

UPPER MILFORD TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
FOR THE JULY 5, 2023 MEETING

**Members Present:** Luke Lichtenwalner, Chairman; Anthony Koneski, Jr., Vice Chairman; Matthew Hunter, Angelika Forndran, John Zgura, Alternate Member; Ellen Larmer, Alternate Member

**Absent Members:** Philip Hartranft, Ronald Guth, Charles Peters, Jr.,

**Also Present:** Brian Miller, Planning Coordinator; Eric Strauss, Planning Commission Solicitor; Zachary Mitchell, Ott Consulting; Cynthia Kuhns, Administrative Assistant

**The Meeting was brought to order at 7:30 P.M.**

**Minutes**

1. Meeting Minutes of May 30, 2023

**Motion:**

**Anthony Koneski, Jr.** made the motion to approve the minutes as recorded. **Ellen Larmer** seconded the motion. All were in favor. No one opposed. **John Zgura** abstained from voting.

**Time Extensions:** None

**Zoning Submissions for Discussion:**

1. Site Plan Review, Appeal # 2023-003 Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless, 6341 Chestnut St. Zionsville Wireless Communications Facility
  - Plan dated 4/19/23 from Scherer Design Group
  - Zoning packet with all review letters

**Present were:** Attorney Richard Williams of the Law Firm of Hourigan Kluger & Quinn P.C. representing Verizon Wireless  
Colleen Connolly, P.E. of Scherer Design Group, LLC  
Andrew Petershon, P.E. of dBm Engineering, P.C.  
Carl Humenik on behalf of Verizon Wireless

**Attorney Richard Williams** said he is the Attorney for Verizon Wireless who wishes to locate a 183-foot-high monopole tower with a 5-foot lightening rod on the top of the tower on 6341 Chestnut Street which is owned by Upper Milford Western District Fire Department. He said at the base of the tower there will be some associated equipment

cabinets located on a 4-foot by 10-foot concrete pad, and a standby generator located on a 4-foot by 6-foot pad, and cable ice bridge, and a meter board and some associated equipment within a 50-foot compound. The facility is an unmanned facility. There will not be any sewer or water to the facility. He said that there may be one truck a month that would come to the facility to maintain the facility. The proposed facility would be in the Rural Agricultural (R-A) Zoning District which wireless facilities are not permitted within this Zoning District. He said that Verizon is requesting several variances to be able to construct the tower on the subject property. He said that they do not meet the requirement with respect to the rear property line setback and one side yard property line setback. The tower would be set back 120 feet from the rear property line and 160 feet from the one side yard property line. In addition to that variance there is a prohibition to more than one principal use on any given lot in the Rural Agricultural Zoning District. Since this would be an additional principal use on the subject property, they are requesting a variance in connection with that as well. He said that there is a 20% maximum impervious coverage in this Zoning District and the property is already at 24.11% maximum impervious coverage. The addition of the tower and equipment cabinet would increase the maximum impervious coverage to 25.4% so they are requesting a variance to the maximum impervious coverage.

**Colleen Connolly, P.E.** said that the wireless communications facility would be located at 6341 Chestnut Street which is currently owned by Upper Milford Western District Fire Department. The property is located within the Rural Agricultural (R-A) Zoning District. The overall property consists of 6.8 acres with a one story building close to Chestnut Street which is the fire station, one shed in the middle of the property behind the fire station, and a one-story garage towards the rear of the property, and associated parking for the fire department. She said they are proposing to locate the tower facility behind the one-story garage towards the rear of the lot closer to Powder Valley Road. She said they are proposing a 50-foot by 50-foot compound with an 8-foot-high chain link fence with barbed wire on top of the fence for security purposes. There will be a 183-foot-high monopole tower and equipment cabinets that will be set on a concrete pad inside the compound. She said that there will be an access drive from the existing parking area to access the site. She said that there will be two parking spaces for the technicians to utilize. She said as Attorney Richard Williams stated earlier, the site is an unmanned facility. The site will be remotely monitored and if there are issues with the site a technician would go to the site to do any repairs needed. Typical maintenance to the facility is done approximately once a month. There is a standby generator that will run once a week during regular business hours to make sure that everything is up and running properly and would be utilized when there is a power outage to keep the site working. The tower will have a metal galvanized finish sort of gray in color. She said that they are proposing to plant 6-foot-tall Thuja Occidentalis (aka Arborvitae) evergreen shrubs 10-foot on center around three sides of the compound. She said they meet all the setbacks for the zone itself. The setbacks that they do not meet are associated with the tower setbacks. The Zoning Ordinance calls for 200% setback of the tower height which is 376 feet. The rear

yard setback to Powder Valley Road is 120.2 feet and the side yard set back is 160.5 towards the western side of the property. The total increase in impervious coverage would be 3,913 square feet of gravel surface for the compound and driveway. The concrete pads are relatively small one is 4-feet by 6-feet where the generator will be set on and the other concrete pad would be 4-foot by 10-foot where the equipment cabinets would be set on inside the compound. The tower will not have any climbing pegs that come down at grade to prevent someone from climbing the tower.

**Luke Lichtenwalner** asked how other facilities would access the compound. He asked if the other facilities would enter the compound across the existing impervious or the side yard or coming in from Power Valley Road.

**Colleen Connolly, P.E.** said that would get determined when they get into construction as to where they can pull the facilities from. She said she would anticipate because the tower would be located closer to Powder Valley Road that they would be able to pull the facilities from Powder Valley Road. She said there would be electric and fiber optic services to the site. There would not be water or sewer service to the site. She said that there is an existing gravel access path that leads from the property to Powder Valley Road.

**Andrew Petersohn, P.E. Registered Professional Engineer of dBm Engineering, P.C.** said he represents Verizon regularly at these types of meetings. He said that there would be no potential for the manifestation of harmful interference because of this type of facility. He said it is very common that they share towers with emergency services equipment and other wireless providers. He said even when their antennas are close with other services providers, he hasn't heard reports of interference. He said he has been involved with the design of these types of facilities for the past 25 years and hasn't heard of any issues with interference. The facility will be equipped to support 5G service in the 850 cellular band and 5G radios in the C-Band, and Legacy Technology and 4G technology. He said that the FCC has very specific guidelines as to allowable limits for exposure and those limits do consider more sensitive portions of the population, children, the elderly, etc. He said when they evaluate these types of facilities since they can't go out and test them before they are activated, they use the FCC's prescribed formulas. He said folks like himself use the formulas to analysis and to provide anticipated exposure levels for the surrounding areas including the base of the facility and then out at any distance in all areas of public access. In a case like this they calculated worse case scenario type of exposure, and they end up with 10% of allowable limits on a shorter tower. He said they are typically well below the FCC limits.

**Angelika Forndran** asked if there was the ability for other cellular companies to be able to co-locate on the proposed tower.

**Attorney Richard Williams** said that Verizon Wireless has designed the proposed tower so that two other carriers could put antenna on the tower below the Verizon Wireless antenna and add equipment cabinets within the compound. The antennas would be spaced 10 feet apart on the tower at 180 feet, 170 feet and 160 feet.

**Andrew Petershon** discussed the coverage area for Verizon Wireless currently within the Township and the need for the cell tower at this location to close the gap in coverage within this part of the Township. He said that there is a 2-mile gap in coverage in the Zionsville area. He said that lighting and / or marking of the facility is not required per the FAA Notice of Criteria Tool Screening Report. He said that the PA Bureau of Aviation Screening Report notes that the facility is not an obstruction under the PA aviation code and the PA Bureau of Aviation has no objection to this proposal. He said he received a favorable review from the Lehigh Northampton Airport Authority regarding this proposal.

**Attorney Richard Williams** said that Verizon Wireless has entered into a lease agreement with Upper Milford Western District Fire Department to be able to locate their tower on the subject property.

**Matthew Hunter** asked if the design of the tower would meet the building code requirements.

**Colleen Connolly** said that the tower is designed to meet the current building code requirements.

**Matthew Hunter** asked about the service life of a cellular tower.

**Colleen Connolly** said that the tower is not specifically designed with a set service life. Every time another carrier is located on the tower, or any changes are made to the antenna on the tower a new structural analysis report would need to be completed and meet the current Building Codes and provided to the Township.

**Matthew Hunter** asked if there were inspections required on the tower.

**Colleen Connolly** said that she thought that the Township Ordinance requires an annual inspection of the tower.

**Solicitor Eric Strauss** asked the term of the lease between Verizon Wireless and Upper Milford Western District Fire Department.

**Attorney Richard Williams** said generally the term of the lease is 5- years with four 5-year renewals for a total of 25 years. The tower would need to be removed by Verizon should the lease expire, and the property has to be returned to Upper Milford Western

District Fire Department in the condition it was prior to the construction of the tower with the exception of the foundation because the foundation could be 30 feet into the ground.

**Michael Kline, Fire Chief of Upper Milford Western District Fire Department** said that the Fire Company is 100% on board with this proposal. He said that the Fire Department has hired Attorney Kate Durso with the Law Firm of Fitzpatrick Lentz and Bubba to draft the lease agreement between Verizon Wireless and Upper Milford Western District Fire Department.

**Motion:**

**Angelika Forndran** made the motion to inform the Zoning Hearing Board that they reviewed this Plan and did not see any Planning issues with this proposal. **Matthew Hunter** seconded the motion. All were in favor. No one opposed. **John Zgura** abstained from voting.

**Subdivisions:**

1. Indian Mill Creek Major Subdivision
  - Revised Record Plan, revision date 1/18/23 from Gilmore & Associates
  - Review letter from Jeff Ott dated 6/28/23

**Brian Miller** said the revised Plan that is before you addressed changes to the original recorded Plan for the Indian Mill Creek Major Subdivision. The following changes are noted on the revised Plan:

1. The Basketball court was not installed and in its place a tennis court was installed.
2. The walking path that was to be installed in the open space area behind the townhomes in the center of the development was omitted.
3. The turn-around on John Street was eliminated.

**Brian Miller** said all three changes were agreed upon by the developer and the HOA for the development. He said that the Township was fine with the changes. He said the revised Plan would need to be recorded in the Lehigh County Court House. He said he would need a recommendation from the Planning Commission to the Board of Supervisors to approve the revised Subdivision Plan for the Indian Mill Creek Major Subdivision.

**Motion:**

**Anthony Koneski, Jr.** made the motion to recommend that the Board of Supervisors approved the revised Subdivision Plan for the Indian Mill Creek Major Subdivision noting the three changes to the plan which were the changing of a basketball court to a tennis court, the elimination of the walking path behind the townhomes in the center of the

development and the elimination of a turn-around on John Street. **Angelika Forndran** seconded the motion. All were in favor. No one opposed. John Zgura abstained from voting.

2. The Fields at Twin Run Subdivision Plan

- Revised Plan from Keystone Consulting Engineers, Inc. dated 6/15/2023
- Subdivision review letter from Jeff Ott dated 6/30/23
- Traffic Impact Study review letter from Benchmark Engineering dated 6/28/23
- Component 4A Sewage Facilities Planning Module
- Waiver Request letter dated 6/15/23

**Present were:** James Preston, Attorney for Kay Builders  
Richard Brooks, with Kay Builders  
Alan Fornwalt, Keystone Consulting Engineers, Inc.

**Attorney James Preston** said that they have three waivers that they are requesting. He said they made a couple of revisions to the Plan since the last time that they were before the Planning Commission and most of the changes were done to accommodate the suggestions by the Township Planning Commission, and the recommendations of Ott Engineering.

**Alan Fornwalt** said the last time they were before the Planning Commission was on December 27, 2022. He said since that meeting there has been a lot of discussions back and forth with Township Staff regarding the Plan. He said some of the bigger items that were changed on the Plan were the reduction of the site grading and the overall import of soil that was needed for this project. He said that there were no retaining walls on the site before and there are still no retaining walls being proposed. The fill area in the deepest section was up to 13 feet previously and is now a maximum of 9-1/2 feet because the terrain in this one area is a subtle valley. He said they greatly lowered the site in this one area to reduce the amount of fill. He said they also reclaimed the area on the Engelman tract where the clean fill was stockpiled as part of the overall project scope. He said that they reduced the grading on the site. They picked up the bottom of the central basin 2-1/2 feet, so the basin is not as deep. They added a secondary stormwater management facility on the site. The lot line adjustment for what exists today is the two Engelman tracts. The landscape buffer that is required between the Industrial Zoning District and the Residential Zoning District was split between the two properties and the property line has now been adjusted so that all the landscape buffer is on the residential tract. He said that they reconfigured building lots 44, 45, 78 and lot 1 so that none of those lots' own property up to Indian Creek Road nor do they own land on the Lehigh County Authority Easement. That is all HOA owned land. He said that they moved the walking path and added a cross walk to the common area which is handicapped accessible. The stormwater piping along Indian Creek Road has been proposed to be completely replaced in the one area to contain all the stormwater runoff with no surcharges in a 100-year

storm. There are separate stormwater collection facilities on the subject tract and the Engelman tract. There will be one centralized location for the mailboxes as the Post Office did not like having multiple locations for mailboxes within the subdivision. The cluster mailboxes will be located by the common area right by the open space entrance. The landscape buffer has been added along lots 15 to 20 along the railroad track in addition to a fence. The fencing around the stormwater facilities and along the railroad tracks is now proposed to be a 6-foot-high vertical slat fence similar to what you would see around a swimming pool. The pathway was extended down to the irrigation pump facility for the spray irrigation to increase accessibility to this area. A lot of grading was done all throughout the development to minimize grading and slopes on the individual lots. Some of the slopes in the worst-case areas are 1-5 and the Ordinance requires 1-3 slopes. Additional trees have been added and they are now showing 5 fire hydrants. He said they are proposing the same number of units as they proposed back in December but there have been a lot of changes and improvements to the Plan.

**Alan Fornwalt** said that they are proposing 3 waivers which are as follows:

1. Minimum centerline radii for the horizontal curbs which are slightly underneath the 200-foot minimum radius as required by the Ordinance. He said that they have submitted calculations to show that is appropriate for the 20 mile per hour speed limit that is proposed.
2. The second waiver has to do with the Township's requirement where a land development abuts an existing collector street the Township shall require restriction of ingress and egress involving left hand turns. This development borders a Penn DOT roadway (Indian Creek Road). He said that they are not interested in making this a divided highway and so we are asking for a waiver to this. He said that they are proposing (2) eleven-foot lanes with an eight-foot area along the outside for parking. He said that there will be full access in any direction into and out of the development. There will be stop signs at both entrances to the development.
3. The third waiver is dealing with overusing easements in the development. He said that there is not anything that is being proposed. The public utilities are otherwise accounted for in the public right-of-way that is proposed to not put blanket utility easements around every single lot. He said that they removed the easements that they felt did not have any real importance. He said that they are asking for a partial waiver to this section.

**Motion:**

**Angelika Forndran** made the motion to recommend that the Board of Supervisors grant the requested waivers as noted in the letter dated June 15, 2023. **Anthony Koneski** seconded the motion. All were in favor. No one opposed. John Zgura abstained from voting.

**Zachary Mitchell** said he would like to discuss the Ott Engineering Review letter dated June 30, 2023 which has a lot of drafting issues. He said the Ownership and Maintenance Responsibilities on the Record Plan should be discussed. He said that Ott Consulting Engineers would recommend stormwater responsibilities be separated at the curb line as opposed to the right-of-way line since the HOA will be responsible for the sidewalk. He said they recommend swales be the responsibility of the HOA instead of the individual lot owners. He said that they wanted the open space lots also noted which would be owned by the HOA.

**Attorney James Preston** said they had no issue with those items.

**Zachary Mitchell** asked what the developer was thinking about the stormwater on the Engelman tract, especially the bypass pipe.

**Alan Fornwalt** said it should be added to the Plan. He said that would be installed by Kay Builders and maintenance would be the responsibility of the owners of the Engelman tract not the HOA. He said that they did get the consistency letter from the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission for Act 167.

**Zachary Mitchell** said that the revised grading in the backyards is a lot better with this plan submission than it was on the previous plan submission. He said that the Township may wish to comment on this.

**Matthew Hunter** asked about responsibility or ownership of the swales between the lots.

**Alan Fornwalt** said if the swale is inside an easement than it would be the HOA's responsibility to maintain and if it is not then it is just lot grading.

**Zachary Mitchell** said the fill areas are better than they were before. He said that there are still some basements on fill. He said he would be looking for at minimum some Geotech notes on the Plan.

**Alan Fornwalt** said he did not have a problem with that. He said it is minimized to the extent that they can. There are just a couple of feet here and there but certainly less than what it was and they were okay with that.

**Angelika Forndran** asked if it was the intent to have all the soil on the property be regraded or are they bringing in more soil or taking away soil.

**Alan Fornwalt** said even with utilizing what is there today and the stockpile of soil on the Engelman tract they will be bringing in soil. He said they will be bringing in a lot less soil than they would have with the previous Plan.

**Zachary Mitchell** said the next comment is the street dedication and improvements on Indian Creek Road which is a Penn Dot Road. He said typically the Township does not want the right-of-way. He said that the Township would need to make that decision.

**Brian Miller** said he would discuss this with the Township Solicitor to figure out what the Township would have to do about this.

**Zachary Mitchell** said lot 81 which is an open space area and is proposed to get fees-in-lieu-of credits, however that area is where the spray irrigation system is going. He said that the Township may want to discuss if that area is eligible for fees-in-lieu of since that is where the spray irrigation system is going.

**Brian Miller** said it would be a decision of the Board of Supervisors. He said that the Planning Commission could make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors regarding this item. He said that there would be a credit for the walking trail but he was not sure if lot 81 area would get a credit or not because much of the lot is being use for the spray irrigation system.

**Luke Lichtenwalner** said that this should be up to the Board of Supervisors to decide if they want to accept a fee-in-lieu for lot 81, which is an open space area.

**Zachary Mitchell** said previously they were proposing a 4-foot-high chain link fence around the basin. They are now proposing to have 2 basins with a 6-foot-high black aluminum vertical slat fence around the basins. The ponding depths have been reduced as well. He said the ponding depths for the central basin are now 4.16-feet for the 2-year storm and 5.57-feet for the 100-year storm. The ponding depths for the southern basin are now 1.02-feet for the 2-year storm and 2.14-feet for the 100-year storm. This is much better than the previous Plan submission.

**Brian Miller** said it looks like there is quite a bit of landscaping going around the basins too.

**Zachary Mitchell** said the proposed sidewalk along Indian Creek Road should be extended north to connect to the existing sidewalk along the Indian Mill Creek Subdivisions frontage. The sidewalk within the right-of-way of the Indian Mill Creek Subdivisions property may not have been dedicated and it is also over a sanitary sewer line. He said that there might be an issue with the location and permission.

**Brian Miller** said that the Township can figure that out.

**Alan Fornwalt** said that they have repeatedly requested LCA's input, and LCA has asked him to make the formal submission and they are awaiting a comment from LCA.

**Zachary Mitchell** asked if lot 82 would be owned by the HOA and be a non-building lot.

**Alan Fornwalt** replied yes. He said there is a sanitary sewer line and a stormwater easement on lot 82 and will be maintained by the HOA.

**Brian Miller** said that lot 82 will be owned and maintained by the HOA and not the responsibility of an individual property owner.

**Alan Fornwalt** said that no individual lot owner would own property bordering Indian Creek Road. All the property that borders Indian Creek Road in the development will be owned by the HOA.

**Angelika Forndran** asked a question about streetlighting within the development.

**Zachary Mitchell** said there will be a streetlight at both entrances to the development and one at the centralized mailboxes for safety purposes.

**Zachary Mitchell** said parking at the centralized mailboxes is indicated as no parking, but he thought that the area should be limited to 5-minute parking.

**Alan Fornwalt** said that they could post the hatched area on the Plan as 5-minute parking instead of not permitting parking in this area for people to retrieve their mail from their mailbox.

**Zachary Mitchell** said part of the Ordinance that created the overlay zoning district in this area of the Township to allow a residential use on the subject property that was previously zoned Industrial stated that PCSM BMP's were not allowed on the private building lots. He said on the last Plan submission they were showing swales and inlet sumps on some of the individual building lots which violated that section of the Ordinance. He said there is now more clarification that those are not PCSM BMP's and they are not taking credit for them. He said that the swales and conveyance and the inlet sumps are still there they are just not technically PCSM BMP's. He said there is the question of whether that meets the intent of the Ordinance.

**Brian Miller** asked who would be required to maintain those.

**Zachary Mitchell** said they should be maintained by the HOA.

**Luke Lichtenwalner** said the consideration was that the HOA was responsible for all O & M maintenance on the property. He said if they are not considered PCSM BMP's therefore there is no O & M Agreement associated with them.

**Zachary Mitchell** said that there still is, but it is just a little bit different. He said that there is a gray area between what is a BMP. You have to draw the line at a NPDES PCSM BMP. They are still there, and they still need maintenance.

**Luke Lichtenwalner** said if there is an O & M Agreement associated with it then it does not meet the intent.

**Zachary Mitchell** said that the inlet sumps have to get pumped at least once a year.

**Luke Lichtenwalner** said the way it is shown now is that the individual landowners would be responsible for maintenance.

**Zachary Mitchell** said that a note could be written on the plan regarding who would be responsible for the maintenance of the inlet sumps. He said a lot of the inlet sumps could be shifted because right now they are shown at the corner of the individual lots. He said the swales cannot be moved.

**Brian Miller** asked how many inlet sumps would have to be pumped.

**Zachary Mitchell** said he thought there were seven inlet sumps. He said about half of the inlet sumps are on private property. He said that he felt that they could be shifted a couple of feet to get them off private property.

**Alan Fornwalt** said that they can try to shift some of the inlet sumps but at the end of the day there are still going to be some things that fall in that gray area.

**Brian Miller** said he is more concerned with the property owner being able to provide maintenance for the sump cleanouts. He said that the inlet sumps are not going to be cleaned out by hand, they are going to be cleaned out by a truck. They have to be able to get a truck to each one of them.

**Zachary Mitchell** said that the bigger inlet sumps you would use a vacuum truck to clean them out. He said he has seen people clean them by hand, but it is not that easy but typically they use a vacuum truck. They need to be cleaned about once a year depending on how much sediment gets in them.

**Alan Fornwalt** said if it is under construction it would need to be cleaned a lot more frequently. After everything is established and lawns are growing and everything is complete it would need to be cleaned a lot less frequently.

**Brian Miller** said it is an item that is a necessity.

**Luke Lichtenwalner** said there should be a note on the plan that they are maintained by the HOA with access to the properties so that the Township does not have to have individual O & M Agreements.

**Brian Miller** said the concern was that we did not lose land to the rear of the properties with the easements. This will give the homeowner a little more area on their property for a fence, shed or even a patio. He asked if they could show what kind of access would be needed for the inlet sumps.

**Alan Fornwalt** said he could look where each one is proposed and make some adjustments if necessary.

**Brian Miller** said that there may be some that are really simple to access and others that are really difficult to access.

**Zachary Mitchell** said that the grading being proposed is less now than what was previously proposed. He said that they still have some extensive grading and steep slopes on the entire property.

**Angelika Forndran** asked if all the steep slopes were marked on the Plan.

**Alan Fornwalt** said they are marked. He said the definition of steep slopes in the ordinance has been determined to be existing steep slopes. The only thing that is existing steep slopes is the edge of the edge of the spoils pile which was considered to be artificial. The overall site today has a 40-foot drop in it but nothing on there is a steep slope across the center of the property. He said that there are a lot of walkout basements. Some of the back yards are 5 to 1 slopes they are not anywhere close to the 3 to 1 slopes.

**Angelika Forndran** said she there are not many comments on the Plan regarding the sanitary sewer and asked if that was because LCA hasn't given the developer all of the details yet.

**Alan Fornwalt** said that LCA is reviewing the sanitary sewer plan and once they complete their review, he will revise the Plan regarding the sewer.

**Angelika Forndran** said Final Plan approval would have to be subject to any and all outside agency approvals.

**Brian Miller** said Planning Module component 4A needs to be addressed and went over this with the Planning Commission.

**Motion:**

**Angelika Forndran** made the motion to have the Sewage Enforcement Officer, Brian Miller complete component 4A of the Planning Module and submit the Planning Module to the Board of Supervisors for their approval so as to be able to send the Planning Module to PA DEP for their approval. **Ellen Larmer** seconded the motion. All were in favor. No one opposed. **John Zgura** abstained from voting.

**Luke Lichtenwalner** asked if there were any other questions regarding the Township Engineers review letter.

**Matthew Hunter** said it sounds like most of the other comments in the Township Engineers review letter were items that the developer would comply with.

**Attorney James Preston** said that he would agree with that statement.

**Alan Fornwalt** said a couple of the comments were regarding whether the Township would accept dedication and he went on to say that whatever it is they will adjust accordingly.

**Luke Lichtenwalner** asked if the Planning Commission members felt that they were at a point where they could make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

**Brian Miller** asked Alan Fornwalt if that was what they would like to see happen. He also asked about the Lot Line Adjustment Plan.

**Alan Fornwalt** replied yes.

**Motion:**

**Matthew Hunter** made the motion to recommend that the Board of Supervisors grant Preliminary Plan Approval of The Fields at Twin Run Subdivision Plan last revised June 15, 2023 contingent upon approval of all outside agencies and complying with the comments in the Ott Consulting review letter dated June 30, 2023. **Angelika Forndran** seconded the motion. All were in favor. No one opposed. **John Zgura** abstained from voting.

**Lot Line Adjustments**

1. Engelman Associates 4650 & 4702 Indian Creek Rd.
  - Plan Revision from Keystone Consulting Engineers, Inc. dated 6/15/2023
  - Review letter from Jeff Ott dated 6/30/23

**Zachary Mitchell** said it might be a good idea to waive the perimeter easement for lot 2 on the Lot Line Adjustment Plan since they are requesting a partial waiver of perimeter

easements on the Subdivision Plan. He said this would be an added waiver for the Lot Line Adjustment Plan.

**Alan Fornwalt** said he does not have an issue with that.

**Brian Miller** asked if they would comply with everything else in the Ott Consulting review letter dated June 30, 2023.

**Angelika Forndran** asked if they were giving the Engelman's 2 acres of land.

**Alan Fornwalt** said they are giving the Engelman's 2.18 acres of land.

**Motion:**

**Matthew Hunter** made a motion to recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve the waiver to the perimeter easement for lot 2 on the Lot Line Adjustment Plan revised June 15, 2023. **Anthony Koneski, Jr.** seconded the motion. All were in favor. No one opposed. **John Zgura** abstained from voting.

**Motion:**

**Anthony Koneski, Jr.** made the motion to recommend that the Board of Supervisors grant approval of the Lot Line Adjustment Plan of Engelman Associates for 4650 & 4702 Indian Creek Road revised June 15, 2023 contingent upon addressing all of the items in the Ott Consulting review letter dated June 30, 2023. **Angelika Forndran** seconded the motion. All were in favor. No one opposed. **John Zgura** abstained from voting.

**Other Business:** None

**Luke Lichtenwalner** announced that the next regularly schedule meeting of the Upper Milford Township Planning Commission will be held on Monday, July 31, 2023 at 7:30 P.M. in the Upper Milford Township Building.

**Matthew Hunter** made the motion to adjourn the meeting. **Angelika Forndran** seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 9:16 P.M.

Date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Luke Lichtenwalner, Chairman**