

## **Hilltown Township Planning Commission October 2005 Work Session Minutes**

The Planning Commission met at the Township Building on October 3, 2005. Members present were Bill Bradley, Ken Beer, Jack McIlhinney, Mike Beatrice, Chuck Kulesza, Brooke Rush and Denise Hermany. Lynn Bush from the Bucks County Planning Commission was also in attendance.

Township residents attending were Joe Marino, Mark Funk, James Sensinger, Donna DiMella, and Sandy Williamson.

Corrections to August 29, 2005 special meeting minutes: Under Trade Uses, Mike Beatrice requested that “Other members of the PC did not agree” be added after the words “intense business”, On the second page, under Bed & Breakfast, the word “against” should be changed to “opposed.” Mike also commented that the *PC should vote on the definition of a Barn (which will do at the November 2005 Work Session meeting)*. The minutes were approved, with Jack McIlhinney and Ken Beer abstaining since they were not in attendance at the August 29, 2005 work session.

Corrections to September 8, 2005 meeting minutes: Mike Beatrice noted spelling corrections to the minutes. Jim McKetta is Joe McKetta and Bevilacqua is Bevaliqua. It was also mentioned that Mr. Schaftskeller’s property lies to the south (not the north). Mike noted that Tim Kohler, not Mike Beatrice, presented a map overview. Mike amended the paragraph under Lot Size and Zoning Information Spread Sheet to state the following: Mike’s analysis showed the potential for the greatest number of new homes based on different minimum lot size. The purpose of the analysis was not to project the exact future build out of Hilltown, but rather to show the directional impact of the different minimum lot size scenarios. The PC agreed that the number of potential new homes would probably be lower since the 85% net build able assumption (BCPC’s rule of thumb) seemed aggressive. The board’s consensus was the average net build able percentage would be lower. The PC also commented that it is important to keep the information up-to-date for an accurate overview. Under Old Business, Mike Beatrice requested a joint meeting with the PC and the supervisors. The minutes were approved with Chuck Kulesza abstaining since he was not in attendance at the September 8, 2005 work session.

Guttman – Doug Sanders, representing D’Angelo Construction Inc., attended the work session to present two additional sketch plans which had been previously presented at a supervisor’s meeting. He was seeking direction from the PC.

Both sketch plans do not meet the open space zoning requirements for a CR2 development, but they do incorporate different lot sizes, ranging from 20,000 – 50,000 sq. ft. as requested by some of the PC and the supervisors. After reviewing the plans, some of the PC agreed that they would like to see additional sketch plans that could incorporate some or all of the following:

- The Village Green concept
- Playing fields be group together with parking and access to that parking
- Cul-de-sac streets be connected
- Additional homes be added on the “Guttman” property on the presently noted deed restricted space.
- Additional Homes be grouped around the pond and perhaps the property near the pond (Lot 6) get road frontage from a cul-de-sac.
- Green belt (partial or perhaps full ) along Green Street on one of the sketch plans
- No open space conservation easement along the back of the wooded lots adjacent to the eastern property line

Gitlin/Johnson – The PC discussed the recent waiver request for an 8 ft. tall retaining wall to be constructed between the water retention basin and some of the adjoining properties. If the waiver request is denied, the applicant will need to reengineer their plans to accommodate different sewer sites because the grade of the slope would be too steep to accommodate the proposed sewage systems. Lynn Bush commented that the PC needs to ask what the actual hardship is. Some PC members commented that the applicant didn’t demonstrate the hardship. Denise Hermany has concerns about a retaining wall and believes that the applicant should redo their plans, even if it requires changing lot lines. Jack McIlhinney stated that a stone wall with a wrought iron fence could be attractive. Ken Beer commented that walls fall down and need to be maintained. There would have to be a homeowners association. He has safety concerns about an 8 ft. tall wall with a 4 – 6 ft fence above that in someone’s back yard.

Farmstead Ordinance – The PC requested that Lynn Bush add the Farmstead Ordinance, as previously agreed upon by the PC, to the amended zoning ordinance draft.

CMD - the PC discussed the change in naming of RR to CMD and reviewed the definition of RR in our present zoning ordinance and its description in the Comprehensive Plan. Bill Bradley commented that he didn’t have a strong opinion either way, but was ok with changing the name to CMD. Brooke Rush believes that CMD is more inclusive of the definition. Ken Beer commented that CMD includes RR. Denise Hermany agreed with changing the name to CMD. Jack McIlhinney and Mike Beatrice preferred RR. *5 For CMD, 2 FOR Rural Residential.*

The PC agreed to remove the Purpose section from the proposed ordinance, because you don’t need a purpose for a regulation.

CMD Uses – The PC reviewed each use. There was significant discussion regarding Government Owned Recreational Facility.

- Under C7 the PC agreed that a Private/Recreational Facility needs to be more clearly defined and incorporate a “Deep Run” type of association.
- C12 Hospital – Removed – should be in commercial zoning
- C13 Nursing Home – Removed – should be in commercial zoning

- C16 Continuing Care Retirement Community – Removed - should be in commercial zoning
- B5 – Conversion (Home to Apts.) – Removed - should be in denser zoning

B1 Single Family – The PC had a discussion regarding adjacent townships and the minimum lot size requirement. It was noted that the 3 adjacent townships to Hilltown have at least an 80,000 square ft. minimum (Plumstead Township – 2 acre minimum). Chuck requested that we consider that option instead of 1.8 acres. Denise Hermany, Ken Beer, Bill Bradley, Mike Beatrice and Chuck Kulesza would prefer 80,000 sq. ft. Jack McIlhinney is opposed to 80,000 sq. ft as well as 1.8 acres, and Brooke Rush was for keeping the 1.8 acre minimum lot size option.

Impervious Surface - Brooke Rush requested that post development be defined. He commented that a homeowner should be able to create 3% additional impervious surface on their property 3 years post-occupancy. Denise Hermany and Jack McIlhinney believe that 3 years is too long and that a homeowner should be able to create additional impervious after the occupancy permit is issued or perhaps after a 6 month waiting period. Brooke Rush doesn't want the builder to present options to the buyer that maximizes the impervious surface ratio during the building process and precludes the homeowner from creating additional impervious in the future. Mike Beatrice prefers that the present 9% maximum impervious surface ratio requirement remain.

B2 – Lots of 3 acres or greater but less than 6 acres - This option was proposed for those homeowners who purchased a 3 acre + lot with the hope of subdividing off a 50,000 sq. ft. parcel. Present homeowners would be grandfathered if the option was to be adopted. Some PC members said the maximum should be changed to 4 or 5 acres. Jack McIlhinney said that there should only be one subdivided parcel, otherwise it is a major subdivision. Some PC members didn't believe that this option should be retained in the proposed ordinance. Jack McIlhinney, Denise Hermany, Brooke Rush and Ken Beer were *For* retaining the Option and Chuck Kulesza, Bill Bradley and Mike Beatrice prefer that the option be removed. If retained the maximum lot size should be changed to 4 acres.

The PC will continue its review at the next work session. The meeting adjourned at 11:05 PM.