

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES – FEBRUARY 22, 2010

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on February 22, 2010. Ms. Friedman called the meeting to order at 7:40 p.m.

Those present:

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

Others: Nancy Frick, Director Zoning, Inspection, & Planning  
Maureen Carlton, Township Solicitor  
James Majewski, Township Engineer  
Dan McLaughlin, Supervisor Liaison

Absent: Mark Fried, Planning Commission Vice Chairman

REORGANIZATION: ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The meeting was turned over to Maureen Carlton who called for nominations for Election of Chairman of the Planning Commission for 2010. Mr. Dickson moved, Mr. Bush seconded and it was unanimously carried to elect John Pazdera as Chairman of the Planning Commission for 2010.

The meeting was turned over to Mr. Pazdera who thanked Ms. Friedman for serving as Chair for 2009 and welcomed Mr. McLaughlin as the Supervisor Liaison for 2010.

Mr. Pazdera asked for nominations for Vice Chair of the Planning Commission for 2010. Ms. Friedman moved, Mr. Bush seconded and it was unanimously carried to elect Mark Fried as Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission for 2010.

Mr. Pazdera asked for nominations for Secretary of the Planning Commission for 2010. Mr. Bush moved, Ms. Friedman seconded and it was unanimously carried to elect Dean Dickson as Secretary of the Planning Commission for 2010.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Friedman moved and Mr. Bush seconded to approve the Minutes of October 26, 2009 as written. Motion carried with Mr. Dickson abstained.

Ms. Friedman moved, Mr. Dickson seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of November 23, 2009 as corrected.

## #602 – EDGEWOOD CROSSING – LOT CONSOLIDATION & LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DISCUSSION

Edward Murphy, attorney, was present with C.T. Troilo, and Kurt Rittler, the project architect. Mr. Murphy stated this is a consolidation of two separate tax parcels immediately adjacent to one another which results in 2 ¼ acres and is zoned H/C (Historic Commercial) and is also within the TND (Traditional Neighborhood Design) Overlay. The Plan for the parcel takes advantage of the TND Overlay.

Mr. Murphy stated they had submitted one set of Preliminary Plans, and there were reviews for that Plan; after which they submitted a revised Plan, and they have now received review letters on this amended Plan.

Mr. Rittler showed a copy of the Plan and stated there is one parcel at the intersection of Langhorne-Yardley Road and Stony Hill Road which consists of three existing structures. One is an historic structure located on the corner, behind it is an existing barn, and adjacent to that is a small garage which is in the process of falling down. The second parcel is between this parcel and the existing day care center on Stony Hill Road and it is currently vacant. He stated the Plans calls for the restoration and reuse of the existing two-story dwelling on the corner, and the uses proposed for this are retail on the ground floor in the form of a sandwich shop/deli; and the second floor will be an apartment. The barn will be taken down and reconstructed in a slightly new location and expanded. This will serve as an ice-cream shop on a seasonal basis. Mr. Rittler stated there are two new buildings proposed for the vacant piece of ground – a one-story, approximately 3,000 square foot branch bank and a two-story building with the first floor proposed to be most likely retail and the second floor most likely office although they are trying to maintain some flexibility with that building so that it may be another mix of uses. He stated it will be retail, office, and perhaps an apartment on the second floor depending on how the property can be marketed.

Mr. Rittler stated they propose approximately seventy-five parking spaces, and at this time they are showing three on-street parking spaces along Stony Hill Road with the remainder of the parking stalls on site. Mr. Rittler stated the branch bank will have two drive-through windows. He stated their stormwater management system is proposed to be 100% underground at a location he noted on the Plan in the corner of the property. He stated their calculations show that they can take all of the proposed run off from the impervious surface of the site as well as some of the other pervious areas and totally recharge that into the ground.

Mr. Rittler stated they have shown on this Plan a portion of the Flowers Field project across the street so that it is possible to see the relationship between these two projects. He stated with regard to the Flowers Field project they have proposed on-street parking on the far side.

Mr. Rittler stated the only driveway on the Stony Hill Road side will be immediately adjacent to the driveway for the existing day care facility. Mr. Ritter stated they propose to maintain a small one-way access off of Yardley-Langhorne Road which is the current driveway to the existing building, and they are proposing two new site driveways – one will be in-only between the Buildings 2 and 3 which is the ice cream shop and the bank and a second driveway which will be for egress only on the far side of the bank.

Mr. Murphy stated they have received a series of review letters. He noted the Remington & Vernick letter dated 1/29/10 and stated Pages #3 to #4 list the Waivers being requested. Mr. Murphy stated the balance of the review letter includes some items they would like to discuss and the remainder they will comply with.

Mr. Murphy noted Item #2 on Page #4 and stated although they received a number of months ago a Variance from the Zoning Hearing Board to permit a 1' reduction in the parking setback from the right-of-way of Stony Hill Road, there is currently a pending Application before the Zoning Hearing Board that highlights the two items noted in paragraphs 2A and 2B on Page #4. He stated 2A involves seeking a reduction in the number of cars that are required to accommodate a drive-through window associated with the branch bank, and that relief is based on the recognition that today with modern banking practices much more is done from a remote location rather than in the bank so that the requirement for six cars to be queued up at the drive-through bank is probably excessive. Mr. Murphy stated 2B discusses the total number of parking spaces required and the number of parking spaces they are proposing. He stated both of these items are scheduled for a Hearing before the Zoning Hearing Board on March 2, 2010.

Mr. Murphy noted Item A.3 under Comments and stated this refers to whether or not there are historic structures on the property, and this focuses on the building on the corner of Langhorne-Yardley and Stony Hill Road. Mr. Murphy stated this building is going to be preserved and adaptedly reused, but the barn behind it will be dismantled and a new barn will be reconstructed and is shown on the Plan as Building #2. Mr. Murphy stated the Applicant has sought the removal of the barn building, and there is a pending Application before HARB. He stated HARB reviewed the initial Application on February 8 and chose to defer action on this until the following month.

Mr. Dickson stated in the original Plan they indicated that the barn would be moved, and now they are indicating that it may be demolished; and he asked if this is because of the condition of the barn. Mr. Rittler agreed and stated the barn's foundation is suspect. Mr. Dickson asked if they anticipate providing a structural analysis of the barn; and Mr. Rittler stated his firm has already evaluated the barn structurally, and they are preparing a report now for Mr. Troilo. Mr. Bush asked if they were to proceed with the demolition would they use any part of the existing structure when they build a new barn, and Mr. Rittler stated he is not sure. He stated some of the structural members are adequate for reuse. He stated the footprint of the proposed location of the barn is identical to the footprint of the existing barn so they hope to be able to reuse some of the material.

Mr. Murphy noted Item #4 on Page 5 and stated the Ordinance Section cited suggests the need to review vertical infrastructure to insure that the TND development is properly integrated and that items such as hedges, fences, walls, and benches should be evaluated and recommended to be incorporated into the Plan. Mr. Murphy stated Mr. Rittler has had discussions with the developer about this and is prepared to discuss this tonight.

Mr. Rittler distributed this evening booklets that identify specific site amenities which they are proposing. He stated with regard to the light fixtures, the Edgewood Village Design Guidelines have a specific light fixture identified; but in conversation with Mr. Majewski it has been determined that the light fixture identified is not optimal. He stated what they are showing on the Plans are the light fixtures shown on the first three sheets of the booklet presented this evening. These are single-headed and double-headed fixtures which are high-intensity discharge lamps on a steel pole with a fairly low mounting height. He stated these fixtures reduce the glare because the lamp is actually up in the "hat" of the fixture and it shines down and appears that the globe within the fixture is the light source. He stated this is shown in a night-time photograph which was included in the booklet. Mr. Majewski stated the guidelines in the Edgewood Village Design Guidelines show a fixture where you would see the source of the light; and when you have twenty to thirty lights spread out in a parking lot, he has received complaints from other locations where there is that type of light fixture; and he recommended that they investigate an alternative. He noted a location in Newtown where the type of fixture the developer is proposing can be seen.

Mr. Rittler stated they are also showing a photograph of the directory sign they are proposing which is similar to what is currently used at Heston Hall. He stated the directory sign would be placed fairly close to the entrance of the major ingress driveway off of Stony Hill Road.

Mr. Rittler stated the next photograph shows a bench. He stated they have one bench proposed in front of the bank, and this bench is the same as that which is designed in the Edgewood Village Design Guideline.

Mr. Rittler stated the next photo shows a picket fence and this also comes from the Edgewood Village Design Guideline, and they propose it to be done in painted wood. Ms. Joyce Bigley asked if those present could be provided a copy of the photographs, and a booklet was provided to her.

Mr. Pazdera asked where the fence would be located, and Mr. Rittler stated they are proposing it along the Stony Hill Road frontage on both sides of both driveways, in front of the bank, and also extending in front of the ice cream shop. They will not have a fence on the balance of the site around the corner. It will be from the ice cream shop to the property line with the day care facility.

Mr. Murphy noted Item #5 which discusses the need for visual screening of non-Residential parking areas, and Mr. Rittler showed on the Plan where they have proposed hedge material in front of the proposed fencing in front of the bank with the hedge material extending to the left. It is also proposed in front of the ice cream shop, and in front of the parking area between Buildings #1 and #2. Mr. Majewski had indicated that perhaps they could add some additional screening to help further screen the parking areas so they will add on the Final Plan some additional shrubbery as screening at locations Mr. Rittler showed on the Plan this evening which includes to the left of the egress driveway. He stated they have proposed primarily evergreen shrubbery for almost the entire frontage where there is not a driveway along Stony Hill Road.

Item #6 was noted, and Mr. Murphy stated Mr. Majewski has highlighted a particular Zoning Ordinance section which defines a “woodlands,” and Mr. Murphy stated he does not feel there is a sufficient area of trees that meet this definition on their site. Mr. Majewski has indicated that if they take the developer’s stand of trees and add it to the stand of trees on an adjacent parcel, that area does meet the ¼ acre or more definition. Mr. Murphy stated he does not feel the Ordinance applies to properties that are not subject of an Application, and their site does not meet this qualification. Mr. Majewski stated he does not feel it has an impact on the layout and they would still meet the requirements for Zoning using the definition of the woodlands. Mr. Majewski stated it appears that they will “agree to disagree.”

Item #7 was noted, and Mr. Murphy stated the Ordinance states that if you are not going to have all 10' by 20' parking spaces, it requires Board approval to reduce this. It would not require a Waiver or Variance, but the Board of Supervisors would have to approve this. Mr. Murphy stated over 20% of the spaces on the site are 10' by 20'. Mr. Rittler showed on the Plan where the 10' by 20' stalls were located adjacent to the Bank and Building #4 and stated they also have handicapped stalls behind Building #1 which are also 10' by 20'. He stated they have also located some 10' by 20' stalls adjacent to Building #4. He stated the balance are all 9' by 18'.

Mr. Murphy stated they will comply with Items #8 through #12.

With regard to Item #13, Mr. Murphy stated this incorporated comments from TPD, the Township's traffic consultant, as well as from Captain Roche. Mr. Murphy stated with regard to the TPD comments, they will comply; however, the comment made by Captain Roche is contrary to the TND approach since there are three on-street parking spaces located near the northernmost access point. Captain Roche in his review has indicated that this will be a traffic calming device because it will impact the flow of traffic. Mr. Murphy stated the TND approach is designed to slow the traffic down. Mr. Murphy stated the posted speed limit along that section of Stony Hill Road is 45 miles per hour, and the desired speed Mr. Majewski and TPD would recommend is 25 miles per hour. Mr. Murphy stated there will be parking across the street along the Flower's Field project as well, and he feels this will be an effective traffic-calming device since people cannot go that fast when there are cars maneuvering in and out of on-street parking spaces.

Mr. Rittler stated the TPD letter had discussed a traffic impact study. Mr. Murphy stated they have done a traffic impact study for Flower's Fields across the street but have not done a separate traffic study for this project. He stated they could revise the Flower's Fields traffic study to assess the impact of this project as it relates to Flower's Field and they are proposing to do this and supplement the Flower's Field traffic study to incorporate traffic from this project.

Item #14 was noted, and Mr. Rittler stated Mr. Majewski has asked them to review their total lighting concept with the intent of trying to reduce the number of fixtures and thereby reduce the total light spillage, and they will do this.

Mr. Murphy stated with regard to Item #15 regarding tree replacement, the Applicant would like to discuss this matter with the Board of Supervisors as they are requesting a partial Waiver.

Mr. Murphy stated they will comply with all remaining items in the review letter.

Waivers being requested were discussed. Mr. Rittler stated with regard to Waiver A, there is a requirement that existing features within 200' of the site to be shown on the Plans, and they are requesting a Waiver to accept the existing features they have shown on the Plan which are all the significant features. He stated they did not have room on the sheet to go out 200'. He stated in lieu of this they prepared an aerial photo and included that with the Plan set.

Waiver B was noted regarding the requirement for a transportation impact study; and Mr. Rittler stated as Mr. Murphy has indicated, the traffic study for the Flower's Field project can be annotated to include this project. He stated they do not expect a significant impact from the small amount of building square footage they are proposing.

Waiver C was noted regarding the requirement for pavement core samples, and Mr. Rittler stated both of the existing roads are State roads; and they are requesting a Waiver for having to core those roads. He stated PennDOT will advise them what they want for a paving section.

Waiver D was noted regarding the requirement for an Environmental Impact Assessment, and Mr. Ritter stated they are requesting a Waiver from this on the basis that the project is extremely small in scope and there are no protected natural resources on the site.

Waiver E was noted regarding the requirement for right-of-way widths of 100' to 120' on Stony Hill Road and 80' on Langhorne-Yardley; and they are asking for a Waiver from this requirement in favor of the rights-of-way recommended for the Edgewood Village area. He stated the imposition of the larger rights-of-way would necessitate removal of the existing historic structure and substantially diminish the viability of the balance of the site. Mr. Rittler stated their existing rights-of-way are such that they are about 22' to 32' off of the center line.

Ms. Friedman asked about the potential negative impact to the developer if they build the project as proposed and PennDOT then comes in and wants the right-of-way.

Mr. Majewski stated PennDOT does not have any plans to widen the road out to four lanes, and he does not foresee any other issues. Mr. Murphy stated in their discussions with PennDOT, they have indicated they would defer to the Municipality in this case where they are trying to implement a traditional neighborhood design, and the standard PennDOT right-of-way widths of 100' to 120' are clearly inconsistent with this.

Mr. Murphy stated the developer is trying to comply with the Township's specific standards that were designed to foster a TND project.

Waiver F was noted regarding the requirement for a 5' planting strip between the curb and the sidewalk. Mr. Rittler stated they are requesting a Waiver to permit the sidewalk to abut the curb because the available space is too small to provide both the required 7' sidewalk and the 5' planting strip particularly in the vicinity of the intersection of Stony Hill and Yardley-Langhorne Roads. He noted immediately behind the sidewalk there is green space which will be planted, and there is also proposed green space in front of the sidewalk at both ends of the on-street parking and a small portion to the west of the egress driveway.

Waiver G was noted regarding the requirement that all lighting comply with the Edgewood Village Design Guidelines, and they are requesting a Waiver to use the lighting fixture previously discussed this evening.

Waiver H was noted regarding the requirement for parking areas to be set back 5' from the right-of-way line. Mr. Rittler stated they received a Variance to go to 4' minimum at a small portion of the parking lot between Buildings #1 and #2. He stated the Subdivision Ordinance also has this requirement so they are requesting a Waiver.

Waiver I was noted regarding the requirement that street trees be located no more than 15' from the right-of-way line. Mr. Rittler stated there is a minimum setback dimension as well but this is not at issue. He stated they are requesting a Waiver to permit some of the required street trees to be planted more than 15' from the right-of-way. He stated the size and shape of the site and the existing historic building's driveways preclude strict conformance. He stated all but four of the trees will be placed toward the front of the site, and four of the trees will be planted to supplement the existing trees at the rear of the site. They will therefore be in compliance with seven of the thirteen trees within the 15' section. Mr. Rittler showed the location of the trees on the Plan.

Waiver J was noted regarding the requirement for public sewer facilities to the site if such facilities are within 1500'. Mr. Rittler stated the existing day care facility has a sanitary sewer grinder pump and force main which is routed through the back of the proposed site, across Yardley-Langhorne Road, across the Giant parking lot, and ties into the public sewer on the Giant site. Mr. Rittler stated they are proposing to collect their sanitary sewer on site and use the force main with their own grinder pump and use the line. He stated the existing sanitary sewer ends in front of the Grange Building on Edgewood Road which is quite a distance away. He stated the Flower's Field project planned for the extension of that sanitary sewer main up to the intersection and beyond on Yardley-Langhorne and also extending up Stony Hill Road. He stated this would be quite an expense to be covered under a project of the size of the Edgewood Crossing development; and since they have the force main available, they would like to use it for the time being. He stated when the gravity line goes in, they could alter the sewer arrangement to collect into the gravity lines.

Mr. Rittler stated there is an existing water line in Yardley-Langhorne Road, and they are tapping into it and routing it through the site to provide public water to the entire facility. He stated the Ordinance could be interpreted to have them extending the water main up Stony Hill Road to the limit of the site so that all unserved properties adjacent to them could pick up the public water. He stated routing that line in Stony Hill Road as opposed to on site would be extremely expensive, and it would be impossible to justify this based on the size of their project. He stated they are requesting a Waiver from this, adding that they are providing public water for their own site. He stated when the Flower's Field project goes through, there would be public water down both Stony Hill and Yardley-Langhorne Roads.

Mr. Murphy stated the only other issue is a partial Waiver regarding the required trees, and this needs to be discussed with the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Murphy stated they have received other review letters and Mr. Majewski has picked up the most important comments from all of those.

Mr. Pazdera noted the EAC letter which indicates they are recommending that the Waiver not be granted for the EIA. Mr. Murphy stated they will do this for Flowers Field; but since this site is small and there are no natural resources on the site, they feel it makes more sense to do it for Flowers Field. Ms. Friedman stated the EAC indicated they were waiting for some additional comments from the applicant. Mr. Pazdera stated they asked if the developer had received the Army Corps determination; and Mr. Rittler stated while they have not yet received the jurisdictional determination, they expect that to happen. Mr. Murphy stated they will provide a formal response to the EAC's 1/14/10 review letter in the near future.

Ms. Friedman stated Captain Roche indicated that parking on Stony Hill Road would be dangerous. Mr. Majewski stated he understands his concern and this has been his concern with the whole Edgewood Village concept, but added this is a key element of the concept. He stated this will be similar to Yardley Borough and Newtown Borough where you have on-street parking and you reduce the speed limit, although this is not typical in Lower Makefield. Mr. Majewski stated when they do the site across the street, there will be approximately twenty-five to thirty on-street spaces in the area. Mr. Majewski stated Captain Roche disagrees with the whole concept of on-street parking.

Ms. Friedman noted the memo from the Historic Commission who are very concerned with the Plan. Ms. Friedman stated previously there was discussion about a relocation of the barn, and this evening it was indicated that the barn is being dismantled. Ms. Friedman asked if the barn is historic. Mr. Murphy stated C.T. Troilo made his intentions known to HARB on February 8, and he does not feel that HARB was

comfortable with recommending removal of the barn. Ms. Friedman stated the Planning Commission has received no information from HARB. Mr. Murphy stated they submitted the formal Application to HARB, and they reviewed it at their meeting in February and continued the matter. He is not sure if they are going to make a recommendation at their next meeting. Mr. Murphy stated they did get a letter from the Historic Commission dated 1/13 and their response indicates the Historic Commission's ideas are inconsistent with the developer's Plans so it appears they are at an impasse.

Mr. Pazdera asked if any other lay-outs were looked at, and Mr. Murphy stated Mr. Rittler consider numerous lay-outs. Mr. Ritter stated early on before they prepared Plans to be submitted to the Township, they looked at various ways of generating yield on the site, parking, and ingress and egress. He stated it became clear that they did not want to combine driveways to be full-service out onto Stony Hill Road. He added that Stony Hill Road is the only road that they can access as there is no way they can get a full-service driveway out onto Yardley-Langhorne. Mr. Rittler stated because of the proposed use of a portion of the site for a bank with a drive-through, it became clear that the drive-through needed to be on the egress side; and they wanted to maintain the egress as far away from the intersection as possible. He stated those site constraints, which they have no control over, dictate that they have an ingress driveway and an egress driveway. Mr. Rittler stated with regard to the ingress driveway off of Yardley-Langhorne, it is an existing driveway; and they thought it made sense to get try to get whatever traffic might want to come onto the site that is approaching on Yardley-Langhorne, to get into the site before the intersection rather than make them go to the intersection. He stated he does not feel two access points and one egress point is overdoing it. He stated they have substantial sidewalk across the entire frontage of the site, and he does not feel there is a lot of flexibility.

Mr. Pazdera stated he feels what the Historic Commission is responding to is the fact that they have building-parking lot, building-parking lot, building-parking lot; and they were looking for street front; and if there was a way to fill in with buildings more toward the intersection area and eliminate one of the parking areas, they might be happier.

Mr. Pazdera stated with regard to the entrance drives, there is not a lot that can be done with the site; but there may be other ways of laying out the buildings to give the Historic Commission what they are looking for and still achieve what the Applicant needs.

Mr. Pazdera stated if the Planning Commission had seen some of the early sketches as an informal Sketch Plan, possibly they could have guided them in this direction.

Mr. Rittler stated they did try one option where they left the barn where it is currently and there would have maybe been room for a car to drive between the barn and the existing building on the corner; but leaving the barn where it is has a negative impact on the site. He stated they need the space for parking by Ordinance; and if they cannot move the barn, the parking area between Buildings #1 and #2 must be eliminated, and

Building #1 viability as an operational facility is almost destroyed if they cannot have parking fairly close to the building which was the other reason the parking was put at that location. Mr. Pazdera stated he does recognize the constraints.

Ms. Friedman stated this was not intended to be commercial real estate, and it was supposed to be a village. Mr. Pazdera stated they are setting it up so that it has retail on the lower floors, and Ms. Friedman stated her comment relates to the “look.” Mr. Pazdera stated he feels what the Historic Commission is objecting to is the lack of a streetscape particularly as you go toward the intersection. He added he recognizes that there is only so much that the developer can do if they have a bank with a drive-through. He stated he feels it would have been better to see some other options with more infill.

Ms. Friedman asked if there is a reason why they could not make the bank a two-story building with office space on top and using up less footprint. Mr. Rittler stated the bank wants their entity to be the bank and was not interested in sharing space. Ms. Friedman stated she understood that the office space on the first floor was financial space; but Mr. Murphy stated this is not necessarily true. Mr. Rittler stated the front 3,000 square foot is all financial services, but the back 2,580 square feet per floor for the two floors will be most likely a mix of uses with retail or office on the first floor and office or apartment on the second floor.

Mr. Dickson stated Captain Roche in his January 8 memo indicated he believed the parking along Stony Hill Road is dangerous and stated if those parking spaces were part of the requirements, that requirement should be waived; however, the Historic Commission has indicated that there is not enough on-street parking, and the curb cuts minimize the on-street parking which they feel is necessary to buffer the traffic from the pedestrians to make the sidewalk feel safer. Mr. Murphy stated the Plan as shown is what they are proposing, and the Planning Commission needs to make a recommendation with regard to this.

Mr. Majewski asked if they have a rendering of the façade for the bank, and Mr. Rittler showed the rendering this evening showing the view from Stony Hill Road, the side elevation, and the drive-through side. Mr. Majewski stated it does resemble a two-story building, and Mr. Rittler stated this is what the design guidelines are encouraging. Another rendering was shown of the buildings without the landscaping. He stated on the lower left, Building #4 was shown which is behind the bank building, and this is a two-story structure. He showed a view from the Langhorne-Yardley Road side showing the reconstructed structure on the corner with the sandwich shop/deli on the first floor and an apartment on the second floor. He showed dormers which are aesthetic, and there is not a

third floor proposed for any of the structures. Mr. Majewski asked if they will only take the siding off the structure on the corner, and Mr. Rittler stated there will be some reconstruction of a portion he showed on the Plan adding the sandwich shop will not have a second floor over it, and they are only intending to create some volume inside and are trying to create a smaller unit concept because it is a smaller structure and give it two identities.

Ms. Friedman noted the entrance off Stony Hill Road and the location of the parking spaces. She stated she is concerned about the first two spaces at the "mouth" of the entrance because if someone is pulling out of a space and someone is trying to get in, it could create a problem. Mr. Majewski stated possibly they could relocate those spaces somewhere else. Mr. Rittler stated the initial review from TPD identified one space which they wanted removed because of concerns similar to those being voiced by Ms. Friedman, and they have removed this space on the left hand side of the driveway. He stated they were able to push the space on the right hand side back a few feet. He stated they also identified to TPD a few mitigation factors which TPD accepted. He stated the road widens prior to the driveway; and even though the driveway is only for ingress, it was put in at 25' wide which gives drivers some accident avoidance room. He stated in their second review letter, TPD did not comment negatively on the lay out and accepted the revisions.

Ms. Friedman stated she is concerned with the sidewalk being so close to the road particularly with the speeds being traveled on this State highway. Mr. Majewski stated at Flower's Field they will have on-street parking so that there will be a buffer between the travel lane. He stated on this site the problem is the building at the corner, and there is no room to push the sidewalk back. Ms. Friedman asked if the rest of Edgewood Village will have sidewalks this close to the roads, and Mr. Majewski stated the idea behind the on-street parking was that this would act as a buffer. He stated where there are houses close to the road there is really no way around this; and you either do not allow people to walk which defeats the purpose of the Village or you have them right up against the road. Ms. Friedman stated when they were originally discussing this concept, she felt there was going to be a green patch and then the sidewalk; and she feels they are now making a lot of exceptions and losing what they were envisioning. Mr. Bush stated while this is a good point; for the shape of this property, he is not sure they have a lot of options. He stated possibly they could have ornamental bollards, although he is not sure that this would be permitted in the TND District.

Mr. Majewski stated they may want to consider a textured type of sidewalk as you go on the crosswalk across the ingress/egress and this would delineate the pavement from the pedestrian crosswalk.

Mr. Dave Miller stated his family has been in Edgewood Village for forty years; and he is very upbeat about this presentation because it has been a long time coming doing something in the Village that is productive, but he does have concerns about what he has heard this evening. Mr. Miller stated at the intersection there are “no crossing” signs and pedestrians are not allowed to cross at the intersection. He asked if they are going to do something to make it safe for people to cross the road since Flower’s Field will be on one side and Edgewood Crossing will be on the other. He stated they also need to do something to make it safe for traffic to go across the road. He stated when you are traveling up Stony Hill Road from the Giant and get to the traffic light on the right there is crosshatching which states “stay off the shoulder,” but people are still driving in this area. He stated when someone wants to make a left-hand turn, you are not supposed to go over that striping, but everyone does it. He stated the traffic lights are not adequate now; and if all of this is going to be developed, they will be far from adequate. He stated there are no turning lanes in place, and you cannot pass a car if someone wants to make a left, and he feels this will result in a huge traffic jam.

Mr. Miller stated the driveway shown on Yardley-Langhorne Road which will be in-only, the distance from that driveway to the traffic light is approximately one car length. He stated this means that anyone who wants to go in the driveway would have to be the second car in line in order to get into that driveway or they will have to wait until the traffic light changes. He stated if you go up to the traffic light and someone is making a left-hand turn, you cannot make a right-hand turn. He stated once you make the right-hand turn, the distance from that corner up to the first driveway is only a couple of car lengths and now you need to make a right-hand and you would have 200’ which is ten car lengths.

Mr. Miller asked if this will be a full-service bank, and Mr. Rittler stated it will. Mr. Miller stated he feels most people will use the drive through and not go into the bank and this is going to result in a large “U” of cars. He stated there will also be outside speakers which will be very loud, and will be heard all over the Village.

Mr. Miller stated he is also concerned about the lighting, and he feels they are shining sideways which is what happened at the CVS. He stated he had asked the Board of Supervisors to hold up the Occupancy Permit for the CVS until they corrected the light situation, but they passed it anyway. He asked about the time the lights will be on and off and where they will shine.

Mr. Miller stated he does not feel the bank fits and should not be on this site. He stated when the CVS was planned, there was going to be a drug store and a bank; and the bank was turned down because there was not enough space. Mr. Miller asked if there is a bank planned for Flower’s Field, and Mr. Murphy stated there could be a number of banks. Mr. Miller stated he does not feel a bank fits at Edgewood Crossing, and there will be too

much traffic and too much noise. He stated he is in favor of the ice cream shop, the deli, the apartments, and the streetscape; but he is not in favor of the bank. Mr. Miller stated comments were made that the bank wanted it this way, and he feels the bank is dictating what they are doing; and he does not feel the bank should be dictating what the Village is going to look like.

Mr. Miller stated he has heard from the Supervisors for five to ten years that when they start developing the Village, they will get water and sewer for everybody; and now they are indicating that this piece of property will not be obligated to do this because it is too small. He asked what this developer is going to contribute to the Village other than traffic jams, bright lights at night, and “squawk” boxes. Mr. Miller stated they have indicated that they are not going to put all the trees on the property. He asked if this property abuts the wooded part of Patterson Farm, and it was noted it does. Mr. Miller stated he has walked through this woods and 25% of the trees in that woods are dead. Mr. Miller stated they could plant the required trees in this woods.

Mr. Miller asked about the stormwater, and Mr. Rittler stated they will take the stormwater run off and let it filter back into the ground so that it does not run off as surface water. He stated it will be an underground “pit” which is a combination of crushed stone and prefabricated chambers and will be set about eight to ten feet below the surface. He stated they have dug down and found very adequate percolating soils at that depth. Mr. Miller asked Mr. Murphy if this was what proposed for the CVS originally, and Mr. Murphy stated he feels it was. Mr. Miller stated while it was proposed, it was turned down by the Township. Mr. Miller stated he believes that there is an Ordinance that stormwater management is to be regionalized. Mr. Majewski stated the Ordinance allows flexibility so that if you cannot manage your water on your site, you have to investigate regional alternatives. He stated if they are able to handle the water on site, what they are proposing is legitimate.

Mr. Miller stated CVS wanted to do this underground system and then wanted to put it into the basin that is on the corner of Mirror Lake Extension and this was turned down as well. He stated finally a stormwater pipe was run down Mirror Lake Road to the lake; and if they had been allowed to dump it into the existing basin, this all comes to his property which caused him concern. He stated he already gets a lot of water on his property. He stated a number of months ago surveyors were on Edgewood Road coming down toward his home and right to the stream where it crosses his stream where it crosses the road. Mr. Murphy stated he was not aware of this, and Mr. Miller stated he feels they were trying to look into a way to bring the stormwater down the road and dump it into his stream. He stated they could go out the back of this property, cross the Patterson Farm, and get right down to the stream; and this line would then be there for Flower’s Field so it would not have to be on-site management.

Mr. Miller asked the timing of Flower’s Field, but Mr. C.T. Troilo stated there is currently no time line.

Mr. Miller stated they have discussed sidewalks on both road fronts, and he feels this is necessary recognizing that it would be close to the road because of the setback problem. He stated they need to provide for pedestrian traffic or they will have the same situation they have there now. Ms. Friedman stated while she recognizes this, she wants to consider alternatives that take into consideration the risk factors.

Mr. Miller stated he feels they should look at the McCaffrey Shopping Center lights as you do not see the “orange glow” from blocks away, and the lights shine down. He stated he would prefer that they go with this method of lighting. He also feels the lights need to be turned off at some point in the night.

Mr. Matthew DeSantos, Stony Hill Road, stated he is in favor of the bank and how the roadway comes in and out.

Ms. Joyce Bigley, 1793 Yardley-Langhorne Road, stated she agrees with Mr. Miller. She stated if they are going to have lighting, it will be a problem for the dog kennel in the area; and the dogs will not be able to sleep. She stated it would also not be advisable if there is going to be an inn in the area. She also feels they need to make sure that they are taking care of the water. She stated the intersection is not good now. She stated there is a “no turn on red” sign going from Yardley-Langhorne to the intersection to make a right on Stony Hill Road; and if you are the first person in line you cannot see the sign. She stated the sign needs to be right underneath the red light. She stated there have been a number of accidents because of this. Ms. Bigley stated she has also had discussions with the Township engineer and advised him that it is not Langhorne-Yardley Road – it is Yardley-Langhorne Road, and the sign needs to be changed. She stated the letter they received indicated their address as Langhorne-Yardley Road. Ms. Frick stated this comes from the Doylestown deeds which is where they get their addresses from for notification. Ms. Bigley stated for years she has been getting mail for Yardley-Langhorne Road. Mr. Majewski stated the mailing address does not always match the deed.

Mr. Pazdera stated he feels the developer needs to address the EAC issues, amend the traffic study, and deal with HARB and the barn issue. He also feels they need to address the Historic Commission concerns. He also asked that they look into options with regard to the sidewalks to address the safety concerns.

## MARCH PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS

Ms. Frick stated she does not feel they will be meeting the first meeting in March.

February 22, 2010

Planning Commission – page 16 of 16

There being no further business, Ms. Friedman moved, Mr. Dickson seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dean Dickson, Secretary