

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

April 22, 2019

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular Meeting was held at 7:00 p.m., Monday, April 22, 2019 at Meeting/Activity Trailer, 425 Wells Road, Doylestown, PA 18901. Members of the Doylestown Township Planning Commission in attendance was Chairperson: Judy Hendrixson, Vice Chairman; Gregory Reppa with members; George Lowenstein, Ted Feldstein and Thomas Kelso. Others in attendance included, Township Manager; Stephanie Mason

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

Board of Supervisor Liaison: Richard Colello. In Mr. Colello's absence, Supervisor; Ken Snyder was present.

Review of Minutes:

In the form of a motion by Mr. Lowenstein; seconded by Mr. Reppa the March 20, 2019 Doylestown Township Planning Commission Work Session minutes were approved.

Motion Carried 5 to 0.

In the form of a motion by Mr. Kelso; seconded by Mr. Feldstein the March 25, 2019 Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular meeting minutes were approved.

Motion Carried 5 to 0.

Public Comments:

Pavilion at Furlong – Concept Plan Senior Living Apartments – Continued Discussion

Mr. William E. Benner, Esquire of Benner and Wild began the presentation by clarifying two issues. The first is under the March 25th meeting minutes, Traffic Engineer; Mr. Mark Roth was recorded as speaking, where Project Architect; Mr. David Plotnik should have been noted. Second, the senior living project has been renamed; Ashbridge at Furlong and the previous mixed use, commercial development will remain The Pavilion at Furlong.

Since the March 25th meeting, Mr. Scott Mill of VanCleaf Engineering, LLC. provided an amended plan as per the Commission's comments. The current configuration of the proposed building is a T shape to provide more of a buffer for the adjacent community. The long access is parallel to the existing topography to fit better with the grade. The first floor at the elevation is also with the grade and an extension off the rear to the hillside. Main parking now proposes ten spaces closer to the building. The current orientation shows the parking directly in front and between the building and York Road to allow for a larger field of parking in a total of eighty (80) spaces. Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires four and the plan is showing eight. With a secondary parking area with an additional forty spaces. Overall parking totals 120 spaces for residents, employees, guests and overflow.

The access to loading and emergency access to the building is now oriented to the rear of the building. Upon meeting with Fire Marshall; Rick Shea and Director of Code Enforcement; Sinclair Salisbury, feedback received was to provide an access to at least one side of each wing with a ladder truck.

Upon Ms. Hendrixson's question of the items in yellow noted on the plan, Mr. Plotnik indicated; the recreation area will have an outdoor patio area opening to the dining room, therapy pool and a walking path to the gazebo. Mr. Roth continued; another small recreation area will be located off a patio and a walking trail that extends along a portion of the site, which leads back to the front door at a 1/3 of a mile.

The pump station is provided along the lower end with a few additional areas for stormwater management along York Road and Rogers Road. A large forest area will continue to be maintained near the right in and right out along York Road. Additional buffering is provided along residential properties with supplemental landscaping.

Mr. Reppa questioned; what is the height of the building along the front and back. Mr. Plotnik indicated fifty (50) feet high from the grade and the back is approximately thirty (30) feet. Mr. Mill added; the building cannot be buried due to the need of the first floor access. To achieve, either a wall or an embankment will be utilized for grading off the rear. The bottom ten to fifteen feet will appear to be buried as a walk out basement.

Mr. Kelso questioned; if a preliminary grading plan was implemented. Mr. Mill indicated no due to time constraints. However, preliminary grading was completed under the Pavilion at Furlong plan, which provides an idea of the frontage for the Ashbridge at Furlong plan. Anticipating the topography, additional terrace work will need to be completed along the rear.

Parking:

Mr. Lowenstein questioned; in terms of number, what is the difference of the parking. Mr. Mark Roth, P.E. of McMahon Transportation Engineers & Planners answered; the previous plan noted ten parking spaces along the drop off area and fifty five along the main area with an additional forty under reserves. Total is 105 parking spaces. Mr. Lowenstein questioned if a comparison was made for transportation capabilities under rural versus urban and the average age statistics. Mr. Roth indicated; specific answers are unable to be provided under the current data. Mr. Benner added; similar to a separate facility, the current plan is considered an independent living center with similar demographics. Twenty residents have vehicles and anticipated to be comparable to the proposed site. Amenities will include van service as transportation for outings, shopping and medical appointments. It's projected the number of residents with personal vehicles will be minimal and unlikely to exceed forty. The projection is consistent with the demographics and what the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) indicate for off street parking.

Ms. Hendrixson noted; the facility in Coatesville offers public transportation, where the data may be affected and caused a concern. She then commented; to avoid unnecessary parking, what is the alternative? Mr. Benner responded; the impervious surface ratio offers additional space. The additional space was originally reserved parking. Ms. Hendrixson questioned; why was an additional and reserve parking lot proposed. Mr. Benner answered; the additional parking area is in response to the Commission's concern to provide closer parking spaces to the building. The intent of the secondary lot is to provide employee and overflow parking. To accommodate the largest number of employees at 47 on site during the busiest shift, 20 overflow spaces is provided for residents and visitors.

Upon Mr. Lowenstein's question regarding the average age of residents, Mr. Roth indicated; based on the data collected, the number of parking spaces provided on site is at a rate of 25. For Ashbridge at Furlong, 124 units will have 62 parking spaces. During peak hours for the facility, .41 spaces are required and less than the supply. As a result, the peak demand will have parking spaces available. The supply for the facility is one space per unit and doubled per average. If the Commission believes the site has too many parking spaces, an area may be placed in reserves. For future use, the area can be graded out. Ms. Hendrixson questioned the status of the impervious

surface ratio. Mr. Roth answered; with additional parking and amenities, the site shows four acres and two acres less than the proposed mixed use, commercial site.

Mr. Reppa questioned; where is the cart way and does it show parking. Mr. Roth answered; the main road shows a 26 feet wide cart way and no parking permitted. The main isles through parking lots is 24 feet wide with 10x20 parking spaces.

Ms. Hendrixson questioned if the buffer has changed along the residential area. Mr. Mill answered; much of the vegetation will be preserved and upon speaking with Township Planning Consultant; Judy Stern Goldstein, the non-invasive species area will be removed and supplemented with native species planting.

Mr. Reppa questioned the difference between the property line and adjacent residential community. Mr. Mill answered; 183 feet for the H shaped building versus 173 feet with the T shaped building.

Ms. Hendrixson questioned; with the outdoor area, will terraces be lightened during evening hours. Mr. Mill indicated yes, but the recreation or trail area will not be lightened. Ms. Hendrixson questioned if two retention areas are provided. Mr. Mill indicated two small and one large retention areas are noted.

Mr. Reppa had several questions to include, where will the drainage flow to. Mr. Mill answered; some flow will be towards Buckingham and towards Rogers Road. What is the use of the parking area along the rear of the site. Mr. Mill answered; the area in the rear is for loading of supplies with a dumpster pad and emergency access. If a schedule can be provided for unloading and trash maintenance. Mr. Mill indicated due to the nature of the use; noise will not be an issue. Ms. Hendrixson questioned if there has been any change to the plan's entrances and exits. Mr. Mill indicated no.

Mr. Kelso questioned how far along was the grading report completed for the Pavilion at Furlong. Mr. Mill indicated a report was never submitted due to the change in the property plans. Mr. Kelso questioned where the drainage goes from Edison Furlong Road. Mr. Mill was unsure but indicated the drainage may flow towards to a bulb of a nearby home. Mr. Kelso commented; the plan is greatly improved but would like to view a grading plan to address his concern of the grading along the far back of the site.

Mr. Snyder questioned; in comparison with the Ashford Manor plan, what is the difference in facilities. Mr. Mill answered; the configuration is different. In addition, the Ashford Manor was a repurpose project instead of a newly constructed one.

Resident: Joseph O'Malley of 138 Rogers Road in Furlong commented; the facility is enormous and will take away from the integrity of the area.

Ms. Hendrixson commented; if the plan is overparked, it will become an issue. However, the applicants have addressed the Commission's concerns with the distance of parking. If the plan is overparked, it will make sense to have additional spaces placed in reserve. Mr. Lowenstein noted; the plan hasn't provided enough information for parking and the statistics are not in line.

Mr. Kelso questioned if it's possible to reduce the number of stores, since there is no issue with impervious coverage. Mr. Mill responded; it will supply an issue with the length of the garner into the central dining area. The current plan fits nicely on the site, with good buffers and away from the property line. It also works well with the grades.

Traffic:

Mr. Reppa requested clarification on the left hand turn proposed off Rogers Road. Specifically, why is there an access road off Rogers Road. Mr. Mark A. Roth of McMahan Engineers and Planners clarified; a right in right out

access is proposed onto York Road and a full movement access at Rogers Road. Upon a discussion with the Department of Transportation (DOT), York Road is a DOT road. Once the use, access, operation and function were reviewed, Rogers Road shows it will operate due to the gaps in traffic along York Road to make the left turn in and out safely. A decision is also determined by existing volume presently and once additional movement is added.

However, once the traffic flow during peak hours were reviewed, it falls within the acceptable parameters by the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (Penn Dot). The level of service delay is on an average of less than 35 seconds. Mr. Reppa questioned; why can't a left turn out to the site be completed. Mr. Roth answered; access can be gained to the site from an existing road and governed by Penn Dot. Additionally, the access has a function in place. However, if the access does not function acceptably, it will be reviewed by Penn Dot. If there is an existing left hand turn movement, there is no need to introduce a second left hand turn movement. Mr. Reppa questioned; how much traffic is anticipated coming out of the site towards Spring Valley Road. Mr. Roth answered; it's assumed approximately 5 % of additional traffic will be generated, because other movements are provided. If all movements comes to and from York Road to Rogers Road, the percentage would be higher.

Mr. Snyder questioned; what is the traffic count for peak times along York and Rogers Road presently without the proposed facility versus peak times to access the site from Rogers Road going North to Route 263. Mr. Roth answered; morning records three. Mr. Snyder noted; the numbers are low due to much of the traffic moving towards Spring Valley Road. A right turn onto Spring Valley Road during AM peak hours is recorded at eleven. Afternoon peak hours, the left turn out from Rogers Road going North is recorded as seven and from Spring Valley Road is twelve. The traffic counts were conducted between 7:00am and 9:00am, then between 4:00pm and 6:00pm.

Mr. Reppa questioned; if there any recommendations to slow down the speed along Rogers Road. Mr. Roth commented; during the Synagogue project, Rogers Road was widened, which introduces higher speeds. He recommends either planting close to the road to keep narrow, stripping to provide narrow cart way widths or fading the center line. The pavement does not need to be changed, but steps can be taken to visually narrow the road.

Mr. Kelso questioned; will deceleration lanes be provided for the proposed entrance off York Road. Mr. Roth indicated yes and as a full deceleration lane. Mr. Kelso questioned if a discussion with Penn Dot was had regarding utilizing a center turn lane coming in instead. Mr. Roth answered; the road widens in different areas. Mr. Kelso clarified; the sum total of the traffic improvement is a deceleration lane. Mr. Roth agreed.

Mr. Roth provided an outline of the traffic improvements for a right in and right out off Swamp Road because of the spacing and distance of the frontage, the right out would have to be located where the lanes begin to widen. This caused a concern with vehicles exiting and crossing multiple lanes to make a left hand turn. As result, there is no benefit from creating a right hand turn lane off Swamp Road to enter into the back and will cause disruption.

Mr. Snyder questioned; if a right out only lane off Route 313, would remediate the left hand turn onto York Road from Rogers Road. Mr. Roth answered; there is no conflict or deficiency for making a left turn. In order to place a right out lane, it will have to be introduced to Penn Dot, who previously denied the movement due to the proximity to the intersection.

Resident: Chelsea Paskman of 125 Rogers Road commented; when changing the dates of presentations, residents should be notified in a better process and lines of communications cannot be cut off. Ms. Mason responded; the letter sent to residents is a courtesy notification and the bottom of the letter directs residents on how to follow up to ensure the meetings have not changed. If the applicants do not appear at a meeting for six months, another notification letter will be sent. Additional notifications are listed under the township's website, Facebook and Twitter. Each township meeting is schedule during the same time each month.

Ms. Paskman commented; with the proposed site plan having so much detail, she requested the meeting be separated in a better manner to provide residents time to digest information better and ask questions to relieve

frustration. Mr. Kelso responded; the Ashbridge at Furlong meetings have been broken up with tonight's meeting only discussing the revised building plans and traffic. Ms. Paskman noted; the presentation of the revised plan took most of the meeting's time and doesn't provide enough space for resident's questions.

Ms. Paskman questioned; with increasing the parking spaces, why was the spaces increased to 120 spaces. Mr. Kelso answered; the applicants revised the parking spaces based upon the Commission's comments from the March 25th meeting. Ms. Paskman commented; with additional parking spaces, rather than increase the spaces, statistics should be submitted to support the request. Ms. Hendrixson responded; the plan is still in development and upon reviewing the plan further, a portion of the parking spaces may be placed under reserves. Mr. Benner provided a brief description of the ongoing discussion of parking, indicating due to possible quantity, efficiency and proximity the applicant responded by submitting a revised parking plan for the Commission's review and comments. Mr. Lowenstein commented; the revised parking plan is still inadequate and will not vote in favor of placing additional parking spaces in reserve. He also requested additional details and statistics, which has yet been received. Mr. Kelso added; the Commission requested a revised parking plan to also ensure there is no issue with impervious coverage as with the previous plan. The Commission has determined there is no issue with impervious coverage.

Ms. Paskman has several questions to include, during the high volume peak hours what point are the vehicles coming in and out of either Spring Valley and York Roads. Additionally, why are the trip not factored in under the peak times. Mr. Roth answered; the volume coming out of Rogers Road and left turn up York Road, then down Rogers Road and making a right onto Spring Valley Road has two additional movements. The figures do not completely add up due to other roads and movements. However, the volumes of each movement are close to what is coming into Rogers Road due to distance and balance of volume.

With the traffic signal at the end of the intersection of Rogers Road and Route 263, how can the signal not be warrant at the intersection if a signal was warranted at the entrance of the Pavilion at Furlong off Route 263. Mr. Roth answered; there must be a certain amount of volume coming from Rogers Road to meet signal requirements. Ms. Hendrixson added; the Pavilion at Furlong was a commercial development which warranted a traffic signal. Mr. Roth added; there was another engineering firm that completed the study for the synagogue where the peak traffic was added for the synagogue and the peak traffic for the Pavilion at Furlong project. Adding both projects met the requirements for a traffic signal. A traffic signal for the entrance onto Rogers Road was not included in the study, but assumed it was reviewed.

Mr. Matt Johnston of Pennoni & Associates added; upon reviewing the study for the signals, he confirmed the Temple and Pavilion traffic was included under the study for access onto Rogers Road. The study did meet warrant for a traffic signal for the Pavilion site with access to Rogers Road. However, Penn Dot denied the signal due to the Pavilion was only a plan at the time of submission. Currently, the only traffic flow is from the temple and the existing traffic flow onto Rogers Road, which does not warrant a traffic signal at the intersection. As the Pavilion was developed, it only provided access through the driveway, which met a traffic signal and was scheduled to be constructed. However, with the current independent living plan presented, traffic proposed to be developed and along with the existing traffic from the Temple does not meet traffic signal requirements.

Do the engineering professional find any concerns with traffic flow off Rogers Road and is there validity of residents of Rogers Road and the surrounding neighborhoods concerns for speeding, including U-turns. Mr. Roth answered; there are concerns of speeding off Rogers Road as voiced and studies completed by the police department. From a traffic engineer's standpoint, the original Pavilion project along with the current project provide acceptable engineering access. Mr. Roth acknowledged speeding and cut through issues. However, the proposed independent living development has far less traffic issues than the Pavilion with the daycare and commercial stores.

Mr. O'Malley commented; a cut through road was proposed around the temple and through the Pavilion at Furlong project towards a traffic signal as an entrance. A traffic light will make sense at the entrance to the new project. Ms.

Hendrixson responded; the traffic light made sense with the Pavilion at Furlong due to a commercial development. With a lower traffic flow, the proposed Ashbridge at Furlong does not warrant a traffic signal.

Mr. Snyder questioned; what the threshold to place a traffic light versus current count estimated for the intersection. Mr. Roth answered; site access where Rogers Road is considered a minor approach. In this case, the major approach is York Road and must see a certain threshold. The higher the peak volume, the threshold for meeting at the minor approach goes down slightly. If the volume along York Road were in the high 600s for both directions, the minor approach may need to meet a threshold out at approximately 100 to 120 cars. If the volume rises to 800, the threshold for meeting the minor approach may go down approximately 100 cars. However, the calculations will fluctuate, depending upon various factors. The volume coming out of Rogers Road combined are at approximately 35 cars, which is below the threshold. Adding the development and peak hours traffic, increasing by eight cars and still below the 100 car threshold.

Ms. Paskman questioned; with the counts still be below the threshold if the access off Rogers Road was removed with only an in and out onto York Road. Mr. Roth indicated the counts will not be close to the threshold due to the proposed site only generating 25 cars in the morning and 32 during the evening hours.

Resident: David Dodger of Coon Drive commented; an elderly driver will normally not make a left hand turn from York Road, but instead take a safer route by making a right onto the adjacent development towards a less traffic heavy intersection, which will triple the traffic onto Rogers Road. The statistics are presented without considering the demographics of the drivers. Ms. Mason questioned; can the route be restricted similar with the Temple. Mr. Dodgers responded; flow from the Temple speed also goes through Rogers Road. The proposed Ashbridge at Furlong will now triple the amount of traffic in an already dangerous road.

Ms. Paskman questioned; what the average age of the residents will be. Ms. Hendrixson indicated 75 years old. With independent living, age restriction is not permitted. Mr. Benner will verify the age restriction and provide feedback at the next schedule Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. O'Malley questioned; will the shuttles provided by the facility have a limited travel distance. Mr. Benner answered; no limit is in place and operations is on a supply and demand basis.

Water and Sewer:

Mr. Benner explained; after the stipulation agreement was approved for the Pavilion at Furlong, an onsite water connection was included. Upon receiving Board of Supervisors approval to amend the stipulation agreement, a plan was created for both public water and sewer connections. If the proposed Ashbridge at Furlong development plan is approved, the same infrastructure will be utilized.

A water and sewer representative reported; the sewer connection is a force main with a pump station onsite. The pump station will have a four inch force main, where both water and sewer lines will extend to the same trench along Rogers Road towards Cherry Lane. At Cherry Lane, the force main turns right and the water line turns left and ties into an exiting water system at the corner of East Road and Cherry Lane. Once the force main extends right towards Swamp Road, it will then extend to Doylestown Borough and tie into an existing water line. The proposed force main will be four inches in diameter and the water line will be ten inches with an add alternate that may be increased to 12 inches in diameter.

Ms. Hendrixson questioned; will the demand increase for the Ashbridge at Furlong. Answer; per calculations, the demand will increase due because of the 124 units having a kitchen and bathroom.

Mr. Kelso questioned; what waste water plant will be serving the facility. The representative was unsure but indicated the line will enter Doylestown Borough. Mr. Kelso noted; it will be important to clarify to serve the site

accordingly. Mr. Reppa questioned; if anything else will be tying into the force main. The representative indicated yes. Mr. Benner agreed and indicated with the preliminary work completed, right of way and approved design, there will be no change. However, if a larger transmission line is required, it will increase the diameter for both water and sewer.

Mr. Kelso questioned; if the applicant will completely cover the cost of the public water and sewer connections. The representative indicated yes for both, including the add alternate line at 12 inches. Mr. Benner added; as part of the stipulation agreement amendment, Mr. Grasso will waive his right to recapture. Mr. Kelso questioned if it includes coming down Rogers Road, single lane overlay. The representative indicated yes and according to the design. Mr. Benner clarified; the recapture is when the developer assumes the capital expense for the transmission lines, the resident is entitled to pay a portion of the capital expense in return for the transmission line. The cost to connect will be the responsibility of the resident. If there is a component of the compacity, Mr. Grasso will be waving his right as well if there is a resident who connecting and there is a capacity charge for one EDU developed for the resident. The resident will pay the capacity charge.

Ms. Mason reported on behalf of the Chairman of the Public Water & Sewer Advisory Committee (PWSA); Joseph VanHouton, who is concerned about the force main and the possible need of a connection of public water and sewer for properties along Rogers Road. She then questioned; if the developer can complete an evaluation of connections for property owners who may have failing septic systems, instead of completing a separate sewer project ten to twenty years in the future. Mr. Kelso suggested installing a progressive cavity pump and a discussion should be scheduled to review designs.

Summary:

Mr. Benner requested Commission's recommendation to the Board of Supervisor for approval of the Ashbridge at Furlong Sketch plan. He indicated all questions have been addressed and one pending item is to answer a question of the minimum age limit for the facility. Mr. Kelso clarified; the Commission also requested to clarify if the age limit is being applied through a restriction. Mr. Benner answered; the age limit is applied by a self-imposed condition that the municipality has the right to enforce.

Mr. Kelso requested a preliminary grading plan be submitted. Mr. Benner added; the applicant will research the validity to tap into the sewer line. Mr. Kelso questioned; if the applicant can assist or suggest a resolution with traffic calming along Rogers Road. Mr. Lowenstein requested copies of any materials relevant to the parking of the facility, such as comparisons and statistics. Mr. Benner indicated supplying reports is difficult due to having to reach out to a competitor for information. Mr. Kelso suggested reaching out to a municipal engineer.

Mr. Reppa requested updated plans be submitted for Commission's review, prior to the next scheduled meeting. Mr. Roth questioned; With traffic, what information would the Commission like to review. Mr. Kelso responded; the Commission is trying to raise the level of confidence in the type of facility for the location. Ms. Hendrixson added; one of the concerns was the proximity for the residents, which was resolved. The experts should determine what number of parking spaces is adequate and having the ability to place some parking in reserve. Mr. Feldstein commented; the difference in parking spaces between both independent facilities discussed is public transportation not provided at the proposed site, which is an issue.

Ms. Mason informed; due to the Memorial Day holiday, the next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, May 28th at 7:00pm.

Adjournment:

Hearing no further business, the April 22, 2019 Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular meeting was adjourned at 9:06pm.