

Milford Township
Planning Commission Minutes of April 29, 2026
7:00 P.M.

Attendance: Edwin Bolton, Vice Chair; Susan Edwards, Secretary; and Member; Adam Klein, Member. Fran Murray, Chair was absent.

Staff Present: Jeffrey Vey, Township Manager and Devan Ambron, Assistant Manager/Secretary/Treasurer

Call to Order: Mr. Bolton called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Minutes: The February 25, 2026 Meeting Minutes were approved as presented.

Plan Acceptance:

Bracalente Minor Subdivision, Lot Line Change, 20 West Creamery Road and 220 North Main Street, Trumbauersville, TMP Nos. 45-002-015 and 23-021-013. Mr. Vey noted the Milford Township parcel remains unchanged. The proposal is to make one tax parcel by lot consolidation.

The Planning Commission took a moment of reflection to acknowledge the passing of Merv Afflerbach and to honor his service to the community.

Special Exception:

James Ndungu and Margaret Mungai, 2589 Daniels Lane, TMP No. 23-027-147. The Applicant is seeking a Special Exception under Section 403, H1a Home Occupation /Accessory Use Professional Office in relation to a home healthcare business. The property is located in the SRL-Suburban Residential Low Zoning District. The applicant was not in attendance to present the proposal. Mr. Bolton stated the Planning Commission members are in receipt of a review of the proposal by Chairman Fran Murry. The comments note, by appearance on the plan, is the driveway will no longer be available for parking. The current driveway provides parking for two vehicles. The other neighboring properties driveways are deeper and allow parking for four vehicles. Mr. Murray noted he believes that the garage parking was part of the original calculations in the development and the neighboring community parking spaces may be included in their calculations, which is located next to the dwelling and intended for all. The proposed office area is 112 square feet giving each employee a 4'x7' workspace. Mr. Klein stated Mr. Murray's comments are fair and he would like to know how they anticipate using the office space and why they have defined the office space if all of the business is conducted out of the home. Mr. Bolton stated they are proposing to take up garage space which takes up required parking space. Mr. Vey said the dwelling is an end unit with four common parking spaces next to the dwelling and there are no deed restrictions pertaining to parking. When looking at the parking requirements there is three per dwelling unit and two are to be onsite. They have a two-car garage and parking outside of the garage. Looking at the satellite, it appears the community parking doesn't get overused. Street parking is limited with curb cuts and a wide drive lane. Mr. Vey stated his feeling is there isn't an issue with parking. The wording in the application notes the 4 employees are members of the household, which should be explored further. Zoning Ordinance Section 404a. states no more than 2 persons, other than resident members of the immediate family, may be employed or subcontracted at the residence. Off street parking spaces required for the professional office shall provide one off street parking space for each employee, plus one additional space for each 200 square feet of office space. Does the convenience of being next to the community parking mean that they can utilize these spaces. The questions all revolve around 404H1.a subsections a and b having to do with off street parking. This gets to be a job for the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Bolton stated other than the parking issue he does not have a problem with the proposed use and everything is being keyed off family members, where is the limit. It was noted that space, egress, and fire safety could be an issue. Mr. Bolton said he would like to know more about the nature of the employees and as Mr. Murray noted the proposed space gives each

employee a 4'x7' space to utilize. Mr. Klein asked if a Zoning Hearing Board Decision sticks with the property. Mr. Vey stated it sticks to the use. Mr. Klein said once you start talking about clients coming into the space it creates more issues. It was noted that the proposal states typically clients are not expected to show up to the office since the employees go to them, and therefore extra human traffic and vehicle traffic is not expected.

Mr. Klein made a **MOTION** to issue a letter to the Zoning Hearing Board recommending approval of the application for a Special Exception by James Ndungu and Margaret Mungai, 2589 Daniels Lane, TMP No. 23-027-147 subject to the following conditions and considerations: 1) That the parking requirements set forth in Section 404.H.1.a are fully satisfied; 2) That the proposed use shall not exceed the scope and intensity described in the application materials submitted to the Township; 3) That the matter of outside clients coming into the office is unclear based on the current application and should be more closely reviewed by the Zoning Hearing Board; 4) That the Zoning Hearing Board take into consideration the lack of clarity within the application and conduct further examination of the proposed use. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Edwards and passed unanimously.

Clete Lapsley, 1750 Joanne Drive, TMP No. 23-002-113-002. The Applicant seeks a Special Exception from Section 804c to allow a residential accessory structure to be placed in the front yard of a nonconforming lot. The Applicant further seeks a variance from Section 404.B to construct a residential accessory structure, Section 404.H2 (garage) with a setback of forty feet in the front yard where a 75' setback is required, and a 20' setback in the side yard where a 30' setback is required. The property is located at in the RA-Rural Agricultural Zoning District. The applicant was not in attendance to present the proposal. Mr. Bolton stated he does not see allowing an encroachment in the front and side yard setbacks when they had space in the rear yard to construct an accessory building. Mr. Klein stated it appears they have utilized their allowable impervious surface and they can't come back asking for more. Mr. Klein said he has a question regarding Mr. Kravitsky's denial letter dated March 4, 2026. The letter references a setback of 62' from the front property line and 28' from the side property line. The letter states 40' front yard and 20' side yard. Mr. Bolton stated the applicant's whole justification is damage done to his automobile from the neighboring property mowing their lawn. If a short section of fence was installed it could prohibit damage. If a fence was not wanted landscaping could be installed. The whole idea is to install a garage because the neighbor mows the lawn. Mr. Bolton further noted it appears the vehicle is parked across the property line. Mr. Vey stated on the surface it looks like the application shouldn't be denied. Per Section 1106.c: No variance in the strict application of the provisions of this Ordinance shall be granted by the Zoning Hearing Board unless the Zoning Hearing Board finds that the requirements and standards are satisfied. The applicant must prove that the variance will not be contrary to the public interest and that practical difficulty and unnecessary hardship will result if not granted. The applicant shall establish and substantiate that the appeal for the variance is in conformance with the following requirements and standards; harmony with the general purpose and intent of the ordinance; granting the variance will not permit the establishment within a District of any use which is not permitted in the District; proof of a unique circumstance, that there are special circumstances or conditions for which the variance is sought; proof of an unnecessary hardship. Mr. Vey stated it appears these conditions have not been met; the vehicle can be parked further back on the property. Mr. Klein added the is achievable even with the current layout.

Mr. Klein made a **MOTION** to issue a letter to the Zoning Hearing Board recommending denial of the request for a Special Exception and Variance for the application of Clete Lapsley, 1750 Joanne Drive, TMP No. 23-002-113-002, for having not met the conditions of Zoning Ordinance Section 1106.c. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Edwards and passed unanimously.

Adjournment: With there being no further business the April 29, 2026 Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 7:28 p.m.