

**PLAINFIELD TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING  
FEBRUARY 21, 2022**

A regular meeting of the Plainfield Township Planning Commission was held on Monday, February 21, 2022 at the Plainfield Township Volunteer Fire Company Fire Hall located 6480 Sullivan Trail, Wind Gap, PA 18091.

Solicitor, David Backenstoe, called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

The Pledge of Allegiance was performed.

**ROLL CALL:**

The following Commissioners answered roll call: Paul Levits, Terry Kleintop, Glenn Geissinger, Robin Dingle and Robert Simpson.

Also present were Township Manager, Tom Petrucci, Zoning Officer, Sharon Pletchan, Township Solicitor, David Backenstoe, Township Environmental Consultant, Jason Smith, Township Traffic Engineer, Peter Terry and Township Engineer, Jeffrey Ott. Secretary, Paige Stefanelli, was excused from the meeting.

**REORGANIZATION:**

1. Appointment of Chairman/Chairperson:

**ACTION: Motion was made by Commissioner Robert Simpson and seconded by Commissioner Robin Dingle to appoint Paul Levits as Chairman of the Plainfield Township Planning Commission. Prior to the vote, Solicitor Backenstoe asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.**

Solicitor Backenstoe then handed the meeting over to Chairman Levits.

2. Appointment of Vice Chairman/Chairperson:

**ACTION: Motion was made by Commissioner Robert Simpson and seconded by Commissioner Terry Kleintop to appoint Glenn Geissinger as Vice-Chairman of the Plainfield Township Planning Commission. Prior to the vote, Chairman Levits asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

1. Approval of the November 15, 2021 Regular Planning Commission Meeting Minutes:

**ACTION:** Motion was made by Commissioner Simpson and seconded by Commissioner Geissinger to approve the November 15, 2021 Regular Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. *Prior to the vote, Chairman Levits asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public.*

Chairman Levits requested a correction to the attendance in the draft minutes, as it stated Commissioner Dingle was excused from the meeting, however, she was present and made a motion during the meeting.

**Motion approved, with the one correction as discussed. Vote 5-0.**

2. Approval of the December 20, 2021 Regular Planning Commission Meeting Minutes-Request to Table:

**ACTION:** Motion was made by Commissioner Geissinger and seconded by Commissioner Dingle to approve the December 20, 2021 Regular Planning Commission Meeting Minutes, as presented. *Prior to the vote, Chairman Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public.* Motion approved. Vote 5-0.

#### **EXTENSION OF TIME:**

1. CRG Services Management, LLC. (905 W. Pennsylvania Avenue, Pen Argyl, PA 18072)- Land Development Application:

Chairman Levits noted an extension of time was received from CRG for their plan, which would run through April 30, 2022. This matter was slated for action at the last Planning Commission meeting, but the meeting was cancelled due to inclement weather.

**ACTION:** Motion was made by Commissioner Simpson and seconded by Commissioner Kleintop to approve CRG Services Management, LLC. (905 W. Pennsylvania Avenue, Pen Argyl, PA 18072) Land Development Application Extension of Time request through April 30, 2022. *Prior to the vote, Chairman Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public.* Motion approved. Vote 5-0.

#### **PLANS PRESENTLY TABLED:**

1. CRG Services Management, LLC (905 W. Pennsylvania Avenue, Pen Argyl, PA 18072) - Land Development Application:

Their application was received July 26, 2021 and expires April 30, 2022. This morning, the Applicant requested this matter listed on tonight's agenda be tabled as they are working on additional information.

**ACTION: Motion was made by Commissioner Simpson and seconded by Commissioner Kleintop to approve CRG Services Management, LLC. (905 W. Pennsylvania Avenue, Pen Argyl, PA 18072) Land Development Application Extension of Time request through April 30, 2022. Prior to the vote, Chairman Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.**

**ACTION: Motion was made by Commissioner Simpson and seconded by Commissioner Dingle to accept the CRG Services Management, LLC, N.A.P.E.R. Development, Inc. and 6615 Sullivan Trail Associates, LLC projects as tabled. Prior to the vote, Chairman Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.**

#### **NEW BUSINESS:**

1. Huratiak Homes, LLC. (Delabole Road- E9-10-10-0626) - Sketch Plan. Steve Walsh, from Dynamic Engineering, and Applicant Jason Huratiak, from Huratiak Homes, LLC, were in attendance this evening to discuss two separate proposed developments and their project plans, answer any questions the public and/or Commissioners had regarding the same and for the Commissioners provide initial feedback on the plans.
  - a. 410 S. Main Street. Engineer Walsh discussed this development and stated it would be erected primarily in Pen Argyl Borough (only the southeast corner of the site would be in Plainfield Township). Some of the plan designs included, an extension of Horizon Drive, and erection of townhomes, an apartment complex, carriage houses, three-story apartment buildings and a community center. The development would be serviced by public water.
  - b. Delabole Property Project ("Delabole Project"). Engineer Walsh also discussed this development, which would be located along Delabole Junction Road (south of the 410 S. Main Street project). This project would include townhomes, condominiums and single-family homes. Engineer Walsh stated the Applicant is working on the Township's review letter(s) comments, which included a conservation easement survey, traffic study and the wetlands being delineated. The development would be serviced by public water.

Applicant Huratiak stated they are proposing this development because of the Plainfield extension, which he highlighted because they are seeking to expand the Plainfield parcels mainly for the "For Sale Product." They reviewed Pen Argyl's Revitalization Plan and Plainfield Township's Regional Comprehensive Plan and to determine what they believe the community needs and how they could best improve the community; he stated affordable and high density are needed to meet

both plans in order to proceed with the projects and a For Sale Product within the parcel does not work to preserve natural features of the property and preserve as much green space as required.

Township Engineer Ott asked for the municipal boundary lines to be pointed out. Mr. Walsh discussed the boundary lines, as requested.

Questions and/or comments from the Commissioners regarding the project(s):

Commissioner Dingle asked what kind of data/statistics the Applicant has regarding the need for this type of large housing development, i.e., is there a lack of housing available now, are there vacancies that are not being filled. Applicant Huratiak stated the Revitalization Plan (last updated February 2021) requires 350 dwelling units be erected over a period of time, based on demand. The surveys for the housing need(s) were conducted pre-COVID. He stated the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission (“LVPC”) studies show more housing is needed in the area to meet the population growth in Lehigh Valley. Applicant Huratiak stated they only foresee 1/10 school age children for this type of product, because most of the renters will be empty nesters or retirees, therefore, the population from the two developments should not affect schools capacity limits, plus enrollment in the Pen Argyl School District has declined by 25% over the past 25 years.

Commissioner Kleintop questioned the occupancy rate in the new Wind Gap development on West Street at this point in time. Applicant Huratiak stated it is at 99% because they had a small turnover due to a project and there is currently a waiting list for vacant units.

Commissioner Kleintop then requested confirmation on the amount of land that is required for a septic system installation in Plainfield Township. Mr. Walsh indicated the ordinance states .6 acres, therefore, their understanding is they can develop 26–acres of the total parcel acreage.

Zoning Officer Pletchan discussed some of the comments in her review letter, dated February 07, 2022, regarding the development, which included setbacks, buffer yards, wetlands, Conservation District requirements, confirmation of Lot #10 property ownership, permits and Condominium Association and Home Owners Association (“HOA”) information for the Plainfield Township portion of the development regarding to maintenance and other elements.

Chairman Levits questioned who would own the storm water lot in the end. Engineer Walsh stated they would potentially establish an HOA who would be responsible for the storm water, as they did not want to burden the Township or individual lot owners with it.

Commissioner Geissinger questioned how many units are currently being proposed. Engineer Walsh stated the 410 S. Main Street development would have 276 units and the Delabole Junction development would have 85 units, for a combined total of 361 units.

Chairman Levits asked if the Applicant appeared before Pen Argyl yet and what their comments were. Applicant Huratiak stated they appeared on Thursday, and Pen Argyl was generally excited about the potential architectural, it is a local developer seeking to

reinvestment in community and they were fully supportive on the sewer request, the Applicant would need to go before the municipal Authority and request a potential deferral from Plainfield for the Horizon extension.

Commissioner Kleintop questioned if each development could stand alone or if they were predicated. Applicant Huratiak indicated this would not be possible.

Commissioner Kleintop asked Zoning Officer Pletchan if there would be any issues with the cul-de-sac length. Mr. Walsh stated it was measured from the intersection to the bowl, which is within ordinance. The cul-de-sac and number of units were reviewed by Ott Engineering and the applicant complied with all requirements.

Commissioner Simpson questioned what would happen with the 47-acre piece of property. Engineer Walsh stated it would be Conservation area. Commissioner Simpson then questioned who owns it and what would be done with it (would it be a grass field or go back to forest). Engineer Walsh stated, at this time, it would be preserved with natural features on it (no plan to build a home on it) and it is undetermined if it would be privately owned or not. However, they retained the right to possibly build one single-family “farmette” home on it and preserve it the same manner as a tillable preserved farm would be; this home was listed in the 34 count. There was a brief discussion on if this use would meet the Conservation Easement requirements and ordinance regulations or not; the Applicant would need to submit a plan to Plainfield Township for their review and possible approval.

Section 27-305 *Farm and Forest District (FF)* of the Code of Ordinances was discussed. Township Manager Petrucci commented there is important language in this portion of the Ordinance. He then read a portion of Section 27-305.9.H.(3)(a)(8) *Greenway Land Ownership*, which states “This option shall only be available in locations where the applicant proves to the Board of Supervisors (“BOS”) that none of the above options are feasible or appropriate.” Zoning Officer Pletchan then read a portion of Section 27-305.9.E (1)(a)(b)(c)(d) and (e), which outlines prohibited easements and/or deed restrictions on greenway land. Township Manager Petrucci then read Section 27-305.9.H.(3)(a)(1)-(8), which outlines eight (8) methods to preserve greenway land. He commented these sections of the Ordinance do not carry one preference over another section. Chairman Levits suggested the Applicant consider 3-4 options and speak with the School District, then bring forth in formal application to the Township.

Township Engineer Ott then discussed some of his comments from his review letter, dated February 14, 2022, which included a few waiver requests will be expected for plan scale, Conservation District development, Delabole Junction Road is very narrow (particularly to the south of the municipal boundary line which he suggested the Township traffic engineer review), retention basin, provisions for sidewalks/bike/path ways, a need for street lighting, Horizon Drive extension would need a Land Development plan submission, Blue Valley Care subdivision and adjoining deeds must be factored in, road ownership, Private Drive

questions, and the Township may want to sign an agreement with Pen Argyl Borough relating to 410 S. Main Street.

Commissioner Kleintop noted Delabole Junction Road turns into Jory Road. He questioned if the narrow road was taken into consideration. Township Engineer Ott stated it was noted in their letter, but the Township's traffic engineer and Applicant would have to study it. He expressed concern with a section of Delabole Junction Road (traveling south) where there is a wall on one side of the road and a garage and house very near the road on the other side because there is no room there to expand the roadway; he suggested Benchmark and the Applicant review it. Commissioner Dingle stated she reviewed Benchmark's traffic letter/study and noticed it does not include the intersection at Delabole and Jory Roads; she requested that it be looked at because there will be an increase in traffic at that intersection.

Commissioner Simpson emphasized comment #20 in Township Engineer Ott's review letter, which read "In addition, the extent of steep slopes appear to be somewhat underestimated in this plan." He noted there is no grading on it, which may impact the plan as there is concern about slopes, stability, drainage and retaining walls.

Questions and/or comments from the public regarding the project(s):

Donald Moore commented on the *Conservation By Design* Ordinance. He recalled three developer's attempting to work through it in the past, but did not succeed for various reasons. He expressed support for this section of the Ordinance to be utilized for these developments.

Adrienne Fors questioned if all the units between the two projects would be connected to public sewer. The applicant stated that is there intent. Chairman Levits asked if it was already in the service area or if it would need an extension to be put in the service area. The applicant stated it is unclear at this time, but Pen Argyl Authority has the capacity for it and they need the Township's approval for single-family connections.

Chairman Levits questioned Pen Argyl's plant capacity. It was noted it is approximately 980,000 Gallons Per Day. He commented the development design would be to capture the modern farmhouse design, fencing and pillars to give the "farm feel."

Mille Bean questioned where the sewage would go. It was stated it would go to the Wind Gap plant. Ms. Bean discussed the community and School District population. She stated the schools have room for more students and she expressed concern for the proposed developments not being affordable to moderate income persons/families.

Ms. Bean then asked where the Pen Argyl plant sends their sludge. She expressed concerned for wildlife and insects transporting sludge contaminants to other communities and food supplies. Chairman Levits commented each Authority needs two sources (primary

and secondary) to dispose of their sludge, but it is a question for the plants as it is not part of this sketch plan discussion.

Jerry Lennon, lives in Dotta's Development. He expressed concern for the Horizon Drive extension, because it is currently a cul-de-sac into a private road. He suggested they development come in from Middletown instead and go straight up, so the cul-de-sac area is not disturbed. The applicants engineer noted that the Horizon Drive extension is not needed (it could be used for emergency access only), but it was designed that way because it is a dead end road with room for large fire and lifesaving equipment ingress and egress and turnaround. Mr. Lennon stated non-residents of Dotta's Development already use the private road and traffic would increase from residents of Applicant Huratiak's development(s) using it. Applicant Huratiak acknowledged the area has a private/public road intermix. It was suggested coming through Plainfield into Pen Argyl and putting a cul-de-sac in with a driveway coming off the cul-de-sac to service Applicant Huratiak;s development(s) and/or using the Dotta's Development cul-de-sac for fire and emergency access only. Applicant Huratiak stated they will work to see if they can access through Main Street.

Mr. Lennon asked if there would be a buffer. He expressed concern for traffic which already causes issues during rush hour. Engineer Walsh stated there would be a buffer with dressing of landscaping.

Thomas Carlo – questioned if a traffic study was done and if it included coming off 512 and turning left onto South Main. Engineer Walsh replied yes.

Commissioner Kleintop asked if the neighbors of the current development were informed their backyard views they enjoyed for the past two decades are about to considerably change. Engineer Walsh stated they were not notified of the proposed development. Township Environmental Consultant Smith stated it is by right and by design.

2. Farmstead Realty Holdings, LLC. (968 Bangor Road, Nazareth, PA 18064) - Land Development Plan Application:

Applicants Engineer, Matt Longenberger, provided an update on the project. The uses and plan layout are the same, the zoning issues were cleaned up and relief was received. He noted a comment in Ott Engineering's review letter regarding the driveway entrance and core striping, which he stated the applicant will provide curbing to avoid additional zoning relief.

Engineer Ott discussed some of the comments in his review letter, dated February 17, 2022:

Comment #2, §22-502.1 – an additional waiver is needed for submitting separate Preliminary and Final Plans, which shall be included on the plans and in the waiver requests letter.

Comment #7, §22-503.2.A – the letter and plan note needs to be modified to reflect the Applicant’s waiver request regarding scale size, which the Township Planning Commission (“PC”) previously recommended.

Comment #12, §22-503.4.C – the existing lot layout on the tracts between Bangor Rd and Old Bangor Rd (including the existing storm sewer system) and wetlands within 100’-300’ from the site still need to be shown on the plan. In addition, the stream was identified as National Wetland Inventory (NWI) and the wetlands were mapped within 300’ from the Applicant’s property, which included the adjacent properties.

Comment #18, §22-503.6.B.4 – the tree line limit of disturbance is not shown on the plan. The site meeting that was held since last PC meeting was discussed. Once the trail project is completed it would need to go through its own separate project submission(s), which will then be brought before all of the respective agencies.

The possible trail location was also discussed, however, its location is not certain at this time as the project materializes it could be changed; he then discussed the proposed trail ingress and egress, which are shown on the plan.

Commissioner Dingle questioned if the trail would be linked as a condition to the Applicant’s design and plan project, with the understanding the trail would need to be designed, permitted and completed within a specific timeframe (3-5 years), so it is not a conceptional drawing on the plan but not completed in the future. It was stated the stormwater relating to the trail was accounted for in the design so the applicant is invested, but is unsure how a completion timeline would be assigned as there would be several agencies involved. Solicitor Backenstoe stated the condition could be part of the cost improvement, which would be attached to the improvements agreement to make it secure as the Township could pull funds from the letter of credit to have the trail work completed; there was a unanimous consensus among the Commissioners to make this a condition recommendation.

Comment #24, §22-1003.2 – the land is subject to hazardous conditions (i.e., open quarries, quarry hole). Engineer Ott questioned if the PC had any concerns about adding additional safeguards? Safety concerns for the open quarries were discussed. The Applicant is willing to install a fence; he asked what fence height and material type were desired.

Commissioner Kleintop questioned the depth of the quarry. It was noted the quarry is approximately 20 feet.

There was a discussion on the possible erection of a fence around the quarry. A chain-link fence was suggested and possibly a sign because it is a wooded area and most people would not know the quarry is there. Zoning Officer Pletchan commented the safety could be more of a concern once the trail is completed. Engineer Ott commented

a sign maybe sufficient but that would draw more attention to it; he suggested posting signs within the woods so they are only visible to persons that are off the path. Chairman Levits commented if the quarry can't be seen a fence is not needed at this time but it could be during the trail development.

Commissioner Dingle questioned if the quarry could be seen from a second story deck/building. She then commented a lot can be seen through the woods during leaf-off conditions and a chain-link fence could be the applicants best liability protection. Commissioner Levits stated it may be up to the insurance company to review the risk factor and require a fence. The Applicant will discuss the matter with his insurance company. Township Manager Petrucci commented a motion detection camera, with notifications going to someone, could solve the matter.

Comment #31.L, §22-1009.10.A – the letter and plan note need to be modified to reflect the waiver requests letter. The Applicant will comply.

Comment #31.M, §22-1009.10.D – a waiver was requested for downspout collector and yard drains. Engineer Ott stated he does not object to this request.

**ACTION: Motion was made by Commissioner Simpson and seconded by Commissioner Dingle to recommend the Board of Supervisors to grant a waiver to 22-1009.10.D. Prior to the vote, Chairman Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.**

**ACTION: Motion was made by Commissioner Kleintop and seconded by Commissioner Dingle to recommend the Board of Supervisors to grant the waiver, providing PennDOT does not object to §22-1013.2, which was previously granted by the Zoning Hearing Board. Prior to the vote, Chairman Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.**

Comment #34, §22-1013.4.A.1 – Ott Consulting recommended the gore striped area be constructed of mountable concrete. In addition, this section requires curbing for the access drive, which is not shown on the plan or mentioned in the waiver request. The Applicant will comply, including the mountable curb, which would eliminate the need for a waiver request. Engineer Ott stated he would be okay with it, if they put in a mountable curb and an island.

Comment #37, §22-1015 – the PC discussed provisions for the sidewalks, bikeways and pathways. Chairman Levits questioned where the sidewalks would be installed, he commented there are no other sidewalks on Route 191. The Applicant believes this comment was in reference to the trail and not along street frontage. Engineer Ott questioned if the PC would want the trail illuminated, paved or widened? Chairman Levits commented this does not need to be addressed now. Township Manager Petrucci commented 8 ft., no pavement and no lighting are consistent with the current

trail. It was questioned whether there are any maintenance issues with the slopes. The elevation change was discussed. A pavement is needed. Bohler Engineering will provide for a 20 ft. easement in case switchbacks don't work.

Comment #44, §22-1023 – the Applicant requested a partial waiver to allow minimum disturbance within the wetland buffer area in order to provide access to the site. Engineer Ott stated he did not have any engineering issues with the waiver request. The Applicant explained currently there is existing wetlands along the cul-de-sac and an existing driveway along the wetlands buffer; their intention is to maintain and improve the existing driveway, but they need to encroach into the buffer for the grading and widening of the access drive.

Engineer Smith addressed Comments 43 and 44. Based on the grading, the downstream side of the buffer, they will need minimal grading of the existing road to make it compliant. He does not believe the wetland hydrology will be impacted, therefore, he believes it is reasonable to entertain the waiver request. There would not be a significant vegetation change, just minor clearing.

There was a discussion regarding planning of shrubs/vegetation. Based upon Engineer Smith's description of the plan and review of the figures, Commissioner Dingle proposed the PC accept and recommend the partial waiver, with the condition of the Applicant vegetate the one corner of the wetlands which is not currently vegetated (part of the buffer is not vegetated with forested with plants, native trees and/or shrubs). The Applicant agreed to planting shrubs/trees.

**ACTION: Motion was made by Commissioner Dingle and seconded by Commissioner Simpson to grant the partial waiver request, with the condition of restoration of the disturbed area with trees and shrubs of the one corner (open area) adjacent to the wetlands (part of buffer is not forested in native trees and shrubs) and to delineate the restoration area on the plan. *Prior to the vote, Chairman Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.***

Zoning Officer Pletchan discussed her zoning review letter, dated February 08, 2022, which the Planning Commission did not receive for review.

Comment 6.a.i. – Zoning Officer Pletchan asked if the Applicant prepared a Riparian Buffer Management Plan, which is part of their NPDES Permit, and submit it to the District. The Applicant will provide it as a separate plan. Zoning Officer Pletchan recommended placing the wetland buffer restoration on a separate plan, which was set as a condition for wetland disturbance.

Comment 6a.ii – The PNDI receipt provided with the resubmission was not completed/executed and states that further review is required by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. It was requested to follow-up with the agency to address potential

impacts and provide all correspondence to the Township to factor into reviews. In addition, Survey 1 and 2 have been received and no findings were provided. There will be no anticipated clearance letter as there was no bog turtle habitat located.

Comment 8 – any easements will need to be addressed with the resubmission.

Comment 9 – a status update on the septic design was requested. It was submitted to DEP and they are currently reviewing it. Once the flows are approved, the design will be engaged. The location shown on the plan has not changed.

Comment 10.a.i – relates to the overflow parking area, which has been changed to gravel, instead of asphalt. At their January 26, 2021 meeting, the Zoning Hearing Board (“ZHB”) revised their response to state a depressed or 10 foot wide strip curb, stabilized with Geogrid, would be provided between the overflow parking lot and the retentive grading berm. The Applicant will install a depressed curb, as shown on the site plan.

A vegetation plan was requested, along with a plan on how they will repair ruts and deficiencies. The Applicant has not determined what plan this will be shown on yet, but it will most likely be on the landscaping plan.

Commissioner Kleintop questioned when the parking lot surface changed to a gravel. Zoning Officer Pletchan recalled the paved parking area on the plan was changed to gravel after the PC made their recommendation (based on asphalt); then, when the ZHB reviewed the plan it showed gravel. It was stated the change was made in late November or December. The plan was submitted to the PC on November 29, 2021, and it was discussed in December 2021. Zoning Officer Pletchan then recalled the ZHB approved the gravel parking area (after the PC meeting) with the condition of a depressed curb.

The Ott Consulting Sewer Enforcement Officer (SEO) letter dated, February 17, 2022 was then discussed. To date, the outstanding items in the letter have not been resolved, but the Applicant is working with DEP on resolutions. An update on the project was provided, which included no design was submitted yet, the Applicant is waiting for a response from DEP regarding the performed testing, the on-lot septic system is in progress and the sewage flows are under review by the Township and DEP.

Tonight, the Applicant is seeking a recommendation for conditional approval. If approved this evening, the Applicant is willing to work out the comments before seeking BOS approval at their next meeting. Engineer Ott provided his opinion, which included the plan needs a lot of clean-up and housekeeping, the stormwater management needs to be worked out, the plan would not change and the PCSM is still under design/finalization and there is still an outstanding waiver request.

Solicitor Backenstoe did not recommend the PC grant conditional approval or not, however, he commented a proposed motion could be to recommend conditional approval based upon the Applicant complying with all of the comments in Ott Engineering’s review letter, dated February, 17, 2022, and final plan approval shall not be submitted to the BOS until all of the

conditions set forth in the February 17, 2022 review letter have been satisfied or met, other than third party agencies. It was noted the PC has not received, nor reviewed, the review letters from Zoning Officer Pletchan and Engineer Smith at this time.

There was a discussion on possibly conditionally approving the plan this evening and the outstanding review letters. Engineer Smith stated there were no major issues in his review letter that would require the Applicant to appear before the PC again before appearing before the BOS, however, emergency management services and Fire Chief need to review the plan, the stormwater management needs to be finalized for the final design, approval from outside agencies (LVPC and NPDES permits). The Applicant's Attorney stated they would comply with the comments and work with reviewers.

The Commissioners requested to see a clean plan before making a recommendation as there are several pages of outstanding items listed in the review letter(s) that have not been cleaned up.

The Commissioners discussed some of their concerns regarding the plan and outstanding comments that need to be cleaned up. Commissioner Kleintop commented a gravel parking lot was not what he recalled the PC recommending (he recalled recommending asphalt) and he may have additional concerns/conditions based on the review letter(s). Commissioner Dingle and Engineer Smith requested the landscaping plan show native species of plants, shrubs and trees that are relevant to Pennsylvania, not just species that are used throughout the United States.

There was a unanimous consensus among the Commissioners to table the matter, which would require an extension of time to allow sufficient time for plan clean-up and another PC meeting. Representatives for Farmstead Realty Holdings agreed to provide the PC a three-month extension of time, through June 30, 2022, to allow ample time to clean-up the plan and hold another PC meeting, as the current extension expires next month.

**ACTION: Motion was made by Commissioner Kleintop and seconded by Commissioner Geissinger to grant the extension request, to June 30, 2022. Prior to the vote, Chairman Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.**

**ACTION: Motion was made by Commissioner Kleintop and seconded by Commissioner Simpson to table the Farmstead Realty Holdings application. Prior to the vote, Chairman Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.**

Resident Donald Moore commented about the trail extension being a great effort. He asked for a clarification of Solicitor Backenstoe's comment regarding who may not want to do the trail extension. Solicitor Backenstoe clarified his comment was regarding the possibility of the Applicant not wanting to do it, not the Township, because the Applicant wants to do it in two phases; if the Township wants to secure the trail, they can do it through the improvements agreement and the cost estimate letter of credit would pay for it.

Resident Moore then questioned the water level and stability of the quarry. The applicant noted that it is indeed stable.

Warehouse Ordinance Buffer Options:

Township Manager, Tom Petrucci, stated that at the previous meeting, concerns regarding the ability to enforce the ordinance was discussed. Representatives from Gilmore and Associates provided the Township with two possible options for consideration. The Township has two options, the first being a buffer yard that would provide a full visual screen that is set up as a performance standard rather than a quantifiable amount of trees or bushes. Conformance would be confirmed by the Zoning Officer. The second option is to have a quantifiable number of trees, plants and shrubs that would be able to be quantified by the Zoning Officer. Option #2 may not yield the intended results for long term maintenance/results. Commissioner, Robert Simpson, indicated a time frame for final results should be provided in the ordinance in order to be able to enforce the buffer once it has matured. Wetlands Consultant, Jason Smith, indicated slope requirements need to be 3:1 or greater to allow for maintenance. Mr. Simpson noted that he is in favor of the first option with the addition of a time frame for compliance of the buffer. Mr. Petrucci will take the comments of the Planning Commission and provide a revised ordinance for review.

Clean-fill Regulation:

Township Manager, Tom Petrucci, recommended a special meeting or a subcommittee for the Clean Fill Regulation. In addition, Mr. Petrucci will need to provide the comments to the URDC. Chairman, Paul Levits, questioned the deadline for this submission. Mr. Petrucci indicated comments by the Planning Commission can be emailed as he has one additional month remaining. If there are any major issues, Mr. Petrucci will plan a special meeting for discussion. Mr. Petrucci added that a contractor was concerned with the fill regulations in terms of the regulation of fill inside and outside of the Township. He added this is a valid concern in the event that fill is not available.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Millie Beahn– Ms. Beahn questioned about plan submissions and adjoining municipalities and their input on said submissions. She questioned whether Plainfield Township follows up on any other comments by outside municipalities. Mr. Petrucci indicated the Township follows up on all correspondence from outside municipalities.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Having no further business to come before the Planning Commission, motion was made by Robert Simpson and seconded by Robin Dingle to adjourn the meeting. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.

The meeting adjourned at 10:04 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Paige Stefanelli  
Planning Commission, Secretary  
Plainfield Township