

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES – JULY 28, 2008

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on July 28, 2008. Chairman Bush called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. Mr. Bush welcomed new member, Mark Fried, to the Planning Commission

Those present:

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

Others: Nancy Frick, Director Zoning, Inspection & Planning
 John Donaghy, Township Solicitor
 Michael Eggleton, Township Engineer
 Joe Jones, Township Engineer
 Steve Santarsiero, Supervisor Liaison

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Pazdera moved and Ms. Friedman seconded to approve the Minutes of June 9, 2008 as corrected. Motion carried with Mr. Fried abstaining.

#589 – MAKEFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRELIMINARY PLAN
DISCUSSION

Mr. Tom Gillette, Director of Physical Plant, Mr. Jason Kliwinski, Project Manager, Mr. Francis Guzik, Engineer, and Mr. Scott Downie, Architect, were present on behalf of the Pennsbury School District.

Mr. Bush noted the School District was first present on March 24, 2008 to discuss the renovation/expansion project to the Makefield Elementary School. They then came back on June 9, 2008 for the purpose of seeking the Planning Commission's opinion and recommendation to the Zoning Hearing Board concerning the School District's request for a Special Exception for the expansion of a public school building. He stated at that time the Planning Commission was unable to give full support and approval of the request without review of alternative options, due to the limited size and adequacy of the site area, and due to the lack of the provision of a Feasibility Study warranting the actual

size of the proposed renovation and expansion. He stated they had concerns about the size of the expansion and renovation project and its relation to the needs and growth pattern of the School District. Mr. Bush stated the School District has since provided the Feasibility Study, but he did not see in the Feasibility Study a price for only the renovation without the 20% expansion of the building footprint. Mr. Downie stated included in the Feasibility Study was Option 1A which was the base line option which did indicate that renovating the building with only a 100 foot addition for an elevator would be approximately \$12 million.

Mr. Kliwinski noted the CMX letter dated 7/9/08 Item 1A which asked about the existing features, and added they do show this information within approximately 10 to 50 feet of the site. Because most of the surrounding properties are residential, they did not want to have to provide details beyond this because of privacy reasons and are asking that the Plans be accepted as presented.

Mr. Kliwinski noted Item 1B regarding pavement core samples and stated core samples were done when the road was recently repaved, and they would ask that they be exempted from having to do the core samples.

Mr. Kliwinski noted Item 1C related to Plan scale. He stated they presented the drawings at 1" equals 30' scale because it shows the project cohesively, and they would request that the drawings be accepted as presented.

Mr. Kliwinski noted Item 1D regarding the Environmental Impact Assessment report and stated because this was a previously-developed site and the addition is relatively small, they are requesting that no Environmental Impact Assessment be required.

Mr. Kliwinski noted Item 1E regarding right-of-way width specifically as it relates to West School Lane which SALDO recommends should be 56'. He stated the existing condition is 50', and since one of their intentions is to have traffic calming, they would prefer not to widen the road and are in fact looking to put up "No Parking" signs on that road. He stated they feel widening the road would be detrimental, and they would request that they be permitted to keep the existing condition.

Mr. Kliwinski noted Item 1F which requires a minimum 15 foot radius and a maximum grade of 5% for non-residential driveways. He stated they have a 13.2' radius shown, and the existing driveway grade on Makefield Road is approximately 8%. He stated they would like the existing conditions to continue because of logistical reasons on the site. He stated in order to meet the parking requirement and maneuvering cars around the site, the 13.2' radius is adequate for turning, and they would lose parking spaces and/or playground space if they were to be required to meet the standards.

Mr. Kliwinski noted Item IG and stated they would like to maintain the existing driveway on Makefield Road.

Mr. Kliwinski noted Item IH regarding sidewalks, and stated they are providing a 140' sidewalk along West School Lane from the back development to the School so that children coming from that development do not have to cross traffic. He stated when they were previously before the Planning Commission the parents indicated this was their preference and they did not allow their children to walk or bike on Makefield Road. He stated this preference by the parents relates to Item II as well. He stated there is currently no other connecting bikepaths on Makefield Road.

Mr. Kliwinski noted Item IJ regarding lighting, and he stated there are existing parking lot lights, and they are requesting that these be allowed to remain.

Mr. Kliwinski noted Item IK regarding street trees. He stated they are proposing seven trees as opposed to the required fifteen adjacent to the rear parking lot so that there is visual access from the parking lot and to provide for better maneuverability.

Mr. Kliwinski noted Item IL with regard to berming. He noted the existing berming in the rear of the property line which they do not want to disturb adding there are existing utility lines in this area. He also noted Item IM and stated they propose to maintain the existing berm along Makefield Road.

Mr. Kliwinski noted Item IN regarding emergency spillways and their intention to maintain the existing berm along Makefield Road. He stated they propose to put in a rain garden in order to address some of the stormwater issues.

Mr. Kliwinski noted Item IO regarding the anti-seep collars and stated because of the rain garden, they are using a shallower system but will allow more infiltration.

Mr. Kliwinski noted Item IP and stated they are using 12" and 15" pipes in lieu of the 18" required. Mr. Guzik stated this will be on the School District's private property.

Mr. Kliwinski noted Item IQ and stated they are not planning altering anything on Makefield Road. He also noted Items IR and IS and stated they are maintaining the existing basin.

Mr. Kliwinski stated Items 2 A, B, and C relate to stormwater management. He stated they were asked by the Environmental Advisory Council and the Township engineer to look again at how they calculated stormwater run off. He stated they did submit additional calculations to the Township which show that if they were to follow the EAC's methodology, they would still be reducing run off by volume as a result of the proposed rain garden, green roof, and pervious pavement. He stated if they calculate the

stormwater according to 20% meadow regulations, there is a slight impact, but it is only .06% which they feel is very much within the intent of the Ordinance. They feel the impact is negligible and are asking that it be allowed.

Mr. Kliwinski noted Item 2D regarding the requirement for an access easement around the stormwater management facilities and stated there is currently no easement proposed for the porous paving since it is a parking lot. Mr. Guzik stated as part of the Variance received from the Zoning Hearing Board, there is a requirement to file a stormwater management operating plan to be approved by the Township and subject to the School District honoring it. He stated it outlines the steps that need to be taken to make sure that the green roof, porous paving, and rain garden maintain functionality.

Mr. Kliwinski noted Item 3 and stated they are seeking relief for parking stall size in order to meet the minimum required parking spaces. Mr. Guzik stated there are some 9' by 18' stalls as well as 9' by 20' stalls proposed.

Mr. Kliwinski noted Item 4 and stated ninety-five spaces are provided, and two of these which are marked as "employee only" are located next to the loading berth which the engineer indicated may conflict with loading activities. He stated after discussing with the School District how this would function, they were advised that the frequency of deliveries is such that they do not feel there will be an issue.

Mr. Kliwinski stated they will comply with Items #5 through #8. He stated they will need to discuss Item #9 with the Board of Supervisors as this relates to payment of fees. They will comply with Item #10.

Mr. Kliwinski noted Item #11 and stated this relates to the calculations which were submitted which show .06% increase. He stated there are some existing dry wells which are poorly documented as to their location and size. He stated if they find them on the property, they will use them to further reduce their stormwater; but at this time, they do not know their exact size or where they are located. He stated they feel the Plan as presented meets the intent of the Ordinance.

Mr. Kliwinski stated they will comply with Items #12 and #13.

Mr. Kliwinski noted Item #14 which relates to the green roof and stated they did provide background information on the type of green roof they are proposing and the amount of stormwater it will absorb. He stated there are a number of different systems with different details; and while they will comply with Item #14, they do not have the specific system details at this time.

Mr. Kliwinski stated they will comply with Item #15.

Ms. Friedman asked the amount of impervious surface they will have at the end of the project, and Mr. Kliwinski stated if they are permitted to count the green roof, porous pavement, and the rain garden, they will be reducing the impervious surface by approximately 6%. He stated the existing impervious surface is 30.8%, and this would reduce it to approximately 26%. Mr. Donaghy asked the actual impervious surface as defined by the Township Ordinance which does not count the porous pavement as pervious, and Mr. Kliwinski stated it will be 34.6%. Mr. Donaghy stated as one of the Conditions of the Zoning Hearing Board approval, the School District was required to provide to the Township engineer sufficient evidence to show that the green roof and proposed porous paving were sufficient to reduce the effective impervious surface to the numbers previously mentioned by Mr. Kliwinski, and Mr. Kliwinski agreed and stated this has been done. Mr. Kliwinski stated they were also required to provide a maintenance plan, and the School District is committed to maintaining these features. Mr. Donaghy asked if the School District would agree to enter into a specific Agreement as to the enforcement of the maintenance plan, and Mr. Gillette stated they are willing to enter into such an Agreement.

Ms. Friedman stated they have indicated that they intend to use porous paving in the bus lane, and Mr. Kliwinski stated part of the parking spaces which are being shifted from the side of the building on West School Lane to the front of the building will be porous paving as will some stalls in the back of the building. Ms. Friedman asked if the porous paving will be in the bus traffic areas, and Mr. Kliwinski stated it will not, and will only be used in the parking stalls. He stated the traffic lanes around the parking lot will use regular paving. He stated these areas are designed to sheet into the porous paving areas.

Ms. Friedman noted Item 1L involving a berm; and Mr. Guzik stated there is no berm in that area noted under Item 1L, and they are asking not to be required to put the berm in this particular area. Ms. Friedman asked if there will be any excessive stormwater issues developing at this area due to any of the renovations, and Mr. Guzik stated there will not as it is far removed from the project area and there should be no additional run off in this area. Mr. Bush asked if a berm could be put in place that would not impact the utility wires, and Mr. Guzik stated putting a berm in this area would seriously hamper the use of the athletic fields as well. Ms. Friedman asked why a berm was not installed at this location when the School was initially constructed to protect residences, and Mr. Jones stated it may have pre-dated the Ordinance requirements. It was noted the School was built in 1937.

Mr. Bush noted Item 1P and asked the Township engineer about the use of the smaller size pipe. Mr. Jones stated the Township engineer's office does not have an issue with this. He stated Mr. Majewski's position was that when you install rain gardens it is usually low-level development, and it would be hard to install the larger-sized pipes. Mr. Jones added it is on private property, and the School District will have to maintain this.

Mr. Bush asked the Township engineer's opinion about Item 2 regarding the stormwater calculations, and Mr. Jones stated Mr. Majewski has reviewed the calculations and feels that they have met the intent of the Ordinance despite the slight increase in volume and does not feel there will be any problems with any downstream structures or properties. Mr. Guzik stated it is only if they consider 20% of the existing impervious as meadow that there is a .06% increase.

Ms. Friedman stated she does not feel they will have sufficient parking to handle the larger functions at the School. She asked the residents present to comment on this, but there were no adjoining residents present this evening to answer her concerns.

Mr. Dickson stated he has attended a number of functions at the School; and when they have these large functions, there is a lot of double parking and parking up and down West School Lane and Makefield Road.

Mr. Dickson stated he is also concerned about the increase in student population by the year 2018 where there will be a near doubling of current enrollment. Mr. Gillette stated parking during the larger events is typically a problem at a number of the Schools; and if they were to install adequate parking for these large events, it would not be economically feasible. He stated in a number of instances, they use the grassy areas for overflow parking. He stated the projections do show a doubling of enrollment in ten years, but it is not the intention of the District to double the enrollment at Makefield as it is not possible; and if they were at a point where they would be exceeding capacity, they would have to look at other alternatives. Mr. Dickson stated the Township has almost experienced build out and questioned how they reached the projection shown. Mr. Gillette stated it is a computer program based on recent trends. He stated full-day Kindergarten also impacted this number which increased the number of Kindergarten students they had. He stated they do not really expect the kind of population shown in the Feasibility Study.

Ms. Friedman stated they have indicated that they were trying to provide off-street parking for each faculty member and an additional parking space of one per two classrooms and the offices; and she questioned how much spillover there will be because of parent volunteers coming to the School and the impact on the surrounding neighborhoods. She asked if there are always cars parked on the side residential streets. Mr. Kliwinski stated the way the parking was calculated was two spaces per classroom and office which is how they came up with 95 spaces. He stated there are not really two teachers in each class or two people in each office so there would be additional spaces available. He stated the existing side lot on West School Lane gives drivers the impression that they should pull into this area to drop off and this causes back ups and congestion. He stated they spent a number of days on the site to observe traffic patterns, and this seemed to be the area which was causing the most problems. He stated the existing School has only 50 spaces, and they are proposing 95. He stated at the bottom of the parking lot there is an additional rectangular paved area and this is the play area

which is currently in the parking lot. He stated they will move the play area out and provide a ramp over the curb to the new play area so that it can be used for additional overflow parking for the large events. He stated they have not counted how many spaces this will represent since it is primarily a play area; but at night for events, it could be used for additional parking. He stated they feel what has been provided will greatly alleviate some of the existing traffic problems.

Ms. Friedman asked if there are teacher assistants working with regular teachers on staff so that there would be two teachers in one classroom, and Mr. Gillette stated while he is not certain of the amount, there are some classrooms where this may occur, but it is limited. Ms. Friedman asked if there were more than 28 students in a classroom, would the School District implement having assistant teachers in each classroom at that time; and Mr. Gillette stated he does not feel that they would do this, and if there were to be a bump in enrollment, they would probably look to a sister school and move some of the students to a school where it was not as crowded.

Mr. Bush stated last year the School District left Makefield out of the spot re-Districting they did. He stated when the School District representatives came before the Planning Commission in March, they indicated one of the goals was to reduce classroom size, but in June they indicated that the reduction in size would be incidental and short lived. He stated they now have the Feasibility Study and it appears that enrollment will double by 2018. He stated they indicated this evening the numbers are not accurate because it included full-day Kindergarten which is not currently being offered. He asked if they envision full-day Kindergarten ever coming back into the mix and asked if the Planning Commission could get updated enrollment estimates to 2018. He also asked if the numbers being presented are accurate, does the School District anticipate a further expansion on the Makefield School site to accommodate an almost doubling of the population.

Dr. Paul Long stated the change from full-day Kindergarten to a half-day program is being implemented across the School District. They have no plan to reinstate full-day Kindergarten except for special needs sections which may occur. He stated this does not exist at Makefield at this time. He stated the projected enrollment figures the Planning Commission has been provided are the latest figures they have. He stated although it does show an alarming amount of growth, this is based on the computer program which produces it and is based on historic enrollment, birth statistics, etc. He stated they do feel Makefield will be filled to capacity in a few years; and when this happens, they will have to do re-Districting. He stated the additional capacity they are proposing now is a fortuitous opportunity to provide capacity at the School to reduce the impact of a future re-Districting and try to keep students closer to home. Mr. Bush asked if, apart from the Kindergarten issue, are the numbers provided reliable, and Mr. Long stated the numbers have changed since the Fall, 2006 when the Feasibility Study was submitted. He stated he does feel that they will reach capacity at Makefield in about five years even if they add the additional space being proposed with this project.

Ms. Friedman asked if there is any room for expansion beyond what is being proposed now, and Mr. Long stated they feel the project they are proposing now will meet the needs of the School for 20 years as this is how it has been financed. He stated there is no plan to have temporary classrooms on the site as it would be very difficult to do so at this location. Ms. Friedman stated initially it was indicated that this project is being planned to meet the needs for the next 20 years, but Mr. Long also indicated that in five years they will be at full capacity and they will have to re-District. Mr. Long stated when they look at enrollment trends for the District they see enrollment growth for Makefield, Edgewood, Quarry Hill, and Afton and less in the Schools in the lower portion of the School District. He stated when they had an opportunity to add capacity at Makefield, they wanted to do a reasonable addition that would provide a better school and a school that would be closer to home for more families. He stated they feel they can handle an additional 100 students with this expansion and these students would not then have to be re-Districted.

Mr. Santarsiero asked the number of Makefield parents present this evening who feel they will have children in the School over the next five years, and many of those present raised their hands. Mr. Santarsiero noted the recent re-Districting which occurred at Edgewood School. He commended the School District for trying to add space to avoid re-Districting, and stated he also appreciates the environmental aspects; but he is concerned about the long-range planning, and he would urge the School District to reconsider their approach and take a look at planning now for the future. He stated he is concerned that in five years Makefield families will be asked to go to another School because they do not have capacity. He stated previously he asked if they could build up, and the School District representatives indicated that they determined the cost to do so would increase the cost from \$13 million to \$19 million. He stated while this is not an insignificant amount of money, he asked that they look at this again since if they can add space now when there might be economies of scale and add the classrooms they will need in the future, this would be the time to look at this possibility. He stated if they already know that even with the construction of the proposed addition, the School will not be sufficient to handle the population they foresee in the area, they will have a problem and will have to re-District and this does not serve the neighborhood schools model which is what they all want particularly at the elementary level. He stated he recognizes the difficult Budget issues, but for the parents who have children in the school now and will have children there five years from now, it is difficult to be faced with re-Districting. He stated he recognizes that this is ultimately a decision for the School Board, but as a Supervisor, he is charged with representing the families in Lower Makefield Township.

Mr. Long stated the School Board long debated as to how much the site could bear as well as the matter of financing. He stated there was also the concern that the neighbors and the Township would have were the School District to propose too big of a school for this site. He agreed that this Plan is a compromise. He stated when they get to Edgewood School in their renovation planning, they will have to make similar decisions

about what that site can bear as they do with all the Schools. Mr. Santarsiero stated this is why he asked that they consider building up. Mr. Gillette stated if they added eight classrooms rather than four, they would also have to increase the parking, and there would be a lot more traffic in and out of the School. Mr. Santarsiero stated a number of innovations they have shown in the Plan such as porous paving and the rain gardens could help with this, and he feels they could address these ancillary issues. He asked that they re-consider this alternative. He stated he still feels there is time to consider this recognizing that they want to start construction in the spring.

Ms. Friedman asked if it is possible to construct multi-level parking in a way that would not be offensive; and Mr. Kliwinski stated the costs would be astronomical, and they would be spending a significant amount of money on this as opposed to on education. Mr. Downie stated he does not feel this would be appropriate given the character of the existing building.

Ms. Friedman asked which of the options presented is what is being shown on the Plan, and Mr. Downie stated it is Option 2C with some nominal changes. It was noted the Planning Commission did not get Option 2C, and Mr. Downie stated it would be basically Option 2A noted in the Feasibility Study provided to the Planning Commission. Ms. Friedman asked what changes were made from Option 2A to 2C. Mr. Downie stated the major difference is that the music room would be in the lower level as opposed to the area which was the cafeteria. He stated the differences do not relate to size of the land.

Ms. Jennifer Duffield stated she is a Makefield parent and feels it is difficult to estimate what the Makefield population will be five to twenty years from now. She stated her concern is not the additional cost, but what they will do if they do not see this increase in population and they then decide to close the School in the future. She noted the proposed closure of one of the Neshaminy schools. Mr. Santarsiero stated Edgewood Elementary School is also well at capacity, and he does not feel there would be a downside of having extra classrooms based on the Lower Makefield population projections as he feels they will continue to have a relatively young demographic in the Township. He stated many of the elementary schools that are under capacity are in Falls; and there are some schools which are close to each other which are under capacity which could be combined at one school and still maintain neighborhood schools. Ms. Duffield stated this is still based on a guess. She stated she feels these are questions that need to be addressed at a School Board meeting. She stated she feels there are immediate needs at Makefield since they have music in the hallway during classroom times because there is no classroom space, computers being rolled on a cart from classroom to classroom, children missing school because there is no air conditioning, and children eating lunch at 10:30 a.m. She stated she feels the Township should base their approval on planning and land development issues and not on decisions that the School Board should be making. Mr. Santarsiero stated this is true which was why he prefaced his comments with the comment that if this is how the School Board decides to proceed, he would be willing to vote on the Plan

presented; but he was trying to look out for the interests of his constituents in the future and asked that the School Board look at other options. He stated he is not sure how quickly new Plans could be prepared if the School Board decided to consider other options, but he feels there is still time to start construction when they have proposed in the spring. Ms. Duffield stated she supports what the School District is proposing; and if they were able to proceed with something which would also address these other concerns, she would be in support of this provided they could start construction as soon as possible.

Ms. Tamara Sturgeon stated she is a Makefield parent and feels the School is already overcrowded with a number of programs on carts. She stated the Teacher Lounge is also very unsuitable. She stated her family made a decision to live in this area because of Makefield School. She stated the children are also playing in the parking lot. She stated the parents are also concerned about building security.

One woman stated she is a Makefield parents and feels it would be fantastic if the growth of the School was projected to double because that would mean that the School District is providing an excellent education. She stated she also feels with the proposed plan, the children will receive an even better education as they would be in a more comfortable environment and they could attract excellent teachers because the facility is better. She stated she does not feel that they can expect their children to learn to their fullest ability in the existing environment. She stated the sooner they make the improvements, the better it will be for their children to get the best education. Mr. Santarsiero stated he does not want to hold up the project and is only asking that they consider what he has recommended. The woman stated part of the parking problem along West School Lane is because the only way visitors can access the building is through the front door and people prefer to park as close as possible. She stated there is sufficient parking in the rear of the building but people do not want to walk. She stated with the new improvements school access will be improved.

A woman stated she is a Makefield parent and member of the PTO Board and purchased her home because of the School. She stated the School needs the renovations and the tax base that will result from people moving in to the Township because of Makefield will be a benefit to the Township.

Mr. Craig Bryson stated the Planning Commission should consider the planning issues and recognize that with this project they will get better traffic patterns, modern BMPs, updated stormwater rate control, cost-effective systems, and a state-of-the art LEED certified building. He stated the design professionals have advised the School District, and he feels they are optimizing their dollar. He stated to put up a second story on a building is not easy, and he does not feel they would be able to do this without causing a huge disruption to the students and at a significantly higher cost than what has been presented to the Township this evening. He stated what they have proposed also provides significant improvements from a safety standpoint. He stated what they have proposed

also provides significant improvements from a safety standpoint. He stated he feels the Planning Commission should consider whether this is a well planned projection which meets the Township requirements.

Ms. Karen Lesca stated she is a Makefield parent and feels there has been a lot of good press recently about Makefield being a “green” building. She stated she feels it would be judicious of the Township to consider approval of the Plan. She commended the School Board and the architects who did their best to make this School as green as possible. She stated this is also a learning tool for the children and a flagship School for the District as well as the Township

Ms. Ann Betts stated she is a Makefield parent and feels that Makefield should not be compared to what other Schools need as she feels the School Board has a list of what needs to be done at the other schools when they do renovations at those locations.

Mr. Geoff Goll, 5 S. Homestead, stated he is a Makefield parent and a member of the Township’s Environmental Advisory Council. He stated he is concerned about the potential future re-Districting. He feels consideration of expansion of the School is wise and he stated building up should not hold up the timing of the project.

Ms. Lisa Grayson-Zygmunt, stated she is a Makefield parent and a member of the Township’s Environmental Advisory Council and she commended everyone in the process for putting this together. She stated this is an important project since this will be the first green school in the County. She stated she hopes that the Planning Commission will move the project forward.

Ms. Friedman noted the options they were presented and asked the difference between Option 2A/2C and Option 5. She stated in Option 5 there is an area for a future addition and the costs are similar. Mr. Downie stated the cafeteria is located in the center of the building and currently there is a problem with traveling from one end to the other. Option 5 looked at adding space on the far end of the building where the parking lot is shown, and it would have made the situation worse with regard to increased travel distance. He stated a number of the options did consider a future addition which is something they always look at, but the School Board made a decision based on the size they wanted to pursue which is why Option 2C is proposed.

Mr. Dickson moved and Mr. Pazdera seconded to recommend to the Board of Supervisors’ approval of the Makefield Elementary School Preliminary Plan, Plans dated 2/1/08, last revised 4/18/08 subject to compliance with the CMX letter dated 7/9/08 noting that the Planning Commission is in favor of the Waivers requested under Item #1, #2, #3, #4, #10, and #11. The Applicant has agreed to comply with Items #5 through #8, #12 and #13, #14 when the details are available, and #15. Item #9 is to be determined by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Guzik noted the TPD letter dated 6/5/08 and stated there are two comments (Items #3 and #11) which may bring up additional potential Waiver requests.

Mr. Dickson added to the Motion that the recommendation is subject to compliance with the Bucks County Conservation District letter dated 6/16/08, two letters from TPD dated 6/5/08 and 6/12/08, the Environmental Advisory Council letter dated 6/11/08, the Bucks County Planning Commission letter dated 6/4/08, the Birdsall Engineering letter dated 6/2/08, and letters from Captain Roche dated 2/14/08 and 5/12/08 as well as compliance with the decision of the Zoning Hearing Board dated 6/17/08.

Mr. Bush stated he does favor expansion and renovation of the School, but he does not feel the Plan before the Planning Commission adequately addresses future needs based on the School District's own estimates that maximum capacity will be reached in five years or less and based on a twenty year financing. He stated he does not feel the Plan adequately addresses the future planning needs of this community school.

Motion did not carry as Mr. Dickson and Mr. Pazdera voted in favor, Mr. Bush and Ms. Friedman were opposed, and Mr. Fried abstained. Mr. Donaghy stated the matter will go to the Board of Supervisors with no recommendation.

ZONING HEARING BOARD APPEAL #08-1481 AND #08-1481(A) AMENDED APPLICATION FOR THE FRANKFORD HOSPITAL OF CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, INC. APPLICATION TO THE ZONING HEARING BOARD INCLUDES REQUESTS FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION

Mr. Brian Zappala, engineer, Mr. Brian Sundermier, Senior VP for the Applicant, Mr. Kenneth O'Brien, traffic engineer, and Mike Carr, attorney, were present. Mr. Carr stated the Application involves property at the southwest corner of Stony Hill and Route 332. The tract is slightly more than 41 acres, and they propose a hospital with affiliated medical buildings for a total of three buildings representing 455,000 square feet in size with associated parking and other improvements. Mr. Carr stated initially they made Application for a Special Exception for a hospital use but in an abundance of caution they amended it to also include medical office use. Both uses are permitted in the O/R District by Special Exception. Mr. Carr stated the Planning Commission has the opportunity to submit an advisory recommendation with respect to the Application to the Zoning Hearing Board for the Special Exception, and they expect the Appeal to be heard by the Zoning Hearing Board by the end of August.

Mr. Donaghy stated the role of the Planning Commission in reviewing a Special Exception is to give an advisory report with respect to the location of the use in relation to the needs and growth pattern of the area and where appropriate with reference to the adequacy of the site area and arrangement of buildings, driveways, parking areas, off-

street truck-loading spaces, and other pertinent features of the Site Plan according to Section 200-98 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Carr stated they are at the beginning of what will be a few lengthy processes which will involve numerous appearances before the Planning Commission. He stated the Plans they have provided are not fully-engineered Plans, but they feel these Plans are sufficient for the Appeal before the Zoning Hearing Board for the Special Exception.

Mr. Brian Zappala noted the location of the property in relation to the By-Pass and Stony Hill Road. He stated it is approximately 41 acres and is currently undeveloped and being used as farmland. The site falls from left to right into two different drainage patterns off the far corners of the site in a gradual slope. He stated they propose the construction of the hospital, a medical office building, and an ambulatory surgery building with total square footage of 455,000 square feet. The buildings will have multiple levels. He stated there is an existing unsignalized access off Stony Hill Road opposite the Lower Makefield Executive Campus, and this intersection provides access to and from Stony Hill Road as well as to the signalized intersection at the intersection of Stony Hill and the By-Pass. He stated they have a secondary point of access on the By-Pass for right-in and right-out only. Mr. Zappala stated they have proposed a center drive aisle with a landscaped media toward the core of the hospital project with a loop road that traverses the site to distribute traffic to different points of the site. Mr. Zappala stated stormwater management, lighting, landscaping, etc. are part of the Land Development process, and they are only showing a schematic at this time. He stated they have done a lot of work with regard to the environmental impact as to soils, etc. so that they can move forward in the future, and they have a lot of space available for BMP type of features including infiltration basins throughout the site.

Mr. Carr asked if they will need to request any Variances, and Mr. Zappala stated they will not need any Variances. Impervious surface permitted is 65%, and they are at approximately 46%. Mr. Carr stated he assumes that they will get involved with Waivers once they submit engineered plans, and Mr. Zappala agreed.

Mr. O'Brien stated they coordinated early on with PennDOT to ensure that any study done would be in accordance with PennDOT requirements. He stated they looked at several intersections along the By-Pass from Lindenhurst Road through Stony Hill Road to the I-95 Interchange. They projected the amount of traffic to be generated by the proposed development and put together a traffic study which was submitted to the Township, although they have not yet received a review letter from the Township. He stated preliminarily they are proposing a future signalization of the proposed access intersection which will be directly across the access to the Lower Makefield Corporate Center. Additionally, based on preliminary comments received from PennDOT, they are looking to provide an additional lane on the By-Pass from Campus Drive and Lindenhurst Road across the site frontage, across Stony Hill Road, and turning into the

right turn lane to southbound I-95. In addition, they are also potentially looking at widening the By-Pass at Stony Hill Road to provide a second left turn lane onto Stony Hill Road to provide additional capacity. They have preliminarily discussed those improvements with PennDOT who has preliminarily agreed to them, but they have not yet submitted the traffic study to PennDOT.

Ms. Friedman stated they indicated the maximum impervious surface permitted was 65%, and they are proposing 46%. She asked if there are any Plans to build another building in the back open space area which would still keep them within the impervious surface permitted. Mr. Sundermier stated the Applicant has no such plans at this time.

Ms. Friedman asked if they are engineering the buildings in such a way that at some point in the future they might come back to the Township to request an additional level, and Mr. Sundermier stated they are not engineering the building for this as it would be very disruptive to a hospital operation to build up. He stated they are not currently engineering to go higher than three stories.

Ms. Friedman noted the current location of Frankford Hospital near the Oxford Valley Mall and asked if this new hospital will be a transfer of the existing hospital.

Mr. Sundermier stated the hospital will move to the new location, but future applications for the existing building have not been determined at this time. The new hospital will be approximately the same size as the existing hospital. Ms. Friedman asked the estimated number of employees, and Mr. Sundermier stated they are projecting 900 staff people over three shifts. This includes physicians. Ms. Friedman asked if there will be an emergency room and asked projected numbers for emergency room visits.

Mr. Sundermier stated there will be an emergency room, but he does not know how many visits are projected for the new facility nor did he know the numbers at the current facility. Ms. Friedman asked the number of outpatients they plan to serve at the two additional buildings, but Mr. Sundermier did not have this figure. Ms. Friedman asked the number of beds proposed at the hospital, and Mr. Sundermier stated there will be 225 beds.

Mr. Dickson asked why they are proposing to build the new hospital, and Mr. Sundermier stated the primary purpose is to build a modern, more-efficient hospital. He stated Frankford purchased the existing hospital which was constructed in the 1980's. He stated health care is changing, and the operations, testing facilities, and equipment are changing requiring varying space and utility demands. He stated at the new location, they propose a state-of-the-art, highly-efficient hospital of the future. Mr. Dickson asked on what basis they have projected that there is a need for this new hospital since there are a number of hospitals already in the area. Mr. Sundermier stated this is a growing area. He stated the demographics will not change considerably from the existing location. Mr. Dickson stated there are also some new hospitals being constructed in New Jersey. He asked why it would be more cost-effective for them to take a piece of farmland and put a new hospital at this location when there have an existing facility which could be renovated.

Mr. Sundermier stated they did study this considerably, and it would be less expensive and less disruptive to build a new facility. Mr. Dickson asked their plans for the existing hospital, and Mr. Sundermier stated there has not been a determination made on what uses may remain at that location or whether it may be adapted for another use.

Mr. Dickson stated he would like to know the plans for the existing building before they come back to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Friedman asked if they project any duplication of services, and Mr. Sundermier stated they do not.

Mr. Dickson asked if they took into consideration the Capstone project across the street from Shady Brook Farm, and Mr. O'Brien stated they did have discussions with the Township before they did their traffic study and this was included in their traffic study.

Mr. Pazdera asked how far up Stony Hill Road they went when they did their traffic study, and Mr. O'Brien stated they studied Stony Hill and Township Line Road. They focused on the major intersections in the area.

Mr. Bush noted the potential for a traffic light in front of the Capstone Development, and he stated this will result in four traffic lights in ½ to 2/3rds of a mile between Stony Hill and Township Line Road and Township Line and 332 which he feels will create more traffic problems than already exist. Mr. O'Brien stated PennDOT will review all plans and decide whether or not they feel signals are warranted. He stated they chose the location they did because the access across the street currently warrants a traffic light and vehicles making a left out of the office complex turning onto Stony Hill Road currently operate with heavy delay especially in the afternoon peak; so they tried to put the access in a location where a signal would benefit the hospital site and the existing site as well.

Mr. Fried stated it appears that they are indicating that the reason they are moving is a business decision and not a need issue so that they can be more efficient, make more money, and provide better care; and they do not feel they can do this at the current hospital. Mr. Sundermier stated they reviewed the possibility of renovating the existing facility and found that it would be more feasible to build a new facility. Mr. Fried stated while it will only be approximately two miles away from the existing facility because of the roads and other facilities in the area it is not easy to get from the Mall area to the intersection of Stony Hill and the By-Pass. He asked if this will not affect the people they are currently serving at the Hospital where it is currently located. Mr. Sundermier stated the demographics will probably show that there is some shift and that by moving more north it might make the new location more attractive to people in that area who do not want to go to the Mall area; but they feel that they will still serve basically the same demographics. Mr. Fried stated he is concerned about duplication of services given the location of St. Mary's. Mr. Sundermier stated Bucks County is continuing to expand and grow, and the intention is to serve the needs of the community. They have looked at

population growth and where their customer base is and feel comfortable that this will be a good location to serve the community with state-of-the art care and the finest health care services available.

Mr. Fried asked if they feel there will be an increase of traffic at this new location as compared to the existing location given that they will add state-of-the-art services. He asked if they anticipate that the number of people served at the new hospital will be greater than at the existing facility; and Mr. Sundermier stated the hospital is a business, and they do hope that their numbers will increase. He stated the cost of health care has escalated and hospitals of the future have to be as efficient and cost-effective as possible to survive and be profitable.

Mr. Fried asked how close the proposed entrance to the Hospital will be to the entrance to Shady Brook Farm. Mr. Sundermier stated it is far enough away that it is not seen on the Plan. Mr. Fried stated during the year there are many different events at the Farm, and he asked if they considered the times of year when the Farm is holding these special events. Mr. O'Brien stated they looked at average conditions and compared them to PennDOT seasonal adjustment rates to see if it made sense to adjust those rates.

Mr. Fried noted conditions on the By-Pass and stated the existing condition is very bad particularly at the peak hours. He also asked if they looked at the ripple effect on the other area roads. Mr. O'Brien stated they did consider the study area but the focus was on the intersections. He stated the improvements they propose are significant based on the size of their development. They did not look at the need for improvements beyond Lower Makefield Township.

Mr. Fried asked if an ambulance will be able to get through particularly during the Christmas season when the Farm holds their holiday activities, and Mr. O'Brien stated many of the intersections have emergency pre-emption devices.

Mr. Bush asked if the Township traffic engineer submitted a report on the Applicant's traffic study, and Ms. Frick stated they have not. Mr. Bush stated he feels it may be premature for the Planning Commission to give a favorable advisory opinion without that information from the Township's traffic engineer. Mr. Carr stated the Planning Commission could ask that the Zoning Hearing Board consider this when it is submitted. He stated the Planning Commission could also send a representative to the Zoning Hearing Board meeting. Mr. Donaghy stated the Planning Commission has thirty days from the time the Application was submitted in which to give an opinion adding that the Amended Application was submitted 7/24/08. Mr. Donaghy stated it is possible the Township may not have a report from the Township traffic engineer by the time the Planning Commission next meets.

Ms. Friedman asked if they have considered not having an entrance off Stony Hill Road and only have an access off 332. Mr. O'Brien stated PennDOT will not allow them to have a full movement access off the By-Pass and will only permit right-in, right-out. Ms. Friedman asked if there was any way to build anything on the right side of the property as opposed to Stony Hill Road, and Mr. Sundermier stated they do not have control on that side of the property to provide an entrance but agreed that it would be ideal if they could have a driveway off of Campus Drive. Mr. Pazdera asked if they have approached the owners of that property about this option, and Mr. Carr stated they could discuss this with them. Ms. Friedman stated she feels an entrance off Stony Hill Road will fail. She stated she is also concerned with emergency vehicle access on this road. Mr. Carr stated he feels the Planning Commission should make these concerns known to the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Dickson stated they have an existing traffic problem in this area of the Township and adding a project like this with 1,000 parking spaces will create a traffic disaster during rush hour. He stated it will also have a detrimental impact on the health and safety of the Township and its quality of life. Mr. O'Brien stated he feels what they are proposing will be a significant benefit to the corridor as they are proposing an additional lane all the way down 332 from Campus Drive to I-95 and an additional left turn lane on 332 at Stony Hill Road. He stated those improvements will help to alleviate the additional traffic that will be generated by the Hospital. Mr. Dickson stated the job of the Planning Commission is to protect the Township. He stated he has watched this area of the Township over-develop for the last thirty years, and he cannot be convinced that what they are proposing will improve the traffic situation which currently exists. Mr. O'Brien stated their improvements will mitigate the impact of what they are proposing. He added that their Plans will be reviewed by PennDOT and the Township traffic engineer. He stated he feels that they will be able to address any comments which may arise. Ms. Friedman asked when the traffic study was submitted to the Township, and Mr. Zappala stated it was submitted with the Environmental Impact Statement and they could separate it out and provide it to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Dickson noted Gary Gilman's letter dated 2/9/08. Since the Applicants had not received this, Ms. Frick agreed to provide them a copy. Mr. Dickson stated in this letter, the Citizens Traffic Commission is asking that the Applicants do a regional traffic study as this project will impact a number of other projects including the Scudder's Falls project.

Mr. Fried asked when their shifts change, and Mr. Sundermier stated while there are shift changes at 7 a.m. and 3 p.m. staff does not all leave at those times, and it is staggered.

Mr. Geoff Goll, member of the Environmental Advisory Council, stated he is not sure how the Planning Commission could make a decision since they have been given nothing on which to make an advisory recommendation. He stated the EAC feels that they have

not developed this Plan according to the LID Ordinance which includes the four-step process which involves looking at site constraints and infiltration capacity on the site; and stated they are looking at this site in a vacuum. He stated they are asking the Township to provide for a new hospital, abandon an existing building, and build on an agricultural piece of property which he feels is the opposite of low-impact development. He stated if the hospital is concerned about continuing operations, they should look in Middletown for other facilities that might accommodate their use which would result in a low-impact development. He stated they have indicated that what they are proposing is the same size as their current facility so he is not sure why they need to move and could not retrofit the existing facility. He asked how the project is being funded, and Mr. Sundermier stated this is proprietary information. Mr. Goll asked if there is any public funding, and Mr. Sundermier stated this is not anticipated. Mr. Goll asked if there are going to be loans from the State, and Mr. Carr stated this is well beyond the scope of the land development issue that is before the Township this evening. Mr. Goll suggested that the Planning Commission not make a decision on this tonight.

Mr. Fried asked about the question of use of open land as it relates to the State and the County and asked if this is something the Planning Commission should consider. Mr. Donaghy stated while the property has been used for agricultural purposes in the past, it was not part of any sort of Governmental funding for open space or subject to any easements resulting from Governmental funding. Mr. Fried stated this will reduce the Township's open space, and Mr. Donaghy stated any development reduces open space. He added the Planning Commission will consider whether the Applicant complies with other Township Ordinances when the land development process proceeds. Mr. Donaghy stated the Zoning Hearing Board will have to decide the issue of Special Exception based on the provisions of the Ordinance. He stated even if all the relief requested were granted by the Zoning Hearing Board, the Applicant will still need to submit fully-engineered Plans and meet the requirements of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. He stated at this point of the process, there is no requirement for them to submit Land Development Plans for a Special Exception request. He stated the Planning Commission could state that they do not feel they have the information they need to make an advisory recommendation because of the limited amount of information they have been provided. Mr. Carr stated they are listening to the questions being raised by the Planning Commission, and they will try to address them when they go before the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Santarsiero stated the Board of Supervisors is going to review the issue in Executive Session on Wednesday night. He stated he personally shares the concerns noted this evening with respect to traffic, and the Board of Supervisors is also on record with regard to the original Sketch Plan they submitted in January.

Mr. Donaghy stated if the Planning Commission takes no action, it is deemed as a recommendation of approval.

Ms. Friedman moved, Mr. Dickson seconded and it was unanimously carried that based on information available and presented to the Planning Commission it is unclear as to the need for such a facility at this particular location and supporting the granting of a Special Exception for the Frankford Hospital proposed development project is not in the best interest for the area due to the generation of very high levels of traffic which will detrimentally impact the health, safety, and welfare of the surrounding residents on a Township and regional basis based on recommendations of the Lower Makefield Township Citizens Traffic Commission in their letter dated 2/9/08.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Friedman stated she received some information on training programs available to the Planning Commission members which she made available to the other Planning Commission members to review.

Mr. Fried thanked the Board of Supervisors for appointing him to the Planning Commission and stated he appreciates their trust and confidence in him. He stated he will do his best to represent the interests of the citizens of the Township.

There being no further business, Ms. Friedman moved, Mr. Dickson seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dean Dickson, Secretary