

DOYLESTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

Monday, August 24, 2026, at 7 PM

Community Meeting Room, 425 Wells Road

Meeting Minutes

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular Meeting was held at 7:00 pm on Monday, August 24, 2026. Members of the Doylestown Township Planning Commission in attendance included Judy Hendrixson, Chairman; and members Tom Kelso, Robert Repko and Amy Kaminski. Others in attendance included Judy Stern Goldstein, Planning Consultant, Gilmore & Associates; Dan Wood, Board of Supervisors Liaison; and Stephanie Mason, Township Manager.

Not in attendance was Vice Chairman Michael Kracht.

The meeting officially began at 7:02 pm.

Public/Commission Comments

None.

Review of Minutes

On a motion by Mr. Kelso, seconded by Ms. Hendrixson, July 27, 2026, minutes were approved 3-0, with one abstention.

Land Development

Eisold Tract – Preliminary Land Development – TP# 09-014-045

Presenting the plan on behalf of the applicant was attorney John VanLuvanee and engineer Jason Smeland. Since their last appearance before the Planning Commission, they have met for a site visit and received another set of review letters. They are seeking a recommendation from the Planning Commission for preliminary approval. Two major discussion points were noted including access to the county property at the rear, and the configuration of the bike path.

Ms. Hendrixson asked about the status of the access road to the county property.

Mr. VanLuvanee said that after evaluating several factors, it is the applicant's position not to give any kind of access easement to the county or show one on the plan. This is due to the county's vague future plans for the property. They believe such an easement would have a serious monetary impact on the value of the lots. Neighbors were also not in favor of access there.

As for the bike path, it was recommended by Pennoni that it be contained within the right of way, which is shown. It is expected that the Township would then maintain it.

There was a discussion about the buffer between the roadway and the bike path, which would be grass of at least 5 feet at every location and in some places more. The bike path is 10 feet wide, where 8 is required.

Mr. VanLuvanee noted a comment about a guardrail where the culvert comes under the road. The client will resolve this based on the recommendation.

Mr. Kelso asked about the existing gravel lane between lot 5 and 6. Mr. Eisold explained that the property owner uses it, but not the county. It will remain as an existing feature but will be removed.

There was discussion about a comment regarding an open space requirement, and a variance needed from the Zoning Hearing Board. It was questioned whether it applies to this plan, and it was determined that it does not. Open space would not be required based on the number of lots proposed.

Mr. VanLuvanee All comments in review letters will be complied with or will be addressed to the satisfaction of the Township engineer.

There was a discussion about the county's plans for a parking area near the site at a trailhead.

Mr. Smeland explained that within a mile in both directions there is a parking area for the Neshaminy Trail. While the county was looking for another parking area in this location, the applicant does not deem it necessary.

Ms. Hendrixson asked if there had been a review received by the county.

Mr. Smeland said that only one review by the county is required. They met and went over their plan. While the county can comment, they can't require the access easement. The county has not since reached out to the applicant, and the applicant has not confirmed its plan with the county.

Mr. Kelso noted the Gilmore letter asking for a 6-foot buffer for trees planted along the bike path. He asked if this could be increased due to root intrusion of some types of tree roots.

Ms. Goldstein replied that the plan showed appropriate trees but that the 6-foot buffer would be the absolute minimum. Mr. Smeland said that there is some room there and it would be looked at with the landscape architect.

Mr. Smeland discussed the waiver requests as listed in the Pennoni letter of July 22, 2026. These were as follows:

SALDO Section 153-24. B.(2a) regarding widening the cartway. The applicant requests a waiver from the improvements.

SALDO Section 153-27. A. regarding slopes of driveways. The applicant is requesting a waiver from this requirement. All lots except for one maintain the required 4% leveling area. The remaining lot shows a 5% leveling area. Additionally, regarding driveways, the applicant is proposing 10% where 8% is required. This would allow more efficient grading of the properties.

There was a question about the driveway on lot 7. Mr. Smeland agreed that it can be straightened up to make it better.

Mr. Kelso suggested that the waivers could be resolved by reducing the number of lots. Mr. Smeland noted that the lot depth is still needed for septic planning, and the waivers would not be eliminated.

It was questioned whether there would be an HOA. The applicant replied that there would not be.

There was a discussion of the shoulder along the trail edge and whether it should be 1 foot as noted, or 2 feet wide. It was noted that the applicant should be able to do that.

Mr. Kelso noted that the applicant has not been before the bike and hike committee to discuss the trail.

There was a discussion about lighting at the properties. The applicant is proposing some type of light between the front of the houses and the road, likely lamp posts at each property. Ms. Hendrixson suggested low level bollard lighting for the bike path and said that there might be a safety issue with the driveways crossing the bike path. Ms. Kaminski agreed and said that leaving it to the property owners, they might not turn the lamp post on. It was noted that cars would have headlights on in the dark, and that bikes are required to have a lamp at night. It was questioned whether this is a major issue.

Mr. Kelso made a motion to table preliminary approval pending a meeting with bike and hike and further exploration of the county access. The motion died for lack of a second.

Ms. Mason said that the next bike and hike meeting is on the same day as the Board of Supervisors. The applicant could meet with both on the same day. Mr. VanLuvanee agreed.

Ms. Hendrixson made a motion to recommend preliminary approval to the Board of Supervisors, with the expectation that the applicant meet with bike and hike to get their feedback, and that trees be moved back as appropriate, in addition to compliance with consultant reviews. Ms. Kaminski seconded. Motion passed 3-1 with Mr. Kelso voting nay.

Mr. Kelso made a motion to recommend that Township staff proceed with submitting the Act 537 Plan for sewage facilities planning postcard to DEP. Ms. Kaminski seconded. Motion passed 4-0.

Ms. Kaminski made a motion to recommend approval of the waivers as presented. Mr. Repko seconded. Motion passed 3-1 with Mr. Kelso voting nay.

Ms. Hendrixson reopened the agenda item to hear public comment.

David Becker of Pebble Hill Road said that he is against the bike trails, and roads and parking being added when parking is on the other side already. He said that after a lot of rain everything washes away in that area. He added that bike trails are everywhere, and lights go out when it gets dark. No lighting is needed. The whole idea that the Township is so involved and worried about bike trails when they don't pick up trash and fix potholes, and there are money problems; they shouldn't be worried about this stuff. The creek has changed and will wash everything away.

Ms. Hendrixson noted that the bike trail along the creek is county property. Additionally, the Planning Commission is not asking for a parking lot.

Ajeay Atre, who neighbors the property in question, and said he runs on Pebble Hill Road, said he does not believe the bike and hike trail is needed. He would prefer the houses be moved up and there be more room behind them. Additionally, he does not want more light pollution. He believes that these requests are not helping the neighbors.

Ms. Hendrixson explained that they are trying to add the bike and hike trails throughout the Township to make it safer for pedestrians and bikes. They are also not looking to add lighting and understand these concerns.

Mr. Becker added that there are sidewalks to nowhere.

Sam Kolodney of Pebble Hill Road said that he believes a better solution would be to add speed humps to Pebble Hill Road rather than put in a trail. If traffic slows down, then it keeps everyone safer, and would eliminate the need for more lighting. The neighborhood overall would be safer.

Ms. Mason explained the traffic calming study process for adding speed bumps. The neighbors would have to speak with the Traffic Advisory Committee and the police. The Planning Commission does not have the authority to do that. This issue can be passed on to the Board of Supervisors, and the applicant could also take part in that process.

Heidi Roux of Wilshire Road said that she is the mother of a middle schooler who rides a bike in the neighborhood often and walks her dog along Pebble Hill. She does not believe the bike and hike path is a good idea either and doesn't think it is solving any issues. When bikes ride along the road cars slow down for them. She asked if community feedback had been given.

Ms. Hendrixson said that this is something the applicant would discuss with the bike and hike committee. Ms. Mason added that a sidewalk or trail is required by ordinance.

925 Sandy Ridge Road – Preliminary Land Development – TP# 09-009-005-001

Presenting the plan on behalf of the applicant was attorney Kellie McGowan and engineer Karl Janetka. The Planning Commission has seen the plan a couple times in the form of a sketch plan and been out for a site visit. Modifications have been made to the plan. It is zoning compliant and largely SALDO compliant. It presents a B9 use with lot averaging.

Regarding some high-level discussion items, the applicant has looked at the pond with DEP and is following their guidance. Additionally, some open space has been added in proximity to the neighboring church property. The cul-de-sac road is also now lined up with Oak Leaf Lane, which eliminates issues with existing driveways. There is a 10-foot-wide bike path along the frontage, entirely within the right of way, that meets the path along the frontage of the church property and is proposed to come through the open space and connect to Sterling Crest Court.

Ms. McGowan noted an existing 50-foot easement at Sterling Crest to provide access for a water easement. Additionally, they would like to use that easement for some pedestrian connectivity.

Ms. McGowan discussed waivers requested as follows.

SALDO 153-20.C (10) which requires showing water courses, wells, etc. within 400 feet. An aerial has been provided instead.

SALDO 153-24. E (4) which requires that residential access streets shall not intersect on the same side of a collector or arterial street at an interval of less than 1000 feet. The proposed road intersects Sandy Ridge approximately 390 feet from the intersection of Sandy Ridge and Twin Oaks to align with Oak Leaf Lane across the street.

SALDO 153-23. A (5) which requires the extension of sub streets in new developments. Sterling Crest is not proposed to be extended.

SALDO 153-25. D (2) which requires the bike and hike path along connector roads be 12 feet in width. Ten feet is proposed.

SALDO 153-38. D (6) which requires maximum slopes of detention basin embankments be four horizontal to one vertical. The basin has been proposed at 3 to 1, in order to maximize the basin size. There will also be a retaining wall along the cul-de-sac side of the basin.

Ms. McGowan added that if the Planning Commission is inclined to move the plan forward, they would be seeking preliminary final approval. Apart from the waivers all items are a will comply.

There was a discussion regarding the buffer between this property and the church and whether it is sufficient. A fence may be better than landscaping, but a conversation with the church may be helpful.

There was a discussion regarding the status of the easement with Sterling Crest Court. Ms. McGowan said they found it in the public record, and it is reflected in the plan. The applicant would need permission from Sterling Crest Court for the water access and trail easements.

There was a discussion regarding the improvements to the road. Mr. Kelso asked if there would be a deceleration lane.

Mr. Janetka said that there is a taper to existing paving at an 8 to 1 ratio. The road is widening 10 to 15 feet, and where it isn't there would be a taper.

Ms. Kaminski pointed out a comment that the bike and hike signal should be fluorescent yellow green. They should not be.

Ms. Hendrixson opened the discussion to public comment.

Andrew Smith of Sandy Ridge Road said that he is a 30-year resident and knows it is inevitable that the lot will be built on, but he is concerned about the traffic on Sandy Ridge Road today. People are driving too fast, and there is need for a stop sign. If it isn't handled with this plan, then it will just perpetuate the problem. He also asked how water will be handled. He said that the low light is enjoyed, and they don't want more lighting to disturb the neighborhood.

Ms. Hendrixson said that there are cut-off shield requirements for the lights as per the ordinance.

Ms. McGowan said that the lots would be supplied by public water.

Mr. Janetka said that there is a stop sign proposed coming out of the development. Ms. Hendrixson added that the traffic engineer has looked at it. Traffic calming needs to go through the police department and Traffic Advisory Committee.

Maryann Bianco of Sterling Crest Court, and president of the HOA, said that they will need to put a request in writing for their board to review it and see the plan. She said the 50-foot area has trees and vegetation, and they would need to see how it would be incorporated. She also noted a fence along the property that is not their property is in disrepair. It will need to be replaced. She also mentioned a huge dead tree that needs to come down. She added that even though they have a dead-end cul-de-sac cars always come down and loop around. She asked about stormwater and if it would flow to their basin.

Ms. McGowan said it would not. Ms. Hendrixson added that stormwater must be handled within the property, completely independent of the neighbors.

Kevin Evans of Sterling Crest Court said that there is a dead tree on their side of the fence, but not on their property, that needs to come down. It is a safety hazard.

The current property owner has been working on cleaning up the property and is aware of the condition. They are currently in legal proceedings to try and vacate the property of (former tenants) squatters. They are about 70 days into the process and doing it all by the book.

Mr. Smith asked if the neighbors should be concerned about their safety and whose responsibility this is.

The developer said they are actively working on it, and got the process started immediately following the site visit. They are hoping for the property to be cleared within 30 days.

Mr. Wood asked if the county sheriff is involved.

The sheriff has not been involved yet. But after a certain period, they will be.

Steve McComas of Sterling Crest Court asked if any of the existing houses would remain.

The developer intends to take down all the existing buildings, and save as many trees as possible, except for the dead ones that are hazardous.

Brad Birenbaum of Twin Oaks Drive asked for confirmation that there would not be more water accumulation and asked about the storm sewer on the plan.

Mr. Janetka noted that the named storm sewer would not be touched as it is not on their property. He confirmed that there would not be any more water accumulation to the neighboring properties.

Mr. Kelso made a motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors their agreement to approve all the waivers requested. Ms. Kaminski seconded. Motion passed 4-0.

Mr. Kelso made a motion to recommend that the Township proceed with completing their part of the Act 537 component A and submitting the completed module to the DEP. Ms. Kaminski second. Motion passed 4-0.

Mr. Kelso made a motion to recommend preliminary plan approval with the understanding that the applicant agrees to comply with consultant review letters. The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Kelso said that he would like to see agreement on the easement at final approval. He expressed disappointment that nobody approached the neighbors and believes this warrants a sit down with the church, and other neighbors, including the HOA.

Ms. Kaminski made a motion to recommend preliminary/final approval contingent upon the compliance with review letters and coordination with both the church and Sterling Crest Court. Mr. Repko seconded. Motion passed 3-1 with Mr. Kelso voting nay.

Other Business

Draft Data Center Zoning Ordinance Amendment

Ms. Hendrixson opened the discussion.

Ms. Goldstein explained that this is only on the agenda for information and will be on the next meeting agenda for review. They are currently in the middle of the 180-day requirement for the curative amendment. At the Board of Supervisors meeting last week, they authorized advertisement of the draft amendment. It has gone to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The intention is to advertise the hearing in October. The 180-day period would end in December, so they need to meet that deadline. They are looking to adopt it in that time frame, and if necessary, would add amendments after, so the Township is not at risk.

Mr. Kelso asked if there was an opportunity to make substantive changes prior to advertisement.

Ms. Mason said they would have time to comment but will not have time to send it back to the county. Ms. Goldstein added that if there are substantive comments they should be sent to the Board of Supervisors, so they can pass the ordinance needed within the curative timeframe.

Mr. Kelso questioned the definition of a data center and said that certain current facilities would fall under that category.

Ms. Goldstein said that yes, that is true.

Mr. Kelso said with the range of data centers is very wide per this definition, he is concerned that it precludes normal everyday data centers already all over the place.

Ms. Goldstein said it would not preclude things like IT rooms for an office.

Mr. Kelso expressed concern over certain facilities being able to comply. There was a question of setbacks as listed in the draft.

There was a discussion regarding heat exhaust and whether that is addressed by the ordinance. Additionally, it was noted that the Township does not have a location that would be conducive to a large-scale data center.

Mr. Kelso also noted the wording regarding noise testing and needing to specify more in that area.

It was further noted that water usage lacks specificity. Ms. Goldstein added that the applicant needs documentation that there is sufficient public water from providers. DTMA would have to deal with that.

Ms. Goldstein said that she will need to discuss these small changes with the township solicitor.

There was a discussion regarding power to the site and for different components on the site, and whether lines need to be underground.

Mr. Kelso asked for additional clarification regarding the setback for a substation, if needed.

Ms. Mason said that someone from the solicitor's office would be at the next meeting. She added that comments could be sent to her and she will send those comments off to the planner and solicitor.

Ms. Hendrixson asked about the classifications of data centers and having specific definitions.

Ms. Goldstein cautioned that with too much specificity could come back to hurt you in the future. The intention is not to limit yourself to a specific facility, in case there could be a similar facility in the future that the ordinance does not account for. Additionally, it doesn't make sense to include requirements for something the Township cannot meet, for example a hyper scale data center. It would be exclusionary if you created a use for a specific type but can't accommodate it.

Adjournment

With no other business, the meeting adjourned at 9:17 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kaitlyn Finley
Office Manager, Code Enforcement