



**THORNBURY TOWNSHIP
DELAWARE COUNTY
Planning Commission
6 Township Drive
Cheyney, PA 19319-1020**

**James Bulkley, Chairman
James Quinn, Jr., Vice-Chairman**

**Robert Ricciuti
Allen McCann
Robert Ferrara
Charles Howat**

**MINUTES
Thornbury Township Planning Commission Meeting
Wednesday, July 13, 2011**

The Thornbury Township Planning Commission held a public meeting Wednesday, July 13, 2011 at the Township Administration Building, 6 Township Drive, Cheyney, Pennsylvania. Chairman Bulkley called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: James Bulkley, Chairman Mike Ciocco (Twp. Engineer)
James Quinn, Jr., Vice-Chairman Ken Kynett (Solicitor),
Allen McCann Wayne Grafton, Land Planner
Robert Ricciuti
Robert Ferrara
Charles Howat

ABSENT: 0

MEMBERS OF PUBLIC: 5

Mr. Bulkley reviewed the Agenda, as follows:

AGENDA

1. **SALUTE TO THE FLAG**
2. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES – June 22, 2011**
4. **OLD BUSINESS**
 - a. **Gricco Subdivision Amendment**
 - b. **Accessory Structure Regulations Ord.**
 - c. **Historic District Sign Ord.**
 - d. **Comprehensive Plan**
5. **ACTION DATES REVIEW**
6. **NEXT MEETING – Wed., July 27, 2011 at 7 p.m.**
7. **ADJOURNMENT**

1. **SALUTE TO THE FLAG**: Mr. Bulkley led the salute to the flag.
2. **PUBLIC COMMENT**: There were no comments from the public.
3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**: On a motion by Mr. McCann and seconded by Mr. Howat all members voted “aye” to approve the June 22, 2011 minutes, as amended by Mr. Kynett and Mr. Ciocco.
4. **OLD BUSINESS**
 - a. **Gricco Subdivision Amendment:**

MINUTES – PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

JULY 13, 2011

PAGE 2

Present: Joseph Gricco, the applicant
David Damon, P.E., the applicant's engineer

Mr. Bulkley highlighted the history of this subdivision and explained that the Planning Commission is now making sure that all the lots comply with the Township's current requirements. Mr. Damon stated that the plan was originally approved in 1984 or 1985.

Mr. Damon stated that the lots have since been surveyed and the plans show a conceptual house and driveways. The 75 ft. riparian buffer is now shown on the plan, nothing invades the steep slope areas, and except for slightly angling a driveway to reduce headlight glare to the existing houses which adjoin the property, the driveways remain the same since reviewing them in the fall.

Mr. Damon preferred not to go thru Mr. Ciocco's 7/7/11 review letter in detail, and at this time only discuss replacement trees and the driveways.

Replacement Trees: Mr. Damon asked if the Township has a program where trees could be planted off-site. Mr. Bulkley felt that the applicant could first attempt to comply by using as many bushes and trees with (if permitted) a smaller caliper around the house and on the site. Mr. Damon will obtain a representative count of the trees and felt that areas outside of the pipelines and buffer areas could be used for replacement trees. Mr. Bulkley added that mass plantings of smaller nursery items may also be permitted in the count at an agreed upon replacement ratio. Mr. Damon agreed to Mr. Ricciuti's suggestion to offer buffer plantings to the neighbors.

Driveways: Mr. Damon asked for direction from the members, as the plan shows a 16 ft. wide common driveway to serve 2 homes, with no turn-around at the top. Mr. Ciocco stated that it would be easier to pass on the common driveway if the upright curbs were limited to just 1 side of the driveway or use rolled curbs. Mr. Damon stated that he could eliminate the curb on the high side, which would allow for easier passing. Mr. Ciocco requested a turn-around at the top of the driveway, which may require changing the angle of one of the driveways. The turn-around should be able to handle an emergency vehicle. Mr. Damon noted that the bottom of the driveway was made wider at the bottom for school bus drop off. Mr. Grafton was concerned as to whether an emergency vehicle could use the driveway. Based upon Planning Commission comments, the 16 ft. wide common drive would be acceptable if rolled gutter curbs were added. Mr. Damon agreed to the gutter curbs and to widening the mouth of the driveway entrance by approximately 5 ft. Mr. Ciocco noted

the need for a shared driveway maintenance agreement. Mr. Ricciuti asked if the driveway maintenance agreement includes recourse for one property owner in the event that the other refuses to cooperate. Mr. Kynett stated that the agreement would be enforceable as a contract, but there are no specific provisions for enforcement.

Mr. Ciocco requested zoning of the subject and adjacent properties be added to the plan. Mr. Damon noted that the adjacent property is zoned institutional, owned by Cheyney.

No action was taken on the Plan.

- b. Accessory Structure Regs. Ord.:** Mr. Bulkley stated that the Board of Supervisors would like the Planning Commission to continue to discuss this topic, but felt that the Historic Sign Ordinance should take priority. The discussion was then tabled.
- c. Historic District Sign Ord.:** Mr. Grafton felt that the members should decide whether the Historic District Sign Ordinance draft should be a separate ordinance or integrate it into the existing sign ordinance, in which case he believed that the current sign ordinance should also be updated. Mr. Grafton suggested that the members first review the definitions to see if they mirror those in the existing sign ordinance. Mr. Miller stated that the Historic Commission reviewed the existing sign ordinance in preparing the draft Historic District Sign Ordinance. The Historic Commission then looked at all the signs throughout the Township. Mr. Grafton pointed out examples of how conflicts could occur between properties governed by the Historic District Sign Ordinance and the existing sign ordinance. There was a consensus that the existing sign ordinance needed updating. There was further discussion about first working on the existing sign ordinance and then incorporating the Historic District Sign Ordinance draft as a subsection, so that all signs throughout the Township are addressed in one ordinance. Mr. Ricciuti felt that the Planning Commission should use the Historic District Sign Ordinance draft as the basis for the existing sign ordinance. Mr. Bulkley noted that the historic character was taken into consideration, which may or may not be appropriate for other properties and uses. Mr. Grafton explained that the Township does not have an Historic District, only historic properties. Therefore, if you allow certain signs on an historic property and next door is not an historic property, a different set of standards is required. Mr. Bulkley felt there should be a building inspector review process to ensure such things as proper sight distance. Mr. McCann explained that in 2006 or 2007 the Board of Supervisors asked the Planning Commission to review the sign ordinance due to too many different types of signs in

MINUTES – PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

JULY 13, 2011

PAGE 4

downtown Thornton. The Planning Commission turned it over to the Historic Commission in 2008.

Mr. Grafton explained that the sign ordinance should be reviewed and any historic features should be highlighted. Exemptions may have to be added for industrial or institutional.

The members then debated the policy of permitting signs. Mr. Grafton noted that by permitting a public record is created and you make sure that the sign meets the standards. The members briefly debated the pros and cons of the 5 year amortization policy in the existing sign ordinance to do away with non-conforming signs.

Mr. Ferrara questioned if the Township should create an “Historic District”. Mr. Bulkley stated that the Board of Supervisors do not feel the Township needs an “Historic District”, even as an overlay district.

Mr. Bulkley will email the members the Township’s existing sign ordinance and Edgmont’s sign ordinance for the members to review and discuss at the next meeting. Mr. Bulkley will discuss updating the existing sign ordinance with the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Miller explained that “Rose Hip” was used to test the draft ordinance language.

- d. **Comprehensive Plan:** Mr. Grafton stated that the members will look at the census figures and compare it with other nearby Townships. The population chapter will then be updated. Mr. Bulkley thanked Mr. McCann, Chairman of the Environmental Advisory Commission, for submitting a letter regarding the status of their Comp. Plan tasks.

Mr. Grafton stated that from 2000 to 2010 Thornbury’s growth rate was 13.2%, Concord’s 73.5%, and Edgmont’s 1.8%. Mr. Bulkley wanted to see how the increase in the number of people matches up with the number of homes constructed in the Township from the last census. Mr. Grafton stated that the members will look at the averages and then decide how to accommodate that population. A brief discussion ensued regarding a curative amendment, when a Township does not meet the demands of the public. Mr. Kynett stated that providing for the population growth is something that has to be managed, rather than prohibited.

5. **ACTION DATES – REVIEW:** Mr. Bulkley highlighted the Action Dates.

6. **NEXT MEETING:** Wednesday, July 27, 2011, at 7 p.m.

7. **ADJOURNMENT:** On a motion by Mr. Ferrara and seconded by Mr. McCann, the meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah Zitarelli
Planning Commission Secretary

cc: Planning Commission Members
Board of Supervisors
Kenneth D. Kynett, Esq.
Robert P. Anderman, Esq.
Jeffrey Seagraves, Township Manager

Ted McCandless, Code Administrator
Michael Ciocco, Township Engineer
Wayne Grafton, Land Planner
Geoff Carbutt, Subdivision Coordinator
Suzanne Howat