

**Honey Brook Township
Planning Commission Agenda
Regular Meeting Approved Minutes
May 25, 2017
7:00 p.m.**

The Honey Brook Township Planning Commission held its regular monthly meeting on Thursday, May 25, 2017, at the Honey Brook Township Building. The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m. by Susan Lacy, Chair. Commissioners present were Gary McEwen, Melissa Needles, Terry Schmidt, and Leslie Siebert. Township Engineer, Jennifer McConnell, of Technicon Enterprises, Inc. (TEI), was also present.

Absent: Bob Witters, Troy Stacey

Guests: None

Minutes:

With no further discussion, additions or corrections, the Chair called for a motion to approve the April 27, 2017, Planning Commission meeting minutes. The motion was made by Terry Schmidt, seconded by Melissa Needles. All in favor. None opposed. The motion carried.

Subdivision/Land Development Applications

1. 2017-4 Lester Stoltzfus - Land development Final Land Development Plan (TPN 22-6-36) 1784 West Walnut Rd.

— Plan dated March 25, 2017

—Engineer's review letter dated May 25, 2017

G. David Keener, P.E., project engineer, was present and the applicant later joined him. The applicant is putting in two poultry barns with an access driveway extended off an existing driveway on an existing farm. The TEI review letter was issued Wednesday - copies were sent to members via email. The applicant is looking for a recommendation tonight on whether the project is a major or minor land development along with landscaping and buffering input. Since this is a "new" agricultural operation, and not additional buildings accessory to the existing agricultural operations on-site, the project must go through the land development process. For this project, the main differences between a major and minor land development would be a joint preliminary/final plan approval (for a minor), whether a traffic study is required, and whether landscaping is required by the Ordinance requirements (for a major) or at the Planning Commission's discretion (for a minor).

Jennifer McConnell noted that the anticipated traffic to the site, based upon the engineer's cover letter, shows approximately 4-6 tractor trailer trips per week, a relatively low amount. Mr. Keener explained that the poultry operation will consist of 20,000 cage-free birds per barn. There are existing trees around the southern portion of the site. The Planning Commission discussed the distance from the proposed barns to the residential development along Diane Drive and felt that there was substantial separation and the barn fans were on the opposite side of the building. The PC felt no additional landscaping / buffering would be required for this project.

The applicants have submitted a plan to the Chester County Conservation District, and are addressing a few administrative items before the plans will be technically reviewed for the NPDES permit. Jennifer McConnell referred to the TEI review letter dated May 24, 2017, and noted that the applicant's engineer believes they can comply with all of the review comments.

Gary McEwen asked whether all the fields were currently being farmed (yes) and about the waste and nutrient management plan. The manure is dry, is spread on the fields twice a year, and the excess is in demand by other farms.

With no further discussion, Gary McEwen made a motion to consider the Lester Stoltzfus land development plan submission as a minor land development plan and review it under those standards. The motion was seconded by Terry Schmidt. All in favor. None opposed. The motion carried.

Zoning Hearing Board/Conditional Use Applications

1. ZHB 2017-3: Shane & Kathryn Ware (TPN 22-4-34) variance application

The applicants were present but were called away from the meeting due to a family emergency. The applicant's father (Mr. Ware) remained on the applicants' behalf.

Jennifer McConnell explained the property is located at 904 Twin County Road, on the corner of Poplar and Route 10. There is currently a residential dwelling on the property and the majority of the site lies in flood plain. The applicants are proposing an 80 foot x 50 foot pole storage building related to a landscaping business.

The first part of the discussion focused on the use of the property. The applicants had applied for a special exception for a home occupation for the landscaping business as well as the necessary variances from the Home Occupation regulations – particularly building size, storage, number of non-resident employees, etc. Melissa Needles expressed an opinion that there were too many elements that were not met for home occupation and suggested considering simply applying for a variance for a commercial use (landscaping business) as second principal use on a property, requiring fewer relief items. The other PC members were in general agreement that the landscaping business was more of a second principal use rather than some type of accessory use due to the scale of the business and potential for future growth. It was noted that if the business was permitted as a second principal use, rather than a home occupation, that the project would need to go through the land development process, and the PC indicated that they would treat it as a minor land development plan.

With no further discussion, the Chair called for a motion to (oppose/take no position/support) the special exception application of Shane and Kathryn Ware to allow the operation of a landscaping business as a Home Occupation as described in their application from their property, including variances necessary with regard to building size, number of employees, traffic and outdoor storage. The motion to oppose based upon the proposed business not meeting the Home Occupation ordinance requirements was made by Melissa Needles, seconded by Gary McEwen. All in favor. None opposed. The motion carried.

With no further discussion, the Chair called for a motion to (oppose/take no position/support) the variance application of Shane and Kathryn Ware to allow them to have a landscaping business as described in their application, as a second principal use on their property. The motion to support the variance application was made by Melissa Needles, seconded by Gary McEwen who added with support of someone from Planning Commission to provide additional clarification to the BOS / ZHB. (Melissa Needles indicated that she will be at the BOS meeting). All in favor. None opposed. The motion carried.

The discussion then focused on the location of the proposed building. The applicants are awaiting a decision from FEMA regarding their LOMA request to have the floodplain line on their property modified such that the proposed building would no longer be located in the floodplain. It was noted that the majority of the property is in the floodplain and there is not a suitable location outside of the floodplain to place the building. The rear yard setback was also discussed – the Ordinance requires a 60' setback but only 20' is proposed. The PC asked whether there was flexibility in the building location to increase the 20' setback provided to bring it close to the 60' requirement. The applicant's father indicated there may be room to shift the building but he would need to discuss it with his son. It was noted that there would need to be sufficient area for tractor trailers to turn around and for parking for employees and vehicles/trailers used in the business which may impact the building location as well.

With no further discussion, the Chair called for a motion to (oppose/take no position/support) the variance application of Shane & Kathryn Ware to allow the proposed building for the landscaping business to be located within the floodplain as designated on the most recent FEMA floodplain maps. The motion to support the variance application with the condition that if the building was still within the floodplain after FEMA's analysis, then the building must be flood proofed in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance requirements was made by Gary McEwen, seconded by Melissa Needles. All in favor. None opposed. The motion carried.

With no further discussion, the Chair called for a motion to the variance application of Shane & Kathryn Ware to allow the proposed building for the landscaping business to be within the required rear yard setback (60' required, 20' proposed). The motion to take no position, based on the potential for the building to be located further than 20' away from the rear lot line, was made by Susan Lacy, seconded by Terry Schmidt. All in favor. None opposed. The motion carried.

Pending Ordinances

None

Other Business

None

Correspondence of Interest:

None

Upcoming Meetings - All dates subject to change

June 7 - Zoning Ordinance Task Force Update Meeting #23 (7:00 pm)

June 8 - Board of Supervisors Workshop (7:00 pm)

June 14 - Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting (7:00 pm)

June 15 - Trail Study Committee Regular Meeting immediately followed by Parks & Recreation Committee Regular Meeting (7:00 pm)*

June 21 - Zoning Ordinance Task Force Update Meeting #24 (7:00 pm)

June 22 - Planning Commission Regular Meeting (7:00 pm)

* note time change

Adjournment

With no further business, the Chair called for a motion to adjourn. The motion was made by Gary McEwen, seconded by Melissa Needles. All in favor. None opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 pm.

The next Planning Commission meeting will be June 22, 2017.

Respectfully Submitted,

Leslie Siebert

Secretary, Planning Commission