

Warwick Township
PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
March 2, 2022

Members Present: Kevin Madden
Michael Riotto
Kiel Sigafos
Michael Italia
Robert Fink

Others Present: Brandy Mckeever, Director of Planning & Zoning
Skye Sorresso, Recording Secretary
William D. Oetinger, Township Solicitor
John Evarts, Township Engineer

I. Call to Order

Kevin Madden called the March 2, 2022, Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

II. Consider approval of the February 9, 2022, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Motion by Michael Riotto to approve the February 9, 2022, Planning Commission meeting minutes without revision, seconded by Kiel Sigafos. Motion passed unanimously.

III. LD 21-05 1908 York Road – Ostroff Sketch Plan Review

The following individuals were present on behalf of the applicant:

- Steven Ostroff, Applicant
- Kristin Holmes, Applicant Engineer
- Julie Von Spreckelsen, Applicant Attorney

Ms. Mckeever provided a brief overview of the project. On January 24, 2022, the Township received a sketch plan submission for Steve and Gail Ostroff of 1908 York Road. The applicant proposes to construct a 6,770 square foot daycare center with associated parking and outdoor recreation area. The plan also proposes to maintain the existing single-family detached dwelling and associated accessory structures along with a newly proposed stormwater management system. Three new single-family detached dwelling lots with shared private access are also proposed. The plan reviewed was prepared by Holmes Cunningham Engineering, LLC dated November 11, 2021, last revised January 14, 2022. The applicant went before the Zoning Hearing Board on March 1, 2022, for a special exception required for the G2 daycare center use in the Office District.

Ms. Von Spreckelsen, applicant attorney, thanked Ms. Mckeever for the introduction. She informed the Commission that the applicant is seeking comments and suggestions on the submitted sketch plan of the proposed five-lot subdivision. She explained that the applicant proposes to construct a daycare center on lot one (1) and three single-family dwellings, lots three (3) through five (5). The existing barn and accessory structures would remain on lot two (2).

Mr. Italia asked Ms. Von Spreckelsen if there would be any connection between the main driveway and Stony Road. Ms. Von Spreckelsen clarified that only the existing single-family home would have access to Stony Road. The three proposed single-family homes would utilize a shared driveway with access to Meyer Way. Mr. Italia asked why the proposed dwellings would be given access to Meyer Way rather

than the existing Stony Road driveway. Mr. Ostroff, applicant, clarified that he and his wife would be living in the existing dwelling and did not want the new dwellings to access Stony Road via his property. Mr. Italia noted that a secondary egress at the rear of the property would be needed for emergency access.

Mr. Madden asked Ms. Holmes, applicant engineer, to clarify where the Meyer Way driveway would be located in relation to the existing median. Ms. Holmes clarified that the driveway would be across from the existing Goddard School driveway, just behind the median.

Mr. Sigafoos asked Ms. Holmes how emergency access from York Road would be handled. Ms. Holmes stated that the applicant would coordinate with emergency services to ensure all access points comply with requirements.

Mr. Riotto asked the applicant to explain the daycare center pick-up and drop-off times, as well as how the applicant would handle any traffic back-ups. Ms. Holmes explained that the daycare would offer only half-day programs with a maximum of 99 registrations between both programs. She added that the proposed drive aisle would have room for fifteen (15) cars before the door and fifteen (15) cars after.

Mr. Sigafoos asked about event parking and ensuring that parking would not back up onto Meyer Way. Ms. Von Spreckelsen did not believe the daycare had any such events but stated she would confirm with the franchise. Ms. Holmes added that the space along the drive aisle could be utilized for overflow parking if necessary.

Mr. Riotto asked why the applicant chose to construct a daycare facility. Mr. Ostroff replied that he and his wife currently own a franchise location and have been looking for a good property to house the daycare.

Mr. Madden asked the applicant what age groups the daycare would serve. Mr. Ostroff said children eighteen (18) months to five (5) years old would be accepted. Mr. Madden asked if there was any reason why a child may cross between the Goddard School and the proposed daycare. Mr. Ostroff clarified that the Goddard school serves infant to kindergarten age children and only offers full-day programs. The proposed daycare would serve a different demographic because it would only offer half-day programs.

Mr. Sigafoos asked the applicant if he would be willing to exclude the three single-family homes from the project. Ms. Von Spreckelsen said no because the proposed homes would offset the cost of the needed improvements to the property.

Mr. Sigafoos also asked Ms. Holmes if any other building orientation was considered. Ms. Holmes replied yes, however; the proposed orientation was found to be the best for traffic flow and lot layout.

Mr. Riotto asked the applicant what they planned to place between the proposed daycare facility and the three single-family homes. Ms. Holmes stated that the existing vegetation would be supplemented to create an adequate buffer.

Mr. Riotto also inquired about the security of the proposed recreation area. Ms. Holmes explained that the recreation area would be fully fenced around to the sides of the building to ensure the security of all exterior doors. She added that the fencing would also connect to the walkway around the front of the building to ensure access.

Mr. Oetinger asked Ms. Von Spreckelsen if there would be a shared driveway easement for the three single-family homes. Ms. Von Spreckelsen confirmed. Mr. Oetinger also asked if the daycare would have access to the shared driveway. Ms. Holmes clarified that the driveway would be connected to the daycare lot; however, private road signage would be placed at the entrance and additional gating would be determined at a later date.

Ms. Mckeever asked if the owner of lot two (2) would be responsible for the proposed stormwater management facility, to which Ms. Von Spreckelsen replied yes.

Mr. Sigafoos wished to note that he was in favor of sidewalks along the property on both Meyer Way and York Road.

Mr. Sigafoos also asked about the buffer along Sweetbriar Drive. Ms. Holmes stated that the existing buffer would be supplemented with additional vegetation.

With no further comments, Mr. Madden invited public comment. Ms. Maureen Powers of 1690 Mayfield Circle expressed concern with any increase in traffic from the proposed project. She explained that the Goddard School and several bus stops along Stony Road already generate significant traffic in the morning and evening hours. She felt that constructing an additional driveway on Meyer Way would cause further traffic issues.

VI. Ord. 2022-XX Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Wireless Facilities Review

Mr. Oetinger introduced the proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance. He explained that the amendment would repeal and replace the existing wireless communications article to establish the necessary definitions and requirements for wireless communications facilities and define the Township's control over the process. The amendment would bring the Township into compliance with updated law.

Mr. Oetinger added that several new laws were enacted by the state and federal government permitting wireless facilities in the public right-of-way. As a result, municipalities are now required to permit these devices in all zoning districts and must issue a set of guidelines on how they will regulate installation.

Mr. Madden asked if there would be a limit on the number of devices in this area. Mr. Oetinger replied that the ordinance had been written to prohibit the installation of the devices where they are not technically feasible. He added that all applicants would be required to collocate and demonstrate their inability before they will be permitted to install a new pole.

Mr. Oetinger noted that the devices would boost network capacity, not coverage, and would be installed by both wireless carriers and contractors. He added that municipalities could charge a maximum of \$270 per facility within the right-of-way.

Mr. Oetinger recommended the Commission also act upon the Buck County Planning Commissions' recommendation to include pictures or illustrations in the design manual due to the complexity of the devices.

Mr. Thompson asked Mr. Oetinger about the radius of these devices. Mr. Oetinger replied that they typically cover a radius of about 500 feet.

Mr. Sigafoos invited public comment. There being none, a motion was made.

Motion made by Michael Italia to recommend adoption of Ordinance 2022-XX Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Wireless Facilities Review subject to the addition of illustrations within the design manual.

Seconded by Michael Riotto. Motion passed unanimously.

VII. Old Business

None.

VIII. New Business

IX. Adjournment

Motion made by Michael Italia to adjourn; seconded by Michael Riotto. Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 7:57 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brandy Mckeever". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Brandy Mckeever, CZO
Director of Planning and Zoning