

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES – JULY 12, 2021

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held remotely on July 12, 2021. Mr. Bush called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Those present:

Planning Commission: Tony Bush, Chair  
Ross Bruch, Vice Chair  
Adrian Costello, Secretary  
Tejinder Gill, Member

Others: Jamie Reamer, Planning & Zoning Department  
Barbara Kirk, Township Solicitor  
Andrew Pockl, Township Engineer

Absent: Dawn Stern, Planning Commission Member  
James Majewski, Director Planning & Zoning  
Daniel Grenier, Supervisor Liaison

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Costello moved and Mr. Bruch seconded to approve the Minutes of June 7, 2021 as written. Motion carried with Mr. Gill abstained.

#683 – JD SIGNATURE HOMES LOT LINE CHANGE  
Tax Parcels #20-025-014 and #20-025-014-003  
R-2 Residential Medium Density Zoning District  
936 Sandy Run Road

Proposed plan to shift the existing lot line between the above parcels to the north resulting in a 0.62 acre lot and a 0.66 acre lot in order to remove existing dwelling and construct 2 new single-family dwellings

John DiPasquale, attorney, was present with Mr. John DiPasquale, Applicant/owner, and Mr. Bob Showalter, engineer.

Mr. Bush stated the Planning Commission members received the Township review letters and the Stormwater Management Report from the Applicant. Mr. Bush asked if there was a response from the Applicant to the review letters, and Mr. Showalter stated he sent a response letter to Mr. Pockl. Ms. Kirk stated she received a copy of that today. Mr. Pockl stated he also received his copy today. Ms. Kirk forwarded the letter to the Commission this evening.

Ms. Kirk noted the Remington Vernick review letter of June 7 which highlights what needs to be done, and it seems that the Applicants agreed to comply with most items with the exception of the Waiver requests. Mr. DiPasquale, attorney, stated Mr. Showalter has indicated in his letter that they are requesting four Waivers.

A copy of the Plan was shown. Mr. Pockl stated the site is located along Sandy Run Road. He stated there is an existing two-story, single-family residence with a garage and sheds. These are to be removed. It is proposed to change the lot line.

Mr. Bush asked what will become of the existing home. Mr. DiPasquale, attorney, stated the existing two-story structure, the two garages, and the shed are all outdated and require substantial work; and the plan is to demolish them. He stated the existing structure has structural issues and is very close to the road and very close to the existing lot line. He stated there is a north lot and a south lot, and the south lot is too small. He stated they are proposing to demolish the existing structure and the out buildings. They have created two conforming lots and two conforming structures that are pushed back off of the road and “far more desirable and a much better fit for the street.” The existing structure is approximately 50’ long and 25’ wide. There is a large wood garage behind it that is about half that size, another shed behind that which is slightly smaller, and a third shed on the property as well.

Mr. John DiPasquale, owner, stated that they did extensive studies on the existing structure since the original intent was to buy the property, enhance the existing structure, and build a new home on the existing lot to the right of it. As the “building, engineering, and survey work went on,” they found that the existing structure is an “epic failure” with the foundation crumbling and extensive termite damage. He stated it has been rehabbed by multiple people, and it is not structurally safe or sound. He stated the best course of action is “to get rid of it and make two better lots and two better houses in the Township.”

Mr. Bush asked about the four Waivers being requested. Mr. John DiPasquale, attorney, stated the first Waiver is from Section 178-47A which is the requirement to install sidewalks on Sandy Run Road as there are no sidewalks on Sandy Run Road on either side of the road. He stated it would be an anomalous condition to add sidewalks as noted by one of the reviewers. He added that this is just a lot line change, and it is not a substantial Subdivision. He stated they could have just put one house in although he feels what is proposed is a better fit and better overall for ratables and for the neighborhood. He stated he does not feel sidewalks are appropriate.

The next Waiver requested is from Section 178-58A which is a requirement to install concrete monuments on all corners. Mr. DiPasquale stated for this simple lot line change, they are proposing to just use iron pins. Mr. Pockl stated the response letter does indicate that they are requesting a partial Waiver, and they would set iron pins on all corners and set concrete monuments on the street line at the very front corners.

A Waiver is requested from Section 178-81A which is a requirement for street trees of a 3" caliper at 35' intervals along the frontage totaling eight trees. Mr. DiPasquale stated the Plan proposes to leave existing trees totaling 24" caliper which would be the same diameter of street trees that are required. He stated they feel that the existing trees should satisfy the street tree requirement since they would be the same diameter of trees as the existing mature trees which provide more coverage than a new tree would and would be more likely to last as well.

The next Waiver is from Section #178-85H – paragraph 4, and this Section requires that trees of 10" caliper or more that are to be removed must be replaced. Mr. DiPasquale stated the Plan shows that six trees will be removed because they interfere directly with the construction of improvements. He added they are leaving as many trees as they can, and many of the trees that they are leaving, especially in the cluster along the new lot line, are mature trees that offer shade and a visual buffer. He stated they feel that the Plan shows sufficient trees, and there are eleven trees between the two lots which is more than would be typically placed on lots in a Subdivision which is why they are asking for a Waiver.

Mr. Pockl stated the response letter indicates that a total of twenty-four replacement trees would be required; however, that is incorrect, and it would be thirty replacement trees required. He stated there are two 18" caliper trees being removed that require seven replacement trees

each which is fourteen; and there are four trees that are 10” to 17” in diameter being removed, and they would require four each for a total of sixteen. Therefore, thirty replacement trees would be required.

Mr. DiPasquale stated based on the Plan and the grading they feel adding those trees is excessive, and it would be “too costly, too administratively difficult, and would not be a good fit on the site to be adding thirty trees.”

Mr. Showalter stated there are a lot of steep slopes on the property, and the only way they could add any trees would be on the steep slopes which they do not want to disturb. He stated there is limited frontage to work with as there is a basin, utility tie-ins, driveways, and some significant grades. He stated there is not much of an area where they could put in replacement trees. He stated they might be able to put in a few – but not thirty trees.

Mr. John DiPasquale, owner, stated they are trying to simplify the process moving the lot line to make two equal lots out of two unequal lots. He stated they are “not gaining anything or asking for increased density. He stated they are taking two existing Tax Parcels and keeping two existing Tax Parcels. He stated they do not feel that the Waiver from the street tree requirement and some of the other Waivers should be “instrumental in a problem for what is already existing.” He stated they could go in “with existing Permits and would not have to add the street trees.” He stated they are trying to “take two lots that are really bad and an old house that is really bad and put in two nicer lots and two really nicer houses with the least amount of damage and the least amount of aggravation as possible on the Township’s end and the developer’s end.”

Mr. John DiPasquale, attorney, stated the last Waiver request relates to the comment about widening Sandy Run Road. This relates to Section 178-40C. He stated it is a narrow road and it was again identified an anomalous condition to provide widening in this particular space. He stated they do not feel that it is appropriate for this lot line change to require widening the road or to do it here in isolation.

Mr. Pockl stated Sandy Run Road as it exists varies in width from 20’ to 22’, and the Township standard for roadway width for this type of roadway and traffic is 26’. Mr. Pockl stated the comment was made by the Township traffic engineer. Mr. DiPasquale stated he understands that the right-of-way is there, but the cartway has not been widened; and Mr. Pockl agreed.

Mr. Costello asked if this is unique, and Mr. Pockl stated there was a large Commercial development on Dobry Road as well as a seventy-eight townhome development on Dobry Road. Mr. Pockl stated that was a unique situation and not comparable to this Application since between those two developments, it took up most of the frontage of Dobry Road. Mr. Pockl stated in this Application being discussed this evening, there could be a case for hardship by the developer.

Mr. Bush asked if there is any expectation of widening Sandy Run Road in the future, and Mr. Pockl stated there is not to his knowledge. Mr. Pockl noted the SAFE Highway letter dated June 23, 2021 indicates that widening the cartway along the site frontage would create an anomalous roadway condition, and SAFE Highway would not object to the Township granting a Waiver if a fee-in-lieu of the improvement were provided to the Township to fund a future widening project when appropriate.

Mr. John DiPasquale, attorney, stated they are requesting a Waiver from not only the widening but also the Fee since this is extremely low impact, and they do not “think it would be fairly applied to this project given the minor scale of what is being proposed.”

Mr. DiPasquale stated while they may not require Waivers, Comments 3 through 6 of the Remington & Vernick letter talk about the proposed on-lot basins. He stated the Applicant has suggested instead of doing testing, to simply have the engineer present to inspect the soils at the time that the basins are constructed. He stated this has been explained in Mr. Showalter’s letter in more detail. He stated possibly the engineers could discuss this further.

Mr. Pockl stated this refers to infiltration testing at the bottom of the proposed stormwater management system. He stated sometimes locations of stormwater basins change going through the process, and they may have to bring in a utility especially when the basins are up front as is being proposed. He added that it makes sense to put the basins up front because the site predominantly slopes back to front, and they would not want to have the infiltration up grade of the proposed house as that would encourage water infiltration into a basement. He stated while the proposed locations of the basins are appropriate, sometimes they change. He stated the types of soils on the two lots are generally well-draining soils so he would not object to an investigation during construction.

Mr. Bush stated he understands the Applicant's rationale for not wanting to put in additional street trees when they are already in place. He stated there is a Tree Bank, and he feels that a contribution should be made in lieu of planting the street trees. With regard to the replacement trees, Mr. Bush stated he understands that putting in an additional thirty trees on these two lots seems like a lot but they may be able to install some of them. He stated he would not be in favor of granting this Waiver, and they should be required to make the contribution to the Tree Bank.

Mr. Costello stated he agrees with Mr. Bush with regard to the Tree Replacement Ordinance since it is a fairly new regulation which has been updated by the Board of Supervisors which he takes as a clear direction as to what choices are available to developers if they do not want to plant the trees. Mr. Costello stated the Applicant could petition the Board of Supervisors about waiving this, but he feels the direction the Board of Supervisors has given the Planning Commission is clear, and he would not be willing to overturn this.

Mr. Costello stated there was a prior discussion about sidewalks at a property on Oxford Valley Road and the potential for a sidewalk in that area at some point in the future; and in that instance the Planning Commission recommended that the developer either build the sidewalk or contribute to the sidewalk fund. Mr. Bruch stated this is similar to the Tree Ordinance as there is a solution built in by the Township if the Applicants do not want to install the sidewalk, and they can pay a fee.

Mr. Pockl stated Section 178-85 outlines that the contribution by the developer to the Tree Bank would be \$315 per replacement tree.

Mr. DiPasquale, owner, stated they are comparing this "little project to other projects." He stated the difference between what they are proposing and "everything else they are comparing them to" is that there is no additional density being added to this site, and the density already exists. He stated there is no bonus or benefit to the developer by doing this. He stated the reason why they did this plan this way was as a "courtesy to the Township and a way to make sure they were making good friends with the Township." He stated having them install thirty "street trees" with no increase in density on two building lots that already exist just to move a lot line twenty feet makes "absolutely no financial sense." He stated currently finances and the cost of Zoning and approvals is "through the roof." He stated "these are the things that make this little Subdivision so expensive and they now have to sell homes way higher than

they really want to.” He stated he is not getting a cost advantage by not putting in street trees. He stated he felt moving a line twenty feet would be simple as it is already two building lots. He stated he could have come in for a Building Permit for each one. He stated this is not a Subdivision, and it already exists as two permittable building units, and he could get Building Permits on each one. He stated all he is asking for the Planning Commission to do is “make them two better lots by moving the lot line.” He stated he is not asking for three or four lots, and he “gets nothing out of it.” He stated all the “add-on costs will go to someone else who will have to pay for this.” He stated thirty trees on two lots is not realistic.

Mr. Bush stated he agrees that thirty trees on two lots “does not make sense;” however, there is the tree bank option. He stated he does not agree that the developer will not make money on the Subdivision, and they will make two more desirable lots than they already have.

Mr. DiPasquale, owner, stated he could tear the house down and put two Building Permits in; and the only reason he is doing the lot line change is because it makes more sense to have two equal lots. Mr. Bush stated he understands that it will be two nicer lots, and he feels the Applicant will make more money off of it. Mr. DiPasquale stated he will not be making any more money. He stated he is spending more money by doing it because he wants to make sure that the people who move into the lot that is the “lesser lot” do not come back to the Township later requesting Variances; and he is trying to make it so that down the road the Township does not have a problem with the people who move into the homes who are then lot-constrained because the lot they sold them does not allow them to do anything. Mr. Bush stated that is a laudable goal, and whether or not the developer makes more money is not relevant to tonight’s decision. Mr. DiPasquale again questioned the requirement for thirty trees for two existing lots.

Mr. Costello stated this is not the first time this matter has come up, and the Board of Supervisors have put in a law and already updated it as to what should be done in this circumstance. Mr. Costello stated it is not the job of the Planning Commission to change the law that the Board of Supervisors has passed.

Mr. John DiPasquale, owner, stated while he appreciates the fact that those are the rules, the problem is that there is no avenue for a lot line change for someone who is trying to do the right thing for everybody in the Township; and he will get

“slaughtered” because the Subdivision SALDO rules force on him something that could be handled in a “Tax Parcel thing and then come back later and not have to do anything.” He stated he is trying to “get to Building Permit faster, but yet by doing that he is being crucified so they need to find a solution to the problem.” He asked that they give any recommendation they can to state that there is a valid reason why “this is a simple little thing,” and work with the developer/ builder to get this done because it does not make sense.” He stated this is in the SALDO because normally someone builds a two to fifty acre property and they get density or a bonus. He stated he bought two lots which he owns, and he wants to build two houses on the two lots that he owns; and he is not asking for three or four so there is no added bonus to him. He stated he wants to build two houses on two lots in Lower Makefield with the “least amount of aggravation.”

Mr. Gill asked the number of the existing trees that are being taken down. Mr. Costello stated six trees are being taken down but because of the caliper of the trees being taken down, they have to install thirty according to the calculation in the statute. Mr. John DiPasquale, attorney, stated it does not take into account how many existing trees are on the property; and that is where the “unfair application of this comes into play.”

Mr. DiPasquale, attorney, stated he reviewed the Code regarding street trees, and he does not feel that there is an alternative for street trees. He stated the caliper of street trees is 24” which is what they already have with the three trees that are fronting Sandy Run although they are not spaced out the 35’ that would be required under the Code. He stated he does not feel that there is another avenue for the street trees other than to ask if they can leave the existing street trees as satisfaction of the Street Tree requirement.

Mr. Pockl stated given what he described previously with regard to the stormwater management basins required to be up front for this type of lot, the utilities that are coming in, and considering the fact that there are overhead utilities that are running along the frontage of the property, he feels it would be difficult to get additional street trees on these lots.

Mr. Bush stated the Applicant has indicated the Ordinance does not provide for an alternative to the installation of the street trees, and he asked Mr. Pockl if that is consistent with his understanding. Mr. Pockl stated he does not believe that a contribution to the Tree Bank Fund is specific to street trees.



Mr. John DiPasquale, owner, stated the trees that they were talking about taking down along the front are ornamental trees that were planted by a prior owner, and they are not “natural growing trees that grew in the natural environment of Lower Makefield and the area.” He stated these are landscape trees that were there for the last sixty to seventy years that “grew out of control.” He stated any arborist would say they were never taken care of and “need to be torn down and are not relative and are not really a tree anymore.” He stated this is ornamental landscaping that was placed around the property that he now has to replace with “real street trees where none exist.” He asked if ornamental trees that were “placed in landscaping several years ago are equal to trees that have been there that are part of a forest.”

Mr. Showalter stated that they are in a position adjacent to the ultimate right-of-way. He stated they are not next to the old house, and they are where they would normally be placing street trees spatially. He stated they would have to be placed outside of the right-of-way.

A Google Earth picture of the property was shown. Mr. Pockl showed which were the trees to be removed.

Ms. Kirk stated she feels it is under the purview of the Planning Commission to make the determination as to what would be considered a street tree versus a non-street tree, and the Applicant has made his argument as to why he should get the Waiver. She stated the Planning Commission could make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors on this matter, and the Applicant will make a presentation to the Board of Supervisors as well.

Mr. Bruch stated he feels the lack of a monetary remedy available in the Ordinance is persuasive with regard to the street tree request; however, he is not as persuaded to the other request regarding trees. He stated Mr. Pockl has also indicated that there is the inability to put the street trees in given the utilities and the other changes to the property. Mr. Costello stated he agrees that there is a technical reason why they cannot line the street with trees every 35' because the stormwater management is on the street side. Mr. Pockl added there are also the utilities that need to come into the house; and since there are existing overhead utilities, they would not want trees to compromise any of the utilities.

Mr. Pockl asked the Applicant if they have a sense as to how many replacement trees could be put on the property. Mr. DiPasquale, owner, stated they do not. He stated they do not provide a landscaping package to their clients as they find

that most of their buyers tend to have a landscaper come in with their own landscaping plan, and they want to have the ability to plant trees on their property where it makes sense to them. He stated he does not feel that the Township is going to be at a loss for trees. He stated his concern is that he would put street trees in and in six months to a year he would get a call from the Township that the street tree is being cut down because the client's landscaper did not feel that it was in the right spot. He asked that the Planning Commission give them a good recommendation. He stated he has already closed on the property and is already paying taxes and interest.

Mr. Showalter noted Lot #1 and stated they had to put a retaining wall in the back to get the grading, house, and driveway on the property. He stated the possibility of putting replacement trees on that lot is difficult since they would have to go into the steep slopes on the other side of the retaining wall. He stated Lot #2 has significant grading in the back of the house just to get some yard and behind that are also some steep slopes. He stated they would have to disturb steep slopes to put trees in, and he questioned what purpose that would serve.

Mr. DiPasquale, attorney, stated it is his understanding that the Ordinance has these tree requirements for Subdivision and Land Development Plans. He stated he feels that technically a lot line change falls under Land Development because it is two homes. He stated he feels that in some cases, the application of the requirements for Land Development Plans to a simple lot line change for two Residential lots is excessive. He stated it seems to be a "special punishment for the Applicant for coming through the process in this open and forward way" to apply these rules when as the Applicant has indicated he could do it as a "private matter and not do the lot line change and pull the Permits and build it as-is without going through this process to begin with."

Ms. Kirk stated the Municipalities Planning Code clearly defines a Land Development as construction on two or more contiguous lots of two or more Residential buildings. She stated Mr. Pockl's review of the Plan and the Application applying the SALDO clearly falls within the "square corners of the MPC."

Mr. Costello stated part of the rationale for the decision on Oxford Valley Road with regard to the sidewalks, which was a similar situation, was that since there were some existing sidewalks it was a realistic possibility that sometime in the future sidewalks would extend the length of that street. He asked if there would ever be a situation where there would be a sidewalk on Sandy Run Road.

He added at Oxford Valley Road although there were no plans, there were portions of sidewalk that could eventually be joined together; however, he does not see that in this situation. Mr. Pockl stated there are thirty properties on Sandy Run Road which would be involved. Mr. Bush stated he agrees that this is a very different situation from Oxford Valley Road. Mr. Costello stated if there is very little likelihood of putting in sidewalks on Sandy Run Road, he does not feel it was the intent to fund sidewalks elsewhere with money from those building on Sandy Run Road. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission that they did not feel the sidewalk should be installed.

Mr. Costello moved that the Planning Commission agree to the Waivers requested other than the Waiver with regard to tree replacement, and it would be the Applicant's purview to make a presentation to the Board of Supervisors that they feel that the law that was passed was not taking in mind this type of Application and ask them for relief. Mr. Pockl stated he understands that Mr. Costello is suggesting that the Planning Commission would recommend a Waiver request for the installation of sidewalks, a partial Waiver request for the concrete monuments for setting iron pins in lieu of concrete monuments, a Waiver of the street tree requirement but not recommend a Waiver for the tree replacement requirement, and Mr. Costello agreed. Mr. Pockl stated they would also recommend supporting the Waiver request for not widening Sandy Run Road, and Mr. Costello agreed.

Mr. DiPasquale, attorney, asked in lieu of rejecting the Waiver, would the Planning Commission take a "wait and see approach" with respect to the replacement trees. He stated it may be that they have a potential home-buyer who comes in with a plan or they may be able to sell them on a plan that provides for the replacement trees that the Planning Commission seeks. He stated they would like the flexibility to be able to do that and not pay those costs now. Mr. Bush stated they can bring that up with the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Costello stated he feels that is a fair request; and if it can work out that they do the Fee-In-Lieu once the houses are sold and there is a plan submitted, he feels they may be able to work with that. Mr. Pockl stated they could put the amount for the replacement trees in escrow; and once the trees are planted, the developer would get the escrow back for the trees that are planted. Mr. Costello stated he feels that would be fair. Mr. DiPasquale, owner, stated he would like to go with the original Motion and take this up with the Board.

Ms. Kirk stated the Motion that has been made by Mr. Costello is that the Planning Commission is recommending approval to the Board of Supervisors of the Lot Line change and approval of all Waivers except not waiving the replacement trees, and Mr. Costello agreed. Mr. Gill seconded. There was no Public Comment, and the Motion carried unanimously.

## OTHER BUSINESS

### Bike Paths Discussion

Mr. Bush stated the Bucks County Planning Commission sent out a public notice asking for comment concerning some proposed bike paths, two of which come through parts of Lower Makefield – one called the Newtown to Yardley path, and the other is Newtown to the Scudder Falls Bridge. Mr. Bush stated while the Park & Recreation Board made comments, this is something that normally comes before the Planning Commission. Mr. Bush stated Mr. Majewski provided some information on this today indicating that both paths are on existing bike paths or on the road in a shoulder area, and they will be designated with signage and paint on the roads.

Mr. Bush noted the Plans that were put out by the County Planning Commission, and he particularly noted the Newtown to Yardley path. This Plan was shown, and Mr. Bush noted Stony Hill Road. He stated as part of the Wegmans project they are doing \$8 million in off-site road improvements including work on the overpass of 295 which is part of Stony Hill which will be a walking path/bike path. Mr. Bush stated the County is proposing a bike path that is circumventing what is being built and “taking people out of the way.” He stated he is not sure why that was done, and he feels they should know about these road improvements and recommend a change.

Mr. Bush stated with regard to the other bike path from Newtown to the Scudder Falls Bridge, on Dolington Mr. Majewski indicated that the bike path would be on the wide shoulder, and we may want to recommend that there be an elevation of the road with reflectors to let drivers know not to go over that far on the wide shoulder.

Mr. Pockl stated the Board of Supervisors has authorized Remington & Vernick to develop a design for a section of a shared-use path to be an 8' wide asphalt path that is approximately from the entrance of the Makefield Highlands Golf Course

and would extend down to Taylorsville Road. He stated there is an existing path on the south side of Woodside Road that extends down to Lindenhurst, and along Lindenhurst there is a gap and that would have to be filled in in the future.

Mr. Pockl stated with regard to the “yellow path” he noted an area on the slide shown and as part of the Scammel’s Corner Development, a new path was installed from Newtown-Yardley Road down Afton Avenue. He stated if they were to adjust the alignment of the path down to W. Afton Avenue and make a right onto Lehigh Drive, they would only need to fill in the gap between W. Afton and a roadway he showed on the Plan.

Mr. Bruch stated with regard to Mr. Bush’s comment about Stony Hill Road, they may have felt that they could not rely on that development occurring until it does. He stated what they are showing is also an easier way to connect the light green line that connects to Middletown and provides a path that goes under 295 as opposed to over it which some might prefer. He stated he does agree with Mr. Bush that they should consider the future availability of the added cross section.

Mr. Bush asked if the Planning Commission has a desire to provide comments to the Bucks County Planning Commission adding that comments have been requested by July 23<sup>rd</sup>. Mr. Costello stated he feels they should advise them that the Plan should include future use of the overpass bike lane once it is constructed. Mr. Bush stated he feels they could have the green path as well.

Ms. Kirk stated the Planning Commission could issue a letter indicating their concerns. She asked if they also want to include the comments about Dolington Road that there should be markings to identify the path along the wide shoulder. Mr. Pockl stated this would be similar to what they are putting in on Edgewood Road at Sandy Run to prevent drivers from making a left turn onto Sandy Run Road. He stated that is a concrete mountable curb with reflectors, and this would be a mountable rubber curb with plastic reflectors sticking up out of it. Ms. Kirk asked Mr. Pockl if he could draft a memo to the Planning Commission outlining the two areas that the Planning Commission wants to address with the Bucks County Planning Commission, and he could include the comment with regard to the type of markings for Dolington in addition to consideration of the proposed pedestrian walkway along the Yardley-Newtown bike path in the event that the Wegman project does proceed. Mr. Pockl asked if he should add in his comment about the existing path on W. Afton Avenue, and the Planning Commission agreed.

Ms. Kirk stated the Bucks County Planning Commission is identifying these proposed bike paths, and she asked if they are going to bear the brunt of doing the work or getting Grants for the local Municipalities to install the bike paths. Mr. Pockl stated he believes that this is just a Feasibility Study where they are reaching out to the Municipalities to get their agreement that paths in these locations would be desirable and feasible. Ms. Kirk stated if that is the case, possibly the comments should be done by way of a memo to the Board of Supervisors recommending that the Township issue a response to the Bucks County Planning Commission regarding the Feasibility Study and the areas that have been identified as potential issues by the Township's Planning Commission. She stated it would then be an official response from the Township to the Bucks County Planning Commission. Mr. Bush stated while that makes sense, he would want to make sure it happens by July 23<sup>rd</sup>. He asked when the Board of Supervisors is next meeting, and it was noted that they are meeting on July 21<sup>st</sup>.

Mr. Pockl stated he could bring this up under his Engineer's Report at the Board of Supervisors meeting or as a Discussion item, and he could have a draft copy provided in the Board's packet; and this was acceptable to the Planning Commission. No motion was required by the Planning Commission with regard to this matter.

There being no further business, Mr. Bruch moved, Mr. Costello seconded, and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:46 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Adrian Costello, Secretary

