

**Minutes from the  
DOYLESTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting  
November 28, 2011**

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular Meeting was held at 7:00 p.m., Monday, November 24, 2011 in the Doylestown Township Municipal Building, 425 Wells Road, Doylestown, PA. Members of the Planning Commission in attendance included: Chairman; George Lowenstein, Vice Chairman; Judy Hendrixson, Thomas Kelso, Edward Redfield and Kenneth L. Snyder. Also present: Township Manager; Stephanie J. Mason and Township Planning Consultant Ms. Judy Stern Goldstein.

Absent: Board of Supervisor Liaison; Richard F. Colello

**Review of Minutes:**

In a form of a motion by Mr. Redfield, seconded by Ms. Hendrixson the September 26, 2011 Planning Commission Regular Meeting minutes were approved.

Motion carried 5 to 0

In a form of a motion by Mr. Kelso, seconded by Ms. Hendrixson the October 24, 2011 Planning Commission Regular Meeting minutes were approved.

Motion carried 4 to 1 with Mr. Lowenstein abstaining due to his absence.

**Visitor Comments:** None

**Ventresca Sketch Plans**

Robert Showalter of Showalter & Associates represented the Ventresca family. He handed the commission three single family cluster sketch plans while providing a brief overview of the property to include the subdivision of a 9.7 gross acre parcel into four single family detaching lots on Keeley Avenue. The four units are proposed to be served by a cul-de-sac road. Public water and sewerage facilities are intended to also serve the development. The applicants have ongoing discussions with the Open Space Committee regarding dedicating of a portion of the property. They would like to move forward with the property as the discussions continue. Mr. Showalter then reviewed each of the three plans.

Plan A: Is a four lot subdivision under the B7 District (cluster), which requires 45% of open space. 4 ½ acres of open space adjacent to the civic center will be dedicated to open space, comprised of mostly wooded area and wetlands. Since the tract is 9.7 acres and a minimum of 10 acres is required under the B7 District, relief from the Zoning Hearing Board is required. The Open Space committee commented there were too many lots and access to the open space should be considered to the proposed roadway and cul-de-sac.

Plan B: Keeping with the Open Space Committee's comments, Mr. Showalter designed a second plan. The plan includes three lots with access to the open space area, by narrowing the cart way to 22 feet instead of the standard 26 feet and having the cul-de-sac smaller in size. Lot one would have access directly from Keeley Road on the existing driveway and the house lot will increase to 2.1 acres. Relief from the Zoning Hearing Board would be required.

Plan C: will have three lots with a 2 acre minimum lot size required from the R1 District. The open space will increase to 4.2 acres. Open space will be 2.8 acres with a by right plan with no requirement for open space. The intent is to donate the space to the Civic Association to preserve the most important areas of the property. The roadway will be smaller in width. Presence at the Zoning Hearing Board would be required with regard to the roadway width and may be required because the minimum lot width is 200 feet.

Ms. Stern Goldstein clarified technically the open space has to be offer to the township as per the B7 use. She then noted the definition of a required lot up to 40,000 square feet may have an issue. It would have to be exclusive to the wetlands on the B7 sketches. On the B1 on the third sketch, there is a 2 acre minimum lot size that will need at least 40,000 square feet exclusive of resources. Ms. Showalter indicated there will not be a problem. Ms. Stern indicated calculations will be needed for the pond and imperious surface.

Ms. Stern Goldstein then questioned if there are plans to construct any other buildings or additions on the lot near the wetlands. Mr. Showalter answered; unless relief is approved for the setbacks on the wetlands for a future homeowner, no construction would take place. Additionally, Ms. Goldstein indicated that any open space could not be donated to the Civic Association but to the Township.

Mr. Showalter concluded by informing the commission that the applicants will comply with comments received from a recent letter from the Bucks County Planning Commission with regards to trails. Mr. Kelso suggested speaking with the Bike and Hike Committee which includes both the Doylestown Township and New Britain Boro.

#### Eastburn Tract – Preliminary Land Development Plan

Richard Zaveta of Zaveta Construction provided the commission with a brief history of the ongoing Eastburn Tract Preliminary Subdivision Plan, to include a recent phone meeting with residents that addressed their concerns successfully. Most recently, the plan has been revised to an eight lot plan in a private area. The eight proposed lots will be constructed with in 50 acres tract and will have 8 acres of disturbable building envelope along a non-restrictive area. The applicants are forgoing township funding through the Open Space easement by placing the easement on the tract.

On behalf of the applicant; Eastburn Tract, Eric Clase of Gilmore & Associates reviewed comments presented by Pickering, Corts & Summerson, Inc. in their November 16, 2011 letter and noted the following...

#### Waivers

- 1) Section 153-20.C.(10) – A partial waiver is requested to locate the existing features within 400 feet. Required information was provided to the township engineer.
- 2) Section 153-24.B.(1) – A proposed 12 foot wide shared access drives is requested.
- 3) Section 153-24.B.(2)(a) – A proposal of no improvement along Short Road is requested, because the existing cart way is at 17 ½ feet and in some areas at 16 feet.

- 4) Section 153-25.C – A waiver for all land development to establish a bike/hike path in accordance with the township's Pedestrian/Bicycle Transportation Plan.
- 5) Section 153-26 – A waiver for all curbs to be installed along every residential access street, private street and along existing streets for any part of the project.
- 6) Section 153-27.A.(5) – Due to the topography, the slopes of the driveways have gone up 10% because if held at the 8% required it will result in more tree disturbance.

Mr. Kelso suggested if more specifics can be provided on the waivers, such as Section 153-27.A.(5). Mr. Clase agreed and will state what the maximum percent is.

Mr. Kelso then noted the pull offs on the driveways. Mr. Clase explained; the driveway access widens in order to permit a car to pull over.

**On behalf of the applicants; Eastburn Tract, Mr. Eric Clase will comply with comments of the Pickering, Cortis and Summerson's letter of November 16, 2011 with the following notations...**

Record Plans:

- 3) Pemberton Land and Woodbury Path are private roads that will not be dedicated to the township. The Township Engineer asked for the commission's recommendation.
- 4) Mr. Clase asked the commission if they desire the ultimate right of way off Short Road for dedication to the township. The commission agreed the approval will be by the Board of Supervisors
- 7) Section 153-24.(A).(6)(a) - Mr. Clase requested guidance to obtain shared access off Windover Lane, which is a public road and name their access as Woodbury Path. Mrs. Stern Goldstein indicated changing the name would assist emergency services because Windover is a continuous street.
- 9) Section 153-24-(A).(8) – Requesting a partial waiver as to the width of the cart of way.
- 13) Section 153-37.C.(5) – There will be no fee in lieu of land, only a waiver is requested.
- 22) SALDO Section 153-41.C.(3) – Requesting a waiver.
- 27) A partial waiver is requested. The township requires a maximum slope of 4 to 1. With all the proposed lots, an infiltration system collects the turnaround area and the roof of each home. With each system a portion of the lawn around the homes are being collected and taken into an inlet along a berm. The berm has been graded 3 to 1, not to encroach further into the woods. The partial waiver requested will be to have all the infiltration beds graded 3 to 1.

Mr. Clase spoke in detail regarding stormwater management, clarifying the existing driveways on site are approximately 64,000 square foot of imperious surface. All of the paths currently onsite will be removed. The paths are considered shared access drives and the driveways up to the turnaround area total 41,000 square feet of imperious surface, which equals to a net decrease of 23,000 square feet. For the turnaround and home areas, the infiltration bed will capture water flow and infiltrate almost all of the water.

For the existing storm pipe, the water flow will be captured in a large swale, piping under lot 2's driveway then continue under a road back into the channel and ends up into an existing pond onsite.

Mr. Kelso questioned what the proposed majority use of the open space is. Mr. Clase answered; a wild meadow is in place. Mr. Snyder questioned who will oversee the stormwater. Mr. Clase answered; the individual lot owner will have control over their own systems.

Ms. Stern Goldstein requested clarity on the stormwater infiltration systems on the lots, with grading on some of the lower lying areas will look like rain gardens. Mr. Clase clarified; the swale is in a low lying area with a slope. The slope will take the rainwater into an inlet where it will be raised six inches above the ground. There is a two foot parameter ring of river stone and other materials so when the water flows into the system it will lead into the ground. The debris will be held outside of the ground, so there is no standing water.

**On behalf of the applicants; Eastburn Tract, Mr. Eric Clase of Gilmore & Associates will comply with comments on the Boucher & James, Inc. letter of November 16, 2011 and noted the following...**

4) SLDO Section 153-25.C – Requesting a waiver for a bike and hike path. Mr. Kelso questioned if a connection onto Short Road is possible. Mr. Zaveta responded the connection will bring traffic into personal space, where foot traffic is not desired. Mr. Kelso then requested the applicants consider placing the bike/hike trail in another area. Mr. Zaveta agreed to look into the matter.

5.b) SLDO Section 153-34.B(3) – Requesting a waiver because the driveways have been designed to minimize disturbance to the woodlands.

**On behalf of the applicants; Eastburn Tract, Mr. Eric Clase will comply with comments of the Pennoni & Associates' letter of November 18, 2011 with the following notations...**

- 1) The applicants will not like to widen and curb to the full existing width of 25 feet on Windover Lane. Instead, would like to begin the access drive/ shared easement to come in at 12 feet.
- 2) The applicants have met with emergency services and they are comfortable the truck will be able to make turns with the 12 foot wide shared access. Ms. Stern Goldstein asked if there was a review letter on file. Mr. Clase indicated there was not a review letter on file.
- 8) The applicants are proposing a 12 foot width cart way.
- 9) Requesting a waiver to remove the fee for in lieu of open space that is being provided to the project.

Referencing the SC Engineers' letter of November 21, 2011, Mr. Clase indicated it was the opinion of the neighboring residents and township that an onsite well was not needed.

Public Comment:

A resident question what is the justification for a regional well. Mr. Kelso suggested referring his question to the Township's Municipal Authority.

A resident questioned who will be responsible for repairing a storm drain that erodes underground near his property if Windover Lane is considered a private road. Mr. Clase answered; the applicants will extend approximately 15 feet past the main home and the storm drain will remain part of the city. His second question was why connecting to a public sewer not an option. Mr. Kelso answered; there is no public sewer connection close to the property. The resident's third question; what is being done to the stub at the entrance. Mr. Zaveta answered; the driveway will be tapered down for definition to funnel and a private sign will be posted.

Mr. Kelso suggested bumping the entrance on another side of the road approximately six feet. Mr. Zaveta agreed to consider the idea.

A resident requested clarification of the buffer zone located behind the property. Mr. Clase responded the township requires setback of 50 feet. The applicant is decreasing their footprint of what would be required, in order to pull their home further away and the existing vegetation will stay.

A resident questioned if the property to the right of the existing creek will remain as is. Mr. Clase answered; yes, it will not be touched.

A resident questioned where will the septic systems be placed on the property, how big the homes are and if they have been perked. Mr. Zaveta answered; the Bucks County Health Department has approved and completed testing along the site. The locations of the systems are shown on the plans and will be available for public view. His second question; what action will be taken for the poor condition on Short Road. Mr. Kelso suggested discussing with the township engineer for solutions. Ms. Mason added it may be a condition as part of the final land development plan approval with the Board of Supervisors. His final question; if drilling was planned for each well at the individual lots and what are their depths. Mr. Zaveta indicated drilling is planned at each lot but at this time we are unsure of the depths.

A resident asked if testing of the water will be performed. Mr. Zaveta clarified the request for a waiver is to not perform a hydro study on a large well. Public water testing is required by the township.

A resident questioned will lighting be supplied. Mr. Zaveta answered; deed restriction will take care of lighting and no public lamp posts. Ms. Stern Goldstein added as per township ordinance, lighting is at the discretion of the Board of Supervisors. His final question; what is the time line for reviews of the plans. Mr. Lowenstein answered; there is a 90 day review period, which can be extended. Therefore, at this time it will be difficult to determine when the plans will be approved. Mr. Kelso added the 90 day period ends in February of 2012.

Mr. Lowenstein reviewed the issues that will need to be addressed to provide a cleaner set of plans. The issues to be resolved are as follows.

- A) Connection of segment to two sections of the pedestrian walkway on the property
- B) Include a bump out needed to be created off of Windover Lane
- C) Include a two feet of base of each side of the internal roadways to stabilized the shoulder
- D) Identify areas that are problems on Short Road that might require fixing

- E) An emergency services letter is needed as well as evidence that trucks can maneuver within the proposed roadways.
- F) Provide a complete list of requested waivers and more specifics with regard to the request.

Mr. Kelso suggested having the township engineer look at Short Road. Ms. Mason indicated she will ask Mario Canales to look at Short Road as well as Richard John to review the water well.

#### Thompson Toyota Expansion – Preliminary/ Final Land Development Plan

Attorney for Thompson Toyota; G. Michael Carr provided the commission with a brief overview of the ongoing expansion of Thompson Toyota to include the completion of the Lexus and BMW portions. Currently the Toyota portion is being expanded. He then referred to the Boucher & James and Pennoni review letters of which the applicants will try to comply with most of the comments. He then introduced owner, John Thompson.

Mr. Thompson provided the commission with an overview of the entire expansion plan. Upon land development plan review, they decided to phase the plan into two sections, with the first phase listed as Lexus and BMW and the second as Toyota. The plans were recently scaled back due to the economy to include a new showroom, service center with parking on the roof and surface parking. The main entrance driveway will be changed and the bike and hike trail will be extended along Swamp Road. Curb ramps will be added to connect to the intersection. The total square footage will be 9,000 square feet, which is less than what was contemplated. The ramp parking has also been pushed away from neighboring residential properties and the height will be lowered. Grading will enable all buildings to be at the same height. To comply with the township stormwater management, an infiltration system will be installed.

Mr. Thompson commended the township consultants for the taking the time during the holidays in providing their reviews for such a complex development.

**On behalf of the applicants; Thompson Toyota, Mr. Carr will comply with comments listed on the November 18, 2011 Boucher & James letter with following notations...**

#### Environmental Protection Standards

4-f) Mr. Carr suggests under the Zoning Hearing Board's decision the resource protection area tables are a phase within the site and relief was granted with respect to any resource criteria under the decision. Ms. Stern Goldstein indicated the resource protection calculations were created as a standalone, where the parking was clearly noted, but resources were treated separately. Mr. Carr agreed to review the calculations again with Ms. Stern Goldstein to ensure nothing is open unexpectedly.

#### Off-Street Parking Requirements

5-c) Mr. Carr requested buffering clarification along the western frontage of the property. Ms. Stern Goldstein clarified there is a need to demonstrate compliance by partially removing all of the existing invasive species. Mr. Carr indicated they will comply, but did not want to have a buffer along the bypass. Mr. Carr then added the applicants will no longer be loading or unloading cars from the street.

#### General Comments

8-f) Mr. Carr suggested, as per Penn Dot's recommendation to restripe the two existing crosswalks by the way of a signal permit. Ms. Stern Goldstein indicated for discussion purposes, a better place for people to walk on the other side of area.

Ms. Mason added during a recent inspection, Pennoni & Associates along with Plumstead Township are planning to make improvements along the area of the crosswalk.

Mr. Kelso questioned if there will be any curb cuts on Camel Drive. Mr. Thompson indicated the bike and hike trail will run on the high side to not impact woodlands. Mr. Carr then ran through issues with the bike and hike trail to include placing a stop sign on the path, requesting a distance waiver for no less than 300 feet off the intersection, flat stopping, grading of the driveway and widening and dedication of Campbell Avenue. Mr. Thompson references a comment on Township Engineer; Mario Canales' letter by stating there is no intention to widen Campbell Road. Redirection of the curbing will be needed to mirror the opposite side and offer for dedication.

**On behalf of the applicants; Thompson Toyota, Mr. Carr will comply with the comments listed on the November 18, 2011 Pickering, Corts & Summerson, Inc with the following notations...**

#### Site Plans

7) Mr. Carr also references Mr. Canales' letter by stating paving will be completed on specs with regards to Publication 408 under the Penn Dot Specifications. With bumps and guard rails on a different plan may be implemented to provide someone from rolling down.

#### Tree Protection Plan

24) The applicants prefer not to remove a tree in order to be within the ten foot work zone. Mr. Carr requested clarification if Mr. Canales is requesting a clearance of woodlands within ten feet is required. Mr. Thompson added cut walls will actually be cleared along the construction area. Mr. Kelso clarified; Mr. Canales is requesting a good distance behind the retaining wall be cleared. Ms. Stern Goldstein suggested mapping out what needs to be done prior to clearing so to determine how much of the trees will be impacted.

#### Grading Plan

28) SALDO Section 153-39.C.(5) - Applicants will be requesting a waiver to be able to grade after the property line.

Mr. Carr informed the commission that discussion for stormwater, erosion sedimentation and grading will be postpone for another day so the engineers may have a chance to review.

As with the November 18, 2011 Pennoni & Associates and SC Engineer letters, Mr. Carr stated upon recent discussions with the engineers onsite, applicants will comply with the comments and will work directly with them instead of taking the time from the commission.

Mr. Lowenstein questioned when will Plumstead Township decided on what improvement will be to the crosswalk. Ms. Mason answered; a decision will be made sometime late in 2011 or early 2012. Mr. Carr added his is working with Plumstead Township on the project and will rely any information as he is notified.

Mr. Carr reviewed the requests for waivers by the applicant as stated on the November 7, 2011 Bohler Engineering letter.

- 1) SALDO Section 153-12 – the applicant is seeking Land Development Plan approval for the Toyota site as a Preliminary / Final Land Development plan.
- 2) SALDO Section 153-20 – The project is not anticipating having an adverse impact on existing features within 400 feet of the property. .
- 3) SALDO Section 153-20.E – Applicant is providing a Trip Generation Comparison summary in lieu of a full Traffic Impact Study.
- 4) SALDO Section 153-34.B(3)(a) – The spacing of the existing driveway has been provided as near to the require street tree plantings as possible. Also, the required quantity of trees has otherwise been provided along the frontage.
- 5) SALDO Section 153-34.B(3)(b) – The proposed sidewalk and existing overhead and underground utilities prevent feasible planting areas with five feet of the ultimate right of way.
- 6) SALDO Section 153-34.C.(2) – There are a total of six trees in this category existing on site, with a total of 194 caliper inches. Nineteen caliper inches are permitted to be removed at 10%. Fifty four caliper inches need to be removed as a result of the proposed expansion. However, all caliper inches to be removed will be replaced on a one for one basis.
- 7) SALDO Section 153-39.D.(1) – Due to spatial limitations, slopes of 3:1 and 2:1 are being provided along the property boundary adjacent to the 611 Bypass off ramp. This is to limit disturbance to within the property or as close the property as possible.

Public Comments:

Mr. Kelso questioned who will maintain the trees along the curbing. Mr. Thompson answered; Penn Dot will be responsible.

On behalf of a resident on 144 Campbell Road, Mr. Bogie Rosypal commented the berm elevation is not the same as the building and it slopes down towards Route 313. Any building expansion as projected is going to be completely visible to the residents along Campbell Road. Especially with a parking deck on top the neighbors will be viewing the parking deck from their backyards and in some cases, kitchens. He also indicated the area is not heavily vegetated. There are many dead trees and if the applicants are planning to plant any trees, he suggested the trees should last more than twenty years. Mr. Rosypal then asked if there are any plans for the abandoned residence at 84 Campbell Road. Mr. Thompson responded the will look into it.

Mr. Rosypal suggested full size stop signs be installed at the existing exit will assist with pedestrian issues. However, he is in favor of making the crossing over Route 313 more towards the western side. He feels it would be a safer option for walking. Mr. Kelso questioned if he is suggesting placing a four way stop sign. Mr. Rosypal stated small stop signs will not hinder vehicular traffic. Mr. Carr stated a full size stop sign will be utilized. Mr. Kelso suggested there will be a need for a painted crosswalk on Campbell with pedestrian crosswalk sign, so the police may enforce.



Resident; Wayne Funk of 51 Campbell Road questioned if a shoot would be coming out with a no right turn sign to discourage pedestrian from entering the development. Mr. Kelso responded; the Traffic Advisory Board will look into traffic calming measures along Campbell Road.

Mr. Funk then questioned will headlights from the rooftop parking be blocked with a retaining wall. Mr. Thompson indicated it will construct a four foot wall so the headlights will not be able to shine out into the adjacent residents.

Ms. Hendrixson asked if the parking area will the lighting shine at night. Mr. Thompson indicated minimal security lighting may be proposed. Details are currently being worked out with the architect.

The applicants will present a revised plan to the Doylestown Planning Commission.

Adjournment: 9:43 p.m.