

## **DOYLESTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION**

### **Regular Meeting**

**Monday, June 23, 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, June 23, 2025. Members of the Doylestown Township Planning Commission in attendance included Judy Hendrixson, Chairman; Michael Kracht, Vice Chairman; members Tom Kelso and Jill Macauley. Others in attendance included Judy Stern Goldstein, Gilmore & Associates; Dan Wood, Board of Supervisors Liaison and Stephanie J. Mason, Township Manager.

Not present at the meeting was Robert Repko.

The meeting officially began at 7:00 pm.

### **Public/Commission Comments**

None.

### **Review of Minutes**

On a motion by Mr. Kracht, seconded by Ms. Macauley, the May 27, 2025, minutes were unanimously approved.

### **Presentation**

N/A

### **Land Development**

#### **33 Neill Drive aka Mesiter Property – Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan**

Kevin Reilly, VP of County Builders, presented the plan for 33 Neill Drive. Also present was Rob Cunningham from Holmes Cunningham, the design engineer for the project. This project has been discussed with the Township and neighbors for over three years and has been before the Planning Commission several times, including discussing a carriage home overlay for the C4 zoning district. They have since received approval from the Board of Supervisors for the overlay and are back to request preliminary/final approval. The plan includes 23 market rate townhomes, each two story with a basement. They will be supplied by public water and sewer. The main access will be off Ferry Road, and there will be an emergency access out to Neill Drive. They have received review letters from the fire marshal and code official, and all other review letters from Township consultants are a will comply, with the exception of a few waiver requests. It was noted that this plan does not show a public amenity space, which it should. Two options were discussed for the space, which would include a gazebo or pavilion and some benches. There are also sidewalks throughout the community and along the property frontage to connect the community to Fountainville Village.

It was discussed that the best location for the amenity space is along the Boulevard area in the middle of the property. It will be a greenspace and has some utilities running through it.

Ms. Goldstein noted that all amenities should be shown on the plan including the mailbox area.

Ms. Hendrixson asked about the landscape plan and if it is expected to remain the same.

Mr. Cunningham said the overall concept would remain the same but that they would work with Ms. Goldstein and do an on-site visit to work through some questions.

Mr. Kracht asked if the applicant has met with PennDOT yet. He noted some concern about the signal at 313 and Ferry Road. Ms. Mason noted some requests for a left turn signal on Ferry have been made to the Township.

Mr. Reilly said they have an application out in the Penn Dot Portal system and have received approval regarding trip generation and access locations. He added that they are considering changes to the traffic signal and have to go through a full traffic study and HOP process. They are at the mercy of PennDOT for those updates. They also have a revised traffic impact study and will send it to the Township traffic engineer.

Mr. Kelso asked for specifics regarding a waiver concerning trees on the site.

Mr. Cunningham agreed to spell those things out.

Mr. Kelso noted an item in the review letters about a crosswalk for lots near the entrance to cross both lanes of traffic.

Mr. Reilly replied that this would be added in, and they are considering the best placement.

There was a discussion of adding speed humps for traffic calming. It was noted that speed humps can cause noise for neighbors, but that speed tables might work better. The applicant will discuss this with the Township's traffic engineer.

Mr. Kelso asked about the Swamp Road frontage and replacing the sidewalk to accommodate a wider multi-use trail.

Mr. Cunningham suggested that if it could fit, they would work it out but do need to consider the trees along that frontage.

It was noted that the trail and sidewalks would be maintained by an HOA.

There was a discussion about the street through the property and how it functions like a cul-de-sac or "P loop" as noted. The streets are 24-foot lanes, which are larger than required, and made that way for easier driveway entry and exit. There will be no on-street parking.

Mr. Kelso suggested bump outs where the crosswalks are in an attempt to calm traffic.

Mr. Reilly said they would look into this.

Mr. Kelso noted the comments from the Bucks County Planning Commission for shared driveways.

Mr. Reilly responded that the market prefers these homes to feel like they are detached, which means no shared driveways. There will be a grass strip between them, but a curb depression the whole length.

Mr. Kracht asked about firetruck templates on the turns.

Mr. Cunningham said yes, they ran through the main access and emergency access.

Mr. Kracht asked about the proposed facades.

Mr. Reilly said they are in development stage with that, but that they will likely be brick and stone. These will be a luxury product, likely in the \$900,000 range.

It was decided that the applicant would be back with a revised plan that includes the amenities discussed and will request preliminary/final approval at that time.

### **Sketch Plan**

#### **651 N. Shady Retreat Road**

Present on behalf of applicant Triumph Building Group was attorney Kellie McGowan and engineer Rob Cunningham. They presented plans for a B4 townhouse development that included 12 units, one of which is a historic home on the property that would be preserved, as suggested by Township staff as it is on the Township's list of historic homes. The homes would be accessed by Shady Retreat Road along a cul-de-sac. The plan presents increased setbacks and buffers and maintains much of the woodlands on the property and now moves water and sewer access out to the front of the property to avoid disturbing the woodlands. Some variances would be required with regard to the use and the historic home.

Ms. Hendrixson asked for an explanation of how the historic house fits in.

Ms. McGowan said that it would be attached to units 2 and 3, and they would build off its façade.

There was a discussion of the historic home which could present an existing nonconformity, and whether this should extend to the units attached to it.

Mr. Kelso expressed dislike over this idea.

It was noted that if the Planning Commission is not happy with that then they would consider other options that include preserving the home. They are here for feedback.

Ms. Mason provided a summary of the Township's 1988 historic site survey. At the time there was a list put together of historic sites, which the Planning Commission put together and the Board of Supervisors approved by resolution. The house in question would have been torn down as a result of the last approved plan for this property, but now there is an opportunity to save it.

It was noted that preserving the house is a favorable idea, but that the variances needed for attaching it to other units might not be desirable. It was proposed that this structure stand alone.

Ms. McGowan said they can look at moving units 2 and 3, but they don't want to impede the neighbors anymore by changing the plan.

Joan Zalucki from 410 Mahogany Court asked for clarification of who the applicant was and who owned the property.

Ms. McGowan explained that Triumph Building Group is the equitable owner, and that they are the applicant. They would be the developer and builder of the project.

Ms. Zalucki noted the wetlands at the back of the property and the major water issue there.

Ms. McGowan explained that they have done everything to push the development away from this area and noted that all setbacks are measured from the area of the resource.

Ms. Zalucki asked about the buffer and how they would maintain privacy for the neighbors, which has been a huge benefit to their properties.

Ms. McGowan said that here is a 30-foot buffer along those homes, but that the buffer plan is not fully developed yet. Mr. Cunningham added that the plan would be to supplement the trees that would be saved with evergreens to create a twelve-month buffer.

It was noted that the wetland area has robust wildlife back there too.

John Sandklev from 406 Mahogany Court asked if the lots directly behind his property could be pushed back somewhat. They are the closest lots to any neighbors.

Ms. McGowan noted the concern and said they would look at it. They appreciate all feedback from the Planning Commission and will consider the concerns.

Prior to adjournment, Ms. Hendrixson noted the title of a book that was recommended at the last meeting, "Paved Paradise" which addresses the issues of parking amounts and circulation.

Ms. Mason also noted that she had the Barn Plaza Planning Module which required a motion to move forward. Mr. Kracht made the motion, which was seconded by Mr. Kelso. Motion passed 4-0.

### **Adjournment**

With no other business, the meeting adjourned at 8:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kaitlyn Finley  
Office Manager, Code Enforcement