

Warrington Township Planning Commission

Minutes for February 6, 2014 Meeting

The regular meeting of the Warrington Township Planning Commission was held at 7:30 pm. February 6, 2014 at the Township Building located at 852 Easton Road, Warrington, PA 18976. The members present were as follows:

Fred Gaines	Chair
Ben Redd	Vice Chair
Richard Rycharski	Secretary
Vince Evans	Member
Ted Cicci	Member
Ken Yerger	Excused - 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 – none

4. Old Business

e. Discussion of Planning Department activities

- Stone Manor – There is a vacant parcel that was originally designated as a childcare center. The developer now has requested to change that designation to make this residential. The proposed development will be for the office to stay in the manor house and a 5 story apartment building to be built. When the apartment building the office will move to that building and the manor house will be converted into residential.
- Randolph Scott building – There is a proposal for the building to be maintained as the offices for the real estate developer who is holding it currently. He has proposed to extend Shetland Dr. and allow access for the Police for a secondary exit.
- Proposed development of the Quarry property along Bristol Rd – 2 ball fields are the intended plan.
- Several developments that were incomplete and sent back for completion.
- TDR ordinances - not to be given for parcels less than 25 acres
- Traffic signal at Valley Square – was to be at the beginning of Phase 1, which has not been started.. Valley Square has been approached regarding the installation of this signal

a. Continue comprehensive review of SALDO and Zoning Ordinance.

The focus is to be on parts 22 (signs) and 27 (zoning).

The Township has won the lawsuit against them regarding the placement and size of billboard. The sign ordinance needs to be reviewed and cleaned up, but more importantly it needs to be made clearer.

The temporary sign ordinance was reviewed

b. Consider Conditions for the Gateway district. (Mr. Rycharski)

The old draft is no longer acceptable now that the Board of Supervisors wants this to be mandatory – it can no longer be an overlay. It needs to be mandatory for exactly what we want to have it become. “Proto-typical” design needs to be avoided. They need to draft this ordinance revision so the requirements and the uses work together to avoid the conditional uses and variances that are not in alignment with the vision for this district. Based on the lot size requirements, only the acceptable uses would make sense.

Much of what Mr. Rycharski found seemed to be contradictory to other parts of the documentation for this ordinance.

There must be a lighting requirement.

It seems they are looking for the village concept, with the properties close to the road, which would work with the overlay concept to allow for additional uses as the Board of Supervisors see fit. This would also allow for interconnecting driveways with parking in the back. There would be conceptual architectural requirements as well.

Concepts that were discussed as requirements:

- 8 ft multiuse sidewalk – this should be a requirement. \
- Grassy area – between sidewalk and road way – as much as possible – with a buffered green area between the building and the roadway (to buffer against the lights of the roadway. 3 ft barrier of some type would be required.
- Buffering, a drive aisle and a row of parking would require 50 ft between the building and the main road.

OI – no uses are desired for this district

C1 & C2 are desired, and potentially CRO

Changing the bulk requirements without changing the existing uses makes this task more manageable.

Review the 21 existing uses and decide which ones are desirable.

c. Prepare the vision statement for the Gateway ordinance (Mr. Evans)

Mr. Evans agreed with much of what Mr. Rycharski stated as to what he was found when reviewing the documentation. .

f. Discussion of Alternative Energy Ordinance (Mr. Redd)

The memo and ordinance was reviewed as were the comments from the Bucks County Planning Commission.

With the correction that 2 acres is not big enough for a wind facility. The minimum lot size is 3 acres in the RA District. They can be used in lots 3 acres or more and A wind facility may not be used in subdivision where TDRs have been used. Mr. Redd will make these revisions and resubmit for the Planning Commission to review.

e. Discussion of Comprehensive Plan

The questionnaire can be included in the LINK, but not as a separate flyer. The post office will be contacted with options regarding the return postage options for having these sent back.

6. Subcommittee Reports – none

7. Approval of Minutes

a. December 5, 2013

On a motion made by Mr. Evans, seconded by Mr. Redd, the Warrington Township Planning Commission voted to approve the minutes of December 5, 2013. This motion passed by a vote of 4-0-1.

Mr. Rycharski – yes

Mr. Redd – yes

Mr. Evans - yes

Mr. Gaines – yes

Mr. Cicci – abstain

8. Posting of Minutes

a. January 16, 2014

On a motion made by Mr. Cicci, seconded by Mr. Redd, the Warrington Township Planning Commission voted to post the minutes of January 16, 2014 as corrected. This motion passed by a vote of 5-0.

Mr. Rycharski – yes

Mr. Redd – yes

Mr. Evans - yes

Mr. Gaines – yes

Mr. Cicci – yes

9. Forward Agenda Items

10. Adjournment – 10:10pm

Recorder: Amy Organek