

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES – JUNE 9, 2008

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on June 9, 2008. Chairman Bush called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

Those present:

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

Others: Nancy Frick, Director Zoning, Inspection & Planning
 John Donaghy, Township Solicitor
 James Majewski, Township Engineer
 Steve Santarsiero, Supervisor Liaison (joined meeting in
 progress)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Pazdera moved, Ms. Friedman seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of March 24, 2008 as written.

Mr. Pazdera moved, Mr. Dickson seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of April 14, 2008 as corrected.

CAPSTONE TERRACE – PRELIMINARY PLAN RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL

Mr. Jeff Garton, attorney, Mr. Eric Garton, engineer, and Mr. Bob Riviezzo were present. Mr. Jeff Garton asked Mr. Eric Garton to review the changes made to the Plan since the last review. Mr. Eric Garton stated at the last meeting they discussed making the parking aisles come in more perpendicular so that there would be better sight lines. He showed on the plan where changes have been made in this regard. He noted an area on the Plan where they flipped parking stalls and made it one-way to improve the circulation. He noted an area where they added a landscaped parking island to help channelize flow. They also added the bikepath along the frontage and will extend it to the intersection with Stony Hill Road and down to the common property line with the Prickett property. He stated they did meet with PennDOT and will increase the incoming radius as noted on the Plan and will provide a full “pork chop”. Left turns from Stony Hill Road will be prohibited at this location.

The 6/3/08 CMX review letter was noted, and Mr. Jeff Garton noted the letter outlines the Waivers being requested. He stated they will not need the Waiver regarding street trees shown as Item E and will comply. With regard to Item F they will discuss with the Township engineer where trees can be located to make sure they are placed appropriately.

Item H was noted with regard to topsoil, and Mr. Garton stated there will be excess topsoil, and they would be willing to work with the Township on how to dispose of this. Mr. Majewski asked if they have had discussions with local farmers about this, and Mr. Garton stated while they have not, they would be willing to discuss this with the Township for use of the topsoil at Patterson Farm or with the owners of Shady Brook Farm. Ms. Friedman asked if the Environmental Advisory Council made any recommendation about this, and Mr. Garton stated they have not.

Mr. Garton stated most of the remaining items in the CMX letter are engineering issues. He noted particularly Item 9A which deals with planting details for the entry court and stated they cannot supply this yet because the final lay out of the building has not yet been determined. He stated they would be willing to provide this as part of the Building Permit Application. He stated they do not feel this is a requirement of the Ordinance but are willing to cooperate when the time comes.

Mr. Garton noted Captain Roche's letter, and stated they did incorporate that design into their Plans, and they will comply with his letter dated 4/4/08. He stated they will comply with the letter from Jim Yates dated 4/13/08, the TPD letter, and the Remington, Vernick & Beach letter. He stated they previously discussed with the Planning Commission the Bucks County Planning Commission review letter. He stated the Bucks County Conservation District has granted approval. They will comply with the Birdsall Engineering letter and the letter from the Disabled Persons Advisory Board dated 12/10/07.

Ms. Friedman noted Item #4 in the CMX letter regarding reserve parking spaces. She asked if they will exceed impervious surface percentages in the future if these are installed, and Mr. Majewski stated the Plans already account for those additional spaces, and the stormwater management facilities are sized to handle these additional spaces. He added that based on past experience with other office parks, they do not feel the spaces will be needed unless they get special tenants that would require heavy parking.

Mr. Dickson stated when looking at this area of the Township as a whole, he is concerned that they are adding over 700 potential commuters at rush hour to an area that is already overtaxed. He stated the Planning Commission's mission is to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the Township; and he has major concerns with the traffic noting the possibility of the hospital which is still unresolved. Mr. Garton stated the Applicant did submit a traffic study and the TPD letter did address this. Mr. Dickson stated he did not feel it addressed the number of cars at rush hour, and Mr. Garton stated it did. He stated

the Applicant is also prepared to install, at their expense, a traffic light across from Shady Brook Farm once the warrants are met. He stated they are also making an approximately \$500,000 contribution for traffic impact fees. Mr. Bush stated at the time the traffic study was done, the hospital, Edgewood Village, and the expansion of Floral Vale were not contemplated; and Mr. Garton stated the additional Floral Vale traffic would add to the warrants so that hopefully a traffic light could be installed. He stated the hospital is something over which they have no control and about which they have no data. He stated he feels the proposed hospital facility would have a much greater impact than the Capstone project will have. Mr. Majewski stated PennDOT is aware of all of these projects, and they have indicated that they want to look at the area as a whole. He stated PennDOT recently met with the Township and the consultants for the developers of Edgewood Village and Floral Vale and the hospital has made some preliminary inquiries. Mr. Garton stated they will need a Highway Occupancy Permit from PennDOT.

Ms. Friedman asked if the proposed traffic light is far enough away from the existing traffic light; and Mr. Eric Garton stated they did meet with PennDOT on this and there would be sufficient distance between the lights if the timing was set correctly. Mr. Garton agreed to get something in writing about the proposed traffic light from PennDOT.

Mr. Dickson moved, Ms. Friedman seconded and it was unanimously carried to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the Preliminary Plan dated 11/16/07, last revised 3/28/08 subject to compliance with the CMX letter dated 6/3/08 noting that the issue noted under Waiver H will be deferred; subject to compliance with the letter from the Disabled Persons Advisory Board dated 12/10/07, the Birdsall Engineering letter dated 4/14/008, the TPD letter dated 5/2/08, the letter from Captain Roche dated 4/4/08, the Bucks County Conservation District letter dated 3/20/08, the Jim Yates letter dated 4/13/08, and the Remington Vernick & Beach letter dated 4/14/08. It was noted the Planning Commission is in favor of the Waivers requested noting that Item E has been eliminated.

Mr. Santarsiero joined the meeting at this time.

ZONING HEARING BOARD APPEAL #08-1476 – MAKEFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, MAKEFIELD ROAD – MOTION ON REQUEST FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION

Joseph Bagley, attorney, Jason Kliwinski, architect, Francis Guzik, engineer, and Mr. Tom Gillette were present on behalf of the School District. Ms. Frick stated the Application before the Zoning Hearing Board includes a Special Exception which is why it is before the Planning Commission for a recommendation. She stated the public was not notified about the meeting this evening, but they will be notified of the Zoning

Hearing Board date. Mr. Bagley stated they are going before the Zoning Hearing Board for a Special Exception for a public school use in the Residential District. Certain renovations and additions are proposed, and the School District made a prior presentation to the Planning Commission. He stated they are also seeking Variances for deviation from the maximum impervious coverage ratio and for landscape buffers.

Mr. Bagley provided this evening a revised Project Summary dated 6/9/08 which has changed from the previous Summary based on input received by the School District. Mr. Gillette was asked to explain the overall project purposes in light of this hand-out. Mr. Gillette stated in 2001, the Pennsbury School Board made a commitment to upgrade the District facilities. At that time they put together a priority list of buildings based on the age and condition of the building and whether or not it was air-conditioned. Starting in that year they did a major renovation and addition project at Quarry Hill Elementary School including a six-classroom addition. The following year they did projects at Manor and Penn Valley Elementary Schools which included new media centers. They also did a major renovation at Pennsbury High School West Campus which included a 55,000 square foot addition which was primarily twenty-two science classrooms, new administrative offices, and a nurse's suite. The following year renovations were done at Walt Disney Elementary School which included an addition for a library. Currently they are under construction with renovations at the Oxford Valley Elementary School which includes a new library. He stated the primary focus of the building renovations is to upgrade the existing facilities so that they will be viable schools for the next thirty to forty years. He stated when they looked at the renovations for upgrades of systems, they also looked at the current educational programs and where they see the District going in the future and they looked to see if there were physical changes needed to meet the current and future academic programs.

Mr. Gillette stated when they did the feasibility study for the Makefield Elementary School project, it became obvious that the existing cafeteria and library were undersized. He stated they also looked at the programs and wanted computer and instrumental music to have their own locations. He stated the Plan which was presented included the addition of a new cafeteria and kitchen and reclaiming space in the lower level for a media center and music.

Mr. Bagley asked about the proposed location of the cafeteria in terms of the footprint of the overall building. Mr. Gillette stated the proposed cafeteria will be in the middle of the building rather than being at the far end so that it is more accessible as a cafeteria and for special assemblies.

Mr. Bagley asked how the renovation project will address heightened security needs. Mr. Gillette stated currently there are three access points in the building – one in the rear of the building, one at the side of the building, and one in the front. Currently they lock all the entrances except for the front entrance during the day which creates problems

since there is no parking in the front. As part of the renovation, they will include visitor spaces in the front of the building and that will be the only access used during the day.

Mr. Bagley asked if there are changes being made to windows and energy efficiency, and Mr. Gillette stated they have directed the architect to insure that the building will be LEED Certified Silver at a minimum, although they would like to get Gold Certification if possible. They are replacing windows with more energy-efficient windows and including high-efficiently boilers to greatly improve the efficiency of the building.

Mr. Bagley asked if the building currently has central air conditioning; and Mr. Gillette stated it does not, and the only areas in the buildings that are air conditioned currently are the library, the main office, the nurse's suite, and a few of the classrooms where there are student issues such that it is medically required that they have air conditioning. The School did have to dismiss early today because of the high heat. After the renovations, the School will have central air conditioning.

Mr. Bagley asked about the underground storage tanks, and Mr. Gillette stated the underground heating oil tank will be removed as part of the renovations. He stated currently the School is dual-fuel capable, and they can burn either oil or natural gas and after the renovations, they will be strictly natural gas.

Mr. Bagley asked if there will be an update of the handicap accessibility after the renovations, and Mr. Gillette stated this is included in the renovations.

Mr. Bush stated when they were last before the Planning Commission they indicated that they would convert the existing cafeteria into four classrooms, and Mr. Gillette stated it will be converted into three classrooms. Mr. Bagley asked if there are existing classrooms which have been taken up with other School District program needs such as Special Education; and Mr. Bagley stated there are several classrooms that have been partitioned for Special Education programs, reading specialists, and Advanced Math Placement and can no longer be used as general classrooms because they had to be converted to meet mandated programs. Mr. Bagley asked if this is why the School District is re-capturing the three additional classrooms in the existing cafeteria space, and Mr. Gillette agreed.

Mr. Kliwinski stated currently the building is a U-shaped building. He showed a rendering of the cafeteria addition which will be in the center of the building which is currently part of the courtyard. Currently they need five lunches to serve the School population as it is undersized. The intent is to enlarge the cafeteria to properly serve the School with three lunches which is the standard and to provide a new kitchen facility. They will also provide ADA access to the lower level of the building where they are recapturing space for the media center and music room. As part of this addition there is an elevator and a stair tower to make the space ADA accessible. He stated the existing

cafeteria is not currently ADA accessible; and with the new location, it will be ADA accessible. He stated currently large School performances and other large group activities have to take place in the existing gym so they cannot currently rehearse properly unless they cut out the gym program so the intent is that the cafeteria will have a small platform area so that it can provide additional rehearsal space so that it will not interfere with the instructional time in the gym.

Mr. Kliwinski stated he has designed a number of LEED projects, and they wanted to offset the footprint of the addition from a stormwater perspective. He stated they have proposed a green roof on the cafeteria even though it is a pitched roof. He stated it is a shallow-depth, planted surface that sits on top of the new roof structure and is designed to absorb the one-year storm. In addition, they will use permeable pavement to offset the footprint of the addition. Additional information on the roof system has been provided in the revised submission, and Mr. Kliwinski stated it is a pre-engineered system that comes in a series of trays that interlock and sit on the roof. It is three to six inches deep depending on the final manufacture they choose. The plant media used is a shallow-depth hardy plant that once established does not require regular maintenance. In addition to helping with stormwater management, it will also keep the roof of the cafeteria cooler when it is hot.

Mr. Kliwinski stated where the cafeteria is proposed to be constructed there is some existing playground/courtyard area which will be relocated as part of the project. He noted the area where some play equipment will be moved. He stated this is also a safety issue as children currently have to cross drive/parking areas to get to some of the playground equipment; and the design permits them to come out of the cafeteria and not have to cross any parking to get to the play areas.

Mr. Kliwinski noted the existing parking lot on West School Lane and stated this has been a problem as to traffic and access to the building. He stated because they are moving the media center to the lower level, they propose a sunken courtyard in this area ramped down from the sidewalk which will result in an ADA-accessible entrance into the lower level. He stated this will also become an outdoor reading area and it allows them to install larger windows to the media center. He stated currently the lower level is essentially storage. It is unfinished with a concrete floor, exposed wood beams, and stone walls. There were also moisture problems; and as part of the project, they will correct the stormwater leaders and the water in the area to take care of the moisture issues. They will install state-of-the art air conditioning, ventilation, and de-humidification systems, as well as new lighting and finishes to take this unfinished space and make a state-of-the art media center. He stated as part of the installation of the courtyard space, they will be able to access the underground pipes which they feel are broken. Mr. Kliwinski noted how the building will be connected following the renovations as portions of the building do not currently connect.

Mr. Kliwinski stated the LEED Certification is done by the U.S. Green Building Council. He stated one of the major components of the project and one of the most substantial costs is the upgrade of the mechanical systems of the School and improving energy efficiency. The kinds of materials they will use will also contribute to LEED Certification.

Mr. Guzik stated they will remove the existing parking lot located on the north side of the building where the media center courtyard access is proposed to be located. Those stalls will be replaced by a minor expansion to the existing bus parking driveway bordering Makefield Road. The existing parking lot on West School Lane will be revised as it currently shares minor parking, recreation space, and classroom line-up space for fire drills. Those uses will be relocated to a new basketball court being constructed south of the parking lot, and the entirety of the existing parking lot will be renovated to provide for angled parking and will provide, between that parking lot and the Makefield Road parking lot, the total number of parking spaces required by Ordinance. The new parking stalls along Makefield Road are proposed to be made of porous pavement, and additionally thirty stalls in the West School Lane parking lot will also be porous pavement. They are proposing to offset the overall net increase of impervious created by the project as a composite by taking the area of the porous parking and the area of the green roof to be at or slightly above the net increase in impervious they are creating.

Mr. Bagley stated another security aspect is to move some of the existing play areas away from parking areas, and Mr. Guzik agreed and stated they wanted to get this out of the active traffic areas.

Mr. Bagley asked if there are other areas of porous paving proposed by the School District to be determined based on the outcome of the bid, and Mr. Guzik agreed there are. He stated in the initial Land Use Application, they had proposed that all of the stalls within the West School Lane parking lot would be porous pavement; but due to some of the other additions to the project scope, they did a budget analysis and found that they probably will not be able to afford the entirety of this. They have agreed to include those in an alternate bid package as part of the overall project. He stated since the Township cannot approve this, they have proposed the minimum needed for the offset, but are willing to bid out those additional stalls as porous paving as well. The School District will put out an alternate bid per unit price and depending on the price they get, they may be able to do additional porous paving stalls.

Mr. Bagley asked about additional parking on the Makefield Road side, and Mr. Guzik stated on Makefield Road, they are proposing sixteen additional angled parking stalls. From the edge of the driveway, they are proposing the entirety of those spaces to be porous asphalt under laid with a clean-stone bed system and this will in turn discharge into a renovated detention basin that is currently in the front of the School and not

functioning well. This will be converted to a rain garden stormwater management system. They have also done extensive soil testing on the site, and found some well-percolating underlying soils where they will propose an infiltration trench through the center of the basin so that they can retain the run off generated from the bus driveway and the porous stalls for the one and two year storms, and will re-percolate this back down to the groundwater table.

Mr. Bagley asked for an explanation of a rain garden, and Mr. Guzik stated it is a soil replacement system which is a special mix of topsoil, sand, and composted leaf mulch. Extensive landscaping is proposed within that as well so it is a maintenance-free feature and a potential wildlife habitat for insects and birds. The rain garden is a water-quality feature and combined with the infiltration trench proposed, it will increase ground water recharge that occurs on site by getting water back into the groundwater table rather than sending it down the road to the adjoining properties.

Mr. Guzik stated he feels the stormwater management will be better after construction particularly for the more frequent, smaller duration storm events; and they will be able to keep the lower storms on site. Currently there is a concrete low-flow channel similar to a narrow sidewalk at the bottom of the basin which funnels stormwater entering the basin down to the existing outlet structure and a pipe then discharges directly to the side of the road. There will be an increase of water created by the improvements proposed, but that increase will be mitigated by the design of the rain garden basin.

Mr. Bagley asked for a description of the existing landscape buffer, and Mr. Guzik stated the only part of the property that partially complies with the Landscape Buffer Ordinance is the southeast portion of the property where there are a number of larger trees. Much of the other incidental buffering is due to plants located on the adjacent property owners' properties. He stated the existing building roof line does provide a great deal of buffering as do the larger shade trees on the southern property line. Supplemental plantings proposed were shown on the Plan along with the required buffer. He stated there is one property to the southwest corner, Parcel #151, which does have an existing six foot high fence, and they are looking for relief from planting the buffer along that property line.

There was discussion on the impervious surface, and Mr. Guzik stated existing impervious surface is 30.8%, and the proposed is 34.6%. If the porous pavement and green roof were counted as pervious, there would be no increase in impervious surface.

Mr. Bush stated at the 3/24/08 meeting, the Planning Commission was told that the primary purpose for the addition and the project were space issues and classroom size reduction. He stated he has had discussion with a School Board member who advised that any reduction in classroom size if the project proceeds as proposed, would be incidental and short lived; and that this is really a renovation project. Mr. Bush asked what is the purpose of the project. Mr. Gillette stated initially it started as a renovation

project, and this is the primary purpose. Mr. Bush asked if they envision this as reducing classroom size at all, and Mr. Gillette stated he does not. Mr. Bush stated when they were present previously they discussed that classroom size was going to be reduced; and the Planning Commission members left with the impression that this was the emphasis of the project, and that the renovation was secondary. Mr. Gillette stated he feels Mr. Kliwinski mentioned a reduction in classroom size, and Mr. Gillette stated he went back and tried to explain the reason why they were doing the project. He stated he felt at that time Mr. Bush was asking him why they were doing the project at this School.

Mr. Bush stated his question had been what other alternatives had they considered, adding that this particular property is a lot smaller than the other four elementary schools to which the Township sends students and possibly less suited to handle an addition of this size based on space limitations; and he had asked Mr. Gillette if they had considered any other sites or any other options such as modulars; and the answer was “no.” Mr. Gillette stated this is correct. He stated he must have misunderstood the question as the primary reason for the project was not to do an addition but to do a renovation of the School. He stated he probably had difficulty understanding Mr. Bush’s question.

Ms. Friedman stated while she is in favor of the renovations proposed, she questions why modulars were never considered for meeting the need for extra space adding that most of the Schools that have gone through this extent of renovation have had modulars on the property for some time. Mr. Gillette stated in order to get reimbursement from the State for the renovation of the School, they cannot include modulars as part of the project. Ms. Friedman asked how much reimbursement the State is giving for this project, and Mr. Gillette stated he believes it is about 24%, and if they get the LEED Certification, it will increase.

Ms. Friedman asked why there is no sprinkler system in the School and asked if there are sprinkler systems in the other Schools. Mr. Gillette stated at the time the School was built, it was not required by Code. He stated in some of their renovations, depending on how the building is constructed, they have sprinkler systems in a portion of the building.

Ms. Friedman stated the proposed impervious surface increase is approximately 3.08%, and she asked what this relates to in terms of acreage. Mr. Guzik stated the net increase is 15,600 square feet which is approximately one-third of an acre.

Ms. Friedman asked if they will be going through the reason for each of the Waivers requested, and it was noted they will not be doing so this evening. Mr. Donaghy stated the only thing they are present for this evening is an advisory opinion to the Zoning Hearing Board with regard to the Special Exception limited to the use of the building. Mr. Bagley stated at some point in the future, the School District will come back before the Planning Commission on the Land Development Application.

Ms. Friedman stated at the last meeting Mr. Kliwinski indicated studies were done on numerous options and she asked if they have these available for the Planning Commission to look at. Mr. Kliwinski stated there were a number of studies done, and they could provide these to the Planning Commission. Ms. Friedman asked if they considered only expanding and renovating the cafeteria at its current location as opposed to building an entire new cafeteria. Mr. Gillette stated this was considered. Mr. Bush asked the price of this option, and Mr. Gillette stated this would be in the Feasibility Study which they could provide.

Mr. Dickson asked if there is a log-range enrollment study for the District ten to forty years out; and as part of that does it include projected building utilization and potential closing of existing buildings. Mr. Gillette stated their enrollment projects only go out ten years. He stated their five year projections are solid, but when you get to ten years, it is difficult to anticipate. He stated the ten year projections are being updated now and will be done in a few weeks. Mr. Dickson stated it is obvious that Lower Makefield is close to build out, and the Pennsbury School District should not experience the growth that it has in the last thirty years. He stated he recognizes that Makefield was built in 1937, and they hope to be able to use the building for the next thirty to forty years. He would like to see what they are looking at demographically thirty to forty years in the future. Mr. Gillette stated they do not do projections out that far.

Mr. Bush asked the last time the building was renovated, and Mr. Gillette stated a major classroom addition was built in 1954, and four classrooms were added in 1994 but this did not include renovation of the existing building.

Mr. Pazdera asked what they would eliminate if the bids come in substantially over the Budget projections. Mr. Gillette stated they would have to go back to the architect and review what could be done. He stated they would probably re-bid the project. Mr. Pazdera stated his concern is that the first thing they would eliminate would be the green roof, and Mr. Gillette stated he does not feel this is necessarily true, and the District has directed the architect to provide a LEED Silver minimum building. He stated the architect is continually doing Budget updates as part of the planning process. Mr. Kliwinski stated they would not want to eliminate the infrastructure improvements or any of the green features of the project particularly if approval were based on impervious coverage for which the green roof is a major contributor. He stated they could look at the number of light fixtures, different finishes, windows, etc. He stated they are also seeing more favorable bidding currently because development has slowed down.

Mr. Santarsiero stated he appreciates the fact that they are attempting to do something in keeping with the environmental Ordinances enacted in the Township in the last few years and the Township's preference toward green building and low impact development. He stated he would urge the Zoning Hearing Board to the extent that they would grant relief that it be granted with the condition that they include the green roof and other features

that will minimize the loss of the impervious surface. He stated he understands that the School District looks at population projections only on a ten-year period, and he is not sure that they can do it with any degree of certainty beyond that, but if there is some discussion already about the possibility that the population of school children who will be going to Makefield will in the not too distant future exceed the space, the School District may wish to consider whether this is not also the time to expand classrooms there so that the children will not have to be torn away from their school because the school cannot meet the capacity needed. He stated there are other sites in the Township where the School District owns property where building might be more appropriate. He stated if they are undertaking a project at Makefield, they should address all the problems on a going-forward basis even if the farthest they can look is ten years in the future. Mr. Bush stated this plan adds four classrooms, and Mr. Gillette agreed. Mr. Santarsiero stated he understands that Mr. Bush had a conversation with a School Board member who indicated that even with the gain in classrooms, there may still be a space problem at Makefield in the not too distant future. Mr. Bush stated Howard Goldberg advised him that it would be “short-lived and incidental.”

Dr. Paul Long stated he is CEO of Pennsbury, and the explanation Mr. Gillette provided about the purpose of the construction is accurate. He stated when they add capacity for four classrooms this will equal an additional 100 students for the School; and they will see an initial increase in the School that would allow for growth. He stated their projections show that this will fill up over the next few years, and they will update this again as part of the construction planning process and then again in September at the beginning of their School year as they usually do. He stated the data they have from the last time this was done which was September, 2007, shows that in three to four years, they will have that capacity filled in the School. Mr. Santarsiero stated this is his concern, and he would not want to be in a situation two to three years from now where the School District is in the position that they have to consider re-Districting because the School cannot meet the needs of the community that currently is Districted for that Elementary School. Mr. Long stated they will see in the feasibility study that they looked at options that included as many as eight to ten new classroom in the School and realized that the tract would not support that kind of addition so this was admittedly a compromise as to what they could use in terms of fortuitous reclamation of space in the basement and to build what they needed in an unobtrusive point of the footprint with the cafeteria.

Mr. Santarsiero asked if they considered building up or did the issue of parking preclude this. Mr. Gillette stated they did look at building up over the cafeteria and it increased the cost from \$13 million to \$19 million. Mr. Kliwinski stated they would have had to re-build the entire first floor so it was cost prohibitive.

Mr. Bush asked by when they need to make a recommendation to the Zoning Hearing Board, and Mr. Donaghy stated it must be made thirty days from today. Mr. Bush stated he would like to see the feasibility studies before making a recommendation to the

Zoning Hearing Board. Ms. Frick stated this matter is scheduled to go before the Zoning Hearing Board on June 17, 2008. Ms. Friedman stated what she has been provided indicates it is a Special Exception for an expansion of a public school building, and this evening they have indicated it is a renovation so she feels it conflicts with her concept of what they are doing, and she does not feel she has enough information to favor an expansion. Mr. Bagley stated technically they are expanding a school use as the building is being used as a school and an addition is being added onto it. He stated this is why they have applied for a Special Exception. Mr. Donaghy stated an argument could be made that they do not need a Special Exception but the School District felt it was safer, due to a recent Township case, to request the Special Exception. Mr. Donaghy stated this only applies, if at all, to the expansion because it is already an existing school building. He stated the only issue before the Planning Commission now is whether they are willing to give an advisory opinion to the Zoning Hearing Board as to the requested Special Exception which relates to the expansion. Ms. Friedman stated if she had been provided the feasibility study and information on the other options that were considered, she may have a different opinion as to how much expansion she would feel would be appropriate to recommend. She asked if the Planning Commission recommends approval of the Plan tonight is the Planning Commission committed to what is being shown on the Plan presented. Mr. Donaghy stated when the Zoning Hearing Board makes a determination, they will most likely put parameters on any approval. He stated since this is the Plan before the Zoning Hearing Board, he assumes that any approval for expansion would be based on the request submitted.

Mr. Kliwinski stated to meet the needs of the School with the renovation and reclaiming of space, and adequate space for programs, all of the options considered required some kind of addition. Ms. Friedman stated she questions if one of the other options could have been something the Planning Commission would have been more comfortable with and might want to recommend aside from the Plan they have been presented. Mr. Donaghy stated this is the only Plan that is before the Township. He stated they could make a recommendation that they should expand more or less than what is shown.

Mr. Santarsiero asked the timetable for the project. Mr. Gillette stated their initial schedule was to go out to bid in the summer, but realistically they have pushed this back to bidding in the early fall with an expectation that construction would begin the beginning of March. He anticipates it would be a fifteen month phased project. Mr. Santarsiero stated he would like to see the renovations take place quickly, although he does have the concern that in the next five to six years, the School will not be able to meet the capacity needs.

After further review, Mr. Donaghy stated the thirty-day review time started at the time of the receipt of the Application and not from this evening.

Mr. Bush asked the percentage increase from the current structure to what is proposed, and Mr. Kliwinski stated the structure increase is approximately 10,000 and the existing structure is 50,000 square feet.

Mr. Ethan Shiller, 367 Lang Court, asked for latitude with his remarks. He stated the Planning Commission is providing an advisory opinion to the Zoning Hearing Board on providing relief for specific exemptions to Variances; and Mr. Donaghy stated this is incorrect. Mr. Donaghy stated while the Zoning Hearing Board will be reviewing the Variance issues, the only purpose of the advisory opinion from the Planning Commission relates to the Special Exception for the expansion of the use. He stated if relief is granted, the Application will have to come back to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for approval of the Land Development Plan. Mr. Shiller offered extensive comments regarding his concerns with planning and budgeting by the School Board.

Mr. Bush advised Mr. Shiller that while he is raising a lot of good points, they are not appropriate for this evening's discussion and may be more appropriate for a School Board meeting. He stated the sole issue before the Planning Commission is the request for an advisory opinion to the Zoning Hearing Board on the Special Exception for expansion of a public school; and the issues Mr. Shiller is raising go well beyond that and his questions should be focused on the Special Exception.. Mr. Bagley stated while Mr. Shiller's observations may be appropriate for a School Board meeting, he does not feel he is addressing the Application that is before the Planning Commission. Mr. Bush agreed and suggested that Mr. Shiller come back before the Planning Commission if and when the Applicant comes back for approval of the Land Development Plans as opposed to the specific Application this evening. He stated they would be interested in listening to his comments addressing specifically this request for an opinion on the Special Exception of the public school building. He stated the other option would be to attend a School Board meeting. Mr. Shiller stated this is why he asked for latitude as he feels it is incumbent upon the Planning Commission to pursue the right questions and right answers; and he therefore wanted to shed light on these issues even though it might be too early in the process.

Ms. Friedman stated she has similar concerns but understands that they have to focus on the question at hand. She stated she understands Mr. Shiller is discussing doing a more region-wide evaluation of the Schools to find out if this works or not; and she feels they would have some fair direction if they saw the feasibility study because there will be some good questions answered within that feasibility study. She stated she feels Makefield School to some extent can stand alone apart from the whole District with certain issues. She stated she needs to identify those issues before she can give advisory permission to go ahead. Ms. Friedman asked if they need to make a recommendation this evening; and Mr. Donaghy stated the date of submission to the Township was May 9, so the Planning Commission will have to issue an opinion this evening; and if they do not, the Zoning Hearing Board could deem that the Planning Commission has approved it.

A short recess was taken at this time. The meeting was reconvened at 9:30 p.m.

Ms. Friedman moved, Mr. Dickson seconded and it was unanimously carried to advise the Zoning Hearing Board that the Planning Commission was unable to give full support and approval of the Special Exception 200.20.B(5) without review of available alternative options due to the limited size and adequacy of the site area and due to the lack of a provision of a feasibility study warranting the actual size of the proposed renovation and expansion. Ultimately the Planning Commission has concerns regarding size of expansion and renovation of the project and its relation to the needs and growth pattern of the Pennsbury School District.

Mr. Dickson stated if the Zoning Hearing Board wants someone from the Planning Commission to attend their meeting, he would be willing to go.

Mr. Bagley asked if the need for the feasibility study has been eliminated, and Mr. Bush stated the Planning Commission would still like to see it. Mr. Donaghy stated the School District will have to come back to the Planning Commission for Land Development Approval so he would suggest that they submit a copy of the Feasibility Study to the Planning Commission for their future reference. Ms. Friedman stated she would like to review it prior to the time they come back before the Planning Commission. Ms. Frick stated she feels the Board of Supervisors would also like to review it.

APPOINTMENT OF SECRETARY

Mr. Dickson noted there is a vacancy on the Planning Commission and a need to appoint a Secretary. Mr. Dickson agreed to serve. Mr. Dickson moved and Mr. Bush seconded to appoint Mr. Dickson as Secretary. Motion carried with Mr. Dickson abstained.

There being no further business, Mr. Dickson moved, Mr. Pazdera seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dean Dickson, Secretary