

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
PLANNING COMMISSION
MAY 9, 2022

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on May 9, 2022. Mr. Bruch called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Those present:

Planning Commission: Ross Bruch, Chair
 Adrian Costello, Vice Chair
 Dawn Stern, Secretary
 Tony Bush, Member

Others: James Majewski, Community Development Director
 Dan McLoone, Planner
 Barbara Kirk, Township Solicitor
 Andrew Pockl, Township Engineer
 Daniel Grenier, Supervisor Liaison

Absent: Tejinder Gill, Planning Commission Member

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Bush moved and Mr. Costello seconded to approve the February 7, 2022 Minutes as written. Motion carried with Ms. Stern abstained.

#686 – GIAGNACOVA MINOR SUBDIVISION
Tax Parcel #20-042-109
R-2 Residential Medium Density Zoning District
Makefield Road, 1 Sutphin Road, Fayette Drive

Proposed plan to subdivide the property to create one new 0.42 acre single-family lot and a 1.69 acre remainder lot containing the two existing single-family dwellings and outbuildings

Mr. Majewski stated the property is located at the intersection of Sutphin Road and Makefield Road directly north and across the street from the Lutheran Church. Currently the property has two houses on it, and they are proposing to subdivide off one more lot from the property. He stated they obtained Variances from the Zoning Hearing Board as noted in the letter from Remington & Vernick.

Ms. Kirk stated here are certain Conditions that the Zoning Hearing Board imposed on the property as part of the proposed Subdivision. She stated all of those Conditions were reduced to a Declaration of Restrictions which she did not realize had not yet been circulated to the Planning Commission members. She stated if the Subdivision were to occur as proposed one lot will have two Residential buildings on it; and as a result, the Conditions will effect that lot so that there will not be any non-Residential use on that lot of any nature which would eliminate any short-term rentals, boarding houses, etc. She stated that lot will retain its Residential character as required under the Zoning Ordinance. She stated the Declaration of Restrictions is to be Recorded before any Final Subdivision Plan would be approved and Recorded at the Recorder of Deeds.

Mr. Bruch asked if long-term rentals would be permitted; and Ms. Kirk stated if there were to be a family member or someone wanting to live there and rent the property from the property owner, they could. She stated the restriction is to prevent a constant turn-over of tenants at the property. Mr. Bruch stated he assumes twelve months would qualify as a long-term rental, and Ms. Kirk agreed. Mr. Bruch asked if that document will be provided to the Planning Commission, and Ms. Kirk e-mailed it to the Commission at this time.

Mr. Bush asked what would be considered a short-term rental versus a long-term rental. Ms. Kirk stated the essence of the Restriction was to make sure that the Residential character of the property remains in effect. She stated a short-term Rental would be like an Airbnb where someone comes for a weekend or if it were to be used as a boarding house for a week or two weeks. She stated a long-term rental would be the owner having another family or individual living there for a long term. Mr. Bush asked more specifically the timeframe for what would be considered a long-term rental, and he asked if it would be six months, three months, etc.; and Ms. Kirk stated they just used the definition as set forth under the Zoning Ordinance, and she was not sure if there was any set timeframe. She stated they wanted to reflect on the frequency of people coming in and out.

Mr. Grenier stated the term “short-term rental” is a term that the Township has addressed for other reasons in the past. He asked if the definition that Ms. Kirk is referring to is consistent with that, and Ms. Kirk agreed. She added that the whole premise was to assure that anyone who lived at that property was using it as a primary residence whether they are the actual owner or are renting it from the owner. She stated it is to prohibit somebody from renting a room or indicating that the house could be used for a weekend for a vacation getaway, etc.

Mr. Costello asked what it is about this property that makes this such an issue, and Ms. Kirk stated when the property is subdivided, the one lot will have two houses on it as there are already two houses that exist; and the way they are subdividing it, it will create one lot with two separate houses. Ms. Kirk stated the new lot will have a new house constructed on it, and the remaining lot will have the two existing houses. Mr. Costello asked if at the Zoning Hearing Board anyone asked why they would not subdivide it into three lots; and Ms. Kirk stated she does not feel that came up. She stated she believes it had to do with the size of the property and the setbacks. Mr. Costello stated if they were to sell the one lot, it would have two homes on it, and Ms. Kirk agreed. Mr. Costello stated this is not a normal Residential piece of property that will transact in the Township unless it is subdivided in the future or sold to a developer who takes down the two houses and builds something else, and Ms. Kirk agreed. She stated that was the driving force behind having a Restriction placed on that lot.

Mr. Bruch stated if the existing property were to be sold with no changes it would be sold as one property with two residences on it, and Ms. Kirk agreed.

Mr. Bruch stated the Variances that were sought were due to the fact that the one remaining property that was carved off does not currently meet all of the standards necessary for a Subdivision. Ms. Kirk stated the new Lot #2 would not meet the minimum lot width or side yard setbacks, so Variances were required. She stated otherwise, they meet all other requirements for Subdivision under the Zoning regulations. Mr. Pockl stated he believes there was also the need for a front yard setback Variance. Mr. Michael Grantner, for the Applicant, stated it was for the 80' front setback.

Mr. Costello asked if they would be able to have subdivided if they just took the corner lot and subdivided that into a separate property which would then not require Variances. He stated they tried to "squeeze it on one side when they had more room on the other." Ms. Kirk stated she does not recall the reason they did that. Mr. Albert Giagnacova, property owner, stated that they felt it would be more consistent with the character of the neighborhood the way they are proposing it. He stated they also wanted to maintain the privacy of the Victorian on the side street and not have a new house in front of that front yard. He showed what they are proposing on the aerial.

Mr. Bruch stated he understands that there is no issue with impervious coverage. He stated he saw in the Zoning Hearing Board Minutes that there was discussion about Impervious coverage and there were some additional modifications to some

of the calculations in terms of impervious area. He asked if it is still satisfactory. Mr. Pockl stated he had a discussion with the design engineer last week who indicated that they would make the necessary adjustments to the Plans and the calculations to make it a “will comply.” He stated as they have shown it, the proposed driveway is made of crushed stone, and the Applicant indicated that was not an impervious area. Mr. Pockl stated as our Ordinance indicates if it is a permeable pavement system, 50% of that can be counted as pervious and 50% impervious so they would have to make the necessary adjustment.

Mr. Bruch asked if the property will meet the stands having the 50% addition from the driveway. Mr. Pockl stated in order to meet the requirements, they could adjust the configuration of the driveway. He stated they also have a proposed shed that is going in in the back which they could make smaller, and they could also make the house smaller. He stated he is confident that they can make the necessary Plan adjustments to get it under the maximum.

Mr. Bruch stated the Planning Commission’s duty is not to “fight the Zoning Hearing Board’s battles;” however, that was asked and dismissed as not an issue at the Zoning Hearing Board, but what they are now seeing is that it is not as clear as was portrayed at that meeting which gives him concern.

Ms. Kirk stated at that meeting they came in with a proposed Plan, but she does not know if they had all of the calculations set out; and they wanted to move forward to see what they could get. She stated if it turns out that they do not meet the impervious surface calculations as required, their Subdivision will not go through unless they either comply and meet it or get the appropriate Zoning relief from the Zoning Hearing Board for impervious surface.

Mr. Gartner stated they will be able to re-adjust the size of the stormwater management BMP to account for the 50% so that will not be an issue.

Mr. Pockl stated the maximum impervious area for the Lot is 18%, and the proposed at this point is at 16.9%; and the question is with the addition of 50% of the driveway area, are they still under 18% or will they have to make adjustments to the Plan to meet that 18%. Mr. Edwin Reimon, for the Applicant, stated they will meet the 18%. Mr. Gartner stated they will go back and verify that with the size of the driveway. Ms. Kirk stated there is a “cheat sheet” on how to calculate impervious surface coverage so they can do the actual square footage and determine whether it is 18% or less. Mr. Reimon stated they used the formula that was provided on the Website.

Mr. Bruch stated that driveway will never be permitted to be paved in a traditional fashion that would raise it beyond the maximum. Mr. Pockl stated there would be a stormwater management best management practice, and there would be an Operations and Maintenance Agreement that is included.

Mr. Bruch stated he is not concerned about the current owners because they are well aware of this, but he is concerned about future owners who would not be as well aware of that requirement and the inability to pave. Mr. Pockl stated the Stormwater Operations and Maintenance Agreement would be attached to the Deed and go with the Deed in any sale of the property. Ms. Kirk stated those Agreements will be Recorded at the Bucks County Recorder of Deeds so that there is notice of the restrictions.

Mr. Bush asked if someone were to pave the driveway in the future, what could the Township do about it. Ms. Kirk stated the Township would issue a Notice of Violation and either have them take up part of the driveway or, depending upon the nature of the Stormwater Management Ordinance in effect at the time, have them install additional stormwater management facilities on the property. Mr. Grantner stated a Permit would be needed to pave the driveway and an Application would have to be filed at which point it could be deemed it would not be permitted.

Mr. Pockl stated the Plans show existing sidewalk along the frontages of the entire Lot; but there is not an existing sidewalk – it is a proposed sidewalk. He stated in his discussions with the design engineer, he indicated to the design engineer that most likely because that was the Plan that was reviewed by the Zoning Hearing Board that any change to that Plan or removal of that sidewalk would necessitate another review by the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Pockl stated he believes it would be the preference of the Township that we would require the sidewalk as part of the Subdivision Plan.

Mr. Majewski stated the proposed subdivided Lot actually has an impervious surface area of 24%, and 18% is for the much larger Lot because the impervious surface is based on the Lot size. He stated the smaller Lot has the larger percentage impervious surface than the much bigger Lot. He stated it is 18% for the large Lot and 24% for the small Lot.

Mr. Bruch asked if any other properties near this one on Makefield Road have sidewalks in front of them, and would this be a stand-alone sidewalk.

Mr. Majewski stated there is sidewalk that goes all along Makefield Road from Big Oak Road past the Pennwood Middle School, and up to the Lutheran

Church and then it stops. He stated this would continue it an additional 350' up the road and get it closer to closing gap to eventually get to Makefield Elementary School. Mr. Costello stated he looked on Google maps, and on that side of the road on Sutphin, it looks like the sidewalk is on the other side of the street. He asked if they want to go down the side of the subject property. Mr. Majewski agreed that the sidewalk is on the other side of the road there, but this would allow people from Fayette Drive and that neighborhood to get on the sidewalk and continue on down. Ms. Stern stated the existing sidewalk is on the Church side, and Mr. Pockl agreed.

Mr. Pockl stated when he spoke with the Applicant's design engineer last week, they indicated that the remaining items in the review letter dated April 22 would be "will comply." He asked the Applicants if that is still the case, and Mr. Grantner stated it is.

Mr. Costello stated he understands that the setback Variances have been approved already, and Mr. Majewski agreed. Ms. Kirk stated she does not have a record that they received a Variance for the front yard setback, and her records show that it was side yard and Lot width, and not front yard. Mr. Majewski stated Ordinance #200-63 allows for an exception for front yard setbacks in that if you are following the existing setbacks for existing homes on either side of the property, you are not required to push a house back so that there would not be a staggered look with one house set back at 67' and the other at 65', and you would be pushing it back to 80'. He stated they are in line with the other houses. He stated if there was no Variance granted for the front yard setback that is because it was not needed because of the exception for the existing alignments of the houses on either side so that the houses are all in a row. Ms. Kirk stated that would also involve the setback of 80' from the right-of-way of Makefield Road, and Mr. Majewski agreed. Ms. Kirk stated therefore those two items as noted on Page 3 are not required, and Mr. Majewski agreed.

Mr. Costello asked if the 7' setback from the garage was approved, and Ms. Kirk agreed.

Mr. Bush stated because something was approved for a Variance, that does not mean that the Planning Commission has to agree with that recommendation. Mr. Majewski stated they are held to that Variance. He stated it was approved, and the Planning Commission has no power to weigh in on that. Ms. Kirk agreed adding it was an independent body that granted the Variance. Mr. Bush

stated if this had come before the Planning Commission before it went to the Zoning Hearing Board, the Planning Commission could have weighed in on it, and Ms. Kirk agreed.

Mr. Costello stated from Google maps it seems that they will essentially be reconstructing the garage since it shows a street-facing entrance on the drawings, but there are two windows there on the existing structure. Ms. Kirk stated based on what they said at the Zoning Hearing Board that garage was supposed to remain. Mr. Costello stated he assumes that they are going to re-construct it so that the doors are on the front. Mr. Bruch asked the Applicants if the existing garage is being ripped down and be re-built, and Mr. Giagnacova stated it is not. Mr. Bruch asked how they will change it from east to west to north to south, and Mr. Giagnacova stated the garage will be re-constructed so that the garage doors will be going from the east to west side to north to south. Mr. Bruch stated it will therefore be re-built, and Mr. Giagnacova stated they are “taking out windows, sealing the windows, and cutting a hole in the existing area where the windows were.” Mr. Majewski stated the intent is to have the garage come out the front like it is shown on the Plan with the new doors where the driveway is. Mr. Costello stated they are keeping the roof and the slab, and they are re-doing all of the walls to accommodate a front-entrance rather than a side-entrance. It was noted it is just two of the walls.

Mr. Grenier asked Mr. Majewski if there is anything in the Ordinance where there is some percentage of a re-build that would push you into having to follow the same rules as a new build. Mr. Majewski stated he does not believe there is.

Ms. Stern asked Ms. Kirk who approved the Declaration of Restrictions. Ms. Kirk stated she did, and she had her partner at the firm who does Real Estate work look it over as well. Ms. Kirk stated it was drafted by the attorney representing the property owners at the time of Zoning, but she has since reviewed, modified it, and circulated it as the final version which is what she e-mailed to the Planning Commission. Ms. Stern asked who else was it circulated to at the Township, and Ms. Kirk stated she believes that Mr. Majewski may have been involved and it was the Conditions of the Zoning approval that they were matching.

Mr. Bruch noted the letter received from March 13, 2022 from Tom Roche, the Traffic Safety Officer, who commented on the line of sight with regard to the corner property; and he had suggested removing some of the existing bushes on Makefield. Mr. Bruch stated there is also a recommendation for street trees to be added, and he asked how they “marry” those two issues to

one another. Mr. Reimon noted the “height of sight” of 3.5’ coming off the driveway; and anything from zero to 3.5 or a little bit more than that is considered an obstruction to sight distance so all of the shrubs that are within the sight triangle that are between zero and 3.5 are obstructions to sight distance and should be removed. He stated when you plant trees, the trees are typically 2 ½” to 3 ½” caliper, and the canopy tree is about 7’ high so they are above sight distance. He added the trees will also be set back.

Mr. Grenier stated there will also be a sidewalk in that same general area, and the street trees would be on the house side of the sidewalk which would further improve the sight line, and Mr. Pockl and Mr. Majewski agreed.

Mr. Bruch stated there were a number of near neighbors who had numerous comments at the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Bush moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of Plan #686 Giagnacova Minor Subdivision subject to entry of the Declaration of Covenants and Restrictions provided by Ms. Kirk, subject to full compliance with the Remington Vernick April 22 review letter, and subject to issues discussed in the Traffic Safety Officer’s recommendations about the line of sight.

There was no one from the public wishing to speak on this matter.

Mr. Costello seconded.

Ms. Stern asked if they will entertain what the “objections were or do they have to be on-line.” Ms. Kirk asked which objections Ms. Stern was referring to, and Ms. Stern stated she understood there were comments from neighbors.

Mr. Bruch stated he had commented that at the Zoning Hearing Board a number of neighbors took issue with the proposed Subdivision, but that is not an issue for the Planning Commission. He stated this is a public forum, and the public could have come forward and repeated those same objections.

Mr. Majewski added that some of the objections had to do with the existing use of the property at the existing house, and that has been taken up partly in the Declaration of Covenants on the property. Mr. Costello stated this is in the area where there were issues several years ago. Mr. Grenier stated that was a short-term lodging issue for another property in the area.

Mr. Costello stated while he will approve this to get it moving forward, he is not sure what they are approving since it has already been approved. Ms. Kirk stated it has not been approved, and they have only received Zoning relief in

order to proceed with Subdivision; and they are now in front of the Planning Commission to get comments and recommendations with respect to the Subdivision Plan. Mr. Bruch stated he believe that Mr. Costello is saying that in light of all of the Variances that have been approved there is less to debate about on this particular Subdivision proposal, and Mr. Costello agreed.

Mr. Grenier stated when it comes before the Board of Supervisors, they are going to want to make sure that they are compliant with all of the comments from Remington Vernick and others, look at the tree issues, and make sure that the stormwater management is meeting all of the requirements. He stated he agrees that this is not the norm as there are two houses on one Lot; and while that has been approved by the Zoning Hearing Board, the Board of Supervisors can follow up with the technical details. Mr. Bruch stated even if this current proposal were not approved, that would not change the fact that there are already two houses on the Lot.

Motion carried unanimously.

#687 – CHARLES BOEHM MIDDLE SCHOOL ADDITION – Amended Final Plan
Tax parcel #20-034-090
R-2 Residential Medium Density Zoning District
866 Big Oak Road

Proposed plan to construct a 7,845 square foot addition, minor modifications to the parking/drop-off area, and remove a previously-approved parking lot in front of the building.

Mr. Majewski stated the School District is planning to rehab the Charles Boehm Middle School; and as part of that, they are demolishing part of the building, reconstructing a new section of it for an Administrative wing in the southwest corner of the building, and doing some minor re-aligning of parking. He stated they will actually be reducing the amount of impervious surface over what was previously approved on the prior Site Plan.

Mr. Jamie Lynch, D’Huy Engineering, stated they are the project manager for the Pennsbury School District’s Boehm Middle School renovation. He stated they were also the project manager for the Pennwood renovation several years ago. He stated the Boehm work was approved under a prior Land Development with the Township, and he is present tonight to introduce the proposed changes.

Mr. Lynch stated present this evening is Tom Smith, the new Superintendent of the Pennsbury School District, George Steill, the Pennsbury School District Facilities Director, Travis Bloom, Principal of Boehm Middle School, Mark Marella from KCBA Architects, the project lead architect, and Terry DeGroot from Terraform Engineering, the Civil Engineer for the project,

Mr. Lynch stated several months ago they started working with the School District on this project to provide some upgrades to the Boehm Middle School. He showed a slide of the original Plan for Boehm Middle School which was submitted as part of the Pennwood renovation project. He stated the idea at Boehm was that they were only doing exterior site work, adding a new visitor drop-off lane in the front of the building on Big Oak Road, putting in a new paved area directly in front of the School which was going to be used for visitor drop-off more accessible to the front door, some improvements to the bus storage facility on site, and some parking changes in the back. Mr. Lynch stated all of the work was outside of the building, and there was not a building addition included.

Mr. Lynch stated this was part of the Bid for the Pennwood Middle School project. He stated due to budgetary concerns and some discussion about Charles Boehm being the next School building to be renovated by the School District, the Board elected not to proceed with the work at that time. Mr. Lynch stated the District had received full and complete Land Development approval at that time. He stated what is being presented this evening before the Planning Commission is an Amendment

Mr. Lynch stated the new Boehm Middle School renovation will include the following: Relocating the main, secure entrance of the building and the main office suite to the side of the building where the parking lot is and where the buses go so it will no longer be in the front of the building. He stated the sidewalk that goes to that front now will disappear and the main entrance will have a secure vestibule consistent with modern-day school design. Mr. Lynch stated as a result of that, they are creating an addition of approximately 7,800 square feet on that side of the building. He stated this allows them to create the new office suite area, and the office suite replaces the existing and under-sized music, choral, and drama classrooms. He stated inside the building, they are updating it for a new 21st Century school, and there is a cafeteria renovation, although it does not include the kitchen. He stated there will be classroom upgrades with new flooring, paint, window blinds, etc. although no walls will be relocated to any great extent. He stated there will be a new Family Consumer Science classroom, upgraded Science classrooms, and also

STEM classroom upgrades all within the existing walls. Mr. Lynch stated there will be ADA and security upgrades inside the building. This summer they are embarking on a project to remove hazardous materials from the building which is asbestos in the floor tiles that have been there for years. He stated the project also includes new energy-efficient HVAC including central air-conditioning. He stated there will also be an energy-compliance roof and new windows across the entire length of the School building. He stated there will also be new and improved technology inside the building consistent with today's learning environment and to support virtual learning as well as new and upgraded life safety systems.

Mr. Bloom stated they want to create spaces to bring them up to 21st Century learning and to match what is going on in the other Middle Schools. He noted the purpose of a number of the rooms and the programs they have. He stated the new entrance to Boehm will provide a safe and secure School building, and the students and staff are very excited about the air conditioning. He stated the upgrade to the windows is also important, and they will be able to use different spaces inside and outside of the building that they cannot now because of the existing conditions.

Mr. Lynch showed the Land Development submission of 2016 versus the new one being presented now. He stated in the original Plan there was no interior renovation of Boehm. He stated there was also additional parking and additional impervious in the form of asphalt in the original Plan. They had re-arranged the bus and visitor parking as well as adding an additional lane for additional parent drop-off. Mr. Lynch stated the big driveway entrance was modified significantly, and the Big Oak visitor parking that is on the street was eliminated.

Mr. Lynch stated in the 2022 Plan, there is no additional parking loop, and the net result is a reduction in the impervious coverage being added to the site. He stated they have limited parking lot changes compared to the prior Plan which was a largely a parking lot project. He stated the District has decided instead to put its dollars into the educational program in the inside of the building which in the wake of COVID is a better value for the District and a better investment in the students. Mr. Lynch stated the visitor parking is being re-located so that visitors can come directly into the entrance. He stated on the Plan they are showing tonight, they are leaving the parking in place on Big Oak, but it is not intended to be used for visitor parking; and the reason they are leaving it in place right now is just for overflow parking for large events. He stated it should not be used on a daily basis like it is now.

Mr. Lynch stated there is no School population growth anticipated at Boehm, and they are not doing the renovations to accommodate a larger population of staff or students coming to Boehm.

Mr. Lynch showed the old Site Plan which showed the elimination of the parking spaces on Big Oak Road, adding a traffic lane in front of the School, and the main entrance was remaining where it is today. He stated they were modifying the Big Oak entrance, expanding the bus parking storage area, and a fueling station was being added in the old Plan, and that is not happening in this new Plan. He stated there were also some minor sidewalk and parking modifications in the back of the building.

Mr. Lynch showed the new Site Plan and noted that the yellow lines are the bus traffic and the turquoise is the car traffic. The traffic patterns for buses and cars after the project is done will remain as it is today. He stated the buses run from one Middle School to the next with the three Middle Schools on the site, and that traffic pattern will remain the same; and they will end up with the same number of bus slots, but they think that the arrangement that they have put together is a little safer than the existing arrangement. Mr. Lynch stated the car traffic will remain in the same pattern that it does now, and they will loop in the back around the new small fenced-in area that houses mechanical equipment the location of which he showed on the Plan. He stated they have also added a canopy to the outside and the sidewalk so that in inclement weather conditions instead of backing up students in the building, they have a place outside with bollards that will protect them a little bit from the weather and expand the parent drop-off lane a little bit making it more efficient.

Mr. Lynch stated as noted earlier, the current entrance to the School will be taken away, the sidewalk will be gone, and the new visitor parking will be at the side of the building. He noted where students and visitors will be entering through a secure entrance. He also showed the location of the main office. He showed the outline of the old building, and the new addition.

Mr. Lynch stated they are not expanding the bus parking area. He stated they will have a new main entrance that has the appropriate security for a modern-day School, the rear parking area remains the same, and the traffic patterns remain as they are now.

Mr. Lynch stated they have provided for 196 parking spaces in the Plan that was submitted, and 171 are required based on the count. He stated in the time since the submittal, they have made some adjustments to the Site Plan and they

can add 5 spaces to the Plan, and that will be on the Final Plan submitted by Mr. DeGroot that will get them to 201 spaces and provide the same number of spaces that the School has now on the site including the required handicap parking spaces.

Mr. Lynch showed a slide which indicates in yellow the proposed condition, and the new impervious is lower than what was previously approved. He stated the Township engineer pointed out that in their Plan submission, their front, side, and rear yard setbacks were incorrect as shown in turquoise; but the rear and side setbacks remain unchanged from what was previously approved. He stated the front yard setback is modified slightly, and the existing condition is 122'. He stated the requirement is 100', and their ultimate location will be between 100' and 122' so they will still be compliant. He showed the dotted setback line, and stated they can make those corrections on the Plan when it is submitted.

Mr. Mark Marella showed a rendering from the existing parking lot which is the new addition they are proposing. He stated this will be the entrance with a plaza in the front so that they are not too close to the traffic. He showed where the secure entrance comes in with double doors in the middle which are left open when the School is opened; and once School starts, they go on the left through the secure vestibule where they are screened and allowed into the building when deemed appropriate. He noted the new music rooms on the right side which have volume which is helpful for acoustics for music rooms and which will also give the building a little bit of presence since currently it is relatively low.

Mr. Marella showed a rendering coming in from Big Oak Road with a view of the corner. He stated it fits within the character of the existing building and the gym and identifies where the main entrance is.

Mr. Marella showed a rendering of how they will be upgrading the façade, and they will be able to get rid of all of the individual air conditioning units all over the building and create a clean façade. He stated the materials will be the same brick and glass, and there will be louvers for the mechanical units that they will be adding. Mr. Lynch stated the windows are one of the highlights of the Pennwood Middle School which was renovated including both the outside and the inside with the amount of daylighting that they provide. He stated currently the windows at Boehm usually have their blinds closed, and he feels they will be seeing a lot more open blinds in classrooms because of the style of glass and glazing that will be provided which will give an appearance that is much like that which is seen at Pennwood.

Mr. Marella showed a rendering of the Media Center/Library area from Big Oak Road. He stated the volume will stay the same but they will improve the elevation thermally and they will put in some different types of glass which will be much more insulated. He stated the entire envelope of the building will be improved and will help enhance the character of the building. Mr. Lynch stated this image also shows the double doors which was the main entrance, and that goes away along with the sidewalk to them. He stated to the right of the double doors is the existing Library which will be converted to a Media Center. He stated to the left of the double doors is the existing Administrative space, and that is being converted to classroom space, and the Administration is moving as a part of the addition.

Mr. Marella showed a rendering of a typical classroom, and in the left-hand corner a gray box can be seen which is the new mechanical unit which will provide air conditioning and heating to the space; and it will be vented through the louvers. He stated there will also be new energy-efficient lighting in the ceiling, new flooring, and some new finishes.

Mr. Lynch stated this summer all of the asbestos-based tile in the classrooms and all teaching spaces in the building will be removed, and a floor leveler will be installed which is a precursor to new flooring that will be installed with this project. He stated they are under Contract, and they have a Bidder, and a plan is set up to do the abatement this summer ahead of the next renovation effort.

Mr. Marella showed a rendering from inside the Media Center. He stated the space is basically the same envelope, but the ceiling steps up to allow the light in. He stated there is also new shelving, new mechanical units on the roof to take care of this space, and upgrading to modernize it for technology.

Mr. Marella showed a rendering of the cafeteria. He stated currently there are hallways on either side of the cafeteria. He stated the rendering is a view from the back serving wall toward the corridor, and they have opened up the space, letting light in on the right-hand side. It will be a bigger, brighter space for the students with a little more variety of seating as well. All of the finishes will be new in this space. Mr. Lynch stated there are also two enclosed rooms that will be added to the cafeteria to accommodate students with special needs who do not necessarily want to be in the “big population of the cafeteria,” so they are providing some dining options for students so that they can tend to the needs of all of the student population.

Mr. Lynch stated they worked with Mr. Pockl and Mr. Majewski on the floodplain issues surrounding the Boehm property. He showed a drawing of the existing floodplain on the site. He stated looking at the floodplain line, the new addition is just outside of the drawn floodplain line, and they designed for a floodplain elevation. He stated even though they are outside of the line, they still need to raise the floor of the addition in accordance with the Township Ordinances. He stated in where they have new HVAC and new life safety equipment, and an emergency generator, they are elevating all of that equipment above the floodplain elevation wherever it occurs. He stated to the extent that they can, they are also working on flood-resistant materials.

Mr. Lynch stated the addition itself has been raised more than 1' above the flood elevation, and Mr. Marella has included two ramps within the existing hallway, and those ramps will be installed as part of the new addition in order to make all of the new work rise up above the existing floor elevation and above the flood elevation. He stated because of all of the work that has been done to date in putting the design together, no additional relief is necessary.

Mr. Lynch stated with regard to the timeframe, their goal is to Bid this in August/September and give the contractors procurement time in order to get their materials and equipment for the job; and while work could start on some small items early, for the most part, they will start in the 6th grade wing next summer. He stated abatement would be done this summer to get the floors taken care of, they will Bid the project, and they would start with the first phase of work next summer. Mr. Lynch stated work would go out until the end of October, 2024 with the renovation, and they will move one grade out of Boehm and take it to Village Park. He stated by eliminating one grade, that will open up classrooms so that there can be space to go from space to space. He stated they have put together a Phasing Plan in order to allow renovations to occur while students are in School. Mr. Lynch added that they were not able to remove a grade from Pennwood when they did the renovation there, and it was very difficult. He stated what they are proposing with the Boehm renovation provides a better chance of keeping the educational process first in everyone's mind especially in post-Pandemic times.

Mr. Lynch stated with respect to the review comments provided by Remington Vernick and the traffic engineer, he believes they are all generally "will comply," and the adjustments like the one shown with respect to the setbacks would be included in the re-submission.

Mr. Grenier stated given the current regulations with regard to the extent of the floodplain surrounding Boehm, that building would not have been built today; and he thanked them for elevating key equipment. Mr. Grenier stated while they discussed improving daylighting and airflow and removing asbestos, he asked if they are considering designing to LEED or some other green building standards. Mr. Lynch stated Pennwood Middle School is a Gold LEED-Certified building under the old LEED requirements; however, now everything is LEED Version 5. He stated the way that the District was able to obtain Gold LEED-Certified at Pennwood, given the fact that LEED definitely costs money especially for a School District, was that one of the firms was able to get a lot of money through Grants which for Pennwood. He stated unfortunately that program is no longer available to School Districts. Mr. Lynch stated the premium cost for LEED Gold at Pennwood was about \$1,250,000; and they do not have the ability to raise the Budget for Boehm. He stated costs have also gone up over the last six months to a year by about 20% so they are struggling with the cost of the renovation. He stated those working with them on this project generally design to a LEED-sustainable level, and it is pretty easy to design to a Silver level rating. He stated there are LED fixtures in the building now, and there will be more LED fixtures. He stated with the demolition, the contractor will be directed to recycle the materials and not dispose of them in a landfill. He stated the new HVAC system will be designed to exceed the existing Codes for ventilation. He stated they have also talked about incorporating some form of bipolar ionization. He stated from a daylighting perspective, they have shown the windows that are proposed; and the building lends itself to having the daylighting requirements. It will also have the vacancy sensors to have lighting controls in the building. He stated while they are designing to the standard, going to the actual Version 5 LEED Gold Standard is cost prohibitive for the project at this time.

Mr. Grenier stated when they come before the Board of Supervisors, he asked that they be prepared to discuss how close they can get to certain Certification levels under the current LEED standard.

Mr. Bush stated he feels that the proposed modifications are outstanding, and he understands the removal of the parking loop in front of what had been the main entrance because they are eliminating what had been the front entrance to the building before; however, he feels traffic flow should be looked at carefully. He stated driving by on a rainy day, it can be seen that there is gridlock, and very difficult for others trying to drive on Big Oak Road and to get around all of the traffic turning into the School parking lot. He stated he understands that it may be worse than it was previously even on non-rainy days because a

lot of parents are dropping their children off in this environment when they might have been on the bus in the past. He stated he knows that they discussed expanding the drop-off area on the right-hand side of the building looking at the map; and he feels they need to look at not just expanding the drop-off area, but also how to make the cars move faster and get them off of Big Oak Road more quickly.

Mr. Lynch stated that it has been a priority of the design team as well, and they are handicapped somewhat in expanding parking because they are doing it within the floodplain. Mr. Lynch stated Mr. Bloom has also been working with parents to try to help them, and it is difficult not only on a rainy day but also post-Pandemic as more parents are driving the students back and forth to School. He stated the loop that was shown on the Plan is actually longer than it was pre-Pandemic. Mr. Bloom stated that is the purpose of the new drop-off area with the overhang. He stated currently there are two walkways where you can walk into the building, and they are looking to expand a walkway the entire length of the building; and that way they can bring in a lot of cars, and the students can get out onto a sidewalk with an overhang as opposed to the muddy grass. He stated it will also be the same way at dismissal; and they will be able to line the students up more quickly and move the cars out more quickly. He stated since COVID, they have two kinds of loops – the short loop which is near the dumpster and is usually used in the morning, and there is the long loop that goes the whole length of the back parking lot and comes back around where the cafeteria is in the building. He stated once they get the sidewalks in and the overhang it will be a lot more conducive to getting parents in and out very quickly. He showed on the Plot Plan where the short loop and the long loops are located. He agreed that there are a lot more parents driving their children to School especially when there is rain. He stated once they are through the Pandemic, he feels more students will be riding the buses again. Mr. Bloom stated they are usually done by 3:05 p.m. but there are a lot of parents who come very early because they want to be first in line.

Mr. Lynch stated at least during the two years of construction, with one grade being at Village Park, there will be a staff and a parent load that will be going to Village Park. He stated he recognizes that there will be construction personnel that will take their place, but the construction personnel will be parking in a lot on the other side of the Middle School site that was constructed as part of the Pennwood project.

Mr. Costello asked how many cars they feel the new covered area and sidewalk will be able to handle at once loading or unloading. Mr. Bloom stated at this time two cars can unload at once – one at the back entrance of the building and one at the front entrance. He stated depending on the size of the vehicles, he would estimate that it could be fifteen vehicles as long as they are all following directions and pulling right up to the car in front of them. He stated the difficult part is getting the parents to pull all the way up.

Mr. Bruch asked about the security measures at the doors, and Mr. Bloom stated there are teachers at the entrance during arrival and at dismissal. Mr. Bloom stated once the Home Room bell sounds, the doors are locked.

Mr. Bruch stated it was indicated that there is no anticipated increase in population related to these Plans, and he asked how close they are to capacity at this time. Mr. Bruch asked if there was a 25% increase in the student population he assumes that would put a strain on the resources and capacity that the School could manage, and he assumes that they are nowhere near the threshold where it would be problematic. Mr. Bloom stated with the new rooms there will be a spot for every staff member. He stated currently there are a number of staff members who travel from room to room. He stated he understands that when they did the room space, based on the numbers and projections going ten years out, “they were in good shape.” Dr. Smith stated that is correct. He stated they are close to capacity, and 25% more students would put them way over capacity.

Mr. Costello stated this is much needed, and he is glad that it is happening. Mr. Bloom stated the staff and students are looking forward to it. He stated they will share a lot of this information with the parents of the fifth graders next week, adding fourth grade parents are apprehensive as they are the ones that will be impacted the one year by going to Village Park.

Mr. Lynch thanked everyone for their help. He stated they had a great relationship with the Township during the Pennwood renovation as well as with the community.

Mr. Pockl stated on the slide he sees the bus parking on the left side of the building and it shows the bus pulling forward out of its space, but it is crossing over two adjacent parking spaces; and they might want to consider that further to see if a bus can realistically make that turning movement or if it is going to have to back out and move up the aisleway. He stated if that is the case, they need to make sure that they have enough room for a bus to back out. Mr. Pockl

stated this slide was not part of the information that was provided to him for his review. Mr. Lynch stated there is an updated Plan that needs to be provided which does not show the walkway from the front, and they can provide Mr. Pockl with this information as well. He added that with regard to the buses, they do not all arrive at once; and they arrive intermittently. He stated they have very specific rules and designations on where to park because they pull away in a chevron fashion now at certain times, and that would continue. He stated there is a process by which the buses are allowed to arrive and park. Mr. Bloom stated they get the first and second run buses in first, and they line up diagonally. They start at the back of the building toward the creek, and they pull out from there. He stated they all go, and after they are out, the second group of buses comes in intermittently into those designated spots. He stated once they get through the first week of School they know bus numbers and which spots they are pulling in, and they are consistently in those positions.

Mr. Pockl asked if the buses are parked there overnight and on weekends as well; and Mr. Bloom stated they are not parked in those designated spots, and they park overnight and on weekends in the gated parking area near the woods.

Mr. Majewski thanked the School District and their consultants for working with the Township to make sure that they straightened out all of the floodplain issues and to make sure that the Site Plan and presentation was good for everyone to follow.

Mr. Pockl stated when they first met with the School District, they discussed that the Township has an approved Pollution Reduction Plan that was submitted to DEP which includes a Best Management Practice of streambank restoration on the Charles Boehm Middle School site. He stated the School District indicated that they were amenable to working with the Township to make sure that we can implement that BMP which includes restoring the streambanks, some re-grading, stabilization, and tree planting. Mr. Lynch agreed that they will work with the Township. He stated he understands that it might include introducing some trees to that area, and Mr. Pockl agreed. Mr. Lynch stated there are very few trees around the site; adding there are some in the courtyard and around the building. He stated they do not want to remove them, but they need to do some limbing as there are some trees that are overgrown, and they do not want to have leaves collecting on the School or provide ways for people to get on top of the School building. He stated if trees can be added as part of the program over the creek to the right of the School building, they want to help the Township achieve those goals.

Mr. Costello moved and Mr. Bush seconded to recommend to the Board of Supervisors' approval of the Revised Final Plan subject to compliance with the review letters by the engineering consultants.

There was no one from the public wishing to speak on this matter, and the Motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Majewski introduced Dan McLoone, a new Township employee. Mr. McLoone stated he is looking forward to working with the Board and Committees.

There being no further business, Mr. Costello moved, Mr. Bush seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dawn Stern, Secretary

