

**Meeting Minutes from the
DOYLESTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
February 27, 2017**

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular Meeting was held at 7:00 p.m., Monday, February 27, 2017 in the Doylestown Township Municipal Building, 425 Wells Road, Doylestown, PA. Members of the Doylestown Township Planning Commission in attendance included Chairperson: Judy Hendrixson, Vice Chairman; Thomas Kelso with members; George Lowenstein and Ed Harvey. Others in attendance included Township Manager; Stephanie J. Mason, and Board of Supervisor Liaison: Richard Colello.

Absent: Member: Gregory Reppa

Absent: Township Planning Consultant; Judy Stern Goldstein. In Ms. Stern Goldstein's absence, Ms. Stacy Yoder of Boucher & James, Inc. was present.

Review of Minutes:

In the form of a motion by Mr. Lowenstein; seconded by Mr. Kelso the January 23, 2017 Doylestown Township Planning Commission Reorganization meeting minutes were approved with the following corrections as noted by Mr. Kelso...

Change spelling of Planning Commission member from Gregory Rappa to Reppa.

Motion carried 4 to 0.

Public Comments: None

Bucks County Planning Commission to present Cross Keys Study

Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) Chief Clerk; Lynn Bush presented the Cross Keys study devised into four municipalities as Doylestown Township, Doylestown Borough, Plumstead Township and Buckingham Township. Since meeting with the Commission in February 2014, several suggestions from the Commission was incorporated into the study, such as pedestrian movement along the Cross Keys area. The second item was traffic congestion. To resolve, the BCPC traffic engineer engaged in discussion with the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (Penn Dot). Topic of discussion included, aesthetics, branding and making the corridor attractive. A Transportation Community Development grant was obtained to have studies completed by engineers. The grant will also be used to view the business community and traffic concerns. A series of meetings were also conducted with municipal officers and stake holders. Additionally, a business survey was submitted and results are included with the study.

Bucks County Planning Commission Senior Planner; David A. Sebastian reported; the Cross Keys section serves as the center of economic activity. However, there are various factors hindering the area from reaching its full potential. The Transportation and Climate Initiative (TCI) grant will be funding the study under a Development and Conservation of Natural Resources (DCNR) program. The study area is comprised of approximately 630 acres under four separate municipalities, where multi-municipal planning will be optimal. The study area boundaries are non-residential zoned portions of each municipalities, but areas beyond the study area was also viewed during analysis. Priority issues are noted as transportation, circulation, economic development, assets and future sceneries.

Amy Kaminski, P.E., PTOE. Gilmore & Associates, Inc. reported; as part of the grant opportunity, traffic and eleven signalized intersection information was gathered. Studies included, traffic counts during PM, AM peak and mid-day hours and crash information were compiled on the intersections to determine how safe they are. Transportation improvement projects already programmed in the area are identified as signal timing and coordination plans developed for the intersections. Connector road between Easton and Old Easton Roads, north of Swamp Road. Existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities to evaluate and identify any quoted improvements. Other areas viewed were modifications to intersections to assist in reducing delays, the possible use of a traffic adaptive signal system, best location of a new connector road and pedestrian bicycle facilities.

Studies results concluded; signalized intersections and the use of an adaptive traffic signal system to assist in reducing congestion and improve the three put of traffic through the intersection. Minor improvements at Swamp, Saw Mill Roads at Pine Run. Swamp Road and Route 611 at the northbound off ramp, where there is currently a high risk crash incidents for rear ends. It's believe the quick merge to access the retail area may be the cause. Results found it's the best location of a connector road. Different alignments were viewed for the connector roads at Swamp Road near the Bypass and Easton and Old Easton Roads. Creating an extension road for Landisville Road and connection to Old Easton Road. Connection north of the Swamp Road intersection. The purpose is to improve the corridor level of services and reduce some of the congestion. Provide pedestrian access from Old Easton Road up to Easton Road towards the commercial area.

Concerns include; additional traffic signal installed on Easton Road, north of Swamp Road. Five hundred feet is needed to ensure spacing in between the signals. It will also require cooperative effort from all the municipalities involved.

Ms. Kaminski noted; the location at Swamp, Easton and Old Easton Roads has the highest crash rates. One improvement proposed is removing the traffic signal at Old Easton and Swamp Road and eliminating left turns at the intersection. Currently, the two intersections are less than 300 feet apart. The minimal requirement is 500 feet for spacing between signals. Congestion is also a concern due to conflicting movements occurring that creates gridlock. Proposed improvements are a right in and out to create a through put along Swamp and Easton Roads to eliminate separate phasing.

Upon meeting with Doylestown Borough, residents and retail owners, a concern with eliminating lefts hand turns and the signal was voiced. Upon speaking with Penn Dot, an Alternative B plan was developed, which will allow a westbound left from Easton Road, a left-hand turn with adequate spacing to create a dedicated left hand turn lane at the intersection. Additionally, other movements can be made at the new connector road.

Another area viewed was for the presents of bicycles. The planning commission proposes to defined locations and recommend pedestrian improvements for the year. Additionally, with no sidewalks along Swamp Road, dedicated signalized phasing for movements along Saw Mill Road from the Cross Keys Plaza area is recommended. A map that identifies missing links for pedestrian connections was provided.

Mr. Sebastian reported; the Commission studied three ways to enhance and expand the Cross Keys area. They are defined as evaluating the area, market analysis data and reaching out to the business community to find out what their needs are. Upon providing a brief update of area's growth, Mr. Sebastian indicated: some retail opportunities that will fit with a business type setting will be furniture stores, electronic, appliances, beer & wine, books, restaurants and one other pub.

The Commission mailed surveys to over 300 business owners with 14% response rate and 90% responded the business climate was excellent, very good or good. Concerns noted were high traffic, cost of doing business, high business taxes, retaining and attracting businesses, quality and quantity of employment. Most consumers are residents who indicated the top four fiscal improvements should be public road improvements, enhancing pedestrian

safety, improving street scape appearance, marketing and branding promotions. However, 75% are not willing to pay a small fee for marketing.

For strengths and assets, four are identified as industrial, biotech center, automotive and airport. Retail sales and offices create a small economic base. The Biotech center has 300 employees and the center of the Keystone renovation zone. It has also been a major source of economic impact for employment and an importance source for the study. The automotive industry consists of 115 acres and indicated one challenge is large enough areas to display and store vehicles. This creates a need for balance between the land uses. The airport resides on 85 acres and is concerned with residential nearby, but will accept non-residential plans.

Future scenarios are streetscapes, future development opportunities, concept plans and the potential biotech corridor.

Bucks County Planning Commission Planner; John Ives reported; the enhancement and improvement of the street scape corridor at North Easton and Swamp Roads is proposed by adding common elements, such as street trees, pedestrian scale lighting and sidewalks to assist in creating an identity for the Cross Keys area. It will also create a positive impact on safety and aesthetics.

Connecting of sidewalks are also proposed to revive the redevelopment area and enhance property values. It will also establish a safe zone for pedestrians from vehicular traffic. Two streetscapes areas have been identified as the core area and approach zone. The streetscapes areas will be defined with gateway features. Five gateway areas have been located through the study. Two off Swamp Road, two along North and South Easton Roads and one at the intersection of Landisville and Old Easton Roads. Common elements within the streetscape corridor are sidewalks on one side of the road, landscaping along the entire corridor, pedestrian scale lighting and open space areas.

By defining the passage way in and out along some of the sites, extending the landscape island with added sidewalks, street trees, shrubs and planting stripe are recommended. The side has an existing planting island. It's proposed to enhanced the area with pedestrian scape lighting and shrubs to screen the adjacent parking lot. The gateways were in high, visible, high traffic areas. It's proposed to announced the areas upon entering the Cross Keys corridor.

Mr. Sebastian reported; opportunity areas are defined as vacant, underutilized or aging buildings. Concept plans were considered to determine how to apply design concepts and guidelines to provide redevelopment of a typical site. As an example; the Sylvan Pool site is located across the Biotech center was chosen. This will be a combined site by consolidating lots to provide significant frontage. The site is currently zoned PC1, where a by-right plan is considered. The plan will include single use buildings with significant amount of asphalt and a connector road along the perimeter. The alternative is applying a flexible zoning approach for a balance and utility of the site. The plan will reduce the parking by amending the parking regulations and possibly allowing structured parking. Sidewalks will be added, public open space throughout and multi-use buildings. Possible solutions for the rear of the site would be hotel convention center to compliment the Biotech Center and public.

Ms. Bush noted the area contains several successful segments and important economic components to the non-residential area. All businesses are growing and the Biotech Center could benefit from more similar facilities. These benefits can be created by redesigning underutilized buildings.

The status of the study is the commission completed a draft report, meetings with four municipalities have been scheduled, reviewing comments from attended meetings and creating adjustments. The completed reported will be presented as a guidance document for each municipality for consideration of future plans.

Commission \ Public Comments:

Mr. Kelso commented; the timing of the study is perfect. The area is currently undergoing many activities. With the Biotech Center being the largest employed site, there is a demand to have walking paths available between Old Easton and Easton Roads on the east side. Mr. Ives indicated sidewalks are proposed on Easton Road. Mr. Kelso requested clarification on what improvements are proposed off Old Easton and Swamp Roads. Ms. Bush answered; there are two alternatives. The basic premise is a connector road and changing the existing traffic lights.

Ms. Kaminski clarified; the first plan is to eliminate the existing traffic light at the intersection and provide a connector road. Upon a meeting with Penn Dot, if the connector road was to be built in conjunction with the WaWa, they had to be combined. The traffic signal is needed to be removed and replaced with a connector road. Mr. Kelso indicated; the change would impact the Northside of Easton Road. Ms. Kaminski agreed and indicated there are other traffic signals at North Street. The biggest problem is along the retail businesses located south of Swamp and east of Easton Road. The Alternative B plan allows for a left-hand turn. The only movement not taken into consideration was the Westbound left, which will not enable vehicles to cross. However, the traffic flow can be handled through the proposed connector road.

Mr. Kelso referenced the flashing beacon for pedestrians that was mentioned in the plan and questioned its status. Ms. Kaminski responded; the plan was eliminated by Penn Dot. Mr. Ives added; a compromise was noted as having the pedestrians directed towards Old Easton Road with an installed sidewalk.

Owner Martino Auto Center in Doylestown; Dan Flagler indicated there are 80 residential homes along Mercer and Chapman Roads that will be greatly affected by the study. Upon attending a meeting in Doylestown Borough, he feels the consensus of the community will be to fight the study from moving forward. Mr. Flagler agreed with Mr. Kelso's comments regarding the Alternative B proposal as it will be a detriment to his business and property value.

Mr. Kelso responded; the study provides a good outline of existing problems. The use of the adaptive signal system would provide an opportunity as a first step and reduce some problems. Ms. Kaminski responded; with the 500 feet requirement, it will cause an issue. Based upon her professional opinion, the adaptive system will not resolve the distance problem between the two intersections. There is driver behavior and the gridlock issues, which will effect the adaptive signal system. The issues will not allow enough time for the system to react. Upon speaking with Mr. Kelso regarding his experiences with the intersection, Ms. Kaminski reported; the area has the highest crash rate report.

Resident; Myra Lisowski of 693 North Street commented; the traffic bottlenecks due to the change in the timing of the traffic light. She suggested to have timing checks included into the studies. Ms. Kaminski answered; the traffic signals work together and sometimes when there is no movement on Swamp Road, it could be the lefts on Easton Road can create a clear it signals created by Penn Dot.

Mr. Lowenstein agreed with Ms. Lisowski's comments and suggested to have the BCPC consider the matter. Ms. Kaminski answered; the timing of the traffic lights is a maintenance issue that can be addressed with the municipality.

Resident; Jill Unger at Mercer Avenue in Doylestown Borough recently received a report from Penn Dot, which indicates from 2011 to 2015 the Swamp and Old Easton Road intersection recorded very low crash rates with zero fatalities, major injuries or unknown injuries. Ms. Unger is also concerned with the additional drive through traffic that will occur on Mercer Avenue with the proposed studies' recommendations. The improvements will cause property values to go down and the traffic will be a safety issue for many young children.

Judge Mark Double of Mercer Avenue disagreed with Ms. Kaminski's statement of the intersection having the highest crash rate. He noted there have been more accidents and fatalities occurred on Route 611 and North Street. He also disagrees with the proposed left turn off North Street, due to severe backups. He suggested to eliminate the left turn off Old Easton and leave the right away on North Street. Additionally, removing the traffic light will not be the best answer.

Mr. Colello commented; the study provides great work and energy. With Penn Dot possibly guiding the study, Mr. Colello indicated they have made mistakes in the past. He suggested to meet with Penn Dot to review areas needs and take the residents concern into consideration. Mr. Sebastian responded; some of the elected officials met with Penn Dot, who indicated they were not aware of any issues. Ms. Kaminski added; she submitted the recommendation for traffic improvements. Ms. Bush indicated; Penn Dot is in favor of the BCPC addressing the traffic issues in a comprehensive way. However, no improvements can be completed unless jointly worked out with Penn Dot. Penn Dot is supportive, but not driving the recommendations.

In conclusion, Ms. Bush reported; discussions will continue, where meetings with Plumstead and Buckingham Townships are scheduled in the future. All comments received will be considered. The study is designed to become a guidance document for the municipalities for use of new developments and public improvements.

Mr. Lowenstein suggested; the BCPC take residents comments into consideration and bring them to Penn Dot to discuss. The action will make the municipalities jobs easier to negotiate the improvements.

Metro Storage Doylestown LLC – Preliminary Land Development Plan

Mr. Kelso removed himself from participating in Metro Storage presentation due to a pending contract between his firm; Castle Valley Consultants and Bohler Engineering to complete a portion of the stormwater design.

John A. VanLuvanee, Esquire of Eastburn & Gray, P.C. reported; the plan shows no change since the Commission last viewed the plans. Metro Storage has closed on the property and soon will begin mediation on the site. The applicant met with the Zoning Hearing Board and the Board of Supervisors, where a letter of support was provided by the Board. Sixteen variances will be requested.

Review letters from Bohler Engineering dated February 6, 2017, Michael Baker International dated February 14, 2017, Environmental Advisory Committee dated February 15, 2017, Bucks County Planning Commission dated February 16, 2017, Boucher & James, Inc. dated February 20, 2017, Pickering Corts & Summerson dated February 20, 2017 and Pennoni & Associates dated February 21, 2017 were received and a meeting with Township Planner; Mario Canales was scheduled to resolve stormwater issues. The applicant will comply with most comments noted in the consultant's reports. However, Mr. VanLuvanee indicated there are some issues.

Upon referencing Pickering, Corts and Summerson's February 20, 2017 review letter, Mr. VanLuvanee reported; the applicants will basically comply. However, there are several waivers noted and additional waivers recently added.

- 1) *Section 153.12 - Mr. VanLuvanee first requested a Preliminary Final Land Development recommendation for approval be obtained by the Commission. Approval will assist in the development to remain on schedule and most construction can be completed in 2017.*
- 2) *Section 153.20.C.(10) – the applicants will comply with the conditional waiver and provide with any information requested by Mario Canales or any other consultants.*

Mr. Lowenstein commented; prior to submitting a recommendation, he questioned what will happen with the plan, such as with the stormwater. Mr. VanLuvanne answered; the decision of stormwater will be up to the township. Stormwater will be underground and conceptually on the plan.

- 3) *Section 153-20.E – Michael Baker International review letter indicates a study of a proposed bicycle path is currently being developed by township staff. Mr. VanLuvanee is unsure what the applicants can add.*

- 4) *Section 153-25 - The waiver does not seem to fit with the proposed bike and hike path. There also not enough room for a bike path due to the ultimate right of way that comes up to the front of the building. When Penn Dot widen the road, 50 feet outside of the cart way from the street was removed as a legal right of way. If there was a path in front of the building, it must be within the legal right of way.*
- 5) *Section 153.27.A.(5) - A driveway waiver is no longer needed and will be withdrawn.*
- 6) *Section 153-28.H – the request is due to Duane Road, where there is no other choice for the location. The area needs to be as far away from the bridge as possible. Penn Dot should provide the permit. Additionally, any access from Duane Road has been eliminated.*

Ms. Hendrixson questioned; how far is the site from the access. Mr. Eric A. Britz, PE of Bohler Engineering was unsure, but believes it's within the 300 feet requirement. Mr. VanLuvanee offered to locate the information and provide later.

8) *Section 153-23.B.(3) - There is no location to place the street trees.*

Mr. Lowenstein noted; some street trees can be installed near the creek. Mr. VanLuvanee responded; there are no plans to install trees along the creek due to a lack of room. Ms. Mason clarified; the February 15, 2017 Environmental Advisory Committee (EAC) memorandum recommended street trees be installed the riparian corridor with planting. Upon Mr. VanLuvanee's request, the Commission provided a copy of the review letter. Upon reviewing the memorandum, Mr. VanLuvanee agreed. Mr. Britz added upon reviewing the area, it was scaled off to 300 feet and 10 to 15 feet of the center line to the driveway at Duane Road. There are other access points between the site and Duane as well.

8) *Section 153-39.D.(1) – There are some areas where in order to complete the tie in to the neighboring properties, the slope will need to be steeper than 4 to 1. Mr. Britz added; the area is located on the right-hand side, near the gas station and the eastern side of the residential properties.*

Ms. Hendrixson questioned how will it be completed. Mr. Britz answered; a retaining wall will be created with 3 to 1 slope. Mr. VanLuvanee added; variance was obtained from Zoning criterions.

9) *Section 153-38.F.(5)(b) - The waiver will be withdrawn. Mr. Britz indicated; the waiver may be presented as a partial waiver depending upon his conversation with Mr. Canales.*

Mr. VanLuvanee reported: the applicants will comply with all issues listed under page three of the Pickering, Corts & Summerson Site Plan Sheet dated February 20, 2017. However, under paragraph five, the plan will be revised to construct an onsite easement.

Natural Resource Protection Plan

13) SALDO Section 153-20.C.(6) – the applicants will provided the required information to Mario Canales.

Grading Plan

14) A note referencing what map will be utilized and will comply.

15) SALDO Section 153-39.C.(5) - is a waiver not on the list, but added to the final list. The section has slopes which are required to be a minimum of five feet from the property and/or right of way lines. To tie in properties, a transition of more than five feet is needed to make the grades work.

Storm & Sanitary Profiles

19) Mr. Britz is scheduled to speak with Mario Canales to resolve. Mr. Britz confirmed and clarified; the stormwater is proposed as an underground basin. The difference from a typical underground basin is in the outlet structure itself. A pump will bring the flow into an irrigation system. It's set up to pump the volume required to be held and providing control based upon the township and DEP requirements. The volume that is created by the difference in a two year storm between are proposed and what is today. The proposed system cannot infiltrate the volume. Instead, it will be irrigated. The key difference is in the outlet structure, a pump will be present to allow for the irrigation system to be controlled in the building. It will then irrigate the green area surrounding the site. With caution, a peak rate was designed assuming the volume was completely full and route each storm through the basin. Assuming the infiltration volume is full, each of the peak rates will still meet within township and DEP requirements.

Upon Mr. VanLuvanee's question of what happens to the water, Mr. Britz answered; the stormwater that is in the lower portion of the basin will spread out throughout the site for irrigation. As the volume decreases, it provides more volume, which is over and above that is provided for calculations as excess volume into the storage centers.

Mr. Lowenstein questioned; if the excess will flow towards the creek. Mr. Britz answered; a certain amount of flow will be allowed out per day. The flow will not be much difference of what happens today. In heavier rain storms, the flow will run off to the creek. In addition to the irrigation system, amended soils will be provided throughout the site. It must pass an additional layer to hold extra volume. The system will also be built into the maintenance plan.

Mr. Lowenstein questioned; will plantings be added that can absorb or hold more water. Mr. Britz answered; a large amount of planting was added on the north and east sides of the site. To assist in promoting the planting, the water will be swayed. There is a large area to the north that flows across Duane Road, towards the site and through the storm system into Duane Road. The bypass system will be reconstructed to catch the drainage and placing multiple inlets to catch the drainage that comes in from the north that runs through a dual pipe system. It will also run through an easement bypassing the basin before flowing out.

20) SALDO Section 153-38.F.4.(a) – a new waiver will be requested regarding the length and sizing of a pipe. However, the applicants are currently waiting on Mr. Canales' comments.

Landscape & Lighting Plans and Details

21) A variance was requested through the Zoning Hearing Board, because the zoning ordinance references compliance with SALDO. The intent is to keep the lights lower than what is permitted throughout the site. There is one point at the entrance near the property line needs to exceed the one foot candle. The waiver is requested because the area is near a right of way near the entrance.

Upon referencing the Boucher & James, Inc. review letter dated February 20, 2017, Mr. VanLuvanee noted the following issues ...

16) ZO Section 175-20 \ SLDO Section 153-36.C.1.b – is a waiver that needs to be added and only effects the intersection at the property.

16) ZO Section 175-20 \ SLDO Section 153-36.C.2 – the waiver is for the back of site and is to minimize the lighting. Additionally, with the hours of operation for the property, the requirement is not needed.

Ms. Hendrixson questioned; if lighting will come from the building. Mr. Britz answered; there is a mixture of lighting from the building. There are a couple of areas that dip below half a foot candle and need to make sure lighting is not spilling over. Ms. Hendrixson questioned; if it will make more sense to have lighting from the property towards the building, rather than on the building. Mr. Britz answered; the way the plans were modeled, there is no need to be at

a one foot candle. The IS standard is needed for lighting in the area and currently one foot lower than the candle. The light are about fourteen feet and a whole light will need to be at 20 feet. The fixture will be lowered, fully shielded and right up against the building. No lighting is needed towards the road. The lighting will also not be angled out towards the neighboring properties.

16.b) SLDO Section 153.36.C.2 – the applicants will comply. Mr. Britz will speak with Ms. Stern Goldstein to discuss if a use is necessary in this matter. It's temporary disturbance in areas previously disturbed. Ms. Yoder stated; most issues can be resolved with notes on the plan. Mr. VanLuvanee agreed.

Landscape and Buffer requirements

4) SLDO Section 153-34.C(5) – Tree replacement will be 171 caliber inches. There is no replacement scheduled due to no room on the site. If planting is to be placed along the corridor, a partial waiver will be requested. He will discuss the matter with Boucher & James, Inc.

Bike and Hike Path

The applicants requested a waiver. However, upon reviewing Michael Baker's review letter, nothing was noted the property was implicated earlier. Mr. VanLuvanee offered to provide an easement, if necessary. Mr. Colello responded; upon reviewing options of installing a bike and hike path, more discussion with the Bike and Hike Committee and Township staff is needed. Ms. Mason informed the Bike and Hike Committee meets on the third Tuesday of each month at 8:00am. The next meeting is scheduled for March 21st.

Upon reviewing Michael Baker International February 14th review letter, Mr. VanLuvanee noted the following ...

- 1) Loading areas will be striked and identify on the plan were the applicants will comply. There is no loading or unloading outside of the building. All loading is conducted inside of the building. There is also minimal parking, where a variance was received.
- 2) The applicants are suggesting to place notes on the plan, due to the requirement not applying. The township entered an agreement regarding the existing billboard and placed all the perimeters. Mr. VanLuvanee indicated; he's not sure how the requirement will apply. The applicants are placing one building and the sign will be not included. The issue should be considered a non-conformity, due to two principal uses on the property.

Ms. Mason responded; upon speaking with Ms. Stern-Goldstein, the issue can be resolved by applying notes on the plan, because the two exists. Mr. VanLuvanee agreed. Ms. Yoder added; upon studying the requirements of a plan group development and agrees it doesn't apply, because of one building. However, it's two principal uses and should be acknowledged.

Upon reviewing the February 21, 2017 review letter from Pennoni & Associates most items are will comply based upon a discussion between the applicant's engineer and Pennoni. Mr. VanLuvanee noted the following issues ...

- 1) There is concern with the request of a taper along the driveway. It would be a widen shoulder, upon Penn Dot's approval.
- 2) A waiver for a fee in lieu for a traffic study is requested, because the road is owned by Penn Dot. If Penn Dot requires a traffic study, it will be completed. However, there is no reason why the township will require a traffic study.

Mr. VanLuvanee acknowledged receipt of the SE Engineers, Inc. February 14, 2017 review letter and reported; they are currently working through technical issues with sewer systems recommendations. Ms. Mason indicated; the

Commission has yet reviewed the SC Engineers letter. Mr. VanLuvanee offered to provide copies and indicated the applicants will comply with recommendations.

Mr. VanLuvanee concluded by stating; none of the comments will change the horizontal layout of the project. All the relief has been received and the plans have not changed since first presented. The site has been purchased and demolition will be moving forward.

Commission \ Public Comments:

Resident: James McMullen of 83 Duane Road questioned; during clean up, what will the applicant do to keep all materials on site. Will all equipment be washed out before entering or exiting onto Route 611. A representative answered; to address the asbestos issue, a small ACM is in the existing house and the window molimen mastic will not be located outside. The ACM vendor will conduct all business per state standard within a ten day period. For mud control, a tracking pad is required off Easton Road and fencing will be provided throughout the entire site. All standards required by the Township, County and State will be followed.

Ms. McMullen questioned; if lane closures will be involved off Route 611 for deliveries. The representative could not provide an answer, because it will be up to the general contractor. However, a permit will be required before any lane closures can be allowed. The preference is to unload onsite and not on the highway. Mr. VanLuvanee added; lane closure may be requirement upon Penn Dot's direction.

Resident: Della Ashton of 80 Duane Road what will the direction be of the entrance's driveway. Mr. VanLuvanee answered; the driveway is proposed to be full service.

In the form of a motion by Mr. Lowenstein; seconded by Mr. Harvey the Doylestown Township Planning Commission recommends the Doylestown Township Board of Supervisors approve applicant; Metro Storage Final Land Development plans with the understanding applicants will comply with review letters received by Bohler Engineering dated February 6, 2017, Michael Baker International dated February 14, 2017, Environmental Advisory Committee dated February 15, 2017, Bucks County Planning Commission dated February 16, 2017, Boucher & James, Inc. dated February 20, 2017, Pickering Corts & Summerson dated February 20, 2017, Pennoni & Associates dated February 21, 2017 and SC Engineers, Inc. dated February 14, 2017. Further in accordance to discussions to include attending the March 21, 2017 Bike and Hike Committee meeting to discuss possible trail connection and Boucher & James, Inc. to discuss items to be noted on the plans.

Motion Carried 3 to 0 with Mr. Kelso abstaining due to a pending contract between his firm; Castle Valley Consultants and Bohler Engineering to complete a portion of the stormwater design.

Doylestown Township Municipal Complex – Change of Zoning Municipal Parcels

Ms. Mason explained; the change of zoning parcels is a proposed ordinance for the consolidation of the Township's tax parcels. Township Planner; Mario Canales presented the plans previously, where Central Park and three parcels owned by the Township and is part of the open space is proposed to be consolidated into one tax parcel. Consolidation is also proposed for the zoning of institutional. Notices have been forwarded to adjacent property owners, home owner associations. Additionally, the property was posted for a hearing during the March 7th Board of Supervisors Regular meeting.

Ms. Mason noted; several residents have reached confused the zoning will be listed under industrial instead of institutional. Other concerns, is the new Municipal Complex will be placed near their homes. Ms. Mason provided

clarification the building was never considered to be built near any homes or the open space. The change in zoning and consolidation makes it simple.

In the form of a motion by Mr. Kelso; seconded by Mr. Harvey the Doylestown Township Planning Commission recommends the Doylestown Township Board of Supervisors approve the ordinance of consolidation and change in zoning for Municipal parcels as prepared.

Motion Carried 4 to 0.

Ordinance Amendment – Medical Marijuana

Mr. Kelso questioned; the ordinance will cover dispensaries, but not the growing operations. Ms. Mason clarified; the growing operations will not be included at this time. Ms. Yoder clarified on behalf of Ms. Stern Goldstein; adding growing operations is unnecessary as a use, because it falls under industrial use as processing and manufacturing. Mr. Kelso suggested to add the growing operations, because it's dealt with regulations and two separate items.

Mr. Lowenstein requested clarification of why the ordinance is needed. Mr. Kelso explained; the use needs to be defined on where it will be used, because it's defined by law. If the township does not create an ordinance, someone will direct how it should be defined. Ms. Mason added; the ordinance will be listed as a retail use under a regulated substance.

Upon a discussion amongst the Commission regarding why the ordinance should be created, Ms. Yoder indicated; the ordinance was requested to be created to provide a clear definition, so there is no misconception when the use is proposed. Ms. Mason added; the Township is repeating the regulations as set forth by the state. Mr. Kelso commented; repeating the state regulations may be a mistake, because the Township will not regulate it.

Ms. Mason reminded; when the law came into effect last year, the Board of Supervisors directed the Commission to create an ordinance once the regulations were presented. She added; the residents, Board and the Codes Department will feel more comfortable having a clear definition on record.

Mr. Lowenstein suggested to have the Township Solicitor review the ordinance to determine how the ordinance reflects and summarizes the law. Mr. Kelso noted; there is an administrative aspect to the ordinance. He then provided notations be considered as the Commission take a closer look at the definitions, where the law should be reference. The health department should be recognized as the Pennsylvania Department of Health. Repeating the law may not be beneficial, because it will change. The zoning ordinance should be revised.

Mr. Kelso commented; there is no reference on any ordinance where the Police Chief was to provide approval. He is concerned with the possibility it may not be covered under law. Ms. Mason noted; a security plan needs to be in place and approved as part of an application. Mr. Kelso commented; having the Township being involved in that process maybe a mistake. Ms. Mason added; the regulations should be noted as at the time. This will allow the ordinance to be flexible.

Ms. Yoder questioned; if the Commission would like to have the ordinance have less information instead of more by eliminating all the regulations and only noting the state law. Ms. Mason responded; the Township should be careful how the ordinance is recorded. She then suggested to review to see if the state regulations can be listed under the LI district. Mr. Kelso agreed and noted the paragraph, which list 1,000 distance in two zones should be more defined. He then questioned; what happens when a daycare is in a multiuse area or from a property line of a shopping center. Mr. Colello questioned; what will be the action if a daycare moves in after a dispensary has been established in a

shopping center. Ms. Mason noted; there is no action recorded under the current ordinance and the question should be directed to the Township Solicitor.

The Commission directed Boucher & James, Inc update the draft Marijuana Ordinance for their review at the next meeting. Ms. Yoder agreed and clarified; the ordinance will be update to include clearer definitions, 1,000 feet from property line, remove reference to the Police Chief authority, and if growing and manufacturing can be defined under LI use.

Adjournment: Hearing no further business, the February 27, 2017 Doylestown Township Planning Commission Meeting was adjourned at 9:20pm.