

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

July 24, 2017

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular Meeting was held at 7:00 p.m., Monday, July 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 with members; George Lowenstein and Ed Harvey. Others in attendance included Township Manager; Stephanie Mason, Board of Supervisor Liaison: Richard Colello and Township Planning Consultant; Judy Stern Goldstein.

**Absent: Vice Chairman; Thomas Kelso, Absent: Member: Gregory Reppa**

**Review of Minutes:**

In the form of a motion by Mr. Lowenstein; seconded by Mr. Harvey the June 26, 2017 Doylestown Township Planning Commission meeting minutes were approved.

Motion carried 5 to 0.

**Public Comments:**

Quinlan Tract – Preliminary Land Development

Kirk W. Clauss of Schlosser & Clauss Consulting Engineers Inc reported; the Township consultants reviewed the plan. As per comments, a revised plan have been submitted. Upon a second review, additional comments were provided by Township consultants.

Waivers were also reviewed and not changed, except for one issue. The partial waiver regarding sidewalks installed on one side of the cul-de-sac with the bike and hike trail. The Township's bike and hike engineer suggested installing a side walk instead of requesting a partial waiver. Mr. Clauss requested Commission guidance on how to proceed. Currently, the eight foot wide bike and hike trail is along the frontage and crosses the intersection with a handicap ramp. The side walk then comes around the north side of the property and cuts around the cud-de-sac. There is a 320-foot section of the road that is partially in front of Lot 6, Lot 7 and Lot 8 and does not have sidewalks. This is the section in which guidance is requested.

As per Ms. Hendrixson's question, Mr. Clauss corrected; the bike and hike trail is ten foot wide and the side walk is five feet in concrete. Ms. Stern Goldstein added; the bike and hike trail is still shown. However, one portion shows a side walk only on one side. As previously discussed, the preference of the Planning Commission is to have sidewalks on at a minimum of one side. This will provide an access for the community to walk out. However, since the plan shows few lots, it was not imperative to have sidewalks on one side. However, from a planning prospective, having sidewalks on both sides is more beneficial. For a smaller development, it would be under the preference of the Township. Ms. Clauss agreed and added; with few lots, the preference is to have the sidewalk in front of the homes before walking across the street and stepping onto another sidewalk towards New Britain Road.

Mr. Lowenstein indicated the use of the back of the property is a factor, where the section can be used as a buffer. Mr. Clauss agreed and reported; there is enough space allocated for the additional sidewalk and will be placed under a conservation easement, where no future development can be planned. A fence line was added to the plan to delineate the space to be left in its natural state. Access to the line is provided through the existing water and sewer easement from everyone in the development.

Mr. Lowenstein noted; with the B7 use for smaller lots, the area serves no purpose and suggested to create a community type activity. Mr. Clauss indicated; upon a large discussion, it was determined due to the size, there was no interest from Heritage Conservancy in taking over the area. Additionally, the Township does not have any intentions of owning and maintaining the space as well. Ms. Hendrixson agreed with Mr. Lowenstein's comments utilizing the B7 use provides an ideal to have an open space for the development. Mr. Clauss responded; one of the options was to have an open space easement over a certain portion of the land that was correctly calculated and acts as an effective buffer from the highway.

Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned; if the applicant is willing to add notes to the plan indicating the open space easement will also act as a utility easement for public access of the open space over the properties. Ms. Mason added; the public can have access along the public area if it's noted on the deed. A fence can be added to the easement line from the resident's rear yards. Ms. Hendrixson questioned; if permission from the water and sewer authority is needed to make the space public. Ms. Mason answered; if no plans are created with the space, it should be fine. Mr. Lowenstein suggested to place the area as an open space for future residents.

Ms. Hendrixson questioned if the proposed sidewalks have an impervious issue. Mr. Clauss indicated no and the applicant will be paying a fee in lieu, where there is no financial savings. Mr. Colello commented; with the sidewalks located on one side, the impervious is less and the water will filter to one side. Mr. Clauss added; the calculations on one side will have the impervious shown on the plan and there is an additional allowance for future impervious by the homeowners. There is additional square footage aside for each homeowner to use beyond what is on the plan. If the homeowner goes beyond the allotted impervious, they will have to add their own stormwater management system to compensate. Ms. Hendrixson questioned; can sidewalks be added to both sides. Mr. Clauss answered; the applicant prefers to pay a fee.

Mr. Clauss reviewed the waivers as ...

- 1) *Section 153-24.E.4 – Lower State Road and a nearby intersection is less than 1,000 feet. The waiver is requested due to the distance is not enough space for a driveway.*
- 2) *Section 153-25.A – a partial waiver is requested for the sidewalks*
- 3) *Section 153-26.A – a waiver is requested due to curbing not proposed along New Britain Road. The curb is proposed to be widened with no curbs and an adjacent bike and hike trail.*
- 4) *Section 153-34.B.3.a and– is a waiver for landscaping and not quantity of landscaping. The waiver is for placement, where a street tree for every 40 foot is required. Due to driveway, utilities and other impediments along the cul-de-sac, there are some gaps which equals more than 40 feet. A calculation was completed for the total length and divided by 40. The result was proper quantity for the total amount of street trees listed on the plan. There are some gaps which are greater than 40 feet. Ms. Stern Goldstein confirmed; all the required trees are listed on the plan.*
- 5) *Section 153-34.B.3.b - the second component indicates the street trees should be five foot or less than the right of way line. Because of the clear site triangles of the intersection, it cannot be completed.*

- 6) *Section 153-34.C.5 – upon completing a study pertaining to the inches of trees, there are thousands of inches of trees and a large amount of clearing. Currently, the plan is within the clearing limits. The township ordinance notes two thresholds. If a calculation is completed to add additional replacement trees, the plan is above the threshold to what can be cleared. If it's less than the threshold, replacement trees will be required. To resolve, additional trees were added on the plan, but less than what is required. The waiver is for the differential between the 42 additional trees added versus the total requirement based upon the calculations at 58 trees. As a result, there are 16 replacement trees that are not on the plan.*

*Mr. Lowenstein suggested; the applicant offer a contribution for the additional trees to the Township's tree bank for used toward future projects.*

- 7) *Section 153-38.D.6 – the plan is showing three to one slopes instead of four to one along the retention basin. The basin will be naturalized that will not need to be mowed. The engineer and other staff members were in favor of the waiver.*

Ms. Hendrixson noted an issue with the buffer between the bike and hike path. Mr. Clauss responded; the current property has a tree line along the frontage. Due to the widen along the bike and hike trail, the tree line will come down. In addition to the street trees, this is the area that was focused for the replacement trees to provide privacy. The buffering was completed as much as required with the replacement trees that had to be removed due to public improvements.

Mr. Clauss reported; under section three of the subdivision plan, the road name has been confirmed as Brandon Way. Code Enforcement Officer; Salisbury Sinclair conducted a search and found it to be acceptable. However, approval from the Board of Supervisors is needed.

For the recreation land component in terms of open space, the applicant is proposing to pay a fee in lieu.

Upon a discussion with the township staff regarding the amount and length of road widening and offsite improvements, the road widening will be extended off site. It's proposed to take the widening and go offsite to Lower State Road, as per the decision of the Traffic Engineer, Bike & Hike Engineer, Solicitor and staff. There was a potential to come in for development and the township will receive full widening the applicant is looking for. The applicant was instructed to complete the widening off the front. Additionally, some offsite improvements were completed beyond the property line to the south of the existing culvert at 60 feet. It was elected to show additional widening. An existing guide rail will be relocated to accommodate the offsite widening and noted on the current plan. The offsite improvements will be in exchange for credit.

The right of way for New Britain Road will be offered for dedication and the cul-de-sac is long enough for liquid fuel funding. It's also proposed for dedication to the township.

Upon speaking with the Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority engineer, a review letter was not submitted. However, indicated minor drafting issues, where the applicant will comply. A review letter was received from the Doylestown Township Public, Sewer and Water Authority's engineer, where the applicant will comply and noted minor issues regarding the water system. A 537 ENS and MPDES approval has been submitted to the Bucks County Conservation District. Other issues include, minor clean up and stormwater, which will be addressed with the Township Engineer; Mario Canales.

Upon Mr. Lowenstein's question, Mr. Clauss clarified; the open space is owned by Lot 4 with a conservation easement over it and not Homeowners Association (HOA). Additionally, maintenance will be provided by the owner of Lot 8 as part of the Township's operation and maintenance agreement. There is an easement over Lot 7, in favor of Lot 8 to perform maintenance that is necessary on Lot 7's land for the basin. Ms. Stern Goldstein added; the township can access both lots when necessary.

Mr. Clauss referenced the Boucher & James, Inc letter noting one minor mathematical error, which will be corrected. The applicant will comply with comments from Michael Baker International and Pennoni & Associates, Inc review letter. The Bucks County Planning Commission review letter did not note additional comments.

Mr. Colello requested clarification on the cul-de-sac bulb. Mr. Clauss responded; the Township's Public Works department will confirm, when it comes to snow removal, center islands are a problem. Without having a homeowner's association, no one will take responsibility of maintaining the center island. There is a slight merit to the center island. However, there will be additional black top and will become larger in diameter, if a center island is proposed. There is also no savings in impervious surface to accommodate the center island. Mr. Colello agreed with Mr. Clauss' comments and suggested; the disagreement of the center island should be noted.

*Ms. Hendrixson open the floor for public comments, where none were received.*

Mr. Clauss requested a recommendation of Preliminary \ Final Land Development plan and indicated; details were worked out regarding open space with the Township's Engineer and the MPDES permit is pending.

Mr. Lowenstein questioned; what is the status of the street light, as per resident's request. Upon Mr. Clauss stated; he was not in receipt of Sinclair Salisbury's memorandum. Upon supplying a copy, Ms. Hendrixson explained; Mr. Salisbury indicated there is no need for a street light at the entrance to the street. There are no street lights located at the entrance to other streets entering New Britain Road. Existing residents of New Britain road requested to have the entrance street lights removed from the plan. Additionally, the lighting does not have a full cut off shield. Mr. Clauss indicated, the plan only proposes one street light. However, if the township requests a different fixture for lighting, options will be investigated. He further explained; The colonial lighting has a candelabra veil for aesthetics. The lighting is located inside the hood of the fixture.

However, research will be completed to supply a different fixture. Upon a brief discussion regarding the difference between a street light and lighting for an intersection, Ms. Hendrixson suggested a colonial Lumiere for the entrance lighting.

Mr. Lowenstein questioned the status of the two sets of trees to be substituted with spruce trees as per the Environmental Advisory Committee (EAC) letter.

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: Better Living Homes, LLC Preliminary Final Development plan for the Quinlan Tract. The applicant has agreed to comply with review letters received from the Bucks County Planning Commission dated April 20, 2017, Boucher & James, Inc dated April 18<sup>th</sup> & July 19<sup>th</sup> of 2017, Pickering, Corts & Summerson dated July 10, 2017, Michael Baker International dated July 11, 2017, Pennoni & Associates dated July 19, 2017 and SC Engineers, Inc dated July 21, 2017. Additionally, and upon reviewing, Environmental Advisory Committee dated July 18, 2017, Director of Code Enforcement; Sinclair Salisbury dated July 10, 2017. Further, the applicant will note Doylestown Township Municipal Authority and Bucks County Water & Sewer Authority. The applicants also agreed to supply access to the open space located on site for the property's residents, supply off site contribution of additional 16 trees to the township, and consideration of Colonial Lumiere lighting for the street lighting.

Motion Amended

In the form of a motion by Ms. Hendrixson; seconded by Mr. Harvey the Doylestown Township Planning Commission recommends the Doylestown Township Board of Supervisors approve applicant: Better Living Homes, LLC Preliminary Final Development plan for the Quinlan Tract. The applicant has agreed to comply with review letters received from the Bucks County Planning Commission dated April 20, 2017, Boucher & James, Inc dated April 18<sup>th</sup> & July 19<sup>th</sup> of 2017, Pickering, Corts & Summerson dated July 10, 2017, Michael Baker International dated July 11,

2017, Pennoni & Associates dated July 19, 2017 and SC Engineers, Inc dated July 21, 2017. Additionally, and upon reviewing, Environmental Advisory Committee dated July 18, 2017, Director of Code Enforcement; Sinclair Salisbury dated July 10, 2017. Further, the application will note Doylestown Township Municipal Authority and Bucks County Water & Sewer Authority. The applicants also agreed to supply access to the open space located on site for the property's residents, supply off site contribution of additional 16 trees to the township, consideration of Colonial Lumiere lighting for the street lighting, install sidewalks on both sides of the property. Lastly the Planning Commission will recommend a credit for offsite improvements in exchange of a fee in lieu for both sides of the cul-de-sac.

Ms. Stern Goldstein noted the Board of Supervisors will indicate what fees will be waived.

Motion Carried 3 to 0.

### 3725 Bristol Road – Historic Significance

Christopher Canavan of W.B. Homes, Inc. reported on the property at 3715 Bristol Road is owned by Frank Burke. The property is located adjacent to the Route 202 Parkway, Bristol Road and Burke's Circle. The site includes an existing farmhouse and barn with other buildings located at the rear of the property. For clarification, the site does not include the nursery \ landscape property located at the corner of Upper State Road. The property is currently for sale and will not be purchased by the applicant.

Mr. Canavan explained; the first step of the land development process is to request the existing home be placed on the Township's Historical Registry list. Under the R1 Zoning, the B15 Use allows for certain design elements and plan layouts when preserving a historic structure. To provide support of the request, Mr. Canavan requested the Heritage Conservancy complete an analysis of the home, which was submitted to the township. The plan has been reviewed by the Township's planning consultants. Upon meeting with Commission last month, it was recommended a meeting with the neighbors be scheduled.

The site is currently an 8.9-acre traffic round. It was originally a 12.8-acre traffic round. A portion of the acreage was removed for the Route 202 Parkway construction. A B15 use is proposed to preserve the existing home, the large pole barn and two car garage as one lot off Bristol Road. A private road will be created for the proposed four building as two unit, high end, carriage homes. The 75 foot wide buffer will be provided for the rear units and existing home. The west side of the site will remain open meadow. The area closer to Route 202 will remain naturalized.

Under the R1 District, it's proposed to construct a total of eight new homes with the possibility of nine. A nearby area is open space and will have a walking trail along the frontage off Route 202 parkway. The trail will also provide a possible extension.

Ms. Stern Goldstein clarified; tonight's meeting has two discussions. The first is to review if the existing home should be considered as an historical structure. Second is to present the proposed plan to the adjacent community. She then suggested to begin the request to place the existing home and barn as an historical structure.

Jeff Marshall of the Heritage Conservancy reported; to qualify a home under the historic registry as per the Township's ordinance, the structure must be listed under the historic structure list, must appear on the Heritage Conservancy historic structure list and be approved by the Board of Supervisors. Upon his research of the home's title, the home is documented back to the 18<sup>th</sup> century and owned by a soldier who served in the American Revolutionary war. Architecturally, the home is of German 18<sup>th</sup> century and the barn is considered an American Pennsylvania Bank Barn. Previously, the home was not included on the historic list, because it was not national registry eligible.

Ms. Hendrixson commented; she would like to see the home supported due to the location being close to the road and not the historical significant.

Mr. Lowenstein commented; with the home having a basic paragon, it causes a conflict. He suggested the Commission view the aspects of the home closely.

Ms. Stern Goldstein reported: the B15 use can only be used with existing structures as eligible historical resources in accordance with provisions of Section 175.30.A and the Board of Supervisors will make the final determination. The Board adopts and maintains the list. Upon referencing the ordinance, Ms. Stern Goldstein indicated; as the resources are diminishing, the patriotic aspect of historic homes is being considered. Ms. Marshall added; the home lacks architectural integrity, where it's not a recognized home.

Resident; Steven Portnoy of 10 Cedercrest Court questioned; should the home be placed on the historical registry, will the plan change if the list is amended. Ms. Stern Goldstein answered; once the historical list is amended to include the property, it will become eligible to utilize the B15 use. Attached structures are required under the use with open space and a 75-foot perimeter buffer. Amendments will need conditional use approval under the subdivision land development process. Mr. Canavan added; the number of units can increase once the maximum density is calculated. The Township's B15 use is structured to allow preservation of the historic structure in a different content and provides flexibility.

Resident; Walter McNair of 6 Burke Circle questioned; Will the homes be single or two stories and what will the buffer be made of. Mr. Canavan answered; the homes will be two story and the buffer will be more structural with landscaping and berming. This will provide protection for the view shed towards the parkway. Additionally, the landscape plan is scheduled further along the land development process. The prices of the homes are anticipated to begin at the mid \$600,000. The community will not be designed for seniors or have age restriction.

Resident; Mrs. McNair of 6 Burke Circle questioned; who will be responsible to maintain the berm. Ms. Stern Goldstein answered; the open space is maintained by Penn Dot. However, should the proposed development be approved, a Home Association will be placed and will take over the maintenance. Mr. Canavan added; the Township has the right to oversee the maintenance and contact Penn Dot to address. Once the community is developed, the area will be well manicured within the Township's ordinance.

Resident: Lisa Portnoy of 10 Cedarcrest Court questioned; how many bedrooms will each unit have. Mr. Canavan answered; each unit will have three to four bedrooms. Some units will have a master suite on the first floor with a 2,800 square feet base unit.

Ms. Hendrixson referenced a survey which noted the home, barn, chicken coops and the wagon shed and questioned; how many will remain. Mr. Canavan answered; the house and barn will remain. The chicken coop and wagon shed have been modified into garages.

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 the existing home and barn located at 3715 Bristol Road, Doylestown (Tax parcel 9-7-6) be placed under the Historic Resource List.

Motion carried 3 to 0.

Callan Tract – Preliminary Land Development

Nicholas T. Rose, P.E. of ProTract Engineering, LLC explained since last meeting with the Commission, the applicant met with Township staff to discuss the preliminary sketch plan. As a result, the plans were revised and new review letters submitted. The property is located under the R1 District with an existing home and driveway off Easton Road. The proposed plan will construct two lots with future of a third on a private street. The lot is approximately 2.2 acres.

Based upon the review comments, the stormwater management was reviewed and discussed with the Township Engineer; Mario Canales. Improvement are proposed to build out the last area of the berm because of viewing water in the area. Seepage beds will also be added along the proposed dwellings to address concerns of the area and to add stormwater detention. Upon reviewing the proposal, Mr. Canales agreed with changes proposed.

Ms. Hendrixson questioned; if discussion regarding the proposed stormwater management system was reviewed with the residents. Ms. Stern Goldstein indicated; she was informed of a meeting between Mr. Rose and Mr. Canales, but not the neighbors. She added; the neighbors have repeatedly expressed their concerns of flooding and lack of stormwater management since the late 1990s and early 2000s. Mr. Rose responded; Mr. Canales visited the site and provided a list of concerns. Other than the proposed modification, no other changes are proposed.

Ms. Stern Goldstein suggested a clear explanation be provided to the neighbors. Ms. Mason questioned if the applicant received a letter from the neighbors outlining the issues. Mr. Rose confirmed the letter was received.

Ms. Hendrixson questioned; what is the status of the applicants during the land development process. During the last meeting, the residents submitted many issues. She then reported; upon the last Planning Commission meeting, a meeting was to be scheduled with the neighbors during a site visit to review all problem areas. Mr. Rose answered; he was directed to schedule a meeting with the Township staff and not the neighbors.

Mr. Lowenstein commented; many issues was presented by neighbors of water leaving the site and flowing into their property. It was agreed the applicant would consider the matter and address with neighbors. Mr. Rose answered; the issues were made clear at the last Planning Commission meeting and is aware the drainage issues. Upon an extensive conversation with Mr. Canales, ProTract Engineering did all they can to resolve the issue. Ms. Hendrixson agreed with Mr. Lowenstein's comments and added; a meeting with the neighbors is a very important part of the development plan process. Ms. Stern Goldstein added; the best message the applicants can provide is listening to the neighbor's comments and concerns, so to find a common ground. Mr. Rose responded; a meeting with conducted with the Township staff and engineer to address all issues. He was unaware a meeting with the neighbors was required.

Resident: Jedd Salvesen of 99 Warden Road referred to the plans and indicated; water flows from the applicants site onto his property and creates ponds of water. He added; no meeting was conducted or requested by ProTract Engineers. Additionally, owner; Mr. David Callan never approached the neighbors directly to discuss any issues. One major issue is three inches of water flows down from the applicant's site onto several neighbor's properties causing extensive damage to include uprooted trees and large amount of dirt washing away. The existing berm does not assist with the water flow. Mr. Rose answered; upon a site visit along the corner of the basin, where the berm is located, no water was indicated and most of the properties are not touched. However, the proposed added stormwater basin is a preventative measure. Ms. Stern Goldstein suggested to schedule a site visit with the neighbors to address additional items of concern with Mr. Canales.

Mr. Stern Goldstein explained; some of the issues began prior to Mr. Callan's construction and an aggressive approach should be completed, so the issue does not become exasperated. Mr. Salvesen questioned; if the applicant does not address the issues, who will become responsible. Mr. Lowenstein answered; the issues first needs to be evaluated to locate a cause. The applicant may have limits of what they can complete. However, once the issues are recognized, negotiations can assist in addressing all issues. Ms. Stern Goldstein added; if issues

found were caused by the developer, they will be responsible to address all drainage issues. However, she noted when a pipe was installed near Mr. Salvesen's property, it was not sized property and may be an additional cause to the drainage problem. Mr. Salvesen disagreed. Mr. Harvey suggested; ProTract have someone complete an evaluation of the area as soon as possible. Mr. Hendrixson agreed and indicated a meeting between the neighbors and ProTract needs to happen.

Resident: Patricia A. Claus of 51 Warden Road commented; owner; David Callen should be present at the meetings. The neighbors are very upset and would like a resolution. Ms. Stern Goldstein requested Mr. Rose rely the message to Mr. Callan. Mr. Rose agreed.

Resident: Carol J. Dengler of 87 Warden Road indicated 2/3 of the trees were removed by the applicant and doesn't believe he had the right to do so. Ms. Dengler questioned; how many trees were removed in total and the diameter. Ms. Stern Goldstein answered; tree removal is based on two requirements. First, 50% of the woodlands can be removed as per the zoning ordinance. The applicant has not exceeded the requirements. Second, certain percentage of caliber trees can be removed, per the entire site. The applicant is near the requirements and short a few replacement trees.

Mr. Lowenstein questioned; does the number of trees greatly exceeds the original plan, which created an additional water flow. Ms. Stern Goldstein answered; the issue was addressed when the plan for subdivision was presented. However, since April, the direction has been to meet with the residents.

Resident: Ms. Claus indicated; recently additional trees have been removed. Ms. Stern Goldstein directed; any resident who witnesses trees being removed from Mr. Callan's property to contact the township. Ms. Dengler questioned; is it possible to determine how many trees were removed in total. Ms. Stern Goldstein suggested; visiting the Township Administrative offices and have them assist in providing the information under the applicant's building permit. Mr. Colello suggested to have the applicant supply pictures of the total trees removed. Mr. Rose responded; the most recent pictures are supplied at tonight's meeting.

Ms. Hendrixson irritated; before another meeting can be scheduled, a meeting with the neighbors during a site visit is necessary. Mr. Rose agreed and indicated with existing issues, several items need to be figured out.

Resident: Mr. Salvesen commented; all trees removed seemed to be located along the back portion of the site near a hill. He noted; if more trees are removed along that area, it will cause more of a flooding issue. Ms. Stern Goldstein responded; every property has certain rights and can remove a percentage of trees.

Upon a discussion regarding damaged caused by removed trees, Mr. Lowenstein commented; some of the problems were caused by landscaping. Once records and aerial photographs are viewed, it will provide the Township with a basis for the Board of Supervisors. With scheduled meetings and discussions, a resolution can be found. Mr. Colello reminded the residents; if anyone hears chainsaws or witness additional trees being removed, the township should be contacted as soon as possible. Ms. Mason added; Director of Codes; Sinclair Salisbury is the Township's contact. She then added; a resident can remove ten (10) healthy trees per calendar year.

In the form of a MOTION by Mr. Harvey; seconded by Mr. Lowenstein the Preliminary Land Development plan for the Callan Tract is tabled until the September 25, 2017 Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular meeting.

Motion Carried 3 to 0.

Ms. Mason recommended the neighbors provide their contact information to Mr. Rose to assist in scheduling a meeting. A representative of Mr. Callan noted; at a previous meeting, he provided his business card to all residents, where he never received a phone call.

**Adjournment:** Hearing no further business, the July 24, 2017 Doylestown Township Planning Commission Meeting was adjourned at 8:59 pm.