

**FERGUSON TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 2018  
6:00 PM**

**I. ATTENDANCE**

The Planning Commission held a special meeting on Monday, January 29, 2018 at the Ferguson Township Municipal Building. In attendance were:

**Commission:**

Lisa Strickland, Chairperson,  
Bill Keough, Vice Chairperson  
Ralph Wheland  
Marc McMaster, absent  
Rob Crassweller, absent  
Eric Scott, absent  
Andrea Harman, absent  
Cristin Mitchell, alternate,  
Jeremie Thompson, alternate

**Staff:**

Ray Stolinis, Director of Planning & Zoning  
Lindsay Schoch, Community Planner  
Jeff Ressler, Zoning Administrator,

Others in attendance were: Marcella Bell, Recording Secretary; Steve Watson, Penn State Director of Campus Planning and Design; Mark Kunkle, Ferguson Township resident; Rita Graef, Ferguson Township resident; Carolyn Yagle, Environmental Planning & Design; and Ron Seybert, Ferguson Township Engineer

**II. CALL TO ORDER**

Ms. Strickland called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

**III. CITIZEN INPUT**

There was none.

**IV. DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE – ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING & DESIGN (EPD)**

Ms. Yagle introduced herself and stated that EPD is still working on processing the comments from the January 12, 2018 worksession and will provide the next version of the draft Zoning/SALDO to staff tomorrow to distribute to Planning Commission members. Staff had a chance to meet with Ms. Yagle and Mr. Seybert to review changes to Part 5 Design and Improvement Standards. Ms. Yagle provided the Commission a tracked changes version of the Design and Improvement Standards. Ms. Yagle then turned the floor over Mr. Seybert to review the changes.

Mr. Seybert stated that the classifications of streets were revised. The first classification is arterial which is identified as significant in terms of the nature and composition of travel it serves. Its importance is derived primarily from service provided to through traffic from service provided to major circulation movements within the area and from service provided to rurally oriented traffic. It is identified as streets with trip length and density suitable for statewide travel. Arterial streets are those that provide linkage of cities, towns, and other traffic generators that can attract travel over similarly long distances. The second classification is collector which provides access to arterial streets from other

collectors of local access streets. A moderate level of mobility is expected. A collector street often carries local bus traffic and provides intra-community continuity but ideally does not penetrate identifiable neighborhoods. In the central business district and in other areas of similar development and traffic density, the collector system may include the entire street grid. The third classification is local which provides access to abutting properties and may also conduct traffic from local streets that intersect it. Each local street shall be designed so that no section of it will convey a traffic volume greater than 1,000 average daily traffic (ADT). Each half of a loop local street may be regarded as a single local street and the total traffic volume conveyed on a loop street shall not exceed 1,000 ADT. Local streets shall be designed to exclude external through traffic which has neither origin nor destination on the local access. The fourth classification is very low volume (VLV) local roads which are similar to local street except that the maximum traffic volume on a VLV local road shall be 400 ADT. Many of the revisions were made to be consistent with the Federal Highway Design Standards. The actual design standards of the different street classifications were not changed much—most of the changes were reorganization efforts.

There was a discussion about the Street Connectivity Index addition that states “All street networks shall be designated to provide a minimum Connectivity Index (CI) of 0.75 that is calculated as follows: CI equals the number of intersections divided by the number of intersections plus the number of cul-de-sacs. Mr. Seybert showed an arterial map of the Township and gave examples of developments that had street connectivity indexes of 0.75 like Foxpointe, CATO Park, and Stonebridge. The developments that did not have good street connectivity, or had an index below 0.75, were Good Hope Farms II and Chestnut Ridge. The Street Connectivity Index requirement minimizes the number of dead ends or cul-de-sacs in a development. Mr. Keough suggested that under the number 4 objective, change minimizing crime to discourage crime. He felt that minimizing was not the right word.

Mr. Seybert referred to page 5, number 4, cul-de-sacs. He noted that the first part is stricken out, meaning the only type of cul-de-sac allowed is one with a grass center island with the following dimensions: island radius at 32 feet, cartway width at 26 feet, cartway radius at 58 feet, and the right-of-way radius at 70 feet. The cul-de-sac shall be provided at the terminus of every permanent cul-de-sac. In no case shall a cul-de-sac exceed 750 feet in length. In response to a question from Mr. Keough, Mr. Seybert clarified that the length of the cul-de-sac is the length from the end of the cul-de-sac to the intersection that it intersects with. Mr. Seybert stated that he will clarify that in the language. In response to a question from Mr. Wheland, Mr. Seybert stated that the ordinance does not define a street that closes in on itself as a cul-de-sac, so he will clarify the language.

There was a brief discussion regarding whether or not the ordinance should require neighborhoods to have at least two points of access. Ms. Strickland clarified that the definition of cul-de-sac is a separate issue from the requirement of neighborhoods to have at least two access points. Mr. Seybert stated that having two access points in a neighborhood helps with maintenance and safety factors as well.



On page 6, number 1, clear sight triangles was discussed briefly. An applicant now has to show clear sight triangles on their plans. The entire area of the clear sight triangle shall be designed to provide a continuous view of approaching vehicles within the clear sight triangle. Street trees shall only be planted in the clear sight triangles with the approval of the Township Arborist. Trees must be of the variety that will not limit the continuous view of oncoming vehicles (small diameter tree at larger spacing with 7.5 feet clear understory).

There was a brief discussion about removing the reduction in right-of-way width applicability from the RA district and moving it to the RR district, which is encompassed on page 8, number 2, reduction in right-of way width.

On page 10, number 4, driveways to farm uses, Mr. Seybert pointed out that there is new language for driveways specific to farm uses. He noted that the driveway is specific to the use of the land, not the zoning district. The width of the driveway after the radii shall be between 12 feet and 20 feet. The driveway radii shall be no less than 15 feet and no more than 35 feet. Therefore, the width of the driveway at the edge of the street/curb can range from 42 feet to 90 feet. Mr. Seybert reviewed the driveway density for streets. For an arterial street, 10 driveways per mile are permitted. For collector streets, if the ADT is less than 2,000 vehicles per day, no more than 50 driveways per mile are permitted. If the ADT is 2,000 to 4,000 vehicles per day, no more than 20 driveways per mile are permitted. If the ADT is greater than 4,000 vehicles per day, no more than 10 driveways per mile are permitted.

There was a lengthy discussion regarding the traffic study requirements in Part 5 Design and Improvement Standards. Mr. Seybert stated that most of the changes were really organizational. A new requirement that is being proposed is that the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) shall only be valid for the duration of the development assumptions contained within the TIS. If a phased development occurs over a longer time than studied, a new TIS shall be required. In response to a question from Ms. Mitchell, Mr. Seybert stated that the enforcement of this new requirement would come from when staff reviews the plans. Land development plans, subdivision plans, specific implementation plans, and phasing plans will not be considered if they are outside of the time allotted for the TIS. The main point of discussion revolved around how the Township could require developments to work together to complete a TIS when intersections are affected by multiple development proposals and plans. Mr. Seybert stated that in the past, he tried to create a Transportation Partnership District, but it did not work. Mr. Seybert is not aware of any way the Township can require these developers to work together for a TIS, aside from encouraging each of them to work with the others.

Mr. Seybert briefly reviewed the remaining changes in Part 5. He noted that there were some minor changes to 22-503 – Blocks regarding mid-block requirements. On page 20, Mr. Seybert stated that the language regarding monuments was stricken out because concrete monuments are not used much anymore as it is easier to find iron pins when surveying. On page 21, under 22-512 – Sidewalks, Mr. Seybert pointed out that letter B now includes the Terraced Streetscape District (TSD) and Traditional Town Development (TTD) District to require sidewalks on both sides of all streets. Also under the sidewalk



section, regarding sidewalk crossings of streets across both sides of intersecting streets, a reference to the current ADA requirements, PennDOT RC Standards, and Chapter 21 "Streets and Sidewalks" was added for clarity. Mr. Seybert then reviewed the supplemental changes.

There was a lengthy discussion about parking and the amount of parking required by the Township. Mr. Keough expressed concern that businesses have huge parking lots that only get filled up a few times a year. He stated that he would be in favor of requiring less parking or adding requirements that would allow developers to build parking garages to save space. Ms. Yagle stated that an option would be to move the parking ratio requirements from the Zoning Ordinance to the SALDO. The pervious and impervious percentage and use type requirements for parking would stay in the Zoning Ordinance. The Urban Land Institute (ULI) has done years' worth of studies on the ratios of parking at peak hours for particular uses. Ms. Yagle stated that the study would be worth looking at when discussing parking requirements. Mr. Keough stated that one of his goals for the update of the Zoning/SALDO is to build in opportunities for flexibility. Ms. Strickland asked that the ULI study on parking ratios be provided to the Planning Commission, as well as a strike-through version of the proposed changes to the parking requirements so that the Planning Commission can be ready to discuss parking requirements at the next meeting. Ms. Strickland added that she would like EPD to give the Planning Commission guidance on keeping parking requirements in the Zoning Ordinance or if parking requirements should be moved to the SALDO so that the Commission can have a discussion with the Board of Supervisors about the pros and cons during future worksessions.

The Planning Commission took a 15 minute intermission.

**V. DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE ZONING ORDINANCE (ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING & DESIGN)**

Ms. Yagle gave an overview of the January 12, 2018 zoning discussion. She stated that the one of the main topics of the worksession was land uses and expanded on principal and accessory uses. During the worksession, there were a few proposed changes in permitted and conditional uses which was consistent with the accessory use discussion. Another main topic was definitions, since some of the uses didn't have a definition. During the worksession, there was a lengthy discussion regarding Rural Agriculture (RA) and Rural Residential (RR) as it relates to the district uses and dimensional criteria. In the RA district on a residential lot, there was a proposal to have a minimum of one acre and a maximum of two acres in regards to dimensional criteria. For non-residential lots in the RA that are not agriculture in nature, there was a proposal to have a two acre maximum for dimensional criteria. For all other agriculture uses, the 50 acre-minimum requirement will remain.

In response to a question from Mr. Wheland, Ms. Yagle stated that she had a chance to speak with Attorney Green (Township Solicitor) and it was of Mr. Green's opinion that he did not see a conflict with the 50-acre minimum in the RA district regarding the PA Attorney General's ACRE decision.

There was a lengthy discussion on the dimensional criteria for lots in the RR and RA districts. Some of the discussion centered around the acreage that lots can be subdivided in relation to the Clean and Green program. This discussion topic will be revisited at another meeting.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business for the Planning Commission, Mr. Keough made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:55 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,



ROB CRASSWELLER, SECRETARY  
FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION