

Borough Solicitor:

No comment at this time. Mr. Asteak noted the applicable SALDO Section 213.10.B.5.D by way of explanation why a full review of the plan could not be conducted at this meeting. Mr. Charlesworth and Mr. Carraciola both acknowledged the notices had not been provided.

Zoning Officer:

No comment at this time – reserve for later.

Borough Engineer:

No comment at this time. Applicant was referred to Mr. Rentko's review letter dated July 8, 2020.

Mr. Charlesworth requested a list of comments in Mr. Rentko's review letter dated July 8, 2020 that specifically apply to new Ordinance provisions adopted by the Borough May 4, 2020. Mr. Rentko and Mr. Asteak emphasized the majority of comments from Mr. Rentko's letter apply even if based on the "old" ordinance. Mr. Rentko he would furnish Mr. Charlesworth with a marked copy of his letter noting the comments that specifically refer to "new" ordinance provision adopted by the Borough May 4, 2020.

Public Comment:

No comment or presentation permitted for reasons stated previously – *there was no one from the general public in attendance.*

Planning Commission:

Kathleen Zdonowski:

No comment at this time – reserve for later.

Bryce Good:

No comment at this time – reserve for later.

A. Joseph Gosnell:

No comment at this time – reserve for later.

Sean Dooley:

- a. Requested Applicant reconsider denial of previous request to furnish Borough with PDF copy of submitted land development plans to facilitate distribution while limiting physical contact in light of the COVID-19 situation. Suggested a discussion could be had about paper copy submission requirements to reduce the overall amount of paper copies that need to be submitted.
- b. Reiterated request to provide for stub streets to Unangst and Appleman properties – Applicant's plan benefits from forward planning on the part of the Borough in the past. If it were not for the connection to Farrcroft the project would be subject to the limits of a cul-de-sac road.
- c. The Planning Commission has previously stated its preference for a 30-ft wide road as requested by the Applicant. The submitted plan reverted to a 36-ft wide road.
- d. Have great concern for the current plan – it will be expensive for infrastructure while marketing properties with diminished property value potential because the proposed lot grading that leaves the majority of building lots with unusable back yards. Mr. Dooley encourage the Applicant to do some sort of lot yield optimization analysis to see if less lots can yield higher value by giving room to properly grade the properties. One key will

be to widen the lots on the interior of the loop so the houses on the northern and southern sides of the loop can be pulled in and provide lots with better utilization potential of the yards.

- e. The grading on the south slope is unacceptable. It negatively impacts the adjoining properties along Crown View by steepening the slope – this is the very reason SALDO 213-27.E.(1) concerning minimization of grade adjustments exists. The people there had reasonable expectation the embankment above their properties would not become much worse – the proposed plan will negatively impact those properties. Then there are issues of constructability and concerns about reasonable access to the very substantial stormwater management facility at the toe of slope that are unacceptable.
- f. The infrastructure plan, particularly as it relates to sanitary and storm sewer is unacceptable. The proposed depths of cover for both facilities at certain locations poses an unacceptable financial burden on the Borough as it relates to future maintenance, repair, and ultimate replacement.
- g. Sanitary Sewer: See if you can tie the homes from the Forks Twp line to the proposed highpoint in the Farrcroft to the sewer MH at the end of the cul-de-sac. Alternatively, consider putting in a low-pressure system for those homes – but each home will be responsible for its own pump and an analysis will need to be furnished to make sure no odor control will be required. Another alternative is to create an easement through the lots on the interior of the loop to connect between upper and lower sections of Farrcroft – any such easement would need to be wide enough and of reasonable grade to make sanitary sewer repair and replacement economically feasible in the future.
- h. Recreation area: In light of the lack of usable yards for the majority of the proposed lots and the distance to the nearest existing Borough recreation facility at Newhart park, a recreation area will have to be considered at a future meeting. Lots 28 and 29 look the most appropriate location to serve the greatest number of people in the Boro while dissuading patronage by residents of the neighboring development in Forks Township.
- i. Street Lighting: We can address at a further meeting when it can be discussed, but Mr. Dooley would recommend street lights at the intersection of Crown and Farrcroft, at the Farrcroft cul-de-sac (by Unangst), and at the stub street intersection with Farrcroft for the Appleman property.
- j. For the Farrcroft tie-in at the Forks line – Applicant will need to demonstrate approval by Forks Township to do the tie-in. Having recently visited the cul-de-sac, Mr. Dooley recommended the Applicant look at the development plans for the adjoining development because two driveway curb cuts in the curb of the cul-de-sac as constructed right now appear to conflict with tying in the road. This issue is obviously critical because without the tie-in the Applicant is restricted to the limitations of a cul-de-sac road.

Next Steps:

Mr. Charlesworth asked about next steps and offered an open-ended time extension pending the outcome of on-going litigation between the Applicant and the Borough concerning the Ordinance changes adopted by the Borough May 4, 2020. He stated he did not see the sense in expending a lot of expense addressing the Borough's comments about the submitted Preliminary Subdivision Plan "for a plan that may not have a chance in hell" of being approved pending the outcome of the aforementioned litigation.

