

DOYLESTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

Monday, July 28, 2025 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, July 28, 2025. Members of the Doylestown Township Planning Commission in attendance included Judy Hendrixson, Chairman; Michael Kracht, Vice Chairman; members Tom Kelso and Robert Repko. Others in attendance included Judy Stern Goldstein, Gilmore & Associates; Dan Wood, Board of Supervisors Liaison; Sinclair Salisbury, Director of Code Enforcement and Stephanie J. Mason, Township Manager.

Not present at the meeting was Jill Macauley, member.

The meeting officially began at 7:00 pm.

Public/Commission Comments

None.

Review of Minutes

On a motion by Mr. Kracht, seconded by Mr. Kelso, the June 23, 2025 minutes were unanimously approved.

Presentation

N/A

Land Development

Doylestown Hill – Preliminary Land Development Plan Revised

Present on behalf of the applicant was attorney Dave Shafkowitz. He presented the updated plan for Doylestown Hill which showed a driveway through the property. Based on comments from the Planning Commission and review letters received, it was decided that the driveway plan was appropriate. All additional items in review letters are a will comply, and a waiver letter has been submitted requesting three waivers.

Ms. Hendrixson requested that they go through those waiver requests.

Scott Mill from Van Cleef Engineering summarized those requests with regard to the requirement to show existing features within 400 feet on the plan, widening or providing additional cartway improvements, and the preservation of trees.

Mr. Kelso asked if the second waiver included relief from drainage or curbing as well.

Sam Costanzo, also from Van Cleef, responded that the reviews did not note anything about drainage or curbs, and these items were not requested.

There was a discussion about curbing within the site along the driveway and at the entrance. It was noted that there would be a fee in lieu of should the waiver be granted regarding the widening, drainage, curbing etc. This will be discussed with the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Kracht asked about the traffic study for this project and what was noted in the review letters.

Ms. Mason noted that it was in the packet along with the review letter from traffic engineer Matt Johnston from Pennoni. The applicant noted that it will comply with regard to that review.

Mr. Salisbury asked for clarification with regard to what area is under the control of the homeowners of the townhomes. He asked if they owned any exterior area or if there was opportunity for expansion.

Mr. Mill replied that each townhouse unit owns a ground patio and second floor deck above. The twins own a concrete patio. The rest is common area. Property owners will own the footprint of the home and patio areas.

Mr. Shafkowitz said that they are looking for a recommendation tonight and will go to the Board of Supervisors with a detailed plan.

Mr. Repko made a motion to grant the three waiver requests and preliminary approval, with the condition that under request number 2, they either accommodate or provide a fee in lieu of; in addition, approval is conditional upon compliance with all review letters. Mr. Kracht seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

Doylestown Hill Planning Module

Mr. Kelso made a motion that the Planning Commission recommends the Township Manager sign component 4a for sewage facilities, with the Planning Commission's approval. Mr. Kracht seconded. Motion passed 4-0.

Trinity Gardens at Furlong – Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan

Present on behalf of the applicant was attorney Mark Jonas, and Scott Mill, and Sean McGranahan from Van Cleef Engineering engineers for the project. Mr. Jonas noted that there is a court stipulated agreement for this project, which adds a different layer in how to proceed. This project is a 55+ community, with 124 dwelling units. Review letters are 99% will comply. Additional items are subject to discussion. The applicant is seeking preliminary/final approval.

Mr. Kracht asked if the plan presented is substantially the same as the exhibit attached to the stipulated agreement.

Mr. Jonas replied yes and noted that there will be some variations after detailed engineering.

Ms. Hendrixson asked about the proposed height of the building.

Mr. Mill explained that the height is slightly higher than the previous plan, but it has been discussed in staff meetings with the Township Board of Supervisors and professional staff. He added that one key difference from the previous plan is that there is ground level parking that sits under the first layer of residential housing.

Mr. Jonas noted that as per the stipulated agreement the height will not exceed 50 feet, not including towers for mechanicals or elevator overruns. It was clarified that this will be a four-story building with three stories of housing.

Mr. Repko expressed concern over the traffic flow onto Rogers Road.

Mr. Mill explained that this item was vetted to the extreme with Township Staff and the neighboring community, who expressed great concern over the difficulty and traffic flow in that area. Nothing in that area has changed since the previously approved plan. These items are noted in the stipulated agreement as well.

It was discussed that the plan includes signage to prohibit a right turn from the site onto Rogers Road, but it does not physically prevent it. There was question over whether a configuration to prevent the right turn, i.e. a pork chop or something similar could be added. This will be discussed with the traffic engineer. While the applicant is bound by the stipulated agreement, it will be determined whether a preventative measure can be added, that will not disrupt the agreement but will provide additional safety.

noted that review letters were received from Pennoni, Michael Baker International, Gilmore and Associates, Park and Rec, The Doylestown Township Municipal Authority, the Traffic Engineer from Pennoni and Code Enforcement and the Fire Marshal from the Township. All items noted are generally will comply. He then asked for clarification regarding some items.

Mr. McGranahan noted one waiver request for the sidewalk adjacent to the tennis and pickleball courts to be 4 feet.

There was a discussion regarding maneuverability within the site with regard to the layout of the parking garage. The applicant noted that they will comply with the reviews received. The plan will be reviewed again before going to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Salisbury asked for clarification regarding the Code and Fire Marshal reviews regarding emergency vehicle access. It was noted that the previously approved plan included these items, but that they were removed from the current plan under review. Those items will be added back to the plan and are a will comply.

Mr. Kelso made a motion to recommend preliminary/final land development approval to the Board of Supervisors with the understanding that the applicant has agreed to comply with the Pennoni traffic review letter and Township Engineer review letter, with the understanding that item #7 is a partial waiver and will apply to the sidewalk on the north end of the pickleball courts; and that the Planning Commission recommends that the intersection of the access drive with Rogers Road be redesigned to

incorporate measures to prevent right hand turns onto Rogers Road if possible. Mr. Kracht seconded. Motion passed 4-0.

Sketch Plan

651 N. Shady Retreat Road – Sketch Plan

Present on behalf of the applicant was attorney Kellie McGowan. She noted that the comments taken from the last Planning Commission meeting were focused on the frontage and use of the existing dwelling. The applicant now intends to remove the additional attached units from the original home, and maintain it only as a single-family dwelling, with some expansion of the house. There are 9 additional units to the rear, and there has been some reconfiguration after comments from neighbors. The plan aims to keep as much of the rear in a wooded state as possible. The applicant is here for comments before going to the Zoning Hearing Board for additional relief.

John Sandklev of Mahogany Court asked about the space between his property and the units directly to the back of him. He noted that the wooded area behind them absorbs a lot of water, and he does not want the new development to potentially disturb that and force the water onto his property.

Ms. McGowan replied that there is 58 feet from the rear of the dwelling to the backyard, and there is a 30-foot required buffer, that will be a planted buffer subject to review. The buffer would be maintained by an association. They will look to see if the units in question can be moved slightly more to allow more setback.

Mr. Kracht noted that the updated plan shown captures most of the concerns previously noted. The Planning Commission agreed.

Adjournment

With no other business, the meeting adjourned at 8:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kaitlyn Finley
Office Manager, Code Enforcement