

ROSS TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

MONTHLY MEETING

May 12, 2026

CALL TO ORDER:

The Ross Township Planning Commission (PC) Meeting, for May 12, 2026, was called to order by Chairman Howard Beers at 7:00 pm. The meeting was held at the Township Municipal Building.

ROLLCALL:

The following PC members were present:

Howard Beers, Chairman

Lauri Lapping, Vice Chairman

Keith Noble Jr.

Kevin Overfield

Vincent Delhery

PC members Thomas Wagner, Secretary, and Eric Longenbach were absent.

Also present were:

Tighe Meckes, Keystone Consulting Engineers,

Solicitor Michael Gaul, King Spry Law Firm,

Karen Orlando, Recording Secretary, members of the public, and applicants and their representatives, as noted below.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

April 21, 2026 meeting minutes

Motion: Motion to approve the April 21, 2026 meeting minutes as presented made by Vincent Delhery and seconded by Vice Chairman Lauri Lapping.

Motion Carried: 5-0

COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

OLD BUSINESS:

A. 1889 Kunkletown Road – Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan - 7/20/26 Deadline

Neither the applicant nor their representative were present. Mr. Meckes reported that no new submission or resubmission had been made.

Motion: Motion to table this Plan application to the next meeting was made by Keith Noble, Jr. and seconded by Kevin Overfield.

Motion Carried: 5-0

B. Schultheis/Lobb (Mount Eaton Rd) – Minor Subdivision Plan - 7/20/26 Deadline

The applicants, and their representative Ron Petrie with Arro Consulting, were present. Mr. Petrie stated that last month the shared use driveway and possible options/waivers were discussed. Ron stated that they had prepared a waiver letter dated May 1, 2026, for review and discussion. Ron proceeded to distribute copies of the waiver letter to the Planning Commission.

Tighe Meckes stated that he discussed options with Jeffrey Ott of Arro Consulting. He referred to SALDO Table 10 on page 10-9, which sets the design standards for a private access street. Because the proposal involves a shared driveway, the Ordinance requires a private access street to have a 20-foot right-of-way, a 12-foot travelway, and no shoulders. The current plan shows a 20-foot-wide access easement. Although the proposal is being discussed as a shared driveway, Tighe said he believes it should be treated as a private access street serving two dwellings. He also noted Table 10-1, which states that applicants may submit alternative designs for consideration under Section 98-7 for residential streets serving a limited number of lots, provided AASHTO standards are met. Tighe then cited Table 10-2 on page 10-15, which lists the minimum construction standards for a private access street: 1.5 inches of wearing course, 2 inches of binder, and 6 inches of stone. A note in that section states that Superpave wearing and binder courses are required when the street serves more than one dwelling unit. He added that the first 50 feet from the adjoining right-of-way must still be paved.

Tighe discussed with Jeffrey Ott potentially moving the home's front, having separate driveways, in part to reduce stormwater management concerns. Tighe doesn't know if they want to do that because they don't really want to build there. Tighe thinks they're trying to tackle everything now but would like to discuss options for not paving the entire length because it would be considered a private access street. Their waiver request would be to pave the first 50 feet and then have a beefier stone sub-base from there on back. That is what's up for discussion.

Attorney Gaul asked whether that stone base is a recognized standard. Tighe responded that 6 inches is required with the paving course on top of it. The sub-section says that if you only have 1 dwelling unit, you don't have to pave it but in place of the pavement you can increase the stone to 8 inches. They do want the first 50 feet paved. Tighe asked Attorney Gaul whether a modification is required or can they submit the alternative design for review and approval.

Attorney Gaul replied that alternatives can be provided but it still needs to be approved regardless. Future issues with a shared private access road were mentioned – example if the house sold and they didn't get along with the new homeowner. Attorney Gaul stated that there would have to be an agreement in place where there's an easement for the private access road. Both properties would have the right to use and maintain it. Also brought up was the need for emergency vehicle access. Attorney Gaul thought it would be a good idea to have the fire chief review this. Having a possible contingency plan for another driveway, should it ever be needed, was also mentioned. Ron Petrie questioned if they showed a contingent driveway, would they need to design and do storm water management for it. Attorney Gaul responded that he would think so because it's potential impervious surfaces and it would not be going through planning again.

Chairman Beers stated that the Ordinance permits this. Attorney Gaul stated that the proposal that's in front of everyone is an alternate design asking for approval to pave the first 50 feet. Attorney Gaul stated we don't need to decide tonight. This alternate path may be something you want to see – even if it's just a schematic. Tighe Meckes stated his opinion is that this meets the engineering requirements of the state and township. He would like to see the plans change, so that down the road if something were to happen, the availability could be there for a second driveway – just to make sure there's enough room there. Attorney Gaul stated that he doesn't see any harm to put that in there. However, PennDOT may prefer, in this case, that they come out of the same driveway, as opposed to two driveways.

Tighe Meckes stated that as part of the review, now that this is considered a private access road, there are geometric requirements which are AASHTO standards to be reviewed against the table. The minimum radius is 75 feet so that may get adjusted because here they have a 50-foot radius. That will be a comment in the review.

Attorney Gaul stated that if you're going to allow this, you can put conditions on it. The conditions would be no further subdivisions or residences beyond the 2 proposed and a review by the fire chief. Chairman Beers stated that we need to be careful here so as not to set any new precedents. He doesn't agree with the private access road, but he must allow it since the Ordinance permits it.

Tighe verified that he was okay with the alternative design. Tighe continued that the alternative can be submitted for a limited number of lots – in this case we're limiting it to two lots. Attorney Gaul summarized that it's an alternate design allowed by the Ordinance. Attorney Gaul continued that since everyone seems to agree, let's key this up for our next meeting.

Attorney Gaul felt there was something in the Ordinance about pumper trucks and added he can't think of any other conditions. Chairman Beers feels the driveway curve by the first house needs to be increased to 75 feet instead of 50 feet. He felt the fire chief should have no problem with it then because that's standard.

Chairman Beers asked Ron Petrie with Arro Consulting if he understood everything and was good. Ron Petrie agreed and summarized that, if the proposal proceeds as an alternate design, they can provide cross-sectional details, label it accordingly, add the necessary notes, and revise the curve geometry. He said they were seeking feedback from the Planning Commission to ensure they were moving in the right direction. Ron questioned how restricting future subdivision would affect the property. Attorney Gaul explained that any future request would go through the Township for approval and the Township would have the authority to deny it. He added that placing restrictions on the plan helps protect the Township by avoiding the need to justify a denial in court.

Motion: Motion to table this Plan Application to the next meeting was made by Vice Chairman Lauri Lapping and seconded by Kevin Overfield.

Motion Carried: 5-0

C. Gateway Industrial – Final Land Development Plans- 7/20/26 Deadline

Gateway asked to have their plan tabled for tonight due to not having the review letter yet from the Township Engineer since he was on vacation.

By consensus, the PC agreed to table this Plan Application to the next meeting.

NEW BUSINESS:

None.

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC:

Carolyn Lange, a resident, approached the Planning Committee with a question regarding Gateway Industrial. Carolyn inquired whether an environmental impact study is required for a project of this size. Attorney Gaul responded no - that is something typically seen in the Zoning Ordinance. Attorney Gaul explained that this is

not zoning, this is SALDO. He explained that the Township Engineer has not done a review yet. Most of the approvals for this development are state approvals, not local approvals. Again, to answer your question, Attorney Gaul stated he would be surprised to see environmental impact studies in SALDO.

Carolyn Lange responded that she would look in the Zoning Ordinance. Attorney Gaul informed her that the PC does not decide zoning matters. He also noted that the project had already received prior zoning approval.

Carolyn Lange stated that she did get a copy of the Sewage Facilities Planning Module. The copy that she got has a lot of information missing – like the DEP code number, client number, site id, etc. Carolyn continued that there's no date on this and the municipality contact individual listed is Danielle Romano who has not worked here for approximately 3 years. The Recording Secretary Karen Orlando told Carolyn that they were aware of Danielle Romano being incorrectly listed. She informed Carolyn that the Township Engineer was in the process of having the contact person corrected to Karen Orlando and the Township Solicitor was also reviewing everything. Once that is completed, Carolyn should be able to review this.

Attorney Gaul informed Carolyn that the Sewage Facilities Planning Module is entirely controlled by the state because of the size of the system. The state is the one doing all the analysis. Carolyn responded that she knew that and that's why she was looking for the DEP code number, client number, etc. so she can look it up on the DEP website and find information to get some of her questions answered. Carolyn tried putting in the parcel number but was not successful. Attorney Gaul suggested that Carolyn email Todd Stires who sent the DEP deficiency letter with her questions. Attorney Gaul stated she would probably need to complete a Right to Know form with the office, if she has not already done so.

Carolyn asked if there was a Plan at the Township that she could look at. Attorney Gaul informed Carolyn that she could come in and look at it and confirmed that the plan will show where the wetlands are. Carolyn asked that, if she had questions about the marginal conditions for long-term on-lot sewage disposal, should she direct those to the state? Attorney Gaul responded yes, he would think so. Attorney Gaul continued that the marginal conditions, if they exist, are issues that should be addressed with the state. Carolyn then mentioned soil issues. Chairman Beers responded that again, that's the state that handles that. Attorney Gaul shared that they must do certain testing but doesn't know whether the PC received copies. Carolyn then inquired if the Monroe County Planning Commission Engineer did a review letter. Attorney Gaul responded yes and told Carolyn she can get a copy of that. Carolyn thanked the Planning Commission for their time.

Chairman Beers informed Carolyn that all members of the Planning Commission are new except for one – so they haven't seen the old plan. Attorney Gaul shared that there are residential subdivisions that are more complicated for a Planning Commission review than this plan - because there isn't that much that the township is involved in for this plan. The access is

state, the sewage is state, and the stormwater management and erosion and sedimentation plan are state or county conservation district matters. Additionally, no modifications were requested. The preliminary plan was already approved by the Township. If the final plan substantially conforms to the preliminary plan, there is really nothing for the Planning Commission to weigh in on.

Carolyn asked if they could tell her where it was with PennDOT. Attorney Gaul replied that it's still under review. He continued that she might be able to contact PennDOT for info. Carolyn asked if there was a case number or a person. Attorney Gaul responded that he didn't know the answer to that but stated he has not seen too much PennDOT documentation himself since it's all electronic now. There is a portal and everyone communicates through the portal. We have had traffic study comments. A traffic study is done by the developer and then the Township's Engineer must comment on that. Carolyn asked whether that's been done here. Attorney Gaul confirmed yes and there are letters to that effect and they should be in the file.

Doing a site inspection was brought up by one of the Planning Commission members – since they're all new. Chairman Beers mentioned if they wanted to do so, they should obtain the homeowners permission and do so before the plans get approved because years ago when Blue Mountain Village was approved, it was a close vote with the Planning Commission 4 to 3 and he was one of the 3 not to approve it. For some reason there was a site visit after it was approved. Three of those that voted yes, commented that they didn't realize it was this steep. Chairman Beers stated that by then it was too late. Attorney Gaul stated that the applicant agrees as part of the application process that Township officials can make a site visit; however, he recommends that all site visits be coordinated through the applicant's representatives

PENDING:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:10 pm.

Motion: Motion to adjourn made by Vice Chairman Lauri Lapping and seconded by Kevin Overfield.

Motion Carried: 5-0

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen Orlando
Recording Secretary