

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
ZONING HEARING BOARD
MINUTES – JANUARY 6, 2026

The regular meeting of the Zoning Hearing Board of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on January 6, 2026. Mr. Dougherty called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m.

Those present:

Zoning Hearing Board: James Dougherty, Chair
 Christian Schwartz, Vice Chair
 Peter Solor, Member
 James Brand, Alternate Member
 Robert Heinz, Alternate Member

Others: Dan McLoone, Planner
 Maureen Burke-Carlton, Township Solicitor
 Adam Flager, Zoning Hearing Board Engineer
 Daniel Grenier, Supervisor Liaison

Absent: Mike McVan, Secretary

The meeting was turned over to Mr. Flager

REORGANIZATION OF THE BOARD

A. Election of Chair

Mr. Schwartz moved, Mr. Solor seconded and it was unanimously carried to elect Mr. Dougherty as Chair for 2026.

The meeting was turned over to Mr. Dougherty.

B. Election of Vice Chair

Mr. Solor moved, Mr. Dougherty seconded and it was unanimously carried to elect Mr. Schwartz as Vice Chair for 2026.

C. Election of Secretary

Mr. Schwartz moved, Mr. Dougherty seconded and it was unanimously carried to elect Mr. McVan as Secretary for 2026.

APPOINTMENT OF SOLICITOR

Mr. Solor moved, Mr. Schwartz seconded and it was unanimously carried to appoint Adam Flager as the Zoning Hearing Board solicitor

APPOINTMENT OF COURT REPORTER

Mr. Schwartz moved, Mr. Brand seconded and it was unanimously carried to appoint Ed McKenna as Court Reporter.

APPEAL #Z-25-47 – LISANTI/ASPDEN
Tax Parcel #20-046-197-018
518 KESWICK DRIVE, YARDLEY, PA 19067

Mr. Schwartz moved and Mr. Brand seconded to Continue the matter to February 17, 2026. There was no one wishing to make public comment at this time. Motion carried unanimously.

APPEAL #Z-25-48 – FELIX/VON SPRECKELSEN (Flagship PA Propco, LLC)
Tax Parcel #20-021-006
1675 YARDLEY-LANGHORNE ROAD, YARDLEY, PA 19067

Mr. Schwartz moved and Mr. Solor seconded to Continue the matter to February 17, 2026. There was no one wishing to make public comment at this time. Motion carried unanimously.

APPEAL #Z-25-45 – MILLER/LIU
Tax Parcel #20-036-012
2326 LAKEVIEW DRIVE, YARDLEY, PA 18977

Ms. Tracy Miller and Ms. Liu were sworn in.

Mr. Flager marked the Exhibits as follows: The Application was marked as Exhibit A-1. The Site Plan was marked as Exhibit A-2. The Proof of publication was marked as Exhibit B-1. The Proof of Posting was marked as Exhibit B-2. The Notice to the neighbors was marked as Exhibit B-3.

Ms. Miller stated the Lius would like to put an addition on the rear of their house as shown on the drawing. She stated they do not have a first-floor bedroom, and that addition would provide for a first-floor bedroom in order to deal with some mobility issues that are going on. She stated the addition causes the impervious cover to exceed the allowable 18%, and they are proposing to do an infiltration trench to take the effective impervious surface back to the required 18%.

Mr. Heinz stated it appears that this addition will be on the other side of an existing porch. He asked if it is an exterior porch, and Ms. Miller stated it is. He asked if it will now be enclosed, and Ms. Miller agreed. Mr. Dougherty asked Mr. McLoone if he checked the specs on the infiltration trench, and Mr. McLoone stated the 3 by 6 by 31' infiltration trench will bring it back to the effective 18%.

Mr. Schwartz stated when they see Plans that are asking for impervious surface to go over and be adjusted afterwards, it helps to have grading numbers on Plans to see which way the ground slopes. He stated he understands that this property backs up to a lake and everything slopes to the lake, but that is not the case on everybody's property.

Mr. Dougherty asked if they are tying any of the rain leaders into the infiltration trench, and Ms. Miller stated that they are. She added that anything that they can get there from the back of the house and definitely the new addition would go into that. She stated they will also drain the back of the existing garage roof.

There was no one from the public wishing to speak on this matter.

Mr. Solor moved, Mr. Schwartz seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Appeal subject to stormwater mitigation back to 18% and approval of the Township engineer.

APPEAL #Z-25-46 – RENNEISEN/OMEARA
Tax Parcel #20-072-032
1524 BROOKFIELD ROAD, YARDLEY, PA 19067

Mr. Jeff Renneisen, Mr. Kevin O'Meara, and Ms. Margaret O'Meara were sworn in.

Mr. Flager marked the Exhibits as follows: The Application was marked as Exhibit A-1. The Site Plan was marked as Exhibit A-2. The Proof of Publication was marked as Exhibit B-1. The Proof of Posting was marked as Exhibit B-2. The Notice to the neighbors was marked as Exhibit B-3.

Mr. Renneisen stated they are proposing a new in-ground, concrete swimming pool with a flagstone patio around it. He stated to offset the overage of impervious coverage, they are proposing a stormwater management system. He stated the total impervious coverage is 7,205 square feet, and the system has been designed to cover all of that plus an additional 100 square feet. He stated the property has an existing stormwater management system which was installed in 2019, and all of that has been taken into consideration and is summarized in the Stormwater Management Report.

Mr. Schwartz asked what percentage do they hope to achieve when they are finished; and Mr. Renneisen stated based on his understanding, it is to bring it back to the maximum allowable. Mr. McLoone stated 21% is what is allowable. Mr. Solor stated they are accounting for all of the added impervious which is the Code requirement. Mr. Dougherty stated he understood that they were taking it below what is required by 100 square feet, and Mr. Renneisen agreed. Mr. Solor stated there is also existing stormwater mitigation, so the effective right now is already lower. Mr. Solor stated for the Motion we should use the language they have which is that they will mitigate for all the impervious that they are adding plus 100 additional square feet.

Mr. Brand asked if they will be removing any trees when they install the pool, and Mr. Renneisen stated they will not.

Mr. Heinz stated in addition to the pool it indicates that there is a proposed equipment pad, and he asked if that was included in the calculations; and Mr. Renneisen stated it was.

Ms. Carlton stated while she is not participating, she asked Mr. McLoone if he could confirm if for this and the previous Applicant, that there is an O & M Agreement that is entered into between the homeowner and the Township; and Mr. McLoone stated there is not that he is aware of.

Mr. McLoone stated he could look at when the Permit was done for the infiltration trench. Ms. Carlton asked about moving forward with Permits for this pool, and Mr. McLoone stated they could do an O & M Agreement; and Ms. Carlton stated that would be the preference. Mr. Solor asked if that would need to be made a Condition of the Variance; and Ms. Carlton stated it would be a policy in accordance with the Township, and it would not need to be included in the Motion.

There was no one wishing to make public comment at this time.

Mr. Solor moved, Mr. Brand seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Appeal as presented with mitigation being provided for all additional impervious coverage plus an additional 100 square feet subject to the approval of the Township engineer.

APPEAL #Z-25-44 – MEGINNISS/JMAC INVESTMENTS LLC
Tax Parcel #20-012-018
0 HEACOCK ROAD, YARDLEY, PA 19067

Ms. Carlton stated the Township sent her on behalf of the Township to oppose this Application.

Mr. Mike Meginnis, attorney, was present with Mr. James McCafferty, and Mr. Vince Fioravanti who were sworn in.

Mr. Flager marked the Exhibits as follows: The Application was marked as Exhibit A-1. The Zoning Exhibit Site Plan which has the colored-in property in the middle of the page was marked as Exhibit A-2. The Zoning Exhibit Site Plan without the colored-in property in the middle of the page was marked as Exhibit A-3. The Zoning Exhibit of Similar Lots was marked as Exhibit A-4. The Depictions of what the home would look like were marked as Exhibit A-5. The Permit Plan Erosion Control was marked as Exhibit A-6. The Final Lot Plan was marked as Exhibit A-7. The Tributary and Grading, etc. was marked as Exhibit A-8. The Aerial was marked as Exhibit A-9. The Existing Features Plan was marked as Exhibit A-10. The Permit Plan Erosion Control Plan Sheet 1 of 2 was marked as Exhibit A-11. The Tax Map was marked as Exhibit A-12. The Proof of Publication was marked as Exhibit B-1. The Proof of Posting was marked as Exhibit B-2. The Notice to the neighbors was marked as Exhibit B-3.

Mr. Dougherty stated this property was in front of the Zoning Hearing Board a number of months ago with a different Applicant and requesting different levels of relief. He stated two current Board members participated in that matter, and three members voting tonight were not present at the prior meeting. He asked that there be an explanation given between what was requested then and what is being sought tonight.

Mr. Meginniss stated Mr. McCafferty is the equitable owner of the property, and he is a local builder who builds high-quality, predominantly single-family, detached dwellings in Bucks County.

Mr. Meginniss stated he was in front of the Board in May, 2023 to discuss the construction of a single-family, detached dwelling on this lot which would have the same square footage in terms of the footprint of what they are proposing this evening. He stated the property fronts on Heacock Road, is Zoned R3M, and it is about .4 acres gross, specifically 14,300 square feet. Mr. Meginniss stated part of the prior presentation that was made to the Board was a discussion regarding the differential analysis between gross acreage and net area on the site because of the right-of-way that exists on Heacock Road which brought the functional net acreage of the site down to about 9,300 square feet of a functional lot size. Mr. Meginniss stated that necessitated the relief they were seeking at that time which was similar in terms of the classification but different in terms of the specifics. He stated the Application that was filed in 2023 sought a front-yard setback Variance to permit an 8 ½' front yard, and a rear-year setback Variance to permit a 10' rear yard on the site, which would permit the construction of a single-family dwelling that would be compliant in other respects on the property.

Mr. Meginniss stated based upon work that was completed with DOT, they have now remedied the acreage situation for the property, aligning the net and gross acreage; and now they have a 14,300 square foot net and gross area. He stated that has allowed them to position the home they are proposing so that the front-yard setback that they are asking for has expanded up to 18' and the rear-yard setback would be 25'.

Mr. Meginniss stated one of the concerns that was expressed previously by neighbors and the Zoning Hearing Board was that the compressed rear yard with a 10' rear would functionally limit the usage for a future homeowner while also constructing a home which would potentially be peering over the rear yard of the homeowner who lives behind this lot. He stated the Applicant had discussed at the prior Hearing some of the site constraints which

would make it difficult for a planting to occur along the rear property line while still having a functional rear yard. He stated the suggestion is that the Plan that is before the Board this evening is a significant improvement for this property. He stated a 25' rear yard would permit the planting of a row of arborvitae that would provide natural screening of the site to the rear. He stated there is a very large side yard on the property that would function as a quasi-rear yard while still allowing a rear yard in addition to the screen that they believe they can now adequately provide on this property.

Mr. Meginniss stated Mr. Fioravanti has already procured the Permitting from DOT for the driveway installation that they are discussing with the home orientation. He stated this is relevant as it relates to the rear yard and the front yard and will not cause a hazardous condition on the site.

Mr. Meginniss stated the lot will now meet the acreage requirement in the District, would permit an appropriately-sized single-family-detached dwelling to be constructed, and is compliant with the dimensional performance standards in the District for impervious surface and building coverage. He stated this lot was legally created decades ago, and what they are proposing is the only thing that can be reasonably developed. He stated he feels what is proposed has significantly improved the situation and the proposal from what was previously before the Board.

Mr. Fioravanti stated he is a licensed PE in Pennsylvania and has been recognized as an expert in civil engineering throughout the County including by the Lower Makefield Township Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Fioravanti was offered and accepted as an expert in civil engineering.

Mr. Fioravanti stated he and his office prepared the Plan before the Board as well as the Plan that was before the Board previously for consideration; and he testified at that Hearing as well, and he can testify as to the steps that were taken since the last Hearing.

Mr. Fioravanti stated they are proposing one dwelling unit with a footprint of about 1,550 square feet on a single, vacant lot with a net lot area of 14,300 square feet which is Zoning compliant. He noted Exhibit A-7 which was the original Subdivision. He stated the parcel was an original parcel fronting on Heacock Road that was cut off and isolated with the development of the Heritage Oak Subdivision in 1986. He stated the adjacent parcel, 542 Heacock Road, was also isolated by the same development; and that parcel has two

dwellings on it that are situated in a similar manner to the proposed dwelling on their parcel. He noted parcels which already existed with frontage on Heacock Road.

Mr. Fioravanti showed the location of the parcel on a plan as well as where the original Deed came to what was probably the center line of Heacock Road 50 years ago. He stated at that time all of the properties were deeded to the center of the roadway, and the legal right-of-way was established at 16 ½' wide from the center. He stated when Heritage Oaks was developed, this and the adjacent parcel remained the way they were. Mr. Fioravanti noted Exhibit A-9, the aerial, and noted the orientation of the parcel. He stated also showed on the Exhibits four dwellings where the front-yard setback/situation is very similar to the subject property which is in harmony with the surrounding area. He showed an existing property where the dwelling is about 55' from the road, the proposed dwelling would be about 26' from the street, another is 32', and another is 18' so they are in harmony with what exists on Heacock Road. He noted with regard to the rear yard setback being requested, he believes that it is in harmony with the surrounding area. He stated they estimate the distance between their house and the nearest house in Heritage Oaks is about 110'. He stated looking at the rest of the distances in the Subdivision, theirs will be larger than almost all of them. He stated they will not have a negative impact on the most affected property in terms of the rear yard. He stated they are now proposing 25' where before they had 10'. He stated 25' is enough space to provide a double row of evergreens/white pines which will easily block them from the neighbor who is as far away as anyone in the development.

Mr. Fioravanti stated the ultimate right-of-way is 110' wide/60' from center on both sides. He stated ultimate right-of-ways are offered to the authority having jurisdiction, which in this case is PennDOT. He stated when he looks at the PennDOT records for the highway in front of Heacock Oaks, it showed the 120', and when he looked at the PennDOT where the proposed dwelling is, it shows 33'. He stated they asked PennDOT how the right-of-way could be 33' on Heacock Road where this house is proposed when the paving itself is 30' from the center. He stated it was found that there were no records for this, and it had been overlooked over the years. Mr. Fioravanti stated they offered to PennDOT to formalize the right-of-way of the road in this area and asked how much PennDOT would want, and PennDOT indicated that they do not want extra right-of-way as it creates a liability for them if someone gets hurt; and they agreed to just 5' past the curb even though they were offered 35' from the center instead of 60' from the center. Mr. Fioravanti stated through a

formal agreement and Deeds of Dedication, they accepted the right-of-way. He stated it is now 35' half with in front of their property where the ultimate right-of-way was 60'.

Mr. Meginniss stated this is an elongated property, and it is not deep. He stated the relief they were seeking previously was a 10' rear yard and an 8 ½' front yard setback. He stated at the prior Hearing they discussed that even though it was an 8 ½' front-yard setback legally, the distance from the edge of pavement was considerably larger; but they were constrained based on the ultimate right-of-way and the impact that had on the net versus the gross acreage of the property. Mr. Meginniss stated Mr. Fioravanti is saying that there is now conformation that the property owner has been able to acquire another 25' of depth legally stretched along the entire frontage of the property which is how they have significantly increased the square footage of the lot by about 5,000 square feet in terms of the net area, and Mr. Fioravanti agreed. Mr. Fioravanti stated there is 25' additional depth that has been added to the property and 200' wide for 5,000 square feet.

Mr. Meginniss stated he had earlier indicated that in addition to front-yard and rear-yard setback requirements, there are a number of other dimensional performance standards that anyone has to comply with to develop in the Township; and he had indicated that they comply with impervious surface and building coverage. Mr. Fioravanti stated that is correct, and the lot is compliant with lot area as well.

Mr. Meginniss stated Mr. Fioravanti had testified as to the plantings that they would be able to maintain along the rear, and he understands that they would be willing to volunteer that as a Condition of Approval that could be documented with a Recorded document with the Township having enforceable rights regarding the maintenance of those trees in a manner that was acceptable to the Township; and Mr. Fioravanti agreed.

Mr. Meginniss stated he had earlier indicated that there was a Permit that was in hand from the DOT, and he asked Mr. Fioravanti to provide additional information on that and what he feels that means with respect to the analysis of safety along the frontage. Mr. Fioravanti stated it was a detailed procedure with PennDOT to look through their records and prepare a Deed of Dedication to PennDOT for the additional right-of-way. He stated as a part of that, they also wanted the Applicant to review the driveway geometry and sight distances.

He stated they have a PennDOT Driveway Permit, a Deed of Dedication that was Recorded, and a new right-of-way established. He stated PennDOT was at the site and they looked at the sight distances and the width of the driveway and the slopes, and the Permit was issued.

Mr. Fioravanti stated if this home were to be built, there would need to be an assurance that there would not be any additional stormwater run-off that would negatively affect any of the surrounding properties. Mr. Fioravanti stated they intend to meet the Township Ordinance requirement as part of the stormwater design, and Mr. Fioravanti agreed adding that Exhibit A-8 shows the drainage patterns in the area. Mr. Fioravanti stated they will also if necessary procure an ENS from the County Conservation District as well.

Mr. Meginniss asked Mr. Fioravanti if he believes , based on his experience and testimony as an engineer, that there is anything that can be reasonably developed on this property without receiving relief for front or rear yard setbacks; and Mr. Fioravanti stated he does not. Mr. Fioravanti added that when you look at the special setback that exists which is 100' and the rear yard setbacks being 35' or 40', that would encompass the entire project so nothing could be built here without Setback Variances. He stated this would be the same situation for all of the other properties that front on Heacock.

Mr. Meginniss asked if Mr. Fioravanti feels that this is the reasonable relief necessary to develop the property in a Residential manner, and Mr. Fioravanti agreed.

Mr. Meginnis stated he had made a statement indicating that the rear of the property is 25' but there is a large side yard because of the elongated nature of the property. He asked Mr. Fioravanti his opinion as to whether the orientation of the site would allow reasonable usage for a future homebuyer to enjoy the lot if a home were built. Mr. Fioravanti noted Exhibit A-2, and he stated looking at the orientation of the lot and the driveway, they are trying to work with the shape of the property. He stated the property is 200' wide, and he showed where the entrance to the property would be. He stated there is room for six cars to park, and they could all make k-turns and leave. He stated the rear yard will be occupied by a swale and trees that will provide an evergreen buffer. He noted the architectural rendering which show where you can walk into the front, the location of the garage, and a porch. He stated the front will face Heacock Road so it will look nice driving by. He stated the other side yard can function as a rear yard in terms of use by the owner. He stated he feels the shape of the property allows it

to be used in a good Residential manner. He stated they feel it will be a nice addition to the community, is in harmony with the development, and matches the distance that the other Heacock Road parcels have been developed with.

Mr. Brand asked if the garage would not encompass the entire side.

Mr. Fioravanti stated they are not specifying the complete architecture.

He stated they are envisioning a one-car garage and a porch to enter, but that may change as they develop the house plan.

Mr. Schwartz stated from the pictures it looks like the lot is covered with trees. Mr. Fioravanti stated they had an arborist come out to see if the trees were worth preserving. A letter from Shier Tree Expert LLC was received and indicates that "Physical review of the site identifies vegetation typical of fallow land undergoing natural succession. The growth is consisted primarily of small, deciduous trees and saplings, crabapple, shrubs, thickets characteristic of abandoned field, herbaceous groundcover of unmaintained parcels. No mature tree canopy or long-established woodlands were observed. In conclusion this land parcel represents an abandoned, agricultural field in natural reversion with no vegetation older than 35 years." Mr. Fioravanti stated it would not be characterized as a woodlands.

Mr. Schwartz asked if the parcel is covered by any of our Ordinances for tree removal, percentages, etc. Mr. McLoone stated that would refer to a Subdivision, and he does not feel it would be applicable for a single-family home.

The letter from Shier Tree Expert LLC was marked as Exhibit A-13.

Mr. Brand stated Mr. Fioravanti indicated that it was 110' to the closest neighbor, and Mr. Fioravanti stated that is to the neighbor to the rear in Heritage Oaks. Mr. Brand asked if anyone spoke to the owner of that property, and Mr. Fioravanti stated he has not. Mr. McCafferty stated he has not spoken to any of the neighbors. He stated he was not part of the first Application, and he did not have names or contact information.

Mr. Dougherty stated part of the presentation is that the side yard opposite of the driveway could be used as a rear yard, and he asked if they would Deed Restrict that where the actual back yard is behind the house that no improvements could be built there; and Mr. McCafferty agreed he would be comfortable with that.

Mr. Dougherty stated it was indicated that they met with PennDOT at the property to discuss the minimum frontage, and the Plan will have it at 18 ½' back. He asked if PennDOT would allow the house to get closer to the road if it would bring it off the rear property line. Mr. Fioravanti stated they did not discuss the distance from the road as much as the width of the driveway for vehicle maneuvers. He stated PennDOT did want the ultimate right-of-way to be 5' behind the curb which put it at 35'. He stated from there they did 25' and 18 to match everyone else on Heacock Road. He stated he does not feel PennDOT would have an issue if within the building envelope they went closer to the right-of-way. He stated PennDOT only has jurisdiction on the right-of-way itself. Mr. Dougherty stated there are a number of people present this evening; and he recalls there was an issue with the back of the house being 10' off the property line, and he was wondering if that would be a solution to help ease some concerns.

Mr. Heinz asked Mr. Fioravanti did a Variance search on the three properties to see what Variances they might have had; and Mr. Fioravanti stated he did not, and he was just looking at how they matched up in terms of distance to Heacock Road. Mr. Heinz asked if Mr. McLoone knew of anything, and Mr. McLoone stated he did not. Mr. Dougherty stated they appear to be older, farmhouse-style properties that most likely pre-date not just the current Zoning Ordinance, but probably prior Ordinances; and they are most likely grandfathered in. Mr. Heinz stated they would probably not passed any of the Variances if they were built today, and Mr. Dougherty agreed that they would require Variances if they were built today. Mr. McLoone stated this lot has been the same since the 30's, and he believes the Township started doing Building Permits in 1939.

Mr. Solor stated the area is zoned Residential, and it looks like this is an attempt to balance all of the comments and resolve all of the issues. He stated he feels the Drainage Plan makes sense. He stated the tree coverage helps, and the Board did discuss tree coverage on a single property development before so it is a concern.

Ms. Carlton stated she just looked at the Shier Tree Report; and while she has not inspected the property physically, she takes exception to it as it appears that it is a woodland by definition under the Township Ordinance. She stated that is something that will have to be decided. She stated she feels the "tree report" is a little lacking.

Ms. Carlton asked Mr. Fioravanti the distance from the proposed dwelling to the edge of road, and Mr. Fioravanti stated it is 26'. Ms. Carlton stated that is the right-of-way; however, Mr. Fioravanti stated that is the actual paving.

He added they are 18 ½' to the right-of-way, but then that is 5' more to get to the street. Ms. Carlton asked what was Dedicated to PennDOT over the past few months, and Mr. Fioravanti stated 35' from the center was Dedicated to PennDOT as permanent right-of-way where before the ultimate right-of-way was 60' wide from the center.

Ms. Carlton asked Mr. Fioravanti if he has an idea what is the likelihood of Heacock being expanded. Mr. Fioravanti stated they discussed this with PennDOT, and they indicated that they had no plans now or in the future to do anything with Heacock Road; and that is why they did not want the extra land as it was a liability for them without a need. Ms. Carlton asked the current configuration of Heacock, and Mr. Fioravanti stated the paving is 60' wide so it is 30' from the center. He stated we gave them 35' right-of-way beyond the curbing. He stated they did not want the extra 25'.

Ms. Carlton asked about the proposed length and width of the house. Mr. Fioravanti stated it is 28 by 56. Ms. Carlton asked if there is any way to reduce the width of the house to lengthen/elongate it to increase the rear yard and possibly the front yard. Mr. Fioravanti stated it is possible to look into changing the dimensions of the dwelling. He stated he feels that the 25' that they have in the rear is plenty. He stated when you start to make changes to the dimensions of the dwelling, and you have more of a rear yard, that can make the rear yard look nice, but the house is less desirable; and they are trying to balance everything. He stated they do not want to go too close to the road, and they wanted 18 ½'; and they felt 25' in the rear was plenty to do adequate buffering. He stated this left them with a 28' wide dwelling which they felt would be desirable. Ms. Carlton stated she feels that this has to do with the economics as well.

Ms. Carlton stated she understands that they would be agreeable to a Deed Restriction as to further expansion of the rear. She asked if there are currently any decks or patios proposed for the rear of the house. Mr. Fioravanti stated they were looking at the side yard, and there is nothing proposed for the rear except for swales and evergreens, and they would be comfortable agreeing to there be nothing else in the 25' rear yard. Mr. McCafferty stated the side yard would functionally become the back yard for this project; and a future home-owner may want to put a patio or deck on that side yard as that will be a large usable space. He stated the rear yard would be 25', and it would be used up with screening and swales.

Ms. Carlton stated the Township is concerned with the reduction in the front yard and the rear yard as it is a substantial Variance request from 100' front yard setback to a requested 18.5' yard setback and a 25' rear yard setback when 50' is required. She stated she also takes some exception to the Tree Report not having had the opportunity to look at it prior to today to analyze it; but from aerials and what that area looks like from a drive-by, it looks like it may be considered a woodland under our current Ordinance.

Mr. Meginniss stated they are not looking for a Woodlands Variance. He stated they did have the Tree Report done although it is not germane, and the Township will have to do an analysis if a Variance is granted as to whether they are complying with the Ordinance with respect to woodlands. He stated they are not asking for a Woodland Variance, so there was no obligation to circulate a Tree Report. He stated they are of the position that they are compliant, and the Township will agree or disagree with that; and if they do not agree with that, the Applicant would need to procure further relief with respect to woodlands. Ms. Carlton it is a concern that is not a requested Variance, where the Township believes that it should have been a requested Variance; and this will have to be reviewed.

Mr. McLoone asked what percent this would be based on, and Ms. Carlton stated it would be based on the current Ordinance. Mr. Grenier stated he wrote the Ordinance, and there are two means of defining a woodlands in Lower Makefield Township – one being a grove of 10 trees or more with a dbh (diameter breast height) about 4 ½' of 10" or more and the other being a stand of trees a quarter acre or greater with a minimum dbh of 6" or greater. He stated they are looking at a woodland here because it has been forested since at least 1995 based on historic aerials.

Mr. Dougherty stated since a Woodlands Variance was not requested, it would require a new Application and new advertising. Mr. Flager stated as far as Variances that are needed, the Applicant submits an Application, and sometimes it involves the Township working with the Applicant as to what Variances are needed. He stated once those determinations are made, it is advertised and comes before the Board. Mr. Dougherty stated tonight they would make a decision on the Variances before the Board, and the woodlands issue could be reviewed by the Township in the future. Mr. Solor stated the Board would not be voting on a Woodlands Variance this evening as it was not requested. Mr. Dougherty stated we are not sure that it would be required.

Mr. Schwartz noted the conceptual picture provided, and he asked if they have an idea what percentage of impervious surface they will hit, and Mr. Meginniss stated he believes that it is 28.28. Mr. Solor stated that is below the Code.

Mr. Flager asked the size of the lot, and Mr. Fioravanti stated it is 200 by 71.5.

Mr. Dougherty stated the Board should render a decision on the Variances in front of the Board tonight. Mr. McLoone stated with regard to the need for a Woodlands Variance, that could be determined when they filed a Building Permit. Mr. Carlton agreed with that proposal.

Mr. Meginnis stated typically what happens when they ask for woodlands relief when there is a property that has trees on it, there is a consultant that does an analysis and indicates whether or not they feel a Woodlands Variance is necessary. He stated if it is found that is necessary, they would have an arborist submit a report indicating the Variance needed of a certain percent based on their analysis of the caliper of the trees that they are removing. He stated that would be submitted as part of the Application package. He stated they did not submit that as part of the Application package because the consultant that they dealt with indicated they did not believe that under the Ordinance standards that this met the definition. He stated they could be wrong about that.

Mr. Meginniss stated he assumes that if a Variance is granted on their Application, they would have to submit a report to the Township that is different from the letter that they provided, and there would be an analysis done; and the Township would either agree or disagree with it. He stated if the Township agrees with the analysis, they would not need additional Zoning relief; however if the Township disagrees with the analysis, there would have to an analysis as to what the percentage is, and they would come back to the Board.

This was acceptable to the Board. Mr. McLoone stated there will be multiple people looking at the Permit including himself, Mr. Majewski, and building reviewers.

Mr. Solor stated the setbacks as currently defined in the Code without Variances would mean that nothing could be constructed on this property, and Mr. Fioravanti agreed.

Mr. Dougherty stated those wishing to make public comment were advised that they would need to be sworn in and provide their address and were asked to be concise. He stated those who received Notice can request Party Status. Mr. Flager stated those who are outside of the Notice area and are still requesting Party Status will need to provide a basis for that. He stated anyone granted Party Status can also ask questions of the Applicants if there is additional information that they need. Mr. Flager stated that Party Status also gives the ability to Appeal the Decision.

Mr. Joshua Link was sworn in. He stated he and his wife own the home at 1602 Penn Oak Circle, and he is requesting Party Status and opposes the Appeal. He stated the parcel at issue is directly behind his property. He stated they bought their home in February, 2024 during a time of record high housing prices and near record high mortgage rates. He stated they have two young sons, and one of the main reasons they bought the house was because of the space, the quiet, and sense of privacy that their property and the Heritage Oaks community provide. He stated the houses in their community are spread out with large back yards and lots of open space. He stated their house is on a cul-de-sac and does not face any other houses. He stated their windows do not look directly into their neighbors'. He stated it is these characteristics of the community that will be effected by JMAC's proposal, and JMAC is asking the Board to completely disregard fundamental Zoning requirements applicable to that parcel and every other parcel in the area.

Mr. Link stated the minimum rear setback requirement under R3M is 50', and the majority of homes in Heritage Oaks and the Ashley Estates developments which is the community in the immediate area are much further from the rear property line than the minimum of 50'. He stated JMAC is asking for a 25' Variance which is extreme. He stated there was discussion about how this is acceptable because the last time a Variance request for this parcel was before the Board, the setback was 10'. Mr. Link stated he does not feel an increase of 15' is a meaningful distance. He stated if JMAC is allowed to do what they are requesting, there will be a two-story house which can be up to 35' in height towering over his back yard. He stated his will be the only property in the entire community with another house looming over their property line. He stated the windows will directly face into the windows of his two rear bedrooms and their master bathroom. He stated the sense of privacy in their back yard that they value will be shattered. He stated they will also have to contend with noise from a house and neighbors located very close to their property line and noise from a construction project that will take months to complete and will be occurring directly behind the bedroom that his young son sleeps in.

Mr. Link stated during the presentation, there was a suggestion that the house that they propose to build is consistent with the character of the surrounding communities, and they focused the Board's attention on the farmhouse parcel that has two residences on it and the parcel to the north both of which have driveway access to Heacock. He stated those properties are not comparable to the surrounding community as the community in the area are the 100 homes in the Heritage Oakes and Ashley Estates developments. He stated those houses are typically 3,200 to 3,300 square feet including finished basements. He stated the vast majority of those homes are not only compliant with all setback requirements under R3M, but comply with far more than the minimum setback requirements. He stated the houses located in the development across Stony Hill Road from Ashley Estates appear to be even larger and even more spread out; and directly to the west of Heacock Road, there is another planned community that appears to consist mostly of carriage homes and townhouses.

Mr. Link stated the one or two houses that JMAC has identified as representative of the community are not appropriate comparables to the development that it proposes. He stated public information shows that the farmhouse to the south shows that it was built in 1892, and is the original farmhouse and the remaining structures on the parcel from the land on which Ashley Estates and Heritage Oaks were built. He stated while it does have driveway access to Heacock Road and the residences are not set back that far from Heacock, it is prior non-conforming development from two centuries ago. He stated the rear setback for the two residences on the farmhouse parcel are more than compliant with the minimum requirements under R3M as it is about 150'.

Mr. Link stated with regard to the property on Heacock directly to the north of the subject parcel, that is a single-story ranch house; and public information shows that house was built in 1956. He stated the driveway for that parcel does access Heacock but that is where any similarity to the proposed development ends. He stated it appears to be compliant with the front setback requirements under R3M, and it has a rear setback of at least several hundred feet.

Mr. Link stated there was a suggestion made that they should receive the Variance because JMAC did not cause the hardship requiring a Variance because it did not alter the parcel in such a way that the Variance was necessary; however, there was no representation tonight as to when JMAC acquired the parcel. He stated there was a prior Hearing in June, 2023; and at that time the parcel was owned by ADR Investments LLC so JMAC has

obviously acquired this parcel sometime within the last one or two years. He stated there was no representation as to how much JMAC paid to acquire the parcel, but at the Public Hearing a year and a half ago, it was discussed that the previous owner purchased the property for \$2,400. Mr. Link stated any suggestion that JMAC has a hardship is “preposterous.” He stated in June, 2023 the Board unanimously denied the previous request to develop this property; and given the public nature of those proceedings, JMAC had to have known that the Board had already confirmed that this parcel is entirely unsuitable to Residential development in conformance with applicable Zoning requirements. Mr. Link stated he does not feel it is in dispute that when JMAC acquired the property and when ADR acquired the property previously in 2018, that everything was situated just it is now. He stated the parcel at issue was exactly the same location and same size dimensions, and Heacock Road, the parcels to the north and south, his property, and the entire community around it all just as they were as they are now and all Zoned for R3M. Mr. Link stated the only possible reason that JMAC and ADR before it would be able to acquire this parcel for a “song and a dance,” is because it is obviously unsuitable for Residential development under the then and current Zoning classifications. He stated JMAC knew all of this when they bought the property, and they did it anyway.

Mr. Link stated there was discussion earlier about attempts to contact the neighbors, and during the year he and his wife have lived in their home, no one at JMAC or on behalf of JMAC has ever reached out to them to discuss the proposal, the Variances they are seeking, what their concerns might be, and if and how they might be addressed. He stated they only found out about these plans a week ago, and then only when they received the Notice of Hearing from the Township.

Mr. Link stated the parcel being discussed is a strip of land that buffers a large, planned, Residential development and an arterial road. He stated this is not an uncommon feature of many communities similar to Heritage Oaks throughout Yardley and Lower Makefield Township that are representative of the homes in the area. He stated if JMAC gets approval that will encourage other developers to buy small buffer properties that are plainly unsuitable for development and then request extreme Variances to develop them. He stated this will be the entire Township that will be effected.

Mr. Link stated Section 200-5 of the Township Zoning Ordinance provides that in interpreting and applying the provisions of this Chapter they shall be held to be the minimum requirements for the promotion of public health, safety, comfort, convenience, and general welfare. He stated JMAC is not asking the Board for a

small departure from the minimum requirements, and what they are requesting is extreme. He stated it is so extreme that it will lead to a house towering over his back yard; and if granted, the development they are proposing is not at all consistent with any development that he is aware of that is taking place in the community over the last many decades. He stated the Variance that JMAC is requesting in this proposed development will come at great cost to his family, and their ability right to the quiet use and enjoyment of their home, all of which were present and protected by the conditions that existed when they bought their home; and which have always existed in this community and will forever and negatively be affected. He stated during the June, 2023 Hearing a Board member stated that not every parcel can or should have a house on it.

Mr. Link stated when the Board unanimously Denied the last Variance request, he believes that the Board members were promoting the interests of the surrounding community and the neighboring homeowners, and he is hoping and pleading that the Board once again place the interest of the homeowners who already live in the area and the community before those of a development company that is seeking only to turn an extreme profit based on a small speculative investment. He asked that the Board not allow this to happen to his family.

Mr. Larry Borda, 508 Heritage Oak Drive, was sworn in. He stated he joins in everything that Mr. Link stated. He stated he lives across the street from Mr. Link. Mr. Borda stated this issue comes up every few years when someone tries to come in and buy this lot “on the cheap,” and hopes that the Township will lose the “intestinal fortitude” to uphold the Township Ordinance. He stated the Township is opposing this at this time, and they have always opposed this for the reasons that Mr. Link pointed out which is “why we are bending backwards to accommodate somebody coming in.” He stated there is no injustice being done; and the people who own the property who have rights to it knew what they were buying into. He stated he does not see why we should try to make any special effort to make an accommodation. He stated the houses that were being referred to as analogous to this are older houses similar to farm-houses which you often see very close to the road and are grandfathered. He stated this would be a “stick on, sore thumb” on Heacock Road similar to the house that is across from the Yardley Country Club between the Country Club and the Railroad tracks. He stated it will change the character of the road.

Mr. Borda stated the entrance to his development is immediately adjacent to that particular location, and he asked the Board to Deny this. He asked for Party Status because the outcome of this Decision will affect the value of his property although it will not affect his property as much as it will effect Mr. Link.

Mr. Borda stated there is a reference to a grinder pump in the southeast corner of the property, and he asked what that is for; and Mr. Solor stated that is for a sewer system. Mr. Borda asked why that is needed here, and Mr. Fioravanti stated a grinder pump is a typical system used when a gravity lateral connection cannot be utilized for a sanitary connection. Mr. Borda asked if this will be taking the sewage to a higher elevation to meet up with a sewer line, and Mr. Fioravanti agreed.

Mr. Paul Elrath was sworn in. He stated he is the owner of the property directly next door – 536 and 542 Heacock Road – the two parcels that were discussed as similar properties. He stated these are old properties; and while he owns both of them, he does not live in either of them, and there are tenants who live in both of them. He stated he gets constant complaints about noise and “it is a horrible place to live” directly on top of Heacock Road as it is a very busy road. He stated he “thinks it is awful,” and there is line of sight pulling out of the properties, and it is very difficult to see. He stated the properties hang over top of Heacock Road, and there is “nothing really good about the houses, and the tenants that live in them constantly complain about the noise.” He stated to ask for an 18’ setback when the Ordinance calls for 100’ is “absurd.” He stated when he purchased the property he knew that the two houses on his parcels were in the right-of-way, and he was made aware of that prior to purchasing the property; and he knew that if someday they were to expand Heacock Road, they could take the houses down or he would be forced to move them, and he is okay with that, and he feels that it would be a great thing for the Township.

Mr. Elrath stated he is a 43-year resident and has lived here his entire life. He stated it is a great community, and he loves the Zoning and everything about the town. He stated someday he can see Heacock Road being expanded. He stated it is pretty much two lanes in each direction all the way from Oxford Valley Road down near the Wawa; and if they ever wanted to expand the road from Oxford Valley Road all the way to 295, this would be the only piece that would stop them, and he feels that is important to look at. He stated there is also a sidewalk that does not connect due to his property, the subject property, and the one neighbor’s property that would be a nice thing to someday connect. He stated when he purchased his property he knew that he would probably someday build some houses and maybe move his houses back or possibly live in them himself; and he is more than fine to have the proper setback on his property. He stated the Township has the Zoning rules for a reason, and he hopes the Board continues to abide by them.

Mr. Elrath requested Party Status. He stated he did not receive Notice, and the Notice went to the tenants. Mr. McLoone stated typically they send the Notice to the addresses within 200'; but they could send it to him. Mr. Elrath asked that the Notice be sent where the tax bills are sent, and Mr. McLoone agreed to do so.

Mr. Joe Huegler (no address provided) was sworn in. He requested Party Status adding that he got Notice from the Township. Mr. Huegler stated he agrees with everything his neighbors said, and he wanted to state his opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Richard VanHorn, 584 Heacock Road, was sworn in. He stated he is opposed to this, and he requested Party Status. He stated there are deer in the little piece of woods there.

Mr. Brand stated he feels Mr. Link made some points that should be considered. He asked if consideration could be given to a restriction allowing for a ranch to be constructed as a compromise so that it would not tower over Mr. Link's property. Mr. Dougherty asked Mr. Meginniss if that is something that the Applicant had considered. Mr. Meginniss was given the opportunity to discuss this matter, and a short recess was taken at this time.

When the meeting was reconvened, Mr. Meginniss stated they would be willing to agree to constructing a ranch-style home as a Condition for the site. Mr. Flager stated that would make it wider but not otherwise affect any of the relief being requested, and Mr. Meginniss stated it would have no impact on the building coverage and impervious. Mr. Meginniss stated they will need to confirm the woodlands. He stated they can conform with the rest of the dimensional aspects. Mr. Dougherty stated they would still need the same relief, and Mr. Meginniss agreed.

Mr. Elrath asked what the square footage would be if it is a one-story house. He asked if they would eliminate the garage. Mr. Fioravanti stated the footprint would be wider if it was a ranch; and while the impervious would go up, they would stay within the compliant ratio which is 35%. Mr. Dougherty stated as already noted, they would need no additional ratio other than when the Building Application is made, the Township would determine if they needed to re-visit the Woodlands Ordinance. Mr. Dougherty stated if they need a Variance from that, they would have to come back before the Zoning Hearing Board. He stated they would provide an arborist's report and not what was presented tonight.

Mr. Borda asked if the 18.5' takes them from front of building to edge of right-of-way, and Mr. Fioravanti agreed. Mr. Borda stated there are sidewalks in the area, but this particular span does not. He stated when a sidewalk goes in, which is logical at some point, that distance on the front yard would drop to about 14'. Mr. Dougherty stated that is very speculative, but it would still be their land. Mr. Fioravanti stated if a sidewalk were put it within the right-of-way, it would not affect the front yard at all. He stated if it were put in an Easement or in the front yard, the front yard would still be the same dimension, and there would just be a sidewalk that went through it maybe a foot from the right-of-way. Mr. Borda stated his point was that the green space would be even less, and Mr. Fioravanti agreed.

Mr. Dougherty stated this is a Residential lot in a Residential District. He stated Mr. Link had made excellent points about the Decision made by the Board over two years ago. Mr. Dougherty stated when an Applicant comes before the Board who took the time to go to PennDOT and tried to improve the situation including agreeing to construct a ranch so that this would not be a two-story home hanging over an existing home, he feels that this is a good compromise. He stated he understands many people do not like any development adjacent to their property. He stated there will be a building site for a number of months, but that is what happens all over the Country when houses are built next to them. Mr. Dougherty stated he feels what is proposed is reasonable.

Mr. Heinz asked how we would enforce the restriction. Mr. Solor stated the Conditions that would be attached to the Variance would do that. He stated there would be a height restriction that would restrict it to a one-story house. Mr. McLoone asked if it would need to be a Deed Restriction since if someone filed a Building Permit in ten years they may not be familiar with the fact that they had obtained a Variance ten years ago. Mr. Meginniss stated they would Record it against the property so it would be in the Public Record. Mr. Flager stated it should be made a Condition and included in the Condition would be that it is Recorded.

Mr. Schwartz asked if the neighbors have any more concerns now that it is being reduced in height.

Mr. Brand asked if the Applicant was aware of the hardship when he purchased the property. Mr. Meginniss stated currently Mr. McCafferty is the equitable owner, and he is under Agreement to purchase the property but does not own the property currently. Mr. Meginniss stated most times when there is an Application that is predicated on relief forward before a Board, that is discussed

and that necessitates the Application to the Zoning Hearing Board. He stated there would be a Closing that occurs afterwards, but the property owner has vested Mr. McCafferty with all the rights to agree to the Conditions that we are discussing this evening because Mr. McCafferty would then be the owner and it would be Recorded against the land subsequently. Mr. Meginniss stated Mr. McCafferty was aware of the prior Zoning Decision, and that is why there was substantial effort that was overtaken over the last year to improve the status quo on the property to increase the setbacks and mitigate the potential impact to the property owners.

Mr. Elrath asked if in 50 to 100 years it is decided to expand Heacock Road what would happen to this property. Mr. Dougherty stated if the improvement was in the taking, it would be a full taking of the property; and it would have to go through eminent domain. Mr. Elrath stated then Lower Makefield would have to pay the current market value for the property, and Mr. Flager stated it would be PennDOT not the Township. Mr. Elrath stated it would probably be worth nothing or \$2,400 which would be a disservice to PennDOT. Mr. Elrath stated he feels that the sidewalk will have to go in at some point. He stated he also feels that the two houses that he owns will not be there forever. He stated he hopes that a sidewalk can be put in to connect the sidewalks to get people from Heritage Oaks safely to McCaffrey's.

Mr. Flager stated under the current proposal if they build a rancher and it is a larger footprint, it will have a bigger impact on any potential woodlands and how much can or cannot be preserved. He stated if that comes before the Zoning Hearing Board, it will have to be taken into account that the proposal and compromise was to make it a larger footprint which provides less space for woodlands.

Mr. Huegler stated he is not moved by the reduction in height to a one-story building as it is still extreme Variances to the setbacks. He stated if the road is improved, it is still a problem for him as even though it is PennDOT dollars, that is tax dollars; and he would like the Township to make good decisions all around.

Mr. Link stated he appreciates everyone's' efforts to reach a compromise, but this is still an extreme Variance that is being sought in connection with the rear setback. He stated while the reduction in height does alleviate some of his concerns, it does not alleviate all of them. He stated he understands that there would be a Recorded restriction on the allowed height of any structure on that property which would run with the land and be binding on subsequent

homeowners. He stated he would like clarity as to the continuing legal effect of that restriction since land usage restrictions continuing forever can be problematic. Mr. Flager Deed Restrictions can be for any number of things, and in this case it would be limiting the height. He stated any subsequent owner purchasing that home would be subject to that Recorded restriction. He stated when a Title Search is done this would show up going forward.

Ms. Carlton stated Deed Restrictions are of Record; however, it does take someone to enforce those Deed Restrictions.

Mr. Link stated he is concerned that when someone violates that Use Restriction, he would be responsible for enforcing it potentially in litigation or whatever posture he will be in; and that is expensive and time-consuming. Ms. Carlton stated there is a benefit of it being a Deed Restriction of Record for everyone to see, but it does take someone to enforce that if someone violates it.

Mr. Meginniss stated an Application would have to be submitted to the Township for a Building Permit that would have to be approved; and he assumes that if this Variance is granted it would go in a property file so that it is not just the private neighbors, it would also be the Township that would be reviewing it to issue a Permit approval. Mr. Link stated while he understands that, it would not be the first time that a Municipal body misses a Recorded instrument.

Mr. VanHorn stated he does not recall that they discussed traffic on the road. He stated there is a neighborhood coming out across the street, and he asked if the driveway will be straight across from there or on an angle. Mr. VanHorn stated he lives on that road, and he struggles a lot now getting out of his driveway, and he sees accidents happening there. Mr. Fioravanti stated they had a traffic engineer work with PennDOT meeting at the site, and the Permit was issued. He stated sight distances are good, the traffic counts were suitable, and the driveway will be safe.

Mr. Elrath stated the side yard will be the pseudo back yard, and he asked if there are any other houses that have a side yard on the highway where children would be playing. He stated the road is dangerous. Mr. Dougherty stated how the property is used is not something the Zoning Hearing Board has governance over. Mr. Elrath stated they should still keep this in mind.

Mr. Borda stated he is confused as to why people are “going through all of these machinations to try to make this work as we do not owe these people anything.” He stated they bought this property knowing what the restrictions were. He stated he feels this will change the character of the neighborhood. He stated the setback is an “egregious change from what the original calling was,” and it went from 100’ down to less than 20’. He stated that is an 80% reduction in a setback that someone felt was important in terms of maintaining the character of our area. He stated he does not understand why they are striving so hard to find a compromise to make this work.

Mr. Dougherty stated there is a lot that is non-conforming relative to the neighborhood, and they are talking about an improved property that will not conform. He stated it is already a property that does not conform, and realistically it does not have the opportunity to be developed. Mr. Dougherty stated he does not advocate for Applicants, but he is looking for a fair compromise. He stated the last time there was not a fair compromise. Mr. Borda asked why he is striving for a compromise. Mr. Dougherty stated he has been in Real Estate his whole life, and he knows this ranch house will not negatively impact the neighborhood. Mr. Borda stated it will not add to his neighborhood. He stated they are getting rid of woodlands and natural habitat “for no good reason.” He stated he does not feel they are doing anything to improve anything, and they are detracting from the neighborhood and the community by trying to help somebody make money who is not even a resident but is a developer.

Mr. Schwartz stated this property has been undeveloped forever, and we are seeing a lot of reasons why it is undeveloped. He stated it was indicated earlier that not everything should be developed. He stated he does not think anything should be built there, and he thinks the Township should consider purchasing this. Mr. Grenier stated the Township is open to open space. He stated the Referendum was last year.

There was discussion as to the allowed height of the ranch, and it was agreed by the Applicant and some Board members that 18’ would be reasonable.

Mr. Brand moved to approve the Appeal with a Deed Restriction allowing for a ranch no higher than 18’. Relief of the front and rear setbacks. Also a Deed Restriction not allowing any further development in the rear yard and a row of arborvitae to be planted with Township approval and insure that they are maintained in perpetuity.

Mr. Flager stated the Deed Restrictions will be Recorded for 18' max, no development in the rear of the property, and a row of arborvitae along the rear property with Township oversight and enforcement powers.

Mr. Solor seconded the Motion, and the Motion carried with Mr. Heinz and Mr. Schwartz opposed.

OTHER BUSINESS

Upcoming Agenda items were discussed. Since St. Ignatius will be before the Board at some point, Mr. Dougherty stated he will need to recuse himself since he is a St. Ignatius parishioner and there will be the need for an Alternate. Mr. Heinz stated he is a St. Ignatius parishioner as well.

There being no further business, Mr. Solor moved, Mr. Heinz seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 9:55 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

James Dougherty, Chair