridor into a town center and gateway district. The Towns Center didn't work and an overlay was used to soften the harshness of rezoning. A lot of analysis has been done for the parcels along the corridor for these plans.

When the land is developed is when the majority of the changes will occur. The ordinance will provide the environment for the desired changes to happen.

Trees and sidewalks do not need to be incentivized

Ms. Bush stated that several drafting items need to be correct before moving on. This plan can be sent informally to Bucks County Planning Commission to review for technical corrections. There are some ambiguities.

The Planning Commission wanted to view the Penoni plan for the corridor from 2004.

Lower Barness – The waiver was not included with motion. It was discussed and agreed that a note should be added to the recommendation that the Planning Commission did not object to the waiver, but it was just an oversight. The Board of Supervisors should know that for their consideration of the plan

Workshop adjourned – 10:15

Recorder: Amy Organek