

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES – MAY 13, 2013

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on May 13, 2013. Chairman Bush called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

Those present:

Planning Commission:        Tony Bush, Chairman  
   Karen Friedman, Vice Chair  
   John Pazdera, Secretary  
   Dean Dickson, Member  
   Mark Fried, Member

Others:                             Nancy Frick, Director Zoning, Inspection & Planning  
   Nathan Fox, Township Solicitor

Absent:                             Kristin Tyler, Supervisor Liaison

ZONING HEARING BOARD APPEAL #13-1664 – MANOR CARE OF YARDLEY PA, LLC APPLICATION TO THE ZONING HEARING BOARD INCLUDES A REQUEST FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO ALLOW FOR THE RENOVATION AND EXPANSION OF THE EXISTING ARDEN COURTS FACILITY - DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Mr. Neil Stein, attorney, was present with Mr. Mike Davis, engineer. Mr. Stein stated this is a Zoning Hearing Board Application related to the Arden Courts facility which is the facility closest to Stony Hill Road. He stated Arden Courts is an Alzheimer's Facility, and they are proposing four minor points of expansion to the existing building for a total of 3,524 square feet. He stated this will result in a net increase of twelve additional beds. Mr. Stein stated there is a continuing demand for this type of facility, and the vast majority of the patients that are served by this facility come from the immediate geographic area. He stated there was a limited opportunity provided by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to create additional beds at this location, and they are taking the opportunity to do that given the increase in demand for this type of facility. Mr. Stein stated in order to create the expansion to the building it requires a modest increase in impervious coverage, some of which has to do with parking aisles and parking spaces.

Mr. Stein stated in addition, they have a non-conforming structure; and as part of the expansion, they will continue to maintain the non-conformity relative to the 50' building setback.

Mr. Stein stated this is a Special Exception; and any time you expand a facility provided by Special Exception, you have to ask for a new Special Exception which is what they have done in their Application.

Mr. Stein stated the Plan being shown this evening shows the Arden Courts facility; and in dark brown they show the areas of the expansion, and the light brown shows the existing building itself. He stated they have also taken the opportunity to show the existing Manor Care Facility and where that building is proposed to be expanded which was granted in a separate Application.

Mr. Stein stated they can continue to accommodate stormwater management, and the buffers are not an issue as they remain intact.

Mr. Stein stated if the Zoning Hearing Board grants the relief requested, this will be a Land Development Application so the Planning Commission will see this Plan again.

Mr. Davis showed on the Plan where the additional parking will be located.

Ms. Friedman stated in June, 2012, they were permitted to have 27% impervious surface; and they are now proposing 28.47%. Ms. Friedman noted the exterior perimeter part of the parking where seven new spots are proposed, and she asked if there is any chance they could use pervious paving since they would not be used as much as the others so that they could reduce the impervious percentage; and Mr. Davis stated they could look into this. Ms. Friedman asked that this be considered for any parking area that would not be used as much. Mr. Davis stated the spaces Ms. Friedman has noted will probably have a higher turn over. Mr. Davis stated there are people present from Manor Care who would testify as to the need for parking, and they asked that he provide the maximum spaces that could be fit. He stated there is a high use of the spaces that are used for the daily activities. Ms. Friedman stated she would request that if there is any area of parking that would not be as high as another, that it be considered for pervious coverage; and Mr. Stein agreed to investigate this.

Mr. Pazdera stated it appears that they are requesting 30% impervious surface, and Mr. Stein stated it is actually slightly less than that, but they left a cushion in case it was needed. Mr. Pazdera asked how many square feet additional this would be, and Mr. Davis stated 30% would be approximately 5,000 square feet. Mr. Stein stated he feels they could take it down to 29% in their request.

Mr. Fried asked what each of the four additions were for, and Mr. Davis stated each addition will add four beds. He stated they are also changing some double rooms to singles so the net addition will be twelve beds. Mr. Stein stated the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has a Certificate of Need process, and historically Pennsylvania is extremely conservative about the number of new beds they make available. He stated

for a limited period of time the Commonwealth allowed additional beds, and there was a limited window of opportunity to apply. Mr. Fried asked how this will effect overall care within the facility, and Mr. Stein stated the use of the Arden Care facility will not change, and it is all for Alzheimer’s patients.

Mr. Dickson asked if there is any way to build up rather than out so that they could avoid the encroachment into the setbacks. Mr. Davis stated he does not believe there is as the structure today is entirely a one-story facility, and he does not feel it would be possible to make them two-story additions without an excessive remodel to go higher. He showed the area of encroachment on the Plan. Mr. Dickson asked if they envision any additional future expansions, and Mr. Davis stated he does not feel they propose to increase bed count in the future. He stated he understands from their program that the sixty-four bed model is the most efficient model they run and bringing this facility up to sixty-four beds is bringing it up to the same number as a majority of their other facilities.

Ms. Friedman moved, Mr. Fried seconded and it was unanimously carried to recommend to the Zoning Hearing Board approval of the Special Exception Plan dated 4/12/13 and ask that consideration be given to the use of pervious paving for parking spaces and that the impervious surface request be reduced from 30% to 29%.

## COMPREHENSIVE MASTER PLAN UPDATE PRESENTATION AND OPEN DISCUSSION

Mr. Tim Koehler and Ms. Lisa Wolff were present on behalf of Ms. Lynn Bush, Bucks County Planning Commission who was unable to attend this evening. Mr. Koehler stated a letter went out to members of the Township’s Historical Architectural Review Board, Historical Commission, Citizens Traffic Committee, and Farmland Preservation inviting them to attend the meeting this evening asking them to provide input. He provided this evening two handouts – one on the Demographics and Socioeconomic Characteristics and Trends and the other some suggestions for discussion questions to be considered by the Township Boards and Commissions invited this evening. Mr. Koehler stated they wanted to bring in the various Boards and Committees for discussion with the Planning Commission before they proceed in developing the Master Plan.

Ms. Wolff stated when they do the Census now they send out short statements every year which is different from how it was done in the past. She stated the Planning Commission had indicated that they wanted to get a “snapshot” of the Township.

With regard to population and households Ms. Wolff stated from 2000 to 2010, Lower Makefield's population declined by approximately 120 individuals, representing almost half a percent decrease. This follows significant population increases in each of the previous three decades.

Ms. Wolff stated they were asked to not only look at surrounding communities but also how the Township compares to other communities within the Pennsbury School District. She stated all four Pennsbury School District Municipalities show decreases in population between 2000 and 2010. She stated with the exception of Morrisville Borough, which also shows a population decrease, all other surrounding Municipalities exhibited increases in population, as did the County overall.

Ms. Wolff stated middle-aged residents between the ages of 35 and 54 years make up a third of the Township's population even though this age category saw a decrease of almost 3.5% from 2000 to 2010. School-aged children, ages 5 to 17 years, represent slightly over a fifth of the Township population. Combined, these two age sets make up over half of the Township's population.

Ms. Wolff stated from 2000 to 2010, the Township saw a decrease in the number of young adults between the ages of 18 and 34 years. The decrease is consistent with regional trends and is known as the "Brain Drain" – the trend of young professionals moving to other areas that offer more options for employment and housing.

Ms. Wolff stated between 2000 and 2010, the number of individuals between the ages of 55 and 64 increased by almost 5% which is more than any other age set. All age categories from 55 years of age and older saw increases from 2000. Residents aged 55 and older make up almost 28% of the Township's population. She stated this is significant because it is almost one third of the Township's population.

Ms. Wolff stated the number of housing units continued to increase, although at a much lower rate. Housing units increased by 2.1% from 2000 to 2010, compared to 34.6% between 1990 and 2000, and 59.9% between 1980 and 1990.

Ms. Wolff stated between 2000 and 2010, the number of households in the Township increased by approximately 100. While almost 80% of Township households are family households with approximately 37.5% of those having children under 18 years of age, the number of family households actually declined since 2000, reversing the trend shown in the previous decade. The number of non-family households grew by approximately 11% between 2000 and 2010; and within that category, the number of householders living alone increased by almost 12%.

Ms. Wolff stated compared with other Pennsbury School District Municipalities and other surrounding Municipalities, a greater percentage of Lower Makefield's households are family households with children. Likewise, when compared with these same communities, the Township has a lower percentage of single-parent families and non-family households, with the exception of Upper Makefield Township.

With regard to education, Ms. Wolff stated generally Township residents have higher education levels than the County average and surrounding communities with the exception of Upper Makefield. She stated almost 98% of residents, 25 years of age and over are High School Graduates and almost 62% hold Bachelor's Degrees or higher. Almost a third of residents (29.8%), aged 25 and over, hold Graduate Degrees or higher. This is higher than all surrounding communities and is more than double the County average of 13.4%. She stated this is significant since it is almost a third of the Township residents. She stated both in the Township and the County, the percentage of High School Graduates, as well as the percentage of residents who held advanced degrees rose between 2000 and 2010.

Ms. Wolff stated when you look at the place of work and travel to work, the percentage of employed Township residents working out of State declined 4.5% from 2000 to 2010. That percentage correlates with the 4.5% increase in the percentage of residents who now work within Pennsylvania compared to the year 2000. Of those residents who work in Pennsylvania, approximately 45% work within Bucks County, which is over a 6% increase from year 2000.

Ms. Wolff stated the percentage of Lower Makefield residents who work out of State is more than two times higher than the percentage of County residents who work out of State. She stated that is not unusual when you look at the location of Lower Makefield. She stated the percentage of Township residents who work out of State is consistent with that of many surrounding and nearby communities due to the Township's proximity to both New Jersey and mass transit options to New York.

Ms. Wolff stated compared to the County and nearby communities in Bucks County, Lower Makefield residents generally have longer travel times to work. Township residents have a higher mean travel time to work than all surrounding municipalities. Almost 30% of working Township residents travel 45 minutes or more to work; and of that number, slighter over 17% travel more than an hour to reach their place of employment.

Ms. Wolff stated three-quarters of working Township residents drive to work alone. Almost 8% of working residents take public transportation to work, which is higher than that for any surrounding Municipality and more than two times higher than the percentage of workers within the entire County.

Ms. Wolff stated almost 63% of the Township's workforce is employed in management, business, science, and arts occupations. This is higher than all surrounding Municipalities and the County. Compared with surrounding Municipalities and the County, the Township has the lowest percentages of residents employed in occupations dealing with natural resources, construction, maintenance, and service. More Township residents are employed in education, health care, and social assistance industries than any other industry category.

Ms. Wolff stated of surrounding Municipalities, only Upper Makefield has a higher percentage of residents employed in professional, scientific, and management industries. When compared with surrounding Municipalities, Lower Makefield ranks third highest, behind Newtown and Upper Makefield Townships, in the percentage of workers employed in the finance, insurance, and real estate industries. Compared with the County, the Township has a slightly higher percentage of self-employed workers and almost double the percentage of residents who work at home.

Ms. Wolff stated in 2010, the Township's median household income was \$121,260. This is higher than that for the County, as well as all surrounding Municipalities except for Upper Makefield. This figure suggests a strong correlation between Township residents' high education levels and types of employment. Almost 62% of all Township households had incomes of \$100,000 or more, and almost 20% of Township households had incomes of \$200,000 or more. Compared with surrounding Municipalities, Lower Makefield had the highest percentage of households earning between \$150,000 and \$199,999.

With regard to housing, Ms. Wolff stated single-family detached dwellings make up slightly over two-thirds of the Township's housing stock while attached units make up almost one-fifth of the Township's housing stock.

Ms. Wolff stated the percentages for each housing type stayed fairly consistent between the years 2000 and 2010. Slight increases occurred in the categories of single-family attached and buildings containing two or more units. Slight decreases occurred to the number of single-family detached and mobile homes.

Ms. Wolff stated compared with most surrounding Municipalities and the County as a whole, Lower Makefield has a higher percentage of single-family detached and single-family attached dwelling units and a lower percentage of structures containing two or more dwelling units which would be twins, multi-family, and apartments.

Ms. Wolff stated housing value in all surrounding communities and the county as a whole rose significantly between 2000 and 2010. Lower Makefield's median housing value is higher than all surrounding communities except for Upper Makefield Township.

Ms. Wolff stated after dropping slightly between 1990 and 2000, the percentage of renter-occupied units in the Township increased by almost 1% between 2000 and 2010. Almost one-eighth of all dwelling units in the Township are renter-occupied. Compared with surrounding Bucks County Municipalities, Lower Makefield has one of the lowest rates of rental-occupied units. The percentage of renter-occupied units in the Township is less than half that in each of the other three Pennsbury School District Municipalities and is lower than all surrounding communities except for Upper Makefield. For rental-occupied units, the Township's median monthly rent of \$1,608 is higher than all surrounding and nearby Municipalities other than Upper Makefield.

Ms. Wolff stated almost 52% of the dwelling units within the Township contain four or more bedrooms. This percentage is higher than that for all surrounding Municipalities except for Upper Makefield and is almost 20% higher than the County percentage.

Mr. Stephen Heinz asked if they have any information about residents who have taken early retirement or those who have given up looking for jobs who are over fifty. Ms. Wolff stated they did not get information on this. Mr. Koehler stated there may be information from Labor Statistics on this that could be added.

Mr. Heinz asked if they have information on the percentage of the Township that has been built out, and Ms. Wolff stated although they do not have that in the reports they have provided this evening, this will be done as part of the Master Plan. Mr. Koehler stated they just completed this information for the entire County so they can provide this information.

Dr. Helen Heinz, Historic Commission, was present and stated over the years the Historic Commission has been concerned about the protection of the Township's historic structures. She stated there was discussion some time ago to create an Ordinance possibly giving some sort of Façade Easement tax relief to those who own historic structures because of the additional maintenance that goes into preserving them. She stated since 1985 what is historic has crept up to the point that they are now looking at the 1930s. She stated they often talked about creating some additional Historic Districts in the older neighborhoods toward Morrisville such as Westover, but she does feel they will get "push back" from the residents. Dr. Heinz stated in other Townships where they have kept up the historic ambience, it helps with value in the Township and makes the Township a higher class neighborhood. She particularly noted Upper Dublin.

Dr. Heinz stated the Edgewood Village District is on everyone's mind, but she feels that development seems to have stalled. She stated they wanted to see historic preservation of the existing structures and infill that would be scaled to the existing development, and she does not feel this is what the developers have in mind. Dr. Heinz stated she would like to see more housing for the "twenty-somethings," since their children cannot afford to live in the neighborhood where they grew up. She stated part of the planning for Edgewood

Village included apartment housing. She stated there is little of this in the Township as the report submitted this evening has indicated. She stated the planning for Edgewood Village included creating this type of housing.

Mr. Dickson stated he agrees with the need for dwellings for the young people who grew up in the Township; but in other areas where they have provided this type of housing, the people who moved into those units were from outside of the Township and even the County.

Mr. Stephen Heinz, HARB, stated market forces make the biggest difference as does public transportation. He stated he feels they should have at least a shuttle bus from the apartment complexes to Yardley Station. Mr. Heinz asked that they also look at the March Associates Plan that was done some years ago which included a denser Edgewood Village and housing that might appeal to a younger clientele. He stated there should be a mixed use including small apartments. He stated Edgewood Village is the only potential the Township has for a Township center. He stated it should be tighter structures with a lot of commercial mixed with some kind of residential.

Dr. Heinz asked if there is an opportunity to get a Regional rail stop in Lower Makefield since there is a long distance between Woodbourne and the Yardley Station which is “packed.” She stated there is a need for more mass transit.

Mr. Bush stated he understands that in Upper Dublin they did an inventory of historic buildings; and Dr. Heinz stated Upper Dublin has a very strong Historic Commission that reviews the Plans that come in and they have a list of historic structures. Mr. Bush asked if this includes private and public structures, and Dr. Heinz stated they are all privately owned. She stated recently a property was Denied by Upper Dublin which held up in Court. She stated the Historic Commission recommended Denial, and the Supervisors upheld it.

Mr. Fried asked if they are considering “historic” to be a property that is just old. He stated his concern is that there could be a building in poor repair or from the 1930s or 1920s but beyond that it is just a house and does not really have any significance or an example of any kind of period. He stated he would be concerned about holding up someone from trying to make the highest, best use for that particular area. He stated this is his concern with historic restrictions that there is the balance between saying it is old so they have to protect it versus it is old and has some significance. Dr. Heinz stated Upper Dublin has two categories one is houses that are deemed eligible by the County for National Registry or County Registry. She stated this could be due to the architecture or an association with a person or an event that occurred in the house; and then there is a second category of older, interesting properties. She stated their local Commission made a list of certain Tax Parcels and this put them in a different category in terms that there would be more flexibility. She stated the house that was denied was on this second list.

Dr. Heinz agreed that it is a difficult balance. Mr. Fried stated he would be concerned about holding up a landowner's right to do something with their property which could be considered a taking or an extension of eminent domain. He also asked if the property owner would have the right to be compensated because of the restrictions the Township is putting in place. Dr. Heinz stated in Upper Dublin this has not been an issue. She stated in Lower Makefield the parcels that are left are so small that it would be nothing that a large developer would want.

Dr. Heinz stated in the next ten to twenty years, she feels the Township will be dealing with the subdivision of parcels on Makefield Road, Yardley-Morrisville Road, and Yardley-Langhorne Road which are larger parcels that were created as mansions in the 20s and 30s which she feels property owners may want to demolish and put in three houses. She stated they need to consider how as a Township they are going to view this. Mr. Fried stated they would be using the Historic Registry as a "stumbling block" if there is a historic estate that the Township does not want to see chopped up; and Dr. Heinz agreed. Mr. Fried stated he feels they want to maintain the historic integrity of the community without necessarily being too onerous on the property owners. Dr. Heinz stated this is why she suggested a Façade Easement that would provide a tax break for the homeowner. Mr. Fried stated he has been told by some people living on those streets that their homes are their "retirement plan."

Mr. Fried stated with regard to the wish to keep younger residents in the Township by having higher-density, low cost housing, he asked if this is what they want in Lower Makefield. He stated many young people move into the city, and when they get married and have children they move back. Mr. Fried stated he is concerned about increased traffic in Edgewood Village if they have higher density. Mr. Bush stated he feels the intersection in Edgewood Village can be fixed.

Mr. Heinz reviewed his background in architecture. He stated with regard to density it has been adopted by the Township in terms of the TND so that it created a situation where more density could exist. He stated HARB does not deal with issues such as cost versus value. He stated there are a set number of historically-designated homes some of which were originally businesses. He stated possibly they could add "infill" on the larger estates and consider this in advance by planning for how they will address these larger estates. He stated if they build smaller structures to look like gatekeeper houses or other structures that would be appropriate to the main structure, they will not have to tear the large structures down. He stated they could also give allowances for zero lot lines in those situations. Mr. Heinz stated the Township should be doing advance planning.

Mr. Heinz stated with regard to Edgewood Village maintaining the Village and the existing structures is a critical aspect. He stated being able to build something that financially from the viewpoint of the developer would support that seems reasonable. He stated once something is granted there should be hard and fast rules as to what needs

to be done to maintain the structure so that in the future it is not sold to another developer who comes to the Township and says because the structure is in poor shape, it needs to be torn down. He stated HARB can only deal with the architectural aspects. He stated this should also be considered for the other older, “specialty” areas such as Westover and the other strongly-defined neighborhood places the Township might want to deal with as a Historic District. Mr. Fried asked how Mr. Heinz would rank this on a scale of one to ten compared to other planning issues that the Planning Commission would have to face as part of the Master Plan. Mr. Heinz stated he feels it would be a six or seven because once a historic structure is removed, it can never be replaced. He stated he feels it is one of the higher social values.

Mr. Dickson stated one of the dilemmas is property rights versus social value. Mr. Heinz stated if it was a long-term owner he agrees that they should have the right to say this has been a long-term plan and they should be able to do what they want in order to get the retirement they are looking for, but Mr. Heinz stated he also feels they should give them options to be able to maintain the older structure and make it a viable alternative. Mr. Dickson stated he feels there is case law where the Courts have ruled in favor the homeowner when they say they cannot financially take care of the property. Mr. Heinz stated in most cases Mr. Dickson may be right, but in historic cases where the property has recognized historic value, there is a significant amount of case law that will support the determination by the Zoning Code and the Board of Supervisors to maintain a structure in spite of hardship.

Mr. Bob Dwyer stated he is aware that in Lower Merion they created incentives for the older structures and they had provisions that allowed development with higher density at less expense provided the developer follows certain guidelines and this has saved a number of dwellings in Lower Merion. He stated in Lower Merion they actually make it easier to develop if you save the historic structure rather than taking it down.

Mr. Heinz stated in terms of accommodating the Building Code, there is the checklist version; but there is also the alternative, engineered method that gives certain value for safety aspects. He stated Planning Code development has been around for forty to fifty years and it is not necessarily a development that is prescribed by the Zoning Code or by the planning lay out, and they could come up with alternatives as long as it complies with the same types of effects in the end thereby giving some relief to the financial pressures. When questioned what he was referring to, Mr. Heinz stated he is referring to coming up with a checklist version of planning. He stated he was using the Building Code as an example. He stated maybe the planning package could also have that same kind of approach.

Mr. Heinz stated on HARB they have starting working on a more critical appraisal of what the requirements are, and they are trying to come up with a list of requirements for submittals and the timetable for submittals.

Mr. Ken Martin, Historic Commission, stated the Township is almost built out and the Historic Commission is trying to preserve certain properties, and he particularly noted the Scammell's House. He stated sometimes the Historic Commission does not feel they are getting enough support, although he does not feel you can tell people what to do with their property or their house. He stated he feels people in this area enjoy large houses, and he does not feel this is going to change over the next fifteen to twenty years.

Ms. Friedman asked if the Historic Commission could make a list of what structures they feel would be important over the next twenty years. She stated if there was an Ordinance, these structures could be listed and consideration given at the time of re-purchase to make sure there is an opportunity for preservation. Dr. Heinz stated there was an Intern working in the Township who did this a number of years ago so this is available. Ms. Heinz stated this was done up to 1900, and the Intern also did a tentative list of properties from 1900 to 1930. Ms. Friedman stated she feels the Township needs to get ahead of this before they lose these structures.

Ms. Friedman also asked if there is a list of things that are used for historic preservation such as the age of the house, as well as the process it goes through to get the house Registered. Ms. Friedman stated she has heard that there are houses that are Registered and also houses that are on a list waiting to be Registered, and she would like to understand why that is difficult. She stated if there is a waiting list that is onerous, possibly they could have some verbiage in an Ordinance to make sure it has a "second chance" before it gets neglected. Ms. Frick stated the Registration is not done through the Township. Dr. Heinz stated the National Register is for properties of National significance, and the State Historic Preservation Agency handles this, and there is a submission which includes why it is important, the date of the house, etc.; and it is a huge Application to the State. She stated they only hear Applications once a year, and very few properties owned by private people get accepted as there can be problems if the property is sold. She stated there was previously a State Registry of properties that were considered for State recognition, but this has been done away with. She stated locally they have the Bucks County Conservancy for properties of local significance. She stated the two options are National or Local and it has to do with either the architecture, a person who owned the property, or an event that took place at the property that was of significance.

Dr. Heinz stated the Historic Commission can provide information on a property if someone requests information about their property and they can also assist with Registration.

Mr. Bush stated in other communities he has seen plaques on properties which are of State or Local importance, and he asked if there is a process for this in the Pennsylvania and Bucks County. He asked why there is very little of this locally. Dr. Heinz stated Florence White of the Historic Commission worked on a small oval plaque that was put on houses many years ago, but this program was not kept up.

Dr. Heinz stated they could have another local District – Edgehill Gardens which was the first Development Plan approved by the County in 1922 with a number of restrictions so it could be considered as a Registry District although she noted there could be push-back from the neighbors. She stated they could look at a Township Overlay for areas such as Edgehill Gardens, Westover, and Arborlea.

Ms. Friedman stated she feels it is important to make sure that there is preservation of the Township's historic areas. She stated she feels they can provide more information to people and more people may want the areas preserved and taken care of. Dr. Heinz stated she also feels this would help with property values for those areas. She stated she does feel that there needs to be incentives offered such as tax advantages.

Mr. Fried stated he feels if there are other Townships that have gone through this and come up with Ordinances that are working, it would be interesting to see them. Mr. Dwyer stated he could provide something to the Township on this.

Mr. Koehler thanked the members of HARB and the Historic Commission that were present this evening. It was noted that no one was present from the Citizens Traffic Commission or Farmland Preservation, and Mr. Koehler stated he would like to send them the copy of the Discussion Question hand out he provided this evening so that members of those Commissions could respond in writing and provide feedback to the Planning Commission in this way.

Dr. Heinz stated with regard to traffic she feels they need to encourage slower traffic particularly in Edgewood Village. Mr. Heinz stated possibly one-way traffic for some of the roads in Edgewood Village may be something to consider. Ms. Wolff stated lowering the speed limit could be looked into as well. Ms. Frick stated these are State roads.

Ms. Frick noted that she did send out letters to all members of the Committees and not just to the Chairs of the Committees inviting them to the meeting this evening.

May 13, 2013

Planning Commission – page 13 of 13

#560-A – FREEMAN'S FARM @ MAKEFIELD (A/K/A FERRI TRACT) UPDATE

Ms. Frick stated they just received a Plan for this project on May 2, and it will be put on an upcoming Agenda in a month or so.

OTHER BUSINESS

It was noted that the next meeting of the Planning Commission will be held on 6/10/13.

There being no further business, Mr. Fried moved, Ms. Friedman seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

John Pazdera, Secretary

