

**Minutes from the
DOYLESTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
April 28, 2014**

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular Meeting was held at 7:00 p.m., Monday, April 28, 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; George Lowenstein, 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.

Review of Minutes:

In the form of a motion by Mr. Kelso; seconded by Mr. Harvey the March 24, 2014, 2014 Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular meeting minutes were approved.

Motion carried 5 to 0.

Public\Commission Comments – None

Announcements

- 1) Joint work session of the Doylestown Township and New Britain Borough Planning commissions will be held on Tuesday, June 10, 2014, 5:00 PM to discuss Butler Avenue corridor study.
- 2) The next Doylestown Township Planning Commission meeting will be held on Wednesday May 21 at 7:00 PM at the Doylestown Township municipal building.

Plans for Scheduled for Discussion: Casa Bella Preliminary Land Development Plan (formerly Happ Tract)

James Ceglia of Site works presented the commission with the preliminary land development plan for applicant; Casa Bella. The four lot subdivision plan was a property previously submitted in October \ November of 2013. Tax parcels 9-4-10-7, 15.6 acre site located in the R1 District Residential zone along the northwest side of Sandy Ridge Road near Pine Valley Road, next to Doylestown Woods community. Open space owned by the township is located across Sandy Ridge Road.

Previously the property was a farm and first sub divided in 2008 to separate the farm buildings from the farm fields. Remaining are phallic fields and a driveway perverting the site. Farm buildings are located in the rear of the site near the gravel driveway, which is scheduled to be removed. A small stream is flowing across the driveway and flows along the southerly property line ultimately towards Pine Run Road. A 15 inch pipe carries underneath to the existing gravel driveway.

The plan proposes to divide the property into four residential lots with access by a single cul-de-sac, private road connecting to Sandy Ridge Road. Water supply and sewage disposal will be on lot and driveways servicing each lot will access the private roadway. The cul-de-sac will be 650 feet long with a 20 foot wide cart way and a 44 foot wide easement. The existing 15 inch pipe under the driveway will be replaced with 36 inch pipe. The water main along Sandy Ridge Road will be extended across the property for frontage. Applicants are not proposing to bring on site, instead on-lot wells for each lot are proposed. Dwellings will be generic in nature at 40 x 70. However, the dwellings have yet been designed. One thousand square feet of additional impervious surface has been accounted for each lot. Although not shown on the plan, the additional impervious surface are shown on the zoning plans with coverage and runoff calculations. Storm water management is proposed as 4 foot wide infiltration trenches along the proposed roadway. Runoff will be collected off roadside swales and roof leader connections. Excess runoff will over flow in to lower trenches and ultimately a retention basin. Infiltration trenches will be located on both sides of the street and connected to an inlet located in the center of the cul-de-sac. Water flow will then pipe down to the center the water detention basin towards the westerly corner of the site. Ultimately the basin will outlet back onto the stream. Street trees are proposed for landscaping and single light fixtures for lighting. Lighting will be located at the intersection of Sandy Ridge Road.

Applicants; Casa Bella are requesting waivers as noted on Pickering, Corts and Summerson's April 4, 2014 letter for the following...

1) Section 153-19.K – The applicants have shown approximately 100 feet of topographic and physical features on or within 500 feet of the site. Ms. Hendrixson requested an aerial photo be provided. Mr. Ceglia agreed.

Mr. Lowenstein questioned if adjacent on-lot wells locations considered. Christopher Pisani of Casa Development answered; the adjacent well locations are noted on the plans. He added the lots are within 200 feet as required by township ordinance. Due to the size of the lots each location has a sizable separation. The proposed septic system is shown on sheet three of the plan as well as the well locations. Ms. Hendrixson questioned why there is no commitment for public water. Mr. Pisani answered; Geothermal is proposed for heating and cooling on the job site, which he prefers. It is advantageous to use it for domestic water. Mr. Kelso noted it doesn't address fire protection. Mr. Pisani responded; the water will eventually be placed across the fire hydrant within 15 feet of the site. The farthest house will be located more than 500 feet from the fire hydrant. Mr. Kelso added the location of the fire hydrant is important as per the recommendation of the Municipal Authority. Mr. Kelso then questioned a pumping systems will be considered as part of the geothermal water system. Mr. Pisani noted the water will be pumping into another well, where tests have been completed along Apian Way. Mr. Kelso was concerned with wells pumping 20 gallons per minute into a pond. Mr. Pisani responded; the water system will actually keep the water level up. In this case, two wells will be utilized. Mr. Pisani guaranteed all water will pump back into a second well and change the temperature of the water, depending on the season. For example; in the winter, water temperature will begin at 55 and go up to 60 degrees. In the summer, water temperature will begin at 55 and go up to 65. Mr. Kelso suggested the township authority look into the matter. Ms. Mason agreed.

2) Section 153-20.C.(8) – a previous survey showing elevation, location and description of the National Geodetic Vertical Datum (NGVD) benchmark is the same used for submittal of the 2008 land development plan. Ms. Stern Goldstein noted as long as there is an equation that ties into a future datum. Mr. Pisani agreed.

3) Section 153-20.C.(10) – instead of supplying a connection of public water service the applicants will propose using a water pumping system. Mr. Lowenstein requested details of the water pumping system be provided as it pertains to fire protection. This information will need to be submitted to the township's Municipal Authority department for review. Mr. Pisani indicated the fire hydrant can be brought halfway up the street for fire protection. Mr. Lowenstein responded; the matter will need to be reviewed by the authority.

4) Section 153-24.A.(8) and 153-24.J. – the proposed streets do not meet township standards as it pertains to widths and improvements. Pavements will comply with a 24 foot cart way and a 44 foot wide easement for the road. Due to the 4 lot subdivision proposed on 15 acres, this will reduce the amount of impervious surface placed on the property. Mr. Lowenstein noted several issues, such as the ability to have emergency trucks maneuver or around the site and parking. Mr. Pisani will address the issue of emergency vehicles by creating a larger bulb. With parking, each driveway will be extremely long. Also, the turnaround area will have the ability to fit 4 to 5 cars.

5) Section 153-25.B.(1) – curbing and sidewalks are requested to be waived due to conflict with the size of the streets. Mr. Pisani finds it will be in the residents' best interest to walk up the middle of the street instead of using sidewalks to connect to the existing bike path connection located across the street from the site.

Mr. Lowenstein questioned; how will a connection to the bike paths be connected. Mr. Pisani answered; upon a recent meeting with Mr. Canales', only a connection from the existing bike path leading towards the entrance to the subdivision will be necessary. Mr. Lowenstein there is a township requirement to connect with existing bike paths on record. Mr. Kelso agreed and added the township's ordinance requires sidewalks located on both side of the streets and across the frontage. Mr. Kelso clarified a need for an additional bike and hike trail across the frontage, but not the elimination of sidewalks for at least one side of the road. Mr. Kelso prefers to see a sidewalk off at least one side of the road. However, agrees a bike path across the signage is not necessary. Mr. Pisani questioned; where will the sidewalk be connected from. Mr. Kelso recommends a connection be placed out to the street and then across street onto the existing bike and hike path. Mr. Pisani responded; the purpose of the plan is to keep the site as rural as possible and sidewalks will be meaningless. Ms. Hendrixson clarified; the sidewalks will be macadam pathway to achieve a pedestrian access. Mr. Redfield questioned; if it's possible to widen the driveway. Mr. Pisani goal is to keep the impervious surface a low and widening the driveways will add to it by requiring more retention.

Mr. Pisani explained there will be four homes, which are far apart. The sidewalks are considered vast spaces not going to all whole lot of area. The bike path located on site is considerably smaller than the path located off the adjacent community, where the bike path is located along the frontage. Ms. Stern Goldstein noted Mr. Pisani's request for reduction of the right-of-way down to 44 feet and a 24 foot cart way, which is current standard is if you have the proper of right-of-way. This brings an issue with the sidewalks and the current right of way. Mr. Pisani responded; the purpose is to keep the impact as low as possible, were only four homes are being built along 15 acres. If the township continues to challenge the economics, additional lots will need to be considered. Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned; what is the purpose for the reduction of the right-of-way. Mr. Pisani answered; the cart way itself is reduced and a larger right-of-way is needed. Mr. Lowenstein added; having a larger right-of-way will be beneficial to have in the future.

Ms. Hendrixson explained macadam driveway makes sense to keep the road narrow and keeps speeds to a minimum. Most residents like to have bike paths connected for easy access and with the right-of-way present will help the look of the neighborhood by tying into something that is more pedestrian oriented.

Mr. Kelso asked if the road will be offered as dedication. Mr. Pisani answered; a home owners association will be offered instead. Mr. Pisani requested a recommendation of the commission regarding sidewalks. The commission agreed by consensus the applicants should consider adding sidewalks to the site and connect to the existing pathway.

6) Section 153-24.B.(2)(a) – a waiver is requested to widen Sandy Ridge and Pine Valley Roads. Also, relief is requested to improve both roads, where no improvements are shown on the plan currently. Mr. Pisani clarified; the only improvements proposed on Sandy Ridge Road are to repair a water main across the frontage and not widen the road to save on imperious and costs. Ms. Stern Goldstein noted improvements to the water main improvements were deferred on a previous subdivision plan to become part of a future subdivision. The commission will need to make recommendations for the current subdivision. Mr. Kelso questioned; if repairs to the water main will be along the current cart way. Mr. Pisani noted the water main is currently located along the cart way. Mr. Kelso recommends to have the water main come out of the current shoulder and then paved it. Mr. Pisani agreed and will present at a future meeting.

7) Section 153-25 – a waiver of constructing curbs along the cul-de-sac street is requested.

8) Section 153-26.A. - Mr. Lowenstein questioned how the main road will remain intact during high traffic. Mr. Pisani responded; compact stone on the side of the road with a topsoil will keep the road from breaking apart. Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned if this will be considered a 2 foot widen stabilized shoulder detail and will it be noted on the plans. Mr. Pisani agreed. Mr. Kelso clarified the end of the shoulder of the road is going into the swale. Mr. Pisani agreed.

9) Section 153-26.A (3) – a boundary street is not proposed and considered off site. Ms. Stern Goldstein clarified; it's a site to the extent the connection comes up to the property and is defined as a boundary street. A waiver is requested so connection can be completed. The applicants do not list this connection as part of the plan.

Mr. Lowenstein questioned what type of traffic exists on the road. Mr. Pisani referred to the maps and defined the road as the loop road, where it will be a dead end. Mr. Kelso added the road is a short stub, which is a dead end.

Resident; Christa Harper commented on her approval of the proposed plan due to its low impact along a wet property; the less impervious surface the better, because of the area being so wet. Ms. Harper also confirmed the street as a dead end and street leads to a barn of an adjacent neighbor.

10) Section 153-37 – Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned with the waiver request requirements for recreational land, the applicants will pay a fee in lieu the land. Mr. Pisani agreed and will comply.

11) Section 153-41.A.(1) – a waiver request to provide water to each individual lot.

Commission Comments:

Mr. Colello questioned if applicants received all review letters to include, the Bike and Hike Committee and Environmental Advisory Committee. Mr. Ceglia confirmed Boucher and James' letter April 14, 2014, Pickering Corts and Summerson's letter of April 4, 2014 in Michael Baker's letter of April 14, 2014 were received. Ms. Stern Goldstein indicated Michael Baker's letter noted the bike and hike path issues. She then asked if the applicants

received a memo from the Environmental Advisory Committee and the Municipal Authority. Mr. Ceglia indicated he did not receive the letters. Mr. Colello suggested, prior to the next meeting to check with the township to ensure all review letters are received. Mr. Ceglia agreed.

Resident; J.Stover questioned what protection does neighbors have with regards to their well against the geothermal heating and cooling system proposed. Mr. Pisani responded; with the geothermal system, water will flow back into the well. Mr. Stover questioned if the water will go back into the same vein as with the residents wells. Mr. Kelso suggested the township's the municipal water authority check into the matter. Ms. Mason added the applicants should attend the authority's next meeting.

Resident; Christa Harper commented she hopes a waiver is not granted with regards to public water. She doesn't believe the geothermal will keep pumping water into the wells. With the impact unknown, it makes more sense not to grant the waiver. Mr. Colello reported the next meeting of the Municipal Authority will be held on May 15th at 4:00pm.

Ms. Harper then questioned if a waiver for a retention of water basin has been requested and if it's located too close to the property line. Ms. Stern Goldstein responded; storm water comments were noted in the April 4th Pickering Courts and Summerson letter and April 14th Boucher & James letter noting landscaping was not proposed for street trees, but there is landscaping required off site and retention basin. Ms. Hendrixson questioned if the basin is dry. Mr. Ceglia indicated yes. Mr. Kelso added infiltration is shown as trenches on either side of the property in an attempt to infiltrate some of the storm water. He then questioned if the permeability testing has been completed. Mr. Pisani answered; testing has been completed along the cul-de-sac. The rates did not read well, but read well in other areas where trenches will be utilized.

Mr. Kelso questioned in the septic system and testing seemed sparse. Mr. Ceglia indicated the testing is shown on the sewage facility plan. The sewage facility plan also showed the proposed sites' septic systems.

Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned if the applicants will comply with other review letters comments. Mr. Ceglia indicated additional input is needed with Pennoni & Associates, letter, item 12 on page three regarding offsite improvements. Mr. Kelso questioned if any offsite improvements have been identified. Mr. Ceglia responded none, but will meet with Township Engineer; Mario Canales for clarification. Mr. Lowenstein questioned; will applicants follow up with other issue prior to the next Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Ceglia indicated yes.

Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned if applicants will comply with all comments noted in the April 14 Boucher and James letter. Mr. Ceglia requested clarification of the riparian corridor comments. Ms. Stern Goldstein clarified; the riparian buffer is not required unless it's lower than the main water main listed on the map. Wetlands and waterways are needed to be shown on site, where calculations are needed to be corrected. Mr. Ceglia indicated his company is in the process of trying to find where the calculations came from. Ms. Stern Goldstein suggested to contact the previous engineer. The current calculations are shown as water supply. Ms. Stern Goldstein indicated those calculations are fine, however calculations are still needed to be corrected. She added if you are relying on someone else's plan, documentation for water and wetlands should be included. Ms. Stern Goldstein strongly suggest to have their own testing completed. She then offered her services, if additional assistance is needed.

Mr. Ceglia then requested a variance for the wetlands to replace an existing pipe. Ms. Stern Goldstein indicated variance cannot be granted unless a Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) permits is supplied, which begins with the proper study.

Ms. Hendrixson indicated the commission will ensure applicants have all review letters and will meet again where the applicant will supply the revised land development plan.

Continued Discussion: The Pavilion at Doylestown (aka Grasso) Sketch Plan

The Pavilion at Doylestown Attorney; Edward Murphy explained since meeting with the commission on March 24, 2014, the applicants have abide by the comments made by the township's consultants and amended the plans by first meeting with the bike and hike committee on April 15th. The committee guided the applicants on how to add the bike and hike trail along the frontage of Swamp Road and Route 263. A difference in specs were noted as a 12 foot wide macadam path. The commission suggested a 10 foot wide path, however the ordinance spec is at 12 foot. Other items added at the recommendation of the bike and hike committee are a separation be shown between the edge of the cart way and add a path along the green areas, a post and rail fence adjacent to the green space before the bike and hike trail, a stamp and colored concrete showing access points and traditional standard sidewalk off Rogers Road. A wider trail will be provided across the street along Temple Judea. Other additions were fencing around the retention basin, reduced the size of the proposed CVS store to 10,000 square feet stipulated maximum. Because the square footage was reduced, the parking requirement for that use was also reduced. The parking was reconfigured to pull it away from the intersection at Swamp Road and Route 263.

Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned how far is the parking currently. Pavilion at Doylestown representative; Scott Mills answered; it varies because of the angle deflection, but parking is approximately 50 feet away from the street. There is a 24 foot isle plus the 20 foot parking installed deck. Basically, the last isle of the parking lot was removed to increase the distance from Route 313. Mr. Murphy added; considering the width, grass separator and addition of the bike and hike trail, the applicants propose moving the entire project back approximately 20 to 25 feet to accommodate infiltration areas. The calculations are accurate on the plan, but the plan does not visually show the parking lot pushed back 25 feet. Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned; if the parking lot will be pushed back in the westerly direction. Mr. Murphy indicated yes.

Mr. Murphy continued to report, at the recommendation of the bike and hike committee a total of 5 new designated areas have been added for bike racks along all freestanding building, elimination of areas with potential conflict for vehicles backing out into intersections and a supplemental buffer behind the buildings adjacent to the open space. The plan still does not show the addition of trees required. The expectation is to install the trees along the open space area between the rear of the building and the residential area to the north. The final change was to revise the one-way traffic circulation in front of the daycare.

As per the request of the bike and hike committee and Ms. Stern Goldstein, Mr. Murphy reported there will be some elevation differences between the travel portions of the roadway and path. The road will eventually decrease towards the entrance of the site. Mr. Mills added; as the road transitions towards the entrances of the site where grading is to be matched, the paths will have to come down to grade. Mr. Murphy added; the project's architect is present this evening to assist with any questions.

Mr. Kelso questioned; if any improvements are needed to the traffic signal located at the intersection of Route 313 and Swamp Road. Mr. Murphy answered; permits will need to be updated and reinvestigated especially with the anticipated permit already slated for Route 263. Also, the site's bike and hike path along Route 263 and the regular sidewalk along Rogers Road have been interconnected internally, except for one area. Mr. Kelso noted there is an opportunity to address pedestrian crossing in that area. Mr. Mills indicated a sidewalk is scheduled.

Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned the status of several dead end areas and if they have been corrected. Mr. Mills answered; all areas and especially along Route 263 have been looped.

Mr. Kelso questioned the status of the waste water area, especially along the northwest corner of the site that was originally designated for wastewater. The area was to be reviewed and broken up. Mr. Murphy indicated the area has not been reviewed to date.

Pavilion at Doylestown architect; Peter Stampfl presented the commission with several renderings of the site, the first of the view taken from York Road showing as the main entry off the Retail Centers. The goal is to provide a village like site. Each building has a second floor look, but there is no physical second floor. The second rendering showcases a view from intersections 313 and 263 towards the proposed CVS store. The mix of materials used will be party plank, siding, metal roofs, stucco and cultured stone. The roof itself will be asphalt shingles with metal accents. The final rendering shows views from the bike and hike trail and how it may appear from York Road. A planting area will appear between the cart way and parking with landscape buffers.

Mr. Kelso questioned if a concrete posts fence should be installed. Mr. Stampfl indicated the split rail fence would be a good choice, however concern with the solid finish needed. However he will review the option.

Ms. Hendrixson questioned the height of the buildings. Mrs. Stampfl answered; the buildings will vary between 20 to 22 feet high to the ridgeline. Other buildings will be under 30 feet in height. As an option, windows can be resized to provide and parents of a shorter second floor.

Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned if proposed our own lighting or goose neck lighting is proposed. Mr. Stampfl indicated yes on all the buildings with no back lighting. Ms. Stern Goldstein commented on her preference was goose lighting for the site.

Mr. Murphy reported upon their discretion when CVS representative, it is preferable the entrance of the store be facing Route 263 and Swamp Road. However, the aesthetics of the building is open as with the square footage.

Public Comments:

Resident; James Bingler of Turkey lane noted to 40% of impervious surface indicated on the plan, where resource protection was calculated at 3.8 acres. This will increase the impervious surface over township requirements at 59%. Mr. Bingler then questioned what the impervious surface is expected to be. Mrs. Stampfl answered; based upon the natural resource calculations being compensated an accounting for air conditioner pads and other factors, the impervious will be 59.1%. There will not be much of an increase in square footage of impervious, it would be factoring in the Woodlands to help calculate the impervious surface ratio. Mr. Bingler noted the plan is over the 40% of route by township ordinance. He then suggested removing one building to bring the impervious surface down. The neighborhood is prone to flooding and a smaller footprint would be beneficial. As per Mr. Bingler as calculations,

once the footprint is reduced the 340 trees need it can be replaced. Mr. Bingler then commented a traffic calming device was to be installed along Rogers Road in lieu of a traffic light, as per the agreement with Temple Judea. He then asked how the device would be incorporated into the plan. Ms. Mason responded; plans to consider the device will move forward upon approval of the applicants land development plan. Once the plan is closer to approval, engineers from both side will schedule a meeting to review options and address. Mr. Kelso agrees with Mr. Bingler and questioned if zoning variances are required. Mr. Stampfl indicated yes.

Resident; Mary Lou Streznewski of 22 Brook Drive had several questions to include if the access road connected to the plan with line up with the Temple's exit road. Mr. Stampfl did not recall the notation. Ms. Stern Goldstein confirmed Ms. Streznewski comments by indicating notes were included in the review letters for the private sketch plan. The applicant's representative confirmed the location. Mr. Stampfl responded the exact site location is not known of the temple driveway. However, the intent is once information is received, both driveways will be lined up.

C) Where will the bike and hike path will end once off route 263. Mr. Murphy answered; the trail will end at Route 263 until the next section is constructed. D) What is the status of back lit signage to provide illumination during rainy evenings. Ms. Stern Goldstein responded; as previously mentioned the plan is proposing goose neck lighting, which will provide adequate lighting for rain evenings. Lighting commitments will not be made until a plan is submitted and reviewed by Code Enforcement Director; Sinclair Salisbury. E) What is the status of the no left hand turn off Rogers Road. Ms. Streznewski noted Rogers Road was previously considered a feeder road not suitable for through traffic. Ms. Stern Goldstein responded; the definition of Rogers Road as a feeder road depends on which township plan is referenced and the exact phrase used. The comprehensive plan is a guideline and does not contain regulations. The zoning and subdivision land ordinances are both regulatory, one of which waivers can be obtained. Ms. Streznewski informed the commission, residents of Rogers Road are very concerned with the possible speeding issue with cars passing through on their way to the shops. It's the consensus of the community not to have Rogers Road be considered a through way for the proposed site. Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned for verification the consensus anyone who lives within the vicinity of the roads that feed into Rogers Road be prevented from coming down Rogers Road and turning left into the center. Ms. Streznewski agreed and added a petition of 350 signatures can be provided to show possible increased traffic is not wanted along Spring Valley Road and Rogers Road.

Resident; Henry Strong of 91 Rogers Road agrees with Ms. Streznewski's comments adding traffic along Rogers Road is currently busy and will increase with the proposed site. The new traffic pattern is working out with Temple Judea, with some cars making occasional left hand turns. He prefers not to have a road at all to possibly assist with impervious surface.

Resident; _____ questioned; if the water from the retention basin will exhaust. Mr. Stampfl answered; designs for the retention basin will need to be created. However, there will be a discharge of the water at the basin. Testing to see if water can be held has not been completed. There is still a lot of work that has to be done to include engineering. Once the plan is closer to completion infiltration testing will be completed. Mr. _____ commented currently waters not retain that flows from Temple Judea and requested the issue be addressed. Mr. _____ then questioned what steps will be taken to address the sand mounds. Mr. Stampfl answered; provisions will be taken to determine exactly what the issues are and to ensure the soil is improved.

Resident; Mark Mayler of 150 Rogers Road questioned why is there a need to have Rogers Road as an access point. Mr. Murphy answered; one of the principal reason was to enable visitors to the synagogue exit at a signalized

exit. Mr. Murphy added, the increased traffic issue should be addressed with the board of supervisors. The design of the traffic single off Rogers Road was from it include previously receive from residents and approved by Penn Dot. Mr. Kelso questioned; if traffic signals will be coordinated once Temple Judea request is approved. Mr. Murphy was unsure but indicated it's doubtful.

Resident; Alan Victor of 116 Rogers Road suggested Rogers Road be angled to only have an entrance from Route 263 to avoid making a left hand turn.

Resident; Dave Zabele of 7 Old Nursery Way commented he appreciates the proposed bike and hike trail, but questions how much use will it have. Also, with structures being moved 20 feet closer to the residential community, wonders how will be noise factor be addressed. Mr. Murphy answered; the buildings will be pushed 256 feet back with a potential of approximately twenty more feet. Additional trees instead of a possible sound wall is being considered, but that distance is considerable as the closest point to the back property. Mr. Kelso noted one main property which use was not considered to have deliveries. He noted there is an opportunity to address the noise issue successfully with the size of the building or other options. He suggested the applicants take a closer look before their next meeting with the planning commission. Ms. Stern Goldstein noted to use caution with vegetation that is proposed to be saved along the common property line. A berm or mound should not be utilize along an area when trying to save the vegetation. Mr. Kelso added the most effective buffering is closest to the building. Mr. Murphy agreed and will comply.

Butler Avenue Corridor Study – Top Ten List for Development

Ms. Hendrixson reported one of the tasks of the commission was to provide their top 10 list for development. Mr. Kelso indicated his impression was to provide content of a top 10 list and provided some ideas to explore as...

- 1) Safe pedestrian access, street scape will be a good opportunity to work with the borough
- 2) Dilapidation of buildings along the area is a deterrence for overall rehabilitation.
- 3) Multi-mobile transportation.
- 4) Housing in general. With the demands and growing population higher density housing may be beneficial.
- 5) Age appropriate housing, such as townhouses in relation to the hospital.

Mr. Redfield questioned if appropriate housing includes college age residents. Mr. Kelso indicated that a recent meeting with Delaware Valley college, housing was an issue. Ms. Hendrixson added housing may be required for graduate students, but not in the form of dormitories. Ms. Mason added population will increase at Delaware Valley College. Currently, there is approximately 1600 undergraduates with 700 graduates. The goal will be to an increase the undergraduates to 2000 but the total projected number of 3000. Mr. Kelso indicated is no reason to change zoning in that area, because there's nothing else that can be done.

- 6) Mr. Redfield suggested having entertainment activities for the students.

7) Ms. Hendrixson suggested grocery stores, restaurants and/or micro-brewery as a music venue. Ms. Mason indicated with some of the large universities, senior housing is provided. Mr. Kelso added in some cases townhouses are considered depending upon the space.

8) Mr. Kelso noted biotechnical use is not the best use for the township due to outstanding issues. However, it's worth looking at due to the access road than Butler Avenue. Further discussion should include Lower State Road when meeting with the Borough.

9) Mr. Kelso noted there seems to be a consensus regarding hotel use. In terms of the township the best location would be the Route 611 corridor.

Ms. Hendrixson commented more retail and housing makes a lot of sense with more access to Doylestown. Mr. Kelso added with the reduction of traffic due to the Route 611 parkway, it may not be beneficial. Ms. Hendrixson stated more attractive structures are needed, especially for the college students. Ms. Stern Goldstein added with only 1600 students at the college, this will not support retail business.

Upon further discussion, the commission agreed by consensus to develop their top ten list for further discussion at the May 21st regular meeting. Ms. Stern Goldstein noted the final decision can be put off until June where Delaware Valley College is scheduled to submit their master plan.

Adjournment: 9:19 p.m.