

## WINDSOR TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

August 15, 2013

1. The meeting of the Windsor Township Planning Commission was called to order at 6:01 P.M. by Chairman Pilachowski.

Present at the meeting were Jerry Pilachowski, Charlie Wilson, Dean Heffner, J. LaRue Harvey, Paul Ilyes, Jennifer Gunnet, Kipp Allison, Teresa Miller, J. Michael Hess, P.E. (ARRO Engineering)

2. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.
3. Public Comment – There were no public comments.
4. The minutes of the July 18, 2013 meeting were approved with a motion from Mr. Wilson seconded by Mr. Heffner. Motion carried. Five votes yes.
5. Plans submitted in August: There were no new plans submitted in August.

6. Plans tabled in August:

A. MIA BRAE INDUSTRIAL PARK – Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan #011231 by James R. Holley & Assoc., Inc., extension of Boxwood Road across Route 74 (Delta Road) (6/1/13) - On the motion of Chairman Pilachowski seconded by Mr. Harvey this plan along with 6B, 6C, 6D, 6E, 6F, 6G and 6H were tabled.

B. HOWARD/SNOOK PROPERTIES WEST – Preliminary Subdivision Plan #120817 by James R. Holley & Assoc., Inc., 292 lots along East Prospect Road, Stonewood Road and Freysville Road (12/1/12) – For action on this plan see 6A.

C. HOWARD/SNOOK PROPERTIES EAST – Preliminary Subdivision Plan #120817 by James R. Holley & Assoc., Inc., 61 lots along Freysville Road (12/1/12) - For action on this plan see 6A.

D. KENSINGTON – Preliminary Phase 2 & 3 Subdivision Plan #2005332-069 by RGS Assoc., 229 lots along Ness Road. (5/1/10) - For action on this plan see 6A.

E. MEADOW CREEK TOWNHOMES – Preliminary Subdivision & Land Development Plan #378.14 by Site Design Concept, Inc., along Cape Horn Road, Ruppert Road and Kendale Road. (10/1/07) - For action on this plan see 6A.

F. BROOKFIELD CROSSING – Preliminary Subdivision Plan #2003-16A by Johnston & Assoc., Inc., 71 lots along Smith Road. (2/1/07) - For action on this plan see 6A.

G. COOL COUNTRY PROPERTIES – Preliminary Subdivision Plan #060619, by James R. Holley & Assoc., Inc., 32 lots along Snyder Corner Road. (8/1/06) - For action on this plan see 6A.

H. CORA E. DELLER – Preliminary Subdivision Plan #060620, by James R. Holley & Assoc., Inc., 34 lots along Winterstown Road, Neff Road and Sinclair Road. (8/1/06) - For action on this plan see 6A.

7. Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance – Article 6 – Manufactured/Mobile Home Parks –Mr. Allison advised he had done some additional research on the side yard setbacks between mobile homes in existing mobile home parks so the Planning Commission could better understand what setbacks exist to make a recommendation to keep existing setbacks or make a change. Mr. Allison provided the Planning Commission with copies of site plans and photos of existing mobile homes. Mr. Allison advised that after reviewing the site plans, the majority of the examples did not meet the current ordinance.

Mr. Wilson questioned the close proximity of mobile home placement and expressed concerns related to probable noise disturbances. Mr. Allison advised that mobile homes are built sturdier today and that there probably would be instances of noise disturbance, however in most cases individuals that move into mobile homes are aware of this possibility.

Mr. Allison advised that the average side yard setbacks were 26.43' from his examples. When he further removed duplicates the average setback was 29.88'. Mr. Allison advised that the current side setback is 35'.

Mr. Ilyes expressed concerns about the close proximity of the mobile homes and fires. Mr. Allison advised that the side yard setbacks for homes in a Single Family Development is 20' so the issue of a fire spreading wouldn't be any different in a mobile home park than in a development.

Mr. Allison advised that during his research he noticed that the access in many new mobile homes was a small access at the front of the homes with a larger porch at the back or they entered from the side with a larger back porch. He further advised that he noticed that the double wide mobile homes typically had bigger front porches with no porch at the rear entrance.

Mr. Hess advised there are two issues that need to be considered. The first being the distance between the actual mobile homes. Secondly, the construction of porches and whether they should be included in the calculation of side setback or if a provision should be made to allow any porch to extend into the established side setback.

Chairman Pilachowski questioned if porch setbacks had to meet the established setback. Mr. Allison advised yes.

Mr. Allison suggested a side setback of 25' be established for the distance between the actual mobile homes with a secondary side setback of 10' being established for porches and patios.

Mr. Ilyes asked if there were front and rear setbacks for mobile homes. Mr. Hess advised there were setbacks and they are 50' front any street setback line and 25' from any property line.

On the motion of Mr. Ilyes seconded by Mr. Heffner the Planning Commission recommended the side setbacks for mobile homes be set a 25' with a maximum permitted encroachment of 10' for porches, decks and patios. Motion carried. Five votes yes.

Mr. Allison asked if the Planning Commission wanted to make any recommendations regarding setbacks for accessory structures. Mr. Hess advised that in the revision of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance there is an established setback of 15' for service buildings, he advised that the Ordinance could be changed to reflect this same distance for accessory structures, porches and decks.

Mr. Wilson questioned how lot coverage worked in mobile home parks compared to developments with single family homes. Mr. Allison briefly explained the process and advised that typically lot coverage isn't an issue when it comes to mobile home parks and construction of accessory structures. Mr. Allison advised that in the future if a new mobile home park is proposed the developer would have to provide a layout of the proposed park to make the determination of what would be permitted. Mr. Hess advised that the current ordinance stated there was 5,000 sq. ft. per space. He advised the proposed Ordinance did not indicate a sq. footage per unit only a separation distance of 35' per unit. Mr. Hess advised if the distance was reduced to 25' it could possibly allow for more doublewide mobile homes to be installed. Mr. Allison stated that the way current mobile home parks were laid out many had existing concrete pads where the mobile homes were to be installed and he didn't think the majority of existing park owners would want to remove the existing pads and have to install footers to upgrade to newer mobile homes.

8. Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance – Article 7 – Time Limitations and Ordinance Changes – Phasing Report - Mr. Hess is proposing the Ordinance be changed to require developers who submit plans that will be completed in phases submit an update to the Township every year so the Township knows where in the development process they are. Mr. Hess felt that for purposes of planning this information may be beneficial for the Township to receive. Mr. Hess advised that many times the phasing schedule noted on the plan is not accurate and by requiring a yearly update the Township would stay more informed. Mrs. Gunnet asked what would happen if the developer failed to submit a yearly update. Mr. Hess advised it could be considered a violation of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance and could result in a fine.

Mr. Ilyes questioned why the wording “in its discretion” as it relates to the Supervisors approval was included. Mr. Hess advised that the Supervisors would still have the ability to make modifications to this process as they felt necessary. Mr. Hess advised this wording could be removed. Mr. Ilyes suggested he just change the wording to “in their discretion”. Mr. Hess agreed to change the wording.

Mr. Allison asked if this would supersede the 5 year window provided by the MPC. Mr. Hess advised this would not supersede the MPC. He advised that placing this in the Ordinance would simply make the developer keep the Township updated on each phase of development.

Mrs. Gunnet asked what the phasing plan would consist of; she asked if it would just be a letter. Mr. Hess advised it could be a letter that was received on a yearly basis advising the Township of any necessary updates to the development process.

Mr. Ilyes asked if we currently had problems with the Township not knowing where a developer was within a particular phase of development. He questioned whether we really needed to track this. Mr. Hess advised that keeping track of a developer's progress would be beneficial to the Township as it relates to planning for sewer and traffic impact. Mr. Allison advised he didn't think getting the updates would really be necessary because the Township typically knows where a particular project is in its completion. Mr. Hess advised he would remove this section.

Mr. Ilyes questioned how EDU's work and what would happen if EDU's were being held in reserve for an approved development that did not get done and a second development came in next to it and needed EDU's. There was a brief discussion about EDU's and how they are held in reserve for proposed and future development.

Mr. Hess asked what the Planning Commissions opinion regarding requiring phased plans to include at least a 25% minimum of the total lots in each phase. The Planning Commission agreed that a 25% minimum with four phases of development was acceptable.

Chairman Pilachowski asked how the adoption of roads was done, when there were phases involved. Mr. Allison and Mr. Hess advised roads were adopted by phases. Mrs. Gunnet advised the Township tries to hold off doing adoption until all phases are done. She cited Whisper Run as an example of a development that the construction of Phase II requires construction vehicles to drive through Phase I to get to Phase II. The Planning Commission agreed this was acceptable.

## 9. Planning Commission Comments

Mr. Ilyes asked if there was going to be a future discussion about requiring a land development plan for small projects as it relates to the request of his church to construct a pavilion. Mr. Allison advised that a discussion had already taken place regarding this. Mr. Hess advised this was discussed when Article II was reviewed. Mrs. Gunnet felt that after the earlier conversations it was determined that even if a project was small and had little impact the property owner would still have to do studies to determine if stormwater was affected or there was an impact to traffic. After doing all the necessary studies there wasn't really any reason not to require a Land Development Plan for non-residential projects.

Mr. Allison asked if Article VI identified any requirements for visitor parking within a mobile home park. Mr. Hess was unsure but advised he would check. Mr. Hess advised he would review the Zoning Ordinance to see how townhomes and apartments handle visitor parking is done.

Mr. Wilson thanked Mr. Allison for doing a good job in putting together tonight's handout for Article 6 he also appreciated the clarity of the July minutes in relation to the breakdown of the Mia Brae discussions.

Mr. Wilson also expressed concerns about the submission of minor subdivisions and the Ordinance requiring them to do so much. He referred to the Woerner plan and the requirement of a 2 lot subdivision having to do installation of trees, road improvements, sewer and water connections. Mr. Wilson felt that there was no separation between minor and major subdivisions. Mr. Allison advised he was working with Mr. Woerner regarding the trees, he may already meet the requirements. Mr. Hess advised that typically small subdivisions get the waivers they need.

10. The meeting of the Windsor Township Planning Commission adjourned at 7:14 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Kipp D. Allison  
Zoning Officer