

Minutes from the
DOYLESTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
October 28, 2013

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular Meeting was held at 7:00 p.m., Monday, October 28, 2013 in the Doylestown Township Municipal Building, 425 Wells Road, Doylestown, PA. Members of the Planning Commission in attendance included Chairman; Judy , Vice Chairman; Kenneth L. Snyder with members Thomas Kelso, Edward Redfield and George Lowenstein. Other in attendance included Township Manager; Stephanie J. Mason and Board of Supervisor Liaison; Richard F. Colello.

Absent: Township Planning Consultant; Ms. Judy Stern Goldstein. In Ms. Stern Goldstein's absence, Ms. Karen Morgan Mallo was present.

Review of Minutes:

In the form of a motion by Mr. Redfield; seconded by Mr. Kelso the September 23, 2013 Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular meeting minutes were approved.

Motion carried 5 to 0.

Public\Commission Comments - Ed Edenbach – Telecommunications Advisory Board

Mr. Edenbach addressed the commission as a follow up to Telecommunications Advisory Board's (TAB) February letter to request Planning Commission materials and/or subject of interests to broadcast on Doylestown Television (DTV). Currently, 30 to 45% of the channel are informational videos, to include the Environmental Advisory Committee, Traffic Advisory Board and Central Bucks Regional Aging Task Force. The TAB Board is searching for more information from all Boards and Commissions to place on air regarding relevant township activity.

Ms. Hendrixson commented DTV is a great service where the commission is currently preparing materials to broadcast. However, additional preparation is needed, such as creating a script to format into a conversation outlining the duties of the commission. Mr. Lowenstein questioned Ms. Mason if Delaware Valley College offers a course that will assist the commission in moving forward in creating a format. Ms. Mason offered to contact DVC. Mr. Edenbach offered the assistance as well.

Items for Discussion – Street Hierarchy; Amendments \ Zoning & Subdivision Land Development Ordinances

Upon reviewing the Street Hierarchy, in the form of a motion by Mr. Lowenstein; seconded by Mr. Kelso the Doylestown Township Planning Commission recommends the Doylestown Township Board of Supervisors enact the Amended Zoning & Subdivision Land Development Ordinance to include additions noted below prior to discussions.

- 1) Zoning Modification; Section 1 \ Article §175-16.E(6)(a) – alter sentence to read “both Community Collectors or Arterial Streets be listed as direct access.

- 2) Zoning Modification; Section 3 \ Article §175-16.E(8)(a) – alter sentence to read “both Community Collectors or Arterial Streets be listed as direct access.

Motion carried

Mr. Lowenstein reported a public hearing for the Street Hierarchy Amendment to the Zoning & SALDO ordinance will be held at the next Board of Supervisors Regular meeting scheduled for Tuesday, November 19, 2013 beginning at 7:00pm.

Plans for Scheduled for Discussion:

360 Old Dublin Pike, Preliminary Land Development Plans \ T.P.#9-48-23 & 9-48-10

Gilmore & Associates engineer; Gregory R. Glitzer begin his presentation with an overview of the site as two tax parcels boxed in off the corner of Old Dublin Pike and Pine Run Road. The plan proposes using Use B15 District, which is a single family attached dwelling to construct 7 townhouse units and adaptive reuse of the existing home and renovation of a barn to serve as a dwelling.

The access road aligns with an outer road and sharing across the street as a low impact development with minimal imperious surface. A multi-use trail will be incorporated along the frontage of Pine Run Road and Old Dublin Pike. Rain gardens will serve has stormwater management.

The applicants met with the Zoning Hearing Board in June of 2013 in order to allow the Use B15 on a parcel less than 10 acres. The property is actual two parcels totaling approximately less than 10 acres. A relief was granted for the use as well as the incremental decimal of density. RJA Investment Fund V, LP have acquired the property and moved forward with the sub division land development plan.

Mr. Glitzer concluded his presentation by indicating the applicants will comply with review letters from Pickering, Corts and Summerson, dated October 17, 2013, Michael Baker, Jr. Inc., dated October 18, 2013, Pennoni & Associates dated October 18, 2013 and Boucher & James, Inc. dated October 23, 2013.

Ms. Hendrixson questioned if the townhouses will have garages. Mr. Glitzer answered; each unit will have a two car garage. Upon ongoing discussion, it's likely the barn will have a garage due to configurations. Ms. then asked what will be the function of the barn. Mr. Glitzer answered; the barn will become a single family dwelling. Gilmore & Associates engineer; Sharon Dotts added a driveway is proposed to be constructed off of the cul-de-suc into the rear of the building to use a separate lower area as parking.

Mr. Lowenstein questioned if another building existed. Mr. Glitzer answered; an existing carriage house will be removed. Ms. Dotts added several other sheds and out building will be removed as well.

Mr. Lowenstein then requested an outlined of parking be clarified. On the plans there is no indication of no room for parking and two cars are required. Mr. Glitzer explained; With not counting the cars in the garage, the plans notes a double full width driveway going up to the two car garage to accommodate additional cars. He then agreed to update the plans to document all parking dimensions. He added a proposed 26 foot wide road with a sign indicating no parking. They request the flexibility to proceed because it will be considered a private road.

Mr. Lowenstein indicated he didn't see anything indicating accommodations for emergency and large vehicle traffic through the site. Ms. Dotts answered; a truck template was designed and will provide with an exhibit showing the road width will accommodate a full size truck as long as no vehicle is parked. Mr. Kelso questioned if the template will accommodate a truck turning if cars are parked along one side of the road. Mr. Glitzer answered; in certain areas and a certain truck will be able to turn around the entrance. Mr. Kelso then questioned Mr. Glitzer if no parking on both sides is acceptable. Mr. Glitzer agreed.

A discussion ensued amongst the commission and Mr. Glitzer reviewing the best area to develop to accommodate turning ratios for large trucks and emergency vehicles.

Mr. Hendrixson suggested the plans added an area for visitor parking. Mr. Glitzer agreed.

On behalf of the applicants, the commission reviewed the following waivers with Mr. Glitzer and noted...

- 1) Section 153-20.C.(10) – the applicant will comply by providing detailed information regarding existing watercourses, wells, onsite septic systems and stormwater management facilities within 400 feet of any part of the land to be developed.
- 2) Section 153-24.A.(8) and 153-24.J. – Ms. Dotts the plans are low impact with narrow streets, no curb or sidewalks.

Mr. Kelso suggested with regards the first waiver, to show detailed improvements, particularly with pedestrian and road improvements on the highways. The aerial provided doesn't show details of improvements very well. Mr. Kelso commented he would not support a full waiver, unless information is provided. Ms. Dotts agreed.

Ms. Dotts then referred to the second waiver by explaining the plan is part of a low impact development with less imperious in order to keep rural. Mr. Lowenstein questioned if the waiver refers to depth in pavement. Ms. Dotts clarified it only refers to the width of the sidewalk and pavement. Its' required to have curb and sidewalk and doesn't meet township standards for public roadway. Mr. Lowenstein suggested to review the waiver so it does not tie into parking and anything else. Ms. Dotts added the area is not considered paved but part of the stormwater management system as a rain garden. Mr. Glitzer added the goal is to have a visual feature and also to provide stormwater management quality control or volume. It doesn't make sense to pick on a site that works and exists right now. The plan will keep the center of the road as a gutter to have flow enter the rain garden. It's also a good opportunity for snow plow with a flat area to the edge. Mr. Kelso asked if there are other sites that utilize a center swale. Ms. Dotts noted the residential portion of Neamand Tract currently has a center swale under construction and completed swales located in Solebury. Mr. Kelso voiced his concern with a reverse slope on the road and the effect with snow plowing. Mr. Glitzer indicated the properties will not have a large front yard where water flowing to the front will not be a concern. Mr. Kelso then asked will melting snow run off the properties. Mr. Glitzer answered; there is a slope on the road and will be gathered in the center. Mr. Kelso commented seeing the design as a problem with freezing roads.

A discussion ensued between the commission and Mr. Glitzer regarding the best option for the design of the road for snow removal.

Mr. Lowenstein suggested the applicants review the commissions' suggestions and schedule a follow up meeting. Mr. Glitzer agreed. Mr. Kelso suggested having the township's Municipal Authority Director; Richard John review the plans for comment. Ms. Mason agreed. Mr. Snyder requested clarification if stormwater flow is only captured in the rain gardens. Mr. Glitzer answered, all surface flow is captured by the rain gardens. Ms. Dotts added the two rain gardens have inlet overflows that pick up runoff and enters into a seepage bed.

- 3) Section 153-24.B.(2)(a) – a partial waiver is requested. No street improvements are intended on Pine Run Road and improvements will be minimized off Old Dublin Pike to what Penn Dot requests. As shown, there is a small taper with a widen pull off to a right turn and improved shoulder on ingress.

Resident: Steve Anderson of 123 Sandy Hill Drive questioned how many trees will be removed to widen the entrance of the site. Ms. Dotts answered; three trees will be removed in order to line up with Trafalgar Road. However, the applicants will be replaced with smaller trees.

- 4) Section 153-24.E.(4) – Because the access road is lining up with Trafalgar Road, Birchwood Drive is 280 feet and the distance to Pine Run Road is 290 feet from the corner, this does not add up to the 1,000 feet required.
- 5) Section 153-25.A.(1) – a bike and hike path is scheduled to be installed along the frontages and will take the place of the sidewalks. The requested waiver is for the cul-de-sac itself as part of the low impact development. Mr. Kelso noted the township requires a sidewalk on one side of the cul-de-sac. Mr. Glitzer noted the Neamand Tract does not have a sidewalk, but has a bigger path with a partial sidewalk. Mr. Kelso indicated he would like to see a sidewalk on one side of the cul-de-sac for children's safety.

Resident: Mr. Anderson questioned if a sidewalk would be safer when getting on and off school buses. Ms. asked if there is a restrictive age. Mr. Glitzer responded the age is not restrictive, but targeted with mastered down plans. Ms. suggested a sidewalk would be beneficial for pedestrians and commented she is not sure why it wouldn't be considered.

Resident: Raymond Hendricks of Spring Valley Road questioned if the sidewalk will place the plan over the imperious surface limit required by the township. Ms. Dotts responded the plan is well under the imperious surface limit, the sidewalks would be a matter of reducing imperious surface for a more low impact development. Mr. Hendricks then questioned what the percentage of open space is. Ms. Dotts answered; 63½% of open space is recorded on the plan.

Ms. Dotts requested clarification if the commission would like a partial waiver to reflect a sidewalk located on one side of the cul-de-sac and in around the whole. Ms. Hendrixson indicated yes, it would be important to try and connect with the rest of the community.

- 6) Section 153-26.A. – The waiver is requested on the proposed street where an old concrete curb and gutter exists. Widening of the streets and replacements of the curbs are proposed within the cul-de-sac. Mr. Kelso commented the request is tied into the overall concept of drainage.
- 7) Section 153-27.A.(2) – The requirement indicates the driveway slopes no more than 4% per drainage, but keep a 2% level area. Given the configuration of the driveways, the plan cannot have either the 4%

drainage or the 2% level area because they will end up at the same spot. Gilmore & Associates are trying to maintain the drainage. Mrs. commented on how short the driveways are along four townhouse at 20 feet. She questioned if moving them back would be an option. Mr. Glitzer responded the driveways are 20 feet from the right of way line. With the sidewalk added, it will become 22 feet to the back of the apron. He also noted the townhomes will have double wide garages. Ms. Dotts added not all driveways can be moved back. Units 7, 8 and 9 cannot be moved back, but can be rotated around. However, this will prevent a separation from the existing home.

Upon additional discussions, Mr. Glitzer noted that units 8 and 9 may be moved back and realistically the box of the house envelope is designed to accommodate all the options. Mr. Kelso commented the requested waivers will need to be addressed fully and upon returning to the Commission, reasoning is needed to support them. Mr. Lowenstein noted the driveway issue as more of a design problem and not a waiver.

- 8) Section 153-31.C.(1) – a waiver of two different sections are requested both requiring the same 50 foot easement for an existing watercourse. The watercourse is located inside the deed restricted area along Lot #5. An easement on top of the deed restriction will duplicate the same purpose.

Mr. Kelso questioned who will be living in the area. Ms. Dotts answered; the area will be owned by lot 5, but with the deed restriction no improvements can be made. Mr. Kelso then commented the township normally takes over easement over watercourses. Ms. Mason agreed. Mr. Glitzer added he believes this is a way of labeling the line because it's encumbering the buffer and the limits of the open space.

Mr. Kelso then commented the applicants' waivers are not specific enough. Ms. Dotts clarified the easement is to protect the watercourse. It would be a different topic if the easement is considered township maintenance. Ms. Dotts agreed to review the language of the ordinance and advise whether the easement is considered an access for the township.

- 9) Section 153-34.C. – On the existing plan the driveway goes under several trees. The applicants would like to remove the driveways, but save the trees. To achieve, work is needed underneath the trees.

Mr. Kelso indicated the requested waiver is too broad and needs to be more specific. He then asked if the whole section of the removal is requested as part of the waiver. Ms. Dotts indicated the requested waiver to preform minor work to the existing trees canopies, but not limited to removal of existing imperious and minor grading. Mr. Snyder clarified the waiver needs to specific the removal of only the driveway.

Resident; Nancy Lee Moore of 8 Kings Cross Circle questioned how many trees will be removed for the driveway access and how many large trees are located on the property. Ms. Dotts answered; three trees out of six will be removed across from Trafalgar Road.

- 10) Section 153-35 – Similar to waiver 9, but reference a different section of the site to remove an existing driveway under the canopy of a number of large trees, but not to remove them. Ms. Hendrixson suggested to resubmit the request to be more specific.

- 11) Section 153-38.D.(10) - Since the proposed stormwater management system will be rain gardens, they are intended to be flat on the bottom and not sloped. The rain gardens are being designed as per the Pennsylvania BMP manual.
- 12) Section 153-38.D.(11) – The rain gardens doesn't use a collector swale.

Resident: Ms. Moore requested clarification on waiver request for Section 153-38.D.(10). Ms. Dotts explained with a large detention basin, they typically drain to the middle and have a swale in the middle. The rain gardens are slightly different to where they are smaller and designed to be flat. This design will absorb water and nourish plants.

Ms. Moore commented how she expected a swale collector design to prevent flooding. Ms. Dotts further explained with three rain gardens proposed is the first step. Two rain gardens will over flow will pick up the rear and a large part of the yard that will then flow into a seepage pit. As a result the seepage pit will collect the water and place it back into the ground to act as an infiltration system for ground water. Ms. Moore then questioned if test were performed to proof how the rain gardens will affect the runoff water off Pine Run Road. Ms. Dotts answered; tests proves runoff will be reduced to less than previous years. In a ten year storm will be reduced as a five year storm. Ms. added each of the site proposes is required to have water management within their own development.

Ms. Moore then commented on the traffic increase off Old Dublin Pike to approximately 100 cars a day due to the development. She indicated regionally, the site will have an impact. Mr. Glitzer responded; the impact will begin regionally with the ACT 167 watershed plan. However, it's unclear when or if development will happen. ACT 167 does look at watersheds and break it down to sub areas. Mr. Lowenstein stated the applicants must show they are not allowing more runoff is flooding out to the surrounding areas, which is enforced by the township.

Resident: Mr. Anderson questioned if the third rain garden larger than the other two. Ms. Dotts answered; the third is long and skinny as opposed to round. Mr. Anderson then questioned how much water the rain gardens will contain before over flow. Ms. Hendrixson responded the designs are included in the plans, but prefers the logistic be worked out before additional information is released. Mr. Anderson commented the overflows enters the existing creek and the footbridge will be removed. Mr. Glitzer agreed and added the footbridge will be removed as per the request of the residents. Mr. Anderson then noted the footbridge off Sandy Hill Drive backs water up to the storm drains which causes flooding. He believes removing the foot bridge will solve the problem, but cause more of a problem with flooding on Pine Run Road unless the rain garden is large enough to slow the process. Mr. Glitzer responded; the applicants will work together with residents to resolve the problem.

Mr. Glitzer then suggested rather than reviewing the remaining waivers, instead the applicants will review and consider the commission's comments and schedule a follow up presentation and provide more background a specifics.

Mr. Anderson questioned if there are any modifications to the existing house, specifically the front porch and is the barn at 20,000 square feet. Mr. Glitzer clarify a notation on the plans notes a porch and not part of the dwelling itself. The home will remain as part of the plan. The plan notes the size of the lot near the barn as 20,000 square feet, not the barn.

Mr. Snyder questioned trees that are 25 to 45 inches (#3) will be removed. Ms. Dotts clarified the trees are not located on the property and not included as part of the count of trees to be removed. They are located in the right of way.

Ms. Morgan Mallo recommended for requested waivers 9 and 10, the applicants need to specifically describe the request, tree protection standards on where fencing will be placed and what will be disturbed.

Shumack, Kwiatkowski & Pfluger Tract – Sketch Plan (No revisions requested)

Attorney; John VanLuvanee addressed the commission to request their comments regarding the removal of a no further subdivision restriction on a rural residence of 60 acres originally sub divided in 1985.

At the previous Planning Commission meeting, Mr. VanLuvanee presented the minutes of the November 25, 1985 Doylestown Township Planning Commission meeting which notes Mr. Lowenstein's comments towards his agreement with the original plan showing a cul-de-sac so the no further subdivision restriction would not have to be opposed on lots 3, 4 and 5. In 1999 the applicants provided signed agreements from neighboring residents showing their support to lift the restriction.

As per the commission's request, Mr. VanLuvanee provided copies of the plan. As a result in conducting additional research, it was found an amendment to the ordinance was created to note a lane lot is not prohibited as part of a major sub division. In 2004, a second amendment was created for flag lots. Mr. VanLuvanee is prepared to address the Zoning Hearing Board on issues as a result of the amendments regarding the imposed restriction on a 100 foot front side and rear yard on a lane lot. He then noted a conflict where one ordinance states at least a 100 foot front yard and the second states 100 foot yard setback for a lane lot should be equal to the distance of the front yard requirement for the distance in where the lot is located.

Plans provided also shows the location of the sewer lines to show where they lead from the back of the site. The back of sewer line was then placed through the properties as compensation for granting an easement.

With the exception of the 100 foot side yard, Mr. VanLuvanee stated the applicant's meets with ordinance requirements and request waiver of no further subdivision. He added the propose plans illustrate how the initial plans should have been originally submitted showing the cul-de-sac so no further sub division was necessary.

Mr. Kelso questioned if the applicants need address the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. VanLuvanee clarified first meeting with the Board of Supervisors to request approval for removal of no further subdivision is needed. Then the applicants will address the side yard issues with the Zoning Hearing Board due to existing narrow lots.

Mr. Kelso then questioned; in terms of sub division land development provision, are any common areas shown on their own lots. Although no plans have been created, Mr. VanLuvanee agreed and added the concept of the cul-de-sac is to be private with common access pursuant to a shared driveway agreement. Also considered, is a separate lot for the road may be created and shared by the six property owners. A meeting with the properties owners is needed to determine a final decision, where the commission's recommendation will be requested at a future date. Currently, lot 3 has a shared driveway where it goes down the property line.

Ms. Morgan Mallo questioned if any site capacity calculations were performed. Mr. VanLuvanee indicated no testing have begun to date. Unless the Board of Supervisors approve to release the restriction to allow the opportunity for testing there is no point in spending money ahead of time.

Mr. Kelso noted at the last meeting, it was the consensus of the commission to move forward with a recommendation to have the Board release the restriction. Other than some hurdles to jump with design, he doesn't see a problem.

A discussion ensued amongst the commission and Mr. VanLuvanee regarding the impact on removing the further subdivision land development restriction.

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission agreed by consensus the Shumack, Kwiatkowski & Pfluger Tract request for removal of no further subdivision move forward to the Doylestown Township Board of Supervisor for consideration.

Happ Tract \ Ren Way – Sketch Plan \ 460 W Sandy Ridge Road

On behalf of the Happ Tract \ Ren Way applicants; Danielle Davis, Developer; **Chris Pasani** presented the proposed sketch plan as a 15.6 acre property, zoned R1 A District for two acre lots. The proposed plan is to create 4 lots and reduce the cul-de-sac within the township requirements as a 20 foot wide reduced cul-de-sac.

Upon reviewing Pickering, Corts and Summerson's October 23, 2013 review letter, Mr. Pasani noted the following...

- 1) SALDO Section 153-19 and ZO Section 175-27.E – since only a sketch plan is being presented the comment that the calculations not being addressed and added to the plan is premature. However, the applicants will comply.
- 2) ZO Section 175-27 – Will comply

Mr. Lowenstein requested Mr. Pasani present the entire plan of the proposed property. Mr. Pasani explained the plan will probably meet all township criteria. Waivers are requested for the size of the road to reduce the imperious surface. Currently the property is at two acre zoning, the plan is to create 3 and 4 acre lots to keep the impact of the subdivision as low as possible. A lessor size road is also requested to keep as a private road.

Mr. Lowenstein questioned if a driveway located on the corner of the lot will remain. Mr. Pasani answered; the driveway has been removed and seeded as part of the original subdivision plan. Ms. questioned if the rest of the road will be removed. Mr. Pasani answered; the remaining road along with telephone poles has been removed and replaced with grass. Only the beginning of the road will be utilized because it's easier to go through Penn Dot if there already an existing driveway.

Ms. then questioned if there is a right of way or existing easement present for the removed road and utility. Ms. Pasani indicated the driveway is private and removed as part of the sale of the property with no easement. Ms. then questioned if there are restrictions. Mr. Pasani indicated a riparian buffer is noted, but not for the road.

Mr. Pasani continued no sidewalks or curbs are proposed, because the property is considered rural with only four homes. Ms. questioned if rain gardens are proposed. Mr. Pasani answered; rain gardens are proposed to be located on the back parts of the property with an underground basin. Additional, soil testing is scheduled to be completed in December, once the soy beans are removed.

A discussion ensued amongst the commission and Mr. Pasani regarding the impact of no sidewalks or curbs on the property with rain gardens as it pertains to the previous proposed sketch plan presented by Shumack, Kwiatkowski & Pfluger Tract.

Mr. Kelso suggested adding a connector to the bike path as access for pedestrians. Mr. Pasani agreed and noted the open space is owned by the township for easier access. Mr. Kelso then suggested the trail be shown on the plan as a request for permission from the township to build the access.

Mr. Redfield questioned if the commission agrees the proposed sketch plans don't need to construct sidewalks and curbs on the site. Mr. Kelso commented the intensity of the development is light and doesn't see the need. However, he is concerned of the 14 foot width noted around the cul-de-sac and would like a full explanation submitted. Mr. Pasani agreed, stating the goal was reduced imperious surface. However, he sees no problem with constructing a full 20 foot cul-de-sac with an open center.

Resident; Jay Stover of 219 Pine Valley Road questioned the plans for stormwater to prevent flooding. Mr. Pasani answered; once soil testing is completed, the engineer will decide how the soils perk before designing a storm water management system.

Ms. Morgan Mallo questioned have any environmental calculations been performed and if the riparian buffer was part of the original subdivision. Mr. Pasani answered; the calculations are still in the aerial phase and the buffer was part of the original subdivision. Ms. Morgan Mallo then questioned if there is anything else noted that was part of the original subdivision. Mr. Pasani indicated only the driveway that has been completed.

Resident; Donald C Reinhard at 23 Pine Circle questioned plans for public water. Mr. Pasani answered; on site sewer and wells are proposed to be extended to the end of the property line.

A discussion ensued amongst the commission and Ms. Mason regarding public sewer line that may benefit Mr. Reinhard. Ms. Mason suggested Mr. Reinhard contact the Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority to check on the ability for public connection. Also, contact Brendon O'Boyle of the Department of Health to have an assessment completed on the property for possible failure that would result in an emergency connection.

In the form of a motion by Mr. Kelso; seconded by Mr. Redfield the Doylestown Township Planning Commission recommends the applicants; Happ Tract \ Ren Way move forward with a sketch plan and address the pedestrian access toward the existing trail, review the truck turning ratios of the cul-de-sac and address the stormwater management issues.

Motion carried 5 to 0.

Continued Discussions

Mr. Kelso reported on his attendance at the recent Board of Supervisors meeting with Ms. Hendrixson and Ms. Stern Goldstein to hear the presentation regarding the proposed sketch plan of Pavilion at Furlong. He noted the plan does not offer a pedestrian bike and hike trail along York Road. Mr. Kelso also spoke with the attorney who understood the request and are planning to schedule a presentation with the Planning Commission in the future. Ms. Mason confirmed the presentation may be scheduled in January as per a discussion between Ms. Stern Goldstein.

Mr. Kelso commented the plan is greatly improved than previously submitted, where many of the concerns regarding the rear of the property was eliminated. However, it's still burden by access.

Upon a discussion regarding construction along Shady Retreat Road, Mr. Kelso suggested scheduling a discussion with Doylestown Borough regarding creating a connection path along the right of way between Beulah and Shady Retreat Road to create an opportunity for the other side of the tracks. Ms. Mason offered to bring up the topic at her next meeting with the Borough.

Ms. Mason reported on her recent meeting with Bucks County Planning Commission Executive Director; Linda Bush regarding her meeting with Buckingham Township staff. Buckingham would like to complete additional work, analysis the area and then review different zoning ordinances before making a decision with regards to the Cross Keys area. Ms. Mason estimates a result by January of 2014. However, Ms. Bush indicated the township is very interested in speaking with the Planning Commission to develop a working relationship.

Adjournment: 8:51 p.m.