

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
MINUTES – MARCH 21, 2005

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on March 21, 2005. Chairman Stainthorpe called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. noting that the Board had been meeting in Executive Session since 7:00 p.m. to discuss legal matters.

Those present:

Board of Supervisors: Pete Stainthorpe, Chairman
 Scott Fegley, Vice Chairman
 Grace Godshalk, Secretary/Treasurer
 Frank Fazzalore, Supervisor
 Steve Santarsiero, Supervisor

Others: Terry Fedorchak, Township Manager
 Jeffrey Garton, Township Solicitor
 James Majewski, Township Engineer
 Kenneth Coluzzi, Chief of Police

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Jim Tolbert, 884 Slate Hill Road, stated at the last meeting he raised an issue regarding Verizon and he thanked the Township for their cooperation in this matter which is getting resolved.

Ms. Virginia Torbert, 1700 Yardley-Newtown Road, asked for an update on the Dalgewicz condemnation and the farmhouse in the Wilshire Development where the property owner wanted to demolish the property. Mr. Garton stated with regard to the Dalgewicz matter, the property owner took an Appeal, and they are waiting for a Hearing date from Doylestown for the Common Pleas Court. With regard to the Wilshire Development farmhouse matter, he is trying to find individuals to serve as Hearing Officers and by the next meeting of the Board he will have three recommendations and they will hear an Appeal from the denial of the demolition permit by the Zoning Officer at that proceeding.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Fazzalore moved and Mr. Fegley seconded to approve the Minutes of March 7, 2005 as corrected. Motion carried with Mrs. Godshalk abstained.

Ms. Virginia Torbert asked the location of the fields which are planned to be lit, and Ms. Liney showed the location on the Plan. Ms. Torbert stated her parents are buried at the cemetery adjacent to Macclesfield Park and she does remember that a promise was made as far as the field directly behind the cemetery not being lit. She stated she agrees that there is a need for new fields. She stated she feels they should start to build on North Park, Samost, and Snipes now. She does not feel anyone who is from the sports organizations would want their homes lit up like this. She stated if the Board of Supervisors made a promise not to install new lights, they should live up to this.

Mr. Fazzalore moved to table this matter until the Township Manager reviews the Minutes to see where they stand. Mrs. Godshalk seconded.

Mr. Santarsiero moved to amend the Motion to include a proposal that they take a look at what buffering they could put in there and do so in an expedited basis so that this is not lingering farther and to make a decision at the next meeting one way or the other.

Mr. Stainthorpe stated he does not believe they need to pass anything this evening. He stated the lights are in the Budget and if they were to do anything tonight it would be to take the lights out and come up with alternatives. He does not feel there is any question that there are significant recreational needs in the Township. He stated when Macclesfield was first built in 1990 the population of Lower Makefield was about 17,000 and it is now 34,000. He stated the Township needs to make many decisions on what projects they can proceed with in the Township, and they can only tax the citizens so much. He suggested that they move forward with the lights but also look into the suggestions made by Mr. Santarsiero for buffering.

Mr. Fedorchak stated at the current time they are doing the preliminary engineering for the lights. Mr. Santarsiero suggested that as this process goes forward, they should also look into the buffering and the timing of the lights.

Ms. Mavis stated they should consider if the lights are going to be off at 10:00 p.m. if this is really going to accomplish much for the Township. She stated they should also consider what it will take to monitor this. She stated if the lights are going to be off by 10:00 p.m., play needs to be completed by 9:30 p.m. and she questions how much this will add to the playing time. Mr. Santarsiero stated the teams would have to work around the fact that the lights will be off at 10:00 p.m. and possibly they will have to put equipment away with their high beams on.

Vote was taken on the Motion to table and did not pass as Mr. Fazzalore and Mrs. Godshalk were in favor and Mr. Fegley, Mr. Santarsiero, and Mr. Stainthorpe were opposed.

Mr. Fazzalore asked that the Township Manager review the Minutes to find out what was promised.

Mr. Santarsiero moved and Mr. Fegley seconded to have the Park & Recreation Director come back with firm costs on improvements on lighting including timers and recommendations on buffering. Motion carried with Mrs. Godshalk abstained.

Mrs. Godshalk moved and Mr. Fegley seconded to immediately start drawing up plans for development of Samost Park.

Mr. Fegley stated the reason why much of the new field development has not gone forward was because of the Senior Center issue. Mr. Stainthorpe stated he feels the Park & Recreation Board should move forward in an orderly manner. Mrs. Godshalk stated she feels the Park & Recreation Board does need guidance noting they have been trying to come up with something for Samost for ten years. Mr. Fegley stated the Motion is not to go out for bids, but to direct the Park & Recreation Board to come up with a Master Plan for Samost. Mrs. Godshalk stated the Samost Tract is approximately twenty-six acres and there is room for a Senior Center if it is to be built. Mr. Fegley stated they could also budget money next year for more development of the Master Plan they already have for Memorial Park.

Mr. Fazzalore stated he would vote for the Motion on the condition that the Senior Center be included. No change was made to the Motion as stated.

Motion carried with Mr. Fazzalore and Mr. Stainthorpe opposed.

DISCUSSION AND MOTION ON REFINANCING GOLF COURSE BOND

Mr. Gordon Walker was present and stated they requested the go ahead from the Board of Supervisors to convert a portion of the Golf Course debt from a variable rate to a fixed rate. They have obtained all the information they need for the prospectus, secured bond insurance, and the credit rating of Moody's. They have reaffirmed the Township's AA rating. Only two other Townships in Bucks County have an AA rating. He stated they had agreed that once all the information was available, they would meet with the Board one more time to see how much of the debt they wanted to convert. He noted the Interest Rate Chart on Page 3. He noted Page 4 which shows that the variable rate for the entire issue is currently 1.98%. Adding the Admin Fee shows that the Golf Course debt is currently costing the Township 2.38%.

Mr. Fazzalore stated six weeks ago they did not take any action and they were at 3.44 on \$8 million and now they are 40 basis points above that. Mr. Walker stated the rates are up and down. He stated currently they are only 10 basis higher than they were in mid

re-fund as well as call in the variable. Mr. Rubin stated he was present during the prior discussions on rates and he felt the fixed rate less than a year ago was under 3%. It was noted this was not correct. Mr. Rubin asked the fixed rate at the time. Mr. Fedorchak noted the Interest Rate History Chart and stated where they are now is very close to where they have been for a number of years. Mr. Walker stated in 2002 when the decision was made to go variable, the fixed rate was higher than it is today. Mr. Rubin stated he is talking about last year. Mr. Stainthorpe stated they have been looking at this constantly. Mr. Walker stated last year he did not appear before the Board of Supervisors but they continually updated Bill Taylor on the rates. In 2003 the fixed rate was higher than today as it was 5%.

Mr. Matt Bulger stated they indicated that there is an option that they could come back to whoever wins the auction and fix a larger portion. Mr. Garton stated they would try to do this the day of the auction. Mr. Walker stated if they would convert a little more, those maturities are higher so it tends to raise the average rate on what you are converting. If you convert less, you get a lower average rate. Mr. Bulger asked about converting more and Mr. Walker stated if you go above \$10 million you will be paying the higher rate. Mr. Garton stated if you go over \$9.9 million it is no longer attractive to large financial institutions. This is \$9.9 million a year in total. He stated you cannot go back a year later and renegotiate with whoever was the low bidder.

Motion carried with Mr. Fazzalore, Mr. Fegley and Mr. Stainthorpe in favor, Mr. Santarsiero opposed, and Mrs. Godshalk abstaining.

Mr. Santarsiero moved, Mr. Fegley seconded and it was unanimously carried to direct the Township Manager to authorize advertisement of a special meeting on Tuesday, March 29 at 4:30 p.m.

**PUBLIC HEARING AND APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS BY FARMLAND PRESERVATION INC. FOR INCLUSION OF TAX PARCELS IN THE LOWER MAKEFIELD TOWNSHIP AGRICULTURAL SECURITY DISTRICT
RESOLUTION NO. 2078, RESOLUTION NO. 2079, AND RESOLUTION NO. 2080**

Mr. Garton stated pursuant to the Board's receipt of the Applications, the Planning Commission and Agricultural Security Committee recommended that they be included. These were advertised for consideration this evening.

Mr. Sam Conti, Farmland Preservation Corporation, stated they have nine tax parcels, five of which were included in the Agricultural Security District. They are requesting approval of the inclusion of three more. He stated one more is missing which is Clearview which is twenty-five acres. This is the old Black Farm. He would like this to be included. Mr. Garton stated he has the record of what is included because he recorded

all the adoptions with the Recorder of Deeds Office. He asked that the Township send him a letter with the tax parcel numbers and he can cross check what is included.

Mrs. Godshalk asked the impact if the land ceases to be actively farmed. She stated she felt the land can be used as recreation land without a Referendum. Mr. Garton stated this is in the restrictions that created the organization. She asked if it states that there can be a Referendum where it can be developed into three acre lots. Mr. Garton stated they would have to have a Referendum in order to sell it. Mrs. Godshalk stated she feels it can only be developed as three acres lots. Mr. Stainthorpe stated this does not effect the Agricultural Security District. Mrs. Godshalk stated she questions if this would have any jurisdiction. Mr. Garton stated it has no impact. He stated this has a seven year duration and if it not used for agricultural purposes, it can be reviewed and have another hearing and take it out of the Agricultural Security District. Mr. Conti stated he feels they have to have a Referendum approved if it is going to be used for a use other than farming. Mrs. Godshalk stated she does not feel this is correct and a Referendum is not required if it is going to be used for recreation. Mr. Garton stated the Agricultural Security District gives certain protection. If it is no longer being used as a farm, it ceases to be protected under this particular Resolution.

Mr. Santarsiero stated they will keep the Agricultural Security Council active until they find out if they need to add another parcel.

Mr. Santarsiero moved, Mr. Fazzalore seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Applications by Farmland Preservation Inc for inclusion of the following parcels in the Lower Makefield Township Agricultural Security District:

- Resolution No. 2078 – Tax Parcel No. 20-3-33 – Bethel
- Resolution No. 2079 – Tax parcel No. 20-8-82 – Longshore
- Resolution No. 2080 – Tax Parcel No. 20-80-48 – Bridle Estates

APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION NO. 2077 OFFERING EMPLOYEES AN INCENTIVE TO WAIVE HEALTHCARE COVERAGE

Mr. Fedorchak stated this is to create an opportunity for the Township to save money on hospital costs. He stated it is not uncommon for employees' spouses to have healthcare coverage and this would allow the employees to make a choice. If they would go with their spouse's plan, they will pay the employee 30% of the Township's premium costs. The Township would then save 70%. Mrs. Godshalk stated she asked Mr. Fedorchak to look into this for a number of years as this is the standard in industry.

Mr. Santarsiero noted Paragraph 3 where it states they reserve the right to cancel the waiver program or otherwise alter its provisions from time to time. He asked if they

should have an obligation to provide notice to the participants, and Mrs. Godshalk stated they would have to do this. Mr. Santarsiero stated there is nothing in this Resolution that states this. Mr. Garton stated they could have a specific timeframe or leave it to the Manager to give notice. Mr. Santarsiero stated he feels it should be in the Resolution so that they know what the Notice period is. Mr. Garton suggested that they provide for sixty days notice and they Amend that provision.

Mr. Bob Slamen, Bedford Place, stated if there is double coverage, a person with a claim cannot go after both, and it was noted this is correct. Mr. Slamen asked if 30% is the correct number, and Mr. Garton stated he has seen it as high as 50% and as low as 20%. Mr. Slamen stated he feels 30% is probably a lot of money. Mr. Fedorchak stated depending on whether it is a single or a family it could range from \$2,000 to as high as \$6,000 a year. If they decide to go with hospitalization and/or the prescription there is a matrix of opportunities.

Mr. Santarsiero moved, Mr. Fazzalore seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve Resolution No. 2077 offering employees an incentive to waive healthcare coverage subject to amending Paragraph 3 that the Township shall provide sixty days notice to anyone receiving the waiver prior to the Board's action as to whether to do away with it or not.

DISCUSSION ON CLOSING WOODSIDE ROAD BETWEEN TAYLORSVILLE AND RIVER ROAD/CULVERT REPLACEMENT

Mr. Majewski stated they have been monitoring the culvert on Woodside Road since it was damaged last September. They feel the road should be closed. They have contacted emergency services and closure will be Monday at the earliest. Mr. Fazzalore asked the estimated cost, and Mr. Fedorchak stated Mr. Majewski has projected the replacement cost to be approximately \$200,000. Mr. Fazzalore stated the Township recently spent \$450,000 on a similar project, and Mr. Fegley stated this was a bridge and was much larger. Mr. Majewski reviewed the differences between those two projects.

Mr. Fazzalore asked if they need permission from PennDOT, and Mr. Majewski stated this is a Township road and does not require permission from PennDOT. He stated it does qualify for an emergency permit from the DEP. Mr. Fazzalore stated they did not include this in the Budget. Mr. Fedorchak stated he feels they may have a portion of the costs covered. He noted they did make application to FEMA to replace this culvert and last week FEMA contacted him and indicated they have tentatively agreed to cover the cost to replicate the existing structure. He would recommend that when they put this out to bid they get a number for replacing the culvert that is there and a second bid for what Mr. Majewski is proposing to be the optimum solution. They will then take this to FEMA and hope to get reimbursed in the amount of \$125,000 to \$150,000.

Mr. Fazzalore agreed that this project needs to be done. No action was needed to be taken by the Board this evening.

Ms. Torbert asked how long the road will be closed and asked about the detour route. Mr. Majewski stated the official detour route will be Mt. Eyre Road. He stated they anticipate the road will be closed approximately six months. Ms. Torbert asked if Upper Makefield and Yardley Borough have been notified. Mr. Majewski stated Upper Makefield was notified and agreed it would be a good idea to notify Yardley Borough.

MESSICK PROPERTY DISCUSSION AND MOTION

Mr. Edward Murphy, attorney, and Mr. Chris Messick were present. Mr. Garton stated this was an Appeal from the recommendation from HARB not to issue a Demolition Permit. He stated this is a continuation of the discussion held at the last Board meeting. The 3/3/05 memo from Mr. VanDyke was noted, and Mr. Murphy stated the survey discussed in that memo has been completed and transmitted to Mr. VanDyke. In addition, the Board of Supervisors requested that the Heritage Conservancy be consulted about the circumstances giving rise to the Permit Application and Mr. Marshall is present this evening. He has had the opportunity to look at the materials and has been out to the site. Mr. Murphy understands he has prepared a report although they have not been provided a copy. He stated in one of the meetings Mr. Messick had with Mr. VanDyke, he did see a copy of the Sketch Plan that Mr. VanDyke's office felt was appropriate for the re-development of the site, although they have not been given a copy of this either since the Township has not yet made available the Escrow Agreement. Mr. Garton stated this was sent to the Township weeks ago. Mr. Murphy stated they have not seen it and as noted two weeks ago they have requested it and agreed to sign it and fund it.

Mr. Jeff Marshall was present. Mr. Stephen Heinz asked if Mr. Marshall is present as a consultant to Mr. Messick, and Mr. Stainthorpe stated he is present as a consultant to the Township. Mr. Stainthorpe stated Mr. Marshall has looked into this matter and provided the Board with written input. He stated it appears that the issue with regard to the percentage of buildings that have to remain in order to maintain their status as a National Historic Register site is totally unclear and there do not seem to be any percentages required. Mr. Marshall stated it is more qualitative than quantitative. He stated when you initially list a property or District, there are rules and depending on the size of the District this can range from 50% to 75% of the buildings being historic or contributing. There are no set rules for the opposite which is where there is a number of contributing resources where you fall below that you would be de-listed. He noted the individuals involved at the National Register and the Local Preservation Office agreed there is no "magic" number. They indicated it has to do with location and the significance of the District.

Ms. Michelle Stambaugh stated she has also looked into this further. She stated they do not want any more buildings to get to a point where they could encroach on the historic integrity of the Village.

Mr. Bob Oaks stated he has worked with Mr. VanDyke and has been building and restoring houses for fifty years. He feels the way to restore the house is to reproduce and recycle as many of the materials as possible. In working with Mr. Messick, he would supervise the project.

Ms. Stambaugh stated they want to get the Agreement and escrow finalized and move forward. She also suggested that there be signage at the Village on what is going on so that it does not just look like they are tearing it down. The sign should indicate it is a revitalization of the community and they would like to work with HARB on this sign.

Mrs. Godshalk stated she has received a number of phone calls from people about what is going on with this property. She stated there are tax credits for restoration and if this is a re-building, they will lose tax credits. Mr. Marshall stated this is where there is a provision setting a certain percentage of the original fabric in order to qualify for tax credits.

Mr. Fazzalore asked how the Historic Commission and HARB feel about this reproduction. Mr. Stainthorpe stated to date there have been no definite plans proposed to comment on. Ms. Wendi Grant, HARB stated they were originally told something different from what is now being proposed. They would agree to set up an emergency meeting to discuss the new plans. They would reiterate that they would deny the Certificate of Appropriateness that was presented to them in November and they wish to preserve as much of the materials as possible.

Mr. Stainthorpe stated Mr. Oaks indicated they should recycle as many of the existing materials as possible and asked if he has been out to the site. Mr. Oaks stated he would recycle as much of the siding as possible. The entire foundation can be repaired as well as the beams and the timbers. Mr. Messick stated he would agree to this. Mr. Messick stated the clapboard is suspect because the aluminum siding has been nailed onto it.

Mr. Stephen Heinz stated they had an organized presentation from HARB to make sure the Board understood all the aspects of their consideration so the Board could make a good decision this evening. Mr. Heinz asked Mr. Oaks if he was an engineer or an architect, and Mr. Oaks stated he is an architect/builder. Mr. Heinz reviewed the history of HARB and the Board of Supervisors working together over the years. He stated he is concerned that this will send the wrong message that properties can be demolished because of neglect.

Mr. Tony Islan stated HARB did review the request by Mr. Messick to demolish the building and they requested a review on how much of the structure could be saved. He stated they are concerned that the Applicant went to the Board of Supervisors rather than come back to HARB to work with them.

Mrs. Godshalk stated if the Township had been doing their job under the CLG and the Historic Village Zoning, this house would not have come to this point. She stated this started happening before Mr. Messick purchased the property. She stated action should have been taken before it got to this point. She stated the Township is the steward under the CLG and the National Register to make sure that these homes are maintained so they will not have to be demolished.

Mr. Stainthorpe stated he does not feel anyone has overturned a decision of the HARB since he has been on the Board, and they do have respect for what they do. He stated in this case they have actually done what was suggested and this is the third meeting they have discussed this. He stated they have employed Mr. Marshall to review this as well. He stated he feels they need to look into much tougher Ordinances regarding historic preservation and preventing people from letting places decay by neglect. Mrs. Godshalk stated this is what she has indicated, and she stated under the CLG, they are obligated to do this. Mr. Stainthorpe stated they need to make sure they are enforcing this. He stated at the last meeting, he suggested a means test for work to be done on a historic property and you would have to show that you have the money to complete work on such a property. He feels they should have the toughest laws in the State and not let this happen again.

Mr. Heinz stated in the approval of the Plan that was previously submitted for renovation of the property by Mr. Celli, a portion of the building was permitted to be demolished. He stated there is no reason why a portion of a structure for the good of the whole could not be demolished. If someone comes to HARB with a full plan of what is intended, they will act on it with all speed. He feels this needs to go back to HARB and reviewed again probably with a different result. He stated the only option they heard – twice – was tear it down with no plan for anything else or anything being preserved.

Mr. Santarsiero asked if they would agree to go back to HARB and show a Plan of what they propose to do after demolition is completed. Mr. Murphy stated it is not their Plan. He stated Carter VanDyke has supposedly prepared a plan, but they have not been able to see it because they were not provided with the Agreement to sign or fund. Mr. Messick stated he has agreed to replicate the structure so he does not know why they have to go another month. Mrs. Godshalk stated she still feels they have to go to HARB since they are the authority in the Village under the National Register. Mr. Garton stated HARB is a recommending authority, and the Board of Supervisors is the authority. Mrs. Godshalk stated under the Ordinance of the National Register, HARB is the recommending authority, and she feels the replication does have to go back to HARB. Mr. Murphy stated once a Plan is prepared it will have to go back to HARB.

Mrs. Godshalk stated she understands that they want to use the building as commercial, but if they use it as residential, perhaps it would not have to be constructed as thoroughly because it would not have to go before Labor and Industry and perhaps then using the present foundations and some of the beams and walls would be easier. Mr. Messick stated he does not feel he or the Board can determine what will be successful at this location as he feels the market will make this determination. He stated he is not sure someone would want to live at this location. Mrs. Godshalk stated in the Village they are going to have a mixture. Mr. Murphy stated they were told that one of the elements of Mr. VanDyke's plan included a residential component, but they have not been able to see this. He stated they will entertain all the elements of the Plan that Mr. VanDyke wants to propose. Mrs. Godshalk stated she felt that the older structure would not have to meet Labor & Industry requirements. Mr. Murphy stated there is no more Labor and Industry and it is all Township Codes and the Township provides the inspectors.

Mr. Garton reviewed possible conditions of approval of granting the demolition permit. Mr. Murphy stated he is concerned that the proposal is that they are required to get approval from HARB before the building is able to be taken down. He expressed concern with the time this would take. Mr. Garton asked if they were willing to execute a Development Agreement agreeing to the conditions if the demolition permit is granted, and Mr. Murphy stated they are willing to do this. Mr. Murphy stated he felt once there was a new Plan, they would then go back to HARB with the Plan. Mr. Garton stated he is trying to find a mechanism to guarantee that they can move forward. Mr. Garton stated they are not looking for a Land Development Plan, but rather a plan for the structure. Mr. Murphy stated they have not been able to get this from the Township because the Township has not allowed them to sign the Agreement. Mr. Garton stated Mr. Murphy indicated Mr. VanDyke did have a Plan, and Mr. Murphy stated they have been advised of this. Mr. Messick stated Mr. VanDyke has a site plan for the entire site. Mrs. Godshalk stated they do not need to do the entire site and are just referring to this building. Mr. Garton stated they want to identify what is going to be saved and to see a conceptual Plan that articulates what Mr. VanDyke has recommended. Mr. Marshall stated this would be an elevation of the building to be constructed. Mr. Garton stated they are not looking for an engineered Plan. Mr. Messick stated he will replicate the façade of the building. Mr. Stainthorpe stated this needs to be put in writing. Mr. Murphy stated it is not the Applicant's Plan as the Board of Supervisors directed them to use Mr. VanDyke as a consultant and he has the Plan. Mr. Santarsiero asked why this Plan cannot be given to the Applicant.

Mr. Stainthorpe stated if Mr. Messick is willing to agree in writing to replicate the façade of what is there he feels he should be permitted to tear it down. He stated he does not want to delay this any further noting that this is the third meeting during which this has been discussed. Mr. Oaks stated if they wait long enough, the structure will fall down and someone will get hurt.

Mr. Murphy stated in 1978 when this building was cataloged by the Township, it was stated that it was in need of repair at that time.

Mr. Fegley moved and Mrs. Godshalk seconded to grant the Demolition Permit subject to:

- 1) Building is replicated so as to reproduce the façade consistent with the recommendation received from Carter VanDyke;
- 2) As much of the clapboard and the beams that can be saved are in fact saved and the foundation reutilized;
- 3) There is an elevation of Carter VanDyke's recommendation provided to HARB and an appropriate agreement be executed complying and guaranteeing that Mr. Messick does all the aforementioned.

Mr. Murphy agreed to the Conditions.

Mr. Heinz stated HARB is not a consultant organization; it is an approval organization and it is either approved or not approved. He stated this has not been approved.

Mr. Garton stated HARB is a recommending body.

Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAN FOR RAYMOND & LINDA RAWLINS LOT LINE CHANGE

Mr. Edward Murphy was present. Mr. Garton reviewed possible Conditions of Approval. Mr. Murphy stated there were comments in the 3/9/05 PCS letter which are not applicable, and he has discussed these with Mr. Garton. Mr. Garton stated this is understood. Mrs. Godshalk asked about the entrance to Lot #1. Mr. Murphy stated it must take access from the street of the lowest classification so it would be W. Ferry. Mr. Murphy stated they are moving the lot line 65'.

Mr. Fazzalore moved and Mr. Santarsiero seconded to approve the Preliminary/Final Plans dated 1/5/05 subject to:

- 1) PCS letter dated 3/9/05 to the extent not resolved including the following Waivers:
 - a) Section 146.a requiring curbs and street improvements
 - b) Section 178.47a requiring sidewalks
 - c) Section 178.93 requiring stormwater facilities

- 2) Receipt of all approvals by agencies having jurisdiction;
- 3) Payment of All Township expenses related to the Application.

Mr. Murphy agreed to the Conditions, and the Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVE EXTENSION TO ROBERT AND KATHLEEN WIDMER

Mr. Fazzalore moved, Mr. Santarsiero seconded and it was unanimously carried to grant an extension of time to Robert and Kathleen Widmer for Preliminary Subdivision Plans for property on Evergreen Road.

SUPERVISORS REPORTS

Mrs. Godshalk stated at the next meeting they hope to have the Memorial finalized and will ask to go out to bid. Mr. Fazzalore asked about the status of the road. Mr. Majewski stated they did take time off due to weather, and anticipate starting up again next week.

Mr. Santarsiero stated he was unable to attend the EAC meeting because of a conflict with the Zoning Hearing Board which meets on the same night. He stated he would like to continue to serve as liaison to the EAC, and they are looking to see if they can reschedule their meetings to Thursdays. If this is not possible, a new liaison will need to be appointed. He stated there will be a Canal Clean Up on April 2 at 9:00 a.m. and they will be meeting at the intersection of the Canal and Black Rock Road. He stated the EAC is sponsoring a seminar on low impact development and stormwater management to be held in the Township Building on April 20. This will be open to other Townships in the area at a cost of \$150 per Township. He stated the Southeastern Bucks League of Municipalities will have their next meeting in Tullytown on March 28.

AUTHORIZE EXECUTION OF CONTRACT FOR 2005 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT

Mr. Fedorchak stated in October, the Township made application to the County for a \$20,000 Grant for various historic preservation purposes. The Township has received notice that they will be granted \$19,000. Mr. Fedorchak stated this can be applied for planning efforts, and he would suggest they use \$10,000 of the \$19,000 to pay Mr. Marshall's Contract and the other \$9,000 can be used for repairs/renovations to the Satterthwaite House and Elm Lowne.

Mrs. Godshalk moved, Mr. Santarsiero seconded and it was unanimously carried to authorize execution of the Contract for 2005 Community Development Block Grant.

APPROVAL OF 2005-2006 BUCKS COUNTY CONSORTIUM ROAD MATERIAL
BID

Mr. Santarsiero moved, Mr. Fazzalore seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the 2005-2006 Bucks County Consortium Road Material Bid.

DISCUSSION OF REQUEST BY PENNSBURY ARTS FOR DONATION OF A
GOLFING FOURSOME FOR FUNDRAISER

Mr. Stainthorpe stated they did discuss a similar donation request at a prior meeting and since then they discussed this matter at the Golf Committee. It was unanimously decided by the Golf Committee that they should stick with their policy of “no free golf.”

Mr. Santarsiero asked approximately how many of these requests have been made in the past; however, it was not known. Mr. Stainthorpe stated these are usually telephone requests made to Terry Bannon. Mrs. Godshalk stated if people have an Outing at the Course, and are bringing in revenue, she does not have a problem with the donation of a foursome. She stated the Memorial Outing brought in \$40,000, and they did give a foursome as a prize. She is concerned where they would draw the line on donations to community groups. She stated she feels that the policy of giving it to people bringing in money for an outing is one they should stick to. Mr. Fegley stated he does not feel they should give away a foursome to every community or civic group that wants to have a foursome for a fundraiser.

Mr. Garton stated they would also be giving away taxpayer dollars and this would involve choosing which charity the taxpayers are supporting and which they are not.

Mr. Fegley stated he feels the policy should be that you can only give a foursome in conjunction with an outing that takes place at the Golf Course. Mr. Stainthorpe stated he believes that is what the policy is. Mr. Fegley stated he would like to know if this is the written policy; and if it is not, it should be put in writing.

Mr. Santarsiero stated he would like to know the policy of other Townships which have public courses. Mr. Rubin stated RAM had a fundraiser at Middletown, and the Management Company donated the rounds, not the Township.

Mr. Garton stated whatever they decide is appropriate, it should be done by Resolution of the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Fedorchak was asked to find out what other Townships which have public courses do. Mr. Fazzalore stated he does not care what other Municipalities do and feels they should not give away free golf when they have a large bond to pay off. Mr. Santarsiero

stated he would also like to know how many people are requesting free golf noting the experience of other courses may indicate that you do not really get many requests. Other Supervisors stated they feel once it is know that Lower Makefield donates free foursomes there will be numerous requests.

APPROVE CANCELING APRIL 18 MEETING DUE TO STATE CONVENTION

Mr. Fazzalore moved and Mrs. Godshalk seconded to cancel the April 18, 2005 meeting due to the State Convention. Motion carried with Mr. Fegley abstained.

MOTION TO APPEAL SUNRISE ZONING HEARING BOARD DECISION

Mr. Fegley moved and Mrs. Godshalk seconded to Appeal the Sunrise Zoning Hearing Board decision. Motion carried with Mr. Fegley, Mrs. Godshalk, and Mr. Santarsiero in favor and Mr. Fazzalore and Mr. Stainthorpe opposed.

APPOINTMENTS

Mrs. Godshalk moved, Mr. Fegley seconded and it was unanimously carried to re-appoint Susanne Curran to the Historic Commission.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,


Grace Godshalk, Secretary



Township of Lower Makefield

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Pete Stainthorpe, Chairman
Scott I. Fegley, Vice-Chairman
Grace M. Godshalk, Secretary/Treasurer
Frank J. Fazzalore, Supervisor
Steven J. Santarsiero, Supervisor

**MARCH 2005 WARRANT LISTS AND
FEBRUARY 2005 PAYROLL COSTS FOR APPROVAL
MARCH 21, 2005 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING**

03/07/05 Warrant List	\$ 297,599.40	
03/05 Manual Checks	0.00	
03/21/05 Warrant List	690,325.91	
Total Warrants & Prepaids		987,925.31
PAYROLL COSTS:		
February 2005 Payroll	332,296.05	
02/05 Payroll Taxes, etc.	25,420.64	
Total Payroll Costs		357,716.69
TOTAL TO BE APPROVED		\$ 1,345,642.00

