

**Meeting Minutes from the
DOYLESTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
February 25, 2019**

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular Meeting was held at 7:00 p.m., Monday, February 25, 2019 at Meeting/Activity Trailer, 425 Wells Road, Doylestown, PA 18901. Members of the Doylestown Township Planning Commission in attendance included Chairperson: Judy Hendrixson, Vice Chairman; Gregory Reppa with members; George Lowenstein, Ted Feldstein and Thomas Kelso. Others in attendance included, Township Manager; Stephanie Mason Board of Liaison: Richard Colello and Township Planning Consultant; Judy Stern Goldstein

Review of Minutes:

In the form of a motion by Mr. Kelso; seconded by Mr. Reppa the January 28, 2018 Doylestown Township Planning Commission meeting minutes were approved.

Motion Carried 5 to 0.

Public Comments:

Pavilion at Furlong – Concept Plan Senior Living Apartments

Mr. William E. Benner, Esquire of Benner and Wild began the presentation by stating; due to the building not being fully designed, some of the Commission concerns may not be addressed.

Upon providing an outline page of the Ashbridge Manor Senior Living facility located in Downingtown, PA, Mr. Benner explained; the proposed site will provide similar amenities and services. The project is designed to be an independent senior living and not a continuing care retirement community, assisted living or offer medical assistance.

Of the total 124 units, 112 will be one-bedroom apartments and 12 two bedrooms. In comparison with the Ashbridge Manor, the average age of the residents is anticipated to be 75 years old. It's expected to have a total staff of 47 employees. Of the 47, the maximum number of onsite employees during afternoon peak hours will be twenty. In addition, a twenty four hour concierge service will be available onsite as well with an on call manager. Onsite amenities are not open to the public and include housekeeping, security, recreation activities, utilities, full access to many onsite services, laundry rooms and dining room. The indoor swimming pool will be 4 feet in depth.

Parking:

The sketch plan shows 65 onsite parking spaces with an additional 40 spaces in reserves. As per an Ashbridge Manor survey, twenty residents will have their own motor vehicle. It's also the experience, visiting takes place mainly during dinner time and daily visiting is approximately ten. Saturdays are peak visiting days during the weekend with approximately 35 visitors. For special events, such as entertainment for residents will generate approximately twenty more vehicles. With the proposed site anticipated to be managed and ran similar to Ashbridge Manor, parking provided will be more than adequate.

Engineer, Mark A. Roth of McMahan Engineers and Planners reported; as per the national publication IT, one space for each two units is recommended. The proposed sketch plan provides sufficient parking with an additional forty spaces in reserve. Mr. Benner added; most residents will opt for van services for transportation, which the facilities will provide.

Mr. Lowenstein commented; the sketch plan does not provide adequate handicapped parking spaces, as per Federal requirements and should be reviewed. Mr. Roth responded; four parking spaces are located at the front entry and within American Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.

Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned; what the total residents at the Ashbridge Manor is. Mr. Benner answered; the Manor is 100% occupied with 136 residents. Most of the residents are under a single person household but will vary.

Ms. Hendrixson questioned; if bus stops will be provided. Mr. Roth answered; drop off area is located nearby. Ms. Stern Goldstein clarified; no bus stop for public transportation is noted on the plans. Ms. Hendrixson commented; parking is very far from the building for both staff and residents. There is also no pedestrian corridor, and nothing covered, which will become an issue. Mr. Colello agreed and indicated; the corridor should be reviewed closer and based upon the parking calculations, one in three units is noted as having a car. The parking should be reviewed closer as well. Mr. Benner responded; the calculations are reliant on the experience from a similar facility. Mr. Colello suggested rather than one facility, the applicants should compare the proposed project with five other senior living facilities to provide more accurate figures.

Ms. Stern Goldstein noted; the Ashbridge Manor in Downingtown has a bus stop for public transportation onsite. This should be factored into the proposed plans to include employees, which will have a big difference. Mr. Benner indicated the forty additional parking spaces in reserve can be expanded without affecting the impervious surface. Mr. Lowenstein questioned; what type or use of impervious surface will be affected under the zoning ordinance. Mr. Kelso answered; 40% will be affected. Mr. Roth added; the stipulation agreement allows for 60% of impervious surface disturbance. The impervious under the mixed use will be approximately 6.2 acres. Under the sketch plan, it's shown with reserve parking being paved is approximately three acres and less than half than what was previously offered under the mixed-use commercial plan. Mr. Kelso clarified; upon reading the stipulation agreement, it notes the impervious surface disturbance as 40% not 60%, excluding minor issues.

Ms. Hendrixson indicated; another issue was pedestrian circulation along the site. She questioned; if there is any opportunity for a walking path along the green space. Mr. Benner answered; yes and hasn't been built into the plan as yet. The intention is to create a seating area for gatherings but will consider adding pathways.

Ms. Stern Goldstein reiterated; the parking will need to be addressed and what is currently being proposed is not standard under the ordinance and will become an ongoing discussion. Mr. Lowenstein questioned; will the applicant be advised and agree on the changes recommended by the Commission to revise the stipulation plan. Mr. Benner answered; the intent is to have the detailed concept plan completely substitute the commercial plan. The applicants are also requesting guidance from the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors once sufficient information is provided and comfortable with the concept, submit a recommendation. Upon receiving a recommendation, the vagueness of the plan will be flushed out. There is no resistance to formulate the details. However, before investing additional time on details, the applicant is requesting the Planning Commission recommend the concept plan is acceptable to move forward in the land development process.

As per Mr. Lowenstein previous question, Mr. Colello again questioned; will a revised plan noting the Planning Commission's comments be made so a recommendation to amend the stipulation agreement may be submitted to the Board of Supervisors or is this what is expected by the Planning Commission to make a decision on. Mr. Benner answered; the intent is not to present the current plan to the Board of Supervisors for approval. The intent is to present a concept plan to the Planning Commission for discussion. The applicant will return with a more detailed plan to receive a recommendation for Board of Supervisor action. Ms. Mason clarified; the Board of Supervisors are looking for a recommendation from the Planning Commission and noted; Mr. Kelso suggested at the November meeting to have the plans presented as a Pre-Engineered Sketch plan for Board of Supervisors review. Mr. Benner agreed.

Building:

Mr. Roth reported; the building has four wings, each at approximately 180 feet. The central core of the four wings is where the amenity space is located, such as the entrance and lobby. Of the 123 units, 12 are two bedrooms and located at the ends of the building wings. The building is approximately 50 feet in height along three wings. The core section will occupy the kitchen and community dining room. The back of house area will be three stories.

Mr. Lowenstein questioned if the residents residing at the end of the wing are expected to walk over 180 feet to the core of the building. Mr. Roth answered; the dining areas will be located more towards the center of the core section. Mr. Roth continued; one bedroom units will be approximately 500 square feet and two bedrooms at 700 square feet.

Mr. Reppa questioned is was a cross shaped building proposed and were other options considered to site the building. Mr. Roth answered; the cross shape building was proposed to create shorter hallways. Mr. Reppa suggested to shift the building closer to the south. Mr. Roth answered; the cross shape is better location for the site with less impact on the grade and buffers. The proposed shape will also assist in preserving the woods and achieving entry points as per Penn Dot's requirements. Mr. Reppa questioned; if there is a possibility of having a right hand turn off Swamp Road. Mr. Roth indicated no.

Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned the status of emergency access and the need to get around the building. Mr. Roth answered; the matter will be reviewed and coordinated with the Fire Marshal to achieve.

Mr. Kelso questioned; if a preliminary grading was completed. Mr. Roth indicated no, but some discussion was made in placing the first floor apartments below grade. Mr. Kelso commented; there is concern in having apartments located below grade and would like to see a rough grading plan before any decision is made. It's difficult to visualize with a slope and without placing units below grade. Mr. Reppa suggested a H type design with central and tubing should be considered from a layout stand point. Mr. Roth responded; the X shape has the least amount of impact. Mr. Lowenstein commented; the site needs access around the building and currently close to the setbacks and the protected woodlands. Mr. Roth responded; there has been apprehension to revise the plan due to a lack of satisfaction the use and concept of layout versus the commercial retail. Ms. Hendrixson responded; with the proposed use being apartments for seniors, density of the use of the site is positive. However, the buildings, don't relate to the contours and to the site visually. Additionally, the parking does not seem to be integrated well. The plan has a long way to go. Geographically, the plan has some issues. Mr. Lowenstein commented; the concept is acceptable, but the concept of the land and how it looks is a concern. Mr. Benner responded; the building is being designed for older seniors with smaller apartments and a large variety of amenities. One of the main issues is the development is site specific from the stipulation agreement. The manner on how the township regulates the zoning

on the property is exclusively through the stipulation agreement, where the only use permitted is mixed use commercial. If the project succeeds, any change to the zoning is dependent upon the approval of the Board of Supervisors. The approval will become an assurance the development of the site will be in accordance with the sketch plan, unless the Board changes it.

Mr. Benner indicated as per the Commission's comments, a more detailed plan showing emergency circulation, parking, alternative layouts to become more contusive needs to evolve the plan until the Commission is comfortable. Once the details are confirmed, a more formulated plan will be designed and submitted for Commission recommendation. It's understood, the applicant is not at this point. Ms. Hendrixson clarified; the Commission concerns are the overall design and the concept of the use. Mr. Kelso added; the relation of the appearance is another issue. Mr. Lowenstein indicated; for visibility, there are two issues. The first is what the residents sees on the left side and what the community views on the right. Ms. Hendrixson commented; the concept opposed to the commercial is appreciated. However, the configuration is an issue and doesn't seem to relate to the site and neighborhood. The lesser density is positive for the neighborhood and traffic flow. Once all the details are worked out, there is a potential for a very nice project.

Resident: Ken Snyder of 50 Foxcroft Drive questioned; if the entire project is four stories high or certain wings. Mr. Roth answered; three wings are four stories. Mr. Snyder questioned; what the distance is up from top to bottom. Mr. Roth indicated approximately 18 feet.

Mr. Lowenstein noted; two main roads, which are highways. The plan shows an entrance from the road, which may cause issues and should be addressed during the traffic discussion.

Resident: Joe Gunsiorowski of 25 Turkey Lane questioned; what is to stop the hair salon from advertising outside of the community. Mr. Benner answered; the stipulation agreement prevents any service located in the facility from servicing the general public.

Resident: Mary Dodsworth commented on a four story building being too high. Ms. Hendrixson answered; working with the contours, some of the building may be four stories. However, some of the building may be less than four stories closer to the hill.

Mr. Gunsiorowski questioned; how many feet to the peak will the four story building be. Mr. Roth indicated it will depend upon the pitch of the roof.

Ms. Hendrixson reported; the next Pavilion at Furlong Concept plan discussion will cover traffic.

Tabor Property | Sketch Plan

G. Michael Carr, Esquire of Eastburn & Gray, P.C. reported since meeting in November, applicant: Rick Lyons will be seeking a zoning change for proposed amendments to the Tabor Property. The plans will need additional engineering and comments from review letters need to be addressed. Mr. Carr indicated the applicant will comply with any issues not addressed at tonight's meeting. Discussions are scheduled with the Fire Marshall and Bike & Hike Committee to ensure the plan is headed for the right direction.

Director of Code Enforcement; Sinclair Salisbury – February 21, 2019

Item 1: The addition of a canopy will not increase the impervious surface, due to any entrance canopy coverage area is not planned to be grass.

Item 3: IBC 2015, Section 1104 – the applicants are working with Philip W. Wursta, P.E with Bucks County Planning Department to coordinate a bus stop off Easton Road, road, signal and pedestrian improvements. This will also address item 4 regarding including an emergency service vehicle access plan.

Item 2: IBC 2015, Section 1106 - To date, the applicant has not addressed the even distribution of handicap parking throughout the site.

Michael Baker International – February 20, 2019

Item 2: Mr. Kelso questioned; were the roundabouts sketches received. Ms. Mason answered; the plans have not been seen for over one year. Penn Dot conducted a presentation to the Board of Supervisors last winter and no updated plans have been received to date. Mr. Carr indicated the roundabouts will have no impact on the property.

Item 3: A discussion is planned to provide a new pedestrian crossing on either New Britain Road intersection, Easton Road southbound or both. The applicant is open to discussion to provide access to a park located adjacent to the site. Most details listed will be discussed with the Bike & Hike Committee.

Item 4: Mr. Kelso indicated a bus stop would be beneficial. Ms. Stern Goldstein suggested to discuss the option of moving the bus stop to the entrance with Ms. Mason. Mr. Lyons added; discussion is needed concerning a section which needs to be prepared before a stop sign is constructed. Mr. Kelso informed; there are plans to extend the trail towards the parkway. Ms. Mason added; a trail is also plan along the newly constructed Wawa in Doylestown Borough. In addition, the Borough has worked with the developer to bring a trail towards Doylestown Township to include design and engineering. The plan also includes a connection into the Callan property where the Tabor Property has the option to connect as well. Mr. Lyons indicated he is open to further discussions.

Upon Ms. Hendrixson question if variance will be requested, Mr. Carr informed; details need to be worked out and the applicant will not be seeking a recommendation from the Planning Commission at tonight's meeting

Pennoni Associates – February 21, 2019

Item 1 and 2: Per Pennoni Associate's request for a traffic impact study, the applicant will be requesting a Penn Dot highway occupancy permit and signal plans. Greg R. Glitzer, P.E of Gilmore & Associates indicated he will include the township in the process.

Item 4: Some of the areas on site are existing, non-conformities relative to the park setback. They are existing parking bays and a solution may be difficult. There is an existing slope which needs to be addressed where some collections need to be lined up. Some options are a raised pedestrian crossing and stop to create a more secure area. Mr. Reppa questioned if there is a reason for a cut through. Mr. Glitzer indicated no due to the previous bad experiences. Mr. Lyons added; some pedestrians may prefer to walk through the site instead of crossing through an intersection.

Mr. Kelso commented; previous experience with the fire access along the west side of the personal care has not been well. However, they are needed sooner or later when used. He questioned; what will be result if the road is turned into parking on the north side and build a one way around it, instead of periarcticular parking. The change may reduce the impervious coverage and still provide good circulation. Mr. Glitzer responded; the overall site total with a small amount of excess parking is short on the office component. Mr. Lyons added; as per the ordinance, the plan is over parked by 39 spaces. One option is providing a shared environment to some of the parking pursuant to an easement.

Mr. Kelso commented on his concerned with some of the other buildings. Specifically, with the internal pedestrian circulation and how it relates to the parking, because some sidewalks may not be necessary. Mr. Glitzer responded; the issue has not been given the attention as it should have. However, several options were considered, such as consolidation and redundancy removal to the perimeter walks. The buildings are not designed and currently considered place holders. Mr. Lyons added; the buildings are backwards and sit in an awkward position and been a challenge to retain them. However, this was the goal due to the front doors face Route 611, but the parking is in the rear of the building. To resolve, it was discussed to bring the parking to the front of the building, facing Route 611. Currently, the plans are unknown for the other buildings. An addition is proposed for one 10,000 square foot building and relief will be requested.

Mr. Kelso commented; he's pleased with the access through the parking lot to the south of the building. He questioned if the entrance of the 10,000 square foot building will lead into the courtyard. Mr. Glitzer indicated yes. Mr. Kelso indicated; the sidewalk on the western edge of the parking, added from the previous sketch plan looks odd. Mr. Glitzer responded; if the building was considered a community building, a connection to a raise pedestrian crossing should be provided. Ms. Stern Goldstein added; the area is mature, and most pedestrians will walk the drive isle. However, there is an issue with the ends and how the crossings are treated. If the building is considered a community center, it will be a different discussion as how parking is lacking. Mr. Lyons indicated he is aware of the impervious surface issue with parking and currently viewing options to address.

Mr. Reppa commented; the plan doesn't show a good connection leaving the site near the arboretum. Mr. Glitzer responded; a chip path is being considered towards the building. Mr. Reppa questioned will any amenities be provided for the facility. Mr. Glitzer answered; options are currently being viewed. Mr. Lyon added; an interconnection is an option to go around the property. Ms. Stern Goldstein agreed adding, the connection leads to outside the site and should be corrected.

Boucher & James, Inc. (Engineering Review) – February 21, 2019

Item 2 | Section 2; SALDO Section 153-19.K – Mr. Glitzer noted the review letter indicated a lot of work needs to be completed. Waivers will be requested for details pertaining to offsite information and proposed improvements to be located by utilizing an aerial.

Item 4 | SALDO Section 153-25.D.(-6) – A waiver will be requested to have a 10 foot width path instead of 12 foot. Mr. Kelso noted; the ordinance indicates the path cannot be closer than five feet from the base of the curb of Easton Road.

Boucher & James, Inc. (Planning Review) – February 21, 2019

Item 1 | Use – Mr. Carr requested the ordinance be amended to allow the proposed C-8 Community Center, C10 Daycare and D1 Office use in the C3 District. Mr. Kelso indicated changes are typically not requested through a variance. Mr. Carr responded; the situation is lifesaving as opposed to hardship. Ms. Stern Goldstein added; a text amendment will be required to request a change of use.

Item 2a | Area and Dimensional Requirements (ZO Section 175-76) – for the specific impervious surface requirement pertaining to the use, the applicants will be suggesting the change be allowed subject to the underling District requirements which allows 40% of impervious as oppose to 35% permitted for the C17 use. Ms. Stern Goldstein responded; the suggestion will be considered under a text amendment request.

Item 1b | Use (ZO Section 175-16.C(17)(b) – the density and the breakdown for the types of units are acceptable for density with the number of units proposed if the calculation is not including a portion of the site allocated to the use.

Items 16 and 17C – Mr. Carr requested clarification on a maximum of 10% of beds may be included with an independent living unit. Ms. Stern Goldstein clarified; upon speaking with another municipality last year, who informed; independent living is considered as anything otherwise regulated. If the units are not considered personal care, assisted living or nursing care, it will be considered independent living. Mr. Carr indicated; the proposed site will provide aid as food, laundry and medicine intake assistance and the facility will not be considered condominium rentals. Although it will not be 100% regulated, the entire building can be licensed as assisted living. It will impose some requirements to break into different licensing categories within the building. The applicants are not interested in pursuing variances once the mixed is identified. The suggestion will be no dependent living at all if pertaining to non-licensed living arrangements or argue the ordinance is vague due to a definition that doesn't exist. Ms. Stern Goldstein presented two options as, the request is addressed as part of a text amendment. The section will be reviewed if a text amendment is implemented where the antiquated references will be removed pertaining to agencies and definitions. Mr. Carr responded; it's not the intent to make the text amendment more complicated than it should be. Ms. Stern Goldstein indicated; the request may also be considered a house cleaning item, due to regulations being in place since 1988 in some respects.

Ms. Stern Goldstein commented; upon conducting a tour of a facility in Westchester, one noted item was the difference of a wood structure and steel. The steel frame is required for assisted living and wood frame for independent. There is a desire from Mr. Lyons to have an even flow of units as a need and avoid moving from place to place within the building for more flexibility. Mr. Lyons responded; the building will be fully steel. Ms. Stern indicated some of the requirements from a building code and suggested to ensure the applicant will make the layout work.

Mr. Carr continued reviewing Boucher & James, Inc. February 21st letter by indicating the applicant will comply with the remaining comments under section one.

Item 2c | ZO Section 175-23.C (13) – There are some non-conforming parking features along the existing lot.

Item 2b | ZO Section 175-76 – As noted by Ms. Stern Goldstein, there is some intrusion into the 100 foot setback yard to the north of the site. As per the ordinance, the setback can be reducing no less than 250 feet with special buffers. The plans will need additional development in terms of planting and parking lot buffers

Item 4c, d, e | ZO Section 175-23.B(1), ZO Section 175-23.B(2) and ZO Section 175-23.B(4) – there is some non-conforming parking, that may not require buffering. However, the applicant will defer to the request to buffer all parking. Ms. Stern Goldstein indicated; existing items that will not be touch is technically conforming. However, the way the plan was drawn on top of the aerial made it difficult to determine what was changing. Mr. Glitzer responded; the landscaping will be completed for uniformity. A detailed plan will be created for parking for the planner and engineer's review and not to repeat the process. Mr. Carr concluded by stating the applicant will comply with remaining comments.

Ms. Stern Goldstein offered to provide the South Eastern Road Gateway plan for reference. The document will provide information on access, cart way and widths as it relates to corridors.

Mr. Reppa suggested to carefully view drainage flow towards neighboring communities to avoid any flooding issues.

Adjournment:

Hearing no further business, the February 25, 2019 Doylestown Township Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 8:55pm.