

The stated meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Abington was held on Tuesday, February 22, 2022, via webinar with Chairperson Lucy Strackhouse presiding.

CALL TO ORDER: 7:03 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Present: STRACKHOUSE, BROWN, DiCELLO, GAUTHIER,
ROSEN, RUSSELL, BAKER
Excused: ROBINSON, COOPER

Also Present: County Planner NARCOWICH
Township Engineer LEE
Traffic Engineer RICHARDSON
Commissioner DiPLACIDO

CONSIDER APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Ms. Gauthier made a MOTION, seconded by Mr. Russell to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission Meeting of August 24, 2021, as submitted.

MOTION was ADOPTED 7-0.

Election of Officers:

Mr. Rosen nominated Ms. Lucy Strackhouse as Chairperson of the Planning Commission, seconded by Mr. Russell.

There were no other nominations.

By a unanimous vote of 7-0, Ms. Lucy Strackhouse was reappointed Chairperson of the Planning Commission of the Township of Abington on this 22nd day of February 2022.

Mr. Rosen nominated Mr. Nicholas Brown as Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission, seconded by Mr. Baker.

There were no other nominations.

By a unanimous vote of 7-0, Mr. Nicholas Brown was appointed Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission of the Township of Abington on this 22nd day of February 2022.

PRESENTATION: None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None.

NEW BUSINESS:

Consider approving the Minor Land Development for Hollywood Tavern located at 700/710 Huntingdon Pike:

Ms. Strackhouse said the applicant proposes to remove the existing concrete walkway and portions of the vegetation areas located within the front area of the existing building and construct approximately 825 square foot concrete patio for the purpose of outdoor dining.

Mr. Michael Urban, Eustace Engineers, representing the applicant/property owners, Mr. and Mrs. Braman, presented the existing conditions in front of the Hollywood Tavern along Huntingdon Pike, Shady Lane, and Gibson Avenue. There is one existing walkway with a few steps and the parking area is on Gibson Avenue. The applicant proposes to construct a new 825 sq. ft. patio along Huntingdon Pike, remove the existing walkway, and construct a new ADA accessible walkway to the new outdoor patio area.

Originally, outdoor seating was going to be 56 seats; however, the owners are concerned about too many tables, so seating was reduced to 38. The tables/chairs will have umbrellas and along the edge would be a low wall to provide protection. All stormwater runoff will be captured by an underground seepage bed onsite recharging into the ground noting the onsite steeper slope will be heavily landscaped; street trees will be provided; and one additional ADA parking space will be added to the parking lot. By reducing the number of seats, we are required to have 33 parking spaces and proposed is 39. Planting materials will be replaced with more native plantings and shown on the plan were the street trees, shrubbery, and groundcover placed along the sloped area around the decorative concrete patio that will have a low wall protection barrier along Huntingdon Pike.

Mr. Rosen asked for the height of the low wall.

Mr. Urban replied 18 inches high around the patio to create a safe barrier for patrons.

Ms. Strackhouse clarified that the applicant is only looking for comments and no recommendation from the Planning Commission tonight. Is that correct?

Mr. Urban replied that is correct.

Ms. Strackhouse expressed concern about traffic and pedestrian safety towards the parking lot. Do residential tenants and staff use that parking lot too?

Mrs. Braman replied no, the apartment has its own parking lot, although a staff member from the tavern uses it sometimes.

Ms. Strackhouse suggested installation of a crosswalk for pedestrian safety to the tavern and its new seating area.

Mr. Urban agreed that a crosswalk would make sense in the area as shown on the plan.

Mr. Greg Richardson, Traffic Engineer representing the Township, agreed that a painted crosswalk further down on Gibson would be the most desirable location along with ADA ramps and installation of pedestrian signs in both directions of the crosswalk to alert traffic of pedestrian activity to improve safety. He also recommended relocating the driveway further down on Gibson or on Fox Chase Road.

Mr. Urban replied that moving the driveway will take away parking on the street.

Ms. Gauthier said she would prefer that Fox Chase Road be reviewed for ingress into the parking lot.

Mr. DiCello agreed that access from Fox Chase Road would be better.

Ms. Allison Lee, Township Engineer, suggested the applicant review recommendation for relocating the access drive onto Fox Chase Road. Also, regarding this land development application, no waivers were requested by the applicant; comments regarding traffic were noted; there was a prior zoning application dating back to 2008 when the applicant wanted to install an outdoor patio, and at that time, it was turned down due to neighborhood complaints such as noise, parking, and the type of clientele, so how is this application different?

Mr. Braman replied the clientele are the neighbors as it is a neighborhood bar.

Ms. Gauthier asked about the hours of operation of the outdoor patio and will it be open in the winter.

Mr. Braman replied that it will be shut down in the winter. When the pandemic hit, we lost a lot of money and then received approval to put picnic tables there, but it looked “trashy” on the grass and then mud was dragged into the bar, so we decided to cement the area making it nicer. Hours of operation for the patio have not yet been discussed, but everyone needs to be 21 years old, and typical dinners and bar food will be served on the patio.

Ms. Strackhouse questioned whether it has been considered putting features along the wall to prevent from sitting on it as it is so close to the street; also, has a permeable surface been considered instead of concrete to help with stormwater runoff?

Mr. Urban replied we can look at possibly lowering the height of the wall so it would not be comfortable to sit on as well as make it an attractive feature along Huntingdon Pike. Also, porous paving would make the area uneven and that would be unsafe for the tables and chairs as well as food and drink will be spilled, which could get “mashed” into the porous area. As designed, there will be one yard drain as shown on the plan and underneath will be a seepage pit and no stormwater runoff will leave the site.

Ms. Strackhouse noted there were comments from the Shade Tree Commission and EAC commending the applicant on using native plantings; however, six street trees are required and four are listed on the plan.

Mr. Urban replied this plan proposes a total of six street trees.

Ms. Gauthier suggested the applicant get approval from the zoning officer regarding the nonconforming lot size; intensity of the proposed expansion; number of parking spaces as required as well as all other requirements. Also, she clarified that the Township Engineer indicated that the zoning should be carefully examined prior to any recommendation on this proposal. Is that correct?

Ms. Allison Lee replied that there are five zoning comments listed in Pennoni’s review letter dated December 23, 2021, noting that outdoor dining is a permitted use, but there is no ultimate right-of-way line shown on the plan; regarding parking lot landscaping, there are opportunities for greening where there are no parking spaces, and the applicant indicated they will comply with providing required number of street trees as well as the recommended type of species.

Mr. Narcowich questioned whether the applicant would consider converting the traffic circulation to one-way as a loop within the parking area, which would allow for narrowing of the isle freeing up more area for required planting areas such as a medium intensity buffer around the perimeter and the 10% minimum green area.

Mr. Richardson suggested putting planters around the outdoor seating area to protect the patrons or planting fixtures on top of the wall to add greenery.

Mr. Russell commented that he is in favor of the 18-inch wall and there are brass fixtures that can be bolted on to prevent skateboarders, etc. Also, he agrees that the patio should be concrete, which is something that can be hosed down; also, the applicant has a good stormwater management plan.

Ms. Strackhouse asked for any public comment.

Lora Lehman suggested restructuring the pathway for public safety; also, she asked for an open comment period at the end of the meeting.

Ms. Allison Lee suggested that the applicant make updates to the plan as well as submit any waiver requests prior to coming back before the Planning Commission.

Mr. Urban said our intent is to submit revised drawings including any waiver requests and come back before the Planning Commission.

Mr. Rosen commented that he would like assurances that this meets safety protocols appropriate for this location as he is concerned about safety considerations of what is being proposed.

Mr. Narcowich commented that there were numerous zoning comments in which the plan does not demonstrate compliance at this time, and he suggested that the applicant add details regarding the loading area, decorative verge, and vegetative buffers.

Ms. Strackhouse welcomed the applicant to come back next month or when they are ready for another review by the Planning Commission.

Consider approving the Major Subdivision and Land Development Plan for 365 Cedar Road:

Ms. Strackhouse said that the applicant is proposing to demolish an existing residential dwelling, covered porch, garage, shed, and boulder wall, and subdivide the existing 177,620 square foot parcel into eight (8) individual lots ranging from 15,022 sq. ft. to 21,514 sq. ft. Along with the subdivision, the applicant is proposing to construct a single-family detached dwelling on each lot, as well as associated sidewalk, curbing, driveway, streetlights, and stormwater management facilities. Access to/from the site will be by way of one new cul-de-sac roadway named Independence Circle that will intersect with Cedar Road as a new T-intersection. Each new dwelling is proposed to be served by public water/sewer service.

Mr. Lawrence Byrne, Project Engineer, representing the applicant, Mr. Paul Yanessa, said plans as submitted are preliminary and he requested a recommendation of approval by the Planning Commission. Presented was an aerial image of the property located at 365 Cedar Road immediately across from McKinley Elementary School, bounded in the rear by Valley Glen Condominium complex along with single-family homes on Glenmore Avenue. Currently, the open field property has an existing garage and dwelling, which are proposed to be demolished.

Site plan was presented showing proposed subdivision of the the property into eight single family lots that will be provided with public water/sewer. Also, the applicant submitted waiver requests and has received review letters from the Township Engineer, MCPC, EAC and the Shade Tree Commission.

Pennoni's review letter dated January 7, 2022 - applicant's waiver requests as follows:

Waiver #1 - Section 146-11A (4) – Property Identification Plan –

Township Engineer supports a partial waiver due to the size and scope of the project contingent that the applicant shows the tax parcel numbers, owners' names and approximate acreage of the immediate abutting properties of the tract. We also request that the applicant revise the aerial plan to increase the resolution, zoom out the aerial image, and provide and label a 400 ft. radius surrounding the site.

Waiver #2 - Section 146-11B (3) – Existing Features Plan –

Township Engineer indicated that the applicant has requested a waiver to show all existing and proposed features, tax parcels, and owners' names within 400 ft. of the site. The applicant has provided an aerial plan of the parcel on Sheet 3 of the plan set. We support a partial waiver due to the size and scope of the project, contingent that the applicant shows the property lines and names of the immediate abutting properties of the tract. We also request that the applicant revise the aerial plan to increase the resolution, zoom out the aerial image, and provide and label a 400 ft. radius surrounding the site.

The applicant will comply with making modifications to the aerial plan including additional information.

Waiver# 3 - Section 146-11H (1) – Landscaping and Shade Tree Plan –

The applicant indicated they will revise the plan and have a landscape architect prepare a landscaping plan.

Waiver #4 - Section 146-11 L – Architectural Plan –

The applicant requested that an architectural plan be deferred until the final plan is developed as this is just a preliminary plan, and Township Engineer supports that request.

Ms. Strackhouse requested that the applicant provide renderings to the Board of Commissioners as well as to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Byrne agreed to submit renderings with the final plan.

Waiver # 5 - Section 146-24. D. (1) – Right-of-Way and Paving Widths – Streets –

The applicant is proposing a 24-ft. wide roadway cartway in-lieu-of the required 30 ft. roadway cartway width. Township Engineer does not support this waiver request especially since the minimum required roadway cartway is 30 ft., and it appears that the applicant intends to dedicate this street to the Township.

Mr. Byrne said we understand the 30 ft. cartway requirement but proposed is to reduce it because this is only a single-loaded road as there are no homes on both sides of the street and we do not believe 30 ft. wide is necessary for a single loaded road; also, we would be reducing the amount of impervious surface by making the road narrower helping with stormwater management. And we would incorporate into the plan “No Parking” on one side of the road for consideration of reduced cartway width.

Waiver #6 - Section 146-24. D (4). (a) – Right-of-Way and Paving Widths – Cul-de-sac –

Township Engineer indicated that based on their measurements, the applicant has proposed a cul-de-sac length of approximately 583 linear ft., which is greater than the required 500 ft. maximum; thus, requiring a waiver from this code section. We support a waiver from the roadway length requirement due to the existing size of the tract and contingent that the applicant adequately demonstrate that emergency services and sanitation vehicles can adequately maneuver the site. However, we do not support the reduced cartway width of 24 ft. and recommend that the applicant provide the required 30 ft. cartway width especially since the applicant intends to dedicate the street to the Township.

Mr. Byrne requested a waiver for length of the cul-de-sac.

Waiver #7 - Section 146-25 D – Curb –

Township Engineer indicated that the applicant did not label the curb radii for the new roadway at the site entrance. We support this waiver request contingent that the applicant label the curb radii and provide turning templates to show that emergency services and sanitation vehicles can adequately make turning maneuvers in/out of the site entrance.

Mr. Byrne requested that the curb radius as shown on the plan be reduced to approximately 15 ft. to not encroach into the neighbor's driveway. Also, this plan was submitted to PennDOT, and PennDOT indicated not to extend the curb radius in front of the neighbor's property, and by having a reduced cartway width would help with the curb radius not encroaching onto the neighbor's driveway.

Waiver #8 - Section 146-33. D – Drainage – Size, Shape and Type –

Township Engineer indicated that the applicant is requesting a waiver to allow the use of high-density polyethylene pipe (HDPE) in-lieu-of reinforced cement concrete pipe (RCCP) for the stormwater system. The applicant is proposing 15-inch and 18-inch HDPE pipes beneath the proposed roadway at least 2.67 ft. of cover. We support this waiver request contingent that the applicant provide stormwater calculations to adequately convey the stormwater runoff from the site improvements.

Mr. Byrne said it is standard to use the black pipe instead of concrete as it is easier to install.

Waiver #9 - Section 146-43. C. (3) (a) – Cut & Fill Slopes –

Township Engineer indicated that the applicant is proposing grades of 3:1 slope (33%) to construct the raingarden in the rear of Lot 5 and regrading in various areas throughout the site. We currently do not support this waiver request as we do not believe that there is adequate usable rear yard space behind the dwelling units of Lots 7 and 8 due to existing steep slopes. We suggest that the applicant revise the plans to provide for either better or safer stormwater BMPs or look into omitting a dwelling or two making this a better site.

Mr. Byrne said waiver request is to permit 3:1 slope only where proposed work is to be done. Also, the applicant will address all zoning comments from Township Engineer's review letter with proposed number of lots, which is eight.

Mr. Narcowich said the cartway width of 24-ft. could be a problem unless "No Parking" signage is erected along the entire street and approval by Township Engineer as well as approval by Public Safety Officer is obtained.

Ms. Gauthier asked about 26 ft. wide with parking on one side of the street.

Mr. Richardson replied he would not recommend anything less than 28 ft. with parking on one side of the street, which would allow for two-way traffic, and he suggested getting input from the Fire Marshal regarding access for emergency vehicles. Also, by PennDOT's standards this is considered a local road as it serves four or more properties and requires a 35 ft. radius; however, based on volume, he could support a smaller radius, although there is a utility pole on the corner.

Ms. Gauthier asked about meeting PennDOT's requirement for sight distance.

Mr. Byrne replied we measured, and it exceeds the requirement for both the left/right directions going out of the driveway as well as the safe stopping distance.

Mr. Richardson requested that the applicant provide Township Engineer with scope comments from PennDOT.

Ms. Allison Lee commented that as noted in Township Engineer's review letter there is concern about emergency vehicles not being able to make the turn onto Independence Circle.

Mr. Byrne replied that the applicant will review it.

Mr. Narcowich continued that Cedar Road is listed on the Abington Master Bike Plan as Bike Route 23 to Pennypack connector and that plan calls for "share the road" markings in this location, and he asked the applicant to communicate with the Township about it.

Ms. Gauthier commented that this is a wide road near McKinley Elementary School and would be a great candidate for some type of traffic calming device, and she suggested the Township look into a pilot program such as "Safe Routes To School."

Mr. Narcowich agreed that it could be a potential candidate for a grant application. Also, he suggested a pedestrian connection to Glen Lane as this is an area where children are walking to/from school, and he asked the applicant to confirm whether the sidewalk is proposed to be 4 ft. wide.

Mr. Byrne replied that the existing sidewalk along Cedar Road is in bad shape, so the applicant is willing to replace it with new sidewalk and curb along Cedar Road, and Independence Circle is proposed to be 4 ft. wide.

Mr. Narcowich suggested that the area on the far side from the homes be used for vegetation to soften the view from resident's properties along with low shrubbery to block headlights.

Mr. Byrne replied there is an existing row of Spruce trees on the neighbor's property, and we will supplement that with additional vegetation, and we will comply with requirement for planting of street trees and work with the Township on a landscape plan.

Mr. Narcowich said there is recommended species of street trees for resilience, visual and tree replacement depending on sight disturbance as noted in his review letter.

Ms. Strackhouse asked for any other comments from members of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Russell said regarding stormwater management, is it anticipated to be a public street, or will there be an HOA?

Mr. Byrne replied that the best infiltration, percolation on the entire site is the area shown on the plan, and the applicant would like to dedicate the road to the Township, but if the Township does not want to accept it, we would agree to make it a private road with an HOA.

Ms. Gauthier commented that she is not in favor of having the stormwater management facility in a public street right-of-way.

Ms. Allison Lee said we also do not recommend having a stormwater basin underneath a public roadway as well as we do not recommend a reduced roadway width as it would be substandard to what the Township would approve. The stormwater management facility could be moved to one of the lots that has no backyard, and Lots 7 and 8 are a concern in that Lot 8 has a much steeper slope and Lot 7 has some steep slope, but it has more of a yard than Lot 8.

Ms. Gauthier suggested putting the stormwater management facility on Lot 8 and combine Lots 7 & 8 for construction of one house.

Ms. Allison Lee continued that the raingarden behind Lot 5 is not an ideal situation.

Mr. Byrne agreed that Lots 7 & 8 are not the most desirable, but they are buildable.

Mr. Baker questioned whether the roadway width could be 30 ft. and still build eight properties at approximately 15,000 sq. ft.

Mr. Byrne replied that the right-of-way of the road does not change, it is still 50 ft. wide, and advantages of a reduced cartway would be reducing the amount of impervious surface as it is only a single loaded road.

Mr. Baker said if it was a 30 ft. wide road, it would help with the entrance and turning radius, and as a potential buyer, it would be nice to park additional vehicles on the street.

Mr. Byrne replied if the waiver is not granted then that is what we will need to do. We feel a reduced cartway would be a better alternative than six extra feet of impervious surface.

Mr. Rosen clarified that if the applicant consolidates Lots 7 & 8 that would solve both issues. Is that correct?

Mr. Byrne replied yes.

Ms. Allison Lee said even if the applicant agrees to a 30 ft. cartway, she would still not be agreeable to a stormwater basin underneath a public road.

Mr. DiCello commented that he is not in favor of a 24 ft. cartway, and he does not support an underground stormwater basin underneath a public road.

Mr. Brown suggested that the applicant consider consolidating Lots 7 & 8 making the entire proposed development more in line with Township's regulations.

Ms. Strackhouse asked Mr. Yanessa if he would be amenable for his historic properties to be documented including photos taken of the exterior and interior of the existing home on Cedar Avenue prior to demolition and for the photos to be shared with the Old York Road Historic Society.

Mr. Yanessa replied he will mull it over.

Ms. Strackhouse asked for any public comment.

Mr. Giannopoulos Ioannis and Catherine Anastasopoulou, said they are the owners of 345 Cedar Road adjacent to Mr. Yanessa, and they feel upset and disappointed about not receiving any notice that a "major subdivision hearing" was occurring today, and learned about it by sheer chance from a friend. He does not see any other neighbors here, so they do not have any say tonight. He had an hour to go through about 80 pages and has questions about something that will affect himself, his family, his neighbors, and the adjacent area. We are not against the development; however, we should have been notified, so our remarks, questions and concerns will be heard, and will a motion be made tonight?

Ms. Strackhouse explained that this is the first time the Planning Commission has reviewed this application and the Planning Commission is advisory to the Board of Commissioners and we will make a recommendation tonight. After review by the Board of Commissioners, review of the final development plan will still need to come back before the Planning Commission.

Mr. Ioannis continued that this property is located right across from McKinley Elementary School, and this area gets very busy when children are being picked up as well as when events are being held at the school, and he expressed concern about “No Parking” signs because there will be no parking, just standing ques waiting for the children to come out, so a narrow road will create a big problem. If the cartway is 30 ft. wide, would that require redesign of the basin because this site will also get rainwater from adjacent properties.

Mr. Byrne replied we did investigate offsite flows noting that the property located at 345 Cedar does not drain onto this site, and he offered to meet with the neighbor to discuss it further.

Mr. Ioannis said that the slope on his property is towards proposed basin, so water will drain there. Also, neither his house or garage are shown on any of the applicant’s maps, and it was mentioned that it is a single loaded road, but it is not, because there are five homes on one side and one on the other.

Mr. Byrne replied that 345 Cedar would not take access from Independence Circle.

Mr. Ioannis said, but we could enter from Cedar and exit from Independence Circle.

Also, he traced the existing house back to the Culp family since 1783 from maps of the Jenkintown Historical Society and it possibly dates back further, so an historical house dating back over 200 years will be torn down.

Regarding sewer, he inquired years ago about sewer being available to his property and was told by Township Engineer at that time there was none because that portion of the Township drains into Cheltenham Township, which drains into Philadelphia’s public sewer system, and there is a moratorium, so how will this development be connected to the public sewer system, and if it somehow gets connected, what does that mean for the neighbors?

Ms. Gauthier clarified that the Stormwater Planning Module, the moratorium, and Act 537 has been updated. Is that correct?

Ms. Allison Lee replied that Mr. George Wrigley, Director of Wastewater Services for the Township, reviewed the sewer availability for this application and agreed with the layout as proposed.

Mr. Byrne replied there is an existing manhole at the end of Glenmore Avenue, and we worked closely with Mr. Wrigley to come up with this arrangement as well as the HOA of Valley Glen Condominium Association to obtain an easement so that Independence Circle will drain into the manhole. Mr. Wrigley issued a letter dated December 6, 2021, indicating there is sewer availability; however, we still need to finalize the sewer planning module with DEP.

Mr. Rosen expressed concern about what the implications are for existing neighbors.

Mr. Byrne replied that it would be available for the neighbors, but there would be connection fees, etc.

Ms. Strackhouse suggested that Mr. Ioannis speak directly with Township staff about how it would affect his property as well as his neighbors.

Ms. Allison Lee said she will follow up with Mr. Wrigley.

Lora Lehmann expressed concern about notification; also, there should be fewer homes and more green space.

Susan Myerov, member of EAC, asked the applicant to provide information about the existing features as well as species and size of proposed street trees.

Mr. Byrne replied we have an existing features plan, and the species will be part of the landscape plan.

Ms. Myerov commented that the EAC expressed concern about the location of the raingarden in the backyard of Lot 5 as well as the design and future maintenance of it.

Mr. Byrne replied the raingarden is a stormwater management feature and it is proposed for that location because that is where it would catch the water, and the HOA would be responsible for it.

Gene Geld commented that he lives next to McKinley School, and he did not know about this meeting until recently as well as all this development. Will there be a traffic study because Cedar Road looks like “Daytona 500” on most days, and now, we are going to add to the traffic with construction of seven or eight homes. Also, he does not know why a bike lane would be added as he never sees anyone riding a bike along there.

Jeanette DiMeo agreed that a narrowed entryway into that street would be very dangerous, and if someone wants to make a right turn into the driveway with traffic speeding behind will cause more accidents. Trying to squeeze eight houses and drainage underneath the street, she cannot conceive why it would be planned that way other than looking for “maximum profit without respect for the residents and neighbors.” Why weren’t the neighbors notified about this possible development?

Mr. Rosen said he as well as several members of the Planning Commission are upset that there is still a question of notification of those who will be affected by development in their community. It has been a matter discussed explicitly with the Township, and he wants to know what efforts were made to notify relevant stakeholders on this development as it is depriving the neighbors of a chance to be heard in matters that are most important to them. He would like follow-up, and if they have been properly notified, he would like that to be on record. He does not like making decisions where he could not consider viewpoints from those adjacent to the development.

The Planning Commission feels strongly that everyone who has an interest in these matters be notified and has a right to be heard, which has been true for the longest time, and he would like to embrace that principal going forward. The Planning Commission should not be subject to these kinds of complaints every time there is an important matter before us.

Ms. Strackhouse said she agrees with Mr. Rosen wholeheartedly, and she does not know why neighbors are not being notified anymore, but it is a problem, so we’ll need to discuss that again with the Township.

The applicant will comply with comments from Township Engineer’s review letter dated January 7, 2022, regarding waiver requests #1, #2, #3 #4, but for #5 the applicant requests reduced cartway of 24 ft., although they will agree with whatever the Planning Commission recommends. Waiver #6 – applicant requests a waiver for additional 83 ft., and the fire hydrant as proposed will cover majority of the development noting there is an existing fire hydrant along Cedar Road. Waiver #7 – the applicant requests a waiver as the Township’s ordinance requires 20 ft. and proposed is 15 ft. and PennDOT’s approval will also be required; Waiver #8 – applicant requests a waiver to use HDPE pipe that meets stormwater requirements; and Waiver #9 – applicant proposes grading of 3:1.

Ms. Strackhouse noted that the Planning Commission is not in favor of a BMP in the public street and requests a better layout for the raingarden such as moving it to another lot and consolidating Lots 7 & 8 into one lot.

Mr. Rosen made a MOTION, seconded by Ms. Gauthier to recommend approval of the Major Subdivision and Land Development Plan for 365 Cedar Road subject to the conditions that the applicant provide a traffic study; that the applicant develop one less lot to eliminate the water mitigation in the roadway and maintain the 30-ft. cartway; also, that the Township meet with the surrounding neighbors.

MOTION was ADOPTED 7-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Lora Lehmann asked to have public comment at the beginning of the meeting; also, for a solution for notifying residents.

ADJOURNMENT: 10:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Vile, Minutes Secretary