

June 3, 2016

TO: Christen Pionzio
Cc: Jason Bobst, Michael Valyo, Joseph Estock, PE, Jon Dzedzy
FROM: E. Van Rieker, AICP
RE: Markley Farms

Christen-

1. For me, the basic Zoning and Planning issues were resolved at the time of Conditional Use Approval, including conditions of the approval. For ready reference, I prefer that the date and conditions of Conditional Use Approval be listed on the Record Plan. This was a previous recommendation and I note that Sheet 2 has revised 02/16/16: Overall Project/Record Plan does contain the approval citation along with conditions. Please check to make sure that the conditions listed are those that are a part of the decision. (I do not have a final copy or I would have checked this).
2. Park and Rec Fee – I had forwarded a brief email to you dated April 29, 2016, outlining my thoughts regarding the P&R fee. Unless this has been recently provided, the actual amount of fee, net of any credits, still needs to be calculated and submitted for Township review.
3. Zoning issues outlined in the Joe Estock email dated April 20, 2016:
 - #2. Joe had asked that all five categories outlined in ZO §27-505.C. I agree with the applicant that only one condition is required in order to qualify for Conditional Use consideration, but I also agree with Joe Estock that if these categories exist on the site, then all need to be shown.
 - #6. It is my understanding that the Yield Plan will be made a part of the Subdivision Set of the Final Plans.

- #7. Reference is made to relocating the Pedestrian Access Trail out of the perimeter buffer along the Hines Lot. I assume that Joe means the emergency access lane and I concur that this should be relocated if not already existing.
 - #12. Current FEMA Flood Plain Map. While the submission has been overtaken by events, the recently adopted March 2, 2016 FEMA Flood Plain Map has been pending for five years. Where the new map differs from the prior FEMA map then those differences should be identified on the plan and naturally any proposed improvement should be positioned outside of the 100-year regulated flood plain as may be required by the new ordinance.
 - #13. The perimeter buffer issue. Please find attached for ready reference a copy of two emails from me, both dated February 17, 2016, which address the requirement of the location and the plant material within the perimeter buffer.
 - Basically, the 35-foot perimeter buffer shall be provided in addition to the required setback along perimeter streets and shall be required in the rear yard where proposed building lots, within the cluster, abut existing single-family lots along the perimeter of the cluster property. The landscaping plans contained in the 02/16/16 submission comply with this.
 - However, Joe Estock correctly points out that the requirement for the primary buffer to contain a row of evergreen trees planted at a height of 6 feet and spaced not more than 8 feet apart on center, has not been provided on all lots where a landscape buffer is required (see comments above). Therefore the plant list and quantities need to be updated in order to satisfy this requirement.
4. Previously we had discussed the need for recognition where an emergency access lane or trail connection easement is proposed over a lot to be created as part of the cluster subdivision. Thus, I would suggest that a split-rail fence be provided along the edges of the easement between lot #37 and #38 and lot #75 and #76 to insure that the trail connections are identified and protected.

Depending upon how the applicant responds to other engineering review items, there may be a need to further modify these comments.
