

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES – OCTOBER 27, 2014

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on October 27, 2014.

Ms. Friedman called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. Ms. Friedman welcomed new member, William Clark, who was appointed to the Board to replace Tony Bush.

Ms. Friedman stated it was an honor to serve with Mr. Bush, and she admired his dedication and loyalty to the Planning Commission. She stated she valued his input, and he will be missed.

Those present:

Planning Commission: Karen Friedman, Chair  
John Pazdera, Vice Chair  
William Clark, Member  
John Tracey, Member

Others: Nancy Frick, Director Zoning, Inspection, & Planning  
Nathan Fox, Township Solicitor  
Mark Eisold, Township Engineer (left meeting in progress)  
Kristin Tyler, Supervisor (joined meeting in progress)

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

#629 – MOON NURSERIES TRACT – PRELIMINARY PLAN DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Mr. Edward Murphy, attorney, was present with Mr. Doug Waite, engineer.

Mr. Murphy stated the Planning Commission last saw this Plan in June following the Applicant's receipt of the review letter from Boucher & James in May. Mr. Murphy stated at the meeting in June, there were comments from the neighbors on various aspects of the Plan; and it was agreed that they would continue the matter further to give the Applicant the opportunity to further revise and re-submit a Plan set.

He stated this was done in late summer, and they did receive earlier this month the October 2 review from Boucher & James. Mr. Murphy stated since the issuance of that letter, they have discussed those comments with Mr. Eisold and his staff.

Mr. Murphy stated the one issue that is mentioned throughout the letter is the impact of the pending FEMA adoption of the revised flood plain map. Mr. Murphy stated they have known since the inception of the project that FEMA has been working on possibly adjusting the one hundred year floodplain delineation. He stated there had been a handful of challenges to the line once it was first published a few years ago. Mr. Murphy stated FEMA had been delaying the ultimate enactment of the new line. In September, FEMA issued a letter confirming that all the challenges had been disposed of; and the new FEMA delineation would become effective March 15, 2015. Mr. Murphy stated this pending Plan presumes the adoption of that new line as it has from the beginning. He stated in their discussions with Mr. Eisold they discussed how they would proceed assuming the new line will become effective in March. Mr. Murphy stated a Note will be added to the Plan that indicates that the Plan is contingent upon the ultimate adoption of the new FEMA line.

Mr. Murphy stated it should also be understood that this project is not going to start until after that date. He stated they had started the process to obtain a Letter Of Map Amendment (LOMA) which is something that individual property owners can do to modify a line that they believe to be in error. He stated they ultimately abandoned that effort when they knew the likelihood of FEMA adopting the new line could occur quicker than they could pursue their own individual one. He stated they will now be dependent upon the adoption next spring of the new line, and the Plans are based on that; and the Note will be added to the Plan confirming that they will not proceed with the project until after March 15, 2015.

Mr. Eisold agreed with Mr. Murphy's summation.

Mr. Murphy stated after the last meeting they met in the field with Mr. Gunkel who was at the June meeting and expressed interest in certain of the floodplain implications as it pertained to his property and others that share a common boundary line with the proposed development to the west. He stated changes have been made to the Plans based on that meeting.

Mr. Murphy stated at the last meeting they had reviewed the Waivers listed on Page 2 of the October 2 Boucher & James letter. Mr. Murphy stated they did add one new one dealing with the way they are going to treat Hillside Lane. Mr. Eisold agreed that they had discussed making this an emergency-access only along with the provision that there be some kind of turn around at or close to the driveway entrance so that if anyone went down that road, they had enough space to maneuver to turn around without going into the driveway. Mr. Eisold stated the emergency access would be identified and stabilized but not be paved, and it would basically be stabilized grass for emergency access only. Mr. Murphy stated they had discussed with Mr. Eisold making sure that they did not add a lot of unnecessary impervious

just to create the turn-around so they were going to treat it more like a driveway extension rather than doing a full width widening. Mr. Murphy stated early in the Sketch Plan process both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors wanted to provide some comfort to the Hillside neighbors that there would not be a permanent connection, and there will not be as this will only be for emergency access. He stated they will provide the ability for cars to turn around on the developer's portion of Hillside that they will be constructing.

Ms. Friedman asked if there will be anything between the turn-around area and the area that starts becoming the Hillside portion such as a chain to prevent people from going through; and Mr. Eisold stated there was some discussion about having a chain for the emergency-vehicles only, but he feels this would be at the property line and not at the end of the driveway. Ms. Friedman stated she wants to make sure that there is something that would deter someone from going through and using it as a cut through. Mr. Eisold stated it will appear as just a grass area, and they could have trees to document where it is; and the intent is to keep it stabilized but totally grass. Mr. Murphy stated no one wants to encourage anyone to think they could cut through.

Mr. Murphy stated they will comply with the balance of the comments in the Boucher & James letter.

Mr. Eisold stated the developer's engineer should look at the wetland buffer. He stated he knows that it requires 50' or an increase based on the slopes; and he believes the slopes are close to the 5%, and they should verify this. Mr. Waite stated he feels it may come down to an interpretation, and Mr. Murphy stated they will work this out with Mr. Eisold.

Ms. Friedman asked about the 24' cartway, and Mr. Murphy stated they will do this.

Ms. Friedman noted Waiver #7 and asked about the landscape berms along the frontage of Quarry Road. Mr. Waite stated they want to be able to maintain the buffer trees that are already there. He stated they did not want to have to take down trees to put up other trees. Mr. Murphy stated the trees that are there are more mature and of good quality.

Ms. Friedman noted Waiver #9 which would allow stormwater BMPs to discharge into tree protection areas, and Mr. Eisold stated he does not feel that this is a concern. Mr. Waite stated this is the existing condition as well.

Ms. Friedman noted Waiver #11, and Mr. Eisold stated he does not have a concern with granting this Waiver.

Ms. Friedman noted #12, and Mr. Eisold stated what is proposed would be acceptable.

Ms. Friedman noted Waiver #16 to allow concentrated run off onto adjoining properties as previously she was advised that they could not allow run off from the driveway at the proposed Senior Center to go into the woodlands since it was someone else's property. Mr. Waite stated the existing condition is that there is a storm pipe system that feeds the neighbor's pond, and they are looking to replicate the existing condition so that the neighbor's pond does not go dry.

Mr. Murphy stated the "adjoining property" reference is to the pond only, and they want to continue to feed the pond with the stormwater from this project. He added that property owner is present this evening. Mr. Eisold stated that not allowing the pipe to be in place would adversely impact that pond as it would dry out.

Mr. Stu Revness, 1267 Bridle Estates, stated he feels the current Plans will increase the flow to that pond and the pond itself right now is not properly draining to handle the overflow that comes in during a very moderate rain. He stated he has been out there during a moderate rain, and the pond will overflow its banks. He stated the overflow may be exacerbating the water that backs up onto his property. He stated he is concerned that maintaining the existing condition will only continue the problem.

Mr. Eisold stated the impervious surface that exists there today will be reduced with this project which means that there will be less run off from the project after it is completed. He stated that, in conjunction with the new detention basins proposed at various locations along the property line, will reduce the overland run off from the property.

Mr. Revness asked how they can measure this in six months to two years since he feels more water is coming down Core Creek than was ever anticipated as evidenced by the one hundred year floodplain moving to his back door. Mr. Eisold stated it is difficult from an engineering standpoint to empirically measure what that flow is, and this is why time and money is spent on the Plans to show what the watersheds are and the calculations for different rain distributions on what the run off will be. He stated this is based on models that are accepted and per the Township Ordinances. He noted the detailed stormwater report which has been prepared.

Mr. Revness stated he assumes that those plans were also in place for the prior developments, and Mr. Eisold stated it is possible that some of those developments were before the Stormwater Management Act although a number of them were after that time.

Ms. Friedman asked if there will be letters signed off on for permission to have the pipe into the pond, and Mr. Eisold stated the Applicant has indicated that there will be an Agreement with the neighboring property owner.

Mr. Murphy noted the prior speaker is not the neighboring property owner who owns the pond.

Mr. Nadhu Dandora, 1931 Quarry Road, stated he is the owner of the property with the pond. He stated he is in the process of entering into an Agreement with Moon Nurseries, and they will have to maintain the pond for ninety plus years, and the builder will make sure that the pond is clean and there is no algae. He stated there is an overflow pipe in the pond, and they need to make sure the pipe is kept clear. Mr. Dandora stated he is concerned that children and young adults will be living in these new homes, and they need to make sure that they do not go in the pond. He stated the pond is frozen in the winter, and he does not want people skating on it, etc.

Ms. Friedman asked for clarification regarding the Subdivision and Land Development Comment #6 about the sidewalk as they are requesting a Waiver for a portion of the sidewalk to be outside of the right-of-way. Mr. Eisold stated it appears that the right-of-way is not at the back face of the sidewalk but the front face of the sidewalk on the Plans. He stated they need to understand their intent as it is currently shown with the sidewalk on the properties. He stated typically the sidewalks are within the right-of-way of the street. Mr. Waite stated the reason they have the sidewalks outside of the right-of-way is so that they can permit some of the low-impact development BMPs to be right next to the road picking up the drainage and allowing infiltration. He stated in order to have the low-impact development improvements, there was no room to put the sidewalk there are well. He stated along a good portion of the proposed road, the sidewalk is just to the outside of the right-of-way. He stated they will clarify this. Mr. Eisold stated this will be included in the impervious surface calculations of the lot, and Mr. Waite agreed. Mr. Murphy stated this is a situation where the Township's Low Impact Development Ordinance regulations have not caught up with the typical SALDO requirements so when you are trying to create an LID and you have stormwater improvements next to the roadway where typically sidewalks used to go, you need to adjust it a little bit. He stated at some point the Township regulations may need to be changed to reflect the fact that the current Low Impact Development improvements crowd out where sidewalks would otherwise typically have gone. He stated they will revise the language so it is clear.

Ms. Friedman asked if there will be adequate topsoil left on the property. She stated it was indicated “that a Note should be added to the Record Plan that if the topsoil on site is determined to be inadequate to support future residential lawn and tree growth, sufficient topsoil will be provided.” Mr. Murphy stated they will comply with this, and it is a standard Note that has not yet been added to the Plan. Mr. Eisold stated this is atypical in that a lot of that property is now stone. Ms. Friedman stated she wants to make sure there is sufficient topsoil, and Mr. Eisold stated if needed, they will have to bring in additional topsoil.

Ms. Friedman asked if they resolved the ingress/egress situation with regard to the hills and the traffic; and Mr. Eisold stated in their last letter, they had asked that the developer perform a Traffic Survey to determine what the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile traffic speed was along Quarry Road because the sight distance calculation as you come out is based on the actual speed of traffic. He stated they did that study and determined that the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile was a little higher than they had originally estimated, so they had to move the entrance slightly to the east away from the curve to address the new sight distance requirements. He stated what they have meets the Ordinance and the PennDOT standards. Ms. Friedman asked if there will be any warnings or yellow flashing lights; and Mr. Eisold stated currently there is a sign about construction vehicles entering the roadway, and he understands that will be adjusted to recognize that residential traffic will be coming out of the development instead of construction vehicles. Mr. Murphy agreed.

Ms. Friedman stated the September 27 letter from James Yates indicates that he does not recommend approval. Mr. Waite stated he spoke to Mr. Yates today to try to clarify that, and he just wants to see the fire truck turning movements around the cul-de-sac; and they will provide that to him.

Ms. Friedman noted the Historical Commission letter dated September 26, 2014 where they raised concerns about preservation of a cemetery area and suggesting some kind of enclosure. Mr. Murphy stated he met with representatives of the Newtown Presbyterian Church as this is one of their remote cemeteries. He stated he met with them and reviewed the Plans as to the impact on this cemetery; and when they realized that the impact was negligible since while there are lots that back up to this area, it is preserved open space, they indicated they did not have a problem. Mr. Murphy stated the Church is going to maintain the cemetery in its existing condition, and they are no longer talking about possibly relocating the graves that are there.

Ms. Friedman noted the Bucks County Planning Commission letter dated October 1, 2014. She stated most of the concerns seem to be exactly the same as what was submitted May 5, 2014. She stated they are recommending that the Township not Waive Section 178-85C which is the partial request to allow tree protection fencing to be placed at existing tree drip line only. Mr. Waite stated typically they would comply with this completely, but there is a tie in they are doing with the Hillside Lane extension – emergency lane – that has some grading; and in order to comply with that Ordinance Section completely, they would be taking down a lot of the neighbors' trees in that area which would be detrimental to the existing condition. He stated keeping tree protection within the drip line is typically accepted in many other Municipalities; and there are Sections in the Ordinance that if a tree does die during construction, there are replacement requirements. He stated he has asked for this partial Waiver, and he does not feel it is outside of typical practice.

Mr. Eisold stated the drip line is the accepted method of protecting trees. He stated there could be a small tree which has a smaller drip line which is less than 15', and this is what they are requesting. He stated for the large trees this would not be an issue. Ms. Friedman stated she wants to make sure they make every effort to preserve whatever they can.

Ms. Friedman noted under Natural Resources, the Bucks County Planning Commission asked if the 50' buffer was sufficient; and Mr. Eisold stated they already discussed this, and they are going to double check this. Mr. Eisold noted there will be some kind of averaging involved.

Ms. Tyler joined the meeting at this time.

Mr. Pazdera moved and Mr. Tracey seconded to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the Preliminary Plan dated last revised 8/22/14 subject to compliance with the following:

- 1) Boucher & James letter dated 10/2/14
- 2) Captain Roche's letter dated 9/15/14
- 3) James Yates letter dated 9/27/14
- 4) Tri-State letter dated 9/22/14
- 5) Bucks County Planning Commission letter dated 10/1/14
- 6) EAC letter dated 10/9/14
- 7) Historic Commission letter dated 9/27/14

The Planning Commission is in support of all Waivers.

Mr. Benedetto stated he is present on behalf of “Ed and Stu” from Bridle Estates who had asked for a meeting with the Township, and subsequently they met with Mr. Eisold and Mr. Fedorchak about flooding in the area of Bridle Estates. He stated there were promises made at that meeting in July that Mr. Eisold would go out and look at the issues as to drainage and significant flooding. He stated he and the two residents made multiple follow ups with the Township, but nothing was ever done. He stated the neighbors reached out, and nothing was done; and the Township has not been responsive to himself or the neighbors. Mr. Benedetto stated he feels it is early to grant Preliminary Approval due to the fact that the Township has not been responsive to the neighbors. Mr. Benedetto stated these two neighbors had asked to be notified about future Planning Commission meetings regarding Moon Nurseries; and they were not notified.

Ms. Friedman asked if the flooding is coming from the pond overflow; and Mr. Ed Nini, 1263 Bridle Estates, stated they do not know since no one has come out, and they have no guarantee that it will be made better. Mr. Revness stated there was a clear expectation that the Township would look into what was happening upstream to see the impact on the flow to see if something could be done.

Mr. Eisold stated there was a meeting at the Township with a number of residents, himself, and Mr. Fedorchak and they discussed that their flooding issues are really not being caused by this project. He stated this project will in fact help the situation get somewhat better. Mr. Eisold stated there is quite a large drainage area that comes down the stream behind their properties which he estimated to be hundreds of acres, and it is basically the whole part of the Township north of this area that comes through the stream. He stated at Mr. Fedorchak’s request, they are in the process of pulling the Development Plans for all of the approved projects upstream of this flooding area. He stated they have copies of those Plans from the Zoning and Planning Department, and they are going out to verify that the projects are functioning as designed. He stated while they have not completed that process because of the large number of properties upstream, they are working through it. He stated they will have this information within the next month or so.

Mr. Eisold stated they did explain to the residents that the proposed project is not causing their problem and that the amount of run off from the Moon property compared to what is coming down the stream from the other twelve to fifteen developments is miniscule. He stated all of this was discussed at the meeting with the residents. He stated Mr. Fedorchak did make the commitment that the Township engineer would evaluate the other projects to ensure that there was no detrimental impact to the neighbors.

Mr. Eisold stated a lot of this is based on the new FEMA mapping, and the new FEMA mapping actually correlates very well with the empirical data on where the floodplain is on these houses. He stated the old floodplain was inaccurate, and the new one actually mimics very closely where the floodplain is in their back yards. He stated the new floodplain maps are based on much more detailed topographic data. He stated they empathize with them that there is a flooding situation in their back yard which initially they may not have been aware of when they moved into the development, and it is being substantiated by the new floodplain maps.

Ms. Friedman asked how they could have been aware of it if the floodplain map was not accurate. Mr. Eisold stated it is FEMA that is making this change.

Ms. Friedman asked if the neighbors will get notified of the work that was done. She also asked if they find there is a problem who will the residents be able to go to for relief or suggestions on how to handle this. Mr. Eisold stated they will issue a report on their findings, but they are not at that stage yet. Ms. Friedman asked who would be the body to help with their problem, and Ms. Tyler stated it would depend on what they find out. Mr. Eisold stated if it is found that there is a construction problem with a development upstream, he feels the Township would have the right to somehow get those adjustments made.

Mr. Eisold stated the development of this property under discussion is not going to adversely impact the situation that is behind their properties; and if anything, it will help make it better. He stated this is based on the design and the stormwater reports. Mr. Fox stated the Township and the State have Stormwater Management Ordinances. He stated this is Preliminary Approval, and the project still has steps to go through. He suggested that the concerned residents attend the Board of Supervisors meeting when this is on their Agenda and make their opinions heard.

Ms. Friedman stated under the Stormwater Management Ordinance in place in the Township less water usually leaves the property when the new development takes place so she feels this particular development will not add to their problem.

Mr. Benedetto stated Mr. Eisold is stating that this new development will not adversely impact the neighbors and they are looking at everything other than this development that is going right in behind the Bridle Estates houses. Mr. Benedetto stated other residents have come to meetings about Freeman's Farm that had the same issues with water run off. Mr. Benedetto stated common sense dictates that this will exacerbate their problems. Mr. Benedetto stated he is also concerned that when it gets to the Board of Supervisors they will not just give this Preliminary Approval and will give Preliminary/Final when it gets "lost in the translation." He stated he does not feel they deserve Preliminary Approval because of the reasons he has stated. He stated there were promises made to neighbors who have extreme

concerns. He stated no one responded to them. He stated he does not feel it is acceptable not to respond to residents who are taxpayers, and he feels moving forward does not make sense from a “good neighbor perspective.” Mr. Benedetto stated if the Township is not willing to make a guarantee that this will not make the problem worse, he does not feel they should give them approval.

Ms. Tyler stated the job of the Planning Commission and the Township is that when an Application comes in for Land Development, their only authority is to make sure that the Land Development Application is in compliance with the Ordinances; and they do not make guarantees since they are not the builders or the owners of those parcels. She stated all the Township can do is make sure that the Plan complies with the Ordinances.

Mr. Benedetto stated he is asking that the Planning Commission not grant Preliminary Approval. Ms. Tyler asked Mr. Benedetto what data he is basing this on; and Mr. Benedetto stated it is based on the meeting that took place between himself, Mr. Eisold, the Township Manager, and the neighbors on a study that was going to be conducted that has not been completed according to Mr. Eisold. Mr. Murphy stated that has nothing to do with the development of this property. Mr. Benedetto stated that is true according to Mr. Eisold; however, Mr. Benedetto stated at the meeting with the residents they said they were going to walk the property and look at all the developments, and nothing has been done.

Ms. Tyler stated that is not correct as Mr. Eisold has indicated that they have already begun the study which is an upstream study. Ms. Tyler stated what Mr. Eisold also indicated with a reasonable degree of engineering certainty was that the project that they are discussing this evening for which they are seeking Preliminary Approval will not exacerbate the problem experienced by the residents. Mr. Benedetto stated he feels that until the study is completed as promised, this Preliminary Approval is premature and will be a “slap in the face” to the residents who took the time to come to the Township and were ignored. Ms. Tyler stated it is not appropriate to characterize their concerns as being ignored as the Township is paying a significant fee to the engineers to put a team out to look into this problem in hopes of resolving it.

Mr. Benedetto stated he sent e-mails to the Township, and the Township was non-responsive. Ms. Tyler stated they are present this evening about the Moon Application. She stated the concerns of the residents will never be ignored. Mr. Benedetto stated he feels they were ignored. Ms. Tyler stated the engineer has just explained the analysis that is going on to hopefully solve their problems, and he also explained that the FEMA maps that have been revised are in accordance with the empirical data of the water problems within their back yards.

Mr. Benedetto stated it would have taken “two seconds” to respond that they were doing this study but Mr. Fedorchak did not respond and Mr. Eisold did not respond. Mr. Benedetto stated he did not receive a response and the neighbors were ignored. Ms. Tyler suggested that Mr. Benedetto discuss this with Mr. Fedorchak.

Ms. Friedman stated she recognizes the problem, but the Planning Commission is only an Advisory Board. She stated she has no evidence to not give Preliminary Approval. She stated they will recommend that the study be completed prior to Final Approval so the Planning Commission has the information they need to make the more detailed suggestions to protect the residents.

Mr. Dandora stated he wants to make sure his concerns are addressed about the pond. Ms. Friedman asked if it is a stagnant pond, and Mr. Dandora stated it has a pump.

Mr. Revness stated during moderate to heavy rains there is spillage over the side of the pond walls. He stated the pipe is not large enough. Ms. Friedman asked if making the pond deeper would be an answer to this, and Mr. Murphy stated today there are no stormwater management controls on the Moon Nursery property, and there will be a series of detention basins installed as described earlier by Mr. Eisold. He stated this is an unusual circumstance in that they will be reducing the amount of impervious surface that is out there today.

Ms. Friedman asked Ms. Koehler if she is comfortable with what was discussed with regard to Hillside Lane; and Ms. Koehler stated she is provided there is something to delineate it so that people will not cut through.

Mr. Pazdera moved and Mr. Clark seconded to Amend the Motion to include the following:

The Planning Commission recommends that the Township engineer complete the stormwater management study upstream as it impacts Bridle Estates and that it be completed prior to receiving Final Plan approval from the Board of Supervisors.

Motion as amended carried unanimously.

After review of the list of those notified about this evening's meeting it was noted that the residents of 1263 Bridle Estates Drive and 1267 Bridle Estates Drive were both sent letters about this evening's meeting.

Mr. Eisold left the meeting at this time.

#### COMPREHENSIVE MASTER PLAN UPDATE SECOND DRAFT DISCUSSION

Ms. Friedman stated they are in the review process of editing. It was agreed that Ms. Friedman would make the changes on her copy of the Draft and provide those to Ms. Bush and the Bucks County Planning Commission.

#### Introduction

Ms. Friedman noted the second paragraph and stated she feels the paragraph should end after "...land use patterns of tomorrow." Mr. Tracey noted while he had no problem removing the rest of the paragraph, the third paragraph is a continuation of the quotation. Mr. Fox stated they have therefore decided that on Page 1 paragraph 2, line 4, they will delete from the word "Even" all the way to the end of that paragraph ending in the word "process" and then continuing that paragraph with the third paragraph ending the paragraph with the end of the quotation.

Ms. Friedman noted the third paragraph under Update of the 2003 Comprehensive Master Plan, and stated she feels they should also include that they enacted a Pervious Pavement Ordinance and the Stormwater Management Ordinance as well as LEED, and the Floodplain Mapping Ordinance. It was agreed to include all of these in this paragraph. Ms. Friedman stated if anyone can recall any others, they should be included in this Section as well.

With regard to The Planning Process, third sentence, Ms. Friedman suggested that they remove the word "update" since she felt it was unnecessary.

There were no suggested changes to Components of the Plan.

#### Early History Of The Township

Ms. Friedman stated for this Section she compared what is proposed in this draft to what was in the 2003 Master Plan. She noted the last paragraph on Page 5, second sentence from the bottom, and suggested that "His plans went into action.

He appointed his cousin..." and suggested that it be changed to "William Penn appointed his cousin..." so that some of the words are eliminated and it reaffirms who did the appointing. This was acceptable to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Friedman noted page 6, first paragraph, and she asked if it is necessary to state, "He offered generous terms for land purchasers, usually giving them a city lot..." as she does not feel this point is a purposeful direction. She suggested that they eliminate it from the point she read to the end of that first paragraph ending with "servants." Ms. Tyler stated this is a point that she has heard about the original land Grant, and Mr. Pazdera agreed. Ms. Tyler stated it is significant in that it allowed people land ownership who otherwise may not have been able to own land. It was agreed to leave this in the document.

Ms. Friedman noted Page 6, fourth paragraph beginning with "Thomas Holme" and stated there is a date conflict from the old version as the 2003 Plan states, "In 1681 Thomas Holme began his survey of the lands on the west bank of the Delaware;" but in the new version it states, "Thomas Holme began his survey of the lands on the west bank of the Delaware in 1683..." so they will need to determine from Ms. Bush which date is correct.

Ms. Friedman noted Page 7, fifth paragraph beginning with "John Palmer" states, "There are several old family houses on this tract and one may be the original Palmer House built in 1682." In the 2003 Plan it states, "The House, now known as Journey's End, may contain traces of the original Palmer House built in 1682. There are five other houses in adjacent areas that formerly belonged to members of the Palmer family." Ms. Friedman stated she feels that was an important fact that has been taken away in the new version. She questions if this was removed because these no longer exist. Ms. Tyler stated they should ask Ms. Bush why this was changed. Mr. Tracey stated it may be that what was included in the 2003 Plan could have been historically inaccurate which is why they removed it in the new Draft. Mr. Pazdera stated what Ms. Friedman is looking at from the prior Plan was not what was actually adopted, and Ms. Friedman stated this was what she was provided.

Ms. Friedman noted Page 9, third paragraph states, "... he also provided a boardwalk from the railroad stop to his 12-room inn..." and she suggested that they include that the inn still stands on Stony Hill Road. It was agreed that this should be revised as follows, "... 12 room inn, which still stands on Stony Hill Road, advertised in the Reading RR Centennial brochure."

Ms. Friedman noted that a section has been left out in the new version that was included in the old document. She stated at the end of that paragraph after "... local youth on summer evenings" there was a section as follows: "A public library was built beside Lake Afton in 1878 and this replaced the reading room above Slack's Store. This library served the area for about one hundred years. After a brief occupancy at the Municipal Building, the library moved to a new one beside Lower Makefield Township." She questions why this was removed from the new version, and it was agreed to ask Ms. Bush why this was removed.

### Vision For The Future

Ms. Friedman noted the first sentence, and stated she feels it should read, "The Township's Master Plan envisions the continuation and improvement of the quality of life in Lower Makefield."

### The Natural Environment And Natural Systems

Under Regulatory Authority, Ms. Friedman noted the second sentence should read as follows, "Some of these regulations, such as those pertaining to wetlands or woodlands protection, ..." She stated she also feels they should not have the second paragraph separated, and it should just continue with the first paragraph but after "... deem most valuable" add the following: "and as deemed in the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania" and then eliminate the rest of that paragraph. Mr. Fox stated he assumes Ms. Friedman is looking for brevity, and he suggested that at the end of the first sentence, it should read, "...protect the natural resources they deem most valuable in accordance with Federal, State, and local law" and eliminate the rest. This was acceptable to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Friedman stated Geology was fine since it was the same as was in the prior document, and there was no reason to make any changes since it was factual.

Ms. Friedman noted page 15 prior to the Soils Section, the second full paragraph, and stated she feels they should keep the first two sentences and eliminate everything else in that paragraph. She suggested they add a third sentence that states, "Lower Makefield Township enacted and adopted a Zoning Ordinance setting protection standards to greatly reduce the adverse environmental impact of new development." This was acceptable to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Pazdera noted the top of Page 17 where they are missing a Map number.

There was discussion as to going forward how the Planning Commission would proceed with further edits to the document, and it was suggested that the representatives from Bucks County Planning Commission be present at subsequent meetings so that they could answer any questions and make the changes recommended by the Planning Commission directly to the document.

Agricultural Soils was reviewed, and no changes were suggested.

Under Woodlands, Ms. Friedman noted Page 17, second full paragraph and questioned the need for the last sentence as it is a redundant statement. Ms. Tyler stated she feels it should remain as it speaks to the commitment on behalf of the Township to preserve such items and speaks to Township policy. Mr. Tracey stated it reinforces it as well. Mr. Fox stated they could delete the third last sentence and state, "The Township preserved this area because it contains some rare and endangered plant species, including wild orchids, and a sphagnum bog." He stated this would therefore combine the last two sentences, and it was agreed to make this change. After review it was agreed to re-write the paragraph as follows, "The Township preserved this area because the fall line runs through Five Mile Woods, making it one of the few areas where vegetation of the Piedmont Plateau and the Coastal Plain can be found and in addition it contains rare and endangered plant species, including wild orchids, and a sphagnum bog.

Ms. Tyler stated on Page 17, the last paragraph before Wetlands, the first sentence should read, "... the Township..." rather than "...the Township officials..."

Ms. Friedman asked if the wetlands can change in the Township since under Wetlands on Page 18, it indicates there are about 584 acres of wetlands in the Township. Ms. Frick stated she has learned that they can change. Ms. Friedman suggested they discuss this with Bucks County Planning Commission since this may have increased with the FEMA adjustment.

Floodplains was reviewed. Ms. Frick stated she feels the third paragraph may need to be updated, and it was agreed to discuss this with the Bucks County Planning Commission representatives. Ms. Tyler stated she feels they will probably indicate that this has not been adopted yet. Mr. Fox suggested it state, "as may be amended from time to time by the Federal Government" and this was acceptable to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Friedman noted Page 19, first paragraph, the last two sentences which she does not feel is a fluid thought. Mr. Tracey suggested taking these out as they are confusing, and it was agreed to eliminate these.

Ms. Friedman noted the second sentence in that paragraph with regard to benefits, and it was suggested that this be changed to "... results in the preservation of woodlands, steep slopes, wildlife habitats, and passive recreational areas" and then eliminate the rest of the paragraph.

There was further discussion about whether or not the Bucks County Planning Commission representatives should be present at the next meeting when this is reviewed, and Ms. Friedman suggested that they not come to the next meeting but come to the third meeting when this is discussed. She also suggested that they provide them the changes they have already made after review this evening.

Ms. Tyler advised Mr. Clark that he will be provided a hard copy of the Draft, and he was asked to review it to see if something is missing that could be relevant to the Township Master Plan.

Mr. Clark stated with regard to the floodplain, he lives near the River; and while he is not in the flood zone, his development becomes an island when there is flooding. He stated he felt there was a problem with New York State releasing the reservoirs. Ms. Tyler stated New York would not respond to this although it is being scrutinized at this time. Mr. Clark asked if they could get protection from FEMA, and Ms. Tyler suggested Mr. Clark discuss this with Ms. Saylor who is knowledgeable about this.

There being no further business, Mr. Pazdera moved, Mr. Clark seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 10:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen Friedman, Chair

