

The Peach Bottom Township **Planning Commission** met on **April 16, 2015** at 7:00 p.m. in the Municipal Office Building. Members present Dave Arnold (Chair), April Cooper (Vice), Wesley Carter, David Stewart, and Ben Hushon.

- **Motion** to accept the minutes as presented was made by Member Cooper and 2nd by Member Carter, vote 5/0.

### **Subdivisions & Land Development Plans**

Green/Fisher – add on lot – Map 4 Parcels 109 & 110.

Parcel 109 is providing .079 acres to parcel 110 to encompass a driveway that has been used by parcel 110 for years. The existing shed will continue to encroach on the side setback, but the porch is now in compliance with the rear setback.

- **Motion** to approve the Sewage Non Build Waiver and Final Subdivision Plan was made by Member Cooper and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Member Hushon, vote 5/0.

Royal Farms - Map 7 Parcels 1E & 1F - Sewage Planning Module.

Royal Farms is applying to the Department of Environmental Protection for approval to connect to the Peach Bottom Inn Sewage Treatment Facility. The proposed plan was reviewed. An error in a lot line was noted and will need to be corrected.

- **Motion** to approve the Sewage Planning Module was made by Member Cooper and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Member Hushon, vote 5/0.

53 Sassafras Lane - Map 1 Parcel 359 - Sewage Planning Module.

The on lot sewage system has failed and the only alternative is holding tanks or a Small Flow Treatment Facility. The owner is applying to the Department of Environmental Protection for a Small Flow Treatment Facility. The Sewage Planning Module was reviewed.

- **Motion** to recommend approval of the Sewage Planning Module for Map 1 Parcel 359 was made by Member Carter and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Member Cooper, vote 5/0.

### **Zoning Ordinance**

SECTION 202.9 – Limitations with Respect to Dwellings.

Stoltzfus, Benjamin – 10 Acre lot change

Member Cooper informed that the Planning Commission spent 3 meetings deliberating the small parcel division of agricultural land. She stated that the pros and cons were laid out from an agricultural point of view. From her research, when you allow a subdivision you have an overall loss of agricultural productivity. We have to think about what we recommend as a policy change, we have to keep in mind how that affects every aspect of the community. We have to be very careful that we are not making decisions that are based on race, age or cultural diversity. The framework that is in place now fits the comprehensive plan that was developed for this community. We are going to have to address storm water management and small parcel agriculture will be a hard issue to control.

Member Arnold questioned why an agricultural building on a 2.5 acre lot is not required to have storm water management. He was informed that agricultural buildings are not required to have storm water management no matter the lot size.

Member Cooper informed that the Storm Water requirements are coming down the pike, but for now the Township does not have a way to address it.

- **Motion** to adjourn at 8:10 p.m. was made by Member Carter and 2<sup>nd</sup> by Member Hushon, vote 5/0.