

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

June 25, 2018

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular Meeting was held at 7:00 p.m., Monday, June 25, 2018 at Meeting/Activity Trailer, 425 Wells Road, Doylestown, PA 18901. Members of the Doylestown Township Planning Commission in attendance included Chairperson: Judy Hendrixson, Vice Chairman; Gregory Reppa with members; George Lowenstein, Thomas Kelso and Jeffrey Deppeler. Others in attendance included Township Manager; Stephanie Mason, Board of Supervisor Liaison: Richard Colello and Township Planning Consultant; Judy Stern Goldstein

Review of Minutes:

In the form of a motion by Mr. Kelso; seconded by Mr. Lowenstein the May 22, 2018 Doylestown Township Planning Commission meeting minutes were approved with the following corrections as noted by Mr. Kelso and Mr. Lowenstein,

Page 2, Paragraph 3 – change sentence to read; For clarification; Mr. Kelso questioned; if \$27,600 times the gross number of units was correct and not the net versus the total number of units.

Mr. Dean agreed and clarified; the calculations does use the gross number of units times \$27,600.00.

Page 2 – change MOTION to payment in the amount of \$27,600.00 times the gross number of units.

Page 2, Paragraph 7 - Remove Mr. Lowenstein's comment.

Motion carried 5 to 0.

Public Comments:

Preserve @ Burke Farm – Revised Preliminary/ Final Land Development Plan:

Senior Vice President of WB Homes; Christopher Canavan provided an overview of the plan as an 8.9 acre site located at the corner of Bristol Road and the Route 202 Parkway. An issue with the historic significance of the property to allow the B15 use was resolved and accepted. The applicants met with the Zoning Hearing Board on two occasions. The first for a tract area variance and second for calculations of the density based upon the 2.0 dwelling units per acre, which was granted.

Mr. Canavan continued; the applicants submitted revised plans to include the second submission of review letters from Township consultants. As a result, the plans were revised. He noted; if a comment is not mentioned, it's considered as will comply by the applicant.

Upon reviewing the June 12, 2018 Pickering, Corts and Summerson review letter, Mr. Canavan referenced page four and indicated; curbing has been installed when the Route 202 Parkway was completed to approximately just passed the entrance, near the right of way. A waiver will be requested. Penn Dot is not looking for curbing as part of the HOP application.

Mr. Lowenstein noted; further down the site, there are areas, which have been closed down by or for sale. It may become an issue and should be discussed. Ms. Hendrixson added; curbing is along Upper State Road, but not Bristol Road and should continue to the proposed site. Gilmore & Associates' Senior Project Manager; Ronald G. Monkres responded; from Penn Dot's stand point, if additional curbing is added, the road's side swale water will be re-routed towards the street. Mr. Canavan added; with the existing inlets and stormwater, the goal is to have the rural feel remain with the design of the site.

Mr. Kelso questioned; what is the current shoulder width on the same section. Mr. Canavan answered; the shoulder has an approximate four foot width. He suggested; if there is not at least a four foot shoulder, in lieu of the curb, the road should be widen with additional pavement. Mr. Monkres clarified; the shoulder is two foot wide to the edge of paving. Mr. Kelso indicated; to continue the width of the northern radius at the entrance and continue the width all the way down. If needed, make improvement to the existing swale. Mr. Kelso questioned; what the distance between the proposed northern curb and the edge of the road is. Mr. Canavan indicated four feet. Ms. Hendrixson suggested; to keep consistency of the property line, widen the shoulder to four feet towards the nursery.

Item 9: Mr. Canavan requested guidance if the issue regarding options for the fee in lieu of the recreation land should be discussed with the Commission or Board of Supervisors. Ms. Mason answered; typically the issue is discussed with the Board. However, the Commission is permitted to make a recommendation. The fee in lieu will be 8 times \$1,880.00 per each new unit. Mr. Canavan agreed.

Upon reviewing Boucher & James, Inc. review letter dated June 18, 2018, Mr. Canavan indicated; the application is contingent of a conditional use request. The application has been submitted and will be completed concurrent with review of the preliminary \ final development plan. The applicant's architect is finalizing the elevations for the front of the units. The designs from the Heritage Conservancy will be applied to assist in meeting the intent of the Ordinance by marrying to some of the aesthetics of the existing home and barn. Upon completion of the renderings, it will be submitted for Board and Commission review.

Requirements for the conditional use with regards to public health and safety, value of the ground and compatibility for the use for existing development, each must be reviewed. Mr. Canavan questioned; if the Commission prefers to view at tonight's meeting or when the architectural renderings are completed. The Commission agreed to review at tonight's meeting. Mr. Canavan requested a recommendation for conditional use standards, which are presented in the Boucher & James' letter. With the proposed property as eight new units on an 8.9 acre tract, it's compatible with the adjacent land use by the buffers and general layout. Ms. Stern Goldstein noted; if the Commission makes a recommendation, testimonies will have to be prepared at the conditional use hearing.

Page Four \ Five, Section D - with regards to slopes having a 15% or greater required to have a certain amount of invasive ground cover, a waiver is requested due to the slopes being adequately maintained based upon the ground cover provided.

Upon reviewing Michael Baker International, LLC June 15, 2018 review letter, the plan now reflects the recommendations, as well as feedback received from the Planning Commission prior. The trail comes off the property towards the Route 202 Parkway and will now run between the spring house and the wooded area. It will then lead out towards the Parkway with a culvert underneath. The area is a better location than previously proposed. Mr. Canavan indicated; other items listed in the review letters are will comply.

Mr. Kelso commented; the trail's dimension is not appropriate. It's difficult to view the width reduction of the trail on the plans. He suggested to add dimensional aspects to avoid further discussion regarding the extension. Mr. Canavan responded; he will be adding taper identification to the plans.

Mr. Kelso questioned the status of an existing tree and has it been evaluated. Mr. Canavan answered; the tree is located adjacent to the garage and currently healthy. Ms. Stern Goldstein confirmed; an arborist from Boucher &

James examined the tree and found it to be healthy. The tree currently stands along, where no grading is expected to be completed. The only work planned near the tree is having the trail installed. Mr. Kelso commented; a 200-foot taper is excessive. The proposed trail will become an arterial trail toward Bristol Road. Mr. Canavan responded; if there is a desire to have an eight-foot section truncated, it can be accomplished.

Mr. Kelso noted; a trail halfway between the spring house, where the trail bends sharply and an upgrade swale towards the home. He suggested installing an eight-inch to twelve inch pipe. The proposed structure works but short and the slope between the head wall and the edge of the trail is at 20%. The township's standard is to have a two-foot shoulder on the trail, where there is no room. He suggested to add an eight to ten-inch pipe. There is a detail for a post and rail fence and can be used to define. For the cross section, Mr. Kelso provided standard sections from Consultant of the Bike & Hike Committee; Chris Stanford, P.E. It shows the trail raised approximately six inches to avoid a large amount of cross flow.

Upon reviewing the Pennoni & Associates review letter of June 19, 2018, Mr. Canavan referenced item one, which references widening Elizabeth Lane from 24 to 28th feet. The road will end from Bristol Road towards the cul-de-sac bulb. Twenty four feet were shown, due to the scale of the development and anticipated traffic volume. It will become a better scale for the overall development rather than a 28 foot wide cart way. Each of the units will have a two car driveway with two car garages. There wasn't a need to widen the entire roadway out and provides a better look for the size of the development. Additionally, so the homes are not being pushed closer to the adjacent neighbors, two feet may be added to the opposite side of the road. The current plan work well, located on a private street and within the township's standards.

Mr. Deppeler commented; the Planning Commission's concerns is the same as Penn Dot with on street parking. Ms. Hendrixson commented; the narrowness of the street is not the issue, but additional parking is needed. Mr. Kelso noted a large parking area is located across the street from the site. Mr. Canavan responded; it's not guaranteed who will be living on the property. However, the nature of the anticipated buyers are residents who are empty nesters or looking to downsize and don't normally host large parties. Mr. Reppa questioned; how many bedrooms will be offered in each unit. Mr. Canavan indicated three, with a fourth bedroom option. Mr. Reppa agreed; additional parking will be required. He suggested to designate the parking at the end of the cul-de-sac. Mr. Reppa then questioned; what the dimension inside the cul-de-sac are. Mr. Monkres indicated approximately fifty feet wide and seventy five feet long. Mr. Reppa indicated; eight to ten parking spaces can be easily placed in the area.

Upon a discussion regarding parking standards, Mr. Reppa commented additional parking on one side of the street is acceptable. Mr. Canavan noted; with a twenty four wide road, some of the parts of the bulb in the cul-de-sac will be restricted, so fire equipment can maneuver around the curb. He then suggested to run the firetruck template through the area and appropriately mark off no parking along the cul-de-sac bulb, so not to interfere with emergency vehicles. Otherwise, leave the area as twenty four wide with parking on one side and no parking on the driveway side. Ms. Hendrixson suggested; installing approximately six parking spots along the outside of the cul-de-sac. Mr. Canavan responded; although he is not opposed to the suggestion, there is enough parking spaces in the development for what is needed. Mr. Canavan questioned; if the plan can show no emergency access limitations around the bulb, would the Commission agree to eight houses will be adequate. Mr. Reppa agreed, but will need to show which part will be restricted or where it's allowed. Parking on one side of the street will be acceptable, but restrictions on both sides should not be shown. Mr. Canavan agreed.

Item Two, the applicant requested to use more signage different from the standards to keep within the character of the development. Mr. Canavan referenced; Michael Baker International review letter under item five, supporting the signage and design of the cross-walk paving. However, Pennoni & Associates suggested replacing the pedestrian crossing signs with Penn Dot standards signs. Mr. Canavan requested to follow Michael Baker's comments. The Commission agreed.

Mr. Canavan indicated; comments on the Bucks County Planning Commission letter are noted and incorporated under the plan revisions.

Upon Ms. Stern Goldstein referencing the SC Engineers review letter, Mr. Canavan indicated the applicant will comply with all comments. Several meetings were conducted to review some issues regarding location of the water main within the easement, where the issue may be resolved. Ms. Hendrixson questioned; the drawing submitted for the turning radius. Mr. Monkres answered; the drawings were update with other admissions. Mr. Kelso questioned the status of the DEP letter regarding remediation. Mr. Canavan answered; with the oil tank, four quarters of sampling was completed and noted as clean. The owners have submitted for an ACT II release. Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned; if Doylestown Township Police Chief Logan review letter, dated June 6, 2018 was received. Mr. Canavan indicated no. Ms. Stern Goldstein referenced the letter, if the widening will not be completed have the turning template completed to ensure a fire truck is able to turn around the site. Mr. Canavan responded; the applicant will comply.

Upon reviewing Gilmore & Associates June 25, 2018 letter, Mr. Canavan noted requested waivers and informed, two new waivers are requested due to the most recent reviews letter received by township consultants.

- 1) *§153-12.A – because of the size of the development, a waiver to permit a preliminary plan submission is requested. The applicants will return to request a final submission.*
- 2) *§153-20.C(10) – a request for waiver to submit an aerial in lieu of the 400 feet of existing features.*
- 3) *§153-24.E(4) – The location of the access road is less than 1,000 feet from the Route 202 parkway. The plans lines up with Coach Lights circle across the street as the appropriate intersection. The plan has also completed the Penn Dot review process, where no issues are note regarding distance.*

Mr. Reppa questioned; if a left hand turning lane will be included on the plan. Mr. Canavan answered; yes and has enough space. The gore has to be eradicated and restriped.

- 4) *§153-24.E(7) – a waiver for the 50 foot distance from a straight course as the distance approaches the right of way line. Currently, there is 30 feet to the right of way line and 40 feet to the stop bar. This was completed because, the road way allowed to keep the houses up the hill and further away to the adjacent residential community.*

Mr. Kelso requested clarification of the right of way. Mr. Monkres answered; the calculations are exactly how it appears on the Penn Dot right of way plans. Mr. Kelso questioned; if a waiver is needed for the township ultimate right of way requirements. Mr. Monkres indicated no, due to the township's requirements being less than Penn Dot's. Upon a discussion, the calculations were devised from Penn Dot's as fifty feet from the right of way line as it pertains to the widening of the Route 202 Parkway. Upon further review, the measurement was devised is from the Penn Dot right of way from the other side of the road at thirty feet from the center line of the road located in the middle of the left turn lane to the gore.

- 5) *§153-24.I – for the required deceleration lane, a waiver is requested as the proposed 8 unit density is categorized as a low volume driveway using Penn Dot criteria.*
- 6) *§153-25.A(2) – a technical waiver for the sidewalks to be provided along the streets, due to a bike and hike proposed in lieu, ranging in width from 6 to 8 feet is proposed along the entire Bristol Road frontage.*
- 7) *§153-26.B(1) – a partial waiver is requested due to using a Belgian block curbing to enhance the appearance of the streetscape and not use concrete curbing.*

- 8) §153-31.A(5) – *A waiver to enable improvements from the right of way line to Bristol Road and build the improvement from the property line through the Route 202 parkway right of way to the proposed connection to the bike trail. Township Engineer; Mario Canales requested to specifically detail what items and restricted to only those items. Two driveways connections will be removed for the existing home from the Penn Dot right of way.*
- 9) §153-34.B(3)(a) – *A partial waiver for location along the internal roadway to avoid an uneven distribution, due to utility conflicts and other items working back to the houses. The homes were clustered in a formal arrangement around the development.*
- 10) §153-34.B(3)(b) – *A partial waiver, because the street trees were planted further away along the lower end of Bristol Road to allow the trail to be installed at the right of way end near the street trees and have the streetscape remain.*
- 11) §153-34.B(5)(d) – *as part of a new comment from the June 25th letter under the Boucher & James comments, a waiver to allow invasive cover along the bottom of basin, due to the nature. Additionally, an appropriate slope is located outside of the basin to use grass and other ground cover maintained by the homeowners' association. There is no issue with being appropriately maintained.*

Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned; the width of the side slopes. Mr. Monkres answered; four to one or twenty five percent, where mowing can be completed at three to one.

- 12) §153-35 – *A partial waiver to relocate the driveway for the proposed new home. Some additional grading will be accomplished for the trail.*
- 13) §153-38.D(3) – *A waiver due to the detention basin no longer designed to facilitate regular mowing and be in compliance with the MDS permit requirements.*
- 14) §153-38.D(10) – *A waiver due to the basin having a flat bottom per the design of the MDS permit requirements and received from Bucks County Conservation District.*
- 15) §153-38.D(11) – *A waiver due to basin no longer installed.*
- 16) §153-38.E(4) – *A partial waiver to accommodate transitional grading of three horizontal to one vertical in the side yard areas in between the paired units only. It's necessary to accommodate the walk out basement conditions that better fit existing terrain and limited length in which to catch grade down slope. The area will be maintained by the homeowners' association three to one, which is limited and can be appropriately maintained with grass and lawn mowing.*

Mr. Reppa referenced waiver request #12 and questioned; how the existing trees will be protected. Mr. Monkres answered; notes have been placed on the ENS plan and the partial waiver requested for the removal of the existing driveway. Ms. Stern Goldstein added; additional details were requested, such as pruning, have an arborist on site and have items followed. The request is also asked to be placed in sequence and placed on the plans.

Mr. Canavan concluded by requesting a recommendation for preliminary \ final development plans and conditional use.

In the form of a motion by Mr. Kelso; seconded by Mr. Lowenstein the Doylestown Township Planning Commission recommends the Doylestown Township Board of Supervisors approve the Conditional Use for the Preserve at Burke Farm as requested by the applicant with the understanding the applicant will provide the required documentation needed at the Board of Supervisors meeting for the Conditional Use requirements.

Ms. Mason offer to provide copies of architectural renderings.

Motion Carried 5 to 0.

In the form of a motion by Mr. Kelso; seconded by Mr. Lowenstein the Doylestown Township Planning Commission recommends the Doylestown Township Board of Supervisors approve the Preserve at Burke Farm Preliminary \ Final Land Development plan with the understanding the applicant agree to meet requirements set forth in review letters received from Michael Baker International, LLC dated June 15 2018, Pennoni & Associates dated June 19, 2018, Boucher & James, Inc dated June 18, 2018, SC Engineers dated June 14, 2018, Chief Logan dated June 6, 2018 and Pickering, Corts & Summerson dated June 12, 2018, except for Page Four, Item Eight on the Bucks County Planning Commission concerning the installation of curbing along Bristol Road.

The Planning Commission recommends the four foot shoulder be extended north on Bristol Road the length of the property in lieu of adding curbing.

The Planning Commission agrees with the use of the twenty four foot road width, where parking is allowed on one side. It will be restricted in the cul-de-sac bulb.

The Planning Commission recommends approval of waivers be granted by the Board of Supervisors as stated in the Gilmore & Associates June 25, 2018 letter.

The applicant has agreed to add a second drainage pipe for the trail between the spring house and Elizabeth Lane.

The applicant has agreed to evaluate the length of the currently proposed drainage pipe near the Route 202 Parkway to ensure the two foot shoulder on the trail can be maintained.

As per Ms. Hendrixson clarification; MOTION AMENDED to The Planning Commission agrees with the use of the twenty four foot road width, where parking is allowed on one side. It will be restricted in the cul-de-sac bulb, subject to meeting clearing requirements for emergency vehicles along the length of the road.

The applicant has agreed to continue the ten foot width of the trail, except for a thirty foot length around the tree to be reduced down to eight feet.

MOTION CARRIED 5 to 0.

Continued Discussion: Fireworks Ordinance

Ms. Mason informed the Commission the Fireworks Ordinance is for informational purposes only. The Ordinance is on the agenda for the Board of Supervisors August meeting and impacts the zoning ordinance. Most issues have been previously addressed with the Fire codes department. The revised ordinance will be placed on the agenda for the Commission's review in July.

Ms. Mason reminded the Commission the Comprehensive Plan is still needed to be reviewed and will be placed on the agenda for a future meeting.

Mr. Colello informed; two zoning cases have been forwarded to the Zoning Hearing Board, where the Board is in opposition of one application listed at Edison Furlong Road.

90 Day Review:

Ms. Mason informed the Fireworks Ordinance will be placed on the July agenda for review. Bray, Long, Schmidt tract will be returning in July for review of the revised overlay ordinance.

Adjournment: Hearing no further business, the June 25, 2018 Doylestown Township Planning Commission Meeting was adjourned at 8:15pm.