

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES – FEBRUARY 10, 2014

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on February 10, 2014. Ms. Friedman called the meeting to order at 7:40 p.m.

Those present:

Planning Commission: Karen Friedman, Chair  
John Pazdera, Vice Chair  
Tony Bush, Member

Others: Nancy Frick, Director Zoning, Inspection, & Planning  
John Koopman, Township Solicitor  
Kristin Tyler, Supervisor (joined meeting in progress)

Absent: Dean Dickson, Planning Commission Secretary  
Mark Fried, Planning Commission Member  
Dan McLaughlin, Supervisor Liaison

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL OF PROPOSED IMPERVIOUS PAVEMENT ORDINANCE

Mr. Jim Bray and Mr. Alan Dresser of the Environmental Advisory Council were present. Mr. Bray stated the last time they were before the Planning Commission regarding the proposed Ordinance there were several comments made by the Planning Commission which he believes have now been addressed. He stated the Township engineer has also reviewed this as has the Township Solicitor who actually wrote the Ordinance in proper legal language.

Mr. Dresser stated this is now in Zoning and not in the SALDO. He also stated Section F has been added which is the responsibility for compliance and makes it clear that the owner is responsible for maintenance and outlines what will happen if they do not maintain it. Mr. Koopman stated it has enforcement provisions.

Mr. Koopman stated impervious surface is regulated under the Zoning Ordinance so he felt it was proper to have this as an Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance although it does reference the Stormwater Management Ordinance. He stated essentially this is the same Ordinance that the Planning Commission reviewed previously taking into account the recommendations made by the Planning Commission. Mr. Koopman stated representatives from the Township engineer's office also reviewed it and he made some changes based on their input as well.

Mr. Koopman stated he understands that this will be on the Supervisors Agenda on February 19; however, at that time it will only be opened for a Public Hearing and then tabled since Mr. Dresser is not available on February 19. Mr. Dresser stated he understands that it will be discussed by the Supervisors on March 19.

Mr. Koopman stated Ms. Frick and Mr. Habgood have also reviewed this and there may be some other minor changes made before it goes before the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Dresser noted Page 1, Section 1 on Pervious Pavement Systems, and stated Mr. Koopman took out the original definition of pervious pavement; and in that they had indicated that pervious pavement is pervious concrete, pervious asphalt, or non-separated pervious pavers; and he asked if they should put that back in since they do not want grass pavers. Ms. Friedman stated if they do not want to have grass pavers, they should list what they feel is acceptable. Mr. Dresser asked that they go back to the original language which was "Pervious bituminous asphalt, pervious concrete, or non-separated pervious paver blocks." Mr. Dresser provided to Mr. Koopman this evening a copy of the earlier draft of the language he would like to see in the Ordinance. Mr. Koopman stated they will add this to the definition of pervious pavements.

Ms. Frick stated she feels that they need definitions for all of these different systems; however, Mr. Koopman stated this Ordinance will be interpreted mainly by the Township engineer since they are the ones who will have to review the Plans and probably do the inspections. Ms. Frick stated since it is in the Zoning Ordinance, it is going to have to be interpreted by the Zoning Department; however, Mr. Koopman stated he feels they discussed that they will give this to the Township engineer who will have the responsibility for reviewing the Plans and probably doing the inspections.

Mr. Bush asked if it was delineated that the Township engineer will be doing this. Mr. Koopman stated he feels this is a decision that the Township is going to have to make. He stated he was advised by Boucher & James that the Stormwater Management Ordinances that are in place already provide for similar inspections by the Municipality, although it does not define who is doing these inspections and so it will be up to the Township to determine who will make the inspections with respect to the pervious paving. He stated he would not recommend making this specific in the Ordinance since the Township may at some point decide to engage someone in-house to do this job.

Ms. Frick asked who is doing the stormwater management inspections now; however, this was not known for certain. Mr. Dresser stated someone should be doing this. Mr. Koopman stated he will discuss this with Ms. Saylor and Mr. Eisold as someone should be doing this now for the BMPs, and it would be logical that they should do the inspections for the pervious paving as well.

Ms. Frick stated since this in the Zoning Ordinance she still feels she needs to be able to explain this to someone as to how it is going to be interpreted even if she is not doing the inspections. Mr. Koopman stated this is why Boucher & James have been involved in the reviews.

Several minor typos were noted which Mr. Koopman agreed to correct. Mr. Dresser suggested that a change be made on Page 4 of the Ordinance E (7) where it states, "The owner of the property upon which pervious paving has been installed shall be responsible to clean the asphalt or concrete pavement..." should be changed to "pervious paving."

Mr. Bush noted Page 2 Applicability of Credit and stated they have discussed where the credit cannot be taken, but have not specifically defined where it can be taken. He stated he is also not sure that they were envisioning that this could be taken in Edgewood Village where they have the Traditional Neighborhood Overlay Ordinance since in that space it was Zoned so that there could be buildings that have dwellings that have commercial establishments on the first floor, and he asked if they envision this would be applicable there. He stated it will be very dense if it is built as it is Zoned. Mr. Bray stated they struggled with this; and when they discussed this with Mr. Koopman he had felt that you could better define it by defining where it could not be used. He stated they could define it as Commercial and Institutional or you could define it as where it is not applicable. Mr. Koopman stated he felt the Planning Commission concluded the last time this was reviewed that there were certain areas where they did not want this to apply, and what has been listed are defined terms in the Ordinance. Mr. Bush stated his concern is that they were discussing allowing it in Commercial areas and other Institutional uses, but what is shown is stated in the negative. He asked if it should not be stated in the positive so that they are clear about where it is allowed. Mr. Koopman stated he felt the Planning Commission had last indicated they wanted it to state where they did not want it and anywhere else it would be allowed. Ms. Friedman stated there may be something they are not thinking about that should be included as allowed. Mr. Koopman stated they did struggle with this at the Planning Commission meeting previously, and he recalls that it was decided to exclude certain areas from the credit. Ms. Frick read from prior Minutes where this issue was discussed. Mr. Koopman stated they made sure that what they used were defined terms by referencing the Ordinance provision. He added they may need to make some changes as time goes on to see what does and does not work.

He stated it will also be subject to interpretation by the Township engineer. He stated he feels normally this will be used in Land Development Subdivision projects for larger Commercial or mixed uses.

Mr. Bush noted Page 3 D.(6) which states, "The bottom of the pervious pavement system shall be at least 2 feet above the seasonally high water table...;" and he asked if this is possible throughout the Township. Mr. Dresser stated this is required for all infiltration BMPs as well as detention basins which have this requirement, and occasionally you find it is too high, but for about 90% of locations, it would be okay. Mr. Koopman stated where you do not have this, pervious paving would probably not work well there. Ms. Frick stated she assumes that the Township engineer is going to have to determine this, and Mr. Koopman agreed that they are going to have to submit documentation as outlined in the Ordinance to document that this is appropriate where they want to use it. He stated he does not feel that Ms. Frick or Mr. Habgood will be making this determination, and he feels that the engineer will have to get involved. He stated there will have to be a Plan that is Recorded.

Ms. Frick noted Section D.(2) regarding the pervious pavement being designed in accordance with the PADEP BMP Manual adding she does not have this; and Mr. Bray agreed to provide a copy to her.

Ms. Frick stated that Section also refers to the fact that it must be "installed by a contractor knowledgeable in the particular proposed system." Ms. Frick asked who would determine who is "knowledgeable." Ms. Friedman asked if they could state "certified," and asked if there is a certification that can be obtained. Mr. Koopman stated he does not feel there is a certification for this. Mr. Bray stated they all struggled with this, and this was the best they could come up with as there is no absolute certification process and felt the best thing to put in was "knowledgeable." Ms. Frick asked how "knowledgeable" would be determined, and Mr. Bray stated this would be up to the property owner and the Township. Mr. Dresser stated they should have to provide references. Ms. Friedman stated they could use the phrase "knowledgeable and experienced," as this would make reference to the fact that they have experience. It was noted that this would still be difficult to determine. Mr. Pazdera stated they could include something that indicates they have completed a certain number of similar projects. Mr. Bray stated he likes the term "experienced" rather than "knowledgeable" as it is a more conclusive term and would mean more to the average person. Mr. Pazdera asked if they are going to require that they show proof of that experience. Mr. Dresser stated they are hoping to have a representative from the Pennsylvania Concrete Association attend the Supervisors meeting when this is discussed on March 19. Mr. Dresser stated in speaking to that representative, there is a certification program that is just starting up; but this is just for concrete and not for asphalt.

Ms. Frick expressed concern about the use of “experienced” since this is a new field. Ms. Friedman stated that “experienced” would help somewhat since they do not want just anyone saying they can do this work.

Mr. Koopman stated his assumption is that the Township engineer is going to have to oversee this, and at least having something in the Ordinance would give them something to “hang their hat on” if someone comes in that they know is not going to be able to do a good job.

Ms. Friedman stated even though the certification does not exist yet, they should state: “Installed by a contractor experienced and/or certified in the particular proposed system,” and it was agreed to make this change.

Ms. Tyler joined the meeting at this time.

Mr. Bush noted Page 4 F – Responsibility for Compliance – it discusses fines, but it does not go into the detail that the Agreement goes into which is noted in the Appendix and discusses the Township going onto the property owner’s land to fix a problem if the property owner will not address it themselves. Mr. Bush asked if there should not be a reference to this in the Ordinance itself as he feels if it is just in the Agreement and not the Ordinance, this could result in legal issues in the future. Mr. Koopman agreed to make a reference to this in the Ordinance.

Ms. Frick noted E. (3) it states “The Township shall inspect the pervious pavement system at a minimum of once every three years to ensure it is properly functioning.” She stated she assumes the Township engineer will do this. Mr. Koopman stated he does not feel they should state “Township engineer,” because the Township may someday have a staff person that does this; and this is something the Township will determine. He stated this is the same language that is in the inspection for the BMPs. Ms. Frick asked if there is any criteria of what this inspection entails if she does have to do it. It was noted you pour water over the surface and see if it goes through. Mr. Dresser stated you visually inspect it. He noted there is a method that can be used that costs approximately \$15 where you pour water and time it. Mr. Koopman stated he feels they need to leave the method up to the Township engineer or the staff person that is going to do this. Ms. Frick stated if it is a staff person they need to be able to tell them what they expect them to inspect.

Mr. Koopman stated the purpose is to see if it is still working. He stated he does not feel they should define exactly what tests they are going to use to determine this, and he feels that they need to let the person who has some experience who is going to be doing the inspection determine how it will get done. Mr. Dresser stated he can provide Ms. Frick with information on how to test this in case she is the one who has to do this.

Ms. Friedman stated since this deals with inspections, would this not be the better area to put the reference about accessing the owners' property rather than in the Responsibility for Compliance Section. Mr. Koopman stated he will consider this further. He stated the Contract will allow this. He stated they could add something to the Ordinance in this area as suggested by Ms. Friedman. Ms. Friedman stated people may be looking at the Ordinance and not necessarily the Contract. Mr. Koopman stated E. (2) does make reference to this. Mr. Koopman stated there is to be both a Plan and the Operations and Maintenance Agreement, and both of these are referenced in E. (2).

Ms. Frick noted E.(4) and asked if they are going to require the property owner to submit anything to the Township to show that they have at a minimum done semi-annual inspections. Mr. Dresser stated this is the responsibility of the property owner, and he does feel that they need to submit a report. Mr. Koopman stated he feels if there is a problem it will hopefully come to the Township's attention, and it will then be addressed.

Ms. Tyler asked if the homeowner has to prove the worthiness of the pervious if they wish to get the credit, and Mr. Bush stated this is not for residential homes.

Ms. Frick noted Appendix C, Paragraph 1 of the Pervious Pavement Maintenance Agreement and feels it should state, "The pervious pavement shall be constructed by the Landowner "or designee." Mr. Koopman agreed to make this change.

Ms. Friedman noted the Ordinance Section 2. A.(1) and stated she feels this is confusing, and feels it should state: "The purpose of this provision is to reduce the amount of impervious surface being built in the Township and "to" take advantage... Mr. Koopman agreed to make this change.

Ms. Friedman noted Section 2. C.(1) and asked where they came up with the 50% figure. She asked if anyone did any calculations changing that percentage to see what would happen. Mr. Dresser stated this is why they put in the 1.25 cap in C.(2). Mr. Bray stated the pervious systems they are looking at are essentially 100% pervious, but they are only giving them 50% credit.

Ms. Friedman asked what they feel the charge will be for the Township to do the inspections. She asked if it is indicated in the Agreement what the property owner will have to pay. Mr. Bray stated he feels the Township determines what the fees are. Ms. Friedman stated she feels someone who is going to put in a system should have an idea of what the fees are. She stated if they are charging based on the amount of acreage possibly the property owner could have a table to work with.

Mr. Dresser stated whenever they build a detention or an infiltration basin, etc. it is supposed to be inspected every three years. He feels this is a fee the Township should be getting already. Ms. Friedman stated at least they should provide a base charge so that at least there is a minimum. Mr. Bray stated his understanding is that under the Municipal Code of Pennsylvania the charges have to reflect the amount of work that is done. Mr. Koopman stated normally they do not put the fees in the Ordinance, and instead it is put in a Fee Resolution that is updated every year.

Ms. Friedman suggested that they at least put “a fee will be incurred.”

Mr. Koopman stated Paragraph 12 of the Agreement indicates that the Township would be reimbursed for any and all expenses incurred, and he suggested that they include the word “inspections” to clarify this.

Mr. Koopman stated a lot of the language used was taken from the BMP Agreement, and he stated he feels the Planning Commission should make a comment to the Board of Supervisors asking who is doing the BMP inspections now and how this is working. Ms. Frick stated the BMP Agreements do not go through her office.

Ms. Lisa Wolff, Bucks County Planning Commission, stated her office did review this and made a number of comments. She stated it was to go before the Bucks County Planning Commission last week; but due to the storm, that meeting was canceled. She stated there is a list of what is eligible, and single-family attached dwellings are not specifically listed as ineligible, and they wanted to know if the intent was to exclude all residential uses; and if so, single-family attached dwellings should also be excluded. Mr. Bray stated the intent was to not include any type of residential dwellings. Ms. Wolff stated the Township defines four types of dwellings – single family detached, single family attached, multiple family, and two-family dwellings. She stated the one that is not listed specifically in this Amendment is single-family attached, and the question was raised if the intent was to not allow any residential use to take it. Ms. Friedman stated this is just for Commercial at this time. Ms. Friedman stated “single-family attached” should therefore be added as not eligible. Mr. Koopman stated there could be a townhouse development which had a large Homeowners Association, and there would theoretically be someone in charge of maintaining this; however, they started out in this way on the side of caution and they could revisit it in the future. He stated if they want to exclude all residential, it should also exclude “single-family attached.” Ms. Friedman stated in her development they are attached in groups of three to four, but there is no Homeowners Association. Mr. Bush stated this is why his feeling was they should state specifically where it can be used as opposed to where it cannot be used.

Ms. Tyler asked why they would not want this to apply to an attached development such as Regency. Ms. Friedman stated they had discussed this and felt at this point they only wanted this in Commercial, so that they could see whether it works properly. Mr. Bush stated they had concern with individual homes as to enforcement and if keeping track would be possible. Ms. Tyler stated she agrees with this with respect to individual homes, but asked if this is something they may want to promote in a townhouse type development. Ms. Friedman stated they could then get into the complication of whether or not there was a Homeowners Association with it. She stated she lives in a townhouse development, but they do not have a Homeowners Association. Ms. Tyler stated they could consider single family attached on a case-by-case basis. She stated she would like this to include areas where they know substantial amounts of pavement are going to go in.

Mr. Koopman stated there is already in the Ordinance in the definition of impervious surface something that gives the Township discretion and leeway as part of the Land Development process. Mr. Bush stated he felt that they could use these pervious materials but would not get credit for it. Ms. Frick stated the Township engineer does make a determination whether the materials being used would be considered pervious or impervious. She agreed they do not give a credit currently for using pervious materials.

Ms. Wolff stated they felt it should be clarified as to single-family attached dwellings; but also commented that multifamily developments usually contain parking lots, and in those types of developments there would most likely be Homeowners Associations, and the Township should consider allowing that credit if they use these materials in common lots. She stated for the common parking lots, they feel pervious paving would be appropriate. Ms. Friedman stated she felt this was to be used in low-usage areas, and Ms. Wolff stated it could be used in an overflow parking lot. Ms. Friedman added that the Planning Commission always encourages this anyway. She stated she is not sure this should be considered for the Ordinance at this time. Ms. Tyler asked what the net result would be; and Ms. Friedman stated they wanted to limit it to non-residential at this time so they could make sure it works before they open it up to anything else. Mr. Bush agreed.

Ms. Wolff stated another comment they made was about the effect of using the impervious credit on intensity of development; and they feel that the Township should be aware that anytime the pervious paving is going to be used, it will allow for more density.

Ms. Wolff stated they also made a comment about contingency plans for stormwater runoff and asked that consideration be given to requiring extra stormwater runoff handling devices in porous-paved areas. She noted an example in Warrington Township where the developer of the Valley Square Shopping Center and the Township agreed to various BMPs including the provision of pervious pavement in the parking lots, and infiltration basins were built underneath the parking areas to store the stormwater runoff. Additionally, inlets were installed along the curbing surrounding the parking areas. She stated if the pervious pavement becomes clogged or runoff from a storm event is so great that the rainwater cannot be adequately absorbed through the pavement, the excessive unabsorbed runoff enters the inlets, and is then diverted directly and not into the underground infiltration basins. Mr. Dresser stated the gravel bed below is deep enough to accept a two-year storm. Ms. Wolff stated they felt this would be an additional back-up plan.

Ms. Wolff stated their last comment was that on Page 3 of the Ordinance there is a reference to Section 178-03(B)(3) and they feel they should add that this is part of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance.

Ms. Wolff stated their letter dated February 5, 2014 is considered to be unofficial since the meeting during which they were going to endorse it did not take place. Mr. Koopman stated at the February meeting, the Supervisors are only going to open the Hearing, and it will not be discussed fully until March.

Mr. Bush moved, Mr. Pazdera seconded and it was unanimously carried to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the proposed Pervious Pavement Ordinance with the changes discussed this evening as well as consideration of the comments in the unofficial Bucks County Planning Commission letter dated 2/5/14 except for the second paragraph of Item #1 and Item #3.

#### DISCUSSION OF COMPREHENSIVE MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Ms. Lisa Wolff and Ms. Gail Friedman from the Bucks County Planning Commission were present. Ms. Wolff stated they were last before the Planning Commission two weeks ago and discussed some of the remaining sub-Sections in the Community Facilities Chapter. Ms. Wolff stated Ms. Gail Friedman worked on the History of the Township as well as the Chapter on Historic Resources in the Township.

Ms. Wolff stated when they were last present, they discussed the Wastewater Facilities Section, and she had indicated that they had some remaining questions; and Ms. Frick had suggested she contact Kevin Kall who was very responsive.

Ms. Wolff stated she had e-mailed Mr. Kall the draft, and the draft she provided to the Planning Commission this evening reflects his input. Ms. Wolff noted Page 1 has been revised where they list the five service areas. Ms. Wolff noted the bottom of Page 2 under Future Needs and Recommendations for Action; and she stated the verbiage that is in the current Plan discusses that the plans call for providing sewerage to the Edgewood Village Historic District. Mr. Kall has verified that, in 2012, public sewer service was provided to many properties within the Village. She understands from her discussions with him that as Flowers Field develops, this will tie in as well. Ms. Wolff stated the rest of the paragraph discusses other potential sewage installations under the Current Sewage Facilities Plan including Delaware Rim Drive, Sunnyside Lane, W. Afton Avenue, and Yardley-Newtown Road; and Mr. Kall suggested that this remain in the new Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Wolff stated he indicated that the goal is to sewer these areas eventually.

Mr. Bush stated near Delaware Rim there was a development that was before the Planning Commission, and Ms. Frick stated it was Dogwood Drive. Mr. Bush stated there had been discussion about tying in Delaware Rim, and Ms. Frick stated this is still being discussed.

Ms. Wolff stated some of the recommendations have been re-ordered. She stated they have also added #4 at Mr. Kall's recommendation as within the next few years the Township is planning to construct a new permanent pumping station to provide system reinforcement to the Milford Manor Section of the Township. The pumping station will be located on Derbyshire Road.

Ms. Gail Friedman stated they previously discussed the wording on Page 4 of the Historic Resources Section, fourth paragraph from the top which reads, "Township Officials should monitor redevelopment, implementation, and consider adjustments to Zoning and Design Guidelines should they become warranted in order to ensure the continuing appropriateness of development activity." She stated they are discussing Edgewood Village in this Section. She stated the discussion had been about who the "officials" are. She stated this is a blanket recommendation which they often offer that the agencies responsible for overseeing and implementing land use keep an eye on all of their Subdivision Ordinances. Ms. Gail Friedman stated they had enumerated the HARB and the Board of Supervisors, and she would add to that the Planning Commission as an agency with primary responsibility for overseeing land use. She stated she feels the sentence should state: "The Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, and the HARB should monitor redevelopment, implementation ...". She stated alternatively they could say, "Municipal agencies responsible for implementing and overseeing land use."

Ms. Karen Friedman stated she does not feel any one member on the Planning Commission is qualified enough to understand during the implementation of a development what would be going right or wrong. She stated she feels there should be a group or a person who would do this who has better knowledge, and they would report to the Planning Commission; and this is when they would initiate the rest of that sentence. Ms. Tyler stated if it is Edgewood Village, it would be HARB. Mr. Bush stated there would not be one, single person. He stated if they just indicated it was HARB, there would be other components such as Zoning.

Ms. Frick stated she questions why all of this is in the Master Plan. She stated she felt that they were going to discuss editing since there is so much in here. She stated she feels it is reading like an Ordinance rather than a Master Plan.

Ms. Karen Friedman stated she is in favor of the last sentence which begins “Of particular concern is the loss and deterioration ....” She feels that this is something that should be in a Master Plan to make sure that this is considered as important.

Ms. Frick stated there were previously concerns expressed with Page 2 as well and she feels they should start at the beginning to consider what should be edited.

Ms. Karen Friedman noted the changes marked in red, and she asked who has recommended these changes; and Ms. Frick stated she understands it was Ms. Helen Heinz. Ms. Gail Friedman stated she herself mostly wrote the Section with input from representatives of HARB and the Historic Commission. Ms. Tyler asked Ms. Gail Friedman if she is comfortable with the expansive nature of this Section; and Ms. Gail Friedman stated she is. She stated she is a resident of Lower Makefield and is looking at Edgewood Village where resources are being lost and where there are gaps in the historic streetscape in the National Historic District. She stated the Ordinances are in place, and they have approved Land Development Plans which are being implemented. She stated there might be fine-tuning that needs to be done to the Ordinances in the future depending on how the implementation of the Plans play out.

Ms. Frick stated the concern she had with Page 2 is with the list of the properties, and she has no idea what these properties are. Ms. Gail Friedman stated she agreed to put this in the Appendix, and she will find the Tax Map Parcels.

Mr. Bush asked that they go back to Page 4 where they were discussing “Township Officials,” and he suggested that they state: “It is recommended that Township Officials monitor re-development...” He stated this is only a recommendation and he does not feel they need to list who it is and what they are doing.

Ms. Frick noted her concern with Page 5, the second paragraph, and Ms. Karen Friedman stated she too had made a note to review this. She stated when they get the second draft, she feels they should review it all to see what makes sense to be in the Master Plan and what could be part of the Appendix so that the Master Plan is more concise.

Ms. Karen Friedman stated on that same page, they were going to put Act 167 as a reference. She stated Act 247 and Act 167 are going to be in the Appendix. Mr. Koopman stated he hopes they are not going to appendix the whole Municipalities Planning Code as no one will want to purchase the document.

Ms. Frick stated possibly this will all be clearer when they get through the second draft.

Ms. Gail Friedman stated she will put the chart of the Historic Places with the Tax Map Parcels and the explanatory material on Act 167 and Act 247 in the Appendix. They will do this for the next draft.

Ms. Frick stated under Historic Resources of the Township Page1, it discusses buildings on the National Register but those located out of Edgewood Village should also have a better description including Tax Parcel Numbers. Ms. Gail Friedman stated she should be able to locate the Tax Map Parcels for these as well.

Ms. Tyler stated she feels that there is a tremendous amount of extraneous information; and Ms. Karen Friedman stated this is why she is advocating they edit the second draft so they can tighten this up quite a bit.

Ms. Tyler stated she will review the notes from the Planning Commission, and she will compare her notes with those.

Ms. Wolff stated they are not yet ready to prepare the second draft as they still need to discuss Future Land Use, Planning of Surrounding Municipalities, and the Maps the next time they meet with the Planning Commission. She stated once they have all the revisions, they will put them together in a second draft.

There being no further business, Mr. Bush moved, Mr. Pazdera seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen Friedman, Chair

