

**Meeting Minutes from the
DOYLESTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting**

April 24, 2017

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular Meeting was held at 7:00 p.m., Monday, April 24, 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, Ed Harvey and Gregory Reppa. Others in attendance included Board of Supervisor Liaison: Richard Colello.

Absent: Township Manager; Stephanie Mason

Absent: Township Planning Consultant; Judy Stern Goldstein. In Ms. Stern Goldstein's absence, Mr. Michael L. Beuke, R.L.A of Boucher & James, Inc. was present.

Review of Minutes:

In the form of a motion by Mr. Harvey; seconded by Mr. Kelso the March 27, 2017 Doylestown Township Planning Commission meeting minutes were approved.

Motion carried 5 to 0.

Public Comments:

Doylestown Hospital Building Expansion and Heart Institute \ Amended Final Land Development Plan:

Mr. Beuke recused himself from Doylestown Hospital's presentation, due to his relationship as the planning engineer of the project.

Attorney for the applicant; Kelly McGowan of Eastburn & Grey, LLC explained; the plan has two aspects, the first is an expansion of cardiac services for Doylestown Township Heart center. The existing cardiac wing is proposed to add an extensive care unit with single beds. In addition, a reconfiguration of the parking area, a new drop off location also with a reconfiguration of a parking area is also proposed.

The second aspect of the project is named Pavilion Two and a second medical building located on Doylestown Hospital campus. The plan consists of a standalone building with a new parking area fronting at West State Street with a reconfigured entry to the medical office. There is also a new handicap parking area identified as Lot J. The new building will be a combination of hospital and medical offices services. Medical offices will include for physician and orthopedic care.

The plan was presented to the Doylestown Township Zoning Hearing Board in December of 2016, where five (5) variances were granted as ..

- 1) *To prevent parking spaces to be 10x18. The variance applies to the new lot located in the front of the medical office building.*

Mr. Lowenstein questioned; for what reason did the Zoning Hearing Board grant the variance. Ms. McGowan answered; Township ordinance requires 10x20 parking spaces. Although 10 foot is a good width, the 18-foot dimension is ideal to handle modern and large vehicles. In addition, the length provides a full drive isle and efficient access.

- 2) *Permit parking area to encroach into the front yard. Pertaining to parking area I and for the front yard along West State Street. It will allow for parking to approach half the distance of the otherwise applicable yard, a request to pull down 20 feet was submitted. As per the request of Pickering, Corts and Summerson in a review letter of April 13, 2017, the dimension will be provided.*
- 3) *Permit construction of two-foot-wide parking islands. The variance was granted for another application regarding the Lenape Valley building near the proposed site. The variance is for parking lot I, where a 10-foot requirement was requested to be pulled down to two feet to provide sufficient parking.*
- 4) *Permit the proposed cardiac addition along the property line of the on ramp to the bypass. There is a 100-foot special set back, where the existing building was slightly encroaching. The request was to increase the encroachment, resulting in a 70-foot set back from the ultimate right of way of the roadway.*
- 5) *To permit impervious surface coverage ratio in addition to what is permitted. The ordinance permits 60%, the applicant is requesting up to 62%. The current plan shows 60.5% of impervious surface. There will always be an effort to minimize the impervious, and deem necessary as the plan is being developed.*

Ms. McGowan indicated; the Pickering, Corts & Summerson review letter dated April 13th, Pennoni & Associates review letter of April 20th were received. Discussions were completed with the Township regarding the Bike & Hike trail located on the hospital's property and discussions were completed with Chris Stanford of Michael Baker International regarding his review letter of April 10th.

Ms. Hendrixson requested to review the required parking by questioning; how the dimension is being calculated. Ms. McGowan explained; There are two ratios applicable to the property. The first is the hospital parking ratio as per bed measurement. There is also the medical office use as a per square foot usage measurement. The medical offices will also service as a hospital service facility. For that reason, both parking ratios will apply, depending upon the square office usage for the medical office. At this time, internal square footage is unknown. Instead, by using 24,000 square feet devoted to medical office, the site is over the required parking spaces. However, the internal footage is not confirmed and can change. Additional parking is available should the square footage is added on. At the same time, the use for hospital is delineated at per bed. Mr. Chris Rice of CKS Engineers, Inc. added; the hospital use is based upon the beds at total of 15 new beds between the two, separate additions. This calculates a total of 8 new parking spaces for the hospital.

Mr. Kelso questioned if the building is 60,000 square feet and less than half will be assigned to offices. Ms. McGowan indicated yes. Hospital Representative; Joseph Fay explained; the hospital service space is defined as four, large operating rooms with eight (8) beds at 22,000 square feet. As the plan proceeds, there will be one parking spot required for every two beds. The other 24,000 square feet will apply as typical office buildings determined by the square footage ratio. The remaining 20,000 square feet will be additional hospital services as cardiac rehabilitation or physical therapy facilities.

Mr. Lowenstein questioned what exist currently and how much is allocated towards the addition to determine if additional parking will be needed. Mr. Rice answered; in the existing hospital, there are 360 beds. Ms. McGowan added; there is going to be therapy offices towards the existing main entrance and part of the interior in addition to the medical offices reconfiguration. The services moved are going to allow for conference area on the first floor of the hospital. The engineers have accounted for the resulting areas in the hospital and within the parking calculations. As well as the facilities moving to the medical office building. Mr. Lowenstein commented; parking along the hospital is very challenging and is a concern with making spaces smaller and not corresponding to his understanding. Ms. McGowan responded; part of the justification for parking spaces is having additional spaces into the parking lot. Although the physical calculations are within the Township ordinance, there are additional parking spaces.

Mr. Reppa questioned if there will be a charge for the parking spaces. Ms. McGowan answered; currently there is a charge for parking. Mr. Rice added; one of the problems with the campus configuration is the parking garage is underutilized. The goal is to work with the hospital administration to reutilized the parking garage by creating a bridge to connect the garage onto the first and second levels. This will assist in having the ground parking used as additional spaces. Mr. Reppa commented; if there are additional 400 parking spaces underutilized, it should be offered free of charge. Mr. Rice agreed and indicated; one goal is to make the parking garage free for patients and visitors once the bridge is connected. The upper spaces of the garage will be offered for staff parking.

Mr. Kelso questioned if a new vehicular entrance to the garage will be created. Mr. Rice indicated yes as a one-way lane coming in towards the proposed medical building. By opening the space along the Pavilion drop off, the new space will be aimed directly at a new entrance into the parking garage. Ambulances will enter towards the back of the hospital and away from pedestrian crossings. There will also be a barrier between the entrance and the emergency department to ensure segregation from pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Kelso commented; on his concerns with the geometry with one lane coming into two with a five foot ratios, where it shows as awkward and restrictive. Ms. McGowan responded; as per similar comments noted on the Pennoni & Associates review letter of April 20th, the hospital's traffic engineer will review the matter. Ms. Kelso added; at the main intersection, there is one lane coming out from State Street that moves towards two 12 foot lanes down to an 18 foot wide lane. Mr. Rice responded; the 12 foot exit lane crosses over an intersection. Mr. Kelso indicated the section doesn't make sense and may become a real problem with too many confusing movements. Mr. Rice responded; an alternative is to remain with the current flow. Instead of having an exit lane, vehicles can proceed towards the main entrance. Ms. McGowan indicated the engineers will also review this matter. Mr. Kelso suggested to review the possibility of the plans having too many lanes.

Mr. Kelso then commented on his disappointment of no traffic study submitted and indicated he will not provide approval without one. Ms. McGowan responded; the hospital will comply with the review letters received. The comments received are stormwater, Post-Construction Stormwater Management (PCSM), Emergency Notification System (ENS) and grading and will be satisfied to the Township's engineer requirements. The new best management practice (BMP) has been discussed with Township Engineer; Mario Canales. Mr. Kelso commented; that task is not easy to complete when at 60% impervious coverage. Ms. Rice confirmed he will be meeting with Mr. Canales to discuss the BMP, street sweeping and water quality. With water quality, units can be added to separate pollutants.

Ms. McGowan concluded by requesting the date of the next Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Colello answered; the Hospital plan expires on May 20th and the next schedule Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 22nd.

Resident: Jack Punsack of 15 New Britain Road questioned if the two existing entrances can be made into two separate. First access as an entrance and the second as an exit. Mr. Lowenstein answered; there is a property on site that is not part of the hospital, which uses one of the existing exits and may cause rights of ownership issues. Mr. Rice added; a master planner will view the entire site to provide recommendations.

Callan Tract – Preliminary Land Development Plan:

Brian L. Horner of ProTract Engineering explained; the three lot subdivision on tax parcel 9-12-11 is located at 2140 Old Easton Road on an eleven (11) acre lot.

Mr. Beuke reported; one of the issues noted was the natural resource information that has yet been decided. The applicant is required to provide adequate inventory of the trees over six inches in caliber. A sample survey was completed on site, but couldn't locate the sample area. As a result, it's difficult to determine the sample area along the woodlands. Mr. Beuke recommends a second site visit be scheduled to establish an appropriate sample area. Mr. Horner agreed. Mr. Beuke indicated; if the woodlands consist of mature trees in one area and more successional trees in another, it's recommended more than one sample area be designated. The sample area will be identified as 100 foot by 100 foot. Mr. Horner again agreed and will present a meaningful survey.

Resident; Peter B. Fung of 45 Warden Road questioned; will the sampling of trees results in some being cut down. Mr. Beuke answered; the Township requirement for tree preservation is based upon the sizes of existing trees. The number of existing trees needs to be established for a particular size before moving forward with the plan. The tree requirement is based upon the total caliber of inches of each category. Mr. Fung then questioned; if water samples will be submitted and how many for the 11 acres. Mr. Beuke answered; the Boucher & James' review letter did not include water sample as a requirement.

Resident: Matt McDonald of 58 Warden Road questioned; if trees have already been cut down along the site. Mr. Horner answered; sufficient trees have been cut down to build the lot for a septic system and related facilities.

Resident: Patricia A. Claus of 51 Warden Road indicated; when the applicant installed a driveway, an abundance of trees were removed and questioned; what samples were submitted for that project. Ms. Hendrixson answered; the sampling currently required is pertaining to the sub-division.

Resident: Jedd Salvesen of 99 Warden Road questioned; if the township is aware of how many trees already removed during construction of the existing home. He then questioned; will the township take into consideration the removal of previous trees. Ms. Hendrixson answered; the issue is not considered by the Planning Commission. Mr. Colello added; the applicant was only allowed to clear what was necessary to construct the existing home. After, ten trees per years could be cleared. Mr. Salvesen requested to join the site visit due to the issue of water from the applicant property that flows onto his yard.

As discussion ensued amongst several residents complaining the of the clearing of trees, excessive run off flows through their properties causing damage, contamination and overall environmental impact. Collectively, the residents would like the woodlands to remain, prevent additional construction and removal of trees.

Mr. Horner continued his presentation by explaining, two additional homes are proposed to be constructed along a cul-de-sac.

Resident: Matt McDonald questioned if the water runoff will apply to the impervious surface. He explained; all debris from excessive run off affects the woodlands. He then questioned; with the proposed plan, where will the water flow to. Currently, the flow affects the adjacent residents well water. Mr. Horner answered; currently the entire site drains

into Mr. McDonald's property as part of the natural water way. The township does have in place a stormwater management ordinance, which the applicant is required to comply and not permit run off to increase. There is also measure for water quality control, where water is required to be infiltrated. The applicant is planning to address the issues as stated in the received review letters and comply with the ordinance.

Upon reviewing the March 27, 2017 Pickering, Corts and Summerson review letter, Mr. Horner indicated the applicant will comply with most comments and clarified the waiver requests as ...

- 1) *Section:153.24.B.(2)(a)- More features are being shown on site and offered to submit an aerial photograph that covers the entire area. Mr. Horner questioned; if the action will meet the requirement or should a waiver be requested. Mr. Kelso answered; the previous plan provided more details and most issues pertained to drainage and cross pipes on Warden Road. This is more important than having miscellaneous details. The drainage needs to go 400 feet or beyond. Mr. Horner indicated the information is on hand, but not labeled.*
- 2) *Section: 153-24.B(2)(a) – Mr. Horner requested to remove the waiver request.*
- 3) *Section: 153-26 – in order to concentrate on the run off and enhance safety.*
- 4) *Section: 153-25.A.(1) – also to concentrate on the run off and enhance safety.*
- 5) *Sections: 153-24.K and 153.25.C – There is currently a wide, paved road with an eleven (11) wide shoulder and left turn lane.*

Mr. Kelso indicated; he will not support the waiver due to the anticipated bike & hike plan with the Tabor property. A large part of the discussion with the sketch plans waiver is regarding extending the trail system down to the existing trail onto the Tabor property off New Britain Road. Additionally, Doylestown Borough is also interested in extending an access out from the Boro onto Easton Road. Mr. Reppa agreed.

Mr. Kelso suggested a partial waiver to be considered, because of having sidewalks on both sides along a private road will make a difference. Mr. Horner indicated; the issue will be under a separate waiver request to require the road not be constructed and adds to impervious coverage. The applicant is trying to keep a rural feel by minimizing disturbance on site.

Mr. Kelso suggested designing a paved area off the driveway off Route 611, where children can wait for the bus. Mr. Horner questioned; if the area is a separate bike & trail, separate from the shoulder. Mr. Kelso indicated yes. Mr. Horner indicated; the applicant is dedicating a strip and will look in to the matter.

Mr. Horner questioned; if the request not requiring the private street to full public road standards will be considered. Mr. Kelso agreed and noted a restriction on further development of the site will be required. Mr. Horner agreed and will submit a deed restriction. Mr. Horner clarified; the proposal is to provide a wide driveway down to Lot 2 driveway and International fire code, compliant turning area for a fire truck. However, the amount of disturbance will be minimized by not constructing a full street to the standard for a public street. Mr. Hendrixson questioned; if the bulb of the cul-de-sac is not getting paved. Mr. Horner indicated yes and explained the applicant is providing a 60-foot leg with a T and a certain ratio as per the international fire code. Ms. Hendrixson noted the T is a driveway. Mr. Horner indicated yes and wide enough to be used for a fire truck. As per comments stated in Pennoni & Associates' March 23, 2017, the applicant will submit verification a fire truck can maneuver the driveway.

Section: 153-34.B.(3) – Mr. Horner indicated as per tonight's discussion, a waiver is not needed. However, the applicant will identify what trees are intended to be used and label accordingly on the plans. He then stated the waiver will be withdrawn.

Plan of Subdivision – Sheet 1 of 6

Mr. Horner indicated items 1 through 10 noted are will comply. Mr. Kelso questioned if there is an issue with Item 2, net buildable site area. Mr. Horner answered; as documentation, the impervious is shown as presented on the plan and questioned; if it's in the correct manner. Mr. Beuke answered; the calculations for impervious coverage must be in terms of the net buildable site area, which is a smaller number than what is based on the plans. Mr. Kelso noted; there is a lot of room for impervious surface. Mr. Horner responded; pre-development conditions will be removed for the resources, such as steep slopes and woodlands when the existing house was constructed. Mr. Beuke questioned if the impervious was recalculated based upon a net buildable site area and no issues were found to meet the maximum impervious permitted. Mr. Horner indicated yes and will present accordingly.

Item 11 \ Fee in Lieu – Mr. Horner offered to dedicate a small open space area instead of a fee in lieu. Mr. Kelso agreed.

Item 13 \ SALDO Section 153-50 – Mr. Horner noted there is nothing identified as offsite improvements. Mr. Kelso responded; the only issue is the offsite improvements have been on Warden Road as cross pipes and item 13 will be considered open until other issues are resolved.

Grading Plan

Item 21 \ SALDO Section 153-41.A.(1) – providing water supply from the watermain that is located 400 feet south of the property will be impractical based upon the distance. Mr. Kelso informed; if the Tabor property moves ahead with their land development plan, they will offer a water and sewage connection from Route 611. In terms of the site plan, the water doesn't change the plan. However, if public sewer is available, the plan may change. The amount of area will need to drop down significantly. Mr. Kelso suggested; to stay in touch with the township on the status, if Tabor proceeds and will make for a better plan. Mr. Colello agreed commenting; it will also bring both the sewer and water line to Warden Road.

Stormwater Management Report

Mr. Kelso requested clarification on Item 31. Mr. Horner explained; the calculations were completed based on the proposed impervious surface area. Additional impervious was requested to be added for future consideration, such as pool and BMP will be adequate.

Mr. Beuke reported; upon a conversation with Mr. Canales, it was noted the stormwater management calculations were based upon the new methods. The original plan development calculations were completed under the CR55 method. Mr. Horner responded; per the new stormwater ordinance for catch basin areas less than 200 acres, where the SCS method was used and the way the plan was designed. Mr. Horner then indicated; the applicant will comply.

Upon reviewing the Boucher & James, Inc. review letter of April 19, 2017, Mr. Horner indicated most items are will comply and noted the following ...

Environmental Protection Standards

Item 3a \ ZO Section 175-26 – Mr. Horner requested guidance on how the natural resources should be documented.

Item 3c \ ZO Section 175 – 27.B(2) & 175.27.D – Mr. Beuke questioned if there is a understanding of what is required to demonstrate in compliant of the proposed disturbance for each individual natural resource, not accounting for overlap. As part of the site capacity calculations in determining the net buildable site area, the required natural resources are calculated and remove areas of overlap. The required protection of each individual natural resources, in which case the individual natural resource is viewed across the entire site and not viewing overlap in other resources. Mr. Kelso questioned; which is the most restrictive site. Mr. Horner answered; the woodlands are most restrictive, where no wetlands are noted. Overlaps are regular with the slopes of the woodlands.

The applicant will comply with all comments noted on Pennoni & Associates review letter of March 23, 2017 and Michael Baker International review letter of April 14, 2017.

Mr. Lowenstein questioned; with a fire truck, unable to maneuver around the cul-de-sac is there is an obstruction on the opposite driveway, what will happen during garbage pickup days. Additionally, what happens when two fire trucks arrive on site. Mr. Lowenstein then suggested to have the issue re-examined.

Mr. Reppa questioned; with the shared driveway, is the existing driveway paved. Mr. Horner indicated yes as a single dwelling driveway at 12 feet. Mr. Kelso commented; the lane almost becomes a lane lot.

Mr. Horner responded; the fire truck access will be reviewed. Mr. Kelso indicated the access driveway is part of lot one and shared driveways are not ideal. This is an issue that should be re-evaluated to consider garbage pickup. Mr. Horner answered; it was the assumption trash would be pickup at Route 611. Mr. Kelso suggested to include a defined area that is more protected.

Ms. Hendrixson questioned; with the drainage issue and curbing, will the water be directed where it needs to go. Mr. Horner answered; the water will end up at the same place, because the entire site drains into one drainage ditch. Mr. Kelso noted: curbing along Easton Road will not resolve the issue. Mr. Horner agreed. Mr. Kelso suggested; the use of swales may be beneficial and have Mr. Canales view the plans to consider offsite improvements.

Resident: Carol J. Dengler of 87 Warden Road commented; the water has washed over the trees of her property exposing their roots. A retention basin was previously installed, but does not assist the situation. Additionally, she disagrees a 160-wide fire truck will be able to maneuver around the site safely on a surface that is not paved. Lastly, five acres of woods was removed from the previous land development plan and continues to drain the natural resources and impacting neighbors. She then asked why is the community required to pay for water and sewer connection when they are not at fault for the contamination. Mr. Lowenstein questioned; was a deed restriction placed. Ms. Claus responded; upon a discussion with Director of Codes; Sinclair Salisbury, who informed only one home was allowed on the site.

Mr. Beuke offered to walk the site with Mr. Canales to view all issues. Mr. Kelso noted; the Planning Commission have requested to place a deed restriction on the site if the subdivision moves forward. It will be in exchange of not having a street within Township standards and lot one will be restricted from any further subdivision.

Resident: Mr. McDonald commented; he is not interested in having a water or sewer bill. He then questioned; why is the subdivision being considered. Mr. Colello answered; any land development plan submitted has to be considered and viewed.

A resident at 101 Warden Road questioned; can the water management issues be hued with the Tabor property. Ms. Hendrixson answered; any subdivision plan submitted will have the contain the water on site.

Kirk W. Clauss of Schlosser & Clauss Consulting Engineers Inc submitted the Quinlan Property Preliminary land development plan for review. As per the Commission's request, the existing homes located across the street were identified to confirm headlights illuminating from intersection will not shine into adjacent homes. The intersection is located at a common side yard property line between two homes.

Reviews letters from Pickering, Corts & Summerson dated, April 17, 2017 and Boucher & James, Inc dated, April 18, 2017 were received. Ms. Hendrixon questioned if Pennoni & Associates review letter dated, April 19, 2017, Doylestown Township Environment Committee (EAC), Bucks County Planning Commission review letter dated, April 20, 2017 and Michael Baker International dated, April 10th were received. Mr. Clauss indicated the letters were not received.

Upon reviewing the April 17th Pickering, Corts & Summerson letter, Mr. Clauss provided an overview of the waivers as;

- 1) *Section 153-25.A – the applicant is proposing curbs, public streets but no sidewalks. Mr. Clauss requested Commission's comments in having sidewalks internally on the proposed street or not.*

Ms. Hendrixon commented; sidewalks are preferred. Mr. Kelso suggested; adding sidewalks on one side up to the bulb of the cul-de-sac. Ms. Hendrixon added; with the number of the homes, sidewalks add value to the property by providing a walking area and safe place for children waiting for the school bus. Mr. Reppa suggested to have sidewalks in front of lots 1, 2,3 and 4, so to provide access to the open space. Mr. Kelso agreed and added to have a landing area near New Britain Road for a school bus.

- 2) *Section 153-25.D. – Mr. Clauss requested a discussion to the Township's overall plan with the Bike & Hike path.*

Mr. Kelso explained; the overall plan is to connect all the neighborhoods to the trail system. He then noted Michael Baker International review letter of April 10th provides a good detail of what is expected. Construction is scheduled to begin in May for the Lower State Road trail with a signalized crossing for pedestrians and an access ramp at the intersection of New Britain and Lower State Roads. This is for the anticipation of connecting New Britain onto the trail system. There is only one adjoining property between the proposed site and Lower State Road.

- 3) *Section 153-26.A.(3) – For curbing along New Britain Road. Currently there is curbing shown coming out and stopping at the end of the radius. New Britain Road will be widened seven feet then flared back. The request would be not to install curbs along the frontage.*

Mr. Kelso questioned how much will the road be widened and how much of a shoulder will be added. Mr. Clauss responded; six to seven feet will be added to the full width of the property. Mr. Kelso questioned; how much roadway will be provided. Mr. Clauss answered; it will be a seven foot widening or a eighteen foot length from the center line to the new edge of the road. This will match the existing width of radius across the street. Mr. Kelso commented; there is more value in adding a shoulder to the road then a curb in this case. He agreed in not adding curbing along the sides. However, he does not agree with a deceleration lane. Mr. Kelso explained; the road is too wide and requested a traffic count for New Britain Road. He then recommended the applicants meet with Township's Engineer or Road Department to discuss further. There is concern with maintenance and speeding with a wide road. Mr. Kelso concluded by suggesting to narrow a portion of the road down, but extend it 3 ½ feet near Lower State Road.

Resident: Janet Ponsack commented; because the width of the road, it may cause a problem with visitor parking on the side of the road. Mr. Lowenstein questioned; what is the width over the creek. Mr. Clauss responded; thirty feet wide for the bridge.

Mr. Colello agreed with Mr. Kelso's comment for the applicants to schedule a meeting with Township Engineer: Mario Canales to discuss a better option for the road.

- 4) *Section 153-38.D.(6) – With regards to the slope inside the retention basin, the waiver is to allow a steeper slope at 3 to 1, instead of 4 to 1 inside the basin area. This is to provide for adequate storage for stormwater management. The property owner will be responsible for the retention basin.*

Mr. Reppa questioned; if a landscape plan for the basin is in place. The basin will be in the form of a wetland seed mix with a mixture of naturalized grasses and other plant materials suitable for a moist basin. The bottom of the basin will infiltrate with amended soils. The volume of the water will infiltrate into the ground. A pretreatment area at the head end of the basin as well as the standard discharge of the basin that will control the rate of the release.

Resident: Mr. Ponsack questioned; what is a pretreatment basin. Mr. Clauss answered; the water that will come in from the street and flows into the inlet, through the stormwater pipes and comes down between two homes towards a stilling area. The smaller area the water flows into will flow into the main basin area, so during larger storms, the whole area fills up and doesn't stay. Mr. Beuke added; the water is pretreated, so a large portion of the suspended solids settles into the forebay.

Ms. Ponsack questioned; how many feet is the retention basin of New Britain Road. Mr. Clauss indicated; six feet deep.

Upon Mr. Kelso's question, Mr. Clauss indicated property owners of lots 7 and 8 will be responsible for the retention basin. He noted there may be a problem in splitting the responsibility of the basin and an agreement should be placed. Mr. Clauss indicated the township has a stormwater enhancement agreement that will have to be executed. He then offered an alternative to have the owners of lot 8 have full responsibility. Mr. Kelso responded; it may be better. An easement can also be considered.

Mr. Kelso questioned; what is the size of the minimum lot. Mr. Clauss answered; at 30,000 square feet of net lot area. The lots need to exclude the retention basin easement. Mr. Beuke questioned; is it possible to place the stormwater management along an open space. Mr. Clauss answered; the current position is where the infiltration was found along the low point of the site.

Mr. Ponsack questioned; where will the retention basin flow into. Mr. Kelso responded; into a stream. There is four feet from the outlet from the culvert, which is a good process going into the stream. Both Mr. Kelso and Ms. Hendrixson are in favor of the waiver request to note a steeper slope at 3 to 1. Mr. Clauss added; a contractor will maintain the retention basin once per year. A large part of the maintenance agreement will be removing invasive.

Subdivision Plan

Items 2 and 3 - With respect to the access and width of the open space, currently the plan proposes to have the township take dedication. Mr. Clauss was asked to create a conservation entity that will take ownership of the easement. Michael Amoroso spoke with representative at the Heritage Conservancy, who indicated no interest in having ownership of the open space. Mr. Kelso commented; he doesn't see a future for the open space for the township or public use. Mr. Beuke added; with the current configuration, the open space only serves use for three lots located on the property. He then questioned if other opportunities have been investigated to pull the open space away from behind the lots and incorporate in front of the site. Mr. Kelso noted; the Route 611 bypass is a problem with the site and placing the homes further back will be a mistake. Mr. Amoroso indicated; no trees will be removed to provide a sizable buffer from Route 611 and the best place for the open space.

With proposing 16,600 square feet of recreation area, Mr. Beuke suggested to define the area on how it should be utilized as well as access to the site with the ten foot wide road proposed. Mr. Kelso disagreed; indicating the site is

not appropriate to the proceed with the suggestions. He suggested a deed restriction and make the open space part of the lots. Mr. Clauss questioned; if the ten foot narrow strip should be removed. Ms. Hendrixson answered; it will not be needed if the strip is part of the three lots. Mr. Clauss indicated; the recreation land will require a fee in lieu. Mr. Kelso agreed and recommended adding some delineation in the form of a split rail fence. Mr. Clauss responded; the area can be defined at the corners. Mr. Kelso agreed. Mr. Clauss indicated; the applicants will move in the direction as per the recommendation of the Commission regarding the open space.

Resident; Janet Ponsack questioned; if all the trees along New Britain Road will be removed. Mr. Clauss answered; not all trees will be removed. Due to the widening and grading of the road, some trees will be removed. However, a sizable portion of vegetation will remain on the side of Lot 8. Mr. Lowenstein suggested; upon an agreement, not to move forward with the full length of the road, instead keep the area within 30 feet all the way. Mr. Clauss agreed.

Item 9 \ SALDO Section 153-24.A.(6)(a) – the proper procedure for vetting of street names will be followed. The two names considered are Mercer Court or Font Hill. The Commission veto both names due to the generic nature.

Item 10 \ SALDO Section 153-24.E.(4) – New Britain Road is considered a neighborhood collector street. As per the ordinance, there should be an interval of 1,000 feet between intersection. The plans are over by 500 feet from Lower State Road and 1,000 foot will take it beyond the property. A waiver will be requested to allow the intersection to be less than 1,000 feet. The Commission agreed.

Item 11 \ SALDO Section 153-37 – Mr. Clauss will await a call from Mr. Canales regarding an agreement of less widening and additional offsite improvements, if right of way is available. Mr. Kelso noted; if may eliminate the amount needed to be cut back near the bank.

Item 17 \ General Note 15 - The applicants will be offering the right of way to the township. Mr. Clauss questioned; if it's the township's position to accept road right of ways. Mr. Kelso questioned; what is the length of the cul de sac. Mr. Ambrosio indicated; over 200 feet. Mr. Clauss added; a dedication will be conducted during the final approval process of the application.

Upon reviewing the Boucher & James, Inc. review letter dated April 18, 2017, Mr. Clauss indicated a better job is needed in identifying caliber inches of trees. He requested a meeting with Mr. Beuke to review a sample area to determine the number of caliber inches in existing trees. This will include woodlands and standalone to properly adhere to the restrictions and ordinances. This will be a two step requirement where if more trees can be preserved, it will be a matter of documentation. There is a separate gap, where additional trees can be cleared. However, they will need to be replaced as well. The hope is to document a preservation amount of a size, so not to involve replacement calculations.

Upon Mr. Beuke's question, Mr. Clauss indicated all items not discussed with be considered a will comply or discussion from the applicant.

Item 6B \ SALDO Section 153-36.A.(1) – the plan currently proposes three street lights as one at the intersection, cul-de-sac and half way. The applicant requested the township consider individual post lights with photo cells at each driveway at the right of way line. Mr. Kelso requested comments from the neighbors present at the meeting. Ms. Janet Ponsack responded; currently there are post lights in front of their home.

The Commission agreed to have one light installed at the intersection with three post lights along the property to include a bus light.

Ms. Hendrixson provided copies of Pennoni & Associates review letter dated, April 19, 2017, Doylestown Township Environment Committee (EAC), Bucks County Planning Commission review letter dated, April 20, 2017 and Michael

Baker International dated, April 10th. Mr. Clauss added; no letter was received from the Bucks County Municipal Authority with regards to the water.

Upon Mr. Kelso notation of the easement, Mr. Clauss responded; the easement is located on the property. However, it was more effective to keep the public water and sewer in the street to drain down to the existing facilities off New Britain Road. He then noted an existing fire hydrant and sufficient space to install a second in the back of the property. Mr. Clauss noted; a review letter from the Fire Marshall has yet been received.

Mr. Clauss informed; a snow island easement was added to the end of the cul-de-sac, as per the recommendation from the Commission. Mr. Kelso noted; the plans shows a good placement of the driveways along the cul-de-sac. Mr. Clauss added; with street trees, the ordinance suggests one for every forty feet is needed. The calculations were completed based upon the length for a total number of trees. As per comments in the Boucher & James, Inc. letter, there are some areas which are greater than forty feet due to driveway and utility placement. As a result, the proper quantity of trees is received, but there a few spaces greater than forty feet between each tree. Mr. Kelso suggested to request a waiver.

Resident; Mr. Ponsack commented the sewer line off New Britain Road may not have a proper diameter and will it be adequate to support the new development. Mr. Clauss answered; the diameter of the line is 8 inches, which is standard in size for public sewer and pipe diameter. A review letter has yet been received from the Bucks County Sewer Authority's engineer. However, if there is a concern, it will be addressed. Adding eight new homes to an eight inch diameter sewer line is insignificant.

Resident; Ms. Ponsack questioned; how long is the timeline before the plan is approved. Ms. Hendrixson explained; the applicant will need to return to meet with the Commission to receive final land development approval. Mr. Clauss added; construction is anticipated during late summer of 2017. However, certain permits and additional meetings are still needed.

Adjournment: Hearing no further business, the April 24, 2017 Doylestown Township Planning Commission Meeting was adjourned at 9:20pm.