

Warrington Township Planning Commission

Minutes for January 6, 2022, Meeting

The regular meeting of the Warrington Township Planning Commission was held at 7:00 pm. January 6, 2022 in person and via Zoom. The members present were as follows:

Richard Rycharski	Chair (excused)	Vince Evans	Seated for McNaney
William Connolly	Vice-Chair (presiding)	Fred Gaines	Seated for McNaney
Herb Rubenstein	Secretary	Roy Rieder	Zoning Officer
Ted Cicci	Member	Christian Jones	Deputy Zoning Officer
Shirley Yannich	Member	Mary Stover, P.E.	Township Engineer
Shawn McGuigan	Member (excused)	Doreen Curtin	Deputy Zoning Officer
Bob Watts	Member		

Call to Order/ Pledge of Allegiance:

The meeting opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Public Comment - None

1. REORGANIZATION

a. Nomination and election of Chairperson

Mr. William Connolly nominated Mr. Richard Rycharski as chairperson. Mr. Rycharski was approved as chairperson 5-0, with a unanimous vote of the appointed members present.

b. Nomination and election of Vice Chairperson

Ms. Shirley Yannich nominated Mr. William Connolly as vice-chairperson. Mr. Connolly accepted and was approved as vice-chairperson 5-0, with a unanimous vote.

c. Nomination and election of Secretary

Ms. Shirley Yannich nominated Mr. Herb Rubenstein as secretary. Mr. Rubenstein accepted and was approved as secretary 5-0, with a unanimous vote.

2. Approval of Minutes

On a motion made by Mr. Herb Rubenstein, seconded by Mr. Robert Watts, the Warrington Township Planning Commission voted to approve the minutes of November 18, 2021. This motion passed with a vote of 6-0-1 with Ms. Shirley Yannich abstaining.

2. Old Business – None

3. New Business

- a. Review and, if appropriate, make recommendations regarding a subdivision and land development application to construct new homes and restore an existing historic dwelling on the McNaney tract located at the southeasterly corner of the intersection of Street Road and Folly Road in the RD-OD5 zoning district.

Due to the excused absences of Mr. Rycharski and Mr. McGuigan, Mr. Connolly, as Vice Chairman, appointed Mr. Evans and Mr. Gaines to sit on the Planning Commission as voting members for the remainder of the times that this application is before the Planning Commission.

Mr. Edward Murphy, the attorney for the applicant, Mr. Anand Bhatt from Arna Engineering and Mr. Vincent DeLuca, the developer, appeared to present the application to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Murphy explained to the Members of the Planning Commission (hereafter “Members”) that the property and process has had a lengthy history which included a series of meetings that concluded last

spring. A series of plans were presented by the Applicant resulting in the current draft which addressed many of the concerns expressed by the Members. The draft of the plan submitted on December 23, 2021, reviews items of concern, and waivers for consideration. The plan as submitted shows a land development plan consisting of 30 units and the preserved historic house on an independent, non-conforming lot.

Zoning issues were addressed by the review letters from CKS dated 27 December 2021. The Members reviewed the bullet points of the letter, expressing questions or concerns only on some issues. Setbacks, buffering, the historic house and cartway width issues were some of the issued addressed.

A list of waivers was presented, and the most significant issue appeared to be regarding off-street parking, cartway width, and appropriateness of widths as they apply to emergency management vehicles

Ms. Yannich asked about location of hydrants and the applicant indicated the locations of hydrants on provided plans. A discussion ensued.

Mr. Connolly addressed the issue of adequate parking and his concern over how the development would accommodate guest parking. Mr. Gaines noted that the existing Lamplighter development has overflow parking. The Applicant stated that they would look at how additional off-street parking could be accommodated as opposed to widening the cartway which could possibly present a hinderance to emergency vehicles due to on-street parking.

The remaining comments as submitted by CKS for review were met with agreement by the Applicant.

The Members requested information on walls and fencing and how they would serve as barriers for the Stormwater Management components. A discussion of the details of the Storm Water Management plan ensued and the Applicant reviewed diagrams to illustrate locations and types of SWM structures.

Ms. Yannich mentioned the drainage improvements on Folly Rd and requested information on how this plan would or would not affect the existing water management and conditions. Mr. Connolly expressed concerns on the amount of water to be discharged on to Folly Rd. CKS asked for additional SWM calculations. Mr. Evans noted that Folly Rd has historically had issues regarding problems with water drainage and flow.

Ms. Yannich asked the Applicant about grading and grading differentials of the homes including the retaining wall that was to separate the two existing developments. Both Mr. Connolly and Ms. Yannich had questions regarding the location and height of the retaining wall.

There was a lengthy discussion regarding the retaining walls proposed for the property and how the various retention ponds would be protected with adequate walls or fencing for the safety of the residents. Mr. Connolly had concerns regarding the retention basins and the hydrostatic pressure on the retaining walls and existing retaining walls. He requested that there be an engineering analysis done.

The Members had questions regarding the plans for ADA compliance, landscaping criteria, sidewalks and the ability to use the open space in the development.

Ms. Yannich inquired if there would be an HOA. Applicant stated that there would be one.

Mr. Connolly stated the Commission would require a will serve letter from the sewer and water authorities in order to approve the project.

Mr. Connolly requested a Phase One assessment to review chemical and fertilizers that may still be in the soils since the property had been agricultural. The Applicant stated has a Phase One letter was available.

The Members discussed their concerns with the adequacy of lighting and how the proposal would affect existing neighboring properties.

Mr. Connolly brought up his concerns regarding the traffic study and the Members and Applicant discussed how the development would influence the intersection at Folly Rd and whether additional review would be required regarding future needs including turning lanes.

After all discussions were ended, Mr. Connolly noted that the plan was not ready for recommendation for approval and requested that the applicant revise the plans and return. The applicant agreed.

4. Subcommittee Business

a. Zoning/SALDO Revision Committee

Mr. Connolly said the Committee should be finishing the rough draft at their next meeting. Then the county needs to finish the edits to the final draft which hopefully would be completed by mid-February.

5. Additional Business

None

Next Meeting

January 20, 2022

Adjournment

8:45 pm

Recorder: Doreen Curtin