

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

Regular Meeting

August 24, 2020

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular Meeting was held at 7:01 p.m., Monday, August 24, 2020 at 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; Ted Feldstein and Thomas Kelso. Others in attendance included, Board of Liaisons: Jennifer Herring & Nancy Santacecilia, Township Planning Consultant; Judy Stern Goldstein, Township Manager; Stephanie Mason and Director of Code Enforcement; Sinclair Salisbury.

Review of Minutes

On the motion of Mr. Reppa; seconded by Mr. Feldstein the July 27, 2020 Doylestown Township Planning Commission meeting minutes were unanimously approved. 4 – 0

Proposed SALDO and Zoning Ordinance Amendments – Continued Discussion

Ms. Goldstein reviewed the highlighted sections with updated changes made by the board.

On the motion of Mr. Reppa; seconded by Mr. Feldstein the board makes the recommendation for the Board of Supervisors to approve the SALDO amendment. 4 – 0

Zoning Ordinance Amendments – Continued Discussion

Ms. Goldstein noted the discussion was tabled at last meeting.

Accessory Dwelling: The board restarted conversation regarding in-law suites. Ms. Mason stated at least six in-law suite applications per year go to the ZHB for approval. Mr. Kelso inquired if approval was necessary as there are currently no denials from Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Salisbury stated it is required as applicants have to go through the process to have the proper approval as it depends who is living in the suite. Mr. Kelso suggested making the process easier for residents. Ms. Santacecilia inquired if part of the process was to make neighbors aware. Mr. Salisbury agreed and stated one intention is to deter a rental community. Ms. Goldstein stated that a single family home can be rented. Mr. Feldstein inquired if a permit is necessary when single family home is rented. Mr. Salisbury stated a move in permit is required. Ms. Mason noted in-law suites are found during sales of homes in the Township. Mr. Reppa and Mr. Salisbury discussed the process when an in-law suite is not approved. Ms. Mason noted most in-law suites are attached to a main home and Mr. Salisbury agreed the ordinance requires in-law suites to be attached to the home. Ms. Goldstein noted that sub section B states the in-law suite can be separate but attached to an existing structure. Mr. Kelso suggested reviewing small home or in-

law suite structures that are detached to be considered. Ms. Santacecilia inquired if neighbors would approve. Ms. Goldstein suggested to determine if in-law suites would be rentable if attached or detached. Mr. Kelso suggested to add the accessory rental unit as a separate use. Ms. Mason posed the question if the board wants to approve an in-law suite for rental after original use has ended. Mr. Salisbury stated low cost housing is not as available in the Township and this would assist, Mr. Feldstein agreed. Ms. Herring stated properties would be cared for if property owner living in home. Mr. Kelso suggested creating two separate uses. Ms. Santacecilia inquired if an issue would occur with rentals as homeowners may take advantage. Mr. Kelso stated the requests should go through land development for an accessory rental unit. Ms. Goldstein stated special exception is listed. Mr. Kelso suggested an application process be put in place for subsection A and to eliminate rental units. Mr. Salisbury stated the current process is smooth and works well. Mr. Kelso stated he did not find the process easy when he went through it. Ms. Goldstein stated the application process would need to be reviewed and planned. Ms. Mason inquired if the board would like to add an option to go to the board for a rental unit when the original use has ended. Mr. Kelso suggested to add standards if being made a use of right to add guidance for prior approval. Ms. Santacecilia suggested to keep neighbors in mind as they may dislike the update. Ms. Hendrixson stated the limit of two people in place may sustain the concern. Mr. Salisbury noted inspections are not completed as part of the current ordinance. He also inquired if the board would like to add a rental license that included inspections and would keep up maintenance standards. He noted it would require additional staff. Ms. Goldstein stated the decision could be determined at a later time as much planning would need to be completed. Ms. Goldstein stated sub section H would be completed and presented at the next meeting. Mr. Reppa stated an outline would be good to have. The board approved.

Manufactured Home Communities: Mr. Kelso inquired of subsection H and why nine is required. The board agreed to eliminate the subsection. Mr. Kelso inquired how sub section I would be enforced. The board agreed to eliminate the subsection. Mr. Kelso suggested to consider small homes in the ordinance and to update as such. Mr. Salisbury suggested to review the idea at a later time and the board should consider adding conditions that make more affordable housing to the Township a possibility. Ms. Hendrixson stated she would like to see this matter followed up in the near future.

Municipal Overlay District: Ms. Goldstein reviewed the section, stating it would be one overlay. Mr. Reppa inquired if necessary. Ms. Mason stated it was as objection from residents. Ms. Goldstein stated changes would be updated and presented at the next meeting.

Ms. Mason stated the older Neshaminy Manor property was reviewed by BOS and they would like any ideas for the property from the Planning Commission board based on COVID-19. Mr. Reppa suggested an open discussion with the county. Ms. Mason suggested including building influencers in the area to provide a prospective of the future. The board agreed to review individually and bring up the discussion at the next meeting.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:43 pm.