

APPROVED

**SPRINGETTSBURY TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
AUGUST 17, 2017**

MEMBERS IN

ATTENDANCE: Alan Maciejewski, Chairman
Mark Robertson
Charles Wurster
Charles Stuhre

NOT PRESENT: Tim Staub

ALSO IN

ATTENDANCE: John Luciani, First Capital Engineering
Jessica Fieldhouse, Community Development Director
Charles Rausch, Solicitor
Sue Sipe, Stenographer

1. CALL TO ORDER:

A. Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Maciejewski called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. ACTION ON THE MINUTES

A. JULY 20, 2017

MR. WURSTER MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF JULY 20, 2017 AS PRESENTED. MR. STUHRE SECONDED. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

3. BRIEFING ITEMS

A. SD-07-06 Triplett Springs

Attorney Jeff Lobach
Dave Koratich, Warehouse (formerly LSC Design)
Mike Jeffers, Kinsley
Bob Kinsley
Dr. Peter VanGiesen

Attorney Lobach stated the project is approximately 76 acres and is an open space development. It is being developed under the zoning ordinance which was in effect in 2007. He noted at that time they filed for zoning relief and filed the initial preliminary plan. The property is located

between Pleasant Valley Road and Alcott Road. 127 building lots are proposed, 5 of those are considered estate lots and would front on Alcott Road. The remaining 122 are considered the Village lots. The average lot size is approximately 8500 sq. ft. In 2007 they obtained an interpretation as part of the zoning relief that 6250 sq. ft. was an appropriate minimum lot size for an open space development. They also obtained two variances – one would permit a 10-ft. encroachment into the front setback which is 25 ft. under the ordinance in effect at that time. The other variance obtained was a minimum lot width of 45 ft.

Attorney Lobach stated due to the economic recession in 2008 causing a sharp decline in the real estate market, they had to suspend the project. He noted since that time they were granted extensions by the Board of Supervisors over the 10 year period. Attorney Lobach referred to the plan history summarized by the community development director in the case briefing.

Attorney Lobach referred to the formal actions and considerations outlined on the plan summary. The first topic referred to the question of “age-restricted”. Attorney Lobach indicated the project has always been identified as an age targeted project - an active adult community. He noted that formulation was given to their traffic engineers and two traffic studies were performed - one in 2014 and again this year. He pointed out they have always said it is not age restricted, but rather age targeted. That formulation was also given to the third party marketing experts who performed a marketing study provided to the Township. He further explained this is not a “family oriented” project with big back yards and playgrounds, but rather small lots with building design likely to be one story with first floor master bedrooms. He stated at the direction of the Recreation Commission they are not putting in playgrounds or trails. They are making a contribution to the recreation fee. They are looking to sell these lots and the houses to empty nesters and downsizers.

The second subject relates to various plan iterations. Attorney Lobach provided a plan which compares what was submitted as part of their zoning package in 2007 with what is currently pending for approval at the preliminary plan development stage. Attorney Lobach noted there are some changes which are part of the normal evolution that occurs when working with an engaged Staff and Planning Commission. He noted they have briefed the Planning Commission at every stage of change and when compared they are very similar. They also provided statistical information prepared by their engineering firm which shows each iteration and some of the dimensional issues that apply to each one, which demonstrate that in 10 years of evolution the plan has not changed very much. He noted it is still an open space plan with more than 34 acres of open space, more than is required under the ordinance in effect in 2007. He acknowledged that lot sizes have increased slightly, but they have been able to reduce the number of cul-de-sacs and traffic circles. They have also reduced the lineal feet of streets by re-organization. He pointed out they have also removed the clubhouse amenity shown in the 2007 plan. Although that was not a condition for zoning relief or for any waivers, it was taken out of the plan because the number of lots does not justify it. The marketing study also supports their decision to remove the clubhouse amenity

Attorney Lobach referred to an issue of a zoning district boundary that has come up under the zoning ordinance in effect in 2007. He pointed out on the plan where the Professional Office zone begins. He noted the zoning ordinance section quoted in the briefing which states when there is a zoning line that goes through a lot the use permitted on one side of the zoning district can encroach 50 ft. into the other zone. He noted they laid out their lots to accommodate that section. Attorney Lobach stated there are a few lots at the south end of the project where there is a 50-ft. area in the Professional Office zone. There will be no houses in the Professional Office zone – there may be an extension of the sunroom on several lots, but every lot is within that 50 ft.

buffer. He noted there was also a question of maintenance obligation. He noted the HOA budget is still in the discussion stage but it is still their intention to provide lawn care and snow removal for all the residents.

Discussion was held in regards to traffic and storm water management. It was noted that due to traffic changes since 2007 concerns were raised about the flow of the traffic out of the development.

Attorney Lobach referred to the traffic counts done in 2014 and indicated there was a complete study which was recommended for approval by the Planning Commission and approved by the Board of Supervisors in 2014. He noted the traffic study was updated to accommodate the latest plan.

Concern was expressed regarding the impacts the proposed development will have on the intersection of Mt. Zion and Pleasant Valley Road. It was noted that although the developer took into consideration additional development which included Red Robin and the Pleasant Valley development additional studies are needed.

Mr. Luciani explained the traffic and road configurations currently existing in that area and how this project would affect it. He concurred that further evaluation is needed.

Ms. Fieldhouse indicated nothing has been formally submitted. She noted they are still in the midst of reviewing the subdivision plan for Triplett Springs and have yet to finish the review for the traffic impact study. She agreed with Mr. Luciani that they are still involved in different iterations of that study and also for the storm water management involved in Triplett Springs as ongoing issues.

Attorney Lobach stated in regard to both traffic and stormwater they understand their obligations and will mitigate the traffic in accordance with the recommendations and the requirements for stormwater.

It was verified they do meet the current stormwater regulations. Ms. Fieldhouse confirmed they were very thorough on that because of the federal guidelines.

Discussion was held regarding the need for a dedicated left turn lane east bound on Pleasant Valley Road. Attorney Lobach indicated they would look into that recommendation.

Other discussion included sensitivity analysis to determine if there were school age children in the development, how that would affect the traffic study. Attorney Lobach noted since the assumption was that it is a normal residential property that consideration was included in the study. He further noted originally they were planning to create three intersections on Alcott Road and it was changed to one intersection. Pursuant to a waiver from the Board the estate lots will directly access on Alcott Road. This was analyzed from a safety perspective and the sight lines are good.

The zoning district conflict – Attorney Lobach pointed out they can extend not more than 50 ft. into that district boundary. He stated the design of the houses shows only sunrooms would extend into the setback and every lot stops at the 50 ft. line.

Attorney Rausch noted the developer provided another extension for one year. The recommendation for Staff is to grant the extension but this would be the final extension.

Discussion was held on action for the requested three formal actions as bulleted on Page 4 of the Plan Summary.

- If the Triplet Springs Community is no longer “age-restricted” and the duties of the HOA have been reduced to no longer include lawn maintenance and snow removal, does the Planning Commission believe this constitutes a significant change to the development and a cause for significant concern because of the impacts this change would have on both services provided by the Township and by others, i.e., school district.

The Planning Commission indicated based on the testimony of Staff there is no reference in any minutes to this being an age restricted project. It was determined to consider it as an age targeted project.

Attorney Rausch clarified the issue came into play because of the lot size. When the development was changed to the reduced lot size the approval was granted without any representation that it was going to be age restricted. He further noted there is nothing in the Zoning Hearing Board record that indicates there was no testimony and no condition to that effect.

- Does the Planning Commission believe that the revisions to the subdivision plan constitute significant modifications that require a new plan submittal with a new application and a review under the current ordinances?

The Planning Commission stated although there have been changes the opinion was it is not major or significant enough to warrant a new plan. It was also stated the applicant has communicated the changes through the proper channels to the Township Staff who indicated their agreement.

- Does the Planning Commission feel as though the Zoning boundary conflict requires a change to the plan layout?

Ms. Fieldhouse explained currently it is Neighborhood-Commercial and they are dealing with an R-10 and N-C. When the plan was originally submitted it was a mix between RS-3 and RS-2 and then Professional Office. She noted the encroachment is from the 2005 zoning districts where the RS-2 use – single family home is encroaching on Professional Office which no longer exists.

MR. WURSTER MOVED IN THE CASE OF SD-07-06 TRIPLET SPRINGS TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AS FOLLOWS:

- **THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOGNIZES THE TRIPLET SPRINGS COMMUNITY AS AN AGE TARGETED PROJECT.**
- **THE INTENT AS EXPRESSED BY THE DEVELOPER AND THEIR TEAM WITH REGARDS TO HOA WILL BE TO PROVIDE SNOW REMOVAL AND LAWN SERVICES.**
- **THE PLANNING COMMISSION BELIEVES THERE HAVE NOT BEEN REVISIONS TO THE SUBDIVISION PLAN TO NECESSITATE A NEW SUBMITTAL.**
- **THE PLANNING COMMISSION DETERMINED THE ZONING BOUNDARY CONFLICT DOES NOT REQUIRE A CHANGE IN THE PLAN LAYOUT AS THAT WILL BE ADDRESSED THROUGH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN PROCESS.**

SECONDED BY MR. ROBERTSON. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

- 4. ACTION ITEMS - None**
- 5. WAIVER RECOMMENDATIONS - None**
- 6. OLD BUSINESS – None**
- 7. NEW BUSINESS – None**
- 8. ADJOURNMENT**

CHAIRMAN MACIEJEWSKI ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 7:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

/ses