## TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES – JUNE 12, 2023

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on June 12, 2023. Mr. Costello called the meeting to order at 7:33 p.m.

Those present:

Planning Commission: Adrian Costello, Chair

Colin Coyle, Secretary Tony Bush, Member

John DeLorenzo, Member

Others: James Majewski, Community Development Director

Dan McLoone, Planner

Barbara Kirk, Township Solicitor Andrew Pockl, Township Engineer

Absent: Tejinder Gill, Planning Commission Vice Chair

Fredric K. Weiss, Supervisor Liaison

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Coyle moved, Mr. Bush seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the

Minutes of May 8, 2023 as written.

## #692 - TORBERT MAJOR SUBDIVISION

Discussion and Motion on Preliminary Subdivision

Tax Parcel #20-016-011

R-1 Residential Low-Density Zoning District

1700 Yardley-Newtown Road at Creamery Road

Proposed Subdivision of 106-acre farm into 78 single-family Residential dwelling lots

Mr. Edward Murphy, attorney, was present with Mr. Justin Geonnotti, engineer, and

Mr. Joe Blackburn, attorney.

June 12, 2023

Planning Commission – page 2 of 49

Mr. Murphy stated Mr. Geonnotti and Mr. Blackburn were at the recent on-site meeting with the Township staff and others a few weeks ago. He stated before the Planning Commission is the Preliminary fully-engineered Plan that was submitted to the Township in late March. He stated it has been the subject of multiple reviews from the different Boards and Commissions both inside and outside of the Township. He stated they have review letters from Mr. Pockl, the Police Department, the Bucks County Planning Commission, and the EAC. Mr. Murphy stated there are not a lot of issues to discuss in those review letters. He stated there is a list of Waivers that have been highlighted.

No Variances are being sought. Mr. Murphy stated there are some comments from the Bucks County Planning Commission about connectivity of sidewalks and trails.

Mr. Murphy stated the issue is the interest they have heard about in different social media platforms about having a different Plan arrangement, i.e. the opportunity to create a Cluster Subdivision with open space. Mr. Murphy stated he has had some discussion with certain members of the Administration about that. He stated the question was whether the Applicant would be willing to entertain a Cluster Development of some description, and their answer would be a "qualified yes;" but it would depend on what that means. Mr. Murphy stated what has been relayed back to the Applicant through

social media commentary is that there would have to be equivalency if there was going to be a revision to the Plan from the By-Right, one-acre lot Plan that is before the Planning Commission. He stated they suspect that means that if there are 78 lots on the Plan before the Planning Commission, if they were to do a Cluster, the Township may entertain a similar number of lots for a Cluster Plan. Mr. Murphy stated he has told those who have inquired about this, that would be an unacceptable alternative to the Applicant because the value of the lots that are depicted on the current Plan are not commensurate with the value of a lot that would be smaller than a one-acre lot Plan. Mr. Murphy stated in addition someone would have to pay to re-engineer this Plan if they are to do a Cluster as opposed to what has been proposed, and that is not an insignificant undertaking in terms of time or dollars.

Mr. Murphy stated sitting down and trying to better understand what options exist has historically never happened in Lower Makefield in the forty years he has been present, and it has always been an "antagonistic relationship." He stated if they want to try to create a different narrative, they are happy to sit down and have a good faith conversation about whether or not that could happen.

Mr. Murphy stated tonight we could go through the review letters although
he is not sure how meaningful that is since the majority of them are will comply.

He stated if there is a preference to engage in a more substitive conversation
June 12, 2023

Planning Commission – page 4 of 49

about something else, they could do that as well. He stated he is a little bit suspicious about that because there has never been a history of this kind of relationship between the Applicant and the Municipality. He stated every Subdivision has always been a "contested, dragged-out conversation," and he would like to avoid that.

Mr. Murphy stated the choice is up to the Planning Commission if they want to look at this opportunity somewhat differently than the Township has historically done in the past.

Ms. Kirk asked why the Applicant is the Estate of Harry Torbert if the property is owned by Virginia Torbert. Mr. Murphy stated the property is not owned by Virginia Torbert, and Virginia Torbert is one of multiple beneficiaries of the Estate. He stated Harry Torbert, Virginia Torbert's husband, died; and presently it is in the Estate of Harry M. Torbert Jr., Deceased. Mr. Murphy stated he believes that the property will be sold soon. He stated as some in the Township Administration know, the property has been offered for sale, and we expect to have a decision made this week as to who the ultimate purchaser will be.

Mr. Murphy stated at some point before the property is conveyed, it will be in a different name than it is now. Mr. Murphy stated there are three beneficiaries.

Mr. Bush stated he appreciates Mr. Murphy's candor, but he is not sure that it has been as adversarial as Mr. Murphy has described it. Mr. Bush stated while some of the conversations Mr. Murphy has raised could be considered, the Planning Commission does not ultimately make the decision as to whether it would be a Farmland Preservation concept or some other concept. He stated while the Planning Commission can make a recommendation, it is the Board of Supervisors that would have to make that happen. Mr. Bush stated he feels that the Planning Commission should go through what has been presented, but could also comment about some other things that would be discussed between the Applicant and the Township and maybe some negotiations can happen that way or with a subsequent owner.

Mr. Murphy stated they could make an overall presentation of the Plan which they have prepared. He added that his office was responsible for the marketing and sale of the parcel. He stated they received ten written offers for the purchase of the property based on the submitted Plans from March. He stated of those who submitted written offers, more than half preferred a full one-acre lot Plan. He stated there were some who preferred something smaller than that. He stated he believes that of the top three firms who were asked to re-consider their Bids and come back to them, two of the three preferred larger lots than smaller lots. Mr. Murphy stated he believes that

the ultimate successful purchaser, depending on what the circumstances would be, would consider something smaller than one-acre lots to achieve some amount of open space if that is really the goal.

Mr. Murphy stated he understands that may not be the only goal, and there may be other issues including a potential relocation of Creamery Road, which has been the subject of discussion; and that has implications as well for the ultimate design, lot yield, etc. He stated the Applicant is fully aware of all of these things, and all of those considerations would be part of any future discussions if there was an interest in the Township in discussing them.

Mr. Murphy stated with regard to the comment made about Farmland Preservation, the Township was offered the opportunity to participate in the sale of the Torbert property, and they chose not to. He stated the Township received a solicitation the same time everyone else did.

Mr. DeLorenzo stated of the three top potential purchasers, Mr. Murphy had indicated that there was one who would entertain a smaller footprint for each property, and he asked how the number of lots changes relative to a smaller footprint. Mr. Murphy stated every one of them said that if they were going to be asked to reduce a one-acre lot to a three-quarter acre lot or smaller, there was not an assigned value to a smaller lot in the same value as a larger lot. He stated the

expectation is that in a Cluster Plan if the lot size is going to be reduced there would need to be more lots allowed to offset the seventy-eight that are shown on the proposed Plan. Mr. Murphy stated it is true that a Cluster Plan results in less on-site improvements – less road length, less infrastructure, etc.; however, that does not begin to offset the loss in value of lots. Mr. Murphy stated all of this would have to be taken into consideration if they were going to come to a resolution on this.

Mr. Geonnotti showed an aerial of the existing conditions of the farm as it appears today. He noted the yellow line which delineates the parcel. He stated the property is approximately 105 acres. He stated many of those present this evening were at the site walk. He stated the main driveway comes in off of Creamery Road which is running north/south on the slide. Mr. Geonnotti stated along the bottom of the page is Yardley-Newtown Road running east/west.

I-95 runs along the left side of the property. He noted the Interchange with the Newtown Bypass. Mr. Geonnotti stated Patterson Farm is to the south. On the left of the page, left of I-95 is where the business complex is located and where the Wegmans/Prickett Preserve project is being constructed at this time.

A slide was shown which is a colored rendering of the Site Plan showing the lotting out of seventy-eight, one-acre minimum lots on the Torbert property.

Mr. Geonnotti stated there are two points of access being contemplated, both off of Creamery Road. There is no access off of Yardley-Newtown Road. The first access off of Creamery Road is Road B, and the one that lines up with Doe Trail Lane on the north is Road A. Mr. Geonnotti stated they are showing a standard Subdivision, with an access to Palomino Way. He stated this was a stub road which was constructed as part of the previous Subdivision, and it is currently gated off with a barricade. He stated it was contemplated for future development/future extension; and the Torbert Subdivision contemplates the extension and connection of Palomino Way as part of the project. He stated there are a number of streets, one of which is Road A which circulates, Road B which turns into a cul-de-sac close to 95, and Roads, D, E, and C which are north/south on the page for the 78 lots.

Mr. Coyle stated it was indicated that this Plan contemplates the completion of Palomino Way, and Mr. Geonnotti agreed. Mr. Coyle stated they are talking in the context of if they are seeking approval on these Plans, so it is proposing the connection; and Mr. Geonnotti agreed. Mr. Murphy stated it is understood that this will cause concern by the people who currently live in the adjacent Subdivision. He stated we have all heard over the years that no one wants to see a "cut-through" road even thought that stub street has existed since that Subdivision was built.

Mr. Geonnotti stated along Yardley-Newtown Road and along Interstate 95, they are proposing there to be a berm with buffer plantings along all sides. He stated this was discussed at the site meeting, and they wanted to maintain as much of the visual from Yardley-Newtown Road as possible so that will be a heavily-screened planted berm on top of a buffer which runs along the full extent of Yardley-Newtown Road and along I-95 as well.

Mr. Geonnotti stated the property currently is 105 acres of undetained stormwater run-off of a farm field. He stated farm fields contribute a large amount of run-off, and from a run-off coefficient number they have a very high run-off of stormwater volume off of the property. He stated they also have heavy amounts of fertilizer and other contaminants which you do not want going into the stream systems. He stated as part of the Subdivision what is being contemplated is full stormwater management that meets the Township Ordinance and local and State regulations. Mr. Geonnotti stated they already have the NPDES Permit for what is being proposed on this Plan and DEP has reviewed the stormwater and E & S controls and approved them based on what is shown on the Plan today. He stated the stormwater basins which are being proposed along Creamery Road behind Lots 75 to 78 are the stormwater management features which have been designed and approved.

Mr. Geonnotti noted there will be street trees, sidewalks on both sides of the street, and 36' wide cartways along the entire site. Mr. Geonnotti stated at this time they are proposing that there be a full-width widening along their half width along Creamery Road. He stated the Ordinance requires that for any road on which a Subdivision fronts, that road is to be improved to the full extent of the Ordinance requirements. He stated they propose extending Creamery Road and adding curb. He stated there is a stub along Creamery Road of a bike trail, and they will extend that bike trail all the way down to the intersection of Creamery Road as part of this project. Mr. Geonnotti stated there will be stormwater improvements along their half width as well.

Mr. Geonnotti showed a slide which is an overlay of the proposed rendering and Site Plan on top of the existing aerial. He stated the houses being shown are just template houses, and they expect that the houses will actually be a lot bigger based on what they anticipate the market rate will accommodate for this area, and what is shown is just a place holder from a planning perspective.

Mr. Geonnotti stated stormwater management has been designed to accommodate a full build-out of impervious of all of the lots shown.

Mr. Murphy stated Mr. Pockl issued a review letter dated May 15, and they could discuss this if the Planning Commission wishes; although as noted earlier Mr. Murphy stated a majority of the comments are will comply items.

Mr. Murphy noted the reference in Paragraph 9 with regard to the potential re-alignment of Creamery Road. He also noted Paragraph 10 where there is a question about the extension of the trail system and where any such extension would go. Mr. Geonnotti stated the Official Map shows a bike path along the northern edge of Yardley-Newtown Road, and at this time they are not contemplating showing that on the Plan; but that would be a discussion item moving forward with the process. Mr. Geonnotti added that they are showing the connection to Creamery Road which brings the bike trail down to the intersection of Creamery Road which will connect it to the existing network along Yardley-Newtown Road heading east, but not going due west.

Mr. Coyle stated with regard to #9, the Township has an Official Map and that Map connects Mirror Lake Road through to Creamery Road, but this Plan does not propose to do that. Mr. Coyle stated the mechanism for that to occur is that the Township would have to say that they would like to take on the construction of that road and make an offer to the property owner for the right-of-way to do that. He stated there is no requirement for the builder to comply with the Township map on file, and Mr. Murphy agreed.

Ms. Kirk agreed adding that if the Township wants that road to be built out, there would need to be a discussion between the property owner and the Township or the Township could attempt to do it by way of a condemnation which would trigger a different process.

Mr. Coyle asked if the Planning Commission feels that the Township should negotiate to complete that section of road, would we do that in our Motion tonight and recommend that to the Board of Supervisors, and Mr. Murphy agreed. Ms. Kirk stated that would be the same for Item #10 with respect to the bike path issue. Mr. Majewski stated that would be slightly different because the bike path is something that is required by our Subdivision and Lane Development Ordinance.

Mr. Geonnotti stated with regard to the rest of Mr. Pockl's letter, there are a number of technical comments pertaining to Plan presentation, technicalities with stormwater design, etc.; and they would be worked out during the normal course of the Subdivision and Land Development approval.

Mr. Pockl noted Item #23. Mr. Geonnotti stated the requirement is that a minimum of 2,200 square feet of suitable recreation land be provided per dwelling, but it also allows for the developer to provide a Fee-In-Lieu of

providing that amount of recreational space per dwelling. He stated in this situation there would be an offer of Fee-In-Lieu of for that recreational land.

Mr. Pockl asked if it is for the full amount, and Mr. Geonnotti agreed.

Mr. Pockl noted Item #24. Mr. Geonnotti stated the minimum cartway width in the Ordinance for a low-impact development is 26' wide. He stated they have provided the By-Right version. He stated the Ordinance requires 36' wide cartways for a Subdivision in the R-1 District. He stated reducing cartway width could be something that is discussed at a later point. He stated he feels it goes hand in hand with the product they are proposing of one acre lots whether parking is necessary on both sides of the streets, and this is something that would be open for negotiation as we go through the process.

Mr. Coyle stated they are proposing 36' wide cartways, and the Ordinance says that they must be a minimum of 26'; and they are within their rights to make them broader. He added the "traffic assessment" has given the Planning Commission a written recommendation that narrowing that down toward minimum would decrease speeding and create a safer neighborhood.

Mr. Geonnotti stated he would say that the requirement is 36' although it is permitted to go to 26' for a low-impact development; but they are providing what the typical detail/typical cross-section for a Residential road requires.

Mr. Murphy stated he feels they should understand the context and the environment in which this Plan was submitted. He stated they feel that when the Township became aware that the Torbert Farm might be sold, there was an impetus by the Township to develop an Open Space Ordinance, which if adopted the way it was advertised, would have reduced the density of this project by 30% to 35% according to their calculation. He stated Mr. Geonnotti was advised that he should submit a Plan that was to the maximum degree possible a fully-compliant Plan. He stated they did not want to make any presumption that the Township would entertain anything less than the cartway width that is shown on the Plan, although they would be happy to talk about it.

Mr. Murphy stated they did not "forget the fact that what the Township was up to was going to be very hurtful to the position of the Estate," and they acted and reacted accordingly. Mr. Coyle stated "all he is up to is clarity" and doing their due diligence in reviewing the Plan.

Mr. Murphy stated he feels that the cartway width on the Plan is excessive; however, they did not feel they had the choice to unilaterally decide it should be something less. Mr. Pockl noted Section #178-40A for a local Residential road says 26' not 36'. Mr. Geonnotti stated if you look elsewhere in the Township's Ordinance at requirements for local roads, there is a Table, and the requirement is 56' wide right-of-way and 36' cartway with sidewalks on both June 12, 2023

Planning Commission – page 15 of 49

sides. He added that there are a few contradictory things in the Ordinance looking at the typical detail and some of the attachments to the Ordinance under SALDO. He stated they are open to further discussion, but right now they are showing the By-Right submission.

Mr. Murphy stated the Township had indicated that the Open Space

Ordinance would result in the same density that would be on the By-Right

Plan, but that is not correct. He stated with the Plan they have submitted,
they tried to be as conservative as possible.

Mr. Pockl noted Comment #25. Mr. Geonnotti stated the requirement is that local streets shall not intersect the same side of the collector at intervals less than 800'. He stated their intersections with Creamery Road from Road A and Road B meet the requirement of 800'. He stated it goes on to say that the distance from Road B to Yardley-Newtown Road does not comply.

Mr. Geonnotti stated they submitted a full Traffic Study, and it goes by the anticipated traffic generated from this property, and the 95% queue which is the 95% capacity when this is built out is 300'. He stated at the A.M. peak it is 260', and that is how much is stacked up at the intersection based on current conditions at the signal and the operation of the signal. Mr. Geonnotti stated Road B is over 300' away from the signal so from a safety standpoint and a PennDOT standpoint it is more than compliant. He stated if they were to meet

Planning Commission - page 16 of 49

June 12, 2023

the requirement of putting it 800' from Yardley-Newtown Road, which is a arterial road, they would only be able to have one point of access along the whole Subdivision. He stated from a planning perspective, they had to space it at the interval required. He stated they worked with their traffic engineer and they are confident that the intersection can operate safely at the interval it is away from Yardley-Newtown Road right now.

Mr. Murphy stated if the Township wants them to get rid of it, they could cul-desac it, and there would be two other access points, and they will keep Palomino Way open. Mr. Majewski stated it is noted that it does not comply, and the solution is either to modify it or to request a Waiver. Mr. Geonnotti stated the requirement says, "same side of a collector," but Yardley-Newtown is an arterial. He stated the intersections of the collector road, which is Creamery Road, do occur at intervals of 800' or more. He added the intersection of a local road to an arterial road, to the extent that technicality is part of this Ordinance, they are not compliant "from a local road to an arterial." He stated the proposed Road A and Road B are 800' apart on a collector road. He stated it could be a Waiver.

Mr. Murphy stated they could get rid of it and everyone could use Doe Trail

Lane and Palomino Way, which people will complain about to the Township.

Mr. Coyne stated he feels the developer should propose what they want the June 12, 2023 Planning Commission – page 17 of 49

Township to consider. Mr. Majewski stated the Township engineer's letter points out Ordinance deficiencies or discrepancies, and this could be a Waiver request.

Mr. Coyle stated there is possibly a solution when you look at Comment #26,
which deals with the length of Road B, and he feels it is talking about the distance of Road B from Yardley-Newtown Road.

Mr. Geonnotti stated #26 deals with the block length. He stated the only block on this Plan is the distance from Road A intersection with Road B right before the cul-de-sac. He stated the block would be from Road A to the mid-point to the back of the cul-de-sac. He stated Road B has a number of intersections with Roads A, E, D, and C, but it is not a block - it is a continuous run. He stated a block is basically an undisturbed run of a road, so this is not a block. He stated the only block is from Road A to the cul-de-sac of Lots #21 and #22.

Mr. Pockl stated what Mr. Geonnotti has indicated seems to be reasonable that it is not a block. He asked the length of Road B, and Mr. Geonnotti stated it is half a mile.

Ms. Kirk stated it is the Applicant's position that Note #26 does not apply, and Mr. Geonnotti agreed. Mr. Geonnotti stated Road B is 2,700 linear feet, but the distance from the intersection of Road A and Road B is only 350'.

Mr. Pockl stated the definition of block is an area bounded by streets.

June 12, 2023 Planning Commission – page 18 of 49

Ms. Kirk stated looking at the Plan, the three interior roads would be constituted as blocks. Mr. Coyle stated Road A as drawn would have a straightaway in excess of 1,600', and Mr. Geonnotti agreed. Mr. Coyle stated it appears that #26 would be non-applicable.

Ms. Kirk stated #27 appears to be duplicative of #24. Mr. Geonnotti stated they agree that it is a BMP to reduce cartway width and reduce impervious adding that they are not opposed to going to reduced cartway widths.

Mr. Bush asked if the Traffic Study that was done contemplated the increased volume from the Wegman's Development that is going in, and Mr. Geonnotti stated it did. He stated it incorporated all proposed, approved, and planned developments within a certain radius and it included the apartments, the Wegman's, and everything that is in that project. Mr. Geonnotti stated it was done to meet Township and PennDOT standards.

Mr. Bush asked with regard to the Township Map, Comment #9, if the Township through negotiation or condemnation exercised its rights and put a road in through there, how would that effect the number of units that they would be building. Mr. Murphy stated they do not know yet as they have not done a Plan to look at that, although they will probably do that. He stated he believes that it will have a dramatic impact and be expensive.

He stated if would be less expensive for the developer to do it than if the

Township were to do it; however, the economics of the cost of doing that and the implication for the loss of lots remains to be seen. Mr. Bush stated that would require further investigation by the Applicant and discussion with the Township; and Mr. Murphy agreed assuming that there is an interest on the part of the Township in sitting down in good faith to understand those implications and how to get to that point.

Mr. Majewski showed a slide of what that would look like. He stated to the right is Mirror Lake Road with Patterson Farm in the lower right-hand corner. Route 332/Newtown-Yardley Road goes from top to bottom on the screen. What is shown contemplates re-aligning Creamery Road to cut through the Farm and lining up somewhere around where Doe Trail Lane is, taking the existing Creamery Road and turning it into a cul-de-sac for the existing homes that are on the road, and creating several lots in the interior of that project.

Mr. Bush asked if the Applicant has seen this before, and Mr. Murphy stated they have not.

Mr. Coyle asked Mr. Majewski if it is known if that would implicate any other private property outside of this parcel. Mr. Majewski stated the cul-de-sac would serve the existing homes that are currently on Creamery Road.

Mr. Coyle stated he is asking if the creation of the cul-de-sac would be entirely in the current right-of-way or would there be implications for private property that would need to be purchased or taken to make that happen outside the land of the developer's parcel. Mr. Majewski stated it would just impact the Applicant's land.

Mr. Pockl stated there are some Waivers being requested for stormwater management, and he noted his Comment #94 with regard to the number of test pits needed. Mr. Geonnotti stated the Ordinance requires a certain frequency of stormwater infiltration tests being conducted based on acreage. He stated for sites of 20 acres or more, the minimum number of test pits is 13 plus 1 per 5 acres beyond the initial which amounts to about 29 test pits. Mr. Geonnotti stated they did a two-day investigation in the areas where they know stormwater drains. He stated they knew where the points of discharge off the property where, and they knew where they wanted the stormwater management to be. He stated they tested those areas and found favorable results. He stated as noted earlier, they have an NPDES Permit and the State and local Conservation District have already reviewed and approved their

stormwater design. He stated that means that it meets rate, volume, and water quality reduction for points of discharge off of the property. Mr. Geonnotti stated the Township Ordinance requires additional tests which they do not feel is necessary because they did test and found viable and good infiltration rates in the area necessary. He stated they would not arbitrarily test upstream or arbitrarily test "just to conduct tests" as it is expensive to do so. He stated they are asking for a Waiver, and that Waiver is conditioned on the fact that they have a working stormwater design and they do not need to do additional tests.

Ms. Kirk asked if they are asking for an entire Wavier, and Mr. Murphy stated it is a partial Waiver. Ms. Kirk stated they are looking for a reduction in the number of tests. Mr. Geonnotti stated he wants a reduction in the required number of tests. Ms. Kirk stated it was indicated that 29 tests would have been required under the Ordinance, and she asked how many total tests they did. Mr. Geonnotti stated he believes it was close to 12 or 13 tests.

Mr. Pockl stated he understands that the intention of requiring so many tests is to determine the infiltration rates throughout the site to identify areas where stormwater management BMPs could be placed throughout the site as opposed to picking it at one location.

Mr. Pockl noted his comment about the loading ratio of the proposed basin. Mr. Geonnotti stated that comes up a lot as part of any type of infiltration facility. He stated the Pennsylvania BMP Manual, which stipulates all of the regulations and is a guidance manual, stipulates the suggestion of what a loading ratio to a basin is. He stated they look at total contributing area so that if you have a oneacre basin, you are allowed to get thirteen times one acre, and thirteen acres of drainage is allowed to get to that one basin. He stated they set different standards for the amount of loading that gets into the basin. He stated they are trying to make sure that you are promoting the prolonged health of the basin and not overloading impervious. Mr. Geonnotti stated in their situation, they are designing single-family houses that are going to be collected off of swales off of the property, and they are putting in additional levels of water quality and sediment removal getting to the basins so that they are comfortable with the loading ratios that they are getting to the basins as designed. He stated as noted earlier, they have already submitted to DEP, and DEP is typically more stringent than the Township, and DEP has already approved it. Mr. Geonnotti stated they had listed a number of ways that they were reducing pollutant load and reducing the basins and how they are meant to perform.

Mr. Geonnotti stated the basins will be part of an HOA unless the Township wants to own and maintain the basins, and the Operations & Maintenance of the basins will be Recorded against the property forever; and if there is ever an issue with the basins, and if they were to clog or not operate as proposed the end owner/entity that owns the basins will be responsible at their own costs to make sure that they do operate as proposed.

Mr. Geonnotti stated Mr. Pockl or the Township staff will be doing routine inspections to make sure that happens. He stated they agree that they exceed the recommendations for loading ratios, but they are very comfortable with what is proposed.

Mr. Pockl stated there are two vegetative swales primarily along the southern lots, and the northern lots drain toward those basins. He stated it would be preferable to provide infiltration within those vegetative swales, understand what the infiltration rates are within those vegetative swales, and provide infiltration within the swales to spread out the load from a stormwater management perspective. Mr. Geonnotti stated he agrees that it is good to spread out infiltration, and they do have vegetative swales which are an added BMP which they are not taking credit for from an impervious perspective. He stated they understand that there will be some level of infiltration that occurs in those swales even though they are taking credit only for the

infiltration that occurs in the basins. He stated the design is conservative; and if there is an interest in finding how much infiltration can occur in the swales, they will do so. He stated that may result in them being able to reduce their basin size and may result in them being able to get an additional lot based on reducing the basin size if they start looking at taking opportunities elsewhere on the property. Mr. Geonnotti stated they came in with what they considered to be a very conservative, centralized design, and they are only claiming infiltration in the basins.

Mr. Pockl stated he is confident that they will be able to work with the Applicant to make sure that they have addressed his concerns.

Mr. Coyle noted Item #97 and asked if this relates to the stormwater basin for the north end of the property or the south end of the property, and Mr. Pockl stated it is the south end of the property. Mr. Coyle stated he understands that this would not be applicable if the Township opts to negotiate to re-direct Mirror Lake to Creamery. Mr. Geonnotti stated there are three points of discharge leaving this property, two of which are of significance to Creamery Road; and they are maintaining those two points of discharge. He stated what is getting to those points now will be reduced. He stated if the culverts are operating now, they will continue to operate with less run-off getting to them. He stated as part of this plan they are proposing improvements to

Creamery Road, and part of that includes stormwater inlets; and if there are issues on site, the Applicant will be responsible for replacing culverts under the road as it is rebuilt.

Mr. Majewski stated the pipe in question was replaced by the Township about fifteen years ago so it should be in fairly good condition.

Mr. Pockl stated they indicated that they received an NPDES Permit, and he asked if that was based off the same Plan Set that was submitted to the Township for review or was that part of an initial submission to DEP and then DEP had comments, and the Stormwater Management Plan was revised to address their comments subsequent to the submission that was made to the Township. Mr. Geonnotti stated it was the same Plan Set that was submitted to the Township. He noted that on the Permit letter the Plan date did not match this Plan date, and that was because he noticed that the Plan Set submitted to the Township did not have their compost filter sock detail on the Plan and they put a revision date on the Plan, so there is no discrepancy versus what was submitted.

Ms. Kirk asked what is the proposal for the Environmental Impact Assessment.

She stated under Note #103 it indicated that they have to provide one.

Mr. Geonnotti stated it was submitted. Mr. Pockl agreed they did submit an EIA.

June 12, 2023 Planning Commission – page 26 of 49

Mr. Geonnotti stated there was a Waiver request letter submitted. Mr. Murphy stated Mr. Pockl's review letter accurately summarizes the Applicant's review letter. Mr. Geonnotti stated with regard to Waiver #1 this allows the use of an aerial photograph in lieu of providing a comprehensive analysis of existing conditions within 500' of the tract. He stated he has done a lot of work in Lower Makefield, and this is one that is always accepted. He stated anywhere they are developing, they will obviously be surveying.

Mr. Geonnotti stated the next Waiver has to do with the number of copies of Plans that the Township requires. He stated their Plan Set was 111 sheets, and not everyone needs a full-sized Plan Set. He stated they worked with Mr. Majewski on what was required and submitted that.

Mr. Geonnotti stated with regard to the Waiver request for Plan scale the Ordinance requires a minimum scale and they had to go to something bigger than that, but there is excessive detail on the Plans.

Mr. Geonnotti stated the next request is to be able to use an aerial photo in lieu of providing existing features within 200' of the tract which is the same as Waiver #1.

Mr. Geonnotti stated the next Waiver request is to not provide pavement core samples on Yardley-Newtown Road or Creamery Road. He stated Yardley-Newtown Road is a State road, and no improvements are proposed at this time. He stated on Creamery Road, they are proposing reconstruction so it is not necessary to do pavement core samples on a road that they are reconstructing. Mr. Pockl noted that the Township recently paved that road, and the Township would prefer that core samples not be taken on that road. Mr. Coyle stated the Township just re-paved the road, and the developer is going to tear it up and rebuild it; and Mr. Geonnotti agreed. Mr. Pockl stated they are going to be expanding the width of the road as well.

Mr. Geonnotti noted Waiver #6 which relates to Plan presentation, scale, etc.; and he believes that Mr. Pockl is satisfied with the level of detail on the Plans although it does not match the Ordinance.

Mr. Geonnotti stated with regard to Waiver #7 this relates to the intersections of Road A and Road B at Creamery Road. He stated they are slightly in excess of 4% based on the topography of the site. He stated 4% "is nothing," and a handicap curb ramp is allowed to be up to 8%, so what they are proposing is just slightly in excess of what the Ordinance requires.

Mr. Geonnotti stated with regard to Waiver #8, they have already discussed the test pits.

Mr. Geonnotti stated Waiver request #9 is another common one in Lower

Makefield and other Townships with regard to transition grading width 5' of a

property line, and he stated this will be necessary along a lot of the perimeters

of the site to be able to complete the improvements.

Mr. Murphy stated the remaining Waivers are related to stormwater.

Mr. Geonnotti stated they will work with the Township engineer on these; and to the extent that they do not comply, they will request a Waiver.

Mr. Geonnotti stated the rest of the letter is related to "deferrals." He stated Mr. Murphy had alluded to the "environment that they had submitted to", and they wanted to make sure that these were not things that they neglected to point out. He stated they are not necessarily Waivers. He stated Yardley-Newtown Road is not being developed so they do not need center line profiles, and this also relates to the comment regarding grades.

Mr. Coyle asked Mr. Geonnotti if he is saying that #15 is not applicable, and

Mr. Geonnotti agreed. Mr. Pockl agreed as well. Mr. Geonnotti stated this is

also true with regard to #16. He stated #17 and #18 are related to sewer

capacity, and they understand that the Ordinance requires that there be

June 12, 2023 Planning Commission – page 29 of 49

sewer planning for ultimate approval of the project. Mr. Geonnotti stated at the time that they submitted they did not have their "will serve letters," but they understand that it is a condition of approval that they will have to have sewer.

The review letter from the traffic engineer was noted. Mr. Geonnotti stated the first comment discusses Creamery Road including the relocation, the Township's goals and how those goals are going to be met with the proposed development. He stated Item #2 discusses the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA Report), and Mr. Geonnotti stated sight distances can be met, and they will work with the traffic engineer to make sure he is satisfied with the design. He stated Items #3, #4, and #5 are technical, and they will work with the Township traffic engineer on this. He stated #6 pertains to the 35' wide cartways and the 56' rights-of-way, and this was included in Mr. Pockl's letter.

Mr. Geonnotti noted #7 with regard to "the unimaginative design" of having straight cartways and an efficient design in a Subdivision lay-out. He stated it indicated that relatively long, straight roadways encourage speeding; and Mr. Geonnotti stated obviously it will be signed for a lower speed limit, and they can also consider smaller cartways. He stated what they have shown is what the Ordinance permits them to construct.

Mr. Geonnotti noted the comment with regard to the pedestrian crossing of Creamery Road. He stated they are aware that ADA ramps and stop signs are needed. He stated at the intersection of Creamery and 332, the traffic engineer is asking for an extension of sidewalk, an ADA ramp, and a crosswalk to cross Creamery Road; and they are willing to consider that, and he feels that will be worked out as part of the process.

Mr. Geonnotti stated Item #12 relates to the Traffic Impact Fee; and they have indicated that the Fee is about \$3,400 per new weekday, afternoon trip, and they gave a total Impact Fee which the development would be required to pay.

Mr. Coyle noted Item #9 with regard to the ADA ramps. He stated Mr. Geonnotti indicated that he was aware of and will consider that, and he asked if there is a requirement under the law for them to put in ADA-compliant ramps at those crossings; and Mr. Geonnotti stated there will be. He added he mis-read #8 and #9 as being part of the Creamery Road and 332 intersection which they are not showing improvements at, but this is strictly pertaining to the crossing of Road A and Road B at their intersection with Creamery Road, and there will be curb ramps. He stated they are proposing a bike trail so there will be curb ramps.

Ms. Kirk asked Mr. Geonnotti asked if #7, #8, #9, and #10 are all will complies, and Mr. Geonnotti stated #7 is a comment. He stated with regard to #8 that is the same as #9, and that is a will comply. Mr. Coyle stated it is not the same as there is a pedestrian crossing and then there is a ramp. He stated it is two components of one final product. Mr. Murphy stated they will comply. Ms. Kirk asked about #10, and Mr. Murphy stated they will comply.

Ms. Kirk noted Item #12 and stated she wants to make sure that we are clear on the figure. She stated it says "An Impact Fee of \$3,400 for 78 additional single-family homes is excessive." Mr. Geonnotti stated they are agreeing that there is a Traffic Impact Fee, but they have not discussed the amount and the total new trips with the Township's traffic engineer. He stated a Traffic Impact Fee will be paid, but they want to make confirm that the total is based on new trips.

Mr. Coyle asked if they will comply with Item #11 and that there will be a crossing across Creamery at Yardley-Newtown Road, and Mr. Geonnotti agreed.

Mr. Murphy stated they will comply with the comments from the Fire Services

Director. He stated they have already talked about the Police Department

comments, and he does not believe they have added anything new beyond

what was already talked about.

Mr. Murphy noted the EAC review letter. He stated with regard to the first two and a half pages, the Township chose not to participate in trying to buy the property. He stated the property will not be Dedicated, and they are going to develop the property.

Mr. Majewski stated a lot of the loading ratio has to do with basins that are primarily infiltration, and this has infiltration as a component; but it is not an infiltration basin in that it has an outlet. Mr. Geonnotti stated it is an infiltration basin as it is a bio-retention basin, and it does have a component of storage which is ultimately infiltrated and never released; however the storms above that infiltration volume do get released through a slow-release orifice at a controlled rate in accordance with the Township's Ordinance which then goes into the off-site points that can be seen on Creamery Road. He stated there is a release from the basin, and 100% of the water is not infiltrated on site.

Mr. Costello stated it is always a sensitive topic in our Township when something old is taken down, and he asked if there was any thought about trying to salvage the structures that exist today and why they decided not to do that. Mr. Murphy stated he does not believe a lot of time or energy was spent considering that. He stated no one that he is aware of, including Ms. Torbert, felt that there was any historical value to anything that is there today. Mr. Majewski stated a

member of the Historical Commission came to the site walk, and also looked at the Torbert House; and while they indicated that there might be one or two things that might be worth something, they did not feel that they needed to be preserved other than possibly re-using them as part of another project.

Mr. Coyle asked if the Applicant is willing to wait until the November elections so that the Township could put a vote to a Bond to make an offer to purchase the land as was noted in the EAC letter, and Mr. Murphy stated they are not.

Ms. Kirk stated the Planning Commission could make a recommendation based on what was reviewed which would allow the Plan to go to the Board of Supervisors. She stated if there is a genuine desire to have a meeting to discuss a Cluster Development, it could be addressed by the Supervisors as that is where they are going to get their direction from.

Mr. Bush stated it would have been good to have heard from Dr. Weiss as to how the Supervisors are thinking about this. He stated it sounds like if there were to be a discussion about continuing Creamery Road, it changes the whole scope of the Plan; and he questions if it makes sense to vote to recommend something or not recommend something when it may not even be close to what is ultimately potentially discussed in the near future. Mr. Costello stated he agrees.

Mr. Majewski stated the Board of Supervisors meets a week from Wednesday, and he has had a discussion with the Township Manager, and it might be a good idea to have this go to the Board of Supervisors to give direction on the possibility of the Cluster and/or the re-alignment of Creamery Road to see how that impacts the Plan. He stated the time to act on the Plan is before the Board of Supervisors' second meeting in July, and he believes that the first Board of Supervisors' meeting in July is going to be cancelled. He stated if the Applicant was willing to give a one-month Extension, he feels they could go to the Board of Supervisors next Wednesday, get direction, and the Planning Commission could make a subsequent recommendation. Mr. Murphy stated neither he nor Mr. Geonnotti are available next Wednesday. He stated at this point he would not be willing to grant an Extension until he has a better sense of what is being done. He stated if there is going to be a meaningful conversation, he would entertain an Extension.

Mr. Majewski stated the Board would have to act on it at the meeting a week from Wednesday, and he asked Mr. Murphy if he wants the Board to proceed on it without him being present; and Mr. Murphy stated he did not.

Mr. Majewski stated an Extension until the second meeting in July would then make sense. Mr. Murphy asked if they are only meeting once a month now; and Ms. Kirk stated the first meeting was scheduled for July 5, but since

June 12, 2023

Planning Commission – page 35 of 49

there was a "lack of items it did not make sense to have a meeting." It was noted that if the Board of Supervisors did not meet on July 5, they would not be meeting until July 19.

Mr. Coyle stated that would "put the Planning Commission meeting in August."

Mr. Murphy questioned what the Planning Commission would do in August.

Mr. Coyle stated he is discussing the timeline. He stated he believes that the

Applicant is within their rights to request a vote on this proposal as it stands

today, and the Planning Commission could do that as well as make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors that they enter into negotiations.

Mr. Coyle stated none of the Waivers that have been requested seem extreme,

and on its face the Plan is largely in compliance.

Mr. Murphy stated he does not feel it benefits anyone for the Applicant to come back two months from now and talk about the same things we talked about this evening. Mr. Majewski stated if things were to change, then it would make sense. Mr. Murphy stated as he noted earlier they are happy to sit down and have a meaningful conversation with the Township about doing something different; however, he does not want to do the same thing here two months from now and would prefer that the Planning Commission make

a recommendation and follow Ms. Kirk's recommendation that the Applicant enter into a conversation with the Township at some level. He stated he would grant an Extension of time, if they are trying to something different in good faith.

Ms. Kirk stated the reason she suggested it was because if there if a discussion, there would be an Amendment to the Plan that would come back to the Planning Commission. Mr. Costello stated he is open to voting on a Motion this evening. He stated he is concerned that we are about to pass an Ordinance, where the first time it is used, they want to do something different than what is in the Ordinance. Mr. Costello stated he does recognize that the Ordinance would not be applicable to this Application because it came in before the Ordinance was passed.

Ms. Kirk stated the Planning Commission could make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to engage in discussions with the Applicant about a Cluster-type Development along the lines of the proposed Open Space Ordinance with a further discussion as to the re-alignment of Creamery Road as set forth in the Township's Official Map. If those discussions do not happen or if the Supervisors are not inclined to agree to those discussions, then the Planning Commission could make a recommendation as to whether to approve the By-Right Plan subject to the comments as discussed tonight, take no action as to the By-Right Plan, or recommend Denial of the By-Right Plan.

June 12, 2023 Planning Commission – page 37 of 49

Mr. Costello stated he is concerned about the long, straight road, and he asked if it would be appropriate to add a request to look into opportunities to follow some of the recommendations by the traffic engineer.

Ms. Kirk asked if the discussions do not happen regarding the Cluster-Type Development with open space preservation and re-alignment of Creamery Road, what is the Planning Commission's inclination with regard to the By-Right Plan being presented. Mr. Costello stated based on everything that has been discussed this evening, he does not feel he could deny the Plan outright.

Mr. DeLorenzo asked what the next step would be if the Planning Commission took no action. Ms. Kirk stated it would still proceed to the Board of Supervisors without an opinion from the Planning Commission. Mr. Bush stated the Planning Commission could recommend no action on the current Plan, but recommend that the Board engage with the Applicant. He stated that may be a better choice than recommending or rejecting approval as that would "color any discussion the Applicant may have with the Township." Mr. DeLorenzo asked if we should be asking the Supervisors whether we should be having the discussion about a Cluster Development and then make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. Ms. Kirk stated the Planning Commission cannot force the Board of Supervisors to engage in discussions, but they could make a strong recommendation that the

June 12, 2023 Planning Commission – page 38 of 49 Supervisors have a discussion with the Applicant about a Cluster Development.

Mr. DeLorenzo asked why the Planning Commission would not engage in those discussions. Mr. Bush stated "this is about money and the Planning Commission does not control the purse strings."

Mr. Murphy asked if it would make sense for the Planning Commission to recommend to the Board that a Committee be established that includes members of the Planning Commission and the Supervisors to talk about a Master Plan for how this proceeds so that the Planning Commission has a voice in it. Mr. Bush stated he feels that is a reasonable suggestion.

Mr. Costello stated he feels that would be more than necessary, and he feels that there are people who work in the Township who know how to do this, and the Applicants knows how to do their job; and he feels they should get together to come up with a plan that works for everyone or decide that it will not work.

Mr. Coyle stated he feels that we just had discussions about open space, and the Board of Supervisors was very clear that they have no interest in increasing the lot count in exchange for a decrease in lot size. He stated he feels it comes down to whether the Board of Supervisors is going to pay to purchase the property. Mr. Bush stated we heard what the Supervisor Liaison had to say, but we have not heard the opinion of the rest of the Board.

June 12, 2023

Planning Commission – page 39 of 49

Mr. DeLorenzo stated he is not so concerned about having a seat at the table, but feels it is the Planning Commission's responsibility to look at these situations and make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Murphy suggested the Planning Commission include a recommendation that the Board of Supervisors look into a Cluster Option.

Mr. Costello stated he agrees with Mr. Murphy and does not want to have them just come back in two months. He stated he feels the Planning Commission has been given a lot of information, and he feels that they are close to the general direction of where this should go and what the Planning Commission should recommend. He stated the question is whether the Planning Commission should just vote on the Plan before them so that it is available in case the discussions break down or provide no decision but recommend that the Board work with the Applicant on a solution that works well for both parties. He stated there is also the question as to whether or not they should do a road which would fundamentally change things.

Mr. Bush stated they are here for Preliminary approval, and they will have to come back for Final approval.

Mr. Coyle asked if the Applicant would prefer the Planning Commission to make an up or down recommendation or no action on the Preliminary Plan understanding that the Planning Commission is going to recommend that the Board enter into discussions with the Applicant. Mr. Murphy stated he would prefer that the Planning Commission do something this evening with regard to the Plan presented.

Mr. Costello moved and Mr. Bush seconded that there be no decision. It is recommended that the Board work in good faith and earnestly with the developer to resolve the issues of development as a Cluster-Type Development and the realignment of Creamery Road as set forth in the Township Official Map.

Mr. Coyle stated if this does come back after discussion relatively in the form that it is today, there were some items that were discussed this evening that he would like to see the Applicant voluntarily look at revising such as some of the intersection distances and the width of the cartway.

Mr. Murphy stated he feels that there were not a lot of items with which the Planning Commission took issue in the Plan that was presented; and if they come back with this Plan, the Planning Commission would then make a recommendation.

Mr. DeLorenzo asked if the Planning Commission has an opinion about the re-alignment of Creamery Road, and he asked what is the rationale. Mr. Costello stated if it were not for the other dynamics, he feels they should do it. Mr. Coyle stated it would increase safety and decrease wait times at the light.

Ms. Chris Laquidara, 1736 Clydesdale, stated she has heard a little about the clustering that would preserve some of the land, and that would help those in her neighborhood, the Ridings, to retain the setting and their quiet development. She stated there are no through streets currently in her neighborhood, and it is a circle that comes in one way, around, down to Afton Elementary School, and then back out on the other side. She stated opening up Palomino would greatly impact the activity in their neighborhood now. She stated there are about 30 children who are able to ride their bikes and walk to School.

She stated she does not know if children from the new development would be bused or if they would be coming into her neighborhood to go to School.

She stated another 78 homes and all of those children would "hugely" impact the roads in her development.

Ms. Laquidara stated she would ask for a natural tree line like the one on

Yardley-Langhorne Road and that it be extended so that there would be a

buffer in the back of her neighborhood. She stated her biggest concern is

the drainage which was discussed earlier. She stated she has the main drain

June 12, 2023

Planning Commission – page 42 of 49

in her back yard; and if there is more than 2" of rain, she has a stream that runs through her back yard. She stated if it is more than 2" she has water in her basement. She stated her concern is who will maintain the drainage as that is a huge issue for her. She added that there is not good drainage because of the clay and the shale that is there so the water just sits. Ms. Laquidara stated she does not know if anyone walked her neighborhood when they were on the Torbert property, and she asked that they look at her neighborhood as well especially the homes that adjoin the farm. Ms. Laquidara stated the drainage from the farm into the pipe goes underneath her yard and into the middle circle. She stated if there is any additional run-off, she is "in trouble."

Ms. Laquidara thanked the Planning Commission for representing the neighbors adding that she appreciates the questions that were asked.

Ms. Kirk stated she was just advised that the July 5 Board of Supervisors' meeting has not been canceled, it has just not been scheduled.

Ms. Karen Fell, 1550 Doe Trail, stated with regard to the cluster and open space social media "chatter," she feels that there are a certain number of people especially on the Facebook pages who feel that we are going to preserve something for open space. She stated she does not think everyone really understands

what that will look like, and it is not going to be a park on part of the property that people will have access to, and it might only be available to the people in the development.

Mr. Geonnotti stated with regard to stormwater management, there is a drainage area that drains to Ms. Laquidara's property. He stated it is an existing pipe which drains to an existing swale, and the stream that runs all the way through the Ridings and is discharged the same way that this proposed Development's stormwater goes out to Creamery Road. He stated as part of the Development, they took some of the drainage that was getting there that they were permitted to discharge to and put a significant portion of it toward Creamery Road because they were over-compensating on the basins. He stated there will be a reduction in stormwater running off of the property, and it will be at a more-controlled rate going toward Creamery Road at a rate that is allowed even though they are taking it from one drainage area and putting it into another.

Mr. Coyle asked if they know if the children from the new development would be walkers or bused, but Mr. Geonnotti stated they did not look into that.

Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE SUBDIVISION & LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE RELATED TO OPEN SPACE DEFINITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS

Ms. Kirk stated these are the Amendments to those Sections of SALDO to reflect the recommendations in the Open Space Ordinance. She stated at the May meeting the Planning Commission indicated they did not want to lose sight of open space being included in Zoning but not dealt with in the SALDO. She stated Mr. McLoone did a great job working through those Sections of SALDO dealing with this, and we tried to mirror what was in the Zoning Ordinance. What was circulated was the Open Space Ordinance in its final form that went to the Board of Supervisors along with the draft of this revision for SALDO. She stated there was another Township's Open Space regulations, part of which could be used, was also provided to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Kirk stated the red areas are the sections that were added, and they mirror what was in the Open Space Ordinance. She stated the sections that are in the underlined part were Sections that were found in the East Vincent Township Ordinance that seemed to fit well with what she felt the Planning Commission wanted to recommend. Ms. Kirk stated there was a meeting where they went through the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Section by Section.

Ms. Kirk noted Page 4 which says, "Required Open Space Management Plan," and she stated the East Vincent Township Ordinance deals with this regarding a Conditional Use; and she wanted to make sure the Planning Commission was okay with saying, "an Application for Land Development." She stated they will put in "for Land Development approval."

Ms. Kirk stated any Section that is in regular type that has not been modified, changed, or underlined is what is there now and it is not being changed.

Mr. Costello noted Page 2, #4, and he asked what is meant by "innovative community living projects." Ms. Kirk stated that was part of the Preamble to the other Open Space Ordinance that was included. She stated when you are talking about open space it could be privately held or held by an HOA, or anything else that might come along. Mr. Costello stated he felt someone could argue that meant that we were allowing some kind of living arrangement on the open space. Ms. Kirk stated they could eliminate that. Mr. Bush stated they should end it after "providing open space areas which would provide the residents with active and passive recreational opportunities."

Mr. Costello stated a lot has been discussed over the last several months, and he wants to make sure that everything was addressed in the spirit

that the Planning Commission was talking about. Mr. McLoone stated there was a meeting, and they discussed everything that was specifically relevant to the Open Space Ordinance to mimic SALDO.

Mr. Coyle moved, Mr. Bush seconded and it was unanimously carried to recommend that pursuant to the two changes discussed here today that the Board of Supervisors accept the proposed Ordinances and thank Mr. McLoone for his service to the Township in the thorough work in these revisions.

#691 POINT (TROILO) LAND DEVELOPMENT – Time Expires 9/10/23 Acknowledge Receipt of Plans

Tax Parcel #20-021-003

H-C Historic Commercial Zoning/TND Traditional Neighborhood Development Overlay

1674 Edgewood Road at Yardley-Langhorne Road

Proposed renovation of the existing Ishmael House into a 1-unit dwelling, replication of the existing Quill House into a 2-unit dwelling, construction of 1 new 2-story dwelling containing 2 units and 2 new 2-story dwellings each containing 4 units with 28 on-site parking spaces

Mr. Majewski stated the Township received Plans for the Troilo project at the Point which is at the intersection of Langhorne-Yardley Road and Edgewood Road. The Plan was forwarded to the Planning Commission, our consultants, and our other volunteer Committees for review. He stated the Plans can be accessed by the public on-line or can be looked at in the Township offices.

He stated if anyone has any comments or questions they can contact the Township. Mr. Majewski stated a site visit will need to be scheduled, and Mr. McLoone will be sending out an e-mail to get everyone's schedule.

Mr. Costello stated as noted on the Agenda, the plan is to replicate the existing Quill House, and he asked if that means that they intend to tear it down and rebuild it as a reproduction; and Mr. Majewski agreed.

Ms. Kirk stated they came to the Planning Commission a few times in the past. Mr. Majewski stated they also went to HARB about five times, to the Board of Supervisors a number of times, and to the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Majewski stated now they will be coming back to the Planning Commission, HARB, and the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Bush stated the Plans have changed since the Planning Commission saw it, and Mr. Majewski agreed that it has changed significantly. He stated it has been scaled back, and they have tried to address many of the comments that were made.

Ms. Kirk stated there was discussion that they were going to maintain the exterior similar in look as to what the existing houses were. She stated she had a model Façade Easement Agreement that she circulated to the Township that could be used if that is something the Planning Commission wants to recommend in order to tighten up the exterior appearance of the buildings.

Mr. Majewski stated he believes as part of HARB's review, before they went to the Zoning Hearing Board, they did show a rendering of what the Quill House would look like redone, and he recalls that it looked essentially like the House does now.

Mr. Majewski stated this may come before the Planning Commission at the July meeting.

## OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Majewski stated the Ad Hoc Property Committee, which is considering the Patterson Farm Master Plan, will be holding an in-person, public open forum at the Community Center on Monday, June 26 from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. He stated the consultants who have been working on the Plan, which is a team of architects, planners, and historical consultants, will be there available for anyone in the public who has questions. They are also interested in hearing any ideas or comments about what the public would like to see. He stated if you are unable to attend the meeting, you can use the new citizens portal which is available on the Township Website, and any comments submitted in that way would be forwarded to all the appropriate people.

Mr. Bush stated during the presentation by the Applicant earlier this evening

there were several representations to conflicts in our Ordinances about cart-

way width; and if they do exist, they should be cleaned up. Mr. Majewski

stated he agrees. He added that some of the Waivers that are requested are

because some of the Ordinances are outdated, and he noted the submission

requirements. Mr. Bush stated he feels what was indicated was that there are

conflicts in the Ordinances, and he feels that needs to be cleaned up.

There being no further business, Mr. Bush moved, Mr. Coyle seconded and it

was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Colin Coyle, Secretary