

Warrington Township Planning Commission

Minutes for April 7, 2016 Meeting

The regular meeting of the Warrington Township Planning Commission with a workshop session with the Board of Supervisors for the Comprehensive Plan was held at 7:00 pm. April 7, 2016 at the Township Building located at 852 Easton Road, Warrington, PA 18976. The members present were as follows:

Planning Commission

Richard Rycharski	Chair
Ben Redd	Vice Chair
Vince Evans	Secretary
Joe Balent	Member
Nancy Beresovoy	excused – Member
Ted Cicci	Member
Roy Rieder, P.E.	Planning & Zoning
Tom Zarko, P.E.	CKS Engineers

Board of Supervisors

Shirley Yannich	Chair
Carol T. Baker	Vice-Chair
Matthew Hallowell	Member
Millie A. Seliga	Member
Fred Gaines	Member
Terry Clemmons, Esq	Solicitor
Barry P. Luber	Interim Manager

1 & 2 Call to Order/ Pledge of Allegiance:

The meeting opened with the Pledge of Allegiance

JOINT WORKSHOP WITH THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Bucks County Planning Commission representative was not present

Adjourned to the workshop table

Appreciation was noted for making this workshop happen.

The scope of work needs to be set to convey to the Bucks County Planning Commission what we are expecting from them. They have given us a proposed contract, which we have not yet executed, for them to complete revisions to the 2006 Comprehensive Plan for an amount not to exceed \$30,611.00.

Mr. Rycharski stressed that it was important that the Board of Supervisors need to agree and be aware of the new goals and guidelines set forth in the updated comprehensive plan, because it should be a guiding factor for their decisions regarding planning, zoning and development.

- Mission Statement – This needs to be updated.
- Format should be revised and streamlined. It is currently 71 pages of text which could easily be condensed into 7-8 pages with the remaining information added as addenda or appendices.
- Demographics: New information is now available from the 2010 Census which needs to be incorporated
- Open Space Plan: Warrington Township has a consultant that is creating an open space plan that will be incorporated into the comprehensive plan.
- History: This section is good and should not require revision.
- Future: Our vision statement needs to be worked on and refined.
- Natural features: These can be updated as needed although major changes are not envisioned. The EAC could contribute and suggest revisions.
- Land present and future: This section touches on the future section and the open space section as well.
- Community: This shows the location of services. Updates would define the additional services needed through the implementation of this plan.

- Circulation (Traffic) Plan: This needs to be revised. An official map with notation as to where upgrades, interconnections, and improvements are needed could be an ideal means of presentation for this information for the township, property owners, and potential developers.
- Larger community: This is a statement of what is going on around us and how it may affect us. For example, Horsham airbase issues may be included to show how this may affect us
- Implementation of the vision: This could include ordinance updates.

Mr. Shelly (Zoning Hearing Board) suggested that this is a good time to review the zoning and the nonconforming situations.

There was discussion regarding the amount of work can be done in house versus assigning to the Bucks County Planning Commission. It was agreed that the updated comprehensive plan would be a collaborative effort between the Planning Commission and the staff of BCPC.

Ms. Yannich suggested that a subcommittee be formed from both groups for this revision.

Goals for these revisions:

Western District, Route 611, Zoning Ordinance, Circulation Plan

Ms. Baker asked if a strong zoning ordinance will protect us legally. Mr. Clemons stated that a well written zoning ordinance and a clearly defined comprehensive plan that is being followed will strengthen our position and better enable the township to withstand challenges.

The existing comprehensive plan is going to be used as a format and we will revise what we can in house and then forward to the Bucks County Planning Commission staff. The document then will need to be adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

3. Public Comment

Mike Kelly, 135 Muirfield Ln

Are we only taking the copies of the survey from the Link? The concern was that there could be “padding” of the responses by builders or other parties. We do take other copies.

6. New Business

a. Review and make recommendation for TCL Holdings Subdivision Plan (County Line and Titus Ave – 50 031 028)

There was no one present representing this application this evening.

On a motion made by Mr. Cicci, seconded by Mr. Balent, the Warrington Township Planning Commission voted to table this application to a later date. This motion passed with a vote of 6-0.

Mr. Cicci – yes

Mr. Evans – yes

Mr. Redd – yes

Mr. Rycharski – yes

Mr. Gaines - yes

Mr. Balent – yes

b. Review and make recommendations regarding the permanent opening/closure of Park Road

Tom Zarko, CKS Engineers, was present this evening and made a presentation regarding the traffic study done for this intersection. Mr. Zarko reviewed the pros and cons of the possible options:

- 1) Reopen as it currently exists;
- 2) Reopen with the addition of a pedestrian walkway on one side;
- 3) Reopen the road with additional traffic calming devices
- 4) Reopen with traffic east bound only;

- 5) Reopen with traffic only west bound; and
- 6) Permanently closing the road

Public comment:

David Wuld, Esq., was representing the residents of the area. Mr. Wuld asked why there would need to be a turnaround at the closure point if it was permanently closed. Mr. Zarko stated that his would need to be done because of the state funding through Liquid Fuels.

Mr. Wuld asked why the township would need to revise the traffic signal study at Easton Road. Mr. Zarko stated that PennDOT would be reconsidering the timing of the light. PennDOT would probably not reconsider the traffic signal permit

John VanLuvanee, Esq. was present representing the Spognardi office building. Mr. Van Luvanee questioned Mr. Zarko on the traffic study and when the light is to be installed and operational. Mr. Zarko stated that it is in process of installation now.

Mr. Rycharski asked if the light would be activated with the closed road. Mr. Zarko said that PADOT will want to see new traffic numbers

Rod Moyer, 1246 School Ln

Mr. Royer believes the traffic study numbers are very low. He sees that based on personal experience while walking his dogs.

Joe Murphy 2500 Block Pickertown

Traffic is bad everywhere. This is an inconvenience for everyone.

Pete Mahar, 1306 School Ln

Are there projected numbers for improvements on School Lane if Park Road is opened again? Mr. Zarko said that he did not estimate costs for any School Lane improvements. There would be some clearing of trees to do road improvements. He asked if there been any studies on loss of property value and quality of life for these residents? Mr. Zarko stated that he did not do any such studies.

Clair McNeil, 2529 Pickertown

The increase in traffic is atrocious; they are now cutting through the parking lot at the shopping center at the intersection of Bristol Road and Easton Road to avoid the light at the intersection.

Faye Kralik, 2582 Pickertown Rd

Park Road should be open.

Judy Klein, 2559 Park Rd

Residents just want to be safe.

Tom Watson, 2512 Park Rd

He is upset they won the battle and had the road closed. They should not have to make this battle again.

Pete Gerger, 2546 Park Rd

Mr. Gerger asked about the marking that seem to indicate a third land along Bristol Rd east of Easton Road. Mr. Gaines said that those were for turning lanes associated with the northern end of Anderson Way.

Mark Bartow, 2488 Park Rd

Bristol Road and Route 611 may be state roads, but when the traffic comes off of those roads it is now our problems. His major concern is the additional traffic from the townhouses when they are sold out.

Jeff Bigelow, 2470 Park Rd

He asked what was done to mitigate the traffic impacts on abutting communities that will be generated by the new townhouse development. He was referring to the Municipalities Planning Code. Mr. Zarko replied that the provision Mr. Bigelow cited was not applicable for roads outside the proposed development since Park Road is not an abutting community.

Barbara Coyle, 2640 Fawn Ln

The traffic has increased incredibly in the past 20 years that she has lived here. The businesses and the post office in the corner shopping center are suffering. Someone will be hurt because of the traffic cutting through the shopping center to avoid the light at the intersection.

Cathy Bromhead, 2481 Park Rd (corner of Park & School)

She has been keeping articles and documentation of the problems on their road. Current growth was not anticipated, but they have been dealing with it, but the townhouse development will make it completely unmanageable.

Sandy Gerger, 2546 Park Rd

Ms. Gerger asked that if Park Road is opened, can the township at least build speed bumps that make people slow down rather than go faster?

Mr. Rycharski said the Board of Supervisors closed the road because they needed to address the effects of the Highgrove Manor development.

Mr. Rycharski took a verbal roll call on if the Planning Commission members would agree on opening or leaving the road closed. The Planning Commission agreed unanimously to open the road, the next step is to decide how the Planning Commission recommends this be accomplished.

On a motion made by Mr. Cicci, seconded by Mr. Balent, the Warrington Township Planning Commission voted to recommend to the Warrington Township Board of Supervisors this plan of action for Park Rd.

- Park road open to two way traffic
- Install a 5ft trail on the north side
- Install additional speed humps
- Periodic traffic studies will be conducted until the new development is open and established
- Widening will be done if the traffic counts merit it.
- This was amended to include increased police patrols

This motion passed with a vote of 6-0.

Mr. Cicci – yes

Mr. Evans – yes

Mr. Redd – yes

Mr. Rycharski – yes

Mr. Gaines - yes

Mr. Balent – yes

7. Old Business

a. Discuss Warrington Township Planning Commission administrative procedures and bylaws

This was unanimously agreed to table until next meeting.

4. Approval of Minutes

a. March 3, 2016

On a motion made by Mr. Cicci, seconded by Mr. Balent, the Warrington Township Planning Commission voted to approve the minutes of March 3, 2016. This motion passed with a vote of 6-0.

Mr. Cicci – yes

Mr. Evans – yes

Mr. Redd – yes

Mr. Rycharski – yes

Mr. Gaines - yes

Mr. Balent – yes

5. Posting of Minutes

a. March 17, 2016

On a motion made by Mr. Redd, seconded by Mr. Balent, the Warrington Township Planning Commission voted to post the minutes of March 17, 2016. This motion passed with a vote of 6-0.

Mr. Cicci – yes

Mr. Evans – yes

Mr. Redd – yes

Mr. Rycharski – yes

Mr. Gaines - yes

Mr. Balent – yes

8. Subcommittee Reports - none

9. Additional Business

Mr. Cicci made a motion, seconded by Mr. Evans to authorize a letter supporting a grant application to DCNR for the acquisition of open space parcels along Lower State Road and Pickertown Road owned by Eureka Stone Quarry. This motion passed with a vote of 6-0.

Mr. Cicci – yes

Mr. Evans – yes

Mr. Redd – yes

Mr. Rycharski – yes

Mr. Gaines - yes

Mr. Balent – yes

10. Forward Agenda Items – April 21, 2016

11. Adjournment – 10:10pm

Recorder: Amy Organek