

**Minutes from the
DOYLESTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
June 23, 2014**

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular Meeting was held at 7:00 p.m., Monday June 23, 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. 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: Planning Commission members; Edward Redfield and Ed Harvey

Review of Minutes:

In the form of a motion by Mr. Kelso; seconded by Mr. Lowenstein the May 21, 2014, 2014 Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular meeting minutes were approved.

Motion carried 3 to 0.

Public\Commission Comments – None

Plans for Scheduled for Discussion: Enclave at Towns Edge \ Preliminary Land Development Plan

Developer; Richard Zaveta of Zaveta Custom Homes provided a brief background of the Enclave at Towns Edge proposed preliminary land development plan, formerly known as the Goetzberger Tract. The site is approximately 3 acres. Upon several comments from the January 27, 2014 meeting with township staff, applicants met with Emergencies Services to make sure the configurations were contiguous for fire and safety vehicles. Verbal directions were received from Boucher & James and a follow up letter be provided. Storm water management downstream is currently a concern, where Greg Glitzer of Gilmore & Associates has been working on options to reduce the flow grade post construction as oppose to the current conditions.

Upon direction received from the Planning Commission at the February 4, 2014 meeting, several suggestions were addressed. The first include landscaping plans will not suggest heavy berming transiting out onto the stream. With regards to snowplowing for the storm water management system, inlets and sheet flow methods will be proposed instead of reverse street method which may become a challenge. The street flow method for snow process will also become a homeowner association issue. When meeting with neighbors; Mr. and Mrs. Bruschetta it was resolved that a buffer will be provided and cleanup of the property's garage by adding landscaping.

Mr. Zaveta concluded; the revised plan is very similar to the was one submitted originally and will retain the same architectural style.

Mr. Glitzer reported the site will be zoned as single family use, semi-detached. The approach will incorporated a common architectural element that attaches units 1 and 2 to the existing house and the barn. The other units will be similarly be attached in pairs.

Mr. Glitzer then addressed one issue under Boucher & James noted on their June 18, 2014 letter, where the 30 feet buffer around the entire site was misread as a lake view independence court. The buffer along the Bruschetta property will be increased from a 25 foot setback to a 30 foot buffer. One of the units will have a slight encroachment, but will be reconfigured. Mr. Kelso questioned if the buffer will be added to the rear of the property. Mr. Glitzer answered; with a condominium approach, various options will be reviewed, such as a designated buffer yard. However a 30 foot line will be shown. Also, storm water management will be shown as a bio-retention facility. The engineering berm was kept out of the buffer with transitional grading, which will act as the 30 foot buffer. Ms. Stern Goldstein noted a request to keep the buffer with some existing vegetation trimming. As a requirement, documentation should note the performance standard for the buffer. Mr. Glitzer agreed and added there is a fair amount of replacement and open space trees along Spring House. Ms. Stern Goldstein requested buffering be placed along the boundary perimeter and to maintain the meadow on site.

Mr. Glitzer reported Doylestown Fire Marshall; Rick Shay provided updated dimensions for their new ladder truck in which new turning ratios template was designed. Mr. Shay also provided a verbal approval of the plans.

Mr. Kelso questioned if curbing is provided along part of the cul-de-sac. Mr. Glitzer answered; curbing is along the entire perimeter. The stone edging will be a foot in width with a river stone edging. Mr. Kelso was concerned with the narrow width of the roadway where it drops off sharply after the stone area. Mr. Glitzer responded; a two foot level course is located before the drop off into the grading. One of the discussions with the Fire Marshall addressed the same issue and the applicants agreed to provide extra room the ordinance might require or increase the 14 foot lane around the cul-de-sac to 24 feet, as shown on the plan.

Mr. Kelso also had concerns with the grading in front of the barn and existing home. The retaining wall does not indicate a top of wall elevation. Mr. Glitzer agreed and explained there are more details that need to be added. There is a perception of the area being sloped two to three feet near the drop off. Upon reviewing each unit designs, each wants to follow the other where they are connected in elevation. Options are being reviewed to eliminate some of the severity of the drops and keeping the walls to the minimum. Mr. Zaveta agreed with Mr. Kelso's comments and indicated the options will have to make sense. Mr. Glitzer added the plan is to find a positive slope from the existing home and barn back to the gutter line on the driveway. They do not want to pitch them down toward the buildings.

Mr. Kelso noted the water drainage towards the front of the units is not shown. Mr. Glitzer responded; the storm water is graded to a low point, then to a lower point to provide redundancy. Upon a brief discussion regarding the drainage calculations, the applicants will provide a better definition regarding drainage.

Mr. Kelso then addressed the landscaping along Lower State Road by questioning if street trees will be added. Mr. Glitzer answered; street trees currently exist. The total frontage obligation has many utility conflicts where the right total number needs to be clarified with Ms. Stern Goldstein. The intent is to maintain as many of the existing trees as possible. Mr. Kelso suggested to avoid placing high trees near the pipeline or cut back the existing trees.

Mr. Kelso questioned if the manhole sewer cover located in front of the site will be repaired. Mr. Glitzer answered; there is an existing inlet along the center of road. The Inlets will be pushed to either side that will pick up the drainage that would have come and bring flow toward site.

Upon reviewing Baker Engineering June 19, 2014 review letter, Mr. Glitzer noted the following...

- 1) Section § 153-25 B(1) – Mr. Kelso questioned if a mid-block crossing would be considered. Mr. Glitzer will consider placing a refuge island or curb siding to slow down traffic toward Doylestown Borough. Upon a discussion regarding best actions to take to slow down traffic, Mr. Glitzer agreed to comply in having Baker Engineering in assisting with options.

Mr. Glitzer then requested the following waivers be granted...

Mr. Glitzer explained waiver requests are mainly geometry to reduce the cul-de-sac bulb radius, as per the ordinance to have a 50 foot wide area that is less than 3% next to the existing road. Currently the area is at 29 feet as a slightly flatter leveling area and a technical waiver will be requested. It will be a private street, but the ordinance requires private streets to be designed to public standards.

For the decell lane along Lower State Road, a bump out or refuge island will be reviewed as an option

A block curb was chosen for internal curbing and requires a waiver

- 1) For grading, the driveway slopes has a several constraints, such as a sloping site with attached units and flat driveway slopes for the high units, close the road. The request for a waiver is to provide the freedom to provide up to a 5% driveway slope from the back of the sidewalk to the right of way line.
- 2) Under the tree preservation requirement, currently the allowance of amount of trees allowed on site is low. Some of the existing trees are not in good shape and others are close to the units. Incremental waivers will be requested under the tree protection categories and will comply with all tree replacement requirements regarding caliber inches required even though preservation requirements are not currently being met.
- 3) Standard waivers requested are for BMPs versus conventional surface retention and the need to facilitate regular mowing. Other waiver is for rain gardens at the bottom of the facilities. Inside and underneath the cul-de-sac within the bulb is a rain garden and infiltration bed, which provides control and recharge into the retention basin as a hybrid system. A technical waiver will be requested for the collection swale and low flow channel in the basin.
- 4) The perforated riser will be a small scale and low impact bmp. The goal is not to place a riser structure but to find an easier fashion. There are also downspout collectors as 8 to 12 inch plastic pipes, which will be part of the homeowner's association because of the private street

Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned if the tree protection waiver requested is just for the 15 feet needed to meet requirements. If the township grants the waiver, an extraordinary tree protection standard is needed for details.

Mr. Glitzer indicated the applicants will comply with comments stated in Pennoni & Associates letter dated June 18, 2014 and Boucher & James letter dated June 18, 2014 with the following notes...

- 1) Regarding Unit 2, the applicants will comply with design a plan to have part of the back corner have a 30 foot buffer and additional trees and landscaping will be installed.
- 2) For the traffic study, documentation will be provided for highway permit.
- 3) As per David Tomko's request, the Fire Marshall will be provided a packet regarding the bulb design for emergency vehicles. Also, the line painting issue will be addressed.
- 4) The parking spaces were delineated on the plan with generous parking. Mr. Zaveta added; no township related nuisance was noted with regards to parking. The plan provides a generous configuration to provide room for two full size cars with no on street parking. Ms. Stern Goldstein noted the applicants meet the requirements without the garage.

Upon reviewing Code Enforcement Director; Sinclair Salisbury review letter dated June 19, 2014, the following was noted...

- 1) The applicants will comply with comments related to no planting will reside along the right of way and easements.
- 2) The applicants are not proposing a conventional street lighting plan. A street lamp plan is proposed near each driveway and Lower State Road. There is not intention to have lighting that will disturb neighboring residents. Ms. Mason requested clarification of what lighting will be utilized. Mr. Glitzer responded; driveway lamps are proposed, such as a carriage lamp. Upon Ms. Goldstein request, Mr. Glitzer agreed to clarify the lighting plan by noting all locations lighting is proposed.

Mr. Colello questioned if the Bucks County Planning Commission review letter can be provided for township files. Mr. Glitzer reported the applicants will provide clarification for structures of the semidetached units. Mr. Zaveta clarified; the structure is a roofed with side walls and serve as the single entry doors of the garage to avoid using a garage door opener. It will be considered as a connective structure. Mr. Glitzer noted the applicants will comply with comments made in the Bucks County Planning Commission review letter received on June 23, 2014. Mr. Colello then noted for informational purposes, a community called the Enclave of North Doylestown Borough began construction.

In the form of a motion by Mr. Kelso; seconded by Mr. Lowenstein the Doylestown Township Planning Commission recommends the Doylestown Township Board of Supervisors approve applicants; Enclave at Towns Edge Preliminary Land Development Plan with the understanding the applicants have agreed to comply with comments and address concerns noted in the June 18, 2014 Boucher & James, Inc., June 18, 2014 Pennoni & Associates, June 19, 2014 Doylestown Township Code Enforcement and Bucks County Planning Commission dated June 18, 2014 letters. Further the applicants agreed to evaluate drainage issue from the two existing structures and around the edge of the cul-de-sac. Also, a concept will be provided mid-block crossing off Lower State Road as discussed in lieu of a traffic study.

Motioned carried 3 to 0.

Casa Bella \ Preliminary Land Development Plan – Continued Discussion

The engineer site worker addressed the commission to discuss comments from their last meeting regarding the bike and hike path width and extend water main where both are a major design. Developer; Chris Pisani and Danielle Davis attended a recent Bike and Hike Committee meeting where the committee indicated they were satisfied with the plans as shown. Danielle added the once the connector is added and no sidewalks are required, then the plans will be satisfactory. Mr. Kelso disagreed and clarified the committee referred the sidewalk issue back to the Planning Commission. They only addressed the need for an additional multi-use trail across the front of the property. Danielle explained she understood the committee agreed there are to be no sidewalks and no trails where the issue discussed would be the fee in lieu. She continued upon her discussion with Bike & Hike Committee Chair; Lynn Goldman who thanked the applicants for placing the connection and explained for the purpose of the meeting, sidewalks and bike trail will not be required. However, the issue will need to be re-addressed with the Planning Commission.

Upon further discussion of what took place at the Bike and Hike Committee meeting, Mr. Lowenstein explained decisions from the Bike and Hike Committee does not reflect back to the Planning Commission. Ms. Mason clarified the Bike and Hike Committee focus on connections, where a trail was not needed along the applicant's site and internal sidewalks were deferred and not discussed. Mr. Colello added; the Bike and Hike Committee only has jurisdiction pertaining the bike trail and have no control over sidewalks, which why there may be some confusion.

Ms. Hendrixson further explained the commission will determine if any internal sidewalk or path required along the property site. Mr. Kelso suggested internal sidewalks should be added along the same side of the trail off the site. Developer; Chris Pisani disagreed explaining the site will be a four lot private road. Danielle noted the Zaveta tract located in Windsor does not have sidewalks or a bike and hike path with 16 foot wide and no curbing. Mr. Pisani added; he doesn't know of any cul-de-sac with sidewalks. A majority of his clients request a rural feeling with cul-de-sac. With a four lot property, there will be very little traffic. Pedestrians have the option to walk along the grass when a vehicle enters the site. Ms. Davis added; along the township near the site, the preference is not to have sidewalks to keep a rural feel. Mr. Kelso and Ms. Mason disagreed referencing the community off Turk Road.

Mr. Lowenstein explained the commission has to view each zoning issues as requirement without preferences, because it will never satisfy everyone. The main issue of ordinances is to consider is safety.

Upon a discussion between the applicants and commission regarding preferences in having sidewalks along communities, Danielle indicated the reason why their home cannot be sold is because of the trail. Approximately 53 trees were planted around their property with no effect, because prospective buyers don't like the idea of the trail. Ms. Mason questioned if the prospective buyers believe they have to maintain the trail. Mr. Pisani answered the buyers understand maintenance of the trail is not their responsibility, however a lack of privacy is the problem.

Mr. Colello suggested keeping the trail macadam and increasing the width 5 to 6 feet, there will be enough room for incoming traffic will be an option. This will retain the country look of macadam instead of having a concrete walk. Mr. Pisani disagreed indicating the option will cause additional imperious surface and effect the control of storm water

management. Danielle questioned to keep the road at 20 feet wide and mark 4 feet for the trail, such as noted in Doylestown Borough. Ms. Hendrixson responded; the trail doesn't have to be marked. In terms of safety, the trail should remain with a gravel shoulder and not have a gully next to it. She commented that, in her opinion, width of the sidewalk is fine, but additional details should be provided to show no breakdown from a gully. Mr. Pisani reported there is 12 feet from the end of the road to the easement. Ms. Stern Goldstein noted when plowing begin the road will be covered with snow since the shoulder is not touched.

Upon a discussion regarding options and preferences of sidewalks, Ms. Hendrixson questioned if the right of way is wide enough to place a sidewalk for a future trail. Mr. Pisani indicated yes. Ms. Stern Goldstein noted the storm water management system is designed without the sidewalk. As the engineer indicated previously, the plans are very close in increasing the storm water capacity and currently the plan couldn't accommodate a trail. The plan will need to be revised to include a 50 foot right of way with provisions for a trail in the future if the residents want it.

Mr. Lowenstein questioned as a compromise and as a condition of final approval, can the width of the right of way be increased and the capacity be available or have the capacity made wider. Mr. Pisani agreed. Mr. Kelso added; a paved area should be provided at the street for school bus safety. He suggested a long stretch of sidewalk or landing pad capable of accommodating 6 to 8 children located at the right of way line. The width should be at 6 feet wide and extend out to the entrance. Mr. Pisani agreed. Ms. Mason added the Home Association should be responsible to clear the area in winter.

Mr. Pisani reported the applicants will provide a complete water system located in the center of the cul-de-sac and requested the commission provide a recommendation the proposed preliminary land development plan be moved forward for Board of Supervisor approval. Mr. Pisani noted the only issue to review are the sidewalks, but will comply with other conditions.

In the form of a motion by Mr. Kelso; seconded by Mr. Lowenstein the Doylestown Township Planning Commission recommend the Doylestown Township Board of Supervisors approve applicants; Casa Bella Preliminary Land Development Plan with the understanding the applicants will comply and address comments provided by all fo the review letters. Further the applicants agreed to extend water to the satisfaction of the Township's Water Authority regarding across the front of the property and into the bulb of the cul-de-sac with Fire Protection and water maintenance provided. Extend a paved barrier to the edge of the road, proper fully in an L shape connecting onto the site's road and onto the main road to provide a safe have and allow children to wait for a school bus. (approx: 6). Incorporate imperious surface into an allowance for a sidewalk to place in reserve, also provide calculations and size the storm water management to accommodate a five foot wide sidewalk as an addition.

Ms. Stern Goldstein noted the plan will need to show how much imperious surface each property owner have left for storm water management.

Motioned carried 3 to 0.

Items for Discussion

- A. Stone Barn Manor was approved by the Board of Supervisors with conditions regarding public sewer and private wells.

- B. Joint work session of the Doylestown Township and New Britain Borough Planning commissions will be held as a walk through off Butler Avenue. The commission are welcome to attend on July 8, 2014, 5:00pm with dinner provided.
- C. Mr. Kelso noted the trail located behind the Duck Deli should be considered for sidewalks to become visible pedestrian friendly. Ms. Mason agreed stating a trail on both sides beginning from New Britain Road to Shady Retreat Road would be nice to see. A discussion ensued amongst the commission regarding status of existing and future trails, such as at Delaware Valley College and Central Bucks YMCA.
- D. Deadline for article submissions to be placed in the Township Newsletter is August 10, 2014. The Planning Commission need to supply an outline of the commission's duties at 300 words or less and include pictures. Ms. Hendrixson suggested to include the July 8th Joint Work session walk through.

Adjournment:

The June 23, 2014 Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular meeting was adjourned at 8:34pm