

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES – NOVEMBER 26, 2012

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on November 26, 2012. Chairman Dickson called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

Those present:

Planning Commission: Dean Dickson, Chairman
 Tony Bush, Vice Chairman
 Mark Fried, Member (joined meeting in progress)
 John Pazdera, Member

Others: Nancy Frick, Director Zoning, Inspection & Planning
 John Torrente, Township Solicitor
 Mark Eisold, Township Engineer (joined meeting in
 progress)
 Maryellen Saylor, Township Engineer
 Dobby Dobson, Supervisor Liaison

Absent: Karen Friedman, Planning Commission Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Pazdera moved, Mr. Bush seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of September 24, 2012 as written.

#620 – DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF HOCH PROPERTY –
PRELIMINARY/FINAL MINOR SUBDIVISION/LOT LINE CHANGE

Mr. Edward Murphy, attorney, was present with Mr. Jeff Hoch. Mr. Murphy stated Mr. Hoch and his wife own a property in Chanticleer. Mr. Murphy stated their rear yard has a fairly significant slope; and as a result, Mr. and Mrs. Hoch would like to have more of a usable rear yard for their children to play. He stated they approached their neighbors to see if there could be a modest adjustment to the lot line. Mr. Murphy stated the Plan was prepared and submitted, and it created a number of Zoning issues which needed to be dealt with. He stated late this summer an Application was submitted to the Zoning Hearing Board, and in October the Board granted relief that enabled the Plan to move forward; and this is the Plan that is before the Planning Commission.

Mr. Murphy noted the Township engineer review letter dated November 19, and he stated they will comply with all issues.

Mr. Bush moved, Mr. Pazdera seconded and it was unanimously carried to recommend to the Board of Supervisors Approval of the Preliminary/Final Minor Subdivision/Lot Line Change for the Hoch Property, Tax Parcel #20-003-043-006 and #20-003-043-007 Plans last revised 10/18/12 subject to compliance with the Boucher & James letter dated 11/19/12.

#340-B – MANOR CARE SKETCH PLAN

Mr. Neil Stein, attorney, was present with Mr. Mike Davis, engineer. Mr. Stein stated the Planning Commission saw this Plan prior to the Plan going to the Zoning Hearing Board in June, 2012. He stated before the Planning Commission this evening is a Sketch Plan for Land Development now that the Zoning Hearing Board has approved the requested Zoning relief. He stated the Application is essentially the same as was seen previously. He stated it relates to the expansion by approximately 9,000 square feet of the existing skilled nursing facility. He stated the skilled nursing facility is the one closest to Oxford Valley Road as opposed to Arden Court which is the one closest to Stony Hill Road.

Mr. Eisold joined the meeting at this time.

Mr. Stein stated the three areas of expansion will accommodate an additional twenty beds and a therapy suite. He stated those areas are highlighted in the darker color yellow on the Sketch Plan, and Mr. Davis showed these three areas on the Plan.

Mr. Stein stated as part of the expansion, they have proposed additional parking to take care of current and future needs. He stated they will have an additional fifty-six parking spaces to be located throughout the site, and Mr. Davis showed these locations on the Plan.

Mr. Stein stated the Zoning Hearing Board granted a Special Exception to allow the expansion of the existing facility and also granted Variances regarding parking setbacks, building setbacks, and also a Variance to allow for 27% impervious surface. He stated after receiving the Zoning Hearing Board Decision, they submitted the present Sketch Plan Application.

Mr. Stein noted the Boucher & James review letter dated October 19, 2012 and stated that with the exception of the Waivers noted, they will comply with the other items. He stated Comment #3 relates to sidewalks; and since a limitation was imposed of 27% impervious coverage by the Zoning Hearing Board's Decision, while they have some

room for sidewalks of approximately 1,000 square feet additional impervious, they will not be able to achieve all the sidewalks requested in this Comment. He stated this will therefore be a partial Waiver.

Mr. Stein stated they also are requesting a Waiver with regard to the minimum distance of 20' from the building to parking. He stated there are three sections of proposed parking that do not comply with this requirement, and these are existing conditions. Mr. Davis stated there are also wetland and woodland constraints so they will be asking for a Waiver.

Mr. Bush asked how many additional spaces are going to be involved in this 20' span, and Mr. Davis stated he believes there are three to five. Currently there are less than six that are within the 20' setback.

Mr. Torrente asked where the sidewalks that will be installed will go, and Mr. Stein stated he feels they should meet with the Township engineer to have them suggest some appropriate locations. Mr. Eisold stated he feels certain areas are more critical than others, and Mr. Stein agreed.

Mr. Stein noted Item #5 with regard to the dead-end parking areas. Mr. Davis showed a location on the Plan where there is dead-end parking which exists today, and they would be expanding it further and providing a “hammerhead” for the last few vehicles to have space to turn around. He stated they would also mimic that condition at another location he showed on the Plan.

Mr. Fried joined the meeting at this time.

Ms. Joy Persicketti, 1430 Oxford Valley Road, stated she is concerned about additional parking on Oxford Valley Road and stated she would not want the appearance to be changed for the berm and the trees. Mr. Davis showed on the Plan where the parking will be added. He stated they are not impacting any of the trees or the berm along the road. Ms. Persicketti asked about parking being put in other locations rather than the locations proposed, and Mr. Davis stated they would not be able to add parking at those locations because of site limitations related to wetlands and woodlands. He stated the view from the road will be limited because of the berm and the trees.

#608-A – DISCUSSION OF SAMOST TRACT BALLFIELDS – PRELIMINARY/ FINAL LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Mr. Eisold was present with Ms. Saylor, and Mr. Eisold stated they have prepared the Plans for the Samost ball fields. He stated they are proposing two fields, one a 90' field, and the other a 70' field. He stated they have been working with the Park & Recreation

Board for the past six to seven months. He stated the Plan shows the two ball fields with parking in between, a stormwater basin, and some rain gardens within the parking area to meet requirements of Pennsylvania DEP and the Conservation District.

Mr. Eisold stated they have received a number of review letters with comments.

Mr. Eisold stated they propose to extend and utilize the existing driveway off of Edgewood Road. He stated there will be some grading encroachment on the southern end along the Water Company property, and they will have to take down a few trees.

He stated they had considered a retaining wall, but the cost was prohibitive so they are looking to grade it, and they have been in discussion with the Water Company to obtain a 25' temporary grading construction easement along that portion of the property.

Mr. Eisold stated the ball fields will be fully fenced in, and they have designed them with an under drain system in the in fields of both fields so that they can drain and be played on shortly after rainfall events. He stated they are also providing facilities at least on a temporary basis as an alternate to provide water to water the fields if and when there is a need in the summer to keep the fields in shape.

Mr. Eisold noted the Bucks County Planning Commission letter dated 11/7/12. He noted particularly their Comments #3 and #4. He stated with regard to tree protection fencing, they had some question whether the tree protection fencing in lieu of the super silt fence could be utilized. Mr. Eisold stated typically super silt fencing is about 36' high, and they were trying to use this as it was less expensive and serves a dual purpose. Mr. Eisold stated Comment #4 relates to trees, and they questioned two of the trees. Mr. Eisold stated what he is proposing are native trees; and while there have been some instances of disease, they are hardy trees for the most part.

The letter from the EAC dated 11/19/12 was noted. Mr. Eisold stated Comment #1 asked about the use of pervious paving. Mr. Eisold stated they do not have pervious paving shown on the Plan at this point. He stated they did look into a lot of different design alternatives. He stated the proposal is to put the parking lot in stone and not be paved at this point because of the Budget. Mr. Eisold stated Park & Recreation would like to put this parking lot in stone the same as the other parking lot, and hopefully they could pave it in a year or two when the Budget allows them to do so. He stated they pushed the paving back in order to get the ball fields installed the way they wanted them. He stated they could do pervious paving in the future. Mr. Eisold stated the other concern is that a good portion of this site has been used as the leaf-staging facility for the Township, and most of the topsoil has been removed. He stated the soil is very compacted and is a very hard material almost like concrete. He stated it would be more realistic to pave the walking paths with pervious paving, and they will be required to be paved up front

because of ADA requirements. Mr. Eisold stated that initially the parking will be in stone and pervious paving may be installed at some time in the future. He stated they did do infiltration tests, and the area where they have the basin and rain gardens have good percolation; but the other areas were pretty solid and they would have to go down quite a distance to get pervious soils to percolate the water which could be done but would be costly.

Item #2 was noted and has to do with the Township's Tree Replacement Ordinance. Mr. Eisold stated they will be removing some trees in order to construct the basin on the western portion of the property, but they have not at this point measured all the trees in that area. He stated they have proposed quite a few trees shown on the Landscaping Plan, and the Plan that is before the Township actually has even more trees than the Sketch being shown this evening. He stated there are some other developments in the Township that have replacement trees owed to the Township, and they are hoping to cut the costs in the Budget for the Township by using some of those trees on this site so that the Township may not have to purchase all of the trees. Mr. Eisold stated there are quite a few plantings proposed in and around the basin to meet the BMP requirements, and there are about fifty trees in the parking lot and fifty along Oxford Valley Road.

Mr. Bush asked for more information about paving the parking lot, and what might happen with the parking lot in the future. Mr. Eisold stated paving the parking lot would cost about \$90,000; and the Park & Recreation Board was considering leaving it in stone for a year or two until they had funds to finish off the parking. Mr. Bush stated the plan is to ultimately pave the lot, and Mr. Eisold agreed. Mr. Bush asked if there has been any representation by the Township that they will have the funds for this in a year or two; and Mr. Eisold stated there has not. He stated they were looking at the Budget based on what the Grant allowed, and they were at the maximum and would not be able to include a number of the alternatives. He stated the Park & Recreation Board felt that the paving could be done at a later time.

Mr. Pazdera asked why they chose to stop the paving at the existing gravel parking lot rather than carrying it out to the road. Mr. Eisold stated they did discuss this with the Park & Recreation Board, and the front parking lot should also be paved as well. Mr. Pazdera agreed stating that ultimately if the new parking is paved, they would be bringing all the traffic through an unmarked gravel lot where people are parking everywhere which will create a problem, and Mr. Eisold agreed. Mr. Pazdera asked if they do not pave this initially, would the plan still be to pave the handicap parking spaces; and Mr. Eisold stated they would have to be paved and are shown to be paved on the Plan. Mr. Eisold agreed that it would be preferable to pave the drive all the way out to Edgewood Road and pave the existing front parking lot, and possibly a year or two in the future they could pave this possibly as part of the Township's road paving project.

Mr. Eisold stated when they bid out the Township's road paving program, they get very cost effective numbers; and they would not get as good a price from a contractor just doing the ball fields.

Mr. Pazdera asked that the lay out be put on the drawing for the front parking lot, and Mr. Eisold agreed to do this.

Mr. Eisold noted Comment #3 which discusses tree screening on Oxford Valley Road, and he stated they have shown basically what are street along Oxford Valley Road. He stated the comment from the EAC suggests putting more of a buffer at this location as opposed to just street trees which includes evergreen trees and shrubs to cover the first five to six feet from ground level, and he does feel this is a good suggestion. He stated this is a cost to the Township, and hopefully some of the donations from other projects could be used to help with this buffer.

Comment #4 was noted with regard to truck traffic, and Mr. Eisold stated there will need to be some material brought in both fill material and topsoil. He stated where the leaf facility is, there is not a lot of topsoil there for 50% of the site. He stated in the area of Oxford Valley Road, there are some areas which have 7" to 10" which will be helpful and will be used; but the majority of the site does not have a lot of topsoil. He stated part of the truck traffic is to bring topsoil in as they do want to have good topsoil at a good thickness to promote grass growth at the fields. He stated they will try to work with other areas in the Township where work is being done including the Community Center which will have extra topsoil so that they can get the most topsoil for the least amount of cost possible.

Comment #5 was noted which was a request to reduce the dimensions of the smaller ball field along the third baseline so that the field grading would not be as close to the wooded area. Mr. Eisold stated the fields have been designed to the exact specifications of ball field sizes for these types of fields. He stated based on the input from Park & Rec and PAA, they want to hold these dimensions.

Mr. Eisold stated Comment #6 is with regard to the request of Waiver for sidewalks and bike paths. He stated there is a bike path/walkway through the site at a location he showed on the Plan. He stated they have not currently shown on the Plan a bike path along Oxford Valley Road. He noted on the Plan a bike path which could be extended out to Oxford Valley Road with a bike path along Oxford Valley Road, but they will need to understand what the Township prefers in this regard. He stated this would be at an extra cost. He stated there is a walkway on the opposite side of Oxford Valley Road currently and along Edgewood there are some crossings. Mr. Pazdera stated currently they are not showing a connection from the new work to what is existing, and Mr. Eisold agreed. Mr. Pazdera stated a lot of people park across the street and currently you have to walk through the gravel, and he feels at a minimum there should be some kind of connection to what is existing.

Mr. Pazdera noted the interconnection to the other ball fields. He stated when they have the Softball Tournaments, they will probably not be using these fields. Mr. Pazdera stated when they are having the big Tournaments, there is constant traffic from these fields up to the playground area and the other fields; and he feels it makes sense to have something that connects all the facilities. Mr. Eisold stated they could look into this.

Mr. Eisold stated there is currently a stone walkway from Mill Road to the three existing fields, and they have looked at the cost to pave this; and probably with the paving project next year, they will pave this.

Mr. Eisold noted Comment #7 related to the Waiver request with regard to the Delaware River South Watershed Ordinance. He stated the Ordinance requires that the basin not drain in less than twenty-four hours. Mr. Eisold stated the reason they designed it the way they did was because the basin is designed now to have only a 3” orifice which is fairly small, and they did not feel they should go any smaller since there would be a higher chance of having a problem and getting clogged. He stated the other reason is to the west in the woods there are some wetlands; and they felt that if they held that water back too long, they would reduce the flow and impact the wetlands. He stated these are the reasons they did not meet that one specific requirement of the Ordinance.

Comment #8 was noted, and Mr. Eisold stated this is a technical comment related to stormwater run off. He stated the calculations were provided in the Report and possibly the EAC did not review these.

Comment #9 was noted, and Mr. Eisold stated this is a general comment. He stated the seed mix in the basin is not a grass but a native seed mix that includes wildflowers and a number of different native species so it should grow and require minimal maintenance. He stated the Township is promoting the naturalization of the basins.

Comment #10 relates to the native plant selection, and he stated they have used native species wherever possible.

Mr. Eisold stated there is a letter from the Historic Commission where they expressed concern with the hedgerow on the property which they have indicated is an original William Penn boundary line, and which they feel should be left as a hedgerow as it is one of the few left. He stated a portion of this will be cut in order to get the width of driveway in accordance with the current design standards. He noted some other areas on the Plan which will impact this hedgerow which are result of the grading needed and the location of a rain garden.

Mr. Eisold noted the letter from the fire protection consultant who had no issues with the Plan.

The letter from the Pennsbury School District was noted and indicated that they had no comments.

Mr. Eisold stated there was a recent letter from the Citizens Traffic Commission with regard to their concerns with traffic flow, and they requested the traffic engineer to review this; and Mr. Eisold stated this could be done. Mr. Eisold stated they did do the design to Township standards.

Mr. Eisold noted the letter received from Ms. Karen Friedman. He stated she asked if the two ball fields could be switched in order to keep the visible fencing to a minimum; however, Mr. Eisold stated they could not do this with the way the parking is, but they could probably accommodate a thicker buffer along Oxford Valley Road to shield it a little better. Mr. Eisold stated she also commented that she would prefer that there be no advertising on the exterior fencing, and he stated this would be up to the Township. Mr. Eisold stated Ms. Friedman asked if the fields will be lit; and in their discussions with the Park & Rec Board, they would like the option to possibly do this in the future, although the Budget is not there to do this in the near future. He stated they have shown some conduits throughout the site that could accomplish this along with some lighting in the parking lot. He stated he does not feel that this will be possible for some years to come. Mr. Bush asked what lighting would cost, and Mr. Eisold stated for these two fields it would probably be \$80,000 to \$100,000. Mr. Dickson stated he does not feel the adjacent residents would be in favor of lighting these fields.

Mr. Eisold stated Ms. Friedman's other comments were similar to those made by the EAC.

Mr. Pazdera stated in reviewing the Plan it does seem that the hedgerow is going to be significantly impacted, and Mr. Eisold stated they were not looking at it from a historical perspective because they were not aware of it at the time, and the trees in there were not really specimen trees. Mr. Pazdera asked that they meet with the Historic Commission to see if there is a way to save more of the hedgerow. Mr. Eisold stated they could look at it tree by tree to see what makes sense. Mr. Fried stated since the historical importance is the more important part, they should discuss with the Historical Commission if there is a way to put in a marker or something to indicate what it is since there will be a lot of children on the property; and if they knew the significance of the hedgerow, it would be a "teaching moment."

Mr. Bush noted the Citizens Traffic Commission comments, and he asked what impact has been taken into account of the various sites for the proposed Community Center on the Samost Tract and how it would impact the site. Mr. Eisold noted on the Plan the sites being considered on the Samost Tract for the Community Center. Mr. Bush asked what impact either of these sites will have on the Plan for the ball fields. Mr. Eisold stated from a traffic standpoint, he does not feel that they will be connected although they could have a walking path. He stated they do not feel that there would be any internal traffic driveways. He noted areas on the Plan where there could be a bike path. He stated he feels the Community Center would be accessed from Oxford Valley Road.

Mr. Dickson stated last year they had a proposal for a batting facility, and it is shown on the Plan as a “proposed batting facility.” Mr. Dickson asked if there are any parking spaces being considered for that facility or would this be part of what is being presented this evening. Mr. Eisold stated it was not included in the Township’s Budget to construct that facility. He stated it is listed as “proposed,” but it would have to be funded by either PAA or someone else; and the Township did not plan to fund the building of that facility. He stated the parking would overlap between the ball fields. Ms. Saylor stated they are adding one hundred parking spaces for this proposal being presented. Mr. Eisold stated he feels the parking lot would take care of parking needs for the batting facility.

Mr. Dickson stated they do not have a Sketch Plan for the Senior Citizens Center so they do not know how many parking spaces will be needed for that facility. Mr. Dickson stated the Planning Commission is being asked to approve the Plans for these two ball fields, and a lot of the parking for the Tournaments tends to be right where these two new fields are proposed. Mr. Dickson stated when they add the Community Center, he is concerned about the volume of traffic that is engendered by the addition of these ball fields, the existing Fred Allan Complex, and the Community Center. Mr. Eisold stated the Community Center and the use of these ball fields could potentially be complimentary. He stated when they have the large Tournaments, they will have to have more parking off site and bring those people to this area. Mr. Dickson stated he is uncomfortable with granting approval for this project without seeing where the Community Center will be located along with its parking and the entrance onto Oxford Valley Road. Mr. Eisold stated while there has been discussion about the location for the Community Center, there has not been any details done on it at this point. Mr. Dickson stated he feels this is something that the Planning Commission needs to see as he would like to look at the entire tract including the Community Center, the new ball fields, the existing ball fields, and the Fred Allan Complex. Mr. Pazdera stated he feels it would be best to have a Master Plan for the entire area. Mr. Bush stated he concurs, and he feels that a lot of the neighbors would feel this as well and that they would want to know what the traffic is going to look like up front.

Mr. Jason Simon stated he is a liaison from PAA. He stated he has been working with the Park & Recreation Board on this and is generally supportive of the Plan being presented. He stated the dimensions of the ball fields are specified by their League affiliations and the fields will be used for Tournament play, the Travel Program, and the in-house program so it is important that they keep the integrity of the fence lines. Mr. Simon stated they understand the problems relative to the stone parking lot; however, this project came out of the Grant Program that was drafted to construct these ball fields. He stated there have been a number of concessions that have been made along the way because of other projects that the Township has adjoined to this program. He specifically noted the tennis court project by the Township Pool which went over Budget by quite a bit which impacted the ball fields Budget, and this is why certain items such as the paving are being scaled back. He stated Mr. Eisold has worked hard to optimize the field development within the Budget. He stated PAA supports the Plan moving forward. He stated what is done with these new fields will essentially be a precursor to improving the existing ball fields because of issues they have with drainage particularly at Stoddart which was built forty years ago.

Mr. Simon stated with regard to lighting, he would prefer to have the fields lit because it means more usable hours on the field, but he would be concerned about lighting at the Community Center and how that might potentially impact the ability to have lights on the ball fields the Budget notwithstanding.

Mr. Simon stated they feel the location is a good for the baseball fields, and what has been proposed is not an insignificant amount of parking. He stated there are no immediate plans to construct the batting facility. He stated a number of years ago under previous PAA leadership, they felt they had a benefactor for this; but they have found that they do not so currently it is more of just a “place holder.” He stated they also have a number of questions they need to have answered before they proceed with this, and they also need to get the funds. He stated if it does proceed, he does not feel there will be a problem with parking based on the usage and time period.

Mr. Simon reiterated the fact that the field dimensions are regulated by their League affiliations, and the way the fields have been designed will support a significant amount of play. Mr. Eisold stated they have under drains in the infield and the potential for water hook up either through PA American and a hydrant or a well. Mr. Simon stated there are times when they lose playing time to rain but there are also times that they lose the ability to water the fields because none of the ball fields in the Township have irrigation. He stated these two fields will enhance the Township’s experience. He stated concerns over parking can be handled through shuttling when there are Tournaments. He stated one of the softball tournaments they run is a Platinum-level Tournament, and is one of the few that is sanctioned on the East Coast for College coaches to come and recruit. He stated it is a prestigious tournament for PAA and the Township.

Mr. Simon stated the Grant is getting into its twenty-fourth month of availability to the Township. He stated the tennis court project was initiated so that they could activate the Grant funding. Mr. Simon stated they would like to get approval for the fields as soon as possible so they can start the bidding process so that the fields can be used by 2014. Mr. Eisold reviewed the timetable that would enable them to play on the fields by fall, 2014. Mr. Simon stated the fields are desperately needed.

Mr. Allen Dresser and Mr. Jim Bray from the EAC were present. Mr. Dresser stated they are happy that they will consider pervious paving. He stated the EAC will be putting together an Ordinance to encourage the use of pervious paving in the future. He stated he is concerned that they are going to do stone first and then consider the pervious paving. Mr. Eisold stated he had indicated that because they have to delay paving, it is not ideal for pervious paving. He stated they also have to look at the infiltration rates. Mr. Dresser stated pervious paving reduces the amount of stormwater management needed, and they might be able to eliminate the need for the detention basin and one of the rain gardens which would result in a savings. He stated they also may not have to go so far into the woods. Mr. Eisold stated they could look at the viability of this.

Ms. Saylor stated pervious paving does have limitations since a lot of the area is already very compacted, and the slope of the parking lot is not ideal for the use of pervious paving. She stated they have seen it used for parking stalls, but drive aisles will experience more wear and tear. Mr. Bray noted a park in Upper Makefield which has their entrance drive and the stalls in pervious paving. Ms. Saylor stated that park has sandy soil. Mr. Dresser noted the pervious paving at Makefield School where the water disappears.

Mr. Dresser again requested that they change the dimensions of the fields as it would have less impact on some nice trees.

Mr. Dresser asked for further information about the truck traffic, and Mr. Eisold stated they are trying to determine where they could get topsoil, and he stated if they use the topsoil from the Community Center they would not have to have trucks go out into the traffic. Mr. Simon asked how long this process could take, Mr. Eisold stated they are hoping to start the fields April 1, and it would probably take seven to eight months; and they would like to get a growth season this fall.

Mr. Dresser asked for more information on tree replacement, and Mr. Eisold stated they may be able to get some trees from other developments in the Township which would be a way for the Township to save money.

Mr. Bray stated with regard to the buffer on Oxford Valley Road, he feels this is essential because it will impact the neighborhood; and they want the impact to be as negligible as possible. He stated if the evergreens are staggered, it would look attractive, and the EAC would be willing to work with them on this. Mr. Bray stated with respect to the bike and walking paths, he feels what they have here is a single-purpose facility. He stated it was also their idea to open this up and make it a multi-purpose facility; and the way to do this is to have meaningful walking paths and bike paths. He stated continuity is very important in biking. He stated they now have the means to open this project up at a negligible cost to a lot more people in the Township.

Mr. Bray stated with regard to the Pervious Paving Ordinance, if they come up with an Ordinance like this, Lower Makefield will probably be the only Municipality in the State of Pennsylvania to have this. He stated over the last several years the EAC has had a very positive relationship with the Planning Commission, and they want this to continue. He stated with respect to this Ordinance, sometime in January, the EAC would like to send a draft copy to the Planning Commission for their comments; and the EAC would then come to a meeting for a meaningful discussion about it. He stated in the past the Planning Commission has given the EAC excellent comments that the EAC has incorporated into their Ordinances over the years.

Mr. Bray stated overall he feels what is being presented this evening is a decent plan, and he especially likes the selection of native vegetation which was well thought out. He stated the EAC would like to see their comments incorporated in the Plan, and they would like to then look at the Plan again after the changes are made.

Mr. Fried asked if they are going to get a Revised Plan showing where the Community Center will go. Mr. Eisold stated the Community Center is not at that stage yet. Mr. Dickson stated he would like to see a Master Plan that includes the Community Center; and while he does not want to see the construction of these ball fields delayed, he feels the Planning Commission needs to see some sort of formalized idea of where the Community Center will be with the bike paths that have been suggested. He stated he would like to have a Master Plan for the entire area.

Mr. Bush stated he agrees with Mr. Dickson. He stated the Township has been discussing two sites on this tract since February so there is a generalized idea where it will be. He stated he does not feel anyone on the Planning Commission is adverse to seeing these two ball fields built.

Mr. Dickson stated possibly they could have a Sketch Plan showing the Community Center and how it will all be connected. Mr. Simon asked if there is a time schedule for selecting the Community Center site, and Mr. Dobson stated at this point they have only agreed to having it at the Samost Tract. He stated there are discussions taking place with the different groups to see what would be the best location on the Samost Tract.

Mr. Dobson stated he will report on the Planning Commission's concerns to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Simon asked if it would satisfy the Planning Commission if Mr. Eisold came back with a rough estimate of both the locations being considered, and Mr. Pazdera stated they could plan both roughly to see how the whole property will be impacted.

Mr. Dobson stated it is his understanding that they want to have these ball fields started as quickly as possible. Mr. Simon stated he does have concerns with the Community Center being built on the Samost Tract on the front lot because if they were to light the Community Center parking lot, this opens up the debate regarding lighted tracks, and the ball fields could be then delayed.

Mr. Dickson stated they are not trying to hold the ball fields hostage, but they would like to see something that is comprehensive. Mr. Fried stated seeing something on the Community Center at this point would probably eventually help the Community Center since the Planning Commission would have had an opportunity to look at the entire site and provide feedback.

The Planning Commission took no action on the Plan this evening.

There being no further business, Mr. Fried moved, Mr. Pazdera seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dean Dickson, Chairman