

DOYLESTOWN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

Monday, June 22, 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, June 22, 2026. Members of the Doylestown Township Planning Commission in attendance included Judy Hendrixson, Chairman; and members Tom Kelso, Robert Repko and Amy Kaminski. Others in attendance included Judy Stern Goldstein, Planning Consultant, Gilmore & Associates; Libby Naughton, Township Solicitor; Dan Wood, Board of Supervisors Liaison; and Stephanie Mason, Township Manager.

Not in attendance was Michael Kracht, Vice Chairman.

The meeting officially began at 7:00 pm.

Public/Commission Comments

None.

Review of Minutes

On a motion by Mr. Kelso, seconded by Ms. Kaminsky, the May 26, 2026 minutes were unanimously approved.

Land Development

Doylestown Country Club – Minor Final Subdivision – TP# 09-009-088

Presenting the plan on behalf of the applicant was attorney Dan Lyons. Also present was engineer Jeffrey Brown from VanCleaf Engineering. The applicant is presenting a plan for a minor subdivision on the East Road side of the property. The parcel is approximately 22 acres, and the goal is to subdivide it into two parcels, one 17 acres, and the other 5 acres. The 17-acre parcel would then be consolidated into another parcel belonging to the Country Club. A first set of review letters have been received, the plan was revised, and then a second set of reviews were received. Those reviews were quite clean, and all items will comply, with the exception of some waivers and deferral requests. The applicant is not proposing to develop at this time, only subdivide for that 5 acres. They are seeking a recommendation for preliminary final approval.

Mr. Brown presented the proposed plans. Site capacity calculations and a conceptual grading plan were shown to work from a construction standpoint, but it was noted that this is just a concept at this time.

Mr. Brown noted each of the waiver requests:

SALDO Section 153.24.A.2 – Regarding road improvements requested, any further improvements would have negative impact to natural resources.

SALDO Section 153.24.B.2.c – Regarding grading and cartway width, these would cause unnecessary impact to existing resources.

SALDO Section 153.26.A.3 – With regard to curbs, this would also cause unnecessary impact to natural resources.

SALDO Section 153.37.C.1 – With regard to providing for suitable or adequate recreation space, a fee in lieu is proposed, as this is a small lot, with a limited number of dwellings.

Mr. Brown spoke on the deferral requests:

SALDO Section 153.34.B.1 – Overall landscaping requirements with regard to street trees and buffers, all could be met with the preservation of existing trees and new plantings as part of site improvements.

SALDO Section 153.34.B.3 – Street trees, to be planted where suitable street trees do not exist.

SALDO Section 153.34.1 – Woodlands and tree preservation requirements.

SALDO Section 153.35 – Tree protection standards.

SALDO Section 153.35.A.(1) – The tree protection area that is delineated on the site prior to construction shall conform to the approved development plans.

SALDO Section 148.22.B.(4) – A soil erosion and sediment control plan, where applicable, as prepared for and submitted to the approval authority.

SALDO Section 148.31.A – Applicant shall provide a financial guarantee to the Township for timely installation and proper construction of all stormwater management facilities required.

It was noted that the deferrals requested are because the property is to be sold off, and details may change with a new owner. These items would be handled through the land development process.

Ms. Goldstein cautioned that there are certain things that need to be resolved in this stage.

Mr. Lyons said that there would be a deferral agreement between the developer and the Township stating that these items will be addressed by the next property owner, who will need to show compliance at the time of land development.

Ms. Goldstein added that woodland protection cannot be deferred. The plan needs to show what would and would not be disturbed, and also the buffer that would be conveyed.

Mr. Brown noted that they are not trying to cut trees down at this time, so it would essentially be 100% preservation.

There was a discussion of what existing trees would count towards a buffer and whether new plantings would be required.

Ms. Goldstein said that these items need to be documented on the plan, including the calculation for a buffer. She stated that the buffer is on the Country Club side, not the new lot side. The applicant has to do something as part of subdivision and also show that the plan meets woodland requirements.

Mr. Brown said that they can show calculations that can make it work.

Ms. Goldstein noted that notes on the plan negate what they are showing.

There was a discussion over whether this could be solved with a conservation easement, but it was noted that the plan itself needs to show compliance in order to avoid future issues for the new property owner. The subdivided lot needs to show compliance.

Ms. Hendrixson added that the plan needs to show the 50% undisturbed area in order to be compliant, as well as how they are building up the buffer between the two properties. Or they can indicate that there is an existing buffer that complies.

Mr. Kelso said that he has no real concerns over the subdivision but did express concerns over the deferrals. He understood that there can be changes when permits are applied for, but that in this stage, the Planning Commission needs to know what to expect. It also avoids a future owner coming in and finding out that they can't build how they want to or get certain permits. There are valid reasons to go through these other factors at this time. It doesn't affect what they want to do, it's just that more information is needed.

There was a question about whether the consolidation of parcels will avoid some of the need for waivers. It was determined that some could go away, but likely not all.

It was asked whether the calculations on the plan show compliance. Ms. Goldstein said in theory, yes, but it is not shown on the plan what areas are designated.

Ms. Hendrixson added that the plan has to show what areas can't be built.

It was clarified that the plan needs to show a buffer on the club side. Ms. Goldstein said yes, between residential and nonresidential a buffer is required under zoning.

Mr. Lyons wished to reiterate that they are not indicating noncompliance, or that the future owner would not comply.

Mr. Brown added that they don't want to be locked in on something that could be changed by the future owner.

Ms. Naughton clarified that you can't create a subdivision that is not compliant, that is the issue. The applicant needs to prove that it is compliant before we approve a subdivision plan.

It was additionally noted that the buffer may be dense enough as it exists. This will be looked into.

Mr. Kelso asked where the applicant stands with the sewage permit.

Mr. Brown said that it has been submitted, but they have not heard back yet.

Ms. Mason added that the planning modules need to be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

It was summarized that the buffer and woodland protection requirements are the two zoning issues to be looked into and shown on the plan. The applicant needs to delineate the buffer and the 50% woodland to be saved. Even if the future owner wishes to change it, this plan needs to show compliance now.

The applicant agreed to come back with the items noted. The plan was tabled.

Ritter/Mandart Lot Line Change – Minor Subdivision – TP# 09-046-028 & TP# 09-046-028.1

Presenting the plan for the applicant was engineer Landon Woodward. The plan presents a lot line adjustment between two residential properties. The first lot sits at 4.71 acres, and they are proposing to reduce it to 1.84 acres. The second lot sits at 1.47 acres and will increase to 4.55 acres. The owner of lot 1 intends to sell his property, and in order to preserve it and prevent future building, the owner of lot 2 wishes to purchase part of it.

Mr. Woodward said that they believe they are in compliance with all zoning issues and noted an existing nonconformity with the driveway that is to remain the same. They are asking for a waiver with regard to street trees and sidewalks. Impervious coverage calculations are also noted, showing that both lots will remain under the 20% limit.

Ms. Goldstein asked about the existing easements and noted that they will be split between owners.

Mr. Woodward said that is accurate, they will not be changing the locations of the easements.

Ms. Naughton asked if they would update the recording of the easements in each deed. She further added that each owner will need to record a new deed.

Mr. Mandart, the property owner to receive the additional acreage, commented that he likes the plan.

Mr. Kelso made a motion to recommend preliminary/final approval with the understanding that the driveway issue is considered an existing nonconformity, and that the applicant will prepare necessary deeds for each individual property and address ownership of easements and will comply with the review letters provided. Mr. Repko seconded. Motion passed 4-0.

Other Business

137 Pebble Woods Drive – Planning Module

Ms. Mason explained that this is an old existing lot in the Pebble Woods area, and the purchasers want to develop it. The owner is having trouble getting a traditional on lot system, so they are proposing a different type of sewage disposal. There is a detailed report in the Commission's packet, and the Township is looking for approval before processing.

Mr. Kelso noted that he questioned DEP about this, and all of his questions were answered. He made a motion to recommend that the Township proceed with having Ms. Mason fill out the planning component 4a as usual, and that the Board of Supervisors proceed with submission of the module to DEP. Ms. Kaminski seconded. Motion passed 4-0.

Proposed Zoning Amendment – Chapter 175 Establishing B-15.2 Use Ordinance and Zoning Map Amendment for tax parcel 09-009-066-001.

Ms. Goldstein recused herself from the discussion. Craig Bryson from Pennoni acted as planning consultant.

Ms. Mason said that regarding the upcoming advertisement of the ordinance, the Planning Commission needs to make a review and recommendation to the BOS.

Mr. Kelso asked if the Planning Commission's comments to the BOS made the final draft.

Ms. Naughton said yes, they were all incorporated.

There was a discussion as to whether the term "preservation" should be defined under zoning.

Mr. Bryson said that it is defined under SALDO, and being that it is a conditional use, and those conditions have to be met, it isn't necessary to define it under zoning, as that can create more issues.

Ms. Kaminski made a motion to recommend approval of the changes to this section of the ordinance by adding B-15-2 to the RI Zoning District as well as the map amendment of the property from I-2 to R-1 to the Board of Supervisors. Ms. Hendrixson seconded. Motion passed 3-1 with Mr. Kelso, voting nay.

Adjournment

With no other business, the meeting adjourned at 8:06 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kaitlyn Finley
Office Manager, Code Enforcement