

**Milford Township Board of Supervisors’
Work Session Meeting Minutes
February 13, 2024 - 8:00 am**

Call to Order: Chairman Charles Strunk called the meeting to order at 8:04 a.m.

Attendance: Supervisors present: Charles Strunk, Chair; John Mininger, Vice Chair; and Christian Haberle, Member. Staff present: Jeff Vey, Manager; Devan Ambron, Assistant Manager/Secretary/Treasurer; and Kate Harper, Timoney Knox.

Land Development:

Milford Village, Section 1W-Stonewall Village Apartments, John Fries Highway, TMP No. 23-010-175-001. Mr. Vey stated this meeting is to resolve outstanding issues, such as traffic impact fees and recreation fees that are due at the time of building permit issuance. Traffic fees relate to other traffic improvements that are done off site. Discussed was Mill Hill Road curbing down to the southern access to Mill Hill court on the eastern side, with no curbing on the cul-de-sac, with inlets to get as much water into the basin as possible. Mr. Del Markward noted Mr. John Snyder, Mr. Jim Preston, and Mr. Roger Hiser were present. This proposal is a component of the Master Plan, which is a separate entity. Mr. Preston stated LifeQuest has already done an exuberant amount of traffic improvements and has provided recreation and open space. Trails have been installed for the project and he is looking for a little more understanding on what the Township is looking for. Mr. Snyder stated the requirements of the AMU ordinance have been met and as far as traffic improvements, he is unsure what is happening. The perimeter of the site and internal roads are built. Mrs. Harper said the Townships concern is Mill Hill Road, adjacent to the development. The Master Plan deals with the arterial overlay, this development effects Mill Hill Road. Mr. Smith stated plans have been drawn for the added improvements, curbs, and trail access. Mrs. Harper said a traffic study was asked for, for Mill Hill Road. Once the roundabout was complete a traffic study was to be performed. Mr. Vey stated that has been resolved and we are looking at what traffic improvements are needed once the apartments are in. Mr. Mininger stated that is correct, we are not looking for a traffic study at this time. Mr. Vey stated what we are looking for now is the interplay, contributions towards traffic and the improvements that are being done. Mr. Haberle agreed, a traffic study is not warranted at this time. Mr. Haberle stated there is certain work that should be done, curbing, sidewalks and road widening. Mr. Strunk stated when the apartments are built a lot of traffic will be thrown on Mill Hill, Old Bethlehem and Pumping Station and the intersection will be severely affected. Mr. Vey moved the discussion onto Mill Hill Court. Mr. Vey noted he was out with the Public Works Director who feels there should be no curbing installed on the apartment side of Mill Hill and stormwater could be handled with a vegetative swale. With improvements centered on Mill Hill Court that would end up with 20’ wide cartway with 4’ of milling on each side. The roadway should be milled to a depth of 1’. The tradeoff being that curbing and inlets aren’t needed. To control water at the cul-de-sac a depression curb would be installed at the Nye driveway. Mr. Vey stated that is to be left to the engineers to ensure we don’t create a water problem. It was noticed there are trees marked in that area. Mr. Vey asked if there was a way to accommodate 6 parking spaces for the future trail head without taking down healthy trees. With no curbs on that side, it should be straight forward. Mr. Mininger stated one of the biggest wants was curbing and he is willing to relook at that want with the Road Masters recommendations. Mr. Smith said he did an option with curbs and drainage along Mill Hill on the apartment side. If a swale is wanted it is a different design with grading and clearing of trees. Mr. Markward said he was told by Mr. Andersen that the preferred way was to pave their side of the road leaving the other side unfinished. Mr. Vey said there would be drop and the old road has cracking and a trench. Mr. Smith said the waterline trench would be rebuilt. Mr. Smith presented a revised plan showing roadway, parking, curbing, and inlets along Mill Hill Court to tie into the stormwater system. Mr. Markward noted the revised plan is a result of a request made by the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Vey stated the intent is to have a road that is not patchworked. Mr. Markward noted a year and half ago that is

what Mr. Andersen said the Township wanted. This half width and curbing just came up within the last month or 2 and he does not think it best to do it this way. The road is essentially a driveway, it is a public road and to overlay would be an improvement and without curbing trail head parking would be easier to accommodate. He does not like the idea of having the other side not paved. Mr. Vey stated it could work either way. The tradeoff is to have a road that will last into the future. Mr. Smith said he can look at doing a swale along the road. The revised plan was drawn with curbing and widening to 12' half width with a trail shown in place of a sidewalk to connect to township property for a future trail. Mr. Vey asked if trail head parking is adjacent to the cul-de-sac. Mr. Smith stated yes, with this initial concept. This uses the least amount of impervious to accommodate the parking. Mr. Markward suggested they do what the Roadmaster recommends, overlay, no curbing and trail parking, with curbing down at the cul-de-sac. Mr. Haberle stated he is good with following Mr. Winkler's recommendations and the only question he has is, overlay the whole road and add subbase for width and swale? Mr. Vey stated the width is inconsistent and one thing with curbs is edge protection, there is less concern with having open sections. Mrs. Harper said if okay with the swale approach and overlay the best thing to do to memorialize would be for Mr. Smith to draw a plan. Mr. Smith stated he will meet with Mr. Vey and Mr. Winkler to draw up a plan and asked if that counts as required road improvement or is there a need to ask for a waiver for curb. Mr. Vey stated his impression is in recognition of Mill Hill Court there be no traffic impact fee. It is attached to a residential development and the bottom line is there would be no traffic impact contributions as capital improvements are being done. Mr. Mininger stated he would be okay with that, leaving on the table the intersection of Mill Hill and Old Bethlehem Pike when retail goes in. Mr. Strunk stated he would like to see contributions to that intersection made now as a lot of traffic will be thrown out there. Mr. Markward said that ties in with what LifeQuest has already spent and he would have to defer that to LifeQuest. Mr. Hiser stated he has already spent over 15 million on road improvements, walk trails, traffic studies, and Old Bethlehem Pike is a mile away from the site. He is not willing to agree to anything at this point. Mr. Haberle asked Mr. Strunk what he is looking for, the work on Mill Hill Court is a reasonable use of the traffic impact fee and he is okay putting the fees to where the traffic is and where the roadwork is being done. Mr. Vey stated this would be a traffic impact contribution in lieu of contributions. Mr. Mininger stated that is correct. Mr. Vey stated a traffic impact study will not be required for the apartments but we will look for consideration when subsequent development comes in. Mr. Markward said they will not be doing any more traffic improvements with this project. Mr. Mininger asked Mr. Markward, when you say no more road improvements, not referring to Mill Hill Court. Mr. Markward said he is referring to the intersection of Mill Hill Road and Old Bethlehem Pike. There is difficulty to go a mile down the street to do improvements. If the intersection is failing in the future, then it has to be looked at by all. Mr. Strunk said essentially you are saying 262 apartments won't go up Mill Hill to Old Bethlehem, they will all use Portzer Road. Mr. Markward say no, have to look at in the future, it is unknown at this time. Currently there isn't much traffic going through there with the roundabout being open. Mr. Markward noted he doesn't know if a traffic study will ever be necessary. Mr. Vey moved the discussion onto recreation requirements which are to be oriented to the public. Putting in a pool seems to not satisfy the language in SALDO. Mr. Markward stated the pool and recreation area does not satisfy as it is for the 262 apartments and not intended for public use. The walking trails and open space throughout the site covers the fee for this project. Mr. Snyder added in 2010 when the plan was approved, there was 50% open space and facilities intended for the community. The decision complied with the ordinance. The development was an overall 200+ acres and his standpoint is they have complied with Section 525 and do not need to provide more land or a fee-in-lieu. Mr. Mininger said what he is hearing is if the development provides enough open space that then counts for recreation fees. Mr. Snyder said the fee is in lieu of providing that land. If you provide land, there is no fee and in the 2010 decision, the whole project determined what was needed and has specific provisions of compliance with SALDO. Mrs. Harper pointed out the hospital installed trails for township residents with exercise equipment. Mr. Vey said compared to 525.b.2 there is a difference between open space and recreation land and facilities. The hospital provided recreation facilities and the land under it. This should be revisited to see where we are at. Mr. Snyder said we are past that, this has been done in 2010 and does not get reopened, wanting something different now doesn't

change the decision. Mr. Snyder added this is not like a subdivision, this is a project that requires a Master Plan. Mr. Snyder noted the condition can be found in paragraph 8 on page 14 of the June 2010 Conditional Use Hearing Decision. Mrs. Harper asked if the parking at the trail head was discussed as recreation land. Mr. Hiser stated this is not a LifeQuest issue it is a development issue. Mrs. Harper said the site capacity is on the whole site and if the trail and related parking is offered, she would say it complies with SALDO 525. Mr. Smith said they are willing to install the trail along Mill Hill Court and 5 or 6 parking spaces. Mrs. Harper asked if it was too much to put the trail on the plan. Mr. Smith said the layout has been done with the current design. Mr. Haberle said he wants to see what was written and agreed on and he is in favor of no fee if we get a trail and parking. Mr. Mininger agreed, he would like to see what was agreed to and whatever the fee happens to be the trail will count. Mr. Preston said the trail and parking is being offered from the point of view that there will be no outstanding recreation fees. Mr. Vey said the Supervisors want to look at the 2010 decision language and consider it against Section 525. This is a specific plan for apartments with an agreed upon direction for Mill Hill Court. We may want to consider another work session in 1-week prior to the March meeting. Mr. Smith stated he will be getting the plan together to provide to the township. Mrs. Harper said the resolution will need to be revised once the plan is received. There was no further discussion at this time.

Adjournment: With there being no further business Mr. Haberle made a **MOTION** to adjourn the meeting of February 13, 2024 at 9:17 a.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mininger and passed unanimously.