

DOYLESTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

Monday, September 28, 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, September 28, 2026. Members of the Doylestown Township Planning Commission in attendance included Judy Hendrixson, Chairman; Michael Kracht, Vice Chairman; and members Tom Kelso, Robert Repko, and Amy Kaminski. Others in attendance included Judy Stern Goldstein, Planning Consultant, Gilmore & Associates; Greg Heleniak, Township Solicitor, and Dan Wood, Board of Supervisors Liaison; and Stephanie Mason, Township Manager.

The meeting officially began at 7:02 pm.

Public/Commission Comments

None.

Review of Minutes

On a motion by Mr. Repko, seconded by Ms. Kaminski, August 24, 2026, minutes were approved 5-0, with one correction.

Land Development

None

Other Business

Draft Data Center Zoning Ordinance Amendment

Ms. Hendrixson opened the discussion regarding the ordinance. She made a comment regarding item 2 on page 8, regarding power supply, and whether an applicant should need to provide an analysis of potential ratepayer impacts to the Township. She questioned if the “if feasible” wording should be removed in favor of a requirement.

Mr. Heleniak suggested that in some cases there is not enough information available to the applicant. Ms. Goldstein further noted that you cannot set up the applicant for an unreasonable demand.

Mr. Repko suggested changing the wording to “if the information can be reasonably obtained.”

Mr. Kelso asked what HVDC is on page 9, item 3, and questioned if it should be underground.

Mr. Heleniak said that it stands for high voltage direct current grid. It was suggested that this is an example provided to the applicant, or an idea for best designed planning.

Mr. Kelso asked for clarification as to where the PA Utility Commission responsibility ends, and the Township’s begins.

Mr. Heleniak replied that the PUC is regulating more broadly, as opposed to actual site development. They look at supply and rates, whereas the Township has the power to determine on site location of that power.

Ms. Goldstein added that the Township has no say in offsite power supply, even if the utility is in the right of way.

Ms. Hendrixson questioned power generation facilities in item 4, paragraph a on page 9.

Ms. Goldstein explained that this pertains to energy generating systems on the same site, but that are not part of the data center use, but a separate utility use. It must be treated as an F1 utility use.

Ms. Hendrixson then commented on the term “a portion of” relating to on-site energy that is generated being from green energy technology.

Mr. Heleniak explained that this was a comment from the Board of Supervisors. There is no fair percentage determined yet, but as the technology develops, the Township can revisit it and amend the ordinance in the future.

Mr. Repko asked about noise provisions on page 5 and questioned if it should be spelled out what the Township can do if noise problems persist.

Mr. Heleniak explained that paragraph 8 aims to spell out more of what the Township can do, and it gives leeway for the Township to be reactive and creative in figuring out how best to mitigate the issues.

Mr. Kelso asked if the noise requirements are the same as in the existing ordinance.

Ms. Goldstein explained that they are not, here they are much more extensive, specifically dealing with the low frequency hum, not decibels only.

Mr. Heleniak added that post construction noise studies are required, and additional testing and studies can be required, at the expense of the owner, if problems should persist. The Township can then take further action within the law.

Mr. Kracht suggested pushing the Township to stay on top of the green energy generated on site, as it pays back the applicant, and the state isn't doing much to encourage it right now.

Mr. Heleniak agreed but also explained that they are trying to put together regulations right now to make sure that the township is protected. When they are directed to revisit specifics in those regulations in the future, more information will be available, and the ordinance can be improved.

Ms. Mason added that this discussion came from other discussions the Board of Supervisors had with their peers in other townships. The goal here is to take a proactive approach, and be open to amending the ordinance over time, with more specifics.

Mr. Kelso brought up the issue of thermal mitigation, and suggested that there weren't enough standards for heat, as there are with noise.

Mr. Heleniak said that he has not seen enough guidance on measurable standards for thermal impacts. Reasonable standards don't exist yet. Ms. Goldstein added that there are too many variables right now for there to be a standard written in the ordinance.

Mr. Kelso asked if requiring a closed loop cooling system could be problematic. While it can help with the water issue, it can create heat issues. Further this ordinance assumes that a water problem is created.

Mr. Heleniak explained that heat issues can still exist in a non-closed loop. He added that health, safety, and welfare issues are protected through SALDO, zoning and stormwater as well. He also noted that there is sufficient data to suggest that water issues will exist.

Mr. Wood noted that closed loop systems are included because of a lot of public feedback. Water is a huge public concern.

There was a discussion concerning the definition of data center, and how it could impact existing smaller facilities, or those that had a pre-existing permitted use but wish to change to a data center use.

Ms. Goldstein explained that minimum required acreage and setbacks are consistent with LI zoning, and change based on what zoning district is adjacent. Additionally, changing a use would have to go through zoning, and may or may not be permitted.

Mr. Repko made a motion to recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt the ordinance as written, with the clarification that "if feasible" be removed in favor of "if information can be reasonably obtained" regarding ratepayer impacts. Mr. Kracht seconded.

Mr. Kelso questioned whether all of Supervisor Wood's comments were considered.

Ms. Mason explained that all of Supervisor Wood's comments were reviewed and have already been incorporated as appropriate, and that was expressed to the Board of Supervisors at their last meeting.

With a motion and second, Ms. Hendrixson called for a vote. Motion passed 5-0.

Adjournment

With no other business, the meeting adjourned at 7:58 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kaitlyn Finley
Office Manager, Code Enforcement