

**Meeting Minutes from the
DOYLESTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting**

May 8, 2018

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular Meeting was held at 7:00 p.m., Tuesday, March 8, 2018 at the temporary offices off Wells Road, Doylestown, PA 18901. Members of the Doylestown Township Planning Commission in attendance included, Chairperson: Judy Hendrixson with members; George Lowenstein, Thomas Kelso and Jeremy Deppeler. Others in attendance included Township Manager; Stephanie Mason, Board of Supervisor Liaison: Richard Colello and Township Planning Consultant; Judy Stern Goldstein

Absent: Vice Chairman; Gregory Reppa

Public Comments:

Mr. Colello acknowledged Ways and Means, Pension Committee member; Collen Mullen.

Review of Minutes:

In the form of a motion by Mr. Kelso; seconded by Mr. Deppeler the March 26, 2018 Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular meeting minutes were approved.

Motion carried 4 to 0.

In the form of a motion by Mr. Kelso; seconded by Mr. Deppeler the April 10, 2018 Doylestown Township Planning Commission Work Session minutes were approved.

Motion carried 4 to 0.

Mr. Lowenstein requested a summary of what occurred at the April 20th work session. Mr. Kelso explained; the Commission and applicants compared the overlay district to the conditional use approach. The consensus was to take the overlay district and tie it onto a more restricted area.

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission agreed by consensus to table approval of the April 20, 2018 Work Session minutes to the May 29, 2018 and note the following corrections ...

- 1) Add the attendees representing applicants; The Bray Long Schmidt Tract
- 2) Correct spelling of Jeffrey Reppeler to Jeremy Deppeler
- 3) Page one; change unattended to intended
- 4) Page one; third paragraph – change infatuate to enfatuate
- 5) Add Summary section to all meeting minutes

Bray / Long / Schmidt Tract – Proposed Zoning Amendment / Conditional Use:

Applicants in attendance: John Dean, Toll Brothers Senior Project Manager; Vito Polsinelli, PMP, Planner; Emily Stewart of Eastern State Engineering Consultants, Land Acquisition Manager; John Crabtree and Alex Athowasiou

Absent: Mr. Greg Adelman, Esquire of Kaplin Stewart Attorneys at Law

Mr. John Dean reported; since the April 20, 2018 work session, a draft of the overlay district plan was provided to the Commission for review.

On behalf of Greg Reppa, Ms. Mason provided his comments of the draft overlay district ordinance as

- a) *Section 16B, 16A1, under Gross, not Net, Acre Bases – Remove not net. Base site area as defined in zoning ordinance could be considered.*
- b) *Under A1 Yield Plan - Cross out B1 use regulations under preliminary and final development. Cross out word "typical" for sketch plan.*
- c) *Use definition of sketch plan in Subdivision Land Development Ordinance (SALDO)*
- d) *Page 2; Add section E and note as IN LIEU*
- e) *Cross out building set backs are required. Add; separation of an ____ feet.*
- f) *Underline 2B under minimum building to buildings set back from: 25 feet. What?*
- g) *Under the margin, Mr. Reppa commented; concerned about enough on street over flow parking as the curb cut for driveways don't add enough room for effective on street. Not enough on street parking to accommodate residents during an event or party.*

Mr. Kelso commented; the Commission should place Mr. Reppa's comments into the ordinance or require the applicant to calculate the available parking space within the development for both on and off street. Ms. Stern Goldstein responded; in certain circumstances, the ordinance requires the off-street parking and a certain number of on-street parking from .25 to .5 per dwelling unit, depending upon the size of the development. Mr. Deppeler indicated; Mr. Reppa's concern is not meeting requirements between clusters, but between the units. He the questioned; what is the distance. Mr. Kelso suggested to add comments and issues during the Commission's clean up ordinance discussions. Mr. Dean offered to make suggestions for other uses.

- h) *Under 3, see minimum open space (gross). Mr. Reppa noted; base site overview.*
- i) *Under maximum impervious coverage gross as 30. Mr. Reppa questioned; if the impervious is defined.*
- j) *Under section E; 160 feet was double underlined.*
- k) *Under section F; Added "Housing front variation set back materials and design required with final plan submission" as opposed to encouraged.*

- l) *Under section I; replace shall with may. Mr. Kelso commented on his concern of the change may make the ordinance loose. The applicant must provide a second entrance. Ms. Mason added; Mr. Reppa's statement indicated may provide a second access upon approval by the Board of Supervisors.*

Mr. Kelso commented; Bristol Road has a special variance and the more the township can minimize the entrance, the better off the township will be. However, a development this size, there is rarely an issue. Ms. Hendrixson added; two entrances are not needed. However, a second emergency access is needed. Mr. Kelso suggested to have section remain as shall, instead of may.

- m) *Page 3, under Significant Improvements\ Public Infrastructure – Mr. Reppa questioned; how the extent is defined. Under 175.103.4 boundary, Mr. Reppa noted; Should the entire Bristol Road corridor with high density or relate to Borough or smaller parcels.*

- n) *Should other uses be allowed, such as B6 multi-family.*

Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned; instead of the proposed B16 use, should a townhouse use be considered modified by the overlay. She noted; the townhouse use is not noted in the draft ordinance. Instead a new use is proposed. For clarity, Ms. Stern Goldstein suggested; there no reason to create a new B16 use, because it's a townhouse use. Instead, take the townhouse B4 use and incorporate the overlay with permitted modifications as follows. Mr. Crabtree and Mr. Dean agreed. Mr. Crabtree added; a discussion with Mr. Adelson will be conducted.

Ms. Stern Goldstein continued; the intent is to only permit the townhouse use in the overlay district with no other use. In the ordinance, is there any reason to have a single family detached included. Mr. Crabtree questioned; if the question is related to density. Ms. Mason suggested small lot single as an alternative. Mr. Crabtree responded; the issue will be discussed with Mr. Adelson.

Mr. Lowenstein questioned; where it is noted the infrastructure is tied in. Mr. Kelso responded; at the April 20th work session, Mr. Garton suggested implementing a multiplier of the tap in fee. Mr. Kelso questioned; what the Township expects for a formula. The applicant receives an increase in density, which can be calculated. However, how are the benefits reviewed. Mr. Lowenstein suggested to apply the tap in fee as a dollar value. Ms. Mason indicated; the applicant must create a formula and apply to the ordinance. Ms. Stern Goldstein noted; the formula was to be tied into the net increase to determine the difference between what is permitted by the yield plan.

Mr. Dean questioned; if the Commission would like the applicants to create the formula. Mr. Kelso answered yes and suggested to coordinate with Township Solicitor; Jeffrey P. Garton. As an example of significant improvements, Mr. Kelso indicated Bristol Road can be designed and costs provided. Ms. Mason questioned; if a significant formula can be created to include public water and sewer required to be tied into the current EDU rate. Another example can be a street project to show the current cost of square footage or black top. Ms. Stern Goldstein indicated; a note can be created in relating to the overlay district limiting parcels by having significant improvement to public infrastructures. It may be too global for the current project. Instead, it can be multiplier of the tap in fees or EDU cost to make more sense. Instead of actual dollars, the multiplier formula will be added.

Mr. Dean questioned; if the formula should be applied to all related tax parcels. Ms. Stern Goldstein answered; that is how the ordinance is written. Mr. Dean indicated the ordinance will be viewed again during a discussion with Mr. Adelson and Mr. Garton. Mr. Kelso added two notes with the ordinance discussion as renaming to Bristol Road Public Improvements Overlay District, because the intent is to apply to the corridor. Upon referencing page three, section two of the ordinance, Mr. Kelso indicated; the purpose is weak, and more is needed to identify why and what is being completed. The proposed public sewer connection is a benefit to adjacent neighbors and should be incorporated into the purpose. Ms. Mason added; the notation brings the connection into existing failing systems.

Mr. Kelso questioned; if the applicants will make it convenient for adjoining properties along **Del Haven** to connect onto public sewer and water by extending the sewer line to the edge of the property. Mr. Dean responded; the plan will be reviewed to possibly offer an option.

Upon referencing Mr. Reppa's comments, Ms. Stern Goldstein noted; the base site area should also be based upon the impervious. Base site area defined in the ordinance is full tract minus the area in the rights of way as oppose to net buildable. Use term base site area should be noted, instead of the gross. The eligibility paragraph may not be necessary, since the parcels are noted in the boundary of the overlay district. The eligibility provides a false sense of other parcels being eligible. Mr. Dean suggested to strike the section. Ms. Stern Goldstein agreed. Ms. Stern Goldstein requested Commission guidance of the nine times the base yield calculated can note a density. The density buildable is based upon the yield plan to provide a yield, then nine times that. It is to determine what the density is based upon a base site area. Mr. Crabtree indicated; Ms. Stewart attempted to discover a yield plan, which totaled between sixteen and seventeen. Mr. Lowenstein commented; it's important to devise a system that will work for another contractor, should Toll Brothers decide to leave the proposed project. Ms. Stern Goldstein indicated; currently it's written for based density and suggested to consider base site area. Ms. Stewart agrees with shall not exceed three acres of base site area for the overlay district with a bonus option.

Upon Mr. Crabtree request the meeting minutes include focus comments, where a consensus is noted on all subjects discussed, a summary of the meeting was noted as ...

- 1) *The Doylestown Township Planning Commission agreed by consensus to rename the ordinance as the Bristol Road Public Improvement Overlay District.*
- 2) *The density will show as three units, except for the base site. Ms. Stern Goldstein clarified; 3.0 dwellings per acre of base site area.*
- 3) *Mr. Crabtree questioned; if the B16 use will be removed and amend with B4 use as follows. The Commission agreed. Ms. Stern Goldstein added; to possibly consider a small lot single.*
- 4) *Remove the density bonus section to only show section A.*
- 5) *Lot area and initial requirements will remain the same.*
- 6) *Add dimensions to lot area for small lots single. Ms. Crabtree indicated; the applicant may not include the dimensions, due to being complicated. However, the flexibility will be beneficial. Ms. Stern Goldstein commented; the small lot single should be shown now. Should the applicant decide not to have the small lot single included, it should be removed completely.*
- 7) *The minimum open space as noted on page two, under paragraphs C and D as the base site.*

Mr. Kelso suggested to have the parking issue be included as a cleanup issue for the ordinance.

- 8) *Require the applicant to submit architectural drawings as a requirement as part of the final development plan process. Mr. Kelso suggested to have the drawings submitted during the preliminary development plan process. The Doylestown Township Planning Commission agreed by consensus to have the architectural drawings submitted as a requirement as part of the final development plan.*

- 9) *The applicant to add more details on page three of the ordinance, under the purpose paragraph. Details are to include extending the public water and sewer connection toward the end of the property to provide access to the adjacent community.*
- 10) *Defining the significant improvement to public infrastructure, so the Township understands what is to be received as a formula. Ms. Stern Goldstein added; a strip down of the improvements should be indicated.*
- 11) *Remove insert of tax parcels under boundaries to focus on certain parcels as the overlay district.*
- 12) *Eligibility section is removed.*
- 13) *Permitted uses needs to be reviewed further. Additional uses are acceptable concerning small lot family detached. Mr. Crabtree indicated; the B16 use will be removed and stand on B4 with modifications.*

Ms. Mason questioned; what the plan for additional uses by the homeowner is, which can be completed later. Ms. Stern Goldstein answered; Accessory uses should be included, and all residential units have a note impact home-based business under a H2 use. The use will need to include under the overlay district, due using the overlay instead of the underlying. Although home based businesses are included under the R1A District, the overlay applies to the development. Ms. Mason questioned what the procedure for improvements under H1 with a special exception is. Ms. Stern Goldstein answered; if the use is permitted under the overlay district use with special exception. Ms. Mason suggested to have the uses changed or limited should be clarified under the ordinance.

Upon a discussion ensuing between the Commission to determine if uses under R1A District can be utilized, Ms. Mason questioned with a Homeowners Association (HOA) owned the residents, does it include agriculture. Mr. Crabtree indicated no and improvements by the homeowner will fall into the R1A District. Mr. Dean indicated; the uses will part of a discussion between Mr. Adelson and Mr. Garton.

Upon a discussion regarding scheduling a work session prior to the May 29th meeting, Ms. Mason informed; the next regular meeting of the Planning Commission is scheduled for May 29, 2018, 7:00pm at the temporary offices off Wells Road. A revised draft ordinance is expected to be submitted by May 24th before 12:00pm. Another work session can be scheduled in before the next Planning Commission meeting scheduled on June 9th for submission to the Board of Supervisors by July 17th.

Adjournment: Hearing no further business, the May 8, 2018 Doylestown Township Planning Commission Meeting was adjourned at 8:22 pm.