TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD

PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES – OCTOBER 30, 2023

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield

was held in the Municipal Building on October 30, 2023. Mr. Costello called the

meeting to order and called the Roll.

Those present:

Planning Commission: Adrian Costello, Chair

 Tejinder Gill, Vice Chair

 Colin Coyle, Secretary/Supervisor Liaison

 Tony Bush, Member

 John DeLorenzo, Member

Others: James Majewski, Community Development Director

 Dan McLoone, Planner

 Barbara Kirk, Township Solicitor

 Paul DeFiore, Township Engineer

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

the Minutes of September 11, 2023 as written.

Mr. DeLorenzo moved, Mr. Coyle seconded and it was unanimously carried to

approve the Minutes of September 25, 2023 as written.

#691 – POINT (TROILO) LAND DEVELOPMENT

Preliminary Plan Approval

Tax Parcel #20-021-003

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

1674 Edgewood Road at Yardley-Langhorne Road

Proposed renovation of the existing Ishmael house into a 1-unit dwelling, replication

of the existing Quill house into a 2-unit dwelling, construction of 1 new 2-story dwelling

containing 2 units & 2 new 2-story dwellings each containing 4 units with 28 on-site

parking spaces
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Mr. Edward Murphy, attorney, was present with Mr. C. T. Troilo, owner, and

Mr. John Richardson, engineer. Mr. Murphy stated the project has been the

subject of numerous discussions with various Boards and Commission in the

Township over the last four years.

Mr. Murphy stated they have received review letters from the Bucks County

Planning Commission, the Township’s traffic consultant, and the office of the

Township engineer with regard to the latest set of Revised Plans. Mr. Murphy

stated the comments are effectively “will comply” items although Mr. Richardson

will discuss one minor item with regard to the emergency access.

Mr. Murphy stated prior to the meeting Mr. DeFiore spoke to him about two

other comments that did not appear within the review letter; and these were

discussed briefly with Mr. Troilo and Mr. Richardson. Mr. Murphy stated one

involves the need to get a PennDOT Permit, if required, for the emergency access

opening; however, Mr. Richardson was not sure about that since he believes

where that opening is might be a Township road as opposed to PennDOT.

He stated they will get the Highway Occupancy Permit if it is part of PennDOT’s

jurisdiction.

Mr. Murphy stated the other item was the suggested shifting of one of the access

points which Mr. Richardson is aware of since it was marked on one of the Plans;

and they have no issue with re-locating that access a few more feet closer to the

throat of the parking lot. Mr. Majewski stated that was in the letter from SAFE

Engineering for the crosswalk. He added in this way the crosswalk will be closer

to the where people are exiting from the site and provides a little extra room away

from the intersection for visibility.

Mr. Murphy stated Mr. DeFiore also made a comment about the suggested

extension of the length of sidewalk. Mr. Murphy stated Mr. Richardson felt that

they were doing sidewalk all the way across the frontage; but they will do whatever

Mr. DeFiore wants.

Ms. Kirk stated the extension of the sidewalk is going to be to the property

line and the basin outlet pipe should be revised. Mr. Richardson stated the

review letter states that it is about 24’ to 27’short of the property line and it

seems to suggest a Fee-In-Lieu of. He stated they would prefer paying the

Fee-In-Lieu because the basin discharge is there as that is the low point of the

site. He added that they are concerned that water could run over the sidewalk

in the winter and freeze, and they would prefer to pay the Fee-In-Lieu.
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Mr. Murphy stated Mr. DeFiore is aware of that although his staff believes that

there is a way to engineer it to avoid that condition rather than having to re-visit

it later. Mr. Murphy stated they agree to work out a solution off-line, and they

agree to do whatever is agreed upon. Mr. DeFiore stated his office would like

sidewalk to extend to the property line to keep the continuity of the sidewalks

and to look at adjusting the drainage pipe and/or the grading to make that work.

Mr. Murphy stated in the SAFE Highway Engineering letter there is a calculation

of the suggested amount of the Traffic Impact Fee, and he stated that may or

may not be correct because he does not believe the reviewer knew the number

of units on the site. He stated they agree to work with the Township on what

that amount should be. Ms. Kirk stated the Condition would be subject to

payment of the Traffic Impact Fee in accordance with Township Ordinance,

and Mr. Murphy stated they would be fine with that.

Ms. Kirk stated with regard to the sidewalk extension, this is Comment #47

in Remington Vernick’s review letter, and the Applicant has agreed to comply

with that rather than requesting to pay a Fee-In-Lieu subject to the approval

of the Township engineer with regard to the extension; and Mr. Murphy agreed.

Mr. Murphy added that he assumes that everyone would agree that if there is

not a way to re-engineer it to avoid to creating a hazardous condition, they will

pay the Fee. He stated it will be resolved to everyone’s satisfaction.

Mr. Coyle stated he believes that the comment in the review letter with regard

to the extension of the sidewalk was to make it contiguous with neighboring

sidewalks, but he does not believe that there is a neighboring sidewalk to be

concerned with. Mr. Majewski agreed that there is no neighboring sidewalk.

Mr. Coyle stated he understands that the neighboring property is the CVS, and

that is graded to drainage basins that this project would connect to.

Mr. Richardson stated there is an intermediate property which is a chapel,

and the CVS is down the street a little further. Mr. Majewski stated there is

also a doctor’s office on that property.

Mr. Majewski stated where they have the trash enclosure, there are a couple

of large trees on the neighboring property; and they have shown the asphalt

cutting straight through to that. He asked that they pull the asphalt away

from the trees a little bit which will provide extra room to better insure the

survivability of those trees; and Mr. Richardson stated that should not be a

problem.
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Mr. Coyle stated if there is no neighboring sidewalk to be contiguous to, he does

not see any value to increasing the impervious surface on the property; and he

would be comfortable with payment of Fee-In-Lieu. Mr. Costello stated if some-

thing were to happen with the adjoining properties, there would be a gap where

it is not connecting and would have to be addressed in the future. Mr. DeFiore

stated he agrees; and the reason they wanted to look at it now is because there

is the opportunity to adjust the drainage pipe. He stated there are several options,

and they can work with the Applicant off-line. He stated to do this now would be

easier than dealing with it in the future since it connects to the basin. Mr. Costello

agreed. Mr. Murphy stated provided we can create a condition where there is not

overflow in the winter and an icy condition, they will do it; and if that cannot be

done to everyone’s satisfaction, they will pay a Fee-In-Lieu.

Mr. Bush stated the other reason to do it is because this is supposed to be a

walkable village and that needs to be in the forefront of any property in this

area.

Ms. Kirk stated the EAC has recommended pervious paving for the parking lot

according to their review letter of October 12, 2023. Mr. Murphy stated he

believes this was discussed previously, and they told them they were not

inclined to do that because it is a parking lot that will get a fair amount of

use. Mr. Costello stated they provided two examples in their letter where

this was done – Makefield Elementary and a portion of the Wegman’s parking

lot. Mr. Richardson stated the stormwater management on site captures the

vast majority of the impervious surface, and he does not feel the pervious

paving is needed. He stated in theory the pervious asphalt would essentially

do exactly what the dry well is doing. He stated pervious asphalt is porous

and rainwater can drain through it. He stated normally you would lay that

on top of a fairly thick stone bed; and while normally under asphalt you would

have 6” of stone with porous paving you would use 1 foot or 18” of stone.

He stated the water would run into that stone and infiltrate in. He stated

what they have designed on the site is a dry well which is the same thing

although it is in one specific location. He stated water enters the dry well and

infiltrates into the ground.

Mr. McLoone asked what portion of the parking area is captured and gets into

the basin, and Mr. Richardson stated it is 100% of the parking lot area.

He added that there is a little bit on the periphery at the emergency access

and by the driveway close to the right-of-way where you cannot really capture

that area.
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Mr. McLoone stated he feels the design as proposed is sufficient as it is capturing

the rainwater as noted and meeting the peak flows.

Mr. Bush stated he understands that the Applicant’s engineer is saying that it is

not too much traffic on the pervious surface, but that the design is adequate.

Mr. Richardson stated one of the problems with pervious asphalt is that it is a

high-maintenance item which tends to degrade over time. He stated no matter

how much maintenance is done, in about ten years it degrades to the point that

it almost becomes essentially asphalt again. He stated maintenance is costly,

and it does degrade over time. Mr. Richardson stated the believe that a more

long-term solution would be the dry well which has been designed.

Mr. Gill stated they previously discussed the pedestrian crossing, and he asked

if that has been resolved. Mr. Richardson stated in the SAFE letter it was

suggested moving the pedestrian crossing on Edgewood Road down closer to

the dry well away from the intersection. Mr. Bush asked to be shown where

it is proposed to be, and this was shown on the Plan. Mr. Gill asked if they

are doing anything with signage for this crossing. Mr. Richardson noted on

the Plan where SAFE has suggested the crossing be moved to based on the

speed study that they did. He stated the Plans call for signs stating “Pedestrian

Crossing Ahead,” and SAFE Engineering recommended the same sign as

proposed but that the signs be in a slightly different location.

Mr. Richardson also noted on the Plan the painted island proposed which is

not curbed with the purpose being to force traffic out so that they can see

past the building. He stated the Township’s traffic engineer suggested that

it should be re-oriented slightly, but the concept is the same.

Mr. Gill asked if drivers will still be permitted to make a left at that location, and

Mr. Richardson you will still be able to make a left.

Mr. Majewski stated there was some concern about traffic coming down Yardley-

Langhorne Road toward Stony Hill and the ability to make a left; and one of the

issues with an island versus painting was that with painting, they would be able

to go over a lot easier. He stated very few tractor-trailers come down that way

for deliveries because they know that it is easier to come in the other way.

Mr. Richardson stated with regard to the impervious surface issue and the

emergency access, in one of the review letters it was suggested to either turn

that into a full-service driveway or to render it obvious that it is emergency-

access only via grass pavers or some surface that would be approvable by
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the Fire Marshall but still be driveable and would hopefully allow vegetation

to grow through. Mr. Richardson stated of the two options, the Applicant

would prefer the grass paver option which they feel will look nicer; and they

prefer not to have traffic exiting and entering off of Yardley-Langhorne Road.

Mr. Richardson stated that would also help the impervious out on that corner.

Mr. Majewski stated the Fire Marshall would be okay with that.

Ms. Kirk stated Mr. Majewski had commented about trucks making a left off

of Yardley-Langhorne Road onto Edgewood Road at the intersection. She stated

Edgewood Road is a Township road, and she asked if we could install a sign

saying “No Trucks Allowed.” Mr. Majewski stated that would have to be

approved by PennDOT because it is traffic from Yardley-Langhorne which is a

State highway onto our road. He stated to prohibit that left would require

approval from PennDOT. He stated we might want to look into pursuing that

although the Township traffic engineer did not see that as a high priority given

what he observed. Ms. Kirk stated if they are going to submit for an HOP

Permit for the emergency access, it may make sense to add that in.

Mr. Richardson stated they could request it if the Township wanted them to.

Mr. Majewski stated while it does not happen often, when it does occur, it is

very difficult since a tractor-trailer needs to wait for cars to clear in order to

be able to make that turn. Mr. Coyle stated that would not have to happen

with this Application, and the Township could discuss this with PennDOT at

any time; and Mr. Majewski agreed.

Mr. Bush stated while it is not part of this Application, it is reasonable to

assume that the Giant property and/or McCaffrey’s property will be

redeveloped in the not too distant future. He asked if what we are talking

about for this road will make sense if anything on those properties is

reoriented toward Edgewood. Mr. Majewski stated he does not feel it will

impact anything they are doing here. He stated Giant is talking about making

some modifications to that store. He stated he is not sure what the Rite-Aid

plans are given their bankruptcy issue.

Mr. Coyle noted Item #45 about better protecting the stormwater inlet from

run-off from the dumpster, and he asked if that is something the developer

has agreed to address. Mr. Richardson stated they will comply, and they will

utilize the filter that has been requested. Mr. Coyle asked if #49 is a “will comply”

as well, and Mr. Richardson agreed.

October 30, 2023 Planning Commission – page 7 of 9

Mr. Coyle moved and Mr. Bush seconded to recommend approval of the proposed

Land Development Plan subject to compliance with all terms and conditions of the

review letter prepared by the Township engineer dated October 24, 2023 with

approval of all requested Waivers except as noted later in this motion; compliance

with the recommendations of the Township traffic engineer, SAFE Highway, dated

October 19, 2023; compliance with the recommendations of the Township’s

Citizens Traffic Commission per e-mail memo dated October 3, 2023; and

compliance with the recommendations of the Bucks County Planning Commission

dated September 22, 2023 regarding basis for Waivers, historical preservation,

review by Township’s HARB, native plantings, tree protection, and the installation

of sidewalks. Subject to the following additional Conditions: With respect to the aforementioned review letter of the Township engineer, the Applicant will meet

with the Township engineer in order to determine if the sidewalk along Yardley-

Langhorne Road can be feasibly extended to the edge of the property line and

drainage relocated accordingly, and will make that extension if feasible; if not

they will pay a Fee-In-Lieu. With regard to Item #51 in the aforementioned letter,

the Applicant agrees to provide a more significant buffer of pervious surface

around the trees near the dumpster area, and the Applicant will, if necessary,

obtain a Highway Occupancy Permit from PennDOT for the emergency access

onto Langhorne-Yardley Road State Route 2049.

Mr. Costello stated he understands that one of the Waivers was the parking

space size. Mr. Majewski stated it is not technically a Waiver adding our

Ordinance says all spaces must be 10’ by 20’ unless during the course of the

approval, you deem that 9’ by 18’ is acceptable. He stated to reduce impervious

surface we have indicated that is what we would like to see. Mr. Bush stated

he would agree with that for a Residential location, but he does not feel it is

appropriate for a Commercial location as can be seen in many of the super-

market parking lots that do not have the larger spaces where it causes problems.

Mr. Majewski agreed that wherever there is a high turnover that is when you

need the larger spots.

Motion carried unanimously.

#689 – 1101 BIG OAK ROAD SUBDIVISION

Sewage Facilities Planning Modules Component 4A – Municipal Planning Agency

Review

Mr. Majewski stated usually they do the Planning Module mailer which is an

Application to DEP that says that we are in compliance with all of the sewer
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regulations and that we have verified that we have capacity from all of the

conveyance and treatment facilities downstream. He stated in this case the

development was not on the Connection Management Plan for the Neshaminy

Interceptor; and they could not do the Planning Module mailer exemption so

they had to go through full Planning Module Approval. He stated those Planning

Modules have been reviewed by Ebert Engineering, the Township’s Sewer

engineer; and also they signed off for capacity from Bucks County Water and

Sewer Authority, City of Philadelphia Treatment Plant, possibly Township of

Falls Authority, and Lower Makefield Township. Mr. Majewski stated they

have demonstrated that they have capacity for all of the conveyances down-

stream to the treatment plants, and we need the Planning Commission to

recommend approval of the Planning Modules. He stated had they been on

the Connection Management Plan it would have been a much-simpler process

for them.

Mr. Gill moved, Mr. DeLorenzo seconded and it was unanimously carried to

approve the Planning Modules.

ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF PLANS FOR TIMKO-NOYES PROPERTY

No action required

Minor Subdivision

Tax Parcel #20-034-020-004

Zoned R-2 Residential Medium-Density

Proposed plan to subdivide a 4.175 acre lot into 2 single-family Residential lots

Mr. Majewski stated they had submitted a Sketch Plan some time ago, but then

withdrew it and it never appeared in front of the Planning Commission. He stated

they have now prepared Plans and are looking to move forward with a two-lot

Subdivision at the intersection of Edgewood Road and Sandy Run Road. He stated

the Plans will be forwarded to everyone for review.

Mr. Bush stated the Planning Commission discussed at the September 11 meeting

about not putting this type of issue on the Agenda. Ms. Kirk stated she did send

Mr. Majewski an e-mail in that regard following that meeting. Mr. Bush stated

we did not do this previously and just started doing this about two years ago.

He stated there was an issue when the Torbert Farm was on the Agenda for

acknowledgment of the Plan and it indicated “Not for Discussion,” yet there was

still a full room of people. Mr. Bush stated while that was an unusual situation,

on September 11 the only thing on the Agenda was Acknowledgement of a Plan

He stated if it is “just calendaring something,” he asked why they could not just
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put it on the calendar, put it on the Township Website, and take it off of the

Agenda. He stated there is nothing really for the Planning Commission to do,

and it is really just an internal calendaring issue. Mr. Majewski stated it is also

a transparency issue as we have had complaints for some time about not being

transparent no matter what we do. He stated this was an attempt to be trans-

parent and provide notice. He stated if the consensus of the Planning Commission

is not to do this, we can stop doing it. Mr. Bush stated while he is in favor of

transparency, he feels it would be best to put it on the stand-alone Website for

Plans that he learned about recently. He stated when it is put on the Agenda,

even if it says “No Action,” there can be a full room. Mr. Costello stated he

agrees that it would not have to be on the Agenda as a separate item , and the

Planning Commission could just be advised under Other Business that Plans

have come in. Mr. Coyle stated there could be a section “Town Planner’s Report”

that appears on the Agenda when necessary, and Mr. Majewski could deliver

the Receipt of Plans verbally, and it would not have to be an Agenda item, but

could be read into the Record. This was acceptable to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Bush stated at the September 11 meeting the only item on the Agenda was

acknowledgement of a Plan and there was no action required of the Planning

Commission yet the Commission and professionals were all present. Mr. Costello

asked if that is the only thing on an Agenda could Mr. Majewski just e-mail

Ms. Kirk and the Planning Commission members. Ms. Kirk suggested that if

that is the only item, it should be listed on the next month’s Agenda as

suggested by Mr. Coyle and it could indicate confirmation of Plans and the

date received. Mr. Costello asked if the clock can start before that is done,

and Ms. Kirk agreed.

Mr. Majewski stated as referred to by Mr. Bush, the Township did just start

a new platform that makes the sharing of this information much easier.

He stated while that is not up and running yet for Plans, he wants to have

that up and running in the next month or so.

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

was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

 Colin Coyle, Secretary