

Minutes from the
DOYLESTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
February 24, 2014

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular Meeting was held at 7:00 p.m., Monday, February 24, 2014 in the Doylestown Township Municipal Building, 425 Wells Road, Doylestown, PA. Members of the Planning Commission in attendance included Chairman; Judy Hendrixson, Vice Chairman; Thomas Kelso, Members; Edward Redfield and Ed Harvey. Other in attendance included Township Manager; Stephanie J. Mason, Board of Supervisor Liaison; Richard F. Colello and Township Planning Consultant; Ms. Judy Stern Goldstein.

Absent: George Lowenstein

Review of Minutes:

In the form of a motion by Mr. Redfield; seconded by Mr. Harvey the January 27, 2014 Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular meeting minutes were approved.

Motion carried 4 to 0.

Public\Commission Comments - None

Plans for Scheduled for Discussion: Bucks County Planning Commission – Cross Keys

Executive Director of the Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC); Lynn T Bush requested commission's suggestions and comments regarding the proposed Municipal Economic Development Initiative. The BCPC is currently working on a project for the Cross Keys section of Doylestown which is part of an overall Economic Development Initiative in development since 2009. The project is to review current businesses and the county's role in economic development to help business thrive, increase the vitality of downtown in order to build a good quality of life in Bucks County.

Six recommendations have been considered with the most influential being to engage municipal partners with economic development through land developments and approvals. The recommendation is to help communities preserve or build the vitality of their businesses. Upon approaching 54 municipalities the BCPC will have to make sure they understand what's important to each community and receive feedback on what are considered assets. The hope is out of the 54 municipalities to have at least seven or eight to sign onto the program. Currently the BCPC is working with 28, which includes Bristol Borough, Springfield, and Buckingham. Other areas to consider will be future farming.

Ms. Bush met with township managers of all four areas along the Cross Keys section including, Doylestown Borough, Doylestown Township, Plumstead and Buckingham Townships to review various assets for the economic study. Some examples included car dealerships and Pennsylvania Bio-technology Center. They would also like to figure out areas that can be uncovered by looking at the Cross Keys area in depth to improve and create goals to improve

traffic, pedestrian circulation and aesthetics (i.e. signs, landscaping, setbacks and style). Upon assembling various data with businesses, size of lots and zoning, Ms. Bush provided the commission with a market assessment packet developed from a national data service to discover market potential.

Ms. Bush then requested the commission's feedback and comments regarding the areas defined for an economic study for the Cross Key section. While holding an aerial map of Doylestown, Ms. Bush defined the areas in consideration to begin at the Mercer Square Shopping Center, run through the Route 611 Bypass and ending along Saw Mill Road.

Public\Commission Comments:

Mr. Redfield question if improvement plans for traffic along Route 313 are schedule with Penn Dot. Ms. Bush answered; the BCPC will have to look into the congestion issue, but noted the last improvements were designed to make the area safe.

Ms. Hendrixson commented the BCPC should look into the lack of a pedestrian corridor with crossing the road along Route 313.

Mr. Kelso questioned where the improvements identified as part of the Route 313 corridor study incorporated with the new transportation building. Ms. Bush answered; there are no specific projects included with the new transportation building. However, the companion document is included with the 11 billion dollar decade of investments wish list. The wish list is a listing of every municipal proposed projects beginning approximately thirty years ago. The whole Route 313 study area is included on the decade of investment wish list. Although it doesn't mean much to be listed, but if a push is made to begin the project, it will be considered.

Mr. Kelso suggested the County should have a similar wish list in place with projects, such as sidewalks and pedestrian crossings. Also, have a program similar to the Community of Doylestown where branding of areas are incorporated that everyone agrees with to provide uniformity. Ms. Stern Goldstein added; an overall pedestrian activity should be present along Route 313. Some contractors will only developed a certain corner and don't want to be obligated to expand on pedestrian crossing projects in order to work with other municipalities and Penn Dot. Planning ahead for pedestrian crossings will be helpful to create an inter-municipal relationship.

Ms. Mason referenced the recent corridor study that created uniformity nearing what the Doylestown Borough was completing with lighting and other improvements. She suggested having Plumstead and Buckingham create a similar study to ensure they blend together, such as with lamps.

Mr. Kelso noted although the Edison Furlong area near the Route 611 Bypass will be difficult to improve with structural issues, he questioned if a similar study can be applied. Ms. Stern Goldstein added; the area has potential but will be expensive for a developer.

Ms. Stern Goldstein noted the Economic Study focuses on retail and questioned will the BCPC be reviewing other potential economic uses. Ms. Bush answered; they are considering the Biotech Center to create a spinoff or expansion. Ms. Mason added; the key with Doylestown Borough and Buckingham is slated for residential development. There is a potential of walkability along the community, especially for the employees of the Biotech center.

Ms. Bush concluded by reporting the BCPC will review all comments and suggestions made by the commission and any additional comments can be forwarded to Ms. Mason. Ms. Bush is scheduled to meet with other township's planning commissions. A joint meeting will follow to present thoughts and receive feedback. Ms. Hendrixson questioned if the study had a completion date. Ms. Bush answered; the economic study project began in 2014 and currently only receiving data.

Resident; Steve L. Anderson of 123 Sandy Knoll Drive commented nothing is more important than the development of a pedestrian access along Route 313 where walkability is very important to turn the township completely around. Ms. Bush agreed adding walkability is more important with younger families.

Ms. Bush questioned with the intersection of Route 202 and Shady Retreat Road there is one corner located in Doylestown Township closest to Delaware Valley College. Ms. Mason suggested Ms. Bush attend the Planning Commission's Regular meeting in March where Steve Barth will be presenting a project where she can speak with him regarding improvements.

360 Old Dublin Pike – Preliminary Land Development (Continued Discussion)

Gilmore & Associates Engineer; Gregory R. Glitzer presented the commission with a revised preliminary land development for 360 Old Dublin Pike to include the incorporation of a swale cross section along the conventional crown road and storm drainage inlets that will feed into the central rain gardens. A culvert was also incorporated to pick up off site drainage near the intersection of Old Dublin Pike and access road, newly named Stone Barn Court. Township Engineer; Mario Canales has reviewed the revised plans and endorsed the new concept. The waiver requests remained the same as presented on January 27, 2014 as...

- 1) *§153-20.C.(10) – With the concern of the existing features with 400 feet from the property, a site plan for the Penn Color parking lot has been added. Chris Stanford has issued a review for Penn Color and requested to coordinate with applicants features.*
- 2) *§153-24.A.(8) and 24.J. – No change has been made because the street is considered private and to be approved only if the design are within the township's street standards. The cross section currently meets standards and a sidewalk was added to one side.*

Ms. Kelso questioned what the disposition of the clogged inlet is. Mr. Glitzer answered; the matter was address with Penn Dot's Maintenance Unit where it was not located on their records. Mr. Kelso then questioned if the issue was part of development located across the street from the site. Mr. Glitzer responded; the plans were pulled and the issue is not part of the development. However he will continue to follow up with the matter and address as part of the Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP). If they no assistance is received from Penn Dot, they will dig out the source on their own. The clogged inlet is Penn Dot's responsibility, due to the location on a state road.

Ms. Hendrixson questioned if the radius of the street bulb is still an issue. Mr. Glitzer responded no waivers will be requested and there is no issue with the bulb radius.

In the form of a motion by Mr. Kelso; seconded by Mr. Redfield the Doylestown Township Planning Commission recommends the Doylestown Township Board of Supervisor approve the Preliminary Land Development plan for applicants; 360 Old Dublin Pike with the understanding the applicants agree to comply with comments made by Pickering Corts & Summerson, dated November 21, 2013, Boucher & James, Inc. dated December 2, 2013. Michael Baker Jr., Inc. dated December 4, 2013 Pennoni Associates, Inc. dated December 4, 2013 and Doylestown Township Director of Code Enforcement; Sinclair Salisbury's memo of December 6, 2013.

A resident questioned in order to incorporate the sidewalk, will the location of the buildings change. Mr. Glitzer answered; the location of the building will not change and are in the right of way of the sidewalks. The building's setback line are derived from the edge of the right of way. The resident then questioned what purpose the existing fence has on site, so the sidewalk doesn't impact the location of the building. The resident then questioned what purpose does the fenced areas have location behind each building. Mr. Glitzer clarified; the area is considered a lot line with a 75 foot buffer and no fence is planned. Mr. Kelso questioned if common maintenance is planned. Mr. Glitzer answered; common maintenance is planned and anticipate fee simple lots. It's subject to a homeowner's fee to control what can be done. Ms. Mason indicated the dash lines is defined as a setback and not fencing.

Motioned carried 4 to 0.

Penn Color – Preliminary Land Development \ Lot Line Change

Carter Van Dyke Associates engineer; Steve Burger presented the commission with a land development plan for lot consolidation along the upper portion of Penn Color location off Pine Run Road. The applicants are requesting to consolidate the three existing lots into one lot. The area located along south Pine Run Road is three lots, one with an existing employee parking. The goal of the lot line change is to have the parking located on one lot and the resident on another to be owned by Penn Color.

The existing parking lot is hugging the road with a separation between Pine Run Road and Old Dublin Pike. The parking area is proposed to be enhanced by expanding the lots from 52 to 71 spaces. This will enable the applicants to pull back the road, create curbing, islands, lighting, landscaping and handicapped parking. The entrance will be realigned to the office building and manufacturing facility. The two lots will be line up to an ingress and egress points with an employee crosswalk. The crosswalk will be enhanced with color textured pavement, lighting and signage for safety.

Waivers for land development are requested for the lot line change, consolidation and land development. Mr. Kelso questioned if it's too late to request waivers. Mr. Carter Van Dyke answered; the request was technically submitted to make sure the applicants comply with land development requirements. He added the plans are basically for a parking lot enhancement and consolidation for aesthetics. Mr. Burger continued the site will provide a Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) and applied to the Department of Transportation (DOT) to widen both sides of the road at the curb and frontage of property. No new drainage will be added. The flat part of road and drainage calculations shows improvements to the storm water conditions on Pine Run Road. There is a low spot on site that doesn't drain well and the flow will be reduced contributing to that point. The improvement will not additional problems and possibly store more water.

Ms. Burger noted the applicants will comply with all review letters received by Michael Baker, Jr dated January 21, 2014, Bucks County Planning Commission dated January 31, 2014, Pickering, Corts and Summerson dated February 10, 2014, Pennoni & Associates dated February 12, 2014, Boucher & James, Inc. dated February 19, 2014.

Ms. Hendrixson questioned what the commission's role is at this point. Ms. Mason answered the commission can provided their recommendation for the lot line changes since the land development improvement were already submitted and reviewed. There are no other dedicated improvements other than Penn Dot and the Environmental Advisory Committee comments.

Ms. Hendrixson then questioned the buffer requirements for the residential lot parking. Mr. Burger answered; a deed restriction will be put in place to hold the reserve the buffer. There is currently a swale that hits the back of the grading along the parking lot and goes around the bypass well. Because of tight spacing there is a large amount of landscape buffering. The deed restriction will allow the landscaping to be maintained by the owner. Mr. Van Dyke added; Penn Color does not plan to sell the parcel, but they could. Ms. Stern Goldstein noted the buffer plantings being placed along the parking lot under the lot will need to be addressed and defined.

Upon reviewing Michael Baker's review letter of January 21, 2014, Mr. Burger noted regarding the bicycle and pedestrian path along Old Dublin Pike and Pine Run Road, the plans shows a connector corridor at 8 foot wide trail off the curb line. Upon discussions a year ago with the Bike and Hike Committee, it was determined a shoulder incorporated with a bike lane would be acceptable. Since, two other developments have established an 8 foot wide lane bike and hike lane. Mr. Burger requested commission's guidance. Mr. Kelso questioned what the proposed road section is. Mr. Burger answered; a 4 foot shoulder is allocated as a separate shoulder along the Route 611 Parkway. There is another 4 foot shoulder off Old Dublin Pike that is existing, where it will be stripped and signage provided for a bike access along the frontage of one side of the road. Mr. Kelso questioned what happens to the other side. Mr. Burger indicated there are no plans regarding bikes. Only a slight shoulder that blends back to existing pavement. There will be a curb with a small shoulder at 4 or 5 foot with 11 foot lanes.

Ms. Stern Goldstein suggested to review Chris Stanford of Michael Baker Jr. Engineering firm review letter with regards to the bike lane. Mr. Burger noted he did not receive the letter. Mr. Kelso noted the importance of the bike and hike trails for pedestrian access to both Penn Color and 360 Old Dublin Pike. Mr. Van Dyke agreed and stated he will advise his client on the changed due to a higher need for a walking path.

Mr. Van Dyke explained there is section near the parking lot that will remain as turf, because the client doesn't need the space. However, would like to comply with township's ordinance. They also considered paving the area for reserve parking. Ms. Stern Goldstein noted the reserved parking has to be counted toward imperious for zoning purposes. Mr. Van Dyke agreed and the area will most likely remain as turf.

Upon reviewing Pickering, Corts & Summerson February 10, 2014 review letter, Mr. Burger noted the following...

- 1) Page Three, #10 \SALDO Section 153-23.H – The site will not offer any dedication of right of way. DMT has requested a deed of easement, so dedication of land for road purposes. Ms. Stern Goldstein stated this issue should be review with the Board and Township Solicitor. Mr. Kelso added the township typically will request an easement and not Penn Dot. Penn Dot will only request easements when there are part of improvements. Mr. Van Dyke stated he will have attorney deferred to this matter. Mr. Burger added the

clients will comply with Pickering, Corts and Summerson's comments unless the Township's Solicitor advises otherwise.

- 2) Page three, #13 \ SALDO Section 153-50 – No offsite improvements are envisioned.
- 3) Page four, #27 \ Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Notes and Detail – Currently the site has flow coming towards the raised parking lot. The lot is raised approximately 2 feet, where originally a scale back to collect the water at 2% slope then comes down toward the parking lot and through the site. The swale provides grading effects around proposed trees. Upon Ms. Stern Goldstein's suggestions to submit another plan, the proposed grading will be taken away from the swale slightly less than 2%, but have the existing grading remain. The water will get in and flow slowly down and out, but not as quickly. This will stop the grading form around the existing trees. There is still some grading within the drip line of the trees or the 15 foot limit as per the ordinance. It will be 8 to 10 feet from the tree trunk in few cases. Due to the tree disturbance considered as a SALDO issue, Mr. Kelso suggested adding the change to the waiver list. Ms. Stern Goldstein added to also show what measures will be taken to assist the trees.

Mr. Kelso clarified the clients will request a waiver for tree protection, but other items list are will comply with consideration of the right of way discussion. Ms. Stern Goldstein added a notation in Pennoni & Associates letter of January 21st pertaining to the storm water issue will be need to be resolved upon further discussion with the Township's Engineer. Mr. Burger agreed.

Mr. Kelso questioned if a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit is needed. Mr. Burger indicated a permit has been submitted.

Upon reviewing Boucher & James, Inc.'s February 19, 2014 review letter, Mr. Burger noted a minor discussion will be needed regarding the rain garden. Mr. Burger indicated details of the rain garden will be changed to make more natural and keep the hand placed riffed rafted stone in place for velocity reduction. The entire depression will be staked out, then the cobblestone pavement will be pulled back towards the discharged point of the pipes. The area will be stabilized with vivacious materials. Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned if the details will be revised on the plans and resubmitted. Mr. Burger agreed.

Other notes included...

- 1) Page three, Item c \ Section 175-23.B(1) – The client requested to continue the use of Box woods as an edger used previously along other areas of the site. The Box woods will mainly be used along the parking area. The ordinance specifies the evergreen screen has be 4 feet, but doesn't indicate what the installation is. The proposed shrubs cannot be found in 4 foot heights.

Mr. Kelso suggested adding this request to the waiver list. Ms. Stern Goldstein clarified the request is a zoning issue and the applicants previously received a variance for plant material, but didn't ask for anything else on the site. Ms. Mason added as the zoning officer, all shrubbery requests are required to be submitted at the time of installation of plants.

Mr. Kelso questioned how much room is available to plant the box woods. Mr. Carter answered; there is less room than the clients had, because of the proposed bike and hike path. The plan made need to be redesigned due to the place the path where it needs to be as per the ordinance.

Upon further discussion, Mr. Kelso suggested with the shrubbery requirement not well defined the client places 4 foot high yews or reschedule another meeting with the Zoning Hearing Board to receive another variance.

- 2) Page five, Item C \Section 175-27.B (1) – Ms. Stern Goldstein clarified regarding inventory trees standing 6 inch caliber, is a standalone issue and not part of the woodlands. Mr. Burger requested relief for the entire site. Ms. Stern Goldstein clarified the issue, pertains to the area of development.

Mr. Burger indicated the entire area has been mapped out and the delineated areas are noted in the existing feature plan. Ms. Stern Goldstein then requested on the larger site where improvements are being made should be included. Mr. Burger indicated the larger area is asphalt. Ms. Stern Goldstein noted nothing is mapped to show plans. The ordinance states the existing trees need to be mapped or least along the disturbed area. If the area is currently paved and there are plans for removal, a tree adjacent to the area it will need to be mapped or place a note on the plans if no trees will be disturbed. Mr. Burger agreed. Mr. Van Dyke added the tree disturbance will be included with a report of the riparian buffer.

- 3) Page six, Item F \ SLDO Section 153.34.B (4) – The applicants will be removing the ground cover from the island area as invasive. Mr. Burger requested to use other non-native materials but is naturalized through the area. He then questioned if a waiver is needed. Ms. Stern Goldstein responded, either a waiver should be requested or changed the plans.
- 4) Page six, Item G \ SLDO Section 153.34.B (5)(a) – Mr. Burger requested clarification referring to storm water retention facilities. Ms. Stern Goldstein clarified the section refers to a rain garden and a waiver should be requested if different materials are proposed. She added an explanation will need to be included.
- 5) Page six, Item I \ SLDO Section 153.34.B (6) – Mr. Van Dyke indicated a meadowland to use on native plants will be requested to improve the water quality and proper plant mix will assist with filtering. Mr. Burger added the meadowland is part of their conservation plan and will comply with requirements. No waivers will be needed.
- 6) Page seven, Item O – The conservation plan will clarify the aspect that the beds located near the parking lot are up above the flood way and out of reach of flood waters that could damage materials.
- 7) Lighting – with regards to spillage of proposed solar lighting, the applicants will comply and install a house light shield near an adjacent residential property.
- 8) Page 8, Item 10b – the applicants will comply and revised the plans to show the boundary line between Parcel B and C, but not A.
- 9) Page 8, Item 10E – the applicants will not be installing solar lighting for the parking area due to shading from adjacent trees.

Mr. Kelso clarified the applicants are requesting waivers for SLDO Section 153.34.B (4), SLDO Section 153.34.B (5)(a), SLDO Section 153.34.B (6) as noted on Boucher & James, Inc. review letter as 5F, 5G and 5I. Mr. Burger agreed and added a tree protection standard waiver will be requested as noted under 6B. Ms. Stern Goldstein clarified all tree protection is an issue to be discussed with the Zoning Hearing Board.

Upon reviewing Pennoni & Associates review letter of February 12, 2014, Mr. Burger indicated the applicants will comply with all traffic issues and currently under the Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) process regarding signage.

In a form of a motion by Mr. Kelso; seconded by Mr. Harvey the Doylestown Township Planning Commission recommend the Doylestown Township Board of Supervisors approve Penn Color Preliminary Land Development Plan for a Lot Line Change with the understanding the applicants agree to comply with review letters submitted by Bucks County Planning Commission dated January 31, 2014, Pickering, Corts and Summerson dated February 10, 2014 with the exception of Item #27, which they intend to request a waiver, Boucher & James, Inc. dated February 19, 2014 except for Items 5F, 5G, 5I and 6B which they intend to request a waiver. Further the applicants agree to comply with Pennoni & Associates review letter dated February 12, 2014,

Mr. Burger questioned a notation in the Pennoni & Associates letter where an on graded colored walk area is proposed near a 24 foot is as a crosswalk leading to a sidewalk towards the parking area. Pennoni suggested to raise the cross walk and place ADA ramps on both ends. The applicants do not have ADA users. Ms. Mason noted the request is a Penn Dot standard.

Mr. Kelso revised the motion to state, Further the applicants agree to comply with Pennoni & Associates review letter dated February 12, 2014 with the exception of Item #4 which does not appear to be an ordinance requirement and Michael Baker, Jr dated January 21, 2014.

Motion Carried 4 to 0.

Estate of Wilma Kummer Minor Subdivision

Attorney for the applicants; Kellie McGowan explained the corner property is located with frontage only on Turk Road. The proposed plan is to draw a straight line to create slightly under a one acre lot on which the existing multi family dwelling will be located that takes access directly from Turk Road. The remaining acres at 1.23 will take access to the existing easement out to Old Pebble Road. No improvements are proposed to either uses on the property. As noted by Ms. Stern Goldstein, multi family dwelling is a non-conforming use where all dimensional requirements are not going to be applicable. However, the drawing of the line and subdivision of the property will be applicable with site calculations and other requirements.

Primary issues are review letters submitted by Bucks County Planning Commission dated February 3, 2014, Boucher & James, Inc. dated February 7, 2014, Pickering, Corts & Summerson dated February 11, 2014, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) dated February 11, 2014 and Pennoni & Associates dated February 12, 2014. The applicants recently met with the Zoning Hearing Board where threes variances were granted for the lot area for multi family dwelling at a 5 acre minimum, permit a smaller setback for the existing garage at 15 feet and

create a second lot with no frontage on a street as a variance for front yard requirement. Technically there is no front yard on the lot.

Mr. Kelso questioned if the 10 foot easement recorded on the deed. Ms. McGowan indicated the easement is noted on the deed. Mr. Kelso then questioned if parking is located in front of the apartments for the building. Ms. McGowan clarified the parking is located behind the apartment complex, where eight cars can fit.

Mr. Kelso DEP may be wrong by indicating planning modules are required. Ms. McGowan explained once an exemption was requested and speaking with Ms. Mason, the properties are in compliance with sewage management. She also spoke with the Health Department and they will schedule an inspection on lot systems. Ms. Kelso recommended placing a utility easement through Lot 1 for Lot 2 for access to the sewer and not a driveway. Mr. Irick indicated there are two other pump station and the concern is a check valve will fail causing flooding. Ms. McGowan added the BCPC and Health Department recommended the plans show a reserve for replacement on lot systems, but she prefers Mr. Kelso's idea.

Upon reviewing Boucher & James, Inc. review letter of February 7, 2014, Ms. McGowan indicated the applicant will comply with comments and noted the following ...

- A) Many waivers will be requested due to no proposed development and many sections are not applicable to the subdivision.
- B) A site meeting was completed for a visual of existing trees. A survey will be completed to plot the existing trees. A discussion regarding the buffer between the multifamily and the new lot on was also completed. There is existing vegetation and some areas will be supplemented in a natural way.
- C) A waiver will be requested for the bike and hike path because of the location of the property and only 250 feet of frontage off Turk Road. However, an ultimate right of way will be implemented.

Upon reviewing Pennoni & Associates review letter dated February 12, 2014, Ms. McGowan indicated the applicant will comply with comments where the septic system will be addressed.

In the form of a motion by Mr. Kelso; seconded by Mr. Redfield the Doylestown Township Planning Commission recommends the Doylestown Township Board of Supervisors approve the Estate of Wilma Kummer Preliminary \ Final Subdivision plan with the understanding of the applicant's agreement to comply with review letters submitted by Bucks County Planning Commission dated February 3, 2014, Boucher & James, Inc. dated February 7, 2014, Pickering, Corts & Summerson dated February 11, 2014, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) dated February 11, 2014 and Pennoni & Associates dated February 12, 2014.

Ms. Goldstein noted upon a recent meeting, it was determined the site fields did not meet with the definition of woodlands, but the applicants will be seeking verification with the field survey. The line was set up based upon providing 20% imperious surface coverage. If the vegetation was considered woodlands, some of the imperious will come out of the site calculations and the line will have to be moved.

Mr. Kelso continued with the motion to add, the Planning Commission recommends granting of the waivers noted in Irick, Eberhardt & Mientus, Inc. letter of January 15, 2014.

Motion Carried 4 to 0.

Adjournment: 8:43 p.m.