

**Meeting Minutes from the  
DOYLESTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting  
November 26, 2018**

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular Meeting was held at 7:00 p.m., Monday, November 26, 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 Jeremy Deppeler. Others in attendance included Township Manager; Stephanie Mason and Board of Supervisor Liaison: Richard Colello.

**Absent:** Township Planning Consultant; Judy Stern Goldstein. In Ms. Stern's absence, Mr. Michael L. Burke was present.

**Public Comments:**

**Review of Minutes:**

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

- a) Correct Mr. Deppeler's first name to Jeremy

Mr. Kelso questioned; if the Housing Equity Center of Pennsylvania report was received and provided to the Commission. Ms. Mason answered; the information was provided in this month's Commission information packet.

- b) Page two, Last Paragraph of Pickering, Corts and Summerson review letter comments for Tabatabai Tract - Remove paragraph that reads; When the soil was rerouted, it was recaptured in all proposed impervious. As per Mr. Canales' recommendation, the basin will have full volume. The raingarden will be controlled and hauled. To comply, the spill way will be raised to hold the water.

Motion carried 5 to 0.

Central Bucks Family YMCA – Amended Final Land Development

Eric L. Clase of Gilmore & Associates provided an overview of the plan as the last amended approval was made in 2016 for Phase II. Over time, the YMCA revisits the needs of its members and shape of the plan has evolved. Previously, two smaller expansions were approved off Memorial Drive as a 19,669 square foot, two story addition at the east corner. To accomplish, the previous proposed large field house was removed on the western side of Lower State Road. The applicants do not require additional parking. However, full storm water management will be requested and there are questions related to professional letters received.

Ms. Hendrixson commented; the overall parking does not seem to work with having a tough drop off area. If the child care center moves, Ms. Hendrixson questioned; what is the current state of the circulation through the site and will it change.

Chief Operating Officer; Tricia Feintheil of Central Bucks YMCA explained; the proposed expansion is to serve existing members and increase space for the Pathway program. Pathway is a free program to the community and

currently operating in a small space and cannot accommodate all members. In addition, due to increasing need of locker rooms, the area will be reorganized as a multiunit with individual changing areas.

The third lower lot can accommodate approximately forty parking spaces, which was added to the plan. Mr. Lowenstein commented; parking remains a problem on site. Ms. Feintheil responded; a survey was completed, and spots were counted. Mr. Lowenstein indicated the parking will remain a problem, especially with the traffic created from the pool and skate park. He also noted a possible issue with emergency vehicles having only one access. Mr. Clase responded; the site has multiple access and noted four on the plan. Mr. Deppeler questioned; if signage is posted along Lower State Road noting the emergency access. Ms. Feintheil indicated no. Ms. Hendrixson questioned; if the area is paved or proposed to be paved. Mr. Clase answered; the area has grass pavers.

Mr. Reppa questioned; what the process for snow removal is. Ms. Feintheil answered; the area is always cleared during inclement weather and fire drills. To clarify; Ms. Feintheil explained the child care service provided is baby sitting not a full time child care center where a drop off area is required.

Mr. Reppa questioned; if the lower level parking area is for employees only. Ms. Feintheil answered; the employees are directed to park in the lower level to provide additional spaces in the main parking area for members. He then questioned; what is the intent of the brown parcel. Mr. Clase answered; the area is part of the property with no use.

Ms. Hendrixson recommended to increase bicycle racks to promote the bike & hike trail. Ms. Feintheil agreed. Mr. Kelso noted; the bike & hike path was completed in front of the property and should be noted on the plans. Mr. Clase indicated; the plans will be updated to include the trail. Mr. Kelso indicated; the township's ordinance requires bicycle parking. Ms. Feintheil responded; currently two bicycle racks are installed but will promote more.

#### Michael Baker International – November 3, 2018

Mr. Clase informed; the parking lot is not a new addition and approved approximately eight years prior. Additionally, traffic was always planned. With the plan presented as an amended square footage of the building, the applicants should not be responsible for some of the items noted, such as signage. Ms. Hendrixson noted; the signage is pertaining to the bike and hike trail and is important for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.

Mr. Clase explained; the parking lot was constructed and designed a few years prior and now considered an existing parking lot. The Michael Baker letter is revisiting the parking lot as proposed. There is a plan, approved by the township and required signage was placed. Mr. Kelso noted; the trail was a dead end for many years and now becoming one of the township's highly used trails with a direct connection between the Borough and other major sites. Secondly, there is an existing root intrusion along the trail near the main building which needs to be addressed. Mr. Clase agreed.

#### Pickering, Corts and Summerson, Inc. – November 2, 2018

- 1) Item a - an existing shed near the bus parking with a permit from the township on file.
- 2) Item b – the existing octagonal structures to the north of the play courts have been on site for several years, but not noted on the plan. Over the years, the applicants have obtained several engineering firms, where the items were missed. The applicants have agreed to update the plans to show all impervious, sidewalks and structures are shown on the plans.

- 3) Item c – the two sheds south of the play courts are in a front yard setback since 2008. The survey never showed the structures on the plans. The township may consider the structures as existing, non-conformities or as new structures. However, a variance will be required to have them remain.
- 4) Item d – one shed located east of the play courts needs to be shown on the plan but has no current violations to the zoning ordinance or SALDO.
- 5) Item e - a sidewalk to the 884 square foot building to the east of the skate park has never been surveyed and will be placed on the plan. Additionally, all impervious will be analyzed and ensure the storm water basin is well suited. All calculations will be updated to ensure the overall campus meets the ordinances.

Mr. Clase requested Commission guidance on item c, regarding the two sheds along the front yard setbacks. The applicant will comply with other comments on the review letter. Mr. Kelso recommended the issue with the two sheds be presented to the Zoning Officer.

Boucher & James, Inc. – November 6, 2018

- 1) ZO Section 175-59.B – the applicants will comply by revising the impervious surface to ensure all items are recorded on the plan.
- 2) ZO Section 175-17.D(3) – pertains to the two sheds south of the play courts in the front yard setback.
- 3) The applicants will comply with revising the plan accordingly with tree protection detail to provide fencing around the dripline of the trees to be protected.
- 4) The applicants will comply with adequately showing all existing features under the Existing Features and Demolition plan.

Mr. Burke clarified; a variance will be required due to the structure not permitted in the front yard. Ms. Mason suggested the applicant consider relocating the two sheds toward the south side of the site.

Mr. Kelso commented; the set back along the arterial road is significant. It's taken up a lot of land and may be able to be used for parking. Mr. Clase responded; visually, the parking lot is closer to the road than the sheds.

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 Applicant: Central Buck YMCA Amended Final Land Development plan with the understanding the applicant has agreed to address comments listed under Pickering, Corts and Summerson letter dated November 2, 2018. Specifically, the applicants will address Item 1c, pertaining to the two sheds along the front yard setback should be addressed with the Doylestown Township Zoning Officer and staff to determine the best alternative.

Additionally, the applicant has agreed to address all issues listed under the November 6, 2018 Boucher & James, Inc. review letter and Michael Baker International dated November 8, 2018. The Commission suggested the YMCA perform trail maintenance from root intrusion on the existing Bike & Hike trail.

Mr. Lowenstein questioned status of the SC Engineer, Inc. letter dated November 9, 2018. Mr. Clase reported; the applicants will comply with comments. The plan has not changed and will be updated upon a discussion with Alfred S. Ciottoni.

Mr. Clase requested direction on the emergency access. Mr. Deppeler recommended; to have an emergency access at Lower State Road to prepare for a snow event.

In a form of an AMENDED motion by Mr. Kelso; seconded by Mr. Lowenstein to add; the applicants will provide an emergency access off Lower State Road.

Motion Carried 5 to 0.

#### Continued Discussion – Clean up Ordinance

Ms. Mason presented the Chief of Police; A. Dean Logan suggestions for the clean-up ordinance as, re-evaluating the decibel levels under the Zoning Ordinance. The Code Department designed a survey of the neighboring municipalities in the various districts as a comparison.

Upon Mr. Kelso's question, Ms. Mason outlined the issues as commercial properties adjacent to resident communities in the same district. The issues are the combination of timing and decibel levels, such as with trailers or mowers. Although the issue is not continuous, noise from constant turning machinery on and off during transfer, departing and returning is becoming an issue. The most recent complaint was received regarding landscaping machinery being placed on trailers at 7:00am. Other complaints received are regarding trash haulers beginning service before 7:00am, specifically during hot days.

The second issue to consider for cleanup is poultry. Ms. Mason informed; the Board of Supervisors received a Boucher & James, Inc report, presented by Judy Stern Goldstein regarding back yard chickens and roosters' requirements to be recorded under the clean up ordinance. Township Solicitor; Jeffrey P. Garton is currently drafting an ordinance for Board approval at a January 2019 meeting. The draft ordinance will be presented to the Commission at their December meeting for comments.

For the decibel levels, Ms. Mason recommended the Commission consider possibly increasing the decibel level in general and exemptions of motor vehicle operations for construction, emergency, alarms and mowers to become less restrictive.

Mr. Colello questioned; if decibel levels above what is stated in the current ordinance are for both day and night time are the same. Ms. Mason answered; the evening decibels are calculated at a minus three or five, depending on the district. On the residential side, any decibel level between 7:00am and 10:00pm any noise cannot be higher than 55 decibels. However, the issue is higher decibels when machinery is running, such as a mower or tractor at the same time. During the evening hours, decibels are required to be lowered to 52.

Mr. Deppeler requested to have Mr. Salisbury draft a decibel requirement spreadsheet for the Commission's review. Ms. Mason agreed.

Mr. Burke read the nuisance section of the township ordinance which indicated satisfactory sound pressure levels for continuous noise along a residential or institutional property cannot be higher than 55, commercial district at 60 and industrial district at 65. If the noise occurs between the hours of 10:00pm and 7:00am, the correction decibel is

minus three. If the noise is of periodic character, there will be a correction of negative five. Mr. Colello requested to have the current ordinance provided to the Commission for their review and comments.

*Township Planning Consultant; Judy Stern Goldstein arrived at the meeting at 8:07pm to step in for Mr. Burke.*

#### Pavilion at Furlong Sketch Plan – Proposed Senior Living

Mr. William Benner, Esquire of Benner and Wild provided a brief history of the Pavilion at Furlong Sketch plan. In February of 2018, the Grasso Group presented a plan for a proposed independent senior living facility. Upon meeting with township staff, consultants and solicitor, it was recommended to begin the process with a traffic study. The study was completed during the summer of 2018. The Grasso Group met with the township again in August of 2018 and received a request from Penn Dot to obtain a commitment from the township to move forward with the plan before they can approve a highway occupancy permit.

In July of 2016, the Board of Supervisors approve a settlement agreement. Under the terms of the agreement, the partnership controlled by the Grasso Group obtained conditional right to develop the fifteen acre site for a 52,000 square foot, commercial enterprise. The stipulation was modified in December 2017 where Bucks County Water & Sewer Authority agreed to provide a sewer water connection to the site and Doylestown Township will provide water service.

The proposed independent living facility will consist of one use as an independent senior living facility. The use is under B14, which is not permitted in the zoning classification. The applicant will be requesting an amendment to the stipulation agreement upon Commission's recommendation and Board of Supervisors' approval.

Scott Mill of Van Cleef Engineering Associates, LLC presented the current renderings of the plan, which predates the final settlement plan. The plan includes a sewer connection and well for water. The proposed as a single use building under B14, senior citizen housing, two way access will be provided into the site, from Rogers Road and a right in, right out towards York Road. The ingress off Route 313 will be removed. Overall impact is less than 3 acres of woodlands clearing and 3 acres of impervious surface. Fifty five parking spaces with an area reserved for 40 more spaces with a circular area in the front for drop off, loading and short term parking.

On the south side of the building, facing York Road will have another area for loading and trash pickup. A buffer along the adjacent resident community and an eight foot wide path will be provided along York Road. Additional buffering will be added along York Road to screen the building. The basin will be located along Rogers Road with public water and sewer provided. The area behind the entrance road and woodlands will be reserved.

Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned how many stories the proposed building is. Mr. David Polocnik answered; one side of the building will be four stories and the other two. Mr. Mill added; with the topography extending back to York Road, the first floors will be buried. Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned; what the building's height for residents. Mr. Mill answered; it's anticipated to be approximately 52 feet as an average around the building with 124 units.

Ms. Hendrixson commented; the parking doesn't seem to be adequate for the number of units. Mr. Polocnik responded; based upon his experience in constructing senior living facilities, most seniors do not drive, and the parking will be adequate. Mr. Benner added; the housing type proposed is appealing toward independent seniors between 75 and 80 without cars. The facility's management service will provide transportation to and from convenient sites, such as, market and shopping areas. In addition, a dining plan is included under the monthly rental. Ms. Hendrixson noted; the parking is far from the building and suggested to add more parking.

Mr. Kelso questioned what the maximum staff during a shift is. Mr. Polocnik answered; the facility will not be considered as an assisted living. The staff will be reduced, but unsure how many employees will be employed.

Mr. Lowenstein commented on the long corridors and question if the designs consider the travel length from each unit to the parking spaces. He agreed with Ms. Hendrixson's comments and suggested to add additional parking and closer to the facility.

Ms. Hendrixson questioned; what use will the lower level have. Mr. Polocnik answered; the lower level is where the mechanical area will be located.

Mr. Kelso questioned; what will the appearance of the building be along York Road. Mr. Polocnik answered; the area will be designated for the pool area with glass and a stone base. The design has not been fully developed and ongoing with no architectural designs on file. Mr. Benner added; until a commitment is received by the township to accept the proposed concept and the stipulation agreement is amended, the plan will move forward to provide designs.

Mr. Reppa questioned; if rezoning is proposed. Mr. Benner indicated no, and the development of the site will be reliant upon the stipulation agreement. The property is currently split zoned under the CR and LI District. Mr. Reppa commented; he is unsure the proposed uses will be satisfactory under the CR District. Mr. Benner agreed and explained; in terms of front and side yard set back the proposed plan follows the CR District. The stipulation agreement incorporates the Subdivision Land Development ordinance, except where there is a need for waivers. The agreement also has its own sign criteria for front, rear and side yard as well as impervious surface for the plan. The current plan meets the criteria.

Mr. Lowenstein noted; previously, the plan proposed to incorporate two uses. Mr. Benner clarified; the agreement provided for a use, which would individually be allowed in either the C1 or LI District. However, due to the LI zoning, its not a 100% fit. With the plan not meeting any of the criteria, the applicant is requesting a recommendation to allow the use on the property as an amendment to the stipulation.

Mr. Kelso questioned; what caused the change in the plans. Mr. Benner answered; the company has moved into the form of development; the retail business is going through changes and the design is a better fit for the community. Mr. Reppa questioned if the previous plan can be reconsidered. Mr. Benner indicated; the final drafting of the current plan has not begun. However, recommends the current plan be considered.

Mr. Kelso commented; the previous stipulation plan was a well-engineered sketch plan. The current plan proposed is requesting the township to have faith on a design that is not fully created and is limited. Mr. Lowenstein added; the use is not better for the neighborhood and not what was described.

Ms. Stern Goldstein noted the C17 ordinance under Personal Care home, which is permitted in commercial and institutional districts. She further explained; the different between C14 and C17 use as personal care has up to 10% maximum independent living. Mr. Benner added; both operations are primarily assisted living and the C17 doesn't apply due to the proposed facility not being assisted living. The facility will be independent, functioning as assisted without providing the assistance.

Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned; if residents will pay month to month rent and what is included. Mr. Polocnik answered; a monthly rent will be required and includes a meal plan, activities and transportation.

Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned; with the loading facing Route 263 and no restriction around the building, how does it work for emergency services. Mr. Polocnik noted; the designs are in the early stages. However, considering services, location and topography the best location was selected. A discussion is needed with the Fire Marshall and township to determine the best plan and required facilities.

Michael Roth of McMahon Engineers reported; both Penn Dot and township staff requested an updated traffic study. As a note under the comparative report, the trip studies between the two sites are dramatically different. With a mixed use site, the proposed AM traffic is a total of 124 trips with the afternoon at 200 trips. The new assisted living facility plan has 25 AM trips and 32 PM trips. The new plan has a difference of 100 trips less in the morning and 168 less in the afternoon.

Mr. Lowenstein questioned if the facilities' staff trips are considered in the study. The study doesn't seem to calculate the ongoing activities for an assisted living center. Mr. Roth answered; the calculated numbers reported are not specific to this site. It's information that is gathered and published for independent living facilities in Pennsylvania and through out the nation. Data collected include services, bus shuttles and employees entering and exiting the facility. The required peak hours for the study are from 7:00am to 9:00am, where the only activity is services or employees entering the center. The afternoon peak hours are from 4:00pm to 6:00pm, where most residents are preparing to return to the center. Most traffic exiting in the afternoon are from employees or services leaving the center.

For the numbers in between, the data collected shows the peak hours around the roadways are generally between 7:00am to 9:00am and 4:00pm to 6:00pm. Total trips per day for the previous proposed site was 3,000 per day. The new plan's total trip is 475.

Ms. Hendrixson questioned; if a traffic light will be installed. Mr. Roth answered; no traffic lights are proposed along York Road or Rogers Road. As per PennDOT and York Road considered a state highway, the requirement is to have a deceleration lane and to have traffic entering from York Road. Additionally, there will be no left turn movements at or from York Road. Ms. Hendrixson questioned; if the traffic plan will line up with Temple Judea entrance. Mr. Roth answered; the internal circulation of the site is not conditioned to have a use of a traffic light. A two way roadway with movement in the access closer to York Road is currently proposed.

To travel north, if there was not access or two way access onto Rogers Road, a vehicle will leave the site, travel on York Road, make a U-turn, travel onto Rogers Road then circulate through the neighborhood onto Swamp Road. With moving the access closer, the attempt is to provide access onto Rogers Road and York Road. A left turn will be provided onto Rogers Road and York Road.

**Public Comment:**

Resident: Chelsea Paskman of 125 Rogers Road questioned the math of 475 trips per day with 340 trips unaccounted for. Mr. Roth explained; during a 10 hour period of non-peak hours, traffic continues to move in and out of the center. It's the same amount of traffic coming in daily. Ms. Stern Goldstein questioned; if peak hours are for the use. Mr. Roth answered; for the particular use, it will be the same. However, certain land uses have a peak hour generator where the site may generate more traffic during other hours of the day. Per the requirements of the township and PennDOT, the commuter peaks are to be studied and coincide.

Resident: Felipe Polanco at 125 Rogers Road questioned; was a similar study completed for the synagogue. Mr. Roth indicated a study was not completed and PennDOT may not require a study due to the access from a township road. Mr. Polanco commented; moving the driveway closer to York Road will prevent vehicles traveling onto Rogers Road may not be ideal due to currently speeding issues increasing. Mr. Roth answered; with a full movement access from Rogers Road, a right can be made onto Rogers Road. Understanding the traffic patterns in the area and how residents travel, traffic can travel off the major roadways. The study indicates the majority of the traffic will use the major roadways through a neighborhood. There is no reason for traffic to cut through the adjacent community. Issues arising after the site is completed, may not be related to the center. Traffic is associated with Temple Judea and not related to the proposed site. Mr. Polanco indicated the calculation provided under the traffic studies are inaccurate and may cause additional traffic onto Rogers Road. Ms. Hendrixson responded; the traffic calculations must be based on science provided for the use for the roads that exist with formulas. Should an issue arise after the site is built, all complaints should be directed to PennDOT.

A resident requested an opinion regarding retail and day care traffic with the currently approved, stipulation sketch plan, even with no access onto Rogers Road. Will there be traffic onto the adjacent development from the independent living center. Also, with the access onto Rogers Road what is the opinion on traffic being drawn from the local neighborhoods using Rogers Road. Mr. Roth responded; everyone can agree the proposed independent living development has considerably less traffic than the previous approved development plan overall. The individuals entering and exiting the proposed site have the similar patterns of only entering and exiting. Retail or daycare establishments patterns are different and more constant, and the overall traffic will more often use side streets to travel. The resident questioned what is the current traffic counts on Rogers Road. Mr. Roth answered; the traffic calculations on Rogers and Spring Valley Roads are 40 cars during the peak am hours. For Rogers Road and Route 263 are 55 cars during peak am hours. Afternoon peak hours are the same.

Mr. Lowenstein commented; the police department can assist with illegal movements, such as speeding. He suggested speeding complaints along Rogers Road should be directed to the police department to alleviate the situation. There are two issues as enforcement versus volume and each are handled differently.

Ms. Paskman questioned; why was the proposal for a traffic light to allow access onto Rogers Road removed. Mr. Roth answered; in order to install a traffic signal, certain requirements need to be met. The traffic generated on the side streets does not meet the requirements for a traffic signal. Ms. Paskman questioned; why vehicles are not allowed to turn left onto York Road as only a right out. Mr. Roth answered: if there is frontage on multiple roadways access is granted from a local roadway. Since the site can take access, there is no reason for a right out only access. Other items to considered are right way constraints to widen York Road at the location. Mr. Mill noted; a notice was received from PennDOT not allowing an access due to the type of community and volume of traffic.

Ms. Paskman questioned; if it's not safe to make a left onto the York Road, why is the opportunity to allow movement onto Rogers Road, then turn left onto Rogers Road to proceed to York Road to turn left onto York Road allowed. She then commented; the approach is not safe or effective and will push more traffic onto Rogers Road. Mr. Roth responded; the access point is closer to the intersection and Rogers Road is at a location which was studied. There is an existing turn lane on York Road to provide a left turn onto the site and acceptable. With the small amount of traffic added from the proposed plan, the movement is still considered safe per PennDOT and township's requirements. There is no reason to introduce an additional left turn from another location. Ms. Paskman commented; the voices of the community should also be considered. She also commented on concerns on how public transportation routes will be determined that may add to traffic onto Rogers Road.



Resident: Mary Lou Streznewski of 22 Brook Drive noted; a four way stop sign was recently installed at Brook Drive and Rogers Road which improved the traffic issue significantly. She suggested having another four way stop signed placed at Valley Drive. Ms. Hendrixson recommended to address the four way stop sign with the township's Traffic Advisory Committee.

Ms. Streznewski questioned; if the facility will have a swimming pool and will it have an impact on the site. Mr. Mill answered; a swimming pool is possible but doesn't anticipate a problem with an impact to the site or water pressure. She then questioned; is there a possibility to have the water and sewer connection from Route 313 and who is responsible to repave the roads after the connection is made. Mr. Kelso answered; the township has standards for road opening permits. He then suggested the applicants discuss with the township's engineer during the land development stage.

Resident: James Bingler of 29 Turkey Lane noted; the temple generated enough traffic for a signal to be installed. Upon applying for a signal, the temple was denied by PennDOT. Ms. Mason agreed indicating the signal did not meet the requirements at Rogers Road. The previous project generated enough traffic to ensure a signal for safety. He commented on the difficulties in turning left onto Route 263. The proposed site will generate more traffic onto Spring Valley and Swamp Roads toward Route 263. He urged a traffic light to provide access Route 262 be considered for the safety and well being of the residents.

Resident: Steven Murden of 52 Rogers Road questioned; if the facility will be considered an assisted living in the future. Ms. Stern Goldstein answered; if personal care is considered a B14 use is required with no assisted care component included. He then questioned; with cooking provided in units, why isn't more consideration to provide emergency access for a truck to turn around the site provided. Mr. Benner clarified; the previous statement was a misrepresentation of the plan. Mr. Lowenstein added; a meeting with the Fire Marshall is required during the plan development stage.

Ms. Pascan questioned; how many residents will be onsite. Mr. Polocnik answered; only singles will be onsite. Mr. Benner added; the Downingtown center is a mixed of studios and one bedroom. No more than two residents will occupy one unit. Normally with two bedrooms, the second room is utilize as a guest room or study.

Ms. Pascan questioned; is there research supporting an independent center is a benefit to the township and if the center will be filled. Mr. Benner answered; a specific report or research was not completed. However, there isn't another independent senior living center that addresses the niche of the market. It also assists seniors who are independent and not yet prepared for assisted living.

A resident questioned; if lenders are in place for both projects. Mr. Benner indicated not at the current stage of development.

Mr. Kelso questioned; if meetings have been scheduled with the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Benner indicated no and the reason for the presentation is to receive comments from the Commission to determine if the proposed independent senior living center is a good fit for the property.

In the form of a motion by Mr. Kelso, the Doylestown Township Planning Commission recommends the Doylestown Township Board of Supervisors support applicant; Grasso Group move forward with a Revised Stipulation Agreement to allow the development of the proposed Pavilion at Furlong Independent Senior living center and abandonment of the existing Stipulation Agreement for the Retail plan. Further consideration be given in the continuous review of

traffic improvement to be made towards the intersection of Rogers Road and Route 263. The Planning Commission request more architecture information is provided pertaining to its appearance from the adjoining neighborhood at York Road and Rogers Road. Additional consideration in providing more detail of the internal circulation in and around the facility is given. Further information be provided by the applicant on the staffing of the facility and the relation with traffic and parking at the site.

Mr. Reppa commented; traffic engineers should consider a safety study for Rogers Road at the various intersection and pedestrian access points to become safer or decide on the best trade off. Less intensity may be the best trade off to consider.

Ms. Hendrixson commented; to benefit the overall community plan, a village plan instead of independent living should be considered. Mr. Kelso responded; previous, approve commercial properties are not thriving. A senior living center is a better plan which doesn't place a drain on the school district or police force.

Mr. Lowenstein commented; the sketch plan is not impressive and doesn't provide enough information for him to provide a recommendation.

MOTION FAILS due to a lack of a second.

Mr. Lowenstein suggested the applicant improve the current plan to consider the concerns of the community and negate issues. Mr. Reppa added; the community is requesting the traffic is comprehensively viewed and prefers the Commission reviews the plan before a meeting with the Board is scheduled to provide safety recommendations for users of Rogers Road.

Mr. Benner suggested to have Mr. Kelso's motion revised to recommend the plan be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Deppeler responded; the Commission doesn't have enough information to provide a recommendation or make a determination.

Upon Mr. Benner's statement a traffic signal may not be possible, Ms. Mason recommended the applicant meet with PennDOT to discuss a possible traffic signal or right hand turns at Rogers Road due to existing traffic calculations.

**Adjournment:**

Hearing no further business, the November 26, 2018 Doylestown Township Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 9:25pm.