

DOYLESTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

**Rescheduled January 26th Regular Meeting
Monday, February 4, 2026 at 7 PM
Community Meeting Room, 425 Wells Road
Meeting Minutes**

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission Rescheduled January 26th Regular Meeting was held at 7:00 pm on Monday, February 4, 2026. Members of the Doylestown Township Planning Commission in attendance included Judy Hendrixson, Michael Kracht, Tom Kelso, Robert Repko and Amy Kaminski. Others in attendance included Elizabeth Naughton, Solicitor; Craig Bryson, Acting Planning Consultant, Pennoni; Sean Torpey, Township Engineer; Dan Wood, Board of Supervisors Liaison and Stephanie J. Mason, Township Manager.

Ms. Hendrixson welcomed everyone to the meeting and indicated that this meeting is the rescheduled January 26th meeting due to the winter storm that occurred then.

Reorganization:

Chairman: Mr. Kracht made a motion to appoint Judy Hendrixson as Chairman, seconded by Mr. Repko.

Vice Chairman: Mr. Repko nominated Michael Kracht as Vice Chairman, seconded by Ms. Kaminski.

Both motions carried unanimously.

Public/Commission Comments Non-Agenda Items

None.

Review of Minutes

On a motion by Mr. Repko, seconded by Mr. Kracht, the minutes from December 17, 2025 were approved. 4 – 0 - 1 with Ms. Kaminski abstaining

Presentation

N/A

Land Development

N/A

Other Business

Review of Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment

Zaveta – Hart Property – TP 09-009-066-001 – 2250 S. Easton Road

Ms. Hendrixson indicated that the purpose of tonight's meeting is to review the proposed ordinance to incorporate the B-15.2 into the R1 zoning and for the property TP #09-009-066-001 to be changed from I-2 to R-1.

Melissa Scott, Buckingham Township Resident, questioned the B-15 vs. B-15.2.

Ms. Naughton explained the difference; the proposed ordinance is renumbering and restated.

It was decided that the Township solicitor would read through the entire ordinance, discussion among the Planning Commission, answer any questions from the public and or the applicant with responses.

Ms. Naughton began reading the draft ordinance, starting with the preamble, when the Commission got to:

Section 1 - 15.1 B-15.1 (a) it was consensus to eliminate this statement that open space created shall be owned and maintained by homeowners' association, deed restricted or a combination thereof, which said determination shall be made by the township Board of Supervisors.

Section 2 – 15.1 B-15.2 (c) Multifamily building shall be arranged in groups or clusters and not in long rows parallel to street lines. – Consensus of Planning Commission was to delete *and not in long rows parallel to street lines*.

Section 2 – 15.1 B-15.2 (f) All multifamily developments shall have frontage on a minimum of two arterial or higher classification roads. – The Planning Commission reviewed and discussed this, questions and comments after further considerations (f) is to be deleted.

Section 2 – 15.1 B-15.2 (g) Multifamily development dimensional requirements - were reviewed and discussed, with comments from Mr. Kelso regarding why adding the new use. Mr. Repko and Mr. Kracht said that the concern was addressed at the last Planning Commission meeting and the majority felt comfortable with the proposal and how it is going to be applied. There was further review from the reports generated by the applicant showing the impact of the proposed change on the Burpee Property in great detail as well as the Township Acting Planning Consultant and engineers' office who prepared a comparison of other historic sites in the Township that could benefit from the use if it were enacted. Mr. Kracht indicated that it appeared it can be applied. Mr. Glitzer on behalf of the applicant indicated it could be 74 units based their calculations since a portion of the property is in C-4 and R-1, relatively speaking he believes it is closer to 65 units the balance in open space. Mr. Kelso raised concerns about downzoning the Burpee tract in terms of never decreasing density, only increasing it. Mr. Repko believes we are on the right path. Mr. Torpey, Township Engineer indicated he went through the exercise requested by the Planning Commission, sort of a straight math calculation, did not take into account any environmental or other requirements in terms of open space, etc.

Section 2 – 15.1 B-15.2 (h) New Multifamily developments with fewer than 45 units shall not be required to comply with the requirements. it was agreed we would add emergency access, not need two accesses. Mr. Repko further stated that during the site visits the neighbors from Doylestown Hunt were very vocal on this issue and we should be respectful of that. It was indicated that Mr. Johnston, Township Traffic Engineer from Pennoni also honored that request in his review of the scoping letter by the applicant. Mr. Kelso referenced the SALDO trail requirement, which is along Easton Road, maybe adding language about connecting historic properties could be considered even adding a kiosk could be considered for inclusion since it is a conditional use those types of conditions could be added. He also suggested internal trail that would connect with the trail along Main Street.

Section 2 – 15.1 B-15.2 (k) The entire perimeter of a new multifamily development, not including vehicular access drives, shall be buffered either by existing natural vegetation or a landscaped buffer area a minimum of 30 feet instead of 25 feet width Stay consistent with the existing ordinance.

Section 2 – 15.1 B-15.2 (l) (m) & (n) keep these section. Remove the words Township Planning and just say *Township*.

Section 2 – 15.1 B-15.2 (o) remove as it is redundant.

Section 2 – 15.1 B-15.2 (p) change management basins *to facilities and change dedicated to required*

Sections 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7 shall remain correction on the name of the Board of Supervisor with new supervisor added.

Public Comments

Melissa Scott, Buckingham Township Resident – and documentarian stated that there is a lot that the Bucks County Historical Society could do with this project, they don't need to sell it, they should continue to preserve and do things that could benefit the character and culture of the County. They could save the property and enhance it and probably make a profit.

Doreen Stratton, Doylestown Borough – asked about if a traffic study had been done, it was indicated that no traffic study has been done only a scoping application was submitted to PennDOT.

Kathy Aurerbach, Tinicum Township – is in opposition to the change in the zoning, she supports the current Institutional use of the property and allowing the B-15.2 in the Institutional district doesn't make sense.

Ms. Naughton, Township Solicitor Office, explained further that the proposed zoning change is from I-2 to R-1, B-15.2 is an added use to the R-1 which already has the B-15 use.

Ms. Mason explained that the property was previously zoned R-4. It was changed to I-2 in the 1990's when the Bucks County Historical Society built their storage unit on the site.

Ms. Stratton indicated she has a concern for traffic, it's a dangerous location and 39 dwelling units coming in and out are a concern for traffic at high speeds along Main Street. She is also concerned about stormwater which was mentioned would not take place until land development.

Mr. Repko indicated that the process is a review of the proposed ordinance at this time, traffic & stormwater typically come during the land development process.

Ms. Stratton further indicated that this is a historic property and because we're celebrating our 250 Anniversary, we should keep that in mind when considering a zoning change.

Tripp Cohn, Richland Township – is in opposition to the zoning amendment of the Hart Property because of legal precedence, the institution zoning, the ethical standards being violated with the legacy of the Hart Property and the limited financial return. Impact being a onetime fee and that the Township should reject the zoning because of this one-time fee of \$60,000 and the dangerous stretch of 611 and the

collection storage which is in a facility that is in great shape, although Kyle McCoy stated that the structure is not meeting current standards for collections to be preserved.

Christopher Valeri, Buckingham Township Historical Society – addressed the Planning Commission as the Bucks County Historical Society reminding them that the property was a gift from George Hart and put in the public trust and that 36 units violated the trust of the Bucks County Heritage.

Ms. Hendrixson interjected that the Planning Commission is not the Bucks County Historical Society and if he has concerns, he should address the Buck County Historical Society directly.

Mr. Valeri thanked Ms. Hendrixson for her clarification.

Mr. Kracht indicated that he wanted to thank Mr. Kelso for his review of the ordinance, for taking the time to delve in depth and his best effort and perspective was appreciated.

Mr. Kelso indicated that he appreciated the comments, but he’s just trying to break it down further, hoping that the solicitor’s office will provide a revised draft for consideration at their next meeting.

Mr. Repko made the motion to table any further action until the Planning Commission’s next meeting on February 23rd, seconded by Ms. Kaminski. The motion carried unanimously.

Adjournment

Being no further business the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 8:35pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie J. Mason
Township Manager