

**Minutes from the
DOYLESTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
October 24, 2011**

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular Meeting was held at 7:00 p.m., Monday, October 24, 2011 in the Lenape Valley Middle School Building, 313 West State Street, Doylestown, PA. Members of the Planning Commission in attendance included: Vice Chairman; Judy Hendrixson, Thomas Kelso, Edward Redfield and Kenneth L. Snyder. Also present: Township Manager; Stephanie J. Mason, Board of Supervisor Liaison; Richard F. Colello and Township Planning Consultant Ms. Judy Stern Goldstein.

Absent: Chairman; George Lowenstein

The Pavilion at Furlong – Revised Preliminary Land Development Plan

Ms. Hendrixson introduced the members of the Planning Commission. Ms. Stern Goldstein then provided a brief history of the ongoing land development plan submitted by the applicants, The Pavilion at Furlong. Most recently, in October of 2011, the Board of Supervisors provided a 90 day extension until January 2012 for the revised plan to be approved. Ms. Stern Goldstein concluded tonight's meeting is to discussed the revised sketch plans to see what is going on in order to make a decision prior to the deadline. The Pavilion at Furlong's attorney Mr. David Shafkowitz and Heath Dumack of Dumack Engineering were introduced.

Mr. Shafkowitz clarified when the plan was first submitted for rezoning; the Doylestown Township Planning Commission recommended the plans be rezone as District C2. Ultimately, when the District C2 plans were presented the Doylestown Township Board of Supervisors decided not to proceed any further. He then explained upon several discussions during the last year and half with the Board and Planning Commission regarding different plan options that was denied, caused a delay in presenting the revised preliminary land development plan.

He then provided a description of the property, that is a 19 ½ acre, split zoned as Districts LI and C1 (Light Industrial and Commercial), located on the corner of York and Swamp Roads. A conditional use application will be submitted at a later date for a cellular communications tower. The current plans proposed a warehouse use and daycare with on lot water and septic. Based upon the review letters received from the township, a water tower for fire depression only is also proposed and will be replaced with an underground system. Also, as per the Subdivision Land Development Ordinance, the plans were revised to depict road widening along the road frontages, to include Rogers Road as an access to Swamp and York Roads.

On behalf of The Pavilion at Furlong (applicants), Mr. Shafkowitz agreed to comply with the conditions set forth in Boucher & James, Inc letter of October 19, 2011, with the following notes...

2 (Use)

- b. ZO Section 175-16.C(10)(a) - Will comply by having the Department of Public Welfare will call an outside agency to insure all regulations are address as to how a daycare should be designed.

- c. ZO Section 175-16.F(4)(d) – Will comply in removing the existing pad.
3. ZO Section 175-29.B(4) – Will comply by proposing a public centralized sewage disposal system that will be offered to township for dedication, as well as a centralized public water supply system for the entire property. However, it will not be connected to the existing system, due to a public hook up not being within the vicinity of the project.
4. ZO Section 175-29.B(8) – Mr. Shafkowitz questioned if the plans presented this evening will be part of the requirement of plan submission to the Township Planning Commission. Ms. Stern Goldstein answered; the architectural plans will need to be included for submission.
- b. ZO Section 172-28.B(8)(c) – A traffic study was previously submitted, but will need to be revised pursuant to the Pennoni and Associates letter of October 19, 2011. The fire and safety hazard issues will be address during the building permit process. The warehouse use will not engage in noise, glare, air, or water pollution. Necessary arrangements will be provided if any of these uses should arise.
- c. ZO Section 175-28.B(8)(d) – The plan for disposal of sewage will be design upon resolution of the building's definition.
- d. ZO Section 175-28.B(8)(e) – A traffic impact study will be revised upon the design of a building plan along with the architectural plans.

Ms. Stern Goldstein noted under the Paragraph 3, Area and Dimensional Requirements ZO Section should be noted as 175-85.A(3) not 178-85.A(3).

Mr. Dumack explained the plan offered the proposed imperious coverage as 31.3%. However, the stormwater analysis was specially designed for the maximum imperious on the site at the allowed 40%. This allows for an 8.7% increase from what is actually proposed in the capacity of the storm system. In total, the buildings imperious are at 64,800 square feet, driveway and parking is at 80,230 square feet, sidewalk at 2,330 square feet, utility pads at 600 square feet and contingency at 40,842 square feet. The intent is the storm system was over designed under the proposed use for protection of severe weather. Mr. Dumack concluded applicants will comply with the township's ordinance.

4. Parking Design Standards

- b. ZO Section 175-24.B – Mr. Dumack presented the commission with copies of the proposed turning template plan, created by Dumack Engineering indicating how vehicles will enter and exit the loading areas when moving the buildings back 40 to 50 feet as recommended in a previous letter received. The building will actually be moved back approximately 10 feet.

Page two showed the turning template that will be utilized in the proposed warehouse. Mr. Dumack concluded the applicants will comply. Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned what direction will the warehouse be moved and if the paving will remain. Mr. Dumack indicated the warehouse will be moved 10 feet south east away from the adjacent residential properties and a 10 foot increase will be added to the proposed pavement. Ms. Stern Goldstein then suggested the templates be reviewed by the township's traffic engineer. Mr. Dumack agreed.

5. Environmental Protection Standards

- b. ZO Section 175-27.D(5) – Mr. Shafkowitz requested Ms. Stern Goldstein's guidance in identifying what is depicted as woodlands and requested a walk-through of the site with township's staff to identify. Ms. Stern Goldstein agreed.

He then indicated very little of the woodlands as depicted is located on the C1 portion of the property will be disturbed. However, would like the guidance of the township to review the woodlands to help identify the caliber of undisturbed woodlands for practical purposes that may not be depicted on the plan.

6. Landscape and Buffer Yard Requirements

- g. ZO Section 175-23.B – Will comply by changing the materials proposed.
- h. SLDO Section 153-34.B(2)(a) – Mr. Shafkowitz requested a walk-through be completed to insure existing vegetation does not contain noxious weeds and or invasive species to revise the plan accordingly. Ms. Stern Goldstein suggested contacting the township's office to arrange.
- i. SLDO Section 153-34.B(3) – Will comply for Rogers Road. A partial waiver may be requested for York and Swamp Roads to supplement street trees along the area, due to the extent of trees and woodland. Ms. Stern Goldstein indicated at some point a need to demonstrate compliance is required.

7. General Comments

- b. ZO Section 175-109.C – Will comply by demonstrating compliance on the plan.
- e. A fire department review has been completed. However, Mr. Shafkowitz was unsure if a police review has been completed, but will comply by insuring it will be done.

Mr. Snyder requested clarification of traffic flow. Mr. Shafkowitz could not answer any traffic questions, but indicated the traffic impact study will be revised and for the next schedule Planning Commission meeting. Also, a traffic engineer will be present to address any questions. Mr. Snyder then asked what route will the trucks utilized going in and out of Rogers Road. Mr. Shafkowitz answered; until the traffic engineer reviews the plans he cannot provide a definite answer. However he assumes the truck traffic flow will be limited from York into Rogers Road in order to refrain from disturbing the adjacent community roads.

Mr. Kelso questioned if spaces indicated along the warehouse area are parking spaces. Also, if the loading bay area is set up for offloading from the rear side of tractor trailers. Mr. Shafkowitz answered; yes, the spaces are for parking and the bay area is set up for offloading.

On behalf of The Pavilion at Furlong (applicants), Mr. Shafkowitz will comply with the conditions set forth in Pickering, Corts & Summerson, Inc. letter of October 17, 2011, with the following notes...

Record Plan – Sheet 2 of 12

ZO Section 175-24.A - Mr. Shafkowitz indicated as per the letter, the applicants will cover the turning radius to allow proper movement and circulation of tractor trailers.

Requested Waiver

Section 153-20.C.(10) – Request the commission’s guidance on how to request a waiver for the required location of existing watercourses, wells and on-site septic systems, stormwater management facilities within 400 feet of any part of the land to be developed. He then asked if the plans should be presented in the form of an aerial layout. Mr. Kelso suggested beginning with a readable aerial plan as per the comments in the Pickering, Corts & Summerson letter.

Mr. Shafkowitz requested the Pennoni & Associates letter of October 19, 2011 be addressed at the next scheduled Planning Commission meeting, where the applicants’ traffic experts can be present to address in detail.

Upon reviewing the October 19, 2011, SC Engineers, Inc letter for the first time, Mr. Shafkowitz indicated the applicants will comply with comments. He noted they will also will comply with the water testing requirements for the property and plans will be change to show connection into the proposed water supply system.

Public Comment:

Resident; Joseph F. O’Malley of 138 Rogers Road, Furlong found it incredible, traffic issues cannot be addressed at tonight’s meeting after a 90 day extension was approved. He then questioned if distribution will be the primary use of the warehouse. Mr. Shafkowitz answered; the primary use will be a warehouse and it’s a difficult process to prepare a traffic study to submit for township review in time. The township review letters were only received a few days ago and did not have enough time to prepare a traffic impact study. With the understanding traffic is a major issue, Mr. Shafkowitz suggested a single session be dedicated to all traffic issues once the impact study is completed. Mr. O’Malley then questioned the size of the trucks that will be used. The turning template presented for illustration purposes only and once the loading docks are designed will determined what size truck will be used.

Mr. O’Malley then questioned why did the review process take so long. Ms. Stern Goldstein answered; Boucher and James issued there comments in a timely manner with only a week to review the plans. Mr. Shafkowitz agreed with Ms. Stern Goldstein by indicating the township did a great job in providing their comments in timely manner. He added it also made the process difficult when only recently receiving the Pennoni & Associates letter, which did not provide enough time to present a revised traffic impact plan within the requirements.

Resident; Edgar R. Neff of 150 Rogers Road, Furlong requested clarification if the proposed traffic flow will come in from Rogers to Old York Road and back on Old York Road. Mr. Shafkowitz answered; the ideal plan is to have all traffic come in from York Road and Rogers and Old York will be a focus on the traffic plan once developed. Mr. Neff then questioned if widening on Rogers Road is proposed. Widening is proposed only along the frontage of the property, but will consider Rogers Road if it makes sense based upon the traffic.

Mr. Snyder then requested clarification if widening will be up to Route 263 or at the existing building. Mr. Shafkowitz answered; the entire property frontage on Rogers Road is proposed to be widen.

A resident questioned the hours of operation for the warehouse and what impact will it have on noise pollution. Mr. Shafkowitz indicated he could not answer the question at this time, but can be addressed with traffic experts at the next Planning Commission meeting.

A resident questioned if the plans are only to widen the curbs along the frontage. Mr. Shafkowitz indicated as per the ordinance, widen is only proposed from Rogers Road and the property's frontage boundaries and will it interfere with private property.

Resident; Mary Lou Streznewski of 22 Brook Drive asked several questions, such as, how is Rogers Road designated in the plan, why can't the warehouse be completely turned around to serve as a buffer and what type of light factories would operate on the property. Mr. Shafkowitz responded; a coffee roaster is considered in the ordinance as a light industrial.

Ms. Streznewski then asked how will the project effect the existing temple and proposed church, because she feels the project will cause a great deal of air, noise and light pollution. Ms. Stern Goldstein answered; Rogers Road is classified as a sub collector, which means the designation requires a certain width of the paving and does not have any weight or truck restriction under the Subdivision Land Ordinance. Currently, the plan classifies manufacturing as G15 warehouse, in which manufacturing is not permitted, excluding retail use. A plan change will be needed by to applicant to change the warehouse use.

Mr. Shafkowitz added in order to have the most effective location, the warehouse is decided by positioning of the disposal and storm water management systems. Mr. Kelso then questioned if the sewage system was tested. Mr. Dumack indicated the initial perk study was performed to the entire site with a back hoe and excavator. The next step is to bring in the Department of Health to perform a detailed perk analysis. Mr. Kelso then questioned if the **MPDS** permit been prepared and submitted. Mr. Dumack indicated yes, the permit has been submitted to both the township and Conservation District and currently waiting for a response.

A resident had three questions. What will prevent the trucks from coming into Spring Valley Road from Rogers Road. Mr. Shafkowitz indicated along with signage and enforcement from the township will assist in keeping the trucks from entering Spring Valley Road. Will there be a cell tower in the property and what will it look like. A cell tower will be built on the site up to 150 feet. Mr. Schell then questioned is a permit will need to be required by the FAA. Mr. Shafkowitz indicated not with the height at 150 feet. Ms. Stern Goldstein agreed. Mr. Schell's final question was if water wells be located on the property. A centralized system will be installed.

Resident; Martin P. Auman of 49 Valley Drive, Furlong asked what can be stored in the warehouse and does the ordinance classify what can be stored. Ms. Stern Goldstein answered; the zoning ordinance does not classify what can be stored, but the building code can. She added, any questions relating to building or zoning codes can be answered by contacting Doylestown Township Administrative Offices. Mr. Auman's second questioned; what type of on-site septic system is proposed. Mr. Dumack answered; a standard septic with a sand mound is proposed and depending on the Department of Health's analysis prove grading will be changed to standard. Ms. Stern Goldstein noted the plans do not indicated a sand mound, but only the septic will be kept at grade. At the moment the plans are showing standard grade and elevation based upon the Department of Health's findings, but may change.

Resident; Constance Victor of 116 Rogers Road, Furlong commented it should be very clear what road will be used for trucks to enter and exit the project to prevent them from entering residential areas. She then questioned what impact will the air pollution will have to the daycare center and emphases what the water wells and sewage impact will have is very important. A well impact study has been submitted pursuant to the 170 Water Impact ordinances, which requires monitoring of wells in the area. Upon review of the township's experts more details will be provided.

Resident; James Bingler of Turkey Lane, Furlong questioned why haven't the caliber inches of the trees been completed. Ms. Stern Goldstein responded; there is no record on the plan the charts are in compliance. Mr. Shafkowitz indicated the caliber of trees have been completed, but may not have been submitted. He assured the caliber of trees will be on included with the revised submission.

Mr. Bingler then questioned when the building was moved ten feet did it encroach on the basin area, where the water table is the highest. Mr. Dumack indicated soil maps are based on broader scale than what is depicted on the plan. Soil scientist completed a thorough analysis of the site prior to coming up with the design. Based upon the analysis, the best area was chosen keeping in mind the seasonal high water table and infiltration rates. Mr. Bingler then questioned if the water basin will have a point discharge or through a pipe. A point discharge is proposed because it will be mandated by the MPDS to infiltrated into the ground. The result will be a substantial decrease in water coming off the site for best management practice for ground water discharge.

Resident; Paul M. Hayes of 104 Oak Drive, Doylestown questioned what is the requirement and variance for an on-site septic system. Also, he commented why is a commercial property allow to construct a sand mound for septic, when the township pushes for the residents to hook up into a public sewage system due to failing septic systems. Mr. Shafkowitz clarified a centralized systems is proposed for both water and sewer, which will be offered as dedication to the township. It is considered a public system that can be connected to in the future. Mr. Hayes then questioned how can a sand mound be offered to the public, when it reaches into the ground. Mr. Shafkowitz explained, it doesn't matter what the system does, it's considered a centralized system when more than one user is connected and the township oversees maintenance. Ms. Stern Goldstein disagreed that it would be the township's responsibility to maintain the centralized public sewer and water system and will need to be determined.

Resident; Joe Gunsiorowski of 25 Turkey Lane, Furlong questioned if one tenth of the 67, 000 square feet warehouse can be occupied as a distribution center. Mr. Shafkowitz indicated for a distribution center up to 300,000 feet is required, but is not qualified to answer the question in detail. The proposed plan markets individual units at 10,000 square feet, but it's possible for a tenant to take all of it. Mr. Gunsiorowski then asked if the Board has been supplied with data of other acceptable areas for sewer and water system. Mr. Dumack answered the initial studies were completed by a soil scientist that covered the entire site in the course of one day. The analysis was completed in the field with no written report, it was suggested the system be place in the region near Rogers Road for the best suitable infiltration and high water table for the centralized water and sewer system. Ms. Stern Goldstein added the township was not supplied with this data to date, but expects will be in the revised plan.

Resident; Donald E. Parlee of 75 Foxcroft Drive, Doylestown questioned what is the benchmark used to determine an acceptable traffic and sewer impact is for the community given the currently challenges. Ms. Stern Goldstein answered; the township traffic engineer is currently reviewing all the information regarding traffic issues. She added, all information regarding the submitted land development plan is public record and all data can be reviewed by visiting the township building at 425 Wells Road, Doylestown. If copies are requested, a charge may apply. Ms. Hendrixson indicated a traffic committee is working on preserving the character of the township by analyzing all records received and reviewing growth and development. The committee also works with the Planning commission to review the street hierarchy as a definition process.

Mr. Parlee repeated his questions. Mr. Hendrixson indicated the pattern of the roads are determined by the width, character, speed limits and traffic calming in a case by case basis as a continuous process from several committees

within Doylestown Township. Mr. Kelso added during discussions with the traffic committee are level of service and certain perimeter use practiced to make the determinations. Once the materials are ready to present in detail, a more technical discussion will resume at the next Planning Commission meeting.

A resident asked what is the anticipated number of children that will be in the proposed daycare center. Mr. Shafkowitz could not answer the question, but indicated it's a factor as part of the Department of Public Welfare requirements stated in Ms. Stern Goldstein's letter of October 19th. It will also be determine by the square footage of the building, which the proposed daycare will be at 8,400 square feet and ages of the children.

Resident; Paul Hayes questioned if there is a concern the standing water along the retention basin will foster the risk of mosquitos. Mr. Dumack answered; the plan has factored rates of absorption built into the design of the infiltration system, as a standard minimum requirement of the soil conservation and DEP at .02 inches of infiltration. The lower end storms will be 100% infiltrated into the ground. Mr. Shafkowitz added, as part of the new regulations for naturalizing the basin will allow for plants to grow and bring in bird species to create a wetland habitat.

Ms. Hendrixson informed the public the next meeting of the Doylestown Township Planning Commission is Monday, November 28, 2011, where if the applicants have submitted their revised plans, will be present to discuss traffic study concerns. She then encouraged anyone to check the newspaper advertisement as well as the township website for details.

Resident; Anne Woodbury of 680 Spring Valley Road questioned if emergency vehicles will be addressed in the revised traffic study. Ms. Hendrixson answered; all traffic related issues will be addressed once the revised traffic study is available for the next Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Shafkowitz added a review from the Fire Department was submitted, and doesn't believe emergency services provide a review. Ms. Stern Goldstein indicated the applicants can meet with the Township Fire Marshall to obtain one. Mr. Shafkowitz did indicated they have received a review by the Fire Marshall.

Adjournment: 9:10 p.m.