

September 7, 2016  
7:00 PM

The regular meeting of the Monroe Township Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson Nelson. The Pledge of Allegiance was said by all.

ATTENDANCE

Sharon Nelson, Chairperson	Darrell Dethlefs, Solicitor
Sheldon Brymesser, Vice-Chairman	Mark Bruening, Engineer
Carl Kuhl	Holly Wood, Recording Secretary
Michael Pykosh, Solicitor (partial meeting)	

MINUTES

**On the motion of Mr. Kuhl, and seconded by Mr. Brymesser, and by unanimous vote of the members it was duly RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the August 3, 2016 regular meeting.**

CORRESPONDENCE

None

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Sinclair Park Revised Preliminary Subdivision Plan

Mark Hackenburg of RGS Associates and Doug Gelder of DSG Development were present to present the modifications to the original conditional use approved plan from 2008 as briefed to the Planning Commission at the August 3, 2016 meeting. The modification from 8 duplexes to 16 single family homes under the zero lot line provision is the only change to the plan. Mr. Hackenburg is in agreement with the Engineer's comments dated August 31, 2016, and is requesting reaffirmation of the waivers as listed: provide a Park & Recreation Report (402.5.4), soils structure and characteristics shall be provided for all proposed detention basins with an embankment that is 6' or more in height (SWMO 98-2, 304.4.3), Side lot lines shall be radial to street lines for a distance of half the lot depth (611.4.1.) Lots 1, 2, and 55 do not meet

criteria, street trees are required along all road frontages (618.3) All waivers were approved by the Board of Supervisors June 14, 2012 for the first revised version of this plan.

With regard to general comments and recommendations, Mr. Hackenburg stated that the as-builts for the storm sewer system is not yet established, but will be completed prior to any road dedications.

Mr. Kuhl mentioned the UGI project on Sinclair Road and the Turnpike widening project as things to think about, and he also questioned whether there is any value to considering a trail connection with the adjoining development for walking and such. Ms. Nelson stated that it appears to be open space that abuts the Trindle Station Development. Mr. Gelder said the space Ms. Nelson is referring to is a sewer easement, but he will talk to Mr. Tamanini about the possibility of having a connecting trail.

**On the motion of Mr. Brymesser, and seconded by Mr. Kuhl, and by unanimous vote of the members it was duly RESOLVED to recommend reaffirmation of approval of the waivers to the Board of Supervisors as listed in the Engineer's comments dated August 31, 2016.**

**On the motion of Ms. Nelson, and seconded by Mr. Brymesser, and by unanimous vote of the members it was duly RESOLVED to recommend approval of the plan to the Board of Supervisors contingent on satisfaction of all the Engineer's comments dated August 31, 2016.**

#### Sinclair Park Revised Final Phase 1 Subdivision Plan

Mr. Hackenburg explained that this is basically the same plan with 2 additional waiver requests to include temporary or permanent cul-de-sac streets shall not exceed a centerline distance of 500' in length measured from centerline intersection with a street which is not a cul-de-sac to center of the cul-de-sac turn around or provide access to more than eleven (11) units (602.13) and recreation fee to be paid prior to plan recording (403.6.20). It is noted by the applicant that the eleven (11) unit maximum will be exceeded at fifteen (15) units. It was requested by the applicant during the conditional use process to allow the recreation fee to be paid at the time a building permit application was submitted for each unit. All 6 waivers were approved by the Board of Supervisors at their July 12, 2012 meeting.

**On the motion of Mr. Brymesser, and seconded by Mr. Kuhl, and by unanimous vote of the members it was duly RESOLVED to recommend reaffirmation of the waivers to the Board of Supervisors as listed in the Engineer's comments dated August 31, 2016.**

**On the motion of Mr. Kuhl, and seconded by Mr. Brymesser, and by unanimous vote of the members it was duly RESOLVED to recommend approval of the plan to the Board of Supervisors contingent on satisfaction of the Engineer's comments dated August 31, 2016.**

## Ethel C. Wenger Final Subdivision Plan

Joe Burget of Burget & Associates presented the Ethel Wenger Final Subdivision Plan that is a 4 lot subdivision along the east side of Clouser Road. Ms. Wenger owns property on both sides of the road, but at this time there is no plan for the west side of the road. The current plan is to create 3 new 3.75-4.0 acre building lots with 3 new driveways. They had to do a nitrate study to determine appropriate lot size. Each lot will have a primary and back-up septic site, and a back-up septic site was established for the existing dwelling lot. Mr. Burget understands that removing trees and cutting back banks will be necessary to achieve proper sight distances for the new driveways. Mr. Burget is looking for conditional approval based in doing the tree and bank removal. Beyond this issue, the Engineer's comments dated September 1, 2016 are minor issues that he has no issue correcting.

Mr. Burget is also looking for approval of 6 waiver requests as listed: wetland study is required (402.5.7), locate existing features on subject property and within 200 feet of subject property (402.3.4), show the location of existing healthy trees on the subject property (402.3.6), stormwater basins without restricted access shall have impoundment areas with side slopes no greater than 5 foot horizontal to 1 foot vertical (SWMO 402.6.D), plan must be prepared at prescribed scale per Section 402.1.1 (403.1), and street trees shall be provided along road frontages (618.3). Reasons for requesting these waivers include that there are no wetland areas on any of the new lots; the land is currently open farm land and all features will be contained within the 200 feet limit; the stormwater basins will be approximately 2 feet deep and sloped at a 4-1 ratio; and page 1 of the plan is not to scale as a way to give an overall snap shot of the total plan. With regard to the street tree provision, the only trees being removed are the ones necessary to achieve proper sight distances for driveways. It does not make sense to remove trees just to replace them with new trees. After some clarification on tree removal and discussion about the street trees, Mr. Burget decided to remove this waiver request (waiver request #6).

Mr. Burget confirmed that additional right-of-way width is being established with this plan. Mr. Kuhl suggested removal of all trees within the right-of-way to allow for widening of the road to bring it to a safer standard. There are safety concerns by neighbors with the driveway placement on Lot 4. Mr. Bruening stated that widening of the road will enhance sight distances and safety factors, and said the Planning Commission is requesting widening of the road for the frontage of the subdivision to further increase safety. Ms. Wenger could do the widening or put money in escrow to have the Township do the work later. It was explained that the sight distance required for the Lot 4 driveway is 269 feet, and with the clearing of trees and such, they will achieve close to 300 feet of clear sight. Trees on the new lots that interfere with the safe stopping distances and sight triangles will need to be removed. Ms. Nelson suggested a shared driveway as an alternative option.

Ms. Wenger questioned what would happen if she chose to make it a 2 lot subdivision, Mr. Bruening explained that even creating 1 new lot constitutes a subdivision that would need to meet certain requirements prior to recording of the plan at the courthouse. Ms. Wenger also asked where the plan stands at this point. She was under the impression that only a few trees

needed removal. Mr. Burget explained that Mr. Kuhl is requesting removal of more trees to make the road safer. Ms. Wenger mentioned a previous petition by the neighbors to keep the trees. Discussion ensued between Mr. Burget and Ms. Wenger establishing that they would need to talk and take a look at what trees and such will need removed and see if she is happy with that, or if she wishes to pursue a different plan option.

**On the motion of Mr. Kuhl, and seconded by Mr. Brymesser, and by unanimous vote of the members it was duly RESOLVED to table the plan.**

### Intensive Agriculture Uses

Todd Johnson of Willard Agri-Services was slated to speak, and expressed his appreciation for the time and energy the Planning Commission and its members put into doing the job they do. He stated he received a real education attending tonight's meeting and just listening. He also suggested that in light of the time involved to work through the plans presented, he was willing to come back to the October meeting to make his presentation, if that was to the liking of the members.

**On the motion of Mr. Kuhl, and seconded by Mr. Brymesser, and by unanimous vote of the members it was duly RESOLVED to table Mr. Johnson's presentation until the October meeting.**

Greg Rogalski, Zoning Officer, presented a memo with proposed zoning ordinance amendments to address the intensive agriculture uses more effectively. Some of the revisions and additions he is proposing are coming from what the State already requires with nutrient management and manure management plans and such. Mr. Rogalski is suggesting adding a 4<sup>th</sup> category, so to speak, and is looking to the Planning Commission and Mr. Brymesser, in particular, for number guidance and such. The Planning Commission decided to review the information provided and discuss in more detail after hearing Mr. Johnson's presentation at next month's meeting

### Comprehensive Plan

Ms. Nelson explained the Planning Commission was asked to make their recommendations for updating the Zoning Ordinance regarding intensive agricultural uses to the Board of Supervisors before the end of the year and that time is quickly approaching. The Planning Commission needs to start wrapping up their ideas and move them forward as a recommendation.

With that said, Ms. Nelson suggested that we also need to consider the next step in our ongoing review of the Comprehensive Plan. She reviewed some statistics for the 2006 Survey that was sent out to get resident's feedback. Ms. Nelson is asking the members of the Planning Commission to review the current Comp Plan and the past survey questions prior to the October

meeting. She wants everybody to consider what questions to ask on the next survey, and whether we should keep them the same or change them compared to the 2006 survey. Should we consider changing the way the township is geographically divided for the new survey? Ms. Nelson noted that the newsletter article eliciting feedback on home-based businesses got no responses. She is hoping the return on a mailed survey will be better.

#### NEW BUSINESS

#### SALDO

Mr. Kuhl explained that the discussions involving the Wenger Plan prompted a thought to amend the SALDO to require widening of roads that are below standard widths to improve safety and traveling conditions on such road. Ms. Nelson said she feels that with the lengthy discussions prompted by one particular situation, it would be to the Planning Commission's benefit to review the proposed requirement in more detail. Mr. Kuhl verified with Mr. Pykosh that there would be no issue with delaying the passing of the SALDO until a later date. Mr. Pykosh said that there was no problem, that it is actually best to complete these revisions before re-advertising the ordinance for adoption. Formal written review from the County was also submitted for review. It was decided to have the Planning Commission review the proposed amendments and discuss at the October meeting.

**On the motion of Mr. Brymesser, and seconded by Ms. Nelson, and by unanimous vote of the members it was duly RESOLVED to Table the SALDO discussion until the October Planning Commission meeting.**

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION - None

STAFF COMMENTS - None

#### ADJOURN

**On the motion of Mr. Brymesser, and seconded by Mr. Kuhl, and by unanimous vote of the members it was duly RESOLVED to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 PM.**

Respectfully submitted,

Holly S. Wood  
Administrative Assistant