

January 30, 2026

Mr. Jamie Gwynn, Township Manager
New Hanover Township
2943 N. Charlotte Street
Gilbertsville, PA 19525-9718

RE: Traffic Engineering Review #5
Greens at Gilbertsville #812
Land Development Plans/Transportation Impact Study
New Hanover Township, Montgomery County, PA

Dear Jamie:

As requested, Bowman Consulting Group, Ltd. (Bowman) has completed a traffic engineering review for the proposed residential development to be located on the Gilbertsville Golf Course, which is bounded by Swamp Pike, Lutheran Road, Swamp Picnic Road, and Reifsnyder Road. The golf course will be redeveloped to provide up to 176 detached single-family homes, which is one less than provided on the last provided plan set.

Access to the site is proposed to be provided via two new, full-movement intersections. One along Lutheran Road opposite the New Hanover Lutheran Church and one along Reifsnyder Road. The direct access to Swamp Pike proposed on the initial plan (April 8, 2022) has been removed as it was associated with the lower section to the south of Minister Creek. In addition, four (4) single-family homes will have separate driveways accessing Lutheran Road on the east side of the road to the north of the New Hanover Lutheran Church.

The following documents were reviewed in preparation of our comments:

- Greens at Gilbertsville Preliminary/Major Subdivision and Land Development Plans (124 Sheets), prepared by Edward B. Walsh & Associates, Inc., last revised August 27, 2025 (Revision #4).
- Waiver Request List, prepared by Edward B. Walsh & Associates, Inc., dated August 27, 2025.
- Bowman Preliminary Subdivision & Land Development Plan Response Letter, prepared by Edward B. Walsh & Associates, Inc., dated August 27, 2025.
- Bowman TIS Review Response Letter, prepared by TPD dated August 26, 2025.
- Swamp Pike Left Turn Lane Sketch, prepared by TPD, dated August 26, 2025.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the review of the above-listed documents, it is our recommendation that the plans and studies as currently presented **are not ready for preliminary approval** given the number of technical comments, as well as the items that are not in compliance with the ordinances and if waivers are not granted result in additional modifications to the site layout. The waiver requests should be confirmed with the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to allow for the technical review to continue based upon approval and/or denial of the waivers.

General Notes

Bowman offers the following comments for consideration by the Township and further action by the applicant based upon our review of the above items and the Township ordinance requirements in the *Zoning Ordinance (ZO)* or *Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO)* as of the date of the initial application: April 28,

2022. Please note that on May 10, 2022, Parts 8 and 9 of the SALDO were updated along with other sections of the ZO and *Construction Standards* under Ordinance 22-05, and the zoning for the subject parcel was changed from R-25 to R2-M in June 2022 under Ordinance 22-06.

Attachment A contains a summary of the prior review comments that have either been removed due to plan modifications and/or replaced by the comments below, have been addressed, or waivers have been requested. Please note that the new comments are shown in **bold lettering** and the numbers below are also based on the continuation of the numbering from the preliminary land development plan review letters. Items related to requested waivers are highlighted in **gray text**.

General Comments

The following are general notes that apply to the project that do **not** require a formal response from the applicant.

1. A response letter must be provided with the resubmission detailing how each comment above has been addressed, and where each can be found in the resubmission materials (i.e., plan and/or page number(s)) to assist in the re-review process. **For future submissions, one-word responses such as “Acknowledged” or “Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage” are not acceptable. The planned action to be completed to address the comment is provided. If a waiver has been requested, the response should be “Pending Waiver recommendation from Board of Supervisors.” There were changes to the plans that were not clearly reflected in the response to comments letter.**
2. A Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) is required for this project for any work completed within the Swamp Pike legal right-of-way, since Swamp Pike is a County Road. The Township and Bowman must be copied on all HOP submissions, as well as correspondence between the applicant and Montgomery County Roads and Bridges and invited to all meetings among these parties.
3. **The prior plan dated June 11, 2025 proposed a total of 177 single family dwellings, whereas the current plan set dated August 27, 2025 proposes a total of 176 single family dwellings. The one unit which was removed was previously situated adjacent to Stormwater Basin 12 between Units 26 and 27 on the current plan set.** Since the initial plans dated April 8, 2022, the number of homes proposed to the north of Minister Creek has been reduced from 227 to 176 units. The section located to south of Minister Creek, which previously had up to 70 detached single-family homes proposed in the April 8, 2022 plan set that was labeled as “Phase III Future Submission”, has been removed from the project.
4. **Select plan sheets with a revision date of September 19, 2025 were presented by the Applicant during a Township staff meeting held on October 15, 2025. However, those plans were not provided to Bowman for review.**

Transportation Impact Study

3. It is noted that the counts were conducted when New Hanover Square Road was closed to traffic because of the bridge project. The bottom of page 5 (or 9 of 390) of the study refers to a comparison of the 2022 counts to historical counts in the area for the Swamp Pike and New Hanover Square Road intersection and states “the detour at this intersection did not significantly affect the traffic volumes and patterns”. This comparison must be provided in the study in order for the Township to determine if this statement is correct and no adjustments are necessary to account for normal traffic operations without the detour. *Review #2 Item Not Satisfied: Although a comparison of pre-construction counts from 2014 to the 2022 counts completed for the traffic study are provided in Appendix E (pdf page 176 of 456), the comparison is based on pre-construction*

count data that is over eight years older than the January 2022 data. The southbound left-turn movement from New Hanover Square Road to Swamp Pike is showing a significant reduction as a result of the bridge being closed along New Hanover Square Road. The 2014 southbound left-turn movement is 140 and 88 vehicles per hour in the AM and PM peak hours, respectively while the same movement only shows 61 and 19 vehicles per hour in 2022. This same pattern exists for the westbound right-turn movement from Swamp Pike to New Hanover Square Road and for the northbound through movement. These significant reductions in the turning movements are most likely a result of the bridge closure along New Hanover Square Road. As such, we recommend that new traffic counts should be completed at the Swamp Pike/New Hanover Square Road intersection to reflect post-construction traffic volumes at this intersection. Review #4 Item Not Satisfied: The July 2025 study incorporates count data conducted by SAFE Highway Engineering, LLC in August 2024 at the intersections of Swamp Pike with Reifsnyder Road/Rosenberry Road and New Hanover Square Road. The volumes at the signalized intersection of Swamp Pike with New Hanover Square Road do not include the right-turn on red volumes in Figures 3 and 4 that are included in the turning movement count data provided in Appendix C. The evaluation of this intersection must be updated for all conditions as it also reflects incorrect right-turn volumes and right-turn on red volume adjustments in the corresponding Synchro files that are not consistent with the turning movement count sheets for the peak hours provided in Appendix C. **Review #5 Item Not Satisfied: This item remains outstanding as an updated study was not provided. Please also refer to the review letter issued for the Laurel Field project dated December 4, 2025, specifically Review Comment #1 associated with the Traffic Impact Study.**

4. The following comments relate to the projections utilized to develop the future without and with-development peak hour traffic volumes:
 - C. Provide copies of all trip generation, distribution, and assignment details associated with the other area development projects referenced in the traffic study.
Review #2 Item Partially Satisfied: The trip generation information for the Trotter's Gait development is missing from Appendix D. Review #4 Item Partially Satisfied: The requested trip generation table is not included in Appendix D of the July 2025 Study for the Trotter's Gait development. **Review #5 Item Partially Satisfied: This item remains outstanding as an updated study was not provided.**
11. Provide an auxiliary turn lane warrant evaluation for the following intersections, since these will serve as the main access points to the surrounding major roadway network: Swamp Pike and Lutheran Road; Swamp Pike and Reifsnyder Road/Rosenberry Road; and North Charlotte Street (S.R. 0663) and Swamp Picnic Road.

Review #2 Item Partially Satisfied: Turn Lane warrants for the requested intersections have been provided in Appendix K. Based on the results of this analysis, as outlined in Table 15 in the TIS (pdf page 21 of 456), the following turn lanes are warranted; however, the study does not recommend the installation of any of these lanes for various reasons. As these intersections serve as the primary access to/from the site to the major roadway network, their operations are critical to the operations of the site, even if not included in the current version of the Act 209 for the Township. Please also refer to TIS Comment #13 for additional information.

- A 75-foot eastbound Swamp Pike left-turn lane at Swamp Pike/Lutheran Road
- A 75-foot eastbound Swamp Pike left-turn lane at Swamp Pike/Reifsnyder Road
- A 75-foot westbound Swamp Pike right-turn lane at Swamp Pike/Reifsnyder Road
- A 75-foot southbound Charlotte Street left-turn lane at Charlotte Street/Swamp Picnic Road.

Review #4 Item Partially Satisfied: The July 2025 Study includes a discussion on the feasibility of providing these potential off-site auxiliary turn lanes, which are warranted during the weekday afternoon peak hour. The study continues to not recommend installation of any off-site auxiliary turn lanes for a variety of reasons, mainly

stating that providing the turn lanes will not impact the side street levels of service. The information provided in Appendix E related to Montgomery County Bridge No. 172 located along Swamp Pike to the west of Lutheran Road indicates that the bridge will provide a 44-foot cartway width consisting of 12-foot travel lanes with 10-foot shoulders in each direction of travel. This cartway width could be restriped in the future to provide the shadow gore for an eastbound Swamp Pike left-turn lane for traffic turning onto Lutheran Road. However, it is not known if any widening is also being provided along the eastbound approach to the bridge that would potentially allow for the provision of a separate left-turn lane for traffic turning from Swamp Pike to Lutheran Road. Section 22-812.3 of the SALDO permits the Board of Supervisors to require additional rights-of-way and cartway widths to lessen traffic congestion, to secure safety from fire panic and other dangers, to facilitate the adequate provision for transportation and other public requirements and to promote the general welfare.

Review #5 Item Partially Satisfied: TPD has provided a Swamp Pike Left Turn Lane Sketch Concept Plan dated August 26, 2025, which illustrates two alternative layouts. Both layouts include the provision of a separate westbound left-turn lane along Swamp Pike, which is dependent upon the reconstruction/widening proposed by Montgomery County for County Bridge No. 172 that does not yet have a set construction date. The difference in the two layouts is the second alternative also includes widening along the Lutheran Road approach to provide a separate left-turn lane and a channelized right-turn lane. The applicant has noted that they have not offered to complete any of the improvements on the plan.

Bowman notes the following based upon our review of the plan, along with the discussion with the Planning Commission on September 10, 2025:

- (1) The length for the shadow turn lane has a transition length of 192 feet, which is based on the formula WS where the width is 5.5 feet and the posted speed limit is 35 miles per hour. An alternative concept plan that is not dependent on the bridge widening should be provided that utilizes the formula $WS^2/60$ to calculate the length of the transition taper, which according to PennDOT Publication 111M (TC-8600) is allowable for conventional roadways where the 85th percentile speed is 40 miles per hour or less (Swamp Pike is posted 35 miles per hour). This would reduce the transition taper to 112 feet and not require the bridge structure to be widened. This configuration could then be feasible as an interim condition prior to the bridge widening project.
- (2) The alternative formula for the transition taper should also be considered for the transition approaching the eastbound left-turn lane. This could reduce potential impacts to the residential parcel to the west at 2027-29 Swamp Pike (47-00-06964-00-9) where vehicles are parking on the east side of the home, impacts along the Our Place Restaurant frontage at 2036 Swamp Pike (47-00-07352-00-8), and utility impacts.
- (3) The alternative concept plan should also include the separate turn lanes along Lutheran Road with the mountable concrete island separating the left and right turn lanes as a painted/flush mounted concrete island based upon the discussions.

Preliminary Land Development Plan

1. General Note 3 on Sheet 3 of 149 states "parking along streets is not permitted", which contradicts the note provided in the Off-Street Parking Calculation that indicates 110 on-street parking spaces are to be provided, although none are required. Additionally, the waiver request list on Sheet 3 of 149 also refers to no on street parking. Please clarify the intent for on-street parking and which notes on the plan sheets are correct and which ones are to be revised. *Review #2 Item Partially Satisfied: General Note 3 on Sheet 3 of 129 has been revised to indicate that parking is only restricted along Road A. The applicant is requested to coordinate with the local bus company serving the school district to determine if the bus will enter the site since the roads are*

proposed to be privately owned and maintained by the HOA. If the bus company will not enter the site for pick-up/drop-off, then the applicant will need to ensure there is an area for parents to park along the Road A ingress and egress lanes for school students. Review #3 Item Partially Satisfied: General Note 18 on Sheet 3 of 119 notes the internal road rights-of-way are offered for dedication to New Hanover Township. If the board does not accept dedication of the roadways, then the applicant will need to coordinate with the local bus company serving the school district. Areas for parents to park along Road D at its intersection with Lutheran Road and Road C at its intersection with Reifsnyder Road are then recommended to be provided. The Striping, Signage & Circulation Plan (Sheets 29 to 39 of 119) does not indicate any "No Parking" signs along Road A that correspond to the noted restriction and additional striping/signage may also be required where fire hydrants are located. Review #4 Item Partially Satisfied: General Note 18 on Sheet 3 of 124 states the internal road rights-of-way are offered for dedication to New Hanover Township. The June 11, 2025 response letter states "the intent is to provide roads that meet township standards for the roads to be taken by the Township". Please confirm with the Township and Public Works that they are agreeable to maintain the proposed median proposed along Road A from Lutheran Road to Road B and along Road C from Reifsnyder Road to Road B, since the SALDO does not include provisions for medians along any Township streets. The response also states "the road is designed to allow for on street parking" even though "No Parking" signs have been provided where no on street parking is permitted, including the sections of Roads A and C where the medians are proposed. However, the cartway width on each side of the proposed median (15-foot) is not wide enough to allow for a combined travel lane (11 feet) and a parking area (8 feet). This is critical if the board does not accept dedication of the roadways. It is recommended the applicant coordinate with the local bus company serving the school district for areas for parents to park along Road A at its intersection with Lutheran Road and Road C at its intersection with Reifsnyder Road if the roads are not dedicated. Additionally, the Striping, Signage & Circulation Plan (Sheets 29 to 38 of 124) have been revised to indicate any "No Parking" signs along Road A that correspond to the noted restriction; however additional striping/signage where fire hydrants are located have not been provided and are required.

Review #5 Item Partially Satisfied: This comment has not been fully addressed as the applicant's response letter states "Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage". However, a review of the plans indicates the medians previously proposed along Roads A and C have been removed (see Sheets 3, 30, and 39) with a reduced cartway width of 38 feet (see Sheet 122). Due to these revisions, the following items are to be revised on the Striping, Signage & Circulation Plans (see Sheets 29 to 38 of 124):

- (1) The fire hydrants are to be illustrated on the Striping, Signage & Circulation sheets. Provide additional striping/signage where fire hydrants are located where on-street parking will be restricted.**
- (2) Based on the Typical section (see Sheet 38), Roads A and C are wide enough to permit on-street parking on both sides of the road. If the intent is to restrict parking on Road A and on Road C between Road B and Reifsnyder Road, then a reduced cartway width should be provided. Otherwise, it is recommended that only the areas within 50 feet of the intersections be restricted.**
- (3) Provide a "Speed Limit" sign (Sign Legend 3) for traffic entering Road C from Reifsnyder Road.**
- (4) On Sheet 37, there is a "Speed Limit" (Sign Legend 3) / "No Parking with Arrow" (Sign Legend 5) combined on a single post along Road C near STA 19+15. These signs cannot be on the same post.**
- (5) Revise the proposed "No Parking" (R8-3) with "No Parking Arrow" (R7-301) sign referenced in the Sign Legend as #5 with a "No Parking Here to Corner" sign. A detail for this sign noting the size as 12"x 18" is to be provided in the Construction Detail Sheet. There currently are no details provided for the signs referenced in Sign Legend #5 on Sheet 121.**
- (6) The proposed median that was previously shown along Road A from Lutheran Road to Road B and along Road C from Reifsnyder Road to Road B is still shown on the Township Landscape Plans (Sheet 82-88 of 124). Please revise the Landscape Plans accordingly.**

2. The parking requirements for use B-1 Detached Dwellings should be based on a requirement of two (2) spaces per dwelling unit according to *Section 27-305.2.A.(4) of the ZO*. The table provided in *Section 27-1916 of the ZO* states that the minimum required parking is 2 for each dwelling unit with 3 bedrooms or less but does not state what the requirement is for dwelling units with 4 or more bedrooms. The requirements shown on Sheet 3 of 149 appear to be based upon the B2 Performance Standards (2.25 spaces per dwelling unit), which are not permitted within the R-25 Zoning District. Please revise the calculations. *Review #2 Item Not Satisfied:* *The parking calculations on Sheet 3 of 129 continue to reflect the required 2.25 parking spaces per unit for the B2 Performance Standard detached housing unit, which is not permitted within the R-25 Zoning District as of the initial date of the preliminary land development plan application and it is noted that this use did not allow for on-street parking to be counted towards the off-street parking requirement. However, if based upon use B-1 Detached Dwellings, the off-street parking would be compliant as a total of 350 spaces would be required, which are proposed.* *Review #3 Item Not Satisfied:* *The parking calculations on Sheet 3 of 129 continue to reflect the required 2.25 parking spaces per unit for the B2 Performance Standard detached dwelling, which is not permitted within the R-25 Zoning District based on the ordinances as of the date of the initial preliminary land development plan application of April 28, 2022. Please update the parking calculations and remove all references to the Performance Standards. The off-street parking as proposed does meet the B-1 detached dwelling unit requirements.* *Review #4 Item Not Satisfied:* *No change from prior comment as the parking calculations on Sheet 3 of 129 still to reflect the B2 Performance Standard detached dwellings, which are not permitted within the R-25 Zoning District based on the ordinances as of the date of the initial preliminary land development plan application of April 28, 2022.* ***Review #5 Item Partially Satisfied:*** **The parking calculations on Sheet 3 of 129 have been revised to remove the reference to the B2 Performance Standard detached dwellings and are now based on 2 per unit. The proposed off-street parking is shown as 1 space per garage (176 total spaces) and 1 space per driveway for a total of 352 off-street spaces. *Section 27-1913.3 of the ZO* states “parking areas for all uses shall be designed to permit each motor vehicle to proceed to and from the parking space provided for it without requiring the moving of any other motor vehicle”. Please indicate on the Typical Lot Layouts on Sheet 2 for the Proposed Lots Sizes of 16,432 sf and 15,010 sf.**

3. The record plan and landscape plans are to be updated to illustrate the clear-sight triangle based upon *Section 27-1912 of the ZO* for all proposed street intersections and residential driveways. Note the triangle size for intersecting streets is dependent on the roadway classifications, so please refer to Comment #13 for additional details on how to determine this item and the ZO for the triangle dimensions and sample drawing. A note regarding the height of objects in these triangles consistent with the ZO must also be provided. *Review #2 Item Not Satisfied:* *Although sight distance lines have been added to the record plans and landscape plans, these lines do not match the requirements shown *Section 27-1912 of the ZO*. Refer to the ZO for how to draw these triangles as the triangles provided on the landscape plan are not in compliance. Please note that as this is a zoning requirement, a variance would need to be requested by the Zoning Hearing Board if not provided.* *Review #3 Item Not Satisfied:* *Sight distance lines are still shown on the Record Plans (18 to 29 of 119) and Landscape Plans (Sheets 77 to 84 of 119) that are not compliant with the horizontal clear sight triangles in *Section 27-1912 of the ZO*.* *Review #4 Item Partially Satisfied:* *The clear sight triangles in accordance with the criteria in *Section 27-1912 of the ZO* are indicated on the Record Plans (Sheets 18 to 28 of 124; however, the same clear sight triangles are not indicated on the Landscape Plans (Sheets 82 to 88 of 124). Ensure the clear sight triangles are shown on the Landscape Plans. The applicant is requested to provide a plan indicating the classification of the new residential streets based upon the daily trips in accordance with the requirements in *Section 22-813 of the SALDO*, as this is needed to confirm if the triangles at intersections need to meet the requirements for arterials or collector streets per *Section 27-1912 of the ZO*.* ***Review #5 Item Not Satisfied:*** **The prior comment remains outstanding as the response states “Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage”.**

4. General Note 21 on Sheet 3 of 49 refers to the residential mailboxes being installed based on the requirements of the Township. This item is to be coordinated with the local post office. Review #2 Item Partially Satisfied: The applicant's engineer has indicated that the applicant will coordinate with the local post office. Please indicate on the plans if individual mailboxes will be provided or the location of a shared box for the residents. Review #3 Item Partially Satisfied: Note 21 on Sheet 3 indicates that each lot will have its own private mailbox. Please provide the documentation from the post office to confirm this. Review #4 Item Partially Satisfied: The June 11, 2025 response letter indicates that the applicant has contacted the post office and that the post office will no longer provide individual mailboxes to new residences. As a result, the plans now indicate a single Community Cluster Mailbox along the south side of Road C, immediately to the south of Lot 129 in front of Stormwater Basin #10. Note 21 on Sheet 3 has also been revised to note the community mailbox installation. Note 21 should be revised to also note that the community mailbox will be built to the Postal Service specifications, in addition to any township standards. In addition, according to the contours on Sheet 43 of the Grading Plans, it appears that the concrete pad for the mailbox cluster is not fully contained within a flat/level area. Verify the grading at the new community mailbox location and ensure the concrete pad is not situated along a slope. **Review #5 Item Not Satisfied: The prior comment remains outstanding as the response states "Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage".**

5. General Note 31 on Sheet 3 of 49 refers to all proposed curbs being straight Belgian Block. The Township Construction Standards contained in *Chapter 21 Streets and Sidewalks* do not include any details for this type of curbing. Based upon discussions with the Public Works Department, Belgium Block curbing would not be permitted on public roads. *Section 22-809.6 of the SALDO* states "private streets may be approved only if they are designed and constructed to meet public street standards as specified in this chapter and other Township regulations". This is also consistent with the *Revised SALDO* (see *Section 22-816.9*). Review #2 Item Partially Satisfied/Waiver Requested: The previous General Note 31 on Sheet 3 of 129 has been removed from the plan. A waiver has been included for the use of Belgium Block, see #8 on the Waiver Spreadsheet. Review #3 Waiver Requested: A waiver for the use of Belgium Block has been requested, see #7 in the Waiver Request Letter dated December 18, 2024 or #9 on Sheet 2 of 119. Review #4 Waiver Requested: A waiver for the use of Belgium Block has been requested. Note that this waiver is listed as Item 8 of the Waiver Request List dated June 11, 2025 and as Item #9 in the Waiver Request Table on Sheet 2. Ensure the Waiver Request List and Table are consistent in future submissions. **Review #5 Waiver Requested: A waiver for the use of Belgium Block is still being requested. This waiver is listed as Item 8 of the Waiver Request List dated August 27, 2025 and as Item #9 in the Waiver Request Table on Sheet 2. As noted in our prior review, ensure the Waiver Request List and Table are consistent in future submissions.**

10. *Section 22-812.4 of the SALDO* states where a subdivision or land development abuts or contains an existing street of inadequate right-of-way or cartway width, additional right-of-way or cartway width shall be dedicated to conform to the existing street standards. Additional cartway width and right-of-way are required along the site frontage for Lutheran Road, Reifsnnyder Road, and Swamp Picnic Road to accommodate the additional traffic associated with the proposed development of the site, since the existing cartway widths are labeled for these three roadways as ± 18 feet. At a minimum, it is recommended that the cartway widths be widened to meet the local roadway standards (28 feet) in accordance with *Section 22-812.1.A of the SALDO*, as well as the minimum right-of-way for local roads (52 feet) in accordance with *Section 27-1918.1.E of the ZO*. Please note that curbing is required in all zoning districts per *Section 22-812.2 of the SALDO*. Also, the recommended width of 28 feet is consistent with the minimum required cartway in *Section 22-815.1.A of the Revised SALDO* for local roads/residential streets.

The pavement and striping plans have labels saying proposed curb along the site frontage for Lutheran Road, Swamp Picnic Road, and Reifsnnyder Road indicating the cartway will be widened on center by 14 feet along

the site frontage, which would then result in a cartway width of ± 23 feet and not 28 feet total. Details for the required widening along Lutheran Road, Reifsnyder Road, and Swamp Picnic Road are to be provided in the plan sheets including the details cross-section and a plan and profile sheet in accordance with *Section 305.5.D. of the SALDO*. It is also noted that the plans do not include details on sign relocations, transitions to existing cartway widths at the ends of the site property, or details on the widening for any Bridge Structures. These include the Lutheran Road Bridge Structure (see Sheet 66 of 149), which is a County Bridge that is currently scheduled for replacement with no widening of the structure, the Reifsnyder Road Bridge (see Sheet 65 of 149), which is a Township bridge, and the Swamp Pike Bridge (see Sheet 66 of 149) located between Lutheran Road and the proposed Road K intersection with Swamp Pike. The applicant will need to coordinate with Montgomery County Roads and Bridges for the widening of the Lutheran Road Bridge Structure, as well as any widening that may also need to be completed for the Swamp Pike Bridge Structure as left-turn lanes and/or right-turn lanes for traffic turning from Swamp Pike to Lutheran Road or Road K may be required, and with the Township for the Reifsnyder Road Bridge Structure.

Review #2 Item Partially Satisfied/Waiver Requested: The applicant has requested a waiver to not provide any widening along the site's Swamp Picnic Road frontage (see Items 2 and 4 on the Waiver Spreadsheet), for Lutheran Road to be widened to the same width along the site frontage to the north of the bridge only to match the recently completed bridge cross-section, and to widen Reifsnyder Road to a width that will be agreed to by the Township Engineer. It is noted that the Waiver Request Spreadsheet Item 2 states Reifsnyder Road to be widened to 28 to 30 feet from Swamp Picnic Road intersection to the existing bridge on Reifsnyder Road with all widening along the site frontage. This note may need to be revised as the conceptual plan provided by Traffic Planning & Design, Inc. (dated 6/26/23) indicates the roadway width will vary from 20.4 to 24 feet along the site frontage.

Based upon our review of the Reifsnyder Road concept plan, the following comments are noted for potential revisions as the widening progresses to the design stage:

- A. With respect to Detail 2 and Detail 3, a vegetative swale as in Detail 1 do not appear to be proposed in these sections of Reifsnyder Road; however, given the indicated site grading and the drainage patterns adjacent to these areas, vegetated swales should be provided along the length of the roadway improvements along western side of Reifsnyder Road. *Review #4 Item Partially Satisfied: The revised plans reflect that a swale adjacent to the proposed widening is proposed as indicated by the label for "Reifsnyder Road Widening/Swale" on Sheet 122 of 124. However, it is difficult to discern the design details of the proposed widening given the scale of these plan sheets. For example, based on the grading plans (Sheets 39 to 50 of 124) it appears that the proposed swale is situated within the roadway widening as opposed to being adjacent to the roadway widening as per the detail and typical design standards. The plans should be revised to include plan sheets that reflect the details of the Reifsnyder Road widening at a suitable scale (i.e., 1" = 25') with all necessary details to reflect the widening impact and proposed associated elements (elevations, utility impacts, sign relocations, cross-sections, etc.).* **Review #5 Item Not Satisfied: The prior comment remains outstanding as the response states "Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage".**
- B. *The plans indicate impact to the existing "Stop" sign on the southeast corner of Reifsnyder Road/Swamp Picnic Road; however, there is an existing pipe opening at this corner associated with the cross-pipe across Swamp Picnic Road that is likely affected by the indicated radius modification. Note this on the Concept plan and address accordingly. Review #4 Item Partially Satisfied: The revised plans reflect that a new stormwater system is now proposed along the west side of Reifsnyder Road to the north and south of the intersection of Swamp Picnic Road; however, the details are difficult to discern at the scale provided on the land development plans. For example, based on the grading plans (Sheets 39 to 50 of 124) it appears that the proposed pipe installation will impact the existing signs at the intersection with Swamp Picnic Road, the*

existing rip-rap associated with the existing cross-pipe on the northwest corner, will require trenching across Swamp Picnic Road (which is not reflected on the horizontal plans and not clearly reflect on the Off-Road Utility Profile Sheet for this section on Sheet 65 of 124), and will require removal of the existing 15-inch HDPE pipe, which is also not clearly shown. It is also not clear on the plans if the grading necessary to install the new piping north of Swamp Picnic Road will require easements, if rip-rap is proposed at the proposed EW-16 outfall (the upstream end of the existing cross-pipe adjacent to proposed EW-16 does not appear to have rip-rap), if the adjacent roadway slope meets roadway grading criteria or if guiderail may be required, etc. The plans should be revised to include plan sheets that reflect the details of the Reifsnyder Road widening at a smaller scale with all necessary details to reflect the widening impact and proposed associated elements (e.g., utility impacts, sign relocations, cross-sections, grading impacts, easements, etc.). **Review #5 Item Partially Satisfied: The plan scale is not sufficient to complete a review to determine if the prior review comments have been addressed, while the response states "Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage".**

- C. The plans indicate impact to the existing "Stop" sign on the southwest corner of Reifsnyder Road/Swamp Picnic Road; however, there are existing fences present at this location that are not indicated on the plans. In addition, the edge of the existing road at this corner indicates sections of deteriorated pavement that could be attributed to over-tracking of vehicles and/or drainage issues. The land development plans reflect proposed drainage modifications in this area associated with the storm basin outfall. Revise the Concept Plan accordingly and address the aforementioned issues. Review #4 Item Partially Satisfied: The revised plans reflect additional information related to the widening and road improvements along the west side of Reifsnyder Road to the north and south of the intersection of Swamp Picnic Road; however, the details and impacts are difficult to discern the scale of the land development plans. Refer to comments A and B above for concerns and comments regarding the additional plan details and information being requested that are also applicable to this comment. The response June 11, 2025 Response Letter notes that the road widening and improvements proposed will address any existing pavement issues; however, given the amount of roadway widening, the proposed stormwater impacts along Reifsnyder Road and installation/removal of stormwater facilities at the intersection with Swamp Picnic Road, the plans should be revised to indicate a half-width mill and overlay of Swamp Picnic Road and along Reifsnyder Road within the limits of work. This will allow for a uniform pavement in the widening and impact areas and will avoid uneven and settling pavement, driver confusion, etc. Revise the plans accordingly. **Review #5 Item Partially Satisfied: The plan scale is not sufficient to complete a review to determine if the prior review comments have been addressed, while the response states "Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage".**

- D. The detail for the Typical Existing Road Widening – Lutheran and Reifsnyder Roads provided on Sheet 127 of 129 indicates a consistent proposed cartway width of 24 feet for both roadways. If the cartway width of Reifsnyder Road differs from Lutheran Road, then a separate cross section for each should be provided. Review #4 Item Partially Satisfied: Typical sections for both Lutheran and Reifsnyder Roads have been provided on Sheet 122 of 124; however, verify the "Widening Variable Width 0-3'" note shown for the Lutheran Road widening section as it appears this should be "...0-6'" given that the existing cartway is labeled as approximately 18 feet and the proposed widening is shown to be 24 feet. **Review #5 Item Partially Satisfied: The plan scale is not sufficient to complete a review to determine if the prior review comments have been addressed, while the response states "Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage".**

- E. The Reifsnyder Road Widening/Swale detail indicates a minimum 2-foot will be provided prior to the drainage swale, whereas the Typical Existing Road Widening shows a variable shoulder width of 0 to 3 feet. Review #4 Item Partially Satisfied: The Typical sections shown on Sheet 122 of 124 have been revised to

eliminate this discrepancy; however, it is not clear whether this is reflected appropriately on the plans since the details and impacts are difficult to discern the scale of the land development plans. Refer to Comments A and B above for concerns and comments regarding additional plan details and information being requested that are applicable to this comment. **Review #5 Item Partially Satisfied: The plan scale is not sufficient to complete a review to determine if the prior review comments have been addressed, while the response states "Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage".**

- F. Please indicate on the Lutheran Road cross-section if a drainage swale is being provided to convey the stormwater runoff for the widened cross-section. Review #4 Item Not Satisfied: The June 11, 2025 comment letter states that the plans note a drainage swale to be installed along Lutheran Road; however, the roadway widening and associated grading, including the swale, are not indicated on the grading plans (Sheets 39 to 50 of 124). In addition, the Lutheran Road Widening Detail on Sheet 122 does not show a swale being proposed. Clarify and revise the plans accordingly. **Review #5 Item Partially Satisfied: The plan scale is not sufficient to complete a review to determine if the prior review comments have been addressed, while the response states "Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage".**
- G. Review #4: Details for the required widening along Lutheran Road, Reifsnyder Road, and Swamp Picnic Road are to be provided in the plan sheets including the details cross-section and a plan and profile sheet in accordance with Section 305.5.D. of the SALDO. These were requested in the first review and have not yet been provided. **Review #5 Item Partially Satisfied: The plan scale is not sufficient to complete a review to determine if the prior review comments have been addressed, while the response states "Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage".**

Review #3 Item Partially Satisfied/Waiver Requested: The applicant has requested waivers as noted in Review #2, which can be referenced on Items 1 and 3 of the December 18, 2024 Waiver Request Letter or Items 2 and 4 on Sheet 2 of 119. The waiver request related to Reifsnyder Road in the letter still refers to a proposed width of 28-30 feet, while the waiver request on Sheet 2 of 119 refers to a proposed width of 24 feet, which is reflected on Sheets 36, 37, and 117 of 119. The plans also show widening along the Wood parcel (see Sheet 46 of 119), which contradicts the waiver request letter that there will be "No disturbance to Eastern side of Rd (Mr. Wood's property)". Additionally, since no updated Reifsnyder Road concept plan was provided in this submission, all related Review #2 Comments A thru F noted above remain outstanding, as these details are not discernable on the land development plans. Review #4 Item Partially Satisfied/Waiver Requested: The applicant has requested waivers as noted in Review #2 (referenced as Items 1 and 3 of the December 18, 2024 Waiver Request Letter). We note that these waivers are now listed as Items 2 and 4 of the June 9, 2025 Waiver List and shown as Items 2 and 4 of the Requested Waivers Table on Sheet 2 of 124. The June 11, 2025 response letter notes the waiver request is as per discussion and desires expressed by the Township Boards, Staff, Consultants, as well as neighboring residents. Be advised that there are outstanding comments to address regarding the proposed Reifsnyder and Lutheran Road widening as identified in Comments A through F noted above. **Review #5 Item Partially Satisfied/Waiver Requested: The applicant has requested waivers, which are listed as Items 2 and 4 of the August 27, 2025 Waiver List and shown as Items 2 and 4 of the Requested Waivers Table on Sheet 2 of 124. Be advised that there are outstanding comments to address regarding the proposed Reifsnyder and Lutheran Road widening as identified in Comments A through F noted above.**

11. To support the additional traffic generated by the residential development, it is recommended that the cartway widths be widened to meet the local road standards (28 feet per Section 22-812.1.A of the SALDO) for the entire distance from where the Lutheran Road and Reifsnyder Road access are located until they intersect with higher order streets, such as Swamp Pike, North Charlotte Street (S.R. 0663), or New Hanover Square

Road, as well as the section of Swamp Picnic Road to the west of Lutheran Road. *Section 22-812.3 of the SALDO* permits the Board of Supervisors to require additional rights-of-way and cartway widths to lessen traffic congestion, to secure safety from fire panic and other dangers, to facilitate the adequate provision for transportation and other public requirements and to promote the general welfare. Please note that curbing is required in all zoning districts per *Section 22-812.2 of the SALDO*. Also, the recommended width of 28 feet is consistent with the minimum required cartway in *Section 22-815.1.A of the Revised SALDO* for local roads/residential streets. *Review #2 Item Partially Satisfied:* Refer to Comment #10. Also, the applicant has not indicated how left-turning traffic will safely access Swamp Pike Road from either Lutheran Road or Reifsnyder Road (see TIS Comments #11 and 13). *Review #3 Item Partially Satisfied:* This comment remains outstanding as no response has been provided. *Review #4 Item Partially Satisfied:* Bowman continues to recommend that the cartway width along Lutheran Road between the site frontage and Swamp Pike be widened to provide a consistent 24-foot wide cartway width at a minimum. The traffic study also indicated that Montgomery County Bridge 172, located along Swamp Pike to the east of Lutheran Road, was being designed to provide a 44-foot wide cartway consisting of 12-foot travel lanes with 10-foot shoulders (see Appendix E of the July 2025 traffic study). Please refer to TIS Comment #11 regarding turn lanes at off-site intersections. ***Review #5 Item Not Satisfied:*** The prior comment remains outstanding as the response states “Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage”. Please refer to TIS Comment #11 regarding the potential provision of separate turn lanes along Lutheran Road at its intersection with Swamp Pike.

12. The applicant must provide a schematic based upon the daily traffic anticipated to be generated by the development from the traffic study that shows the number of daily trips anticipated to utilize each roadway segment to classify the roads based upon the criteria in *Section 22-813 of the SALDO*. This will also then be utilized to verify that the specific geometric/design elements associated with each street have been implemented. Please note that if the Revised SALDO were utilized, this calculation would not be required. *Review #2 Waiver Requested:* The applicant has requested a waiver regarding the street classifications, see Item 6 on the Waiver Request Spreadsheet. However, it is noted the geometric design features determine the safety of the proposed residential streets. *Review #3 Waiver Requested:* The applicant has requested a waiver from these requirements. Please refer to Item 4 of the December 18, 2024 Waiver Request Letter or Item 5 on Sheet 2 of 119. It is recommended that if the waiver is granted, the geometric design features for the new residential access streets (horizontal and vertical) be designed to comply with the Engineering criteria in the *Section 22-816.8 of the latest SALDO*. *Review #4 Waiver Requested:* The applicant has requested waivers as noted in Review #2 (referenced as Items 1 and 3 of the December 18, 2024 Waiver Request Letter). We note that these waivers are now listed as Items 2 and 4 of the June 9, 2025 Waiver List and shown as Items 2 and 4 of the Requested Waivers Table on Sheet 2 of 124. It is recommended that if the waiver is granted, the geometric design features for the new residential access streets (horizontal and vertical) be designed to comply with the Engineering criteria in the *Section 22-816.8 of the latest SALDO*. Also, the residential street classifications are needed, even if a waiver is provided, to address Comment #3 regarding the clear sight triangle sizes per 27-1912 of the ZO. ***Review #5 Waiver Requested:*** These waivers are listed as Items 2 and 4 of the August 27, 2025 Waiver List and shown as Items 2 and 4 of the Requested Waivers Table on Sheet 2 of 124. We continue to recommend that if these waivers are granted, the geometric design features for the new residential access streets (horizontal and vertical) be designed to comply with the Engineering criteria in the *Section 22-816.8 of the latest SALDO*. Also, the residential street classifications are needed, even if a waiver is provided, to address Comment #3 regarding the clear sight triangle sizes per 27-1912 of the ZO.
13. *Section 22-813.5 of the SALDO* states “the cartway width shall be increased by eight feet where on-street parking is provided along one side of the street and by 16 feet where on-street parking is provided along two sides of the street. In addition to required off-street parking, on-street parking shall be provided along both

sides of residential streets where any lot is less than 20,000 square feet in area or any lot width is less than 100 feet." There are numerous lots that do not meet the lot size or width requirement, which would therefore require on-street parking on both sides of the proposed streets. It is noted the applicant has applied for a waiver from *Section 22-813.7.C.(1) of the SALDO* to reduce the minimum cartway width, without on-street parking, from 32 to 30 feet. With on-street parking, the minimum required cartway width would be either 48 or 46 feet, depending on if the waiver was granted. It is noted that the minimum required cartway width is 38 feet with on-street parking provided on both sides of the road according to *Section 22-816.2. of the Revised SALDO*. *Review #2 Waiver Requested: The applicant has requested a waiver from the cartway width, see Item 5 on the Waiver Request Spreadsheet.* *Review #3 Waiver Requested: Please refer to Item 4 of the December 18, 2024 Waiver Request Letter or Item 5 on Sheet 2 of 119.* *Review #4 Waiver Requested: Please refer to Item 5 of the June 9, 2025 Waiver List and Item 5 of the Requested Waiver Table on Sheet 2 of 124.* ***Review #5 Waiver Requested: Please refer to Item 5 of the August 27, 2025 Waiver List and Item 5 of the Requested Waiver Table on Sheet 2 of 124.***

14. Based upon the number of units, the daily traffic along sections of Road A, as well as Road J to the east of Road K in front of Lots 230 to 236 and Lots 289 to 295, would be classified as a Residential Major Collector roadway. *Review #3: This comment applies to Road A and Road C only based on the current plan, as Roads J and K were removed in the second plan set. The following code provisions are noted related to this type of roadway:*
 - A. *Section 22-813.8* states "this level of street is unsuitable for providing direct access to homes and such access to homes should be avoided". *Review #2 Waiver Requested: The applicant has requested a waiver from this section of the code, see Item 5 on the Waiver Request Spreadsheet for details on the applicable section of the Road. The applicant should provide calculations to denote the roadway daily traffic to confirm the proposed residential street classifications.* *Review #3 Waiver Requested: The applicant has requested a waiver to not base the residential streets on these classifications and if granted, then this section of the code would no longer apply. If the waiver is not granted, then this section would impact Road C only. Please refer to Item 4 of the December 18, 2024 Waiver Request Letter or Item 5 on Sheet 2 of 119.* *Review #4 Waiver Requested: The applicant has requested a waiver to not base the residential streets on these classifications and if granted, then this section of the code would no longer apply. If the waiver is not granted, then this section would impact Road C only. Please refer to Item 5 of the June 9, 2025 Waiver List and Item 5 of the Requested Waiver Table on Sheet 2 of 124.* ***Review #5 Waiver Requested: As noted in our prior review, the applicant has requested a waiver to not base the residential streets on these classifications and if granted, then this section of the code would no longer apply. If the waiver is not granted, then this section would impact Road C only. Please refer to Item 5 of the August 27, 2025 Waiver List and Item 5 of the Requested Waiver Table on Sheet 2 of 124.***
 - C. *Section 22-813.8.B of the SALDO* states "every major collector must be provided with no fewer than two access intersections to streets of equal or higher classification in the streets hierarchy". Lutheran Road and Reifsnnyder Road are both classified as either Minor Collector Roads or Local Roads according to *Section 27-1918.1.D of the ZO* and the existing cartway widths ($\pm$ 18 feet) are not adequate to support the traffic from the new street system (see Comment #11). *Review #2 Item Not Satisfied: The response notes a waiver was requested from this section, but this specific section is not included on the Waiver Request Spreadsheet. The applicant should provide calculations to denote the roadway daily traffic to confirm the proposed residential street classifications.* *Review #3 Waiver Requested: The applicant has requested a waiver to not base the residential streets on these classifications and if granted, then this section of the code would no longer apply. Please refer to Item 4 of the December 18, 2024 Waiver Request Letter or Item 5 on Sheet 2 of 119.* *Review #4 Waiver Requested: The applicant has requested a waiver to not base the residential streets on these classifications and if granted, then this section of the code would no longer apply. Please refer to*

*Item 5 of the June 9, 2025 Waiver List and Item 5 of the Requested Waiver Table on Sheet 2 of 124. **Review #5 Waiver Requested:** The applicant has requested a waiver to not base the residential streets on these classifications and if granted, then this section of the code would no longer apply. Please refer to Item 5 of the August 27, 2025 Waiver List and Item 5 of the Requested Waiver Table on Sheet 2 of 124.*

- D. The minimum required cartway width for this type of residential street is 36 feet and not 32 feet according to *Section 22-813.8.C of the SALDO*. The requested waiver does not account for the difference in the residential street classifications. *Review #2 Item Not Satisfied:* The response notes a waiver was requested from this section, but this specific section is not included on the Waiver Request Spreadsheet. The applicant should provide calculations to denote the roadway daily traffic to confirm the proposed residential street classifications. *Review #3 Waiver Requested:* The applicant has requested a waiver to not base the residential streets on these classifications and if granted, then this section of the code would no longer apply. Please refer to Item 4 of the December 18, 2024 Waiver Request Letter or Item 5 on Sheet 2 of 119. *Review #4 Waiver Requested:* The applicant has requested a waiver to not base the residential streets on these classifications and if granted, then this section of the code would no longer apply. Please refer to Item 5 of the June 9, 2025 Waiver List and Item 5 of the Requested Waiver Table on Sheet 2 of 124. **Review #5 Waiver Requested:** The applicant has requested a waiver to not base the residential streets on these classifications and if granted, then this section of the code would no longer apply. Please refer to Item 5 of the August 27, 2025 Waiver List and Item 5 of the Requested Waiver Table on Sheet 2 of 124.
- E. *Section 813.8.F of the SALDO* states "on-street parking shall be prohibited on major collector streets." It is not clear from the plans where the 110 on-street parking spaces referenced on Sheet 3 of 149 will be located (see Comment #1). *Review #2 Item Not Satisfied:* The response notes a waiver was requested from this section, but this specific section is not included on the Waiver Request Spreadsheet. The applicant should provide calculations to denote the roadway daily traffic to confirm the proposed residential street classifications. *Review #3 Waiver Requested:* The applicant has requested a waiver to not base the residential streets on these classifications and if granted, then this section of the code would no longer apply. Please refer to Item 4 of the December 18, 2024 Waiver Request Letter or Item 5 on Sheet 2 of 119. *Review #4 Waiver Requested:* The applicant has requested a waiver to not base the residential streets on these classifications and if granted, then this section of the code would no longer apply. Please refer to Item 5 of the June 9, 2025 Waiver List and Item 5 of the Requested Waiver Table on Sheet 2 of 124. **Review #5 Waiver Requested:** The applicant has requested a waiver to not base the residential streets on these classifications and if granted, then this section of the code would no longer apply. Please refer to Item 5 of the August 27, 2025 Waiver List and Item 5 of the Requested Waiver Table on Sheet 2 of 124.
15. The proposed new street plan and profile sheets will be further evaluated once the roadway classifications are determined (see Comment #12) for compliance with all geometric design details in accordance with *Section 22-813 of the SALDO*. A cursory review indicates that the profile for Road H on Sheet 100 of 149 has overlapping text around Station 21+50 that results in illegible text. *Review #2 Item Not Addressed:* The applicant has not provided information regarding the classification of the proposed internal roadways. The response indicates a waiver has been requested from the entirety of *Section 22-813 of the SALDO*, but only certain sections (813.2-5) have been requested based upon the Waiver Request Spreadsheet (see Item 5). *Review #3 Waiver Requested:* The applicant has requested a waiver from the roadway classifications, which if waived would impact the road design elements. Please refer to Item 4 of the December 18, 2024 Waiver Request Letter or Item 5 on Sheet 2 of 119. It is recommended that if the waiver is granted, the geometric design features for

the new residential access streets (horizontal and vertical) be designed to comply with the Engineering criteria in the Section 22-816.8 of the latest SALDO. It is noted the profile for Road C (see Sheet 71 of 119) does not have a tie-in elevation to Reifsnyder Road and the tie-in elevation for Road A (see Sheet 64 of 119) at Lutheran Road is not provided. Review #4 Waiver Requested: The applicant has requested a waiver from the roadway classifications, which if waived would impact the road design elements. Please refer to Item 5 of the June 9, 2025 Waiver List and Item 5 of the Requested Waiver Table on Sheet 2 of 124. It is recommended that if the waiver is granted, the geometric design features for the new residential access streets (horizontal and vertical) be designed to comply with the Engineering criteria in the Section 22-816.8 of the latest SALDO. As noted in our previous review, the profile for Road C (see Sheet 75 of 124) does not have a tie-in elevation to Reifsnyder Road. **Review #5 Waiver Requested:** The applicant has requested a waiver from the roadway classifications, which if waived would impact the road design elements. Please refer to Item 5 of the August 27, 2025 Waiver List and Item 5 of the Requested Waiver Table on Sheet 2 of 124. It is recommended that if the waiver is granted, the geometric design features for the new residential access streets (horizontal and vertical) be designed to comply with the Engineering criteria in the Section 22-816.8 of the latest SALDO. We note that the plans have been revised to provide a tie-in elevation grade/slope to Reifsnyder Road for the Road C profile (see Sheet 75 of 124), so this portion of the previous comment has been addressed.

17. Section 22-817.1.C of the SALDO states "driveways shall be so located, designed, and constructed as to provide a reasonable sight distance at intersections with stopping space not to exceed a 4% grade, 20 feet behind the right-of-way line". Please provide spot elevations and grade calculations to confirm compliance. Review #2 Item Not Addressed: The applicant's response letter indicates this information will be provided as part of the final land development plan submission. Review #3 Item Partially Addressed: The grading plans provided in this submission have been revised to include spot elevations for the proposed driveways; however, slope and distance labels are not provided. Considering the size of the development and the number of units proposed on the site, the plans must be revised to provide these labels to confirm all driveways meet this section of the code. Review #4 Item Partially Addressed: The June 11, 2025 response letter cites General Note #34 on Sheet 3 for compliance with driveway grades and notes that the Applicant has agreed no individual building permits will be issued until these individual building permit plans have been reviewed and approved by the Township Engineer prior to issuance of Building Permit. While the note is provided and it is understood that individual permits and future details will be provided, future waivers may be needed and applied for on an individual permit basis, which could require multiple approvals and meetings with the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. It is recommended that the requested details be provided as part of the land development plan process. Review #4 Item Partially Addressed: The June 11, 2025 response letter cites General Note #34 on Sheet 3 for compliance with driveway grades and notes that the Applicant has agreed no individual building permits will be issued until these individual building permit plans have been reviewed and approved by the Township Engineer prior to issuance of Building Permit. While the note is provided and it is understood that individual permits and future details will be provided, future waivers may be needed and applied for on an individual permit basis, which could require multiple approvals and meetings with the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. It is recommended that the requested details be provided as part of the land development plan process. **Review #5 Item Not Satisfied:** The prior comment remains outstanding and the response states "Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage".
19. Section 22-817.1.D of the SALDO states "driveways shall be at least five feet from any side or rear lot lines for single family lots". Please provide dimensions on the plans to confirm compliance. Review #2 Item Not Addressed: Although the applicant's response indicates that these dimensions have been provided, they are not shown on the plans. Review #3 Item Not Addressed: Dimensions have not been provided to confirm compliance. Review #4 Item Not Addressed: As noted in the response letter, the Typical Lot Layout (Sheet 2 of 124) reflects the minimum 5-foot requirement; however, we continue to recommend that dimensions be provided on the

plans, at a minimum where the minimum distance is provided, to help confirm compliance. It appears that the driveway for Lot 146 is not compliant (less than 4 feet). **Review #5 Item Not Satisfied: The prior comment remains outstanding and the response states "Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage". It is noted that Lot 146 is now Lot 145 and still appears to be non-compliant (less than 4 feet).**

22. Provide the corner sight distance triangles on the landscape plans for all proposed new street intersections, including those with existing streets to ensure compliance with *Section 22-818.A of the SALDO*. The distance from the edge of paving must also be labeled on the plans. It is noted that these triangles are missing for the intersections of Road A with Lutheran Road, Road A with Reifsnnyder Road, and Road K with Swamp Pike. Also, please confirm how the labeled "Proposed SSSD 300'" was determined on the record plans. Note the triangle size for intersecting streets is dependent on the roadway classifications, so please refer to Comment #12, and these triangles are not the same as those required in the ZO (see Comment #3). Review #2 Item Not Addressed: The requested sight distance triangles have not been provided as requested (see Sheets 87 to 93 of 129) and as shown on the Figure provided in *Section 818.A of the SALDO*. The required sight distance for the new residential streets is also dependent upon the classification of the proposed residential streets. (Review 3) Item Partially Addressed: The requested corner sight distance triangles appear to be provided on the Landscape Plan Sheets 77 to 84 of 119; however, there are no dimensions to confirm the offset from the edge of the intersecting roads or the distances to the left and right. These labels must be provided and permanent easements provided where these extend across residential lots to ensure any overhanging vegetation is maintained within 2 to 7 feet or planted in these areas in the future. Please check the proposed vegetation/trees in Lots 48, 49, 65, 66, 80, 87, 99, 100, 103, 106, 111, 112, 115, 135, 150 157, to make sure there are no conflicts with the corner sight distance triangles. Review 4 Item Partially Addressed: The requested corner sight distance triangles appear to be provided on the Landscape Plan Sheets 82 to 88 of 124; however, the requested dimensions to verify that the triangles meet the Township standards were not provided as requested. There appears to be overhanging vegetation within indicated sight lines for various Lots (Lots 48, 49, 58, 65, 66, 74, 80, 87, 100, 103, 106, 111, 112, 115, 134, 135, 150, and 157). In addition, verify the sight lines provided across Lot 58, 74, Lot 99, and Lot 103 as the sight lines across these Lots take up significant portions of the property. As previously noted, permanent easements are required where sight lines extend across the residential lots. **Review #5 Item Not Satisfied: The prior comment remains outstanding and the response states "Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage".**
23. Provide labels for all intersection street radii to confirm compliance with the minimum radius *Section 22-818.2 of the SALDO*. Turning templates for trash, delivery, and the largest emergency vehicle that will service the residential community are required at all intersections to ensure the minimum radius provided is acceptable. A profile of the vehicle is also required to be included on the plans that illustrates the vehicle name, length, width, etc. It is noted that emergency vehicle templates were provided for the internal roadway system, but it is not clear what type or size the vehicle is since there are no labels. Turning templates for all entering and exiting movements are also needed for all new proposed intersections, including those with Lutheran Road, Reifsnnyder Road, and Swamp Pike. If on-street parking is provided, then the turning templates must demonstrate that vehicles can safely maneuver around parked vehicles. Review #2 Item Not Addressed: The applicant's engineer has indicated this information is provided on the plans. However, the additional information requested, including curb radii labels, truck template profiles and dimensions, inclusion of all turning movements at all internal and site access intersection, and demonstration of truck maneuverability with consideration of on-street parked vehicles is not provided. A review of the turning templates provided on Sheets 41 to 49 and 129 of 129 indicates potential conflicts with the on-street parking. Furthermore, the scale of the WB-50 truck turning template provided on Sheet 129 of 129 is also not adequate to complete a review. Review #3 Item Not Addressed: Turning templates are provided on Sheets 30 to 37 and 119 of 119. However, these need to provide the details on the design vehicle shown, i.e., type, length, axle spacing, etc. The intersection radii labels are also still missing, as are turning templates at all intersections and parked vehicles are not illustrated along any of the

corresponding streets. There appears to be conflicts with the vehicle paths shown and where residents will be parking on-street. Furthermore, the scale of the WB-50 truck turning template provided on Sheet 119 of 119 (1" = 150') too small/not legible to review. Review #4 Item Not Addressed: Turning templates are illustrated on Sheets 30 to 37 of 124 and the plans have been revised to include the associated truck detail (WB-50). However, turning templates for all allowable movements at all intersections, which would also help identify any conflicts with potential parked vehicles, are not illustrated. There appears to be conflicts with the vehicle paths shown and where residents will be parking on-street on numerous roadway segments. Given the scale of the current plans and the additional turning movements that are missing and need to be added, the plans should be revised to provide all turning templates on separate truck circulation plans for clarity and ease of review and to ensure the Striping, Signage, & Circulation Plans are much clearer. **Review #5 Item Not Satisfied: The prior comment remains outstanding and the response states "Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage".**

24. The minimum intersection spacing along major collectors is 300 feet and 125 feet for minor collector or local roads according to Section 22-818.3 of the SALDO. Please refer to Comment #12 to determine the roadway classifications as the spacing along Road A between Lutheran Road and Road B, as well as along Road A between Road H and Reifsnyder Road are less than 300 feet. Review #2 Waiver Requested: The applicant has requested a waiver from this section of the code, see Item 6 on the Waiver Request Spreadsheet. It is noted the applicant has not indicated the locations and amount of relief requested on the spreadsheet. Review #3 Waiver Requested: The applicant has requested a waiver from this section of the code. Please refer to Item 5 of the December 18, 2024 Waiver Request Letter or Item 6 on Sheet 2 of 119. The waiver has been updated based on the current layout to allow for a spacing of 267 feet along Road C between Reifsnyder Road and Road B. Review #4 Waiver Requested: The applicant has requested a waiver from this section of the code. Please refer to Item 6 of the June 9, 2025 Waiver Request List and of the Requested Waiver Table on Sheet 2. The waiver is requested to allow for a spacing of 267 feet along Road C between Reifsnyder Road and Road B. **Review #5 Waiver Requested: The applicant has requested a waiver from this section of the code. Please refer to Item 6 of the August 27, 2025 Waiver Request List and of the Requested Waiver Table on Sheet 2. The waiver is requested to allow for a spacing of 267 feet along Road C between Reifsnyder Road and Road B.**
25. Section 22-822.1 of the SALDO states sidewalks shall be provided along both sides of existing and new streets in the R-25 zoning district. Sidewalks are to be provided at a minimum along the site frontage along Lutheran Road, Swamp Pike, Swamp Picnic Road, and Reifsnyder Road. Any curb ramps and pedestrian crossings for the new intersecting streets will need to be ADA compliant. Review #2 Waiver Requested: Sidewalk is provided on both sides of Road B between Sta 0+25 and Sta 31+00. However, sidewalk is only proposed on one side of the street on the remaining section of Road B (between Sta 31+00 and Sta 78+43) as well as Road A and Roads C through E. In addition, sidewalks are not provided along Reifsnyder Road, Swamp Picnic Road, or Lutheran Road; however, an eight-foot-wide paved path is proposed along the Lutheran Road site frontage. The applicant has requested a waiver from this section of the code, see Item 7 on the Waiver Request. Review #3 Item Addressed/Waiver Requested: Sidewalks are now provided along both sides of all new residential streets (see Sheets 30 to 37 of 119). A waiver has been requested to not provide sidewalks along both sides of Reifsnyder Road, Swamp Picnic Road, or Lutheran Road, where an eight-foot-wide paved path is proposed along the site frontage. Please refer to Item 6 of the December 18, 2024 Waiver Request letter or Item 7 on Sheet 2 of 119. Review #4 Waiver Requested: A waiver has been requested to not provide sidewalks along both sides of Reifsnyder Road, Swamp Picnic Road, or Lutheran Road (where an eight-foot-wide paved path is proposed along the site frontage). Please refer to Item 7 of the June 9, 2025 Waiver Request List and of the Requested Waiver Table on Sheet 2. **Review #5 Waiver Requested: A waiver is requested to not provide sidewalks along both sides of Reifsnyder Road, Swamp Picnic Road, or Lutheran Road (where an eight-foot-wide paved path is proposed along the site frontage). Please refer to Item 7 of the August 27, 2025 Waiver Request List and of the Requested Waiver Table on Sheet 2.**

26. Section 22-822.5 of the SALDO requires all sidewalks to provide for adequate and reasonable access for the safe and convenient movement of all people across curbs at all pedestrian crosswalks and to be constructed in accordance with PennDOT Design Manual, Part 2, or any amendments hereto and with PennDOT RC-67M Curb Ramps and Sidewalks Construction Details. Design details and C-4401 forms will be required as the project progresses to confirm compliance. Any ramps built that are not compliant will be the responsibility of the applicant to reconstruct. Review #2 Item Not Addressed: The applicant's engineer has indicated this information will be provided as part of the final plan submission. Review #3 Item Not Addressed: Comment remains as no additional information has been provided. Review #4 Item Not Addressed: Comment remains as no additional information has been provided. **Review #5 Item Not Satisfied: The prior comment remains outstanding and the response states "Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage".**
33. Indicate on the Striping, Signage & Circulation Plans where the Street Name, Speed Limit (R2-1) with proposed speed limit, Pedestrian Crossing (W11-2), Downward Diagonal Arrow (W16-7P), and No Parking (R8-3) signs illustrated on Sheet 147 of 149 will be located. Pedestrian Crossing and Downward Diagonal Arrow (W16-7P) signs should be provided along with ADA compliant ramps and crosswalks at all proposed street intersections where vehicles are not required to stop. Review #2 Item Not Addressed: Sheet 126 of 129 includes details for the Speed Limit, Pedestrian Crossing, Diagonal Downward Pointing Arrow, and Pedestrian Crossing Signs. However, the locations of these signs are not shown on the signing and striping plans (Sheets 40 through 49 of 129). In addition, the revised site layout appears to show new midblock pedestrian crossings at multiple locations that do not include continental striping for the crosswalk or ADA compliant ramps and landings, such as Road B Station 22+75, Road B Station 40+50, Road B Station 56+10, Road B Station 65+50, Road C Station 8+10, Road D Station 4+00. Review #3 Item Partially Addressed: The sign detail sheet referenced in Review #2 is now on Sheet 116 of 119. The locations of these signs are still not illustrated on the Striping, Signage & Circulation Plan Sheets 29 through 38 of 119. Continental striping is now illustrated where crosswalks are provided; however, there are missing crosswalks. The applicant must provide additional crossings along Road C at its intersections with Roads B, D, E, and F along with corresponding ADA ramps. Pedestrian Crossing (W11-2) and Downward Diagonal Arrow (W16-7P) signs at all proposed street intersections where vehicles are not required to stop, and where these crossings are located along horizontal or vertical curves, advance warning signs are to be provided. Review #4 Item Partially Addressed: The sign details associated with Street Names, Speed Limit, Pedestrian Crossing, and Downward Diagonal Arrow, and No Parking signs are shown on Sheet 121 of 124. The locations of the Pedestrian Crossing/Downward Diagonal Arrow signs are not included in the Sign Legend provided on Sheets 29 through 38 of 124 and may be represented by the new Sign Symbol 5. Pedestrian Crossing (W11-2)/Downward Diagonal Arrow (W16-7P) signs are not to be installed at Stop controlled locations, as these signs are only required where vehicles are not required to stop. Furthermore, where these crossings are located along horizontal or vertical curves, advance warning signs are to be provided, and sign details associated with the advance warning signs should also be added to the plans. **Review #5 Item Not Satisfied: The prior comment remains outstanding and the response states "Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage".**
35. There are details provided on Sheet 147 of 149 for two end curb treatment details. Please provide details as to where each one will be utilized. Review #2 Item Not Addressed: Sheet 126 of 129 continues to show the curb end treatment details, and there is no information provided on the plan regarding where they are proposed. The plans should be revised to remove the details if they are not proposed or call out where these treatments are proposed. Review #3 Item Not Addressed: Sheet 116 of 119 no longer includes curb end treatment details, which at a minimum would be required where the Road A curb radii ties into Lutheran Road and where the Road C radii ties into Reifsnyder Road. Ensure the plans include labels indicating the locations where the treatment will be more than one detail is proposed. Review #4 Item Partially Addressed: Sheet 37 of 124 has been revised to indicate 5-foot curb tapers where the Road C radii tie into Reifsnyder Road; however, no labels are provided

where the Road A curb radii ties into Lutheran Road (see Sheet 30 of 124). **Review #5 Item Not Satisfied: The prior comment remains outstanding and the response states "Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage".**

37. Section 22-834.2 of the SALDO states "all subdivisions and land developments shall be required to establish bike paths, bike lanes, and bike routes, unless waived by the Board of Supervisors. In lieu of establishing bike paths, bike lanes, and bike routes, as described herein, subject to the discretion of the Board of Supervisors, a fee may be paid by the applicant." No bike paths are proposed for the subject parcel. Please refer to the Township's *Bicycle and Pedestrian Trails Master Plan, Updated October 2015*, which illustrates a proposed Trail around the entire perimeter of the subject parcel except for Swamp Picnic Road. Review #2 Item Not Addressed: The plans do not show any proposed bicycle facilities; however, the response indicates the applicant will comply. Review #3 Item Not Addressed: No bicycle facilities are provided. Review #4 Item Not Addressed: No bicycle facilities are provided. The June 11, 2025 response letter notes that in lieu of bicycle facilities, the Applicant is proposing a trail along Lutheran Road as discussed with the Planning Commission. This item will remain outstanding until preliminary plan approval. Please confirm with the Township Solicitor if a waiver is needed for this item as none has been requested. **Review #5 Item Not Satisfied: The prior comment remains outstanding and the response states "Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage". Please indicate if the need for a waiver has been coordinated with the Township Solicitor.**
38. Please explain the intent of the five-foot wide asphalt path provided from Road H through the Open Space between Lots 37 and 38 to Swamp Picnic Road. Also, if this asphalt path is to remain, it is recommended that it not traverse through Lot 38. Review #2 Item Not Addressed: The plans have been revised to relocate this path between Lots 27 and 28 (see Sheet 46 of 129). Provide a label along with appropriate design details as to the trail connection that is Shown on Sheet 46 of 129 along Swamp Picnic Road. Review #3 Item Partially Addressed: The plans no longer reflect a path between Lots 27 and 28 connecting to Swamp Picnic Road, as there is only a 20-foot-wide trail easement (see Sheet 35 of 119). If the intent is to ultimately provide a trail in this area, then the applicant must do so, as this feature is to be installed as part of the development of the site and would need to be in-place prior to the construction of Lots 27 and 28. The associated easement documentation then needs to be prepared and provided to the Township Solicitor for review and approval. As this feature has been modified multiple times, it is recommended that the applicant discuss this with the Township Planning Commission and/or Board of Supervisors for direction. Review #4 Item Partially Addressed: The plans still indicate a 20-foot-wide trail easement (see Sheet 35 of 124) between Lots 27 and 28 connecting to Swamp Picnic Road). Bowman recommends that if the intent is to ultimately provide a trail in this area, then the applicant should do so, as it needs to be in-place prior to the construction of Lots 27 and 28 or some type of notice provided to those lot owners, so they are aware of the future trail connection between their lots. The June 11, 2025 response letter notes the easement location has been discussed with the Township and documentation will be provided at the final plan stage. **Review #5 Item Partially Addressed: The plans indicate a 20-foot-wide trail easement (see Sheet 2 and Sheet 35 of 124) between Lots 27 and 28 connecting to Swamp Picnic Road. According to the project discussion held at the Planning Commission meeting on September 10, 2025, this easement should be removed from the plans since a connection was requested from the site to the intersection of Swamp Picnic Road and Reifsnnyder Road (see Comment 53).**
40. The Street Pavement Section provided on Sheet 148 of 149 is compliant with the Township Standards for Local & Residential Streets. However, if the roadway classifications meet collector street requirements (see Comment #12), then an additional pavement cross-section will be required, and the plans will need to distinguish where each will be utilized. Review #2 Waiver Requested: The response indicates a waiver has been requested regarding the roadway classifications. Review #3 Waiver Requested: The Street Pavement Sections on Sheet 117 of 119 are compliant with Township Standards for Local & Residential Streets. The applicant has requested a waiver to not base the residential streets on sub-classifications. Please refer to Item 4 of the

December 18, 2024 Waiver Request Letter or Item 5 on Sheet 2 of 119. Review #4 Waiver Requested: The Street Pavement Sections on Sheet 122 of 124 are compliant with Township Standards for Local & Residential Streets. The applicant has requested a waiver to not base the residential streets on sub-classifications. Please refer to Item 5 of the June 9, 2025 Waiver Request List and of the Requested Waiver Table on Sheet 2. Review #5 Waiver Requested: **The Street Pavement Sections on Sheet 122 of 124 are compliant with Township Standards for Local & Residential Streets. The applicant has requested a waiver to not base the residential streets on sub-classifications. Please refer to Item 5 of the August 27, 2025 Waiver Request List and of the Requested Waiver Table on Sheet 2.**

41. Review #2: Provide a table summarizing the sight distance requirements and available sight distance that will be provided for Lots 172 to 175 along Lutheran Road. This information is required to confirm compliance with Section 817.1.C and Section 21-215.3. Review #3 Item Not Addressed: As noted in our previous review, provide a table summarizing the sight distance requirements and available sight distance for Lots 174 to 177 along Lutheran Road. A table should also be provided for the intersections of Lutheran Road with Road A and Reifsnyder Road with Road B. Review #4 Item Partially Addressed: Tables summarizing the sight distance requirements and available sight distance for Lots 174 to 177 along Lutheran Road are provided on Sheet 31 of 124 and for the two intersections on Sheets 30 and 37 of 124. Please also include the sight distance for a vehicle turning left into Lots 174 to 177 looking ahead and for a vehicle approaching from the rear along Lutheran Road. It is noted that intersection sight distance (ISD) is not required for individual lot driveways and can be removed from the table of Sheet 31. Please show the left-turn entry sight distance for the intersection of Lutheran Road and Road A on Sheet 30. **Review #5 Item Not Satisfied: The prior comment remains outstanding and the response states "Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage".**
44. Review #2: Provide additional details as to how the School Bus Staging Area illustrated on Sheet 48 of 149 along Road B near Reifsnyder Road will function and how this staging area was selected. It is noted there is no staging area provided along Road A near Lutheran Road on Sheet 41 of 149. Review #3 Item Not Addressed: The current plans still reflect a "School Bus Staging Area" on Sheet 37 of 119 on the south side of Road C near Reifsnyder Road. There are no details proposed for this staging area and as previously noted, no staging area is provided along Road A at its intersection with Lutheran Road. If the Township does not take dedication of the roads, then a staging area is needed in both locations. Review #4 Partially Not Addressed: The current plans still reflect a "School Bus Staging Area" on the south side of Road C near Reifsnyder Road. There are no details proposed for this staging area and as previously noted, no staging area is provided along Road A at its intersection with Lutheran Road. If the Township does not take dedication of the roads, then a staging area is needed in both locations. **Review #5 Item Not Satisfied: The prior comment remains outstanding and the response states "Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage".**
45. Review #2: Please coordinate with the Township Solicitor regarding the sight distance easements proposed for Lots 49, 58, 80, 74, 99, 133, and 134 according to sight distance triangles provided on Sheets 33 to 37 of 129 as there will need to be some type of deed restriction for these lots. Review #3 Item Not Addressed: The site layout for the internal roadways and lot numbering has been modified. Please coordinate with the Township Solicitor as some type of deed restriction for these lots will be required in addition to showing the easement areas on the record plans sheets (18 to 27). Easements will be required for the following Lots based upon the current plan layout: 48, 49, 58, 65, 74, 75, 75, 80, 99, 102, 103, 106, 115, 135, 150, 157, 163, 167, 168, and 173. Review #4 Item Partially Addressed: The June 11, 2025 response letter notes the need for easements will be discussed with the Board of Supervisors and once determined can be incorporated in the HOA declaration and documentation and/or part of the dedication process if desired. This item should continue to be discussed with the Township as some type of deed restriction for these lots will be required. As a reminder, easements will be required for the following Lots based upon the current plan layout: 48, 49, 58, 65, 74, 75, 80, 99, 102, 103, 106, 115, 135, 150,

157, 163, 167, 168, and 173. **Review #5 Item Not Satisfied:** The prior comment remains outstanding and the response states “Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage”.

47. *Review #2: Provide All-Way plaques in conjunction with Stop Signs where all-way stop-control is proposed. Review #3 Item Not Addressed:* These have not been provided as requested, as this type of control is shown at the intersection of Road A with Road B (see Sheet 31 of 119). A detail of the sign is also required indicating the type and size which should be provided on Sheet 116 of 119. *Review #4 Item Not Addressed:* These have not been provided as requested, as this type of control is shown at the intersection of Road A with Road B (see Sheet 31 of 119). A detail of the sign is also required indicating the type and size, which should be provided on Sheet 121 of 124. In addition, the plan set reflects a new hatch pattern at several roadway intersections: Road A/Road B, Road C/Road D, Road B/Road D, and Road B/Road C. Revise the plans to clarify what is proposed by the hatch pattern via labels, legends, construction details, etc., in order to verify of what is intended to be proposed is allowable and acceptable. **Review #5 Item Partially Addressed:** The All-Way plaques are still missing, and no sign detail is provided as previously requested. The Legend box on Sheets 29-38 has been revised to note that the hatched areas at the intersections of Road A/Road B, Road C/Road D, Road B/Road D, and Road B/Road C are proposed to be designed as raised intersections; however, the plans should be revised to clearly provide all necessary design information (e.g., typical sections, construction details, plan and profile sheets, etc.) in order to verify if the proposed raised intersection will be designed appropriately.
48. *Review #2 Illustrate the on-street parking locations to not only verify the number of spaces as indicated on Sheet 3 of 129 (i.e., 615 on-street parking spaces), but also that the truck turning templates will not conflict with areas where on-street parking is permitted. Review #3 Item Not Addressed:* Illustrate the on-street parking locations to not only verify the number of spaces provided as referenced on Sheet 3 of 119 (i.e., 615 on-street parking spaces) but also confirm the truck turning templates will not conflict with parked vehicles. *Review #4 Item Not Addressed:* While we recognize that the on-street parking is not required to meet the parking requirements and that “No Parking” signs have been provided along Road A, the plans should still confirm the truck turning templates will not conflict with anticipated future parked vehicles, at a minimum at all proposed development roadway intersections and along horizontal curves in order to identify parking restrictions to avoided vehicle conflicts. Additionally, Sheet 3 of 124 makes reference to providing 615 on-street parking spaces. If the number cannot be confirmed, then it should not be included in the table. **Review #5 Item Not Satisfied:** The prior comment remains outstanding and the response states “Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage”.
49. *Review #3* The waiver request numbering in the Table provided on Sheets 2 and 88 of 119 should be revised to be consistent with the Waiver Request Letter dated December 18, 2024. Also, the header above the table refers to “revised silte plan,” instead of “site.” *Review #4 Item Partially Addressed:* The header above the table on Sheet 2 has been revised to “site” instead of “silte” as previously shown. The waiver request numbering in the Table provided on Sheets 2 of 124 (secondary table previously shown on Sheet 88 no longer included) has been revised to be consistent with the Waiver Request List dated June 9, 2025 with the exception of Waivers #8 (21-241.1 & 2) and #9 (23-302.2.B.19), which are listed in reverse as #8 (23-302.2.B.19) and #9 (21-241-1 & 2) on the Sheet 2 table. **Review #5 Item Not Addressed:** The waiver request numbering in the Table provided on Sheets 2 of 124 is still not consistent with the updated Waiver Request List dated August 27, 2025.
50. *Review #3* General Note 18 on Sheet 3 of 119 notes the internal road rights-of-way are offered for dedication to New Hanover Township. The Board of Supervisors will need to determine if they accept dedication of the new roadways. *Review #4 Item Partially Satisfied:* General Note 18 on Sheet 3 of 124 continues to note the internal road rights-of-way are offered for dedication to New Hanover Township. **Review #5 Item Partially Satisfied:** This comment remains pending a decision from the Board of Supervisors.

51. Review #3 Please clarify if it is the intent to utilize a section of the Lutheran Church's parking lot on the west side of Lutheran Road to serve as part of the proposed 24-foot-wide cartway width. It is noted that the pavement type for the parking lot is not the same as the road and coordination with the Church may also be needed to do this as shown on Sheets 30 and 31 of 119. A shoulder line should be striped along the church lot to delineate the limits of the cartway for Lutheran Road. Review #4 Item Partially Satisfied: The plans have been revised to more clearly depict the intent to utilize a section of the Lutheran Church's parking lot on the west side of Lutheran Road to serve as part of the proposed 24-foot-wide cartway width and the widening detail has been provided, which matches the roadway pavement section. However, the Striping, Signage, & Circulation Plans (Sheets 29 through 38) should be revised to clearly label the shoulder line, color/width. Furthermore, as previously noted, coordination with the Lutheran Church is required given the impact of the roadway widening along their frontage. The specific documentation and requirements must be coordinated with the Township Solicitor. **Review #5 Item Not Satisfied: The prior comment remains outstanding and the response states "Will Comply, at Final Plan Stage".**
52. Review #3 Additional streetlights are to be provided to ensure that all pedestrian crosswalks are fully illuminated. The lighting plan on Sheet 90 of 119 shows low or no light level for the delineated crosswalks, which is a safety concern. Section 22-907.1 of the SALDO states the location of streetlights shall be in accordance with a plan approved by the developer and approved by the Board of Supervisors. Review #4 Item Not Addressed: Additional streetlights are to be provided to ensure that all pedestrian crosswalks are fully illuminated. The lighting plan on Sheet 92 of 124 continues to show low or no light level for the delineated crosswalks, which is a safety concern. Section 22-907.1 of the SALDO states the location of streetlights shall be in accordance with a plan approved by the developer and approved by the Board of Supervisors. The June 11, 2025 response letter notes the streetlights as were provided are consistent with the direction provided by the Planning Commission. Bowman notes the plans reflect no lighting for the pedestrian facilities at the following locations: the proposed trail connection at the southern side of Road A, the northern ramps/crossing along Road D at the intersection with Road H and that full coverage of the majority of the remaining ramps is not provided. **Review #5 Item Not Addressed: In accordance with the project discussion held at the Planning Commission meeting on September 10, 2025, the plans must be revised to enhance pedestrian lighting for the pedestrian crosswalks and also along select curved sections of the roadway network. Please ensure that the intersection and/or roadway segment details provided on Sheet 93 include the names of intersection Roads along with stationing to better locate these streetlights on the utility plans (Sheets 51-62), which currently do not appear to provide any electrical line connections to the streetlights. Bowman recommends that a streetlight be provided in all quadrants at every new intersection and along the following roadway segments: Road B near Lots 5/6 and 167/168; Road B near Lots 141/142 and 154/155; and Road C near Lot 101 and between Lots 127 and 128.**
53. Review 5: In accordance with the project discussion held at the Planning Commission meeting on September 10, 2025, the plans should be revised to provide a sidewalk connection from the intersection of Swamp Picnic Road/Reifsnyder Road and connect to the development (e.g., approximately in the vicinity of Lots 36/37).
54. Review 5: In accordance with the project discussion held at the Planning Commission meeting on September 10, 2025, the plans should be revised to provide a permanent swale between Swamp Picnic Road to the proposed drainage system adjacent to the back of Lot 27 to enhance stormwater runoff mitigation associated with Swamp Picnic Road.
55. Review 5: In accordance with the project discussion held at the Planning Commission meeting on September 10, 2025, the northern terminus of the proposed 8-foot paved path adjacent to Lutheran

Road should be revised so that the western edge of the turnaround connects to the 65-foot Legal Right-of-Way in order to allow for future connectivity to the network without the need to require additional property acquisition.

Transportation Impact Fee

In accordance with the New Hanover Township Impact Fee Ordinance as of the preliminary plan application date of April 28, 2022, any "new" weekday afternoon peak hour trips generated by development projects are subject to the Transportation Impact Fee, if located within the Transportation Service Area. The development project is located within the Transportation Service Area, which has an impact fee of **\$4,152.45** per "new" weekday afternoon peak hour trip.

The latest site plans, last revised August 27, 2025, proposed a total of 176 detached single-family homes. These new homes are projected to generate approximately **162** "new" weekday afternoon peak hour trips based the equations for Land Use Code 210: Single-Family Detached Housing from the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) publication, *Trip Generation Manual, 12th Edition*. As there is an existing golf course on-site, a trip credit is applicable for the redevelopment of the site. According to the applicant's traffic consultant (TPD), 20 of the 27 holes associated with the golf course are located within the development project, which would generate a total of **57** "new" trips during the weekday afternoon peak hour according to ITE Land Use Code 430 (Golf Course) from the *12th Edition*. This then reduces the total additional "new" trips for the development from 162 to **105**. The corresponding traffic **impact fee is then \$436,007.25**.

We trust that this review letter responds to your request and satisfactorily addresses the traffic issues at this time as related to the proposed development and the ordinances in place when the application was filed with the Township. Additional comments may be issued upon future submissions of the study or the plans. If the Township or applicant has any questions, or requires further clarification, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,



Sandy A. Koza, P.E., PTOE
Senior Project Manager

SAK/AV

cc: Michael G. Crotty, Esquire, Siana Law
Daniel E. Gray, Knight Engineering, Inc.
Matt Lubitz, Montgomery County Planning Commission
Artisan Land Company (Applicant)
Adam Brower, P.E., Edward B Walsh and Associates (Applicant's Engineer)
Matthew Hammond, P.E., TPD (Applicant's Traffic Engineer)

[https://us-partner-integrations.egnnyte.com/msoffice/wopi/files/bbf6647-878d-4b36-b5f8-cf63b2492f/WOPIServiceld_TP_EGNYTE_PLUS/WOPIDUserld_715.bowman.egnnyte.com/Greens at Gilbertsville #812 Review Letter #5 \(2026-01-30\).docx](https://us-partner-integrations.egnnyte.com/msoffice/wopi/files/bbf6647-878d-4b36-b5f8-cf63b2492f/WOPIServiceld_TP_EGNYTE_PLUS/WOPIDUserld_715.bowman.egnnyte.com/Greens%20at%20Gilbertsville%20#812%20Review%20Letter%20#5%20(2026-01-30).docx)

ATTACHMENT A

HISTORY OF PRIOR REVIEW COMMENTS

The following comments have been addressed as indicated from the prior traffic review letters dated June 23, 2022 (Review #1), October 16, 2023 (Review #2), and February 14, 2025 (Review #3).

Transportation Impact Study

1. Since access to this site is provided to/from Swamp Pike, which is a County Road, the transportation impact study (TIS) is recommended to also be reviewed by Montgomery County Roads and Bridges to obtain any further guidance and concurrence on the improvements proposed in the study. **Review #2 Comment Removed: Access is no longer proposed along Swamp Pike, as illustrated on Sheet 2 of the land development plans.**
2. Table 3 in the study indicates intersection peak hours starting prior to 4:00 PM, yet the text above the table indicates the counts were conducted from 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM. Please address this discrepancy, as the counts in the appendix were from 6:00 AM to 9:00 AM and 3:00 PM to 7:00 PM. Also, as the start of the afternoon peak hour varied from 3:00 PM to 4:30 PM indicate if any balancing of the intersection volumes was conducted prior to analysis. **Review #2 Item Satisfied: The study has been revised to provide the traffic count peak hour information in Table 4 (pdf page 11 of 456 of the study), and the preceding paragraph (pdf page 10 of 456 of the study) was updated to revise the count time period to be from 6:00 AM to 10:00 AM and 3:00 PM to 7:00 PM.**
4. The following comments relate to the projections utilized to develop the future without and with-development peak hour traffic volumes:
 - A. The study is to be revised to include the following development projects within the Township:
 - 1) Hanover Meadows
 - 2) Trotter's Gait
 - 3) Pacer's Court**Review #2 Item Satisfied: Based upon discussions with the Township, the Pacer's Court project is no longer an active project. Traffic associated with the Hanover Meadows and Trotter's Gait projects are included in the future traffic projections shown in Appendix D.**
 - B. The Town Center project is no longer proposed to be developed in Phases. Please contact the Township for the latest information on the project. It is also recommended that a supplemental analysis be completed without the completion of the Town Center or any of its roadway improvements to determine if the proposed project is viable without the potential improvements if they are delayed.
Review #2 Item Not Satisfied: The traffic study continues to include Phase 1 of the Town Center project, which is no longer included in the recently revised traffic study for Town Center. Furthermore, the analysis has not been revised to provide a supplemental analysis which does not include the Town Center or any of its improvements. **Review #4 Item Satisfied: The July 2025 has been updated to include an evaluation of the intersection of Swamp Pike with North Charlotte Street (SR 0663) both without and with the first phase of the Town Center. The evaluation without the Town Center and its improvements to the intersection of Swamp Pike with North Charlotte Street (SR 0663) does not result in any drops in the levels of service (overall or by lane group) with no improvements from base to projected development conditions.**
5. The planned projects section is missing the County Bridge replacement projects along Swamp Pike to the east of Lutheran Road and to the east of New Hanover Square Road, as well as the Lutheran Road bridge replacement project, which are all scheduled to occur within the next two years. Additionally, there are signal equipment and operations improvements planned for the intersection of Swamp Pike and New Hanover Square Road that are not referenced. It is noted that Appendix H does include a copy of the future signal

permit plan, but under current conditions, the signal is not coordinated and the timings on the plan have not yet been implemented. These timings should only be utilized for the future conditions. Review #2 Item Not Satisfied: *The Scheduled Roadway Improvements section (pdf page 12 of 456) does not include the proposed County bridge replacement projects along Swamp Pike to the east of Lutheran Road or the recently completed County bridge replacement project for the Lutheran Road bridge that resulted in the widening of the bridge. Additionally, the existing conditions analysis still utilizes the proposed traffic signal timings at the Swamp Pike/New Hanover Square Road intersection (pdf pages 204 and 222 of 456).* **Review #4 Item Satisfied: The Scheduled Roadway Improvements section of the July 2025 study has been updated to reflect the current status of the various projects in the area, including the bridge replacement/rehabilitation projects. The existing signal timings have been revised to reflect the current signal plan Maximum 1 timings and set to semi-actuated, uncoordinated.**

6. The study analysis for the intersection of Swamp Pike/Proposed Site Access is based on the access being a right-in/right-out only access, yet the land development plans do not reflect any geometric restrictions that would restrict left-turn entering and exiting movements at this intersection. Please confirm with the applicant how this intersection will function and if it is to be right-in/right-out only, then additional geometric recommendations are required to restrict the left-turning movements. **Review #2 Comment Removed: The Swamp Pike access has been removed from the plan.**
7. Verify the referenced posted speed limits in Table 1 and that the posted speeds are then utilized in analysis worksheets. The referenced posted speeds utilized in the analysis for Swamp Pike, North Charlotte Street (S.R. 0663), and New Hanover Square Road do not appear to be consistent with field conditions. **Review #2 Item Satisfied: The speed limits have been corrected in Table 1 (pdf page 7 of 456) and in the corresponding analysis worksheets.**
8. The clearance timings for Phase 4+8 at the intersection of Swamp Pike and North Charlotte Street (S.R. 0663) are not consistent with one another. Please update the analysis worksheets for all time periods and conditions. **Review #2 Item Satisfied: The analysis worksheets in Appendix H (pdf pages 193 to 389) have been updated to reflect the correct clearance times.**
9. Verify the turn lane storage lengths and tapers used in the analysis at the intersection for the Swamp Pike and North Charlotte Street (S.R. 0663) intersection under existing conditions as the lengths and tapers do not appear to be consistent with the permit plan or aerials of the lane striping. Also, for the future conditions, a copy of the permit plan utilized for the analysis with the revised storage areas should be provided for reference for the analysis scenario with completion of the Town Center intersection improvements. For the analysis scenario without completion of the Town Center, the signal permit plan utilized should reflect the signal permit plan based upon the planned improvements that are being implemented as part of the PA 663 Culvert Project by PennDOT. Review #2 Item Not Fully Satisfied: *The existing lane storage lengths in the analysis have been revised to match the existing storage lengths in Appendix H. However, the bay taper lengths have not been adjusted in any of the analysis scenarios, and the lane storage lengths in the future analysis cannot be confirmed since the proposed traffic signal plan is not provided for review. As noted above, an analysis without the Town Center improvements has also been requested to determine the projects impacts to the intersection.* **Review #4 Item Satisfied: The bay taper for the southbound left-turn lane along North Charlotte Street (SR 0663) has not been revised from 25 to 75 feet based on the widening associated with the SR 663 culvert replacement project. Additionally, the signal timings utilized in the future do not reflect the green or clearance intervals that were implemented during the PA 663 Culvert Project by PennDOT. As the changes in the bay taper length will not impact the analysis results, the difference in the green**

times is a result of the optimization of the intersection that is typically required in a traffic impact study, and the clearance intervals would be revised to reflect an increase of 1 second in the all-red timings that will also not substantially change the intersection evaluation results, Bowman is not requesting the update to the intersection evaluation that was conducted in the July 2025 study. The supplemental evaluation of the intersection of Swamp Pike with North Charlotte Street (SR 0663) without completion of the Town Center or any of its improvements to this signalized intersection as presented in the July 2025 study does not indicate any drops in the levels of service (overall or by lane group) from the base to projected with development conditions.

10. The right-turn lane warrant analysis worksheets at the intersection of Reifsnyder Road and the Site Access are missing for the weekday afternoon peak hour analysis. Please provide these worksheets. **Review #2 Item Satisfied:** The right-turn lane warrant worksheet for the weekday afternoon peak hour for this intersection has been provided in Appendix K.
12. The signal warrant evaluation for the intersection of Swamp Pike and Lutheran Road includes an evaluation of the crash warrant, but no crash information is provided or summarized in Appendix I. Please include this information as part of the warrant evaluation. **Review #2 Item Satisfied:** Based on Table 3 (pdf page 10 of 456), the crash data provided indicates that the crash traffic signal warrant is not satisfied.
13. According to *Section 27-2405.H* of the ZO all roadways and/or intersections showing a level of service of D, E, or F and volume/capacity ratios equal to 1.0 shall be considered deficient and specific recommendations for the elimination of these problems shall be listed. At the intersection of Swamp Pike and Reifsnyder Road/Rosenberry Road, during the 2027 future conditions with development, the stop controlled northbound Rosenberry Road shared left/through lane operates at LOS D and F during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours, respectively, while the southbound Reifsnyder Road approach operates at LOS F conditions during both peak hours. During the weekday afternoon peak hour, the volume/capacity ratio is also over 1.0 for the stop controlled southbound Reifsnyder Road approach. These conditions are also projected during the 2032 design year and the overall level of service for the intersection also deteriorates to LOS D during the weekday afternoon peak hour. The projected delays for traffic exiting Reifsnyder Road onto Swamp Pike range from 426 to 564 seconds per vehicle in the weekday afternoon peak hour.

The study does not currently provide any improvement recommendations for the intersection as it is noted that traffic signal warrants are not met and due to the presence of existing residential homes along Reifsnyder Road at its intersection with Swamp Pike, it is not feasible to provide geometric improvements. The study recommendations in Table II on page iii (page 4 of 390) states the recommendation is to “work with New Hanover Township 14 of the TIS that it will work with New Hanover Township to determine feasible improvements at the intersection to improve side street operations, which are deficient with or without the Proposed Development”. McMahon notes that according to Table 11 on page 11 (15 of 390), the without development level of service is at an acceptable level during the weekday morning (LOS C) and in the weekday afternoon the existing operates at LOS E and the without does operate at LOS F. However, the increase in the delay is over five (5) times the delay under without-development conditions.

As traffic will exit onto Swamp Pike via Reifsnyder Road, mitigation measures are required to address this situation. It is recommended that the applicant set-up a meeting with New Hanover Township and Montgomery County Roads and Bridges, once they have also reviewed the study, to discuss the operations at this intersection as movement restrictions may need to be implemented and traffic transferred to other Swamp Pike intersections, such as Lutheran Road.

Review #2 Item Not Satisfied: The trip generation characteristics of the site have been reduced due to the reduction in the number of units proposed on the site. Furthermore, the removal of the Swamp Pike site access also changes the delays experienced at the Swamp Pike/Reifsnyder Road intersection in the future with development conditions. However, this intersection continues to experience unmitigated delays along northbound Rosenberry Road and southbound Reifsnyder Road due to the proposed development, especially during the weekday afternoon peak hour. Our office continues to recommend the applicant set up a meeting with New Hanover Township and Montgomery County Roads and Bridges, once they have also reviewed the study, to discuss the operations at this intersection. If mitigation measures cannot be provided at this intersection, then the intersection of Swamp Pike and Lutheran Road may need to be improved to allow for all southbound left-turn and/or egress movements from Reifsnyder Road to be made via Lutheran Road with a physical restriction on the southbound left-turning vehicles implemented at the Swamp Pike and Reifsnyder Road intersection.

Review #4 Item Satisfied: A coordination meeting was held on November 27, 2023 between the applicant's traffic consultant (TPD), Bowman, Montgomery County Roads and Bridges, and PennDOT to discuss the projected operations of the Swamp Pike and Reifsnyder Road/Rosenberry Road intersection. The meeting minutes are included in Appendix A of the July 2025 study. The updated study also included an alternative evaluation of this intersection and the intersection of Swamp Pike with New Hanover Square Road based upon distributing a portion of the traffic that would potentially turn left from Reifsnyder Road to Swamp Pike to utilize the Laurel Field roadway, which will link Colonial Drive to Harvest Drive and provide for a connection to allow this traffic to utilize the signal at Swamp Pike with New Hanover Square Road to make this left-turn movement. The evaluation did result in a reduction of the delay; however, the deficient levels of service would still exist. The study also provided a signal warrant evaluation at the intersection of Swamp Pike with Reifsnyder Road/Rosenberry Road, which did not meet the criteria for installation of a traffic control signal.

Upon further review of the analysis results, while the levels of service results are LOS D, E, or F, the corresponding v/c (volume to capacity) ratios are not equal to or greater than 1.0. As a result, it is Bowman's opinion that the results do not meet the criteria in the *Zoning Ordinance* for a variance. The applicant has met the traffic study requirements by providing an additional evaluation of the off-site intersection. It is also noted the applicant will be contributing towards the Township's Act 209 Impact Fee.

14. Provide copies of the Synchro files with the revised study for verification of all analysis inputs and confirmation of the future operations. Review #2 Item Not Satisfied: The Synchro files were not included in the information provided to our office. **Review #4 Item Satisfied:** The Synchro files were provided with the July 2025 report submission.

Preliminary Land Development Plan

6. The Blanket Easement Note on Sheet 3 of 149 refers to Upper Pottsgrove Township. Please revise the note to refer to New Hanover Township. **Review #2 Item Satisfied:** The Blanket easement note on Sheet 3 of 129 has been revised as requested.
7. Label the existing legal and ultimate right-of-way lines for all existing streets (Swamp Pike, Lutheran Road, Reifsnyder Road, and Swamp Picnic Road) bordering the site in accordance with Section 22-305.4.A(3). Review #2 Item Partially Satisfied: The existing legal right-of-way has been labeled for the Lutheran Road frontage (see

*Sheets 30 and 31 of 129), and the existing and proposed right-of-way is labeled on the Reifsnyder Road site frontage on (see Sheets 36 and 37 of 129). However, the right-of-way lines along Swamp Picnic Road should be labeled on Sheets 35 and 36 of 129 to differentiate between the existing legal right-of-way and ultimate right-of-way, and the Swamp Pike site frontage is no longer shown on the plans, but as it is an abutting roadway to the overall site, would be required to be labeled. **Review #3 Item Partially Satisfied:** The existing legal right-of-way and ultimate right-of-way lines along Swamp Picnic Road have not been labeled on Sheets 24 and 25 of 119. **Review #4 Item Satisfied:** The existing legal right-of-way and ultimate right-of-way lines along Swamp Picnic Road have now been labeled on Sheets 24 and 25 of 124.*

8. The typical lot layout detail provided on Sheet 2 of 149 shows an 8-foot-wide grass strip separating the 4-foot-wide sidewalk from the 30-foot-wide curbed roadway with a legal right-of-way width of 54 feet. The typical lot layout detail provided on Sheet 30 of 149 shows a 4-foot-wide grass strip separating the 4-foot-wide sidewalk from the 30-foot-wide curbed roadway with a legal right-of-way width of 54 feet. The detail provided on Sheet 148 of 149 illustrates a 6.5-foot-wide driveway apron separating the 4-foot-wide sidewalk from the 30-foot-wide curbed roadway with a legal right-of-way width of 50 feet for Road A and 54 feet for all other roads. *Section 22-822 of the SALDO* references a minimum sidewalk width of four feet with a minimum four-foot-wide planting strip between the curb and the sidewalk along all streets. Based on the proposed legal right-of-way shown in the detail on Sheet 148 of 149 the 50-foot-wide legal right-of-way would not permit the full sidewalk width from being included within the right-of-way, unless it is based on the detail provided on Sheet 30 of 149. Please note *Section 22-828.2.B and C of the Revised SALDO* requires a verge width of eight (8) feet and a minimum sidewalk width of five (5) feet, respectively, and that the sidewalks and verges be within the ultimate right-of-way (*Section 22-828.1.A of the Revised SALDO*). **Review #2 Item Partially Satisfied:** The typical lot layouts on Sheet 2 of 129 are consistent with the applicant's recommended cartway widths (travel lanes with parking lanes and/or landscaped median), grass verge and sidewalk width within a 59-foot right-of-way, while the typical lot layout on Sheet 30 from the prior plan set has been removed. However, the Access Road Cross Section provided on Sheet 127 of 129 does not show the verge or sidewalk areas adjacent to the proposed roadways. Please update this cross-section to be consistent with the others for the site. **Review #3 Item Partially Satisfied:** The typical lot layouts are illustrated on Sheets 2 and 18 of 119, which are consistent with the applicant's recommended roadway cross-section. However, the Typical Lot Layout on Sheet 18 of 119 does not illustrate the front facing garage option illustrated on Sheet 2 of 119. The Access Road Cross Section provided on Sheet 117 of 119 still does not show the verge or sidewalk areas adjacent to the proposed roadways and references Road B instead of Road C. **Review #4 Item Partially Satisfied:** The typical lot layouts illustrated on Sheets 2 and 18 of 124 have been revised to be consistent. While the Access Road Cross Section provided on Sheet 122 of 124 been revised to reference Road B instead of Road C and now shows the sidewalk area and dimensions, the grass/verge area adjacent to the roadway is not labeled/dimensioned. Ensure the verge area is labeled and dimensioned accordingly. **Review #5 Comment Satisfied:** Sheet 122 has been revised to remove the Access Road Cross Section for Roads A and C, since they are no longer needed as the Typical Road Cross Section will be used for all roadways and the area labeled as the Driveway Apron would be grass/verge area where a driveway is not provided.
9. There are 66 dwelling units proposed along Road J to the east of Road K, where there are no other access or connections provided for these units. As such, the section of Road J to the east of Road K functions as a single-access street and *Section 22-809.5 of the SALDO* states "proposed single access streets are prohibited", which is consistent with *Section 22-812.5 of the Revised SALDO*. Single access streets are only referenced for new residential (minor) local roads and the maximum permitted average daily trips (ADT) at the intersection with the through street is 200 (see *Section 22-813.6.F of the SALDO*). Based upon the *Revised SALDO*, the

maximum number of homes would be limited to ten (10) dwelling units (see Section 22-816.7.A). **Review #2 Comment Removed:** The plan has been revised to eliminate the previously proposed single access street.

14. Based upon the number of units, the daily traffic along sections of Road A, as well as Road J to the east of Road K in front of Lots 230 to 236 and Lots 289 to 295 would be classified as a Residential Major Collector roadway. The following code provisions are noted related to this type of roadway:
 - B. Section 22-813.8.A.(3) states “whenever possible, major collector streets shall be designed to have no residential lots directly fronting on them” and “when this is not possible, the amount of residential frontage shall not exceed the limits set forth”, which is based on a chart that limits the percentage of lots that can front on the collector roadway based on its length. This section also states, “only lots having frontages of 100 feet or greater may front on major collector streets” and the lots referenced in this section of Road J do not meet this criterion. The lots along the other streets that also meet this classification will need to be reviewed once the information is provided by the applicant regarding the street classifications (see Comment #12). **Review #2 Comment Removed:** The referenced street section is no longer proposed.
16. Section 22-817.1.A of the SALDO states “driveways shall not be located less than 40 feet from any street intersection”. Provide dimensions for the following driveways: Lots 17, 20, 21, 24, 25, 28, 54, 58, 140, 141, 196, 230, and 284 to confirm if the minimum spacing has been provided. **Review #2 Item Partially Addressed:** The layout of the development has been revised and the corresponding lot numbers in the original comment have changed. However, it appears that the proposed driveways for Lots 36 and 160 should be relocated so they comply with the code requirements. **Review #3 Item Partially Addressed:** The layout of the development has been revised and the corresponding lot numbers in the original comment are no longer valid. To confirm compliance, the plan must include dimensions from the centerline of the intersecting streets for the following lots at a minimum: Lot 147 on Sheet 32 of 119; Lots 10, 14, and 17 on Sheet 33 of 119; Lot 36 on Sheet 36 of 119; and Lot 23 on Sheet 35 of 119. **Review #4 Item Addressed:** The layouts for the noted lots were revised to ensure the minimum of 40-foot distance is provided between the driveways, which was historically measured from the centerline of the nearest intersecting street to the centerline of the driveways since it was not clearly defined in the version of the SALDO that the plans must follow.
18. The applicant will need to demonstrate that there will be safe sight distance for vehicles exiting from Lots 38, 51, 113, 122, 123, 221, 252, 253, 254, 255, 263, and 264. Sight distance easement area within the lots or adjacent lots may be required to ensure that there are no visual obstructions, such as vegetation or structures, which would restrict the minimum safe sight distance, as Section 22-817.1.C of the SALDO states “driveways shall be so located, designed, and constructed as to provide a reasonable sight distance at intersections”. **Review #2 Comment Removed:** The street layout of the development has been revised to eliminate the horizontal curves, which previously limited sight distance at the noted lot driveways and all lots over 175 have been removed from the development plan.
20. Section 22-817.1.E of the SALDO requires driveways to have a minimum curb cut and width at the street line of 10 feet and a maximum curb cut and width of 20 feet at the street line. Please provide dimensions on the plans to confirm compliance. **Review #2 Item Partially Addressed:** The typical lot layouts on Sheet 2 of 129 appear to be compliant with the exception of the Lutheran Road Typical Lot, which is missing the dimensions to verify compliance. **Review #3 Item Partially Addressed:** The typical lot layouts are illustrated on Sheets 2 and 18 of 119. The Lutheran Road lot layout is missing the dimension for the driveway width and the layouts on Sheet 18 of 119 does not illustrate the front facing garage option illustrated on Sheet 2 of 119. **Review #4 Item**

Addressed: The Lutheran Road lot layout (see Sheet 2 of 124) now reflects the missing dimension for the driveway width. The layouts on Sheet 18 of 119 illustrate the front facing garage option illustrated on Sheet 2 of 119.

21. *Section 22-818.1.A of the SALDO* states “whenever a proposed street intersects an existing or proposed street of higher order in the street hierarchy, the street of lower order shall be made a stop street”. Provide stop signs and stop bars for the approaches noted below:
- A. Road A at its intersection with Lutheran Road (see Sheet 43 of 149)
 - B. Road A at its intersection with Reifsnyder Road (see Sheet 51 of 149)
 - C. Road K at its intersection with Swamp Pike (see Sheet 53 of 149)
 - D. At all off-street parking lot approaches to proposed streets within the site.
- Review #2 Item Addressed:** Stop signs and bars are provided on all minor street approaches on Sheets 41 to 49 of 129.
27. The Grading Notes 11 and 15 on Sheet 64 of 149 refer to a maximum allowable cross slope of 2.08% for the ramps. However, the maximum allowable is 2.00%. Also Grading Note 15 refers to “Sheet XX FOR MORE DETAILS”. Please update the notes and indicate the referenced Sheet. Review #2 Item Partially Addressed: *Grading Note 11 has been updated on Sheet 50 of 129, but not Grading Note 15, which is related to providing 5’ by 5’ turning areas every 200 feet along the proposed sidewalks. This comment may no longer be applicable as the sidewalk width proposed is now 5 feet wide.* Review #3 Item Partially Addressed: *Grading Note 11 and 15, which are now on Sheet 39 of 119, are the same as referenced in Review #2. Please update or remove Note 15 as previously requested.* **Review #4 Item Addressed:** Grading Note 15 regarding 5’ by 5’ turning areas, has been removed as requested from Sheet 39 of 124 as it does not apply.
28. To ensure that there is adequate maneuverability per *Section 22-823.5.I of the SALDO*, which states “dead-end parking areas shall be designed to provide sufficient area for backing and turning movements for the end stalls of the parking area”, provide vehicle turning templates for the following parking lots: Road A at Station 21+00, Road B at Station 29+00, Road H at Station 5+00, Road K at Station 1+75, and Road J at Station 54+00. Additionally, the radii must also be labeled within these lots to confirm compliance with *Section 22-823.5.J of the SALDO*, which requires a minimum five-foot radius of creature for all curblines in parking areas. **Review #2 Comment Removed:** The layout of the site has been revised to remove all off-street parking lots.
29. *Section 22-823.7 of the SALDO* states parking lots with less than 20 spaces shall not have a grade exceeding 5%. Provide elevation points and dimensions on the grading plans to confirm compliance. **Review #2 Comment Removed:** The layout of the site has been revised to remove all off-street parking lots.
30. According to *Section 22-823.5.Q of the SALDO*, entrance and exit accessways crossing the street line shall be limited to one accessway along the frontage of any single street. The parking lot along Road C between Stations 2+25 and 4+25 does not meet this requirement (see Sheet 44 of 149). **Review #2 Comment Removed:** The layout of the site has been revised to remove all off-street parking lots.
31. Lots 49 and 50 do not have direct access to Road H, instead a shared cartway (unknown width) is provided for these homes that is separated from Road H by a centralized median. It is unclear from the details provided on the plan if this shared cartway is restricted to one-way movements as no signage is provided and the cartway width is not labeled (see Sheet 50 of 149). Additional design details for this shared cartway are required including the centerline radius, vehicle templates demonstrating that delivery vehicles, such as UPS or Fed Ex

can access the driveways, as well as confirmation from the Township's Fire Marshall that there is adequate access for fire truck hoses and/or ladders to reach the homes in the event of an emergency. Also, additional coordination with the post office will be required, which should be coordinated with the Township Police and Fire Marshall to determine if a new street name will be assigned to the homes along the shared cartway rather than the Road J Street Name. In addition, the applicant must provide additional details regarding the responsibility for the shared cartway for snow removal and other routing maintenance activities. **Review #2 Comment Removed: The lots are no longer proposed with the revised plan layout in this location.**

32. Lots 270, 271, and 272 do not have direct access to Road J, instead a 15-foot wide shared cartway is provided for these homes that are separated from Road J by a centralized median. It is unclear from the details provided on the plan if this shared cartway is restricted to one-way movements as no signage is provided (see Sheet 55 of 149). Additional design details for this shared cartway are required including the centerline radius, vehicle templates demonstrating that delivery vehicles, such as UPS or Fed Ex can access the driveways, as well as confirmation from the Township's Fire Marshall that there is adequate access for fire truck hoses and/or ladders to reach the homes in the event of an emergency. Also, additional coordination with the post office will be required, which should be coordinated with the Township Police and Fire Marshall to determine if a new street name will be assigned to the homes along the shared cartway rather than the Road J Street Name. In addition, the applicant must provide additional details regarding the responsibility for the shared cartway for snow removal and other routing maintenance activities. **Review #2 Comment Removed: The layout of the site has been revised to remove these areas from the plan.**
34. The designer should provide additional details for the proposed culverts on Road J (Sheets 66, 67, 103, and 104 of 149), including calculations indicating if guiderail will be required. If guiderail is required in these locations, additional design details will be necessary. **Review #2 Comment Removed: The layout of the site has been revised to remove Road J and the referenced culverts and guiderails.**
36. The detail for the proposed Contech O-Series Arch on Sheet 148 of 149 is incomplete. **Review #2 Comment Removed: The plans have been revised to remove this detail as this feature is no longer proposed.**
39. A detail is provided on Sheet 148 of 149 for a 5' by 5' Passing Area for the sidewalks. However, these passing areas are not illustrated on any of the plans. Instead of providing passing areas, it is recommended that the sidewalk widths be increased from 4 to 5 feet so that these passing areas are not needed and to comply with current sidewalk width standards within *Section 22-828.2.C of the Revised SALDO*. **Review #2 Item Not Addressed: The plans have been revised to provide five-foot wide sidewalks. Please remove the Passing Area detail from Sheet 127 of 129 and reference it on the Grading Note 15 on Sheet 50 of 129. Review #3 Item Not Addressed: The plans still show a Passing Area detail on Sheet 117 of 119 and reference the passing area in the Grading Note 15 on Sheet 39 of 119. As the sidewalks are all proposed as 5 feet wide, these need to be removed from the plan set. Review #4 Item Addressed: The Construction Detail Plans have been revised to eliminate the previously shown Passing Area detail shown on Sheet 122 of 124 and the passing area note previously indicated under Grading Note 15 on Sheet 39 of 124 has also been removed as these areas are no longer applicable.**
42. **Review #2: Please indicate where curves CC37 to CC40 are located on the plan as these curves are referenced on Sheet 39 of 129 and could not be found on the proposed roadway alignments on Sheets 30 to 38. If the referenced curves have been removed, then they should be removed from the table. Review #3 Item Partially Addressed: The design and layout of the internal roadway system has been revised. An updated review of the road alignment on Sheets 19 to 26 of 119 and the corresponding Road Centerline Data on Sheet 28 of 119 has**

been conducted. Clarify if CC16 and CC17 are separate from CC18, as Sheet 23 of 119 illustrates all three curves in the same area and the labels for CC16 and CC18 in the same spot along Road C. Clarify if both CC21 and CC22 are both needed as these are shown in the same spot along Road B on Sheet 24 of 119. The Road Centerline Data includes information for CC30, but this curve could not be found on the prior sheets, please provide its location. **Review #4 Item Addressed:** The curve information shown on the road alignment sheets (Sheet 18 to 28) and the Road Centerline Data on Sheet 28 of 124 have been revised to address previous comments.

43. Review #2: If the subdivided parcel labeled as Phase V Future Submission is to be its own parcel separate from the Greens at Gilbertsville, then the applicant should not include a Phase number for it associated with the Greens at Gilbertsville phasing. If included as part of the overall development plan, then the applicant would then be required to account for this phase as part of the overall master plan transportation impact study for the site and additional information as to the timing of this phase would need to be provided to the Township. Please clarify the intent of this parcel. Review #3 Item Partially Addressed: The latest plan set reflects three phases (see Sheet 88 of 119) with two phases of the project on the north side (prior had four) of Minister Creek and with Phase III Future Submission labeled for the south side (prior Phase V). If the southern parcel is not a part of the development for Greens at Gilbertsville, then it should not be referenced or included on the plans or with any phase number. As it is shown as a future phase of the site in the current plan set, it would then need to be included as part of the overall master plan transportation impact study for the site and additional information as to the timing of this phase would need to be provided to the Township. Please clarify the intent of this parcel. Also, it appears that if there are delays associated with Phase II, there will be homes located along stubbed streets (Roads E and F) from Phase I, which is not ideal from a traffic management or safety standpoint. It would be better to phase the lots/roads so that they connect with one another. **Review #4 Item Addressed:** The June 11, 2025 response letter acknowledges that the site will be developed as a single phase. The parcel boundaries have been revised to eliminate the area to the south of Minister Creek and all references to that section have been removed from the July 2025 Plan Set.
46. Review #2: The 8-foot-wide trail provided along Lutheran Road is shown to connect directly to Lutheran Road on Sheet 41 of 129. Please indicate how this will be signed and discuss with the Township Planning Commission and/or Board of Supervisors if a note is necessary to determine how this area would be redesigned and the trail extended to Swamp Pike if the parcel to the south of Minister Creek is developed in the future. Review #3 Item Not Addressed: The 8-foot-wide trail provided along Lutheran Road is still shown to connect directly to Lutheran Road on Sheet 30 of 119. No response to Review #2 has been provided. **Review #4 Item Addressed:** The 8-foot-wide trail provided along Lutheran Road has been revised to eliminate the direct connection to Lutheran Road and a turnaround area is provided on Sheet 30 of 124.