



5. The loading zones should be separate from the parking lots so as not to block parking spaces. (§310-16.D Zoning). This could be resolved if excess parking (including the blocked spaces) is removed.
  6. The parking lot will contain more than 30 parking spots, thus requiring 5% interior landscaping. (§310-18.A.1 Zoning). Removing excess parking and returning these areas to pervious surface could eliminate the landscaping requirement.
  7. A landscaping plan is required (§275-40.1 SALDO).
  8. The Engineer's seal and signature are required (§275-24.C.5 SALDO)
  9. A waiver for stormwater requirements should be requested. (§265-110 SWM)
  10. A copy of deed restrictions should be provided to the Township Solicitor for review (§275-24.D.2) SALDO
  11. A bond or other financial guarantee for all improvements should be supplied prior to final approval. (§275-24.D.6) SALDO
  12. A Development Agreement, prepared by the Township's solicitor, shall be executed, and recorded by the Township prior to the release of the Plan for recording.
4. The applicant will resubmit the plan to the Zoning Officer so that another review can be performed prior to the February 14<sup>th</sup> Board of Commissioners meeting, where they will submit for approval.
- **Regents Glen – Lot 78: Inch & Company** – Final land development plan for 24 Dwelling Units.
    1. Paul Minnich, of Barley Snyder introduced himself and said he would be willing to answer any questions the board or audience may have.
    2. Josh George of Landworks Civil Design and Sam Saxon of Inch & Company were present.
    3. The applicant believes the 12 comments from the November meeting have been addressed, the revised plan reflects those changes. The November 7, 2023, review letter sent out by the Zoning Officer was used for the review:
      1. Recreation land or a fee-in-lieu be provided.
        - They will be paying a fee in lieu and that shall be a condition of the plan.
      2. Show the parking provided as color coded on the plan to assure the parking is sufficient.
        - The applicant submitted a parking exhibit plan that delineated all the parking spaces in this specific area of Regents Glen. It outlines where those spaces are located, whether they are surfaces spaces, or underneath the two existing buildings. It delineates the detached garage spaces on the east side of the property. It lays it out clearly and shows what was requested at the last meeting. It shows how the calculations were determined and that it was compliant.
      3. Determine what is the front yard to decide where the dumpster will be located.
        - This was relocated outside the front yard. It is now compliant with the setback and front yard requirements.
      4. The Engineer's seal and signature are required.
        - This shall be a condition of the plan
      5. Provide an Erosion and Sedimentation plan.
        - Provided with the revised plan.
      6. The Owner's notarized signature is required.
        - This shall be a condition of the plan.
      7. Provide the lighting fixture specifications on the lighting plan.
        - They were added to the plan.
      8. Approval of the Stormwater Management plan.

- There are only three or four comments on the Stormwater plan, so they are nearly complete. This shall be a condition of the plan.
  - 9. Financial Security must be posted prior to recording of the plan.
    - This shall be a condition of the plan.
  - 10. Add the landscaping notes to depict the native vegetation and the Landscape Architect's seal and signature be added.
    - The notes were added to the plan. The seal will be added as part of the final approval.
  - 11. Provide a Developers Agreement,
    - Typically, these are done after the Board of Commissioners gives conditional approval. This shall be a condition of the plan.
  - 12. Approval of Waiver for Preliminary Plan Approval.
    - The applicant has requested a Waiver of the Preliminary Plan, and they request the Boards approval.
- The Engineer brought up the parking plan and said that it totals the number of units to 64 there is also Lot 78. While this may total 64 units, you need 128 spaces. You are providing 142. The extra parking in the detached garage units doesn't do the people in the proposed apartments any good. The Board wanted to see that these spaces are associated with this building so that they could see how far residents must walk to get to the parking spaces designated for their building.
- Josh George responded that the surface parking spaces are not designated. The spaces under the buildings are designated, the detached garages are designated, but the surface parking is not. This exhibit is to show compliance with the zoning ordinance requiring two spaces per unit. The lot contains 64 units, total of two per, therefore, technically it meets the requirements.
- The Engineer did not dispute that, however the proximity of the parking to where people live is in question.
- Josh George said that is not a specific zoning requirement.
- The Engineer argues that it is a planning issue.
- Mr. Sandmeyer brought up the location of the dumpster. The Zoning Officer would rather see the dumpster moved to the rear of the buildings in keeping with the existing buildings. A dumpster may not be located in the front yard.
- Josh George says technically it is outside the front yard as defined in the Zoning Ordinance.
- Mr. Sandmeyer agreed that it is located in the front yard, and that this is a Zoning Officer decision and if there is a disagreement over this they will have to file a for an appeal.
- Attorney Minnich feels that there could be a difference of opinion on this and there could be further discussion. He will speak with his client to see if they can come to some sort of compromise to avoid having conflict over this.
- The Engineer discussed the lighting plan that was provided, noting that the specifics on the lighting fixtures need to be provided as well. The details of the poles are on the plan; however, the fixture information, include manufacturer specifications, needs to be on the plan as well.
- The E & S plan does not need to go to County Conservation because it is less than an acre of disturbance.
- Ms. Mitten agrees that the dumpster issue needs to be resolved as it does not belong on Crest Way and would be more cohesive if it was moved to the side yard along Indian Rock Dam Road.
- Mr. Sandmeyer pointed out that there is a tree in clear sight triangle that should be moved.
- The Engineer feels that since the recorded plan shows a clear sight triangle of 150 x 150 at Indian Rock Dam Rd. and Heritage Ln. the Board could hold them to that instead of the 75 x 150. It drastically affects what they can put on this lot.

- Mr. Sandmeyer said he has no issues with the reduction as the stop bar is placed appropriately, there is a gate, and it would reduce the size of the building dramatically.
- Josh George said that the current ordinance requirements state that 75 x 150 is appropriate and they meet the current ordinance requirements.
- Attorney Minnich said he would confer with his clients to discuss the comments and try to accommodate any reasonable requests from both the Board and the public.
- Public Comment:
  - Mark David Frankle, HOA Representative and resident of Regents Glen – He would like Inch and Company to contact them to discuss the HOA Agreement, access to the roads, and the parking issues.
  - Mr. Sandmeyer stated that this is not for the Planning Commission to decide as they do not regulate these matters.
  - Mr. Stevens asked Mr. Frankle if the HOA could designate parking spots for the residents.
  - Mr. Frankle said they can attempt it within the HOA.
  - Mr. Sandmeyer – Who owns the entire Lot with all the existing buildings? That is who should be signing the plans. The owners should be dealing with the parking and HOA issues.
  - Josh George responded by saying the land is owned by RG Lot 78 LLC, which is an entity owned by Inch and Company. The buildings are owned by individual residents.
  - Mr. Sandmeyer – There is one property owned by the applicant and the roads and parking lot are owned by the HOA.
  - Susan Billet, 1010 Crest Way – 24 Garages are owned by outside entities. Only 5 people that live in the building own those garages. 19 Garages are not available to the residents.
  - Scarlett Denman – 1133 Greenleigh – Regents Glen has several HOAs. Wanted to know how they can have rentals if they aren't paying into the HOA.
  - Seth, Villas at Fieldbrook – You can't count the privately owned garages as part of the available parking. The detached garages are a separate HOA.
  - Roger Gorman, 1128 Greenleigh – Wanted to know the plan to allow access to the renters? These are private streets maintained by the HOA.
  - Sam Saxton, Inch & Co, stated that is something they must work out with the HOA. They are only here to get approval to build a building on the lot.
  - Roger Gorman – From a planning standpoint don't they have to provide a plan to have access to the building? If you don't have access how will your tenants get to the apartments.
  - The Engineer stated that there should be some over-arching agreement with Regents Glen that any new development would have access to the streets, but he wasn't sure because this had never come up before.
  - Attorney Minnich stated that Inch & Co owns the property and has access. They would not be developing a plan if they did not have access. There is a developers agreement where these issues can be resolved. An access agreement could be drawn up between Inch & Co and the HOA.
  - Anthony Hutchinson, 1426 Copper Beech Dr – Purchasing units and having them pay HOA fees seems ok, but not rentals that do not contribute HOA fees.
  - Randy Meyerhoff, 1369 Fieldbrook Circle – Would this require a traffic study?
  - The Engineer said there have been studies done and the existing improvements are more than capable of handling the current and future traffic.
  - The Engineer asked if the detached garages are leased to the people on Lot 78?
  - Josh George said he does not know if they are owned by residents or not.

- Gina Campbell, 912 Streamview Ln – The residents of Regents Glen just want Inch & Co to talk to them so this can all be worked out. Designating spots does make sense. The residents pay for those spots. They do not want to be left in the dark about what is going on.
  - Marsha Souza, 1050 Greenleigh – There are not enough parking spaces for them to have the 48 required spaces.
  - The Engineer pointed out that if you take out the 24 detached garages from the total that leaves 118 spaces for the 64 units, that’s less than two spaces per unit so it doesn't conform in that context.
  - Mr. Sandmeyer wants to see adequate parking and confirmation of access.
  - Ms. Mitten suggested adding parking under the building.
  - Attorney Minnich said that he would like to see the Board make a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners that is either favorable or unfavorable or apply conditions. The Planning Commission is just an advisory body, and the Board of Commissioners will make the final decision. The issues could be resolved via conditions. Access is not a problem, and they want to meet the parking requirements. Conditions and including a developers agreement would allow the Board of Commissioners to make their final decision.
- Motion to table this Land Development Plan for Lot 78 to February 2, 2023, Planning Commission meeting to address the following issues:
    1. Resolve the parking issues.
    2. Resolve the location of the dumpster.
    3. Provide the lighting fixture specifications on the plan.
    4. Developers Agreement with how the Maintenance will be shared.
    5. Request a Waiver of the Preliminary Plan
    6. Establish access for residents and for Inch & Co to build.
    7. Provide financial security.
    8. Signatures of the Owner, Engineer, and Landscape Architect.
    9. Provide a Fee-in-lieu of recreation.
    10. Stormwater Management approval.
  - Motion seconded by Mr. Stevens. All in favor. Motion approved.

**OTHER BUSINESS: Ordinance Amendments:**

- Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee – Need to recommend one Planning Commission Board member to the advisory committee. A letter of interest must be completed and submitted to [general@sgtwp.org](mailto:general@sgtwp.org).
  1. Amy Mitten expressed interest in being on the advisory committee on behalf of the Planning Commission. The attending members of the Planning Commission were amenable to her participation. The Zoning Officer recommended completing the application and emailing it to the General mailbox.
  2. Mr. Stevens brought up something he saw on a local social media page, Nextdoor, that some information has been shared that is not completely accurate regarding the Mount Rose Property that is owned by Spring Garden Township. There have not been any zoning changes to the Mount Rose property, no land development plans have been before the Planning Commission board for review, and there are no plans to develop the property.
  3. Anything that would occur with the property will occur after the completion of the Comprehensive Plan where land use can be reviewed, and the best possible use of the property can be established.

Roberta Boffo, 1080 Grandview Rd. – Shared her concerns about the Mount Rose Property and expressed frustration over the 2016 Master Plan being updated instead of waiting for a new Comprehensive Plan.

Julia Dawson, Turnberry – She is new and wants to know how to get more involved.

Raeann Waltersdorf, 1558 Hollywood Parkway – Shared that she only shares accurate information on social media. She expressed frustration over the Reorganization Agenda being different on the screen than the one on the website at today’s earlier Board of Commissioners reorganization meeting.

With no further business to address, motion to adjourn by Ms. Mitten, seconded by Mr. Stevens. All in favor. The meeting adjourned at 8:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dawn Hansen, Zoning Officer