

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

December 14, 2010

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular Meeting was held at 7:00 p.m., Tuesday, December 14, 2010 in the Doylestown Township Municipal Building, 425 Wells Road, Doylestown, PA. Members of the Planning Commission in attendance included: Chairman; George Lowenstein, Thomas Kelso, Edward Redfield, Donald S. Page, Judy Hendrixson and Kenneth L. Snyder. Also present: Board of Supervisor Liaison; Richard F. Colello and Township Manager; Ms. Stephanie J. Mason, Planning Consultant; Ms. Judy Stern Goldstein

Planning Commission Comments:

Mr. Lowenstein announced Planning Commission member; Donald S. Page's retirement. On behalf of the Commission, Mr. Lowenstein thanked Mr. Page for his contributions throughout the years and wished him well in his retirement. Mr. Lowenstein then introduced and welcomed new Planning Commission member; Kenneth L. Snyder.

Review of Minutes:

In a form of a motion, the minutes of the October 25, 2010 Planning Commission Regular Meeting minutes were approved by Mr. Kelso, seconded by Ms. Hendrixson.

Motion was adopted 5 to 0.

Public Comments: None

Neamand Tract – Doylestown Executive Quarters / Silver Maple Farms / Preliminary Land Development

Attorney for the Neamand Tract; Edward F. Murphy began his presentation with a brief history of the ongoing Preliminary Land Development of Neamand Tract to include the recent registry of the existing farmhouse on the Historic Structure list. Most recently, the Preliminary Land Development being re-engineered as a Subdivision Land Development Plan. Mr. Murphy introduced Gilmore & Associate's Engineer; Mr. Greg Glitzer to review the Preliminary Development Plans.

While referencing the plan, Mr. Glitzer explained at a meeting with Doylestown Township Bike & Hike committee a preliminary bike trail leading to the Parkway was provided for their review. Also, a meeting with the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (Penn Dot) and Township's traffic engineer was scheduled to discuss driveways and street widening along the Neamand Tract property. Finally, as per Mr.

Kelso's previous comments, a plan was developed to improve a bike path from the tract to an adjacent development. Mr. Glitzer indicated the applicant will dedicate approximately 28 acres to the Township for the development of the multi-use trail to include a large field and flood plain along Neshaminy Creek and an existing pond. Mr. Glitzer concluded by stating upon the Doylestown Township Planning Commission's approval, a Condition of Use application will be submitted for the Board of Supervisor's consideration along with the Land Development Plan.

Mr. Kelso questioned how the ultimate ownership of the property reported as. Mr. Glitzer answered; a plan to merge two parcels into a single tax parcel but to create two separate association usage. Mr. Glitzer then explained he thought it best to provide virtual overlay zoning plan for clarification of a fee simple land division. Mr. Kelso felt the approach would cause problems with the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Murphy disagreed by stating all zoning requirements were met, by reducing two existing lots into one.

Mr. Lowenstein suggested Mr. Glitzer provide comments to Planning Consultant; Judy Stern Goldstein letter of December 7, 2010.

Mr. Glitzer indicated the applicant will comply with most request of Ms. Stern Goldstein's letter of December 7th and addressed the following concerns...

Paragraph 1; ZO Section 175-19 - Ms. Stern Goldstein pointed out that once the applicants merged the two existing tax parcels into one, it changed to lot from conforming to non-conforming use. This will create an open issue. Mr. Glitzer indicated through direction of the township they will resolve this issue. Ms. Stern Goldstein suggested the issue may be resolved through the Zoning Hearing Board.

Paragraph 1; ZO Section 176-16,B(15)(g)[5] - Assuming the applicant continue with their plans to merge into a single tax parcel for single ownership the Virtual Zoning Plan will demonstrate where it draws an boundary between the base site area to 10 acres of the residential community and therefore demonstrating compliance..

Paragraph 1; Section C – Ms. Stern Goldstein clarified the water area listed on the property description needs to be defined as either larger than a puddle or smaller than a lake because the plans only indicate the pond to be only water. Mr. Glitzer indicated the pond can be avoided by impact, but thought best to clean the pond.

Mr. Glitzer then asked how the commission would like to proceed with the pond issue, other than presenting to the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Lowenstein then asked Ms. Stern Goldstein if anything further has to be completed with the issue. Ms. Stern Goldstein explained the ponds are 100% protected by Township's ordinance from 20,000 feet or greater. First, the term water on the applicants' plan must be defined in order if it meets the townships requirement of Section 175.27(d) and go from there.

Resident & EAC member; Arnold Feldman of 40 Woodview Drive questioned if Phase I and II were completed on the property and will it be available for Environmental Advisory Council's review. Mr. Glitzer answered; yes, but submittal is not required, however he will deliver plans to the EAC for their review.

Paragraph 1; Section 175-16.B(15)(g)[6].- Mr. Glitzer agreed the section should be clarified further and the offices are non-conforming use and not allowed to exceed the imperious surface. However the plans provided an easement for the Bike and Hike trail, but exit parcel 130 leading to Lower State Road never had calculations for imperious surface. In order not to exceed the existing imperious surface a portion of the trail was not included to keep at an "apples to apples" comparison to keep 40% limitation of imperious surface on the clusters of existing buildings. This will remove all the residential communities from the imperious calculations, until the trail is placed, it will be below the imperious surface

Mr. Kelso questioned under the ordinance, what is required for pedestrian's access. Mr. Glitzer was unsure of the master plans regarding the connection points to answer the question, but the applicant would be obligated to hit connection points.

Paragraph 1; ZO Section 175-16.B(15)(f) – Plan to demonstrate that each dwelling unit can individually meet the minimum area and yard requirements will be included as part of the Virtual Zoning Plan prepared by Gilmore & Associates.

Paragraph 3; Section 175-16.B(15)(d)[3][a] – To require a twenty foot front yard setback as measured from the edge of the right –a-way, the applicants showed a thirty foot setback on the edge of the cart way to account for a default right-a-way. Mr. Lowenstein questioned the plans did not mention the existing street line will be built as a private street. Mr. Glitzer indicated demonstrably the street is considered private with one exception. A twenty six foot wide row of trees will be used as a natural buffer and with the additional of a crosswalk for traffic calming.

As per Township Director of Codes; Sinclair Salisbury's memo of December 3, 2010, Mr. Kelso questioned if there are plans to install a flush curb. Mr. Glitzer will review Mr. Salisbury's memo and advised.

Paragraph 3; ZO Section 175-16.B(15)(f) and ZO Section 175-16.B(15)(g)[5] will be included in Gilmore and Associates Virtual Overlay Plan.

Paragraph 4; ZO Section 175-27.D(1)(b) - Mr. Kelso questioned if the bike path will be graded near the pond. Mr. Glitzer answered; grading will begin as the path comes down from the elevation of curves passed the pond in the flood plain. Currently its 100% filled with a 1 foot raise in elevation. Grading will be needed in the approach of the elevation. The applicant will review the grading requirements for either compliance or a variance request.

Resident; Raymond Matullo of 56 Radcliff Drive voiced his concern with the grading of the pond, due to heavy rains causing overflow into his property. Mr. Matullo questioned the path's flow in relationship to the pond. Mr. Glitzer answered; the flow will go through adjacent trees then into an embankment, run across

the pond and return to covert crossing into the parkway. Mr. Matullo then questioned what vegetation will remain near the pond. Mr. Glitzer indicated there are notes to review in the future, pertaining to evaluation of water quality, treatment, aeration and fencing.

Paragraph 4; ZO Section 175-27.D(2)(b) and 175-27.D(3)(b) – the applicant will provided a clear definition of the body of water on site.

Paragraph 4; ZO Section 175-27D.(5)(b) – Will comply and the applicant will try to avoid any type of tree disturbance along the woodlands of the bike path.

Paragraph 6; ZO Section 175-16.B(15)(h) and ZO Section 153-37 – Depending if the Townships has interest in receiving dedicated open space shall determine how it should be maintained. Ms. Stern Goldstein indicated no one can speak for the members of the commission until the pond is defined, since it's included as open space. Mr. Lowenstein requested clarification regarding the Park and Recreation Department's fee in lieu of open space dedicated. Additional tabulation and shading is needed. Ms. Stern Goldstein added, a separate Recreation fee is needed in lieu thereof, which will also be an open issue because it's not traditionally the procedure.

Paragraph 6; Section C – Ms. Stern Goldstein explained as per previous discussion by the Bike and Hike committee, she wanted to make sure there will be no clearing along the frontage of Lower State Road.

Mr. Kelso questioned what improvements are scheduled along Lower State Road. Mr. Glitzer answered; widen completed on the left turn lane to allow traffic flow on the south side of the parkway and extended passed office entrance road. Mr. Kelso then asked where the improvements are ending on the parkway. Mr. Glitzer wasn't sure where they will end, however, the paints stops where the left hand turn lane ends at the existing driveway into White Eagle Labs on Neamand Tract. Mr. Kelso then asked how much shoulder spaces will there be. Mr. Glitzer answered; space will vary, due to the road tapering, however, in the traffic planning design may show a six foot shoulder.

Paragraph 7; ZO Section 175-24 – Mr. Glitzer indicated currently there is no need for an off street loading and unloading spaces for non-residential use, because of no existing office space. Ms. Stern Goldstein suggested providing a drop off area for package delivery. Mr. Glitzer stated there are bump outs available, however they will provide a chalk line for these uses.

Paragraph 8; SLDO Section 153-36.B(1) – Mr. Glitzer requested the commission advice on how to proceed with providing lighting for single family residential subdivision. Currently there is a light at the entrance of the community. Ms. Stern Goldstein suggested lighting be provided in conjunction with the sign post entering into the property near Lower State Road, so residents can find the property. Ms. Mason indicated a sign should be included for the residential property. Mr. Glitzer agreed.

Paragraph 9; Section H – Mr. Glitzer requested guidance from the commission on how the plans should be revised to provide a common area for the composting of leaves. Ms. Stern Goldstein explained it would be

appropriate for a composting area be designated along the property to compost leaves. Mr. Glitzer indicated a property management company will be provided, but will look into the matter further.

Mr. Glitzer concluded by stating the Neamand Tract applicants has no issues with the Township Engineer; Mario Canales letter of November 22, 2010 and with Pennoni Associates' Transportation Officer; Mr. David A. Tomko's letter of December 9, 2010. Ms. Stern Goldstein clarified as behalf of Mr. Canales that his comments did not include the stormwater management issues and requested a separate meeting with Gilmore and Associates and Mr. Murphy to discuss the matter in detail. Mr. Glitzer agreed and commented how helpful Mr. Canales has been through the Land Development Plan process.

Mr. Kelso questioned a steep cross slope in front of the existing homes and drainage issues east of the home. Mr. Glitzer acknowledges there needs to be some way to address the overflow. Mr. Kelso then suggested defining the drainage along the area.

Ms. Hendrixson questioned who will be responsible for maintenance of the bike/hike path. Mr. Kelso stated the applicants are offering their services to maintain. Mr. Kelso then pointed out the plan calls for wooden trails, when it should state pressure treated posts for the path. Mr. Glitzer indicated he first wanted to check the path system, because the section was not defined. Mr. Glitzer then asked if the commission would like post to be included near the Neshaminy Path. Mr. Kelso stated the post worked extremely well with previous properties and would be fine to include. He then suggested limited signage should be included along the path, especially in the intersection.

Mr. Lowenstein questioned if should they be a crosswalk along the path near bump out areas. Mr. Glitzer agreed, and suggested to consolidate the ramps on either side for a gathering area with signage and bike racks.

Mr. Kelso has a concern with the sidewalks placed against the curbs. This may cause a problem with cars overhanging and blocking the sidewalks when parking. Mr. Glitzer agreed and stated it would not be a problem to bring in the sidewalk.

Mr. Kelso questioned the possibility of moving the five townhome units around the cul-de-sac near the north. Mr. Glitzer answered; it may be possible to move the units into an area not being used for the expressway, and still be able to preserve a line of spruce trees. Mr. Glitzer then mentioned a rare chestnut tree in the area that may be in need of saving which might preclude moving the units. Ms. Stern Goldstein will look into the matter in the spring.

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission will review and provide additional comments when revisions to Neamand Tract Subdivision Land Development are presented at a future meeting.

New Britain Township – Proposal to Amend the Zoning Map & Zoning Ordinance

Upon reviewing a memo from Bucks County Planning Commission, dated December 1, 2010, regarding their proposal to rezone TMP #26-11-72 from I Institutional District to RR Residential District, Mr. Lowenstein indicated he didn't see a reason for discussion.

Ms. Mason commented it would be a positive result for the township residential community and may resolve any concerns with Wordsworth Academy. Also, BCPC's request to rezone from Institutional to Residential zoning will result in a very positive outcome for the township community. Ms. Mason then requested a recommendation from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Kelso questioned if there are any pending development attached to signalize and align the intersection and signal on the north side of Ferry Road to place a pedestrian sidewalk. Ms. Mason responded by indicating the township has not seen a pending development plan to date. However, the Bike and Hike Committee is currently working on a grant for Destination Peace Valley along with Doylestown Boro, Chalfont and New Britain Boro. The grant is to have a pathway connection off Ferry Road to Peace Valley Park. Currently, there are some problems with institute use, where the residential neighborhood has been impacted with police action regarding the Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Center. With creating a residential use will provide a consistency to provide a positive outcome from a zoning stand point.

In the form of a motion, Mr. Lowenstein recommended The Doylestown Township Planning Commission will recommend to the Board of Supervisors, the Bucks County Planning Commission proposal to rezone TMP #26-11-72 from I Institutional District to RR Residential District to be a positive change on the Township boundary side and provide a positive response to New Britain Township, seconded by Mr. Redfield.

Motion was adopted 5 to 0.

Adjournment

8:24 p.m.