

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 8, 2014

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on September 8, 2014.

Ms. Friedman called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. Ms. Friedman added that this is the first time in eight months that they have had a full Board, and she welcomed John Tracey as the new member of the Planning Commission.

Those present:

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

Others: Nancy Frick, Director Zoning, Inspection, & Planning
 John Koopman, Township Solicitor
 Mark Eisold, Township Engineer (joined meeting in
 progress)
 Kristin Tyler, Supervisor

Absent: Dan McLaughlin, Supervisor Liaison

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Dickson moved and Mr. Bush seconded to approve the Minutes of June 23, 2014 as written. Motion carried with Mr. Pazdera and Mr. Tracey abstained.

#637 – DISCUSSION OF LOWER MAKEFIELD TOWNSHIP PUBLIC RECREATION FACILITY & ASSOCIATED IMPROVEMENTS PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAN

Mr. Ron Jackson, engineer, was present with Mr. George Hibbs, architect. Ms. Friedman stated the Board of Supervisors discussed this matter at their meeting last Wednesday and agreed to give the Planning Commission another opportunity to review the Plan. She stated she also met with Pete Stainthorpe who agreed to grant the Planning Commission additional time, and hopefully they can come to some resolutions. Ms. Friedman stated at the Board of Supervisors meeting she advised the Supervisors that they were not provided a Sketch Plan at the beginning of the process which caused problems for the Planning Commission in seeing how the property could be better evaluated and used for the community.

Ms. Friedman stated while the Grant can be extended, she would like to get the project moving forward.

Mr. Dickson stated Ms. Frick had provided the Planning Commission a copy of the presentation made by Remington Vernick on 2/15/12, and he feels the Planning Commission should have had this two years ago. He stated all the Planning Commission needed was a simple Sketch Plan showing the two potential sites, and he does not know why they did not get this two years ago.

Ms. Friedman stated while this is true, they need to move on and deal with what they have in hand. Ms. Friedman stated the biggest issue is the way the building is placed on the property because it is placed in an area where one corner of the building is in the deepest part of the woodlands from a slope perspective which means that there will be a lot of backfill which is expensive. She stated the other issue was the problem of having so much parking in front of the building, and this should be minimized. Ms. Friedman stated there should also be more connectivity between the two ball fields. She stated at the Fred Allan fields, they could bring some overflow parking into the back area where the little playground is located, and this could be pervious bricks or other surface. She stated she feels they could get forty spaces in that location which would minimize a lot of what is happening at the Public Recreation Facility.

Ms. Friedman stated the size of the building will remain pretty close to Option #3. Ms. Tyler stated the Plan is on the Township Website.

Mr. Bush thanked Ms. Friedman for articulating the collective voice of the Planning Commission at the last Board of Supervisors meeting. Mr. Bush stated people should know that the Grant needs to be spent by January, 2016; and an extension can be sought if it is asked for three months in advance of that time.

Mr. Bush stated at the Planning Commission's meetings in July and August the public requested that the parking be moved away from the front, but they have not seen anything on the Plans showing a change. He stated he also feels they should address moving the driveway away from the long driveway across the street where he believes three homes take access off that long driveway, and their voices have not been acknowledged.

Mr. Bush stated at the last meeting Mr. Pazdera asked Mr. Hibbs what it would mean if they were to flip the building. Mr. Bush stated Mr. Hibbs had indicated it would cost approximately \$100,000 to fill in underneath the low spot of the building which Ms. Friedman has referenced this evening. Mr. Bush stated at the

Board of Supervisors meeting he thought he heard Mr. Eisold indicate that it would only be a \$15,000 or \$20,000 difference; however, Ms. Friedman stated she felt he stated it would be \$50,000. Mr. Hibbs stated he feels they are discussing two different things. Mr. Hibbs stated the issue Mr. Eisold was discussing at the Board of Supervisors meeting was the issue of cut and fill, and that they have a certain amount of cut on the site to create surface paving. He stated the cut is being created for the permeable pavers and that area which would have gravel, will be taken and used as fill on another part of the site. He stated they are trying to make it an even distribution so that they are not carting soil off the site. Mr. Hibbs stated the issue he brought up in his discussion with Mr. Pazdera was the cost of a retaining feature to retain the earth behind the building and support the corner of the building without utilizing the fill and he had provided a guestimate as to the cost of the retaining wall feature if they did not use the soil that was already on the site. Mr. Bush asked the cost if they did a retaining wall feature, and Mr. Hibbs stated he has not designed it and that is why he indicated it could be somewhere between \$50,000 and \$100,000.

Mr. Bush stated he asked this because the project seems “squeezed” for money, and \$50,000 to \$100,000 is a big range. Mr. Hibbs stated he agrees, and this is why he suggested not to have an expensive retaining wall.

Mr. Bush stated with regard to interior utilization of the space, while they have gotten a lot of good information, he still feels there has been too much focus on the current needs of the Seniors versus the future needs of the Seniors. He stated Seniors are much more active than they used to be and more technologically savvy, and are less likely to use a Senior Center for its current purposes in the future. He stated he feels the Township should pay more attention to that. Ms. Friedman asked Mr. Bush what he would consider to be a future need that needs to be addressed, and Mr. Bush stated there are a lots of organizations that study what Seniors need in these types of facilities. Ms. Friedman asked if he has anything concrete, and Mr. Bush stated this is not what he does and not his focus, but they have not heard that they have looked into anything other than talking to the current Senior group to see what they would like to see in the building. Mr. Bush stated he feels there should be more investigation of this before they map out the interior of the structure.

Mr. Bush asked if they are going to adhere to the Municipal Ordinance with regard to LEED Certification, and Mr. Hibbs stated part of the discussion concerned the concept of LEED Certification, and he discussed with the Board of Supervisors the different levels of LEED and what that means. They also discussed the concept of the building itself, and that it must meet minimum guidelines that are established by the Township, but that they will not go through the formal

paperwork process. He stated after the Board of Supervisors meeting, he was approached by a member of the EAC who indicated they will probably be the LEED liaison so that discussion has started. Mr. Bush stated he is pleased to hear this and that the Township residents can be assured that there is going to be compliance.

Mr. Pazdera asked if they were going for the Certificate to get the plaque, typically they would design in some extra points; and even though they are not doing this, he still feels they should have some extra points built in and not just meet the absolute minimum in case something does not work out. Mr. Hibbs stated they will discuss these options with the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Pazdera stated at the Board of Supervisors meeting he though Mr. Garton indicated that no Zoning Variances were necessary, and he finds this hard to believe particularly with regard to measuring setbacks from natural resources. Mr. Jackson stated under the Zoning Ordinance for a Public Recreational Facility, the setbacks are only 15' from the side yards. He stated it is the side yard they were failing to meet with regard to setback requirements for a Community Center Use since it was 100'.

Mr. Bush stated previously he had asked about maintenance and operating costs on an annual basis once the building is built, and he asked Mr. Hibbs if he had any idea on this. Mr. Hibbs stated he attempted to reach out to several Bucks County Senior/Community Centers and is waiting for calls back. He stated it is difficult to find an exact duplicate of a 7,500 square foot facility in this region. He stated operation costs could range from \$75,000 to \$100,000. He stated he is waiting to hear back and have discussions with some of the Directors of those facilities. Mr. Hibbs estimated it could be \$60,000 to \$90,000 for this size building.

Ms. Friedman stated after the Board of Supervisors meeting where she had discussed the parking lot, orientation of the building, and the auxiliary parking in the Fred Allan field, she made a rudimentary sketch of an alternative concept and asked that they provide her with reasons why this could not be done. She showed on the aerial the location of the woodlands that will be impacted with the proposed Plan and a deep section that will need to be backfilled. She showed on the Plan where she would suggest moving the building to. She stated the area would not be wide enough to have a front to back on the road, so she would suggest turning it so that the front would look at the woodlands. She stated where she is proposing the building to be located is a fairly flat area of land. She stated the building would be moved forward so that it is slightly closer to the street, but it would not look as large because it is only the side of the building. She also noted an area where they could put the picnic tables and bocce courts. She noted on the Plan where she would propose to have the driveway entrance which would come from Countess. She also showed where areas of parking could be in the front. She also

noted other locations where parking would be and an area for pervious parking. She stated with the parking proposed as she noted on the plan, the drainage could go into the woodlands. Ms. Friedman also showed an area where there could be a cut through to the ball fields and additional parking spaces which she feels could be pervious. Ms. Friedman questioned the need for a putting green since she feels they have the Township Golf Course, and she would like to know who feels there is a need for a putting green on this site.

Ms. Beath asked if this would impact the ability for overflow parking for the Tournaments.

Mr. Joe Parell, 612 Brandywine, noted where the parking is currently taking place. He stated they are now institutionalizing Oxford Valley Road, and before they do this, he asked why they could not tie it into the Fred Allan Complex using the unofficial cut through so they would minimize the impact to the neighbors. He stated the building could be pushed back where the cut through is. He stated no one uses the small playground. He stated the building could be on the other side of the tree line. He stated this would hide the parking and have it connect to Fred Allan.

Mr. Benedetto stated he walked the property and saw the natural cut through. He stated he agrees with Mr. Parell and it should be back off the road. He stated the issue had to do with the connection for water and sewer and pushing it back off the road would involve an additional cost. Mr. Parell stated he questions this because there is water and sewer in the recreation building now. He stated before they make a permanent structure on Oxford Valley Road and add parking in front, he feels they should look into this. He stated originally the ball fields were going to have the parking in the front and because of neighborhood impact, it was all removed and brought behind. Mr. Benedetto stated if they push it back, it will impact the residents on Waterwheel.

Ms. Friedman stated she has moved it a little more forward since it is a flat area and would not have as much encroachment.

Mr. Parell stated one of the problems with Countess is the fact that there is an uphill grade up to Countess, and he feels there could be a visual/traffic hazard.

Ms. Lisa Booth, 1180 Longmeadow Lane, asked if a traffic study was done, and it was noted it is not required. She asked the impact to the residents of Roelofs who did not receive notice of the meeting.

Ms. Laura Falcon, 1154 Waterwheel Drive, stated the notice she received about the meeting indicates that this would be located on the corner of Oxford Valley and Edgewood Road; and while this is where it should have been located, it is not.

Ms. Booth asked if there was any thought about funneling the traffic directly onto Edgewood Road, and Ms. Friedman stated she did not feel they could access that area given the ball fields.

Ms. Friedman stated the Seniors have to have at least forty to fifty parking spaces next to the building apart from the overflow for other events.

Mr. Benedetto asked Mr. Hibbs if there is an estimate for moving the building back where the cut through is, and asked if there is additional cost because of the utility lines. Mr. Hibbs stated that was not designed or estimated.

Mr. Frank Fazzalore stated at the Board of Supervisors meeting it was noted that there will still be a need for the overflow parking for the Tournaments, and he was told that there would be no overflow parking coming onto the Senior/Community Center parking lot. Ms. Friedman stated if the overflow parking is in place, the Senior Center will not be impacted when there is a ball game. Ms. Beath stated when they have their Tournaments one or two times a year, she feels the Community Center will have to be shut down for those two days.

Ms. Laura Falcon stated if the building were closer to the street, she would be in favor of this since it is less ugly than parking and backfilling for parking would be less costly than backfilling for a building. She stated she does not feel that they would need to twist the building. Ms. Friedman stated it is a big building, and if they are pushing it closer to the road, it will look very big.

One gentleman asked if they could put in trees, and Ms. Friedman stated they will have landscaping.

Ms. Sue Herman stated if the building were brought forward and turned so that the side of the building faced the road, it would look smaller, and Ms. Friedman stated that was the idea she had.

Mr. Zachary Rubin, 1661 Covington Road, asked if the way the architect has proposed the building does it meet the criteria for sunrise and sunset as related to LEED; and Mr. Hibbs stated it does. Mr. Rubin asked if it would still meet that if the building were turned, and Mr. Hibbs stated there are ways to orient the building differently and still meet LEED.

Mr. Hibbs stated he does not feel they should have the front of the building toward the tree line as they want it to be the “face” of the Township and to have it front onto the tree line is wrong in his opinion. He stated the building should have a presence and front on the street. He stated in terms of the parking spaces, he feels they need to be careful. He stated what he as tried to do is keep the parking spaces concentrated so that the Seniors do not have that far to walk. He stated there is the potential that over time there could be a breakthrough in the tree line where there is already a small path now.

Mr. Hibbs showed on the Plan a tree line which could potentially be eliminated if the alternative Plan suggested by Ms. Friedman were done. He stated while some trees will be lost on the proposed Plan, there would still be a grove of trees. Mr. Hibbs stated they could request a Variance to have less parking if less parking is approved by the Board of Supervisors. He stated the front line of parking could be pulled back so that additional landscaping could be added. He stated their concern was to make sure that there was enough parking for the Seniors.

Mr. Jackson stated a few individuals discussed the cut and fill issue, and he wanted to reiterate that they are not going to have to go out and find fill because there is a large infiltration system proposed and that soil when taken out will be added to the area where fill is needed so that there is a balance and it should not be exceptionally expensive since they are just moving the fill around the site. Ms. Friedman stated they are going to have to build a retaining wall; however, Mr. Hibbs stated they are not proposing building a retaining wall and it was only an option that was discussed at the last meeting. Mr. Jackson stated they will only have a three to one slope which will be vegetated to make it stable. Mr. Jackson stated with regard to the suggestion about having pervious paving, he noted on the Plan are area where they were already proposing to have pervious paving. Mr. Hibbs stated this helps with LEED. Mr. Jackson stated there had been discussion about overflow parking, and he noted an area on the Plan where they allow for access through the site for overflow parking. He stated the Township could monitor who is parking in certain areas; and they could block off the paved area for the Seniors, and the others would have to use the pervious paving. He stated they could also have the ability to have a stabilized grass area when there are large Tournaments.

Mr. Jackson stated they did do a rendering pulling the parking back, and he showed this option. He stated the parking will be surrounded by vegetation.

Mr. Jackson stated Ms. Friedman’s Sketch showed an area where drainage would run off the site; however, they could not do not this because it would be draining onto the Water Company site which is not Township property. Ms. Friedman stated she did not realize that was the Water Company’s property.

Ms. Beath stated there are over three hundred parking spaces existing now within a square mile, and she questioned why they need eighty-five parking spaces.

Mr. Eisold joined the meeting at this time.

Ms. Tyler stated they are not going to use the Community Center for rentals for weddings, etc., and it will not be a money-making venture. Ms. Herman asked if they would not use it for Township groups that need a large area, and Ms. Tyler stated they could. Ms. Beath stated she feels they should use the Township meeting room. Ms. Tyler stated this is why there is allowance for overflow parking since it may not just be needed for the Softball Tournaments. She stated it is designed so that if there is a larger event, the additional parking could be utilized. Ms. Tyler stated she agrees they may not need the eighty-five parking spaces given that it has been designed to have overflow on grass, and she agrees that they should consider a reduced number of parking spaces.

Ms. Friedman stated she feels there is a minimum number of parking that they have to have, and Mr. Jackson stated the required number of spaces for a Public Recreational Facility went up from when it was defined as a Community Center. He stated they are showing eighty-five spaces now; and by Ordinance, they are required to have one for every three on the maximum use, and the maximum use he chose was provided by the architect per the Fire Code which results in eight-three spaces. Ms. Tyler asked if the Zoning requires pavement and does it take into account the overflow area; however, Mr. Jackson stated he was not sure that Zoning would count spaces that were in reserve.

Mr. Koopman stated normally the required number of spaces have to be paved per Ordinance so they would need relief from the Zoning Ordinance if they want to reduce the number of parking spaces. He stated it is an option that they could request this relief from the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Bush stated Mr. Hibbs made a comment that the new building should face the road; however, Mr. Bush noted the Township Municipal Building does not face the road. Mr. Bush noted at the Board of Supervisors meeting, one of the Supervisors indicated that he did not want the building to be moved, and he asked Ms. Tyler and Mr. Benedetto if they were willing to explore an option such as Ms. Friedman has described or to look at something else other than the Plan that has been presented.

Ms. Tyler stated the specific placement of the building was done for a variety of reasons, and she asked Mr. Eisold to discuss why it has been proposed for this location as opposed to the other Options. Ms. Tyler also noted she did not have an opportunity to review Ms. Friedman's Sketch Plan.

A short recess was taken at this time to provide those present including Mr. Eisold the opportunity to review what Ms. Friedman has proposed.

When the meeting was reconvened, Mr. Eisold stated he understands the concern about having too much parking in the front; but in terms of convenience and having a community feel, they did want to have parking that was very accessible to the front. Mr. Eisold stated with regard to Ms. Friedman's Sketch he does not feel the shape of the building really lends itself to what she is proposing, and the building would have to be more linear to fit into that Plan. He also stated if the parking is in the back as Ms. Friedman has proposed, everyone would have to go past the spots, and it would be awkward for the Seniors backing out to have cars continually coming through there. He stated with the proposed Plan there are number of spaces in the front that would be more contained. Ms. Friedman agreed.

Mr. Eisold stated he has had some discussion with Mr. Pazdera, and he feels with a small four foot retaining wall along the back of the building, they could minimize the number of trees that are encroached upon. He stated while there would be a cost for the wall, he does not feel it will be that much more costly; and they could save 50% to 70% of the trees if they did this.

Mr. Eisold also noted the revised Sketch presented by Mr. Jackson this evening where they took out the front ten spaces, and they could do this and also shift the front drive aisle another 20' up so there would be closer to 50' of green space along Oxford Valley Road which he feels will accomplish a lot of what they are looking for. He stated they would still have the handicap spaces and a few other spaces in the front, and they would then put more spaces in the back and on the side. He stated there may also be some way to slightly pull the building out possibly 10' to 15' so that the retaining wall and the tree disturbance would be minimized.

Mr. Koopman asked if they would need Variance relief to make these changes, and Mr. Eisold stated he does not feel relief would be required just to move the spaces from the front to the back. He stated this would just be taking spaces from the front which are more convenient to the back and side which will require a little further to walk.

Ms. Tyler asked that they discuss the rear/side entrance since this would now have more traffic than they had originally intended; and Mr. Hibbs stated there could be the potential to have a drop off at the side entry. He stated the main entry would still be facing the road and that would be utilized during certain conditions and hours. He stated architecturally, the side entry has been designed as a secondary entry, but it still has some character. He stated now that the side entry will be utilized a lot more, it is directly off the main corridor and the restrooms; and he feels this would work fine. Ms. Tyler stated someone could drop off their passenger and then park, and Mr. Hibbs agreed.

A gentleman from 1132 Glen Oak Drive stated he worked at a Senior Center; and they found that if Seniors have to walk more than 50', they will not visit the building so it does not matter if there is a lot of overflow parking. Ms. Friedman stated the Seniors only need approximately 40 spaces, and the overflow would be for larger functions at the Center. The gentleman also stated once this is built, if it is opened up to others they will come; and he feels they should be prepared for this. Mr. Bush stated it is a Public Recreation Center for others, although there will be a Senior component.

Ms. Beath stated she has often asked about what the rules will be for those other than the Seniors. She stated she does not feel they should compete with private industry, and they should not rent space for parties including the Township residents since there are other places in the Township where they could rent space. She stated she does not feel people should be given something for free which will impede businesses such as McCaffrey's and the Continental Tavern. She stated she would like to see rules about what can occur at this building and what could be put in the Township Meeting Room which is going to be 60% to 70% empty. She stated to address the prior speaker's comment about "if you build it, they will come," they will not come if there are strict rules attached.

Mr. Benedetto stated with regard to additional type of activities in the area, he has heard a dog park being discussed. He stated he hopes if there is an Approval tonight, it will only be a Preliminary Plan Approval since there are still questions and additional people who should be notified and able to weigh in. He stated while weighing Mr. Hibbs' comment about having the building with all the parking in front this should also be weighed against the obtrusiveness to the residents. He stated there are approximately fifty spaces immediately connected at Fred Allan which are already existing.

Mr. Benedetto asked the additional costs if they were to move the building as Ms. Friedman suggested. He stated he understands there were additional costs in terms of water and sewer.

Mr. Eisold stated with regard to the parking Mr. Benedetto referenced at Fred Allan, while they are good spaces which are not used all the time, they would be impractical for use by the Community Center; and people are not going to walk to the Center from those spaces. Mr. Benedetto stated he is looking at it as an overflow. Mr. Eisold stated for a driveway to connect those spaces to the Community Center, it would cost approximately \$50,000; and while this could be done in the future, he does not feel it would be a high priority in the first phase.

Mr. Benedetto asked about the water and sewer. Mr. Eisold stated it would be an additional cost if they were to move the building back. Ms. Tyler stated if they moved it back, it would move it closer to those residing on Waterwheel; and this is one of the reasons it was situated half way in between to try to impact both Waterwheel and those living immediately across the street as little as possible. Mr. Eisold stated they also considered placement so that it would not be as intrusive as it would be if it were in the middle of the field. He stated in some respects having it a little bit into the woods will make it blend a little better. He stated moving it out further, they could minimize the number of trees to be removed; however, if they set the building in a little bit, it will not look like such a big building which he feels would be more appealing aesthetically.

Mr. Benedetto stated he is not comfortable with the change in language which he feels is just semantics, and he feels it seems to be a change in language to get around the Ordinances. Ms. Tyler stated Mr. Garton addressed this at the last Board of Supervisors meeting, and the designation as a Public Recreational Facility versus a Community Center is because the owner is the Township. She stated a Community Center would be a privately-owned entity. She stated it has no bearing on trying to get more favorable setbacks, and it is by virtue of definition for both of those types of Centers. Mr. Benedetto stated it did change the need for Variances, and he could see why people are not comfortable with this.

Mr. Eisold stated once they went through the Zoning Ordinance to determine what if any Variances were needed, they reviewed the definitions and had discussions with Mr. Garton and found out that even though it is a Community Center, it is a Public Community Center; and under the Zoning definition of Lower Makefield Township, it is not classified as a Community Center. He stated they are really putting a Use on the entire property which includes the ball fields, and they are all Public Recreation Facilities. Mr. Garton indicated that they cannot have the same piece of property and have two separate Uses on it, and the Use is for the property and not just for the building.

Mr. Benedetto stated there are a lot of Community Centers/Recreation Centers in the surrounding area, and he would like to see what others have done and take their ideas instead of just moving forward with this. Mr. Eisold stated this is what they have done, and they have listened to what the Planning Commission is concerned with and listed a number of things that could be done to "tweak" the Plan to address their concerns recognizing that they are not agreeing to 100% of what they have suggested. He stated he feels they can minimize the parking area, cut less of the woods, put a wall behind it, and possibly pull the building slightly away from the woods which will probably address 80% of the intent of what the Planning Commission wants to do.

Mr. Zachary Rubin stated while they have indicated that the Seniors may only need forty to fifty spots, he has been in the Township meeting room where the Fire Marshall has limited it to one hundred twenty-five people; and they have had overflow people when there were discussions such as trash collection, cable TV, etc. so this meeting room is not adequate to accommodate all the people for a number of issues discussed in the Township. He stated on Veterans Day, they could move that event indoors to the Community Center if there is inclement weather. He stated the Historical Commission may wish to have a Founder's Day and be able to have exhibits where they do not have space now. He stated they could also have non-partisan League of Women Voters presentations in the Community Center as well. He stated currently those involved with the Veteran's Monument have had to go to the Masonic Lodge and pay rent of \$300 for events, and he feels it is wrong for not-for-profit organizations to have to pay for use of the facilities. He stated he feels a Community Center creates community. He stated PAA and the soccer organizations should be able to use the Community Center for fundraisers. He stated this would not be competing with private industry since all the money raised from those organizations goes back into the organization for fields, etc. Mr. Rubin stated there have been PECO meetings when the current Township meeting room was not adequate and it had to be moved to the Middle Schools. He stated he feels there could be Community Center activities where hundreds of people come.

Mr. Rubin asked the capacity of the largest meeting room, and Mr. Hibbs stated it would be one hundred twenty-five people with tables and chairs. He stated in a meeting situation, he feels it could hold one hundred seventy-five people. Mr. Rubin stated because this could be used for that purpose, he feels they should be careful about how much parking they cut down.

Ms. Friedman stated she was discussing that there be forty spaces that would be necessary to be close to the building for the Seniors, and the rest could be further away. Mr. Rubin stated he understands this, but they are losing track that it is a Senior/Community Center; and Ms. Friedman stated she understands that.

Ms. Herman stated she agrees with Mr. Rubin and she feels the best thing would be if there would be a mix of young people and Seniors in this building. She also asked if any thought had been given to having a portable stage for the facility since for many years the Bucks County Performing Arts Society put on musical performances in the Township Meeting Room primarily during the day. She stated they would also need to have storage for a portable stage. Mr. Hibbs agreed this would be possible.

Ms. Herman asked about the ability to expand the proposed Community Center in the future, and Mr. Hibbs showed on the Plan areas where there is potential room for expansion.

Mr. Joe Parell stated they have gone in the last five minutes from what he felt was a Senior Center to a building where hundreds of people will be using it and having an addition making it even larger. He stated he has gone from willing to accept this to now being vehemently opposed to it because of the impact to the neighborhood across the street. He stated they are institutionalizing Oxford Valley Road and going into the neighborhoods. He stated he felt it should have been built in Edgewood Village where they wanted to have a Town Center. He stated there are other pieces of property in the Township that could be utilized for this.

Ms. Falcon stated this should have been on the corner of the site where the ball fields are which was what was indicated in the letter to the residents.

Ms. Beath stated they need to look at this as a whole complex. She stated the existing Township Meeting Room will be vacant 60% to 70% of the time, and as a taxpayer she does not want to see everything moved over to the Community Center. She stated if there are big parties, they should be held in the Township Municipal Building.

Ms. Anna Kitces, 1015 Yorkshire, stated she feels this is being done piecemeal, and the public is going to feel that things are going on "behind their backs." She stated the Plans have already been developed, and she would like to know how much money has been spent on this up to this point. Ms. Tyler stated this is the third building that Mr. Hibbs has designed since 2003. She stated they are paying the engineers and the architect although she does not know what the bills are to date, and she would have to get this from the Township Manager. Ms. Tyler stated she believes the architect's fee was \$98,000, but she is not sure of the engineering costs thus far or where they will end up if some of these alterations being discussed will need to be made.

Mr. Benedetto asked the price of Option #3, and Ms. Tyler stated it was between \$1.4 and \$1.6 million. Mr. Benedetto stated the Grant was \$1 million and there was an additional \$250,000 borrowed.

Ms. Kitces stated she does not feel this has been planned, and does not feel that it is a Community Center because the public is not aware enough, and they have cut out public opinion. She stated she does not feel they have to do this so quickly, and they could back track and get more consensus and not do piecemeal planning.

Ms. Kitces asked why the ball fields were put in that location. Ms. Tyler stated the only space they could engineer the ball fields was at that location. Ms. Kitces asked why that would have priority over the Community Center, and Ms. Tyler stated if they did it the other way, they would not have been able to build the ball fields.

Ms. Tyler stated the Township got a \$2 million State Grant for recreation, and one half of the Grant was for the Community Center and the other was for the ball fields, the inclusive playground which is almost completed, and the renovation of the tennis and basketball courts near the Pool. She stated they looked at the available space they had and consulted with the engineers, and the location where the ball fields were constructed was the only space where the ball fields could have gone.

Ms. Kitces asked if the Planning Commission was involved in the discussion of the ball fields, and Ms. Tyler stated the Park & Recreation Board was involved in this. Ms. Kitces stated she was at a Planning Commission meeting when someone said “they were shoving it down their throat.” Ms. Kitces stated Ms. Tyler is saying that the ball fields had priority over the Community Center; and Ms. Tyler disagreed and reiterated that her comment was that from an engineering perspective and with the land that was available to build these assets, that was the only location where the ball fields would fit. She stated the Community Center, on the other hand, had five potential locations that were considered; and this was the area where they determined it would be. Ms. Kitces stated she feels there has been a lack of communication and coordination and lack of planning for this whole facility. Ms. Tyler stated she has been working on this facility since she was on the Board, and now they have an entire parcel – Oxford Valley and Edgewood Road where they now have softball fields, potential Community Center, and baseball complexes so that they have achieved an all-encompassing recreational facility for the residents. Ms. Kitces stated the Community Center does not connect. Ms. Tyler stated they hope to bring it all together with community walking trails eventually encompassing the entire area, but not necessarily driving through the recreational area. She stated they could drive from one parking lot to another or could walk.

Mr. Benedetto stated there was a five person Site Selection Committee, and they did evaluate all the sites; and it was a comprehensive process. He stated they did not make a unanimous selection as some felt other locations were better. He stated he feels the Library site could have been more fully explored. He stated the Samost site was selected. He stated there were public meetings on this as well.

Mr. Bush stated once the site was selected, and there was consideration as to where the ball fields would be versus the Recreation Center, it was not very well coordinated. He stated when they looked at the ball fields two years ago and were asked to make a recommendation on that, Mr. Dickson asked if they could see where the

the Community Center would be so that they could determine if the plan for the ball fields made sense; and they were told they could not and had to vote on this now, and they were not looking at a coordinated picture for this parcel of land.

Ms. Tyler stated there was nowhere else to put the ball fields. Mr. Bush stated he understands that they cannot go back now. He stated he feels there were potentially other places to put the ball fields. Ms. Tyler stated she is in favor of how the Plan is shaping out, and feels it is the vision of the full Township hub with the fields, the Pool, the Library, etc. and having many of the Municipal assets near each other which she feels shows good planning and is to the Planning Commission's credit as well throughout the years.

Ms. Kitces stated she does not feel the public would agree with this. She stated she feels a lot of people are going to have similar ideas to those present with her this evening. She stated she feels they should consider that the deadline is not until 2016.

Mr. Bruce Cosaboom, 1090 Victory Drive, stated during last year's Tournament, the cars parked in an area he showed on the Plan. He stated he gets the impression that this area will become land locked, and there should be curb cuts so that there is access to all the land. He stated in past Tournaments people were parking in his neighborhood and leaving their trash behind. Ms. Tyler stated they have discussed this with the user groups, and they are going to have a shuttle service to try to keep the cars out of the neighborhoods. Mr. Cosaboom stated he believes they did this last year, and it worked out well.

Mr. Eisold stated he does not feel the area will be landlocked, and he feels the area on Oxford Valley Road could remain parking with the lay out they have proposed. Mr. Cosaboom stated he is a retired civil engineer, and two of the most valuable courses he took were Planning and Landscape Architecture. He stated while he did not go into that specific field, he has an appreciation for the efforts of Planning Boards, and the importance of Planning in the early stages of a project; and he feels that was negligent in this process. He stated he feels the more an area is developed, the more important it is for the planning process to be included. Mr. Eisold stated he agrees. He stated they do have within their engineering firm landscape architects, land planners, and other specialties that have been utilized for the Township to not only review Plans that come into the Township but also to design Plans like the one being presented. He stated one of their planners/landscape architects has spent a fair amount of time on this project with regard to the landscape around the building, the street trees, the lay out, and the traffic movements. He also agrees that the Planning Board serves an important purpose in reviewing all projects in the Township.

Mr. Benedetto asked if there are plans for solar panels, and Mr. Hibbs stated this is not in the plans. Mr. Benedetto stated he feels there should be a recommendation from the Planning Commission for a formal traffic study. He stated he knows there was a preliminary evaluation, but he feels they should take into consideration the potential for divergence of the Quiet Zones traffic. Mr. Eisold stated as he noted previously, the Township's traffic planner did review the Plans, and did not recommend that a traffic study needed to be done because in reality they are not really generating a lot of new traffic. He stated they are moving traffic from a location a quarter mile away to this new facility. He stated overall they are not generating a new use that would result in a lot of new traffic, and it is the same traffic using the property at this time. Ms. Herman stated this is only if it is used as a Senior center; however, Mr. Eisold stated it will be used by groups which will most likely be small groups for meetings of PAA, etc.

Mr. Joe Parell stated earlier in the evening they had discussed use of the facility by groups, and now he understands that any community group in the Township could use the building. Mr. Tyler stated people who currently use the Township Municipal Building could use the new facility. She added they hope to expand the use to include the athletic user groups and Boy and Girl Scout Troops. She stated they have also discussed a reading program between the Seniors and the Elementary Schools, but they have no plans to pack the building with two hundred people. She stated they will not know however the complete use until they have people coming to the Township wanting to use it. She stated they will consider those requests considering the residents as they do not want the building to be used all the time. She stated the primary use would be the Seniors from the morning until the afternoon and whatever user groups that would use it for meetings in the evenings. She stated she was not considering have monthly performances at that facility and wants it for the Seniors and other small meeting groups that want to utilize it.

Mr. Parell stated he feels those uses should be determined before they build the building. Ms. Tyler stated they already know the primary use will be for the Seniors which she feels will be 75% of the use of the building. She stated they also anticipate the other user groups making use of the building for their meetings. Ms. Tyler stated they will manage this property just as they manage the rest of the Township facilities. Ms. Tyler stated the building is designed with multi-purpose rooms so that they have the ultimate flexibility in using those rooms however they intend to; but it is primarily being designed for the use of the Seniors although it does not exclude the use by the rest of the community.

Mr. Bush stated at the last meeting of the Planning Commission he made the point that it is difficult to approve a building without knowing the intended uses of the building, and he had discussed a number of uses that were possibilities; and Ms. Tyler had indicated that it will not be used as a catering hall since this was the concern of a number of residents. Mr. Bush stated tonight he is hearing Ms. Tyler indicate that 75% of the use will be the Seniors; and while this is the thinking right now, there may be Supervisors in the future who may feel differently and those uses may not be consistent with what the current Supervisors are considering now.

Mr. Bush stated Ms. Friedman discussed with him that she feels that there should be a Mission Statement in conjunction with any approval of the building, and Mr. Bush stated he agrees with this. He stated he feels this would go a long way toward giving the residents a comfort feeling as to what to expect at this site now and in the future. Ms. Friedman stated she feels something that tells them what will not happen would be helpful as there are major fears being expressed.

Ms. Friedman stated she does not feel the Planning Commission will be able to vote on this tonight as the Planning Commission has never, and will never, vote on something they are not looking at; and they do not have a Plan since they do not know how the parking will end up or how the property could be used for picnics and other relaxing activities. She stated the Planning Commission would like a simple sketch to show what they are voting on. She stated they do not vote on conversations. She stated the Planning Commission's next meeting is scheduled for September 22, and they could consider this at that time if they can be provided a Sketch of all the things that have been discussed that would work.

Ms. Tyler asked that the Planning Commission make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors tonight on their specific areas of concern and what they would like changed as this is likely to be considered at the next Board of Supervisors meeting.

Mr. Bush stated they should look at the items outlined in the August 25 memo from Ms. Frick to determine what has and has not been addressed. Mr. Bush stated that Mr. Eisold also identified minimizing the parking, lessening the intrusion into the woods, building a small retaining wall, and pulling the building away from the woods.

Ms. Friedman stated she would not agree to vote on anything this evening that is not in front of her. Ms. Friedman stated she wants a printed copy to show what they are voting on. She stated she would also like to see where they will have the passive recreation area such as picnic tables, and Ms. Tyler stated it would be out back. Ms. Friedman stated they would also like a mission statement and more importantly what they are not going to have, and Ms. Tyler stated this will be under the purview

stated she is not the Liaison for Park & Rec, and she is not sure how far into this they have gotten. Mr. Benedetto stated he is not aware that Park & Recreation has come up with a Mission Statement or concept for how this building is going to be used.

Mr. Pazdera stated when they come back with the Sketch, he would like a clarification of the rear yard setback from the natural resources, and have the Plan clearly identify what this is.

Ms. Tyler advised Mr. Eisold she would like this to the Planning Commission as quickly as possible so they have as much time as possible to review this so that if there are questions before the next Planning meeting, they can have a dialogue.

Mr. Eisold stated he will take the Plan presented and make the changes as a Sketch Plan with copies provided to Mr. Frick. He stated he will take into account what has been discussed. Ms. Tyler stated once the Planning Commission sees this, if they feel it does not address their items of concern, they should advise Mr. Eisold.

Ms. Lara Falcon, 1154 Waterwheel, stated it was made clear at the Board of Supervisors meeting that the Planning Commission had one more meeting to provide a recommendation. Ms. Tyler stated she is only one of five Board members. Ms. Friedman stated she discussed this with Mr. Stainthorpe and advised him that she was not sure the Planning Commission would be able to make a recommendation by the next meeting, and he understood this.

Mr. Jackson stated in addition to the memo from Ms. Frick the following items are what the Planning Commission is looking for:

- 1) Try to reduce the parking in the front avoiding Variances
- 2) Less impact to the woods – shifting the building possibly and possibly using a retaining wall
- 3) Identify passive recreation area – picnic tables, bocce court
- 4) Clearly identify the setbacks based on the current definition of the Use
- 5) Side drop off as an option

September 8, 2014

Planning Commission – page 19 of 19

There being no further business, Mr. Dickson moved, Mr. Tracey seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dean Dickson, Secretary