

DOYLESTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

Monday, March 23, 2026 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, March 23, 2026. Members of the Doylestown Township Planning Commission in attendance included Judy Hendrixson, Chairman; Michael Kracht, Vice Chairman; and members Tom Kelso, Robert Repko, and Amy Kaminski. Others in attendance included Judy Stern Goldstein, Planning Consultant, Gilmore & Associates; Jennifer Herring, Board of Supervisors Liaison; and Sinclair Salisbury, Director, Code Enforcement.

The meeting officially began at 7:00 pm.

Public/Commission Comments

None.

Review of Minutes

On a motion by Mr. Repko, seconded by Mr. Kelso, the minutes from the rescheduled February 23rd meeting held on Thursday, March 12th were unanimously approved.

Presentation

N/A

Land Development

Eisold Tract – Preliminary Land Development Plan – TP# 09-014-045

Presenting the plan for the Eisold Tract was attorney John VanLuvanee, from Eastburn & Gray. The site is 26.4 acres on the Neshaminy Creek side of Pebble Hill Road. With one existing house on the plan, the proposal is to subdivide into 8 total lots, about 2 acres each, all with frontage on Pebble Hill Road. All lots will be served by on lot wells and sewage systems. Mr. VanLuvanee noted that the area between this parcel and the Neshaminy Creek is owned by the County, who has plans for a future trail along the creek side, and would like an access to it from Pebble Hill Road. After those discussions, an access was included between lots 4 and 5 on the plan, that would connect to a parking lot for the trail. The plan also includes a 10 foot wide bike path along Pebble Hill Road that meanders along the roadway.

There was a question of an easement with the Township for the bike path outside the road right of way. Sidewalks would be maintained by the property owners, but the bike path would be maintained by the Township.

Mr. VanLuvanee noted the review letter from Pennoni and a few discussion items therein. Most items are will comply, with a couple waivers that would be requested. He added that there were comments from the Code Official with regard to stormwater.

Jason Smeland, Lenape Valley Engineering, explained that based on this type of development, a centralized stormwater basin would not be the best option. Instead, they decided to have multiple small BMPs such as rain gardens on each property. There are instances where water flow and BMPs would be shared by two property owners.

Ms. Goldstein responded that with water flows from one property to another, there becomes an issue with how those easements are enforced. With an HOA, stormwater is handled by one entity, but with different property owners, with shared responsibilities, it can become a problem for the Township.

Mr. Smeland understood the issue and suggested that there would be an operation and maintenance agreement that would spell out those responsibilities. They are confident in the way it is proposed.

Mr. Repko agreed that this may not be the best way to handle stormwater from the Township's view.

Mr. Salisbury suggested that the applicant reach out to Ms. Mason, the Township Manager, to set up a meeting with Township staff to determine the best way to resolve the stormwater issue.

Mr. VanLuvanee then noted the review letter from Gilmore, and said that most items are will comply, with some items of discussion.

There was a discussion regarding the meandering of the bike path and the intent. After meeting with Township staff, this seemed to be what they wanted, and it also allows for saving some of the larger trees on the property. Mr. Salisbury suggested that after looking at it further, a parallel line to the street might be a better option. Mr. Smeland also suggested that it seemed the best option to end the trail before the property line due to a drop in the roadway. There was also a question of the types of trees proposed, and it was decided that the applicant would work with Ms. Goldstein on that.

Ms. Hendrixson asked why the access was put in the middle of the site as opposed to the end, for example, along lot 8.

Mr. Smeland noted that there is an existing farm path there between lots 5 and 6, but that is not usable except for farm equipment, and could cause issues as well. The area between lot 4 and 5 seemed to be the shortest distance to the proposed trail. He added that the trail has been in planning with the county for a long time and nothing is set in stone. He also noted that an access would cause an issue for the neighbor next to lot 8.

Ms. Hendrixson suggested shifting lot lines to make it work.

There was a discussion as to whether the land behind the proposed subdivision would be used. It had previously been farmland and could be used as such, but there doesn't seem to be any intent for that now. Additionally, that land is owned by the County and is largely in a flood plain.

Mr. Kelso suggested a field visit and that this could help resolve the issues presented.

There was a question of the gravel driveway on lot 1 and including it in the impervious coverage calculation. Ms. Goldstein noted that it doesn't have to be included for the stormwater calculation, but

does fall under the definition of impervious for zoning, so should be included in the overall impervious calculation for that.

Mr. VanLuvanee noted the Michael Baker review letter next, and said that those items are will complies, or have already been discussed.

Mr. Smeland expressed their wishes to speak with the Township engineer regarding grades for the driveway, which should be at 8% max, but that they are proposing at 10% max. With discussion, he believes this will still be safe and will work best.

Mr. Kracht suggested showing good cause for each waiver. Mr. VanLuvanee agreed that they would, but wanted the input from the Planning Commission first.

Mr. Salisbury added that having the fewest number of easements and as few as possible on private properties is best, and will be much more simple in the future.

Ms. Goldstein also cautioned the applicant to make sure they are looking at the full canopy with regard to saving trees, to ensure that they are not disturbing any that they wish to save.

Mr. Salisbury added that if the consensus is to save trees, the best thing to do is not meandering the easement, but making it straight across the front so property owners really know where the land is that they can use. It is impossible to mark out a curved and meandering easement.

Ms. Hendrixson opened the discussion to questions from the audience.

Ajeay Atre from Pebble Hill Road, said that he is the neighbor next to lot 8, and has spoken with the development team, and believes they will address his concerns. He noted that his main concerns are privacy, noting the way his property sits, and the access road question, which would significantly impact his property.

Mr. Kelso suggested that Mr. Atre attend the site visit as well, which is a public meeting and will be advertised.

Mr. Kracht questioned how the houses are tipped.

Mr. Smeland noted that the houses are fairly conceptual at this time. They will be custom houses, and their orientation could be angled differently.

A site visit will be planned with the Planning Commission and applicant, and will be advertised.

925 Sandy Ridge Road – Sketch Plan

Scott Mill from VanCleeef Engineering presented the proposed sketch plan, the intent of which is an informal discussion prior to a formal review. He noted some changes to the plan that had been before the Planning Commission about a year ago. Further, this property now has a new owner. The property is a 10-acre lot off of Sandy Ridge Road, close to Sterling Crest Court and Oak Leaf Lane. They are proposing a B9 use, which would allow for lot averaging and more open space. Eight lots are proposed,

22,000 square foot minimum for each lot. The proposed cul de sac would be more consistent with Oak Leaf Lane. There would be two open space areas, totaling about 4 acres. There is also a question of the pond on the property and how it will be used within the site. Additionally, a path is proposed with a connection off Sterling Crest.

Mr. Kelso noted that the small piece of property at the end of Sterling Crest is owned by the developer still, according to the Board of Assessment, and not the HOA. He suggested checking on that.

There was a discussion regarding the condition of the pond and its capabilities. Mr. Mill said these details have not been looked at yet.

Ms. Hendrixson suggested using an existing drive out to Oak Leaf for lot 2 in order to simplify curb cuts. Additionally, she noted putting stormwater on lot 7 instead of lot 3.

Mr. Mill said they would look into both items.

Mr. Kracht asked whether they had discussed the pond in the past and its utilization as a water feature. There was discussion as to the use of the pond area, whether it would have public access, or designed for the development only. Ultimately it was determined that the condition of the pond needs to be evaluated. Ms. Goldstein added that the Township would not want ownership of it with a water feature.

There was also some question of the farmhouse on the property and its historical significance. It was noted that while there is some cultural significance, a study showed that it does not have any architectural significance. All buildings currently on the property will be demolished.

Ms. Goldstein brought attention to lot 4 and the setbacks as proposed. She said that the Township Zoning Officer noted that it should be a 50 foot setback, where the plan shows just over 15. The question is whether this is a side yard or rear yard.

Ms. Hendrixson opened the discussion to the audience.

Bruce Roberts of Sterling Crest Court, asked for clarification regarding the setback on lot 4. He also commented about the open space and land for public use, which throws a red flag up for the neighbors. They would need clarification as to how it would be used with public access.

Steve McComas of Sterling Crest Court noted that the property has been an eye sore with trash and upkeep. Some items have been handled and he is thankful for that, but he added that as soon as the buildings could be torn down, he would appreciate it.

Rachel Stein of Sterling Crest Court said that her property is the one that abuts the lot with the short setback. She is also not fond of the cut through on the dead end like that. She added that the pond is really not a pond or water feature, but is a mess. The whole thing grows when it rains, and there are serious stormwater issues there. She also noted the privacy fence along the length of the property which is falling down and some trees that also need to be taken down. There are people living in the buildings who are very disruptive. All these issues need to be taken care of as soon as possible.

Ms. Hendrixson suggested that the residents attend a site visit with the Planning Commission and the applicant.

Ms. Goldstein noted that many of these items are part of code enforcement rather than land development. With regard to the plan, many of these items are in flux and will be flushed out.

Maryann Bianco of Sterling Crest Court, said that she is also the president of the HOA. She said that their concerns are the wetlands and drainage issues, and they don't want more water to be managed back there. The HOA maintains the property in the rear and another small patch, which she and another neighbor do at no cost to the HOA. She notes the same concerns of her neighbors and that the property is a dump, with many people living there, feral cats and rodents, and needs to be remedied soon.

Ms. Hendrixson replied that with stormwater, they have to make the situation better, not add to it.

Kevin Evans of Sterling Crest Court questioned an access point along the back of the fence, which was determined to be from a former plan, not the current sketch plan. He also noted that the drainage is horrible at the site.

Sean Mason of Sandy Ridge Road asked if they would get notice of the field visit.

Ms. Hendrixson said that it will be advertised but to check with the Township.

It was asked whether the neighbors could get a copy of the plan. It was suggested that once a formal plan is submitted, they can have a copy, though the Township will probably defer to the developer.

Ms. Hendrixson said that they will try to schedule the field visit before the applicant comes back before the Planning Commission.

Other Business

Plumstead Township 2026 Comprehensive Plan Update

Mr. Kelso said that he looked at the border that is shared with Plumstead and sees no issues. The plan reflects common interests to those of the Township.

Mr. Kelso made a motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that they send a letter of support to the Plumstead Township for their comp plan. Mr. Repko seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

Adjournment

With no other business, the meeting adjourned at 8:52 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kaitlyn Finley
Office Manager, Code Enforcement