

**LOWER WINDSOR TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 24, 2023**

The Lower Windsor Township Planning Commission held its regular meeting in person at the Municipal Building located at 2425 Craley Road, Wrightsville, PA 17368. The meeting was called to order by Chair Hollis Bedell at 6:30 p.m. Also present were Planning Commission members Kelly Skiptunas, Marzena Wolnikowski, Rachel Sollenberger, and John Bowser, Zoning Officer, Monica Love, C. S. Davidson, Township Engineer representatives Adam Smith, P.E. and John Klinedinst, P.E. All attendees stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

MINUTES

Dr. Bedell noted there was a typographical error in the meeting minutes of the workshop meeting of July 19, 2023. Dr. Bedell made a motion to approve the minutes with the correction made. Mrs. Sollenberger seconded. The motion carried, 4-0, with Mrs. Skiptunas abstaining.

Dr. Bedell made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of July 27, 2023, with the time of adjournment corrected. Mrs. Sollenberger seconded. The motion carried, 4-0, with Mrs. Skiptunas abstaining.

NEW BUSINESS

A Planning Module (PM) for 1925 Craley Road, originally Smeltzer's store, was reviewed. The store was changed to a 5-unit apartment complex (prior to zoning). The lot is 0.714 acres, has a single structure, and has a failing septic system. The PM is for a Small Flow Treatment Facility (SFTF). As the lot is so small, there is no area for a replacement system, the SFTF is the last resort.

Dr. Bedell asked if there are any other properties in the area with failing systems. Ms. Love noted that there may be other properties in the area that are or will have.

The entire replacement system will be located in the floodplain and will require a floodplain permit after all other permits are issued.

Mr. Bowser asked if the system would have to be inspected every year. Ms. Love replied yes.

Mrs. Wolnikowski asked if the PM is not approved, what would happen. Ms. Love noted that the property would be condemned and not permitted to be used as a residence, or as any use that would require any sanitary facilities. Mr. Bowser asked if the proposed system fails, would the stream have measurable e-coli content downstream? Mr. Klinedinst (as an SEO) believed the more likely issue would be nitrogen and phosphorous, but pollution would occur.

Of great concern is that the SFTF is within the floodplain. The Special Flood Hazard Area encompasses the majority of this lot. There is no way to replace a system without it being in the floodplain.

The Planning Commission is tasked with the reviewing and answering the questions in Component 4a.

Ms. Love reviewed the questions in the Component. Mr. Klinedinst clarified that the Planning Module is a supplement to the Township Act 537 Plan. The Planning Commission reviews the module for its agreement with our Act 537 Plan, however comments are encouraged to be included to PA DEP.

Within the Floodplain Ordinance, there are specific requirements that must be met to construct a sewage facility within the Special Flood Hazard Area.

The Planning Commission has concerns that this may be the first of several failing systems in the area. They also have concerns that the proposed tanks are fully within the Special Flood Hazard Area. Dr. Bedell made the motion to authorize the Zoning Officer to sign the PM with the Planning Commission comments to be included within.

The Fields of East Prospect design modification discussion:

The proposal is under the Enhanced Density for the Conservation by Design.

Mrs. Skiptunas asked if it didn't make more sense to have the commercial business along East Prospect Road, rather than along Nursery Road? Mr. Klinedinst remarked that they likely believe more traffic will be coming from the north, down Nursery Rd. Mr. Smith noted there isn't a lot of room along that area. The developer has requested text amendments for several items. The engineers believe that some of the items may be worthwhile to change – but any text amendment must take ALL future Conservation By Design Developments into consideration. Many of the changes requested appear to be specific to the design of this development. They are also asking for several Subdivision and Land Development modifications, which would allow for those changes to be utilized throughout the Township, which would not be appropriate outside this more urban area. Discussion followed on the Zoning Ordinance and what is required for a variance. There are no hardships to warrant a variance, these are design requests, which will work best as a text amendment. Mr. Klinedinst notes that when the CBD was created, we had no real-world experience to use.

This was not a formal submission, so detailed information was not included.

The noted issues are as follows. C.S. Davidson's preliminary Review Letter is attached. The greenways aren't really connected – there are disconnected pocket parks, with narrow walkways. The Planning Commission would request that these be more cohesive and have more continuity between the parks and greenways and the connections be wider, more than just a trail.

The required percentage of Open Space cannot be verified, there appears to be minimal public open space. A breakdown of those numbers will be required.

Numerous townhouse units have only alley access – how will emergency services, large item deliveries and the like work? How do they move furniture.

Direct access from Nursery Road to the multi-family units parking along Nursery Road will not be advised or viewed favorably.

Private roads vs. public road ownership is a huge question considering the street modifications that are requested. The Township will not likely maintain the alleys.

There was discussion on the steep slopes as defined in the Restricted Development Overlay District however, the only area that meets the definition of steep slopes is the area around the pond.

470-25.B Enhanced Density District Density, Dimensional Criteria and Requirements

Remove the word 'attached' and amend to state that the minimum setback for front loaded garages on single family detached dwellings and two family homes to be ten feet (10') and add minimum setback for front loaded townhome garages as two feet (2'). The Planning Commission agreed that this was an architectural feature, and no one had an issue with that.

Lot area Single Family Attached – change from minimum 2,000 to minimum 1,700 s.f. per unit.

Multi-family lot size is revised from minimum 2,000 s.f. to 1,400 square feet per unit.

Maximum lot coverage 50% or Single Family Detached Dwelling and Single Family Semi-Detached and 75% for the attached dwellings.

The Planning Commission believes these are reasonable reductions to the requirements in the Zoning Ordinance for utilizing the Conservation by Design.

Sec. 470-26.B

Modify the setback – ultimate right-of-way for the ‘Farmstead Gateway Building which the minimum setback shall be 30 feet’ and add the definition of Farmstead Gateway Building.

The PC viewed this as something specific to this development. The change of the Ordinance would not be favorably viewed, although two gateway buildings could be considered to have a better layout. Adding the definition would not be preferred.

Sec. 470-79 Dwelling, multi-family

Modification is requested so that “No building for multifamily dwellings shall contain more than sixteen dwelling units (removing the eight-unit dwelling requirement)”. This section of the ZO already limits the length of a building to 200’ so allowing the units to be stacked is not as obtrusive, however the Planning Commission feels 12 units per building is more reasonable.

The parking required for multi-family dwelling is 2 spaces per dwelling unit, plus a half space provided in a common parking area, which has not been requested to be modified.

The following requirements are based on the SaLDO

Section 410-29 Specific Design Requirements for Roads

Modify the provisions that minor streets and access drives will have a 50’ right-of-way (R/W) with a 28’ cartway. (This is the same size provided in the PRD development in the Township).

Add the following road types:

Alleys	20’ R/W	with	16’ cartway
Yield Street	48’ R/W	with	26’ cartway
Hillside Street	40’ R/W	with	18’ cartway
Green Street (one way travel)	30’ R/W	with	17’ cartway

Mr. Klinedinst and Mr. Smith suggest either adding street changes to the Conservation By Design section within the Zoning Ordinance, rather than changing the SaLDO or they can ask for waivers from the Board of Supervisors. Adding these to the Zoning Ordinance will give the benefit to any future developments as well.

They also recommend that the Roadmaster, Fire Chief, Police Chief, school district, and trash truck turning templates be shown in order to justify the changing radii. The changes they have requested are more suitable for an urban design, so there are areas of the development where they may be more appropriate.

Clarification of which roads will be private and which will be adopted by the Township, and which roads in the development will be designated as which type of street will need to be clarified.

Liquid Fuels money from PENNDOT requires a 33’ wide R/W. Alleys and Green Streets would not meet this requirement.

For planning purposes, driving lanes should be 10 feet wide, parking lanes should be 8’ wide.

410-29.G Minimum radius of curve – changing from 200’ radius to 50’ radius input from the EMS is needed, can a school bus make the turn? Would the school bus go into the development? Trash removal, plow trucks, furniture moving – all are concerns.

410-30.B Curve radii for curbs and/or edge of pavement. – a Minor street intersection with a Minor street change from 25’ to 10’ - 15’ this is appropriate for an urban walking area. The wider main street should not have the smaller radii but in the ‘neighborhood’ streets it is more appropriate.

The Planning Commission will review the request, and C.S. Davidson’s letter, review the meeting minutes and further discuss these requests, at which point the Board of Supervisors will also be notified.

Mrs. Wolnikowski asked if any of the survey items from the Comprehensive Plan preparation can be addressed in this development – biking and the like?

Mr. Bowser asked if the area within East Prospect Borough is designed so differently from the Township Ordinance, will we have a cohesive design? Their requirements allow only single-family dwellings and duplexes and will have wider streets, and deeper setbacks, but it should still look like a single development.

Dr. Bedell noted that approaching the Zoning Ordinance update, we will review the uses proposed, look at what districts they will be permitted in, and then add definitions as needed. We'll start with A and work through to Z.

Dr. Bedell adjourned the meeting at 8:21 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Monica Love
Zoning Officer