

DOYLESTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

**Regular Meeting
Monday, October 24, 2022 at 7 PM
Community Meeting Room, 425 Wells Road
Meeting Minutes**

The Doylestown Township Planning Commission Regular Meeting was held at 7:00 pm on Monday, October 24, 2022. Members of the Doylestown Township Planning Commission in attendance included Judy Hendrixson, Chairman; members Tom Kelso, Ted Feldstein, Jill Macauley and Michael Kracht. Others in attendance included Stephanie Mason, Township Manager; Stacy Yoder, Gilmore & Associates; and Sinclair Salisbury, Director of Code Enforcement.

Not in attendance was Jennifer Herring, Board of Supervisors Liaison.

The meeting officially began at **7:00 pm**.

Review of Minutes

On motion of Mr. Feldstein and seconded by Ms. Macauley, the September 21, 2022 minutes were unanimously approved.

Public/Commission Comments/Presentations

None.

Plans Scheduled for Discussion

None.

Items Scheduled for Discussion

EV Charging Stations Ordinance Amendments

Ms. Hendrixson opened the discussion and asked if there were any questions or comments.

Mr. Salisbury made a few comments regarding the draft ordinance and some potential changes. First, for compliance with ADA, that wording be edited so that the controls on the EV charger are no higher than 48" from the surface to where the EV charger is operated from, rather than from the top of the mount, as this would be too high. He also added that wording in section 8 should include general accessibility requirements as required by the PAUCC and ADA.

Mr. Kelso asked if there is an ADA standard for charging stations.

Mr. Salisbury said yes, for operable controls, but not for the number needed. He also added that the wording be changed to remove "building code" and substitute "PAUCC" as this references the latest building codes, which can change.

Mr. Kelso raised the question of the wording which asks that the EV chargers be placed in more remote locations of a parking lot. This can be costly and should not be regulated because every site and use can be different.

Ms. Yoder noted that the reasoning here is to keep people with non-electric vehicles from using those EV spaces but added that it is somewhat vague.

Ms. Hendrixson suggested removing the wording.

Mr. Kelso asked about the need for a feasibility study as noted and asked what the standards would be for that.

Ms. Mason suggested that it be shown on a plan where and how the EV chargers would be accommodated.

Ms. Yoder added that a feasibility study may include an analysis of statistics as well.

Ms. Macauley suggested that an applicant present their recommendation based on the usage of the site and their rationale for how they arrived at the inclusion or number of EV chargers.

Ms. Hendrixson added that this will be largely market driven over the next few years.

Ms. Mason suggested taking out “feasibility study” and replace it with an “explanation” addressing the site usage.

Mr. Kracht noted that the draft ordinance itself can’t be used to deny approval or say that a plan is not feasible.

Ms. Hendrixson responded that including language for a parking area of 25 or more spaces to address EV charging encourages an applicant to think about it. There are no definitive criteria yet, but that will change in the future.

Mr. Kracht raised the question of how this applies to residential properties and asked when a residential property would have to comply with the ordinance.

Mr. Kelso noted that it applies for either land development or subdivision, and that residential properties do not. The intention is not to make anything mandatory, but to encourage it in commercial properties and possibly some apartment type areas. The language concerning residential properties is to make it clear that it does not apply.

Mr. Salisbury raised the question of an HOA wishing to add EV chargers, would it add a commercial use?

Ms. Mason noted that they could designate spaces to encourage EV.

Ms. Hendrixson added that they could be pay per use chargers, or the cost added into HOA fees.

Mr. Kracht then raised the question about accessible parking spaces and if they can be handicapped spaces and also EV charging stations. How does that count if a non-ADA car uses it?

Mr. Salisbury explained that the code requires that the first EV charging space added must be ADA. It is required to provide the correct number of non-EV accessible charging spaces and then EV is in addition to that. It is regulated by the PAUCC in the building code, only if you provide EV spaces, but not as an overall requirement.

Ms. Yoder noted the changes that had been discussed and that the draft ordinance will be updated to reflect them.

Mr. Kelso made a motion that based on the revisions set forth, the Planning Commission send a draft of the ordinance to the Board of Supervisors for their consideration. Mr. Feldstein seconded that motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Sketch Plans Scheduled for Discussion

N/A

Adjournment

With no other business, the meeting adjourned at 7:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kaitlyn Finley
Office Manager, Code Enforcement