

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES – JUNE 23, 2014

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on June 23, 2014. Ms. Friedman called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. Ms. Friedman noted that there is a vacancy on the Planning Commission and anyone interested in serving should contact Mr. Fedorchak.

Those present:

Planning Commission: Karen Friedman, Chair
Dean Dickson, Secretary
Tony Bush, Member

Others: Nancy Frick, Director Zoning, Inspection, & Planning
Nathan Fox, Township Solicitor
Mark Eisold, Township Engineer
Kristin Tyler, Supervisor

Absent: John Pazdera, Planning Commission Vice Chair
Dan McLaughlin, Supervisor Liaison

#629 – MOON NURSERIES TRACT DISCUSSION

Mr. Edward Murphy, attorney, and Mr. Doug Waite, engineer, were present. Mr. Murphy stated the property is located on Quarry Road, and they were previously before the Planning Commission and subsequently the Board of Supervisors last summer with a Sketch Plan. He stated as a result of the feedback, they submitted a fully-engineered Subdivision Plan in September. He stated they received review letters back, and they elected to resubmit the Plan before scheduling another meeting with the Planning Commission. He stated the Plan that is before the Planning Commission has been revised once as reflected by the May 19 review letter that the Township engineer's office issued.

Mr. Murphy stated their intention tonight is not to seek a recommendation from the Planning Commission, but rather to review with the Planning Commission four specific issues they have highlighted from the May 19 review letter. He stated everything else in the review letter is not an issue. Mr. Murphy stated after discussion, they intend to resubmit the Plan and reappear before the Planning Commission probably in late summer.

Mr. Murphy stated the Plan shown on the easel by Mr. Waite is unchanged from the Sketch that was reviewed last year. It still shows the entrance and exit from Quarry Road with a single cul-de-sac accessing the rearmost portion of the site. He stated one of the big design issues from the Sketch Plan stage was whether or not there was going to be an interconnection with Hillside. He stated the Planning Commission, the neighbors, and the Board of Supervisors made it abundantly clear that there would be no interest in seeing that interconnection; and they are following that request and not providing that interconnection. He stated the Township engineer did raise the question of what type of connection would be provided to Hillside; and Mr. Murphy stated the direction they feel they were given was that they want to provide the flexibility to at least provide emergency access to Hillside, but there would be no permanent interconnection where there would be regular two-way traffic. He stated they will provide for emergency access only which he feels is the clear direction they received from the Planning Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and from the neighbors.

Ms. Friedman asked how they will provide emergency access. Mr. Waite stated they have discussed this with Mr. Eisold who suggested that they provide a stub street coming off of the proposed main road into the right-of-way past the driveway for Lot #3. Mr. Waite stated there would be a grass paver drive that would be a stabilized driveway over which emergency vehicles could traverse. Ms. Friedman asked if they would block it off, and Mr. Murphy stated they would do whatever Mr. Eisold's suggests such as bollards, etc. He stated it would not be an invitation for people to try to use it on a regular basis, and the only access would be for emergency or first responders. Mr. Eisold stated there would be grass with trees or something to delineate where it is, but other than that it would be a grass area with a chain at the boundary line for emergency vehicles only to access.

Mr. Murphy stated the second issue to discuss is that today there is a pipe that provides stormwater to reach the existing pond on the property, and Mr. Waite showed this location on the Plan. Mr. Murphy stated the Township engineer raised the question of whether that pipe would remain. Mr. Murphy stated the pipe is old and needs to be replaced, and they intend to replace it with a similarly-sized pipe possibly at a different elevation than where the pipe is today; but the idea is to continue to maintain the ability to direct stormwater to the pond to keep the pond fed as it is today. Mr. Murphy stated Mr. Eisold's letter had raised the question as to whether there was a Zoning issue associated with that; and Mr. Murphy stated they feel that there is no Zoning issue, and they will maintain the existing condition and

replace it with a new pipe. Mr. Eisold stated originally he did not know where the pipe came from or what it was for, and basically they are replacing it in kind. Mr. Eisold stated he believes that the pond is manmade, and Mr. Murphy agreed. Mr. Eisold stated apparently there is also an agreement between the property owners that the water has to continue to go in that direction in order to maintain the pond, and Mr. Murphy agreed.

Ms. Friedman asked if there is any concern that the pond could become polluted from salt or debris from the road system. She also asked if the pond has any aeration to prevent other incidences. Mr. Murphy stated it does not have aeration now, but they did discuss this. Mr. Murphy stated Mr. Eisold indicated that he wanted some time to consider whether or not there needs to be some ability to aerate it or not; and whatever recommendation Mr. Eisold makes, they will follow it. Ms. Friedman expressed concerns with mosquitos. Mr. Waite stated the pond does have a fountain in the middle now that provides some level of aeration, and they will provide electric service to that area as there is already electric service on the Moon property. He stated there is an existing easement, and they will provide an extension of that easement in order to be able to maintain that power source.

Mr. Bush stated it was noted that there was an agreement with property owners about continuation of the pond, and Mr. Murphy stated that property owner is present this evening. Ms. Frick asked about the electric, and Mr. Murphy stated there is electric now running from Moon to the other property owner on whose property the pond is located. Mr. Murphy stated Moon-Orleans is going to continue to provide the dedicated electric source to run whatever aeration system is necessary. Mr. Eisold asked who will pay this electric in the end, and Mr. Murphy stated it will be part of the HOA. Mr. Bush asked if the agreement would be between the HOA and the adjacent property owner, and Mr. Eisold stated he feels it would have to be; and Mr. Murphy agreed.

Mr. Murphy stated the third discussion item Mr. Eisold raised is that the Plan presumes that the delineation of the floodplain line is based on the current recommended new delineation by FEMA that has not yet been adopted. Mr. Murphy stated FEMA has identified and upgraded its delineation throughout many of the stream corridors including this one, and it has been pending for quite some time. He stated everyone had expected that FEMA would have adopted that new line some time ago, but they keep pushing the deadline back. Mr. Murphy stated the latest deadline he heard was sometime next year. Mr. Murphy stated the Plan does presume that it would be the new line recommended by FEMA that would be incorporated into this Plan. Mr. Murphy stated because of the continuing delays, they have elected to file an Application with FEMA for a letter of map amendment so that they can confirm the accuracy of the line. Mr. Murphy stated there is no challenge to the line as shown on the Plan. He stated there are

two Appeals outstanding in Bucks County about the new delineation line, but none of them involve this property or anywhere nearby. He stated the process is already underway and has already been submitted; and by the time the Planning Commission next sees the Plan, they expect to have the letter of map amendment approved so that issues will go away. Mr. Murphy stated individual property owners have the ability to advance the process by submitting their own request, and that is what they have done; and they expect that FEMA will approve this line at the property owner's request sooner than when they approve everything in Bucks County.

Mr. Murphy was asked to submit a copy of the request to FEMA to the Township for their records. Mr. Eisold stated he understands that the current deadline for adopting the floodplain by the Township is March 16, 2015, although this could be pushed back again. Ms. Friedman stated she would like to have the Planning Commission kept advised with all appropriate letters and documentation by the time they are actually discussing it as they will not vote on anything without having read something in this regard.

Mr. Murphy stated the last item raised by Mr. Eisold in his letter that was the subject of recent discussion has been Quarry Road, and the fact that there is an existing "hairpin" turn. Mr. Murphy stated the ability to straighten out the road does not exist because of the cemetery at the point. Mr. Murphy stated Mr. Eisold's office has asked that the Applicant do a speed study for traffic on Quarry Road, and this will be completed and the results submitted with the next resubmitted set of Plans. Mr. Eisold stated this is not an ideal situation.

Ms. Friedman stated there are also sight line issues there as well. Mr. Eisold stated they have shown the line of sight for the speed limit posted; however, he questions if people are really traveling that speed or are they going faster. Ms. Friedman stated she is familiar with that area, and she never saw anyone follow that speed limit. Mr. Eisold stated this is the point of the speed study which will determine what the actual speed of the cars is, and they can then see if they actually have enough sight distance for the speed. Mr. Eisold stated they also requested that they make some improvements, and the engineers were looking at maybe shifting the entrance further away from that location to give more space and make it safer.

Mr. Murphy stated all other items in the May 19 review letter from the engineer are "will comply" items and will be incorporated into the next set of Plans that are submitted. Mr. Murphy stated they hope the Plans will be submitted to the Township within the next thirty days. They will receive another review letter from Mr. Eisold, and they will come back before the Planning Commission after that.

Ms. Friedman stated previously an issue was raised about Lot #3 and the possibility of eliminating it, and she believes the Bucks County Planning Commission commented on this as well. Mr. Murphy stated the issue with Lot #3 relates to the sub street. He stated the issue is that they can comply with the Ordinance by extending the road to connect to Hillside; however, no one wants them to do this. Mr. Murphy stated they do not want to be penalized for not doing the extension. He stated the comment was made that the Lot may not conform to the Zoning given the current configuration, but no one wants them to conform by connecting the two streets. Ms. Friedman stated the other development was there first; and by opening the road between the two developments, they are penalizing that development severely with regard to safety issues. Mr. Murphy stated they are not complaining about not having to open the road, but they do not want to be penalized for not complying. He stated they do not want to lose a lot because they are not complying. Mr. Murphy stated they already discussed this with the Board of Supervisors at the Sketch Plan stage.

Mr. Eisold stated they would take the dedication of the area, but would not open up the road so in effect they would have the frontage by dedicating that short road and create the lot; but they physically would not connect so that the road would probably go up to where the driveway for Lot #3 came in and it would then stop and have the emergency access. He stated the Zoning would then be cleared up, and the road would be cut off and opened only for emergency vehicles.

Ms. Friedman stated she felt that there was a driveway issue for this Lot, and Mr. Eisold stated the way it is currently shown is that the driveway comes all the way up the main road; and the thought was to extend the public road past the driveway, so the driveway would not have to come in from the cul-de-sac. He stated the way it is shown currently is that it has a driveway which does not make sense. Mr. Murphy stated they stopped the road short and extended the individual driveway for Lot #3 from the edge of the stub street, and Mr. Eisold wants them to extend the stub street to the property line, take the driveway directly off the extended street, and then block off the part that would otherwise connect to Hillside and make it grass pavers so it looks less cumbersome than the way the current Plan shows although the effect is no different. Mr. Murphy stated they will make this change when they resubmit the Plans.

Mr. Stuart Revness, Bridle Estates Drive, stated he backs up to the property. He asked about water mitigation and the creek since there have been situations over the past three to four years in heavy rainfall when their back yards turn into ponds. He stated with the additional development, they would like to know about water mitigation. He showed a picture of the water situation.

Mr. Ed Nini stated his property is adjacent to the proposed development as well. Mr. Waite stated they need to meet the Township Ordinances with regard to run off and will be required to manage the peak flows and volumes; and in doing this, it will be done in several ways through best management practices.

Mr. Nini asked if any of this will go into the existing creek, and Mr. Waite stated it will, but they will lower the peak rates and lower the volume. He stated there are also basins, and he showed where these will be located on the Plan. He stated they will also used underground pipe.

Mr. Eisold stated even without this development the way the reconfiguration of the flood plain is based on topography it is actually being reduced on this property; but as he discussed with Mr. Nini in the field, it is actually being increased on his and Mr. Revness' property. He stated this is because of the way the floodplain mapping has been changed. Mr. Eisold stated in addition the site is highly impervious now given the use on the site; and with the development in place, they will actually reduce some of that impervious surface. Mr. Eisold stated this should reduce the flow off the lot, and they are putting in the basins. Mr. Eisold stated the reality is that the flood plain is being remapped in that area.

Ms. Friedman asked if there are any practices those residents could do to help prevent it from getting worse, and Mr. Eisold stated he did provide them with some alternatives that could be done in their rear yards to keep the water away from their houses. Mr. Nini stated this would all be at their own expense. He stated he bought his house eight months ago, and it was in a low risk zone. It was noted that FEMA is doing the flood plain amendments, and Ms. Friedman suggested the residents may want to take this up with FEMA.

Ms. Donna Martino, Spring Lane, asked if there will be a greenbelt between the existing homes and the new development. Mr. Eisold stated similar uses do not require a buffer by Ordinance. He stated what she is seeing on the Plan may be the rear setback. He stated there is a storm easement in the back as well.

Ms. Lisa Veltrick, 26 Spring Lane, stated their neighborhood is prone to loss of electricity whenever there are storms, and currently the electric company has to get permission from Moon Nurseries to get to those lines. She asked how the electric company will get out to those lines with all of these houses, since they need to get large Trucks in there. Mr. Eisold stated typically PECO gets to where necessary to get things fixed, and they have the right to access their lines wherever they may be. He stated the designer could look into this. Ms. Veltrick stated they always need to get a bucket truck in this area. Ms. Tyler asked why PECO needs to get permission from Moon to access the lines; and Ms. Veltrick stated Moon Nurseries has a locked gate and a chain that does not allow access to that area, and PECO

has to get permission from Moon to take the chain down so the trucks can get in. Mr. Eisold stated the engineers could look at this to see what could be done to accommodate this.

Ms. Friedman noted the letter from James Yates, and she did not see anything that would make him come up with the conclusion that he does not recommend approval. She asked if this is a misprint or is it based on the fact that the roadway turning radii needs to be checked for conformance. Ms. Frick stated she feels he wants the Township engineer to check into this.

Ms. Irene Koehler thanked the Planning Commission and the developer for hearing the residents' concerns.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE TREE ORDINANCES

Mr. Jim Bray, Mr. Alan Dresser, and Ms. Cynthia D'Alessio from the EAC were present. Mr. Bray stated they would like to suggest some changes to the Tree Replacement Ordinance and the Street Tree Ordinance in Lower Makefield Township. Mr. Bray stated they want to set up a tree bank account that can only be used to plant trees in public areas of Lower Makefield Township, and this will be funded by development dollars under a certain set of circumstances.

Ms. Friedman asked if the \$315 amount is for a 2 ½" caliper tree, and Mr. Dresser stated this would be for the purchase, delivery, and installation of 2 ½" to 3" caliper trees. Ms. Friedman stated they also need to understand how the fees collected will be maintained, as she would like to make sure that account is only used for trees. Ms. Friedman stated they are allowing the developers to give a fee-in-lieu of \$315 per tree not to plant them on the site, and she asked if they should put a minimum or maximum of what they can contribute such as a percentage so that the development is not left "naked." She stated she is concerned that a developer will indicate that they do not want to replant any trees in the development, and she wants to make sure that something is planted on the property. Ms. D'Alessio noted under the proposed changes 4d states, "Replacement trees shall be selected in compliance with the Township's Native Plant Ordinance and shall be planted at the Subdivision or Land Development site from which the trees are removed unless, with the Township's Approval, the developer makes a payment in lieu." She stated they are stressing that they are to plant as many trees as possible on site; and then if they want to make an in-lieu contribution because they simply cannot fit all of the required replacement trees on site, they have to request that. She stated this must be approved by the Township. Ms. Friedman stated she would like it to be made very clear in case a Township Board allows them to do whatever they want to do.

Ms. Friedman stated she would prefer something that does not jeopardize the amount of trees that need to be at a development site. Mr. Dresser asked if she is looking for a certain percentage, and Mr. Bush stated it may not be possible to have a percentage. Ms. D'Alessio stated it would be site specific so they would have to have some flexibility. She stated there are going to be situations where they can put in more trees onto a development site, but there are also going to be situations where they are planting on a wooded lot. She stated she feels it would be difficult to set a percentage. Ms. Friedman stated it could be 10% to 30% since she is concerned that it could be abused. Mr. Dresser stated the Township would get trees out of it, but they could just be in a different location. He understands that Ms. Friedman would prefer that they be at the location where they were taken down; however, Ms. Friedman stated she wants to make sure that the development from where the trees were taken is not left more barren than it should be for some reason. She stated she feels this is a detail that should be addressed.

Ms. D'Alessio stated currently there is nothing about this in the current Tree Replacement Ordinance; and it is just based on the suggestions of the EAC and the Planning Commission, with the Board of Supervisors making the ultimate approval. She stated this is not making it easier for the developer not to plant on site. She stated currently they would owe the Township trees with the replacement system, but the problem going on now is that no trees are being put into the ground. She stated the developers owe all the trees on paper, but they never come back to plant the trees.

Ms. Friedman stated possibly they could state under (d) "Replacement trees shall be selected in compliance with the Township's Native Plan Ordinance and should be planted as a priority at the Subdivision or Land Development site..." She stated this way it would be completely addressed to make sure that they are focusing on the development. Mr. Bray stated while it would be hard to quantify, he feels using the word "priority" spells it out clearly what their intent is. Ms. Friedman stated she wants to make sure that the development is handled first; and if there are leftover trees, it is a great idea to have the bank. Ms. D'Alessio stated they did discuss this, and this is why they included (d) since they did not want to make it so that the developer had the "green light" to not plant trees on the site. Ms. D'Alessio stated they do not want to encourage the developers to use the tree bank, and they do want them to be planted on the site.

Mr. Dickson stated he is assuming that the Township will have to create a Tree Bank Ordinance, and Mr. Fox agreed. Mr. Dickson asked who will administer this, and Mr. Fox stated theoretically this would be delegated by the Board of Supervisors to the Township staff in conjunction with the Township engineer and the solicitor's office if something needs to be incorporated into the Development Agreement.

Mr. Dickson stated he feels that there would need to be some oversight since it indicates that the contribution to the Capital Account will be due sixty days after the development receives Final Approval. Mr. Eisold stated possibly it should be included with the Approval of the Development and in the Development Agreement so that it is up front. Ms. Frick stated most of the fees are paid at the Building Permit stage depending on the Development Agreement. Mr. Eisold stated he feels it should be done before that in this instance because the Building Permits could go over a number of years, and he questions how they would split up the trees per lot. He stated he feels it should be up front. Mr. Dickson stated he feels they should work with the EAC to determine when the tree bank should be utilized.

Mr. Dickson noted #3 which indicates the EAC will advise the Township, and he asked who they will advise. He stated he would like to know who is going to be in charge of the tree bank. Mr. Dresser stated he feels it would be the Township Manager who is well aware of this and was in favor of it. Ms. Friedman stated the Township Manager would manage that account. Mr. Dickson stated the Tree Bank Ordinance should indicate that money has to be paid before Final Approval. He stated it should also state who will manage the tree bank adding possibly the EAC might conceivably do this.

Ms. Frick asked who will be making the determination that they should pay the money rather than plant the trees, and Mr. Fox stated ultimately the Supervisors make the final decision. Ms. Frick asked if they are going to want a recommendation from the Township engineer as to the reasons why since they want as many trees as possible. She stated they do not want the developers to decide that they will just pay the \$315 per tree since if they planted a tree and it died, they would have to replace it. She stated the developers may decide it is easier to just pay the fee once. Mr. Fox stated the Supervisors make the ultimate determination with input from the EAC and possibly the Planning Commission and Township professionals as well. Mr. Bray stated the EAC is uniquely situated to make recommendations although the Planning Commission and Park & Recreation should also have input.

Mr. Bush stated he feels that it would be good to have an accounting to the various groups which were just identified to advise how much money is in this tree bank account on an annual basis so that maybe the Planning Commission or the EAC could make recommendations as to where trees should go as opposed to just having the money sitting there.

Mr. Bush asked how this impacts the Township if the Township is the property owner. He stated what has been proposed does not seem to address the Township. He also noted that currently there are uncleared plots of land that the Township has; and periodically the Township takes down trees, and there is no accounting or replacement of those trees. He asked if this should be addressed somewhere as well. Mr. Bray stated he agrees that this is something they should look into. Ms. D'Alessio stated what is so wonderful about Lower Makefield is the tree cover that we have. She stated with all the storm damage they have had in the last ten years, we have lost a significant percentage of the canopy in Lower Makefield. She stated this is the one resource Lower Makefield has that makes it so unique. She feels there should be a comprehensive tree management plan in the Township where the EAC, Planning Commission, and Park & Recreation could all be on the same page as to how we manage the tree resources. She stated they need to know when the Township is taking down trees, and then find out what they are going to do to replace them so that we can keep the tree canopy. She stated she feels the EAC should be working on this with the Planning Commission and other interested parties in the Township. Mr. Bray stated currently there is no replacement requirement, but they could consider whether or not there should be. He stated he feels if something comes down, something should go up. Ms. Tyler stated the purpose of the Tree Replacement Ordinance is for new developments, and it is not to replace trees that die a natural death, but is to replace a tree that was cut down to build the development.

Ms. Tyler stated they are going to be more aggressive with the tree management program in the Township because of the electric reliability issues we have. She stated if a tree has to come down because it is not a safe tree, she does not feel that tree has to be replaced. She stated she feels the purpose of the Tree Replacement Ordinance was to put back something that you killed that was healthy. Ms. Tyler stated PECO can come in and take down trees or cut limbs, and they are not subject to the Tree Replacement Ordinance.

Mr. Bray stated when they revised the Ordinance several years ago, they specified specific trees which are much lower that could only be planted under power lines.

Mr. Dickson stated they cannot force someone to put in a new tree where a tree was taken down from a storm; but possibly there could be creative use of the tree bank money so that it could be used and the Township would then have the funds to replace trees. He stated there is the issue of using Township money on private property, but possibly it is something that could be creatively addressed in the Ordinance. Ms. Friedman stated it is important to address this since the roots help with stormwater management. Mr. Bray stated a mature tree actually returns between \$400 and \$500 a year in environmental value to the Township.

Mr. Dickson also noted the potential for blight; and possibly they could include something that if they lose a number of trees, the tree bank could be used to replace those trees. Ms. Tyler asked where these trees would be in theory, and Mr. Dickson stated they would not know whether it would be private property or not; but they are trying to maintain the canopy of the Township. Mr. Fox stated he does not feel Township funds could be used to benefit one single property owner, even though arguably adding trees is a benefit to the whole. He stated he does feel that it could be used in common areas in the community or Township property. Mr. Dickson stated he agrees with this which is why he used the term “creative.”

Ms. Friedman asked what they do about trees that die within the first year of being planted by the developer in a new development; and Ms. Frick stated there are requirements for replacement in the Development Agreement.

Ms. Friedman stated with regard to the Capital Account Tree Bank to be established she stated she feels the language should be changed to state: “These funds shall ONLY...” unless this too restrictive. Mr. Bray stated they had originally had “sole purpose” there at one time, and it was suggested that they add this back in.

Mr. Zachary Rubin, 1661 Covington Road, discussed the pests which are impacting trees and the potential use of pesticides to protect the trees from what happened to the chestnut trees in the Country. He stated he feels there should be a pro active approach for protection.

Mr. Dresser stated in summary they will include language in 4(d) that the priority is to plant the trees on site, and on D1 they will add “These funds shall be used for the sole purpose of planting replacement trees.” Mr. Bray stated the third item had to do with when the fee should be applied and where they had indicated it would be sixty days after, they would be in favor of Mr. Eisold’s suggestion that the contribution will be due upon execution of the Development Agreement. Mr. Dresser stated Mr. Bush also wanted there to be a clause to specify that the Township annually advise how much money is in the fund. Mr. Bush stated they want it to be known to the EAC and the Planning Commission how much in the tree bank fund.

Mr. Dickson moved, Mr. Bush seconded and it was unanimously carried to recommend to the Board of Supervisors adoption of the proposed modifications to the Tree Replacement Ordinance and the Street Tree Ordinance as presented and modified this evening.

Mr. Dresser agreed to send these to the Township solicitor for review.

Mr. Bray stated they are working on a Heritage Tree Ordinance. He stated Lower Makefield is fortunate to have some historic trees and currently there is no protection. He stated one of the main trees is on Patterson Farm which may be the largest cucumber magnolia tree in the State of Pennsylvania and possibly the first or second largest in the United States. He stated they have a list of trees like this throughout the Township, and a lot of them are on public lands. He stated they hope to have something to bring before the Board in two to three months.

DISCUSSION OF MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Ms. Lynn Bush and Ms. Gail Friedman from the Bucks County Planning Commission were present. Ms. Gail Friedman stated the two Sections to be reviewed this evening – “Vision For The Future” and “Implementation” are the last two Sections of the Plan. Ms. Gail Friedman stated Vision For The Future animates the Plan. She stated the changes are minimal. She stated under Community Goals and Policies they have added to the Vision one line about proper planning in order to communicate with and protect all residents in all areas and neighborhoods in the Township during emergency events which reflects concern with emergency planning that has surfaced since they did the last Plan ten years ago. She noted the bottom of the page where they have changed the wording somewhat to reflect Residential as well as non-Residential development should be balanced and that all of these forms of development contribute to the vitality of the Township. She noted the last page where there is a change to reflect that build out is pretty much approaching.

With regard to Implementation, Ms. Gail Friedman stated the introduction to this section notes that they have made efforts to streamline it, and that they are emphasizing new actions rather than on-going and continuing ones.

Ms. Gail Friedman noted Natural Features, adding these reflect changes in emphasis and wording. She stated Item #2 is somewhat changed because they now recognize more so than ten years ago that watershed plans are inter-Municipal, and this is pursuing an inter-Municipal Plan for Brock Creek and Rock Run.

Ms. Gail Friedman stated Item #3 reflects a new area of intensified concern and this is acquiring or elevating flood prone repetitive loss properties and supporting the recommendations of the Delaware River Flood Task Force which emerged in 2010.

Under Housing Plans, Ms. Gail Friedman stated this remains much the same although they have taken out “Enforce Codes as necessary to maintain housing;” and changed it to “Consider appropriate housing proposals to insure continued diversity.” She stated the one about in-law suites or accessory apartments was also in the previous Plan as a recommendation. Ms. Frick stated she

was not aware that was in the current Plan. Ms. Karen Friedman stated she was not either, and she questions why they would have to worry about evaluating that. She stated she would also make it more generic and incorporate the words, “specialized housing” as opposed to specifying in-law suites or accessory apartments. Ms. Karen Friedman stated her concern is that there could be five families under one roof, and she would not want to invite too much accessory housing in a house that exists. Ms. Frick stated they currently allow in-law suites, but they cannot have separate cooking facilities since later it could be turned into an apartment.

Ms. Gail Friedman stated the broader discussion is that this is a highly specialized and often intensely-regulated by Ordinance form of housing that some communities use in light of the aging of the population; and it is a way to bring an elderly family member onto the property. She stated she feels there are provisions that you can regulate and have it dismantled once that person leaves. Ms. Frick stated they have to go before the Zoning Hearing Board for a Variance, and it states that it is strictly for that person. Ms. Karen Friedman stated she does not understand why this would have to be in the Master Plan, and they would not plan for people to have their parents live with them as it is a choice they make along the way. It was agreed to remove this.

Ms. Frick stated she questions why #1 was added – “enforce Codes as necessary” – since they do this already; and it was agreed to eliminate this as well.

With regard to Housing, Ms. Gail Friedman stated they have removed one item regarding the specific need for Age-Restricted because the Township has that in sufficient numbers to account for the next ten years or so.

With regard to Land Use, Ms. Gail Friedman stated they have added material calling for reviewing the uses and standards in the O/R Office/Research District for updating and taking into account the nature of pending or approved development within that District and also in adjoining Edgewood Village. She stated complimentary to that is #2 – Considering ways to maximize pedestrian connectivity between O/R and the Historic/Commercial District when addressing development proposals in either District.

Ms. Gail Friedman stated #3 is to strengthen existing Commercial and Office areas first rather than encouraging new construction given the situation in the Office and Retail sector paying particular attention to ways to renew or redevelop older properties and to strengthen or institute new marketing efforts with specific efforts on Office. Ms. Frick asked how the Township would be involved in this.

Ms. Gail Friedman stated in the text it refers to the Economic Development Committee and partnerships. Ms. Bush stated she has been to a number of the Economic Development Committee meetings, and she knows that they were interested in trying to figure out marketing and other activities. She stated this is not so much of a Planning function as it is the activity of the Economic Development Committee. Ms. Frick asked if this should still be included in the Master Plan, and Ms. Bush stated she feels the point of not expanding the area until the current pre-built area is better utilized is the main focus. Ms. Bush stated she understands that their role as a public body is limited in this.

Mr. Fox asked if this is not partially included in Item #1 with regard to permitted uses or re-zoning parcels from Office to other uses which would be the only way the Township could get involved in this, and he asked if that was the intent of Comment #3. Ms. Bush stated she has not been present at enough of the meetings to know if they have committed to going in that direction and considering other office-related uses or not. Ms. Frick stated Mr. Dwyer had brought that up. Mr. Bush stated Item #3 is a little different in that it is talking more about advocacy. Ms. Gail Friedman stated in the text it does go into greater detail about doing it in consultation with the Economic Advisory Board.

Mr. Bob Dwyer stated there is some logic to the paragraph in that it suggests that whenever possible the Township should work with existing facilities to try to make things work better such as the way they worked with his company to approve the connection between their two existing facilities.

Ms. Tyler suggested changing the word “strengthen” to “recognize and monitor.”

Mr. Bush asked if PPG has given thought to reinventing themselves so that they are not just suburban office parks and if they are considering this for Lower Makefield in the future. Mr. Dwyer stated they are not with regard to the existing facilities. He noted the problem with the vacancy rates and the need to do something with the parcels they already have. He stated they want to encourage companies to come in to this area, and they would like to see Lower Makefield be a pedestrian-friendly enclave of housing and retail with connectivity. He noted the problems with the “brain drain” because there is no train station, no downtown, and no affordable housing. He stated there is a need for vibrancy which he feels they will have in time.

Ms. Tyler stated with regard to this item, she does not believe that “rather than encouraging new construction...” belongs in here since the Township neither encourages or discourages new construction. She suggested that this be removed and replace “strengthen” with “consider and support existing Commercial and Office

areas paying particular attention to ways to renew or redevelop older non-Residential...” Ms. Gail Friedman asked if they should retain the last part of that sentence about marketing efforts, and it was agreed that they could leave in this sentence since the Economic Development Committee is currently working on this.

Ms. Gail Friedman stated the next recommendation was added by request, and that is to evaluate the adequacy of Commercial Zoning and related land use in light of the fact that there is a large age-qualified housing community that has recently been built in the C-2 District. Mr. Dickson stated he recalls discussing this and they agreed that because the Oxford Oaks Shopping Center is in the area it will take on new importance. He stated he felt that they agreed that the Shopping Center was adequate to handle Regency because of the proximity so he feels this has been addressed. Ms. Karen Friedman stated the Mall is also in the area. Mr. Dickson stated there is also another shopping center in the Township less than one quarter mile away. Ms. Karen Friedman stated more importantly, she does not feel there is any more land in that area that they could change to put in more Commercial.

Ms. Tyler stated when the Township was planned, the large Commercial Zone where Regency is being built was part of the balance of the overall Township. She stated they have lost that Commercial property so when they are considering permitted uses, they must consider the fact that they are now down Commercial property and this effects the overall balance of the Township. She stated the Master Plan was altered by Court Order. Ms. Karen Friedman stated they used the Commercial land for age-restricted housing, and so they need to consider if they want to make that up. Ms. Friedman stated the way it is written she assumed they meant that they needed more goods and services for those people specifically in the age-restricted community. Ms. Bush stated that area was not just Commercial, rather it was non-Residential since there were other things besides Retail to balance the tax base.

Ms. Tyler stated she does feel that something should be included, and Ms. Bush stated they should amend it so that it does not indicate that they want more shopping centers for people who live in Regency. Ms. Tyler stated now that she has re-read it, she does not have a problem with it; and Mr. Bush stated it is just a recommendation and recognition of the loss due to Matrix. Ms. Bush stated she will reconsider the wording so that it is not misleading.

Ms. Gail Friedman stated a number of recommendations have been eliminated as redundant or because they have been placed elsewhere.

Ms. Gail Friedman noted Community Services with a change under Fire Protection where, on the advice of Fire Protection Officials, they have put in items about assessing the adequacy of coverage and identifying needs for the next ten years.

Ms. Gail Friedman stated Item #2 is to evaluate ways to insure that fire protection services are provided within the recommended 2.5 mile distance to all areas of the Township. Mr. Bush stated they did discuss this, and there is one small section of the Township that does not fit into that; and there will never be coverage for that since the third fire house will not be built. He asked if there are arrangements they could make with other communities to cover it. Ms. Gail Friedman stated she suspects that mutual assistance would be the logical venue. Mr. Bush stated he feels they should therefore specifically state this. Mr. Dickson stated he felt they indicated that this would be Newtown for that section of the Township; and Mr. Bush stated if this is the case, they should state this. Ms. Karen Friedman stated by not changing it, they are leaving the Township open to the fact that they are not adhering to this recommendation. Mr. Dickson stated he recalls that after looking at the map, they felt that Newtown Township would be the nearest fire station to that area of the Township that is not covered. Ms. Tyler stated she felt that was still outside of the 2.5 mile radius. Ms. Bush stated she feels that they should take out the "2.5 mile" notation.

Ms. Gail Friedman stated there has been an addition under Emergency and Ambulance Services that is a reference to negotiating increased cost sharing arrangements with neighboring Municipalities that also use the Yardley-Makefield Ambulance Unit.

Ms. Gail Friedman stated with regard to Schools, this is a re-statement of an existing recommendation to coordinate with the Pennsbury School District regarding enrollment and facilities.

Ms. Gail Friedman stated under Library Services they have added the recommendation to coordinate with the County Free Library System to make multi-purpose use of the Library, make use of new technology, and potential expansion of the Library Building. Ms. Karen Friedman asked if they could put something in about potential expansion or re-location of the Library Building in case at some point in the future that would be more beneficial. Ms. Tyler stated it could be expanded by 7,500 square feet as they had considered putting the Community Center there. She stated there is a 99 year Lease with the Library, and she believes that this is the only property in the Library system that the Library does not own.

Mr. Bush stated he does not feel that the Bucks County Free Library system really plans for the future adequately, and he feels there will be a lot of empty space in that building in the next ten years.

Ms. Tyler also asked why the phrase "... including the addition of new technology" has been included, and she asked why the Township would have anything to do with the addition of new technology. She stated the Township would coordinate with them on the potential expansion of the building itself. Mr. Bush stated the Township has an interest in making sure that the building is not empty given that it is across the parking lot from the Municipal Building, and they would not want there to be an empty building there. Ms. Tyler questioned what they would need from the Township in terms of new technology. Ms. Bush stated she felt the discussion was that this was the direction in general the Libraries are going on so it was really just a comment on the likely future direction, and she agreed that this should be reworded. Ms. Tyler stated possibly they could indicate that with new technology, maybe they can make better community use of that space.

Ms. Gail Friedman stated with regard to Water Supply it states "coordinate with PAWC to evaluate the need to enact wellhead protection," and this is a restatement of an existing policy. Ms. Karen Friedman asked if they should add "including conservation of groundwater supply and water quality" or is this unnecessary. Ms. Bush stated these are the two main things they care about so they could emphasize this. Ms. Frick asked if the Township has any say over this since it is a private water company. Ms. Bush stated she agrees that the Township does not have a lot of control over these agencies and implying that the Township does may be misleading.

Ms. Gail Friedman noted Stormwater Management and the first recommendation is to prioritize stormwater problem areas including locations where obstructions and drainage issues exist for remediation. She stated the next is Sewage Facility – update the Act 537 Sewage Facility Plans to be consistent with this Comprehensive Update and new Agreements and Amendments regarding sewage facilities. She also noted the recommendation to implement construction of a permanent pumping station on Derbyshire Road and a restatement regarding on-lot disposal system, OLDS Management Program, and public education. Ms. Bush stated she assumes they have discussed updating the 537 Plan, and it was suggested that they discuss this with Mr. Fedorchak. It was also noted they could take out the recommendation for the pumping station on Derbyshire, since this has been constructed.

Ms. Frick noted the recommendation under Stormwater Management regarding prioritizing stormwater problem areas, and she asked if this would include the area noted by the gentleman earlier this evening which involves private property. Ms. Bush stated she feels this is part of the Township's obligation under the NPDES Permit, and Ms. Frick questioned if this would involve private property. Ms. Bush stated she feels it would involve any discharges they have even if they are on private property which would have to be identified. Ms. Frick stated she questions the use

of the word “prioritizing.” Mr. Fox stated some of this is probably already in the Township Stormwater Management Ordinance in that there cannot be discharge onto someone else’s property, but he understands Ms. Frick’s concern that it indicates that if there is a problem area, it is the Township’s responsibility on private property. Ms. Karen Friedman suggested stating “prioritize Township stormwater problem areas.”

Ms. Gail Friedman noted Township Administration and the first recommendation about a Facilities Master Plan is a rewording of what exists. She stated the second recommendation was added by Mr. Fedorchak – Consider consolidating the Recreation Department into the Public Works Department.

Ms. Karen Friedman went back to Stormwater Management and asked if they should include a recommendation to continue to require that all new developments be served by public sewers; and Ms. Frick stated there is a section in the Ordinance that says if you are within a certain number of feet you will need to connect, but she does not have a problem with including this. Mr. Bush stated if it is in the Ordinance, they would not have to include it here.

Mr. Bush asked with regard to the second recommendation under Township Administration on the consolidation issue, is this what is done in other Municipalities in Bucks County; and Ms. Bush stated she has seen it at the County level which is a very different scale. She stated she does not know what Mr. Fedorchak had in mind doing this, and she is not aware that other Townships have done this. She stated usually they have a Roads Department and a separate Park and Rec Department although they might work together. Mr. Bush stated his concern is that the skill sets and focus are in different directions.

Ms. Karen Friedman stated she does not see an advantage other than to save staff which does not necessarily mean that would be a good thing. Mr. Bush suggested they make a recommendation to review Township structure and various Departments in an effort to achieve greater operating efficiencies.

Ms. Gail Friedman agreed to make this change. Ms. Tyler asked that this be checked with Mr. Fedorchak since this is under Township Administration.

Ms. Gail Friedman noted Solid Waste Management, and there are recommendations related to composting and recycling. She stated the first one broadens it to state, “Examine alternatives to current locations for leaf waste drop off composting.” She stated the next recommendation is “In an effort to expand the amount of recyclables, evaluate other options such as Contract Collection,” and #3 is “Update the Township’s Website to provide information on recycling and send annual

mailings to residents and businesses detailing the recycling and waste requirements." She stated #4 is "Examine the possibility of a drop off center for electronics and bulk items."

Ms. Frick asked where Recommendation #3 came from, and Ms. Bush stated she felt it came from the Bucks County Recycling/Solid Waste Coordinator. She stated there is often a lack of understanding especially among Commercial establishments about what their responsibilities are. Ms. Karen Friedman stated this could be reworded to state, "Provide the most updated information on the Township Website on current recycling;" and it was agreed to change the wording in this way. Ms. Tyler stated instead of sending annual mailings to residents, she suggested they state, "inform residents and businesses" since what is currently written would imply that the Township has to undertake a letter-writing campaign. It was agreed to make that change as well.

Ms. Tyler asked about #2 which discusses Contract collection. Ms. Bush stated she is not sure whether they had discussed the trash collection system. She stated she assumes that they do not want to change the system in any way. Mr. Bush stated he did not recall discussing this at all. Ms. Bush stated most everyone is doing single-stream, but it is possible that there are other haulers that have incentives for recyclables; and she feels that this was the idea here. She stated there is rarely a more volatile recommendation than changing the trash collection systems so if the statement would raise comments, they could back off from it. Ms. Tyler stated possibly they could include this concept in Item #3 so that they would inform the residents and businesses detailing and waste requirements and options, and it was agreed to make that change.

Ms. Karen Friedman noted Item #4 and asked if there is an annual recycling effort for electronics and bulk items. Ms. Tyler stated they do have this, and Ms. Frick stated it is held by the County. Ms. Karen Friedman stated she feels #4 is implying that they would have a Township drop-off center, and the Township would then have to deal with that material. Ms. Tyler stated she feels this could be tied into #3. Ms. Bush stated the County does the hazardous waste and electronics collections, and some of them have been held at the Lower Makefield Corporate Center. She stated usually Townships advertise this on their Website and announce it at public meetings to promote the collection; and Ms. Tyler agreed that they should do that and include that idea within #3. Ms. Bush stated the direction is that the Township does not want to take this on, but they want to make sure the residents know that this is a service provided by the County so they will add language to that effect.

There was discussion about bulk items, and Ms. Bush stated some Townships do a yearly collection, and Ms. Frick stated she believed the trash haulers do this. Mr. Bush stated he calls his trash hauler about these items, and they come at any time to take them.

Ms. Gail Friedman stated under Park & Recreation Item #1 is a restatement of an existing idea to explore recreation items based on the needs of all population groups. Item #2 is to assess the need for additional recreation land and facilities and identify potential facilities gaps and opportunity for Park & Recreation acquisitions. She stated Item #3 is about bike/walking path maintenance, and this is a restatement of what exists. She stated Item #4 is with regard to the implementation of a Concept Plan for a new facility at the Snipes Tract and Memorial Park. She stated Item #5 is new – “Implementation of recommendations from the Feasibility Study for rehabbing and improving the Community Pool.” She stated Item #6 is to evaluate the possibility of a Regional Recreation Consortium involving the School District, and Item #7 is to update the Park & Rec Action Plan. Ms. Frick asked if these came from the Park & Recreation Board, and Ms. Gail Friedman stated Ms. Wolff developed this Section in close consultation with that group.

Mr. Bush noted Items #4 and #7. He stated the Concept Plan for Snipes is almost ten years old, and he is not certain that there is still a need for the facilities that were planned there or the will of the Township to get them built. He feels Item #7 makes more sense than Item #4 as it relates to Snipes. Ms. Tyler stated it could cost \$4 million to develop Snipes, and it has been on the books for over ten years. Ms. Karen Friedman stated #4 may be too specific, and it was agreed to take this out.

There was discussion on the Pool, and Ms. Tyler stated there is a Steering Committee that has been working on the Pool and they have made some Capital improvements and some programming improvements as well as changes to staffing. Ms. Tyler asked what this item is referring to, and Ms. Bush stated she will check into this. Ms. Tyler stated she would use the word “review” rather than “implement.”

Ms. Gail Friedman stated with regard to Open Space, the first recommendation is regarding encouraging future developers to make use of the Farmland Preservation Development Option for properties that meet the criteria, and this was relocated from another part of the Plan. She stated the second recommendation is to establish a maintenance program for Open Space lands that is manageable to the Township and environmentally sensitive. Ms. Karen Friedman stated she felt the Township already had a Plan and Ms. Frick agreed. Mr. Bush stated he feels they should find out where this recommendation came from before they do anything with it.

Ms. Gail Friedman stated the next recommendation is to monitor lotted out Open Space to insure that it is being protected, and she feels this recommendation was also relocated from another part of the Plan. She stated the next recommendation is to update the Municipal Open Space Plan as needed.

Ms. Bush stated the Township has done two Open Space Plans because there have been two County Bond Issues which require the Township to have an Open Space Plan. She stated this has been included in case there is another requirement for the Township to do it to get funds.

Ms. Gail Friedman stated the next Section is Historic Preservation, and the recommendation is to update the Historic Survey, complete National Register nominations, and evaluate potential additional Historic District designations which refers to Westover. Ms. Frick asked who put these in, and Ms. Gail Friedman stated what they did was take the written Chapter and put the high points in here with numbers or bullet points. Ms. Frick asked if they are stating that the Township would update the Historic Survey and complete National Register nominations, and Ms. Gail Friedman stated the Township would probably hire a consultant to do this.

Ms. Gail Friedman stated another item is to enact a Delay of Demolition Ordinance, a Historic Overlay District, and preservation incentives such as density bonuses or added adaptive reuse opportunities. She stated this is also carried over from the last Plan in 2003. Ms. Frick asked about the Delay of Demolition Ordinance, and Mr. Bush stated he felt they had previously discussed this and asked if this is the same as demolition by neglect. Ms. Gail Friedman stated they addressed this within the text, and she asked if this Section should be removed. Mr. Bush stated they would need to consider what they had previously discussed and decided on. Ms. Gail Friedman stated she feels the phrasing on this should include the word "consider;" and it was agreed to use that word instead of "enact."

Ms. Gail Friedman stated the next one for Implementation is: "Periodically review and update design guidelines and related regulations to apply the most suitable standards for materials and products to be used in rehabilitation, replacement, addition, and in-fill construction considering both sustainability and historic accuracy. Ms. Frick stated she feels this is something that the Historic Commission would do, and they have provided guidelines. Ms. Karen Friedman stated she felt this was still under the purview of the Township to make sure the Historic Commission is doing this. Ms. Tyler stated she feels HARB does this, and Ms. Frick stated both the Historic Commission and HARB did work on this. After discussion Ms. Friedman suggested that the wording should be "Have HARB periodically review and update the design guidelines."

Ms. Gail Friedman stated the final item is to establish a permanent home for the Township's collection of historic artifacts. It was noted that some of these are on display in the Township Meeting Room, and Ms. Tyler stated they will be going into the Community Center.

With regard to Transportation and Traffic Circulation, Ms. Gail Friedman noted Item #1 – "Incorporate land use considerations into transportation planning and insure that transportation facilities have adequate capacity to meet demand." She stated #2 gets fairly specific on detailing how developers can incorporate transportation improvements and/or public transportation into Land Development projects by providing office complexes with bus pull-up areas and transit shelters to encourage public transit use, reduce distance from main roads to building entrances so employees will have a shorter walk from the street to the building, and priority parking areas for car poolers as incentive to car pool. She stated they should also monitor the proposed improvements to the Scudders Falls Bridge and I-95. She stated there are also some specifics on encouraging use of public transportation by insuring that Municipal projects incorporate potential use of public transportation services. She stated there is also an item about helping to develop marketing programs aimed at increasing ridership and providing public transit information such as bus and train schedules on the Township Website and providing good pedestrian access to the Yardley-Lower Makefield border to help facilitate pedestrian access to the SEPTA station. She stated all of these are designed to improve the land use transportation connection.

Ms. Karen Friedman noted Item #2 should be changed from "insure that developers incorporate" to "encourage," since we do not have those systems actually set up to make sure that goes in.

Ms. Tyler asked if this is the place where they want to add any language about the Quiet Zones proposal for the trains since the Township is currently engaged with SEPTA, CSX, and the FRA to establish Quiet Zones at the three crossings within the Township.

Mr. Dickson stated he does not feel there is any bus service in the Township. Mr. Bush stated there is a bus that goes mostly through Morrisville which touches a portion of Lower Makefield on W. Trenton Road. He feels it goes to the Oxford Valley Mall. Mr. Dickson stated he questions why they would recommend bus pull-up areas and transit shelters to encourage public transit use if there is no public transit. Ms. Karen Friedman stated this is why she suggested changing the word

“encourage” as opposed to “insure” since they are not set up for this. Mr. Dickson stated they could add something about encouraging SEPTA to consider bus routes to certain areas of the Township. Ms. Bush stated this is all based on demand. She stated these recommendations do seem fairly specific for the Township’s situation, and it seems unlikely that they will be approving any new office complexes. Mr. Bush stated the unknown is the Hospital site. Ms. Bush stated rather than having these take up so much space, they could consolidate this and discuss encouraging accommodations for potential future bus connections; and this was agreed to by the Planning Commission.

Ms. Gail Friedman noted the next area is Energy Conservation and Hazard Mitigation and these are new areas since the last Plan. She stated under Energy Conservation, it states, “Promote implementation of the proposed actions identified in the Township’s Sustainability Action Plan.” She stated there is a suggestion about considering the installation of electric auto-charging stations at Municipal sites and encourage them at private locations. Ms. Gail Friedman stated under Hazard Mitigation, Item #1 is “Conduct a cost benefit analysis of adding additional protection to repetitive loss assets and collect detailed information on all property.”

Ms. Gail Friedman stated there is also a recommendation to evaluate and implement the most effective mitigation projects, e.g. acquisition, elevation, and buy-out of flood prone property when financial assistance becomes available; and identify the most vulnerable residents to the effects of severe weather e.g. elderly or people with special needs, and prepare an implementation plan to enhance response capabilities and foster mitigation measures. She stated the list or data base should be updated annually. She stated Item #4 is: “Assess emergency evacuation routes or exits for all areas and neighborhoods so that they can adequately plan for emergency evacuations.” She stated another item is to identify storage of hazardous material in the floodplain including structures without addresses like propane tanks. She stated another item is to build on the existing stormwater management planning and encourage implementation of small stormwater mitigation projects on private property such as rain gardens, rain barrels, and natural basins; and investigate whether other storm shelters and warning systems near vulnerable communities should be added.

Ms. Karen Friedman asked if they should add “adequately mark” to Item #4. She questioned how people would know what the emergency routes are in the Township. Ms. Frick stated this would have to be reviewed with Chief Coluzzi. Ms. Tyler stated a lot of this information needs to be reviewed by the Chief. Ms. Karen Friedman stated she does not feel that assessing them is sufficient, and they would need to mark them. Ms. Bush stated when she read this Section earlier, she felt there was a lot included. She stated Municipalities and Counties have to adopt a Hazard Mitigation Plan every five years; and the last time this was

done in 2010 all of the Municipalities were part of the process, they sent people to the meetings, and they had to agree to perform certain actions. She stated these items are what the Township agreed to do which is why they are in here. She stated they have had contact with Emergency personnel. She stated after reviewing this tonight, she feels they might want to make a reference to the Hazard Mitigation Plan and state, "Continue to follow up on the recommendations in the Plan." She feels what is currently being shown is very detailed for a Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Karen Friedman stated they could state "assess and post" and posting could mean that it would be on the Township Website, signs in the Township, and a map in the Township Building. She stated to assess the emergency evacuation would not help the residents know what to do, and this is her biggest concern.

Ms. Tyler stated Chief Coluzzi is the Emergency Management Coordinator, and he has already agreed to do these things.

Ms. Frick noted #3 which came from the Disabled Persons Advisory Commission since they were concerned about people in wheelchairs.

Ms. Karen Friedman stated with regard to emergency evacuation there is nothing in this Master Plan that addresses the public, and she feels the public needs to be addressed.

Ms. Bush stated PEMA makes them update the Plan every five years, and the County does the County Plan with Municipal officials in attendance. She stated in that there is a section for Lower Makefield and what they agree to do. She stated they will be looking at this again in 2015, and maybe it makes sense to make a reference to participating in the update.

Mr. Bush stated under Item #4 they could state: "Assess and inform residents to the extent possible of the emergency evacuation routes;" and this was acceptable to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Dickson stated they had a lot of discussion about #3 previously, and he is still concerned about who is responsible for these people, where they will be taken, and how are they transported. He stated there is also the possibility that the individual will refuse to go. Ms. Karen Friedman stated a lot of people do not want to be identified because they then feel vulnerable. Ms. Tyler stated there are privacy concerns. Ms. Bush stated they have had these same discussions at the County level since the Emergency Management people always say you need to know where your vulnerable populations are and have a plan to move them, but they have had the same questions that are being raised tonight. Ms. Tyler stated people do not always want to be identified. Ms. Karen Friedman stated they could state that they

will attempt to address the needs of the vulnerable residents in the community in the event of emergency as opposed to identifying every one of them. She stated it would almost have to be a volunteer program on their part to identify themselves; and she suggested that there be a posting on the Website or a mailer that goes out that if someone wants special assistance during an emergency, they should notify the Township.

Ms. Tyler suggested that they begin the paragraph with the phrase, “where possible,” as this would take into account a lot of the items discussed.

Ms. Frick stated she does not feel they should include Item #5 which requires them to identify all storage of hazardous materials in the floodplain including structures without addresses such as propane tanks. She stated she feels this would be impossible and many of these would be on private property. Ms. Bush stated she had these same questions, but it was apparently agreed to in 2010 by the Emergency Management Committee. She stated the Board of Supervisors adopted the whole Plan. Ms. Bush stated she agrees with Ms. Frick and feels it would be impossible.

Ms. Frick noted Item #6 and stated they did agree to this with the EAC.

There was discussion on the term “vulnerable communities.” Mr. Dickson asked if this means a community where there are vulnerable residents such as Manor Care, and Ms. Karen Friedman stated she felt it was communities that are flooded out frequently. Ms. Tyler stated this could include the River, a train derailment, mulch fire, etc. Mr. Dickson noted the storm of 1996 where the whole community was vulnerable, and he asked how they define a “vulnerable community.” Ms. Karen Friedman stated it still addresses the important part which would be additional storm shelters and warning systems. Mr. Dickson stated he feels they should take out the words “near vulnerable communities.”

Ms. Gail Friedman asked if Item #1 with regard to the cost benefit analysis should remain. Ms. Karen Friedman asked who would do this and what assets would be involved. Ms. Bush stated the Township has participated in some repetitive loss acquisitions, and Mr. Fox agreed. Ms. Bush stated she feels the wording could be simplified, and they should indicate “when feasible.”

Ms. Bush stated she feels they should make all the revisions noted, and they will come back to the Planning Commission with the second draft. She stated they would then be prepared to hand it off to the next level of review. Ms. Bush agreed to coordinate with Ms. Frick on timing.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Friedman stated Begley Carlin sent her a Floodplain Ordinance that they wanted the Planning Commission to review. She stated they would like it be reviewed at the July 14 Planning Commission meeting because it is supposed to go before the Board of Supervisors on July 16. Ms. Frick agreed to put this matter on the Agenda for July 14, 2014.

Mr. Fox stated his office has prepared this, and Ms. Tyler stated they need this to move forward because of the Community Rating System. Ms. Tyler stated the Ordinance is pretty much what FEMA told them they have to do.

It was agreed to have this on the Planning Commission Agenda of July 14.

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Dean Dickson, Secretary