

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 22, 2014

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on September 22, 2014. Ms. Friedman called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

Those present:

Planning Commission: Karen Friedman, Chair
John Pazdera, Vice Chair
Dean Dickson, Secretary
John Tracey, Member

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

Absent: Tony Bush, Planning Commission Member
Dan McLaughlin, Supervisor Liaison

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Pazdera moved and Ms. Friedman seconded to approve the Minutes of July 14, 2014 as written. Motion carried with Mr. Dickson and Mr. Tracey abstaining.

#637 – LOWER MAKEFIELD TOWNSHIP PUBLIC RECREATION FACILITY & ASSOCIATED IMPROVEMENTS PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLANS DISCUSSION AND MOTION.

Mr. Eisold and Mr. Ron Jackson were present. Mr. Eisold stated the Planning Commission received a copy of the Adjusted Plan with changes made as a result of the discussion at the last meeting. He stated they also provided to the Planning Commission a letter dated 9/12/14 which explains all the changes.

Copies of the old and new Plans were shown on the easel. Mr. Eisold stated the first adjustment they made was that they shifted the building approximately ten feet further away from the upper wooded portion. He stated they also adjusted the infiltration basin to provide for less encroachment into the wooded area. He stated

they added a retaining wall behind the building that limited the amount of grading and slope behind the building. Mr. Eisold stated those three items in total represent about a 35% decrease in the amount of woodland that was disturbed in and around the building.

Mr. Eisold stated the front parking area has been reduced from forty-one spaces down to twenty spaces and has been set back from the roadway and provides about fifty-two feet from the edge of the cartway to the beginning of the parking drive. He stated this will provide approximately fifty feet for a buffer, a berm, and some plantings along the road. Mr. Eisold stated they kept the original amount of parking spaces and added them to the long area to the left and extended that to make up the additional spaces. He stated they provided a landscaped berm along Oxford Valley Road to buffer the parking area as well as the building much more than was buffered before. He stated in the upper right hand corner of the front parking area they also provided a curb cut to allow access to the additional parking that may be allowed along Oxford Valley Road for Tournaments, etc.

Mr. Eisold stated they also added a recreation area behind the buildings for picnic tables, bocce courts, etc. He stated it is a flat, grass area where they can add some of those amenities.

Mr. Eisold stated they also added a small, but functional drop-off to the side of the building. He stated this is a small pull off where people could drop off someone and then go park.

Mr. Eisold stated the site setback lines have been shown per the proper use designation – Public Recreation Facility.

Mr. Eisold stated while they have not changed the site dramatically, they have maximized the trees and still provided access to the front of the building with some parking spaces and the handicapped spaces in the front. He stated they have also changed the new Plan to show all parking spaces at 10' by 20' when originally they were 9' by 18' adding that the handicapped spaces are staying at the required width.

Ms. Tyler asked about the dumpster, and Mr. Eisold stated that has been moved. He showed the dumpster's original location, and he stated they have moved it up to the walkway out of the back of the building so that it is closer to the building which is more functional. He stated this will also provide less of a potential impact on the neighbors who live on Waterwheel.

Mr. Eisold stated he feels the changes made make for an improved Plan.

Ms. Friedman asked if the last twenty parking spaces at the end of the building could be 9' by 18' since the Seniors will probably not park that far away, and Mr. Eisold stated he feels they could reduce those that are further away from the building.

Mr. Eisold stated they had also discussed possibly putting some of those spaces in the rear in reserve if it is not felt that they would be needed initially. He stated they would still design it to have them constructed, but then not construct them unless they are really needed. Mr. Pazdera asked if this could be done without a Waiver or Variance, and Mr. Eisold stated he feels that is permitted although he will have to look into this further. Mr. Koopman stated the Land Development Plan would have to address this with a Note and the procedure, and he does feel that there has been precedent for this.

Mr. Tracey noted the cross hatching on the Plan and asked if that is the porous paving, and Mr. Eisold stated the porous paving is shown in gray on the large Plan. Mr. Jackson stated it is the grid-style cross hatching on the Plans presented to the Planning Commission since those Plans were not colored. Mr. Eisold stated it is basically the parking to the rear and the side parking lot will be porous paving. Mr. Tracey asked if the parking is extended in the future would they be extending it in the permeable asphalt, and Mr. Eisold agreed. He stated there is stone under everything, and the middle part is typical asphalt and the outside is porous.

Mr. Pazdera noted the setback on the back, and he asked if they talked to Ms. Frick to make sure everyone is on the same page with regard to the side and rear yards. Mr. Jackson stated the Ordinance is written such that setbacks have to be taken from side yards or rear yards, except when there is a resource out of the resource protection list, that exists within the side yards. He noted the wooded area between the facility and the ball fields to the south, and he stated the setback is taken from the edge of those buffers. He stated in the rear where they are disturbing those woodlands, the setback extends from the extent of the disturbance which is why the setback is taken from the edge of the building because it goes from the edge of the disturbance fifteen feet and that is where the building lies. He stated it is the standard setback for the use they are dealing with in the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Pazdera stated the Plan sent to the Planning Commission shows the fifty foot rear yard, but it shows the line going back into the woods. Mr. Jackson stated when the setback is provided for, it does not necessarily mean that you have to disturb those resources because your setback extends there. He stated they have to account for disturbance and every tree in that area in the land use calculations, but they are not forced to remove the trees even though the setback is shown that way.

Mr. Pazdera stated the setback is supposed to be from whatever your resources are. He asked if they also took into account the steep slopes. Mr. Eisold stated the tree situation is that you have to show that you could disturb those trees and still be within the allowable disturbance which they are on the site overall. Mr. Koopman stated the disturbance is measured from the required woodland preservation area so there could be trees in the setback, but you cannot have trees that are part of your minimum protected woodlands. He asked if they comply with this, and Mr. Jackson stated they do. He stated this is also a true for the steep slopes, and where there are steep slopes if they fall within the setback, they are counted as disturbed even though they are not showing them as disturbed. He stated they do not want to disturb them if they do not have to.

Mr. Eisold stated they are actually talking about the whole tract here so their percentage of woodlands disturbance is actually very minimal compared to what they are allowed as shown on the Plans. Mr. Jackson stated this is another development recently after the first development, and they are adding their totals to the entire total that was done with the ball fields; and they are not taking advantage of the delay of this Plan.

Mr. Koopman asked what percentage of the woodlands will be disturbed on the entire site with this facility, and Mr. Jackson stated this is on Sheet #4. Mr. Jackson stated they are significantly below the standards for all the resource protected areas. He stated the total site is twenty-five acres.

Mr. Jackson stated the setbacks are set where they have to be set, but to show disturbance in there would be incorrect, as they are not proposing disturbance in there. He stated to show a line to account for the possible disturbance has been done mathematically but there is no line to show what the numbers reflect. Mr. Pazdera asked how someone would check this. Mr. Eisold stated they are so far below that it is not an issue; but if they want them to, they could put a line on the Plan. Mr. Koopman stated they would like to see a line that shows the area required not to be disturbed. He added that a lot of time they see on Plans a line that shows the protected area so that they know by looking at the Plan the areas that cannot be touched. Mr. Jackson stated perhaps in this case they could put a line directly over top of the rear setback and indicate that this is the resource protected area and inside this line you are allowed to disturb, but outside of the line you are not allowed to disturb anything; and Mr. Pazdera stated this would be fine so long as it is clear.

Mr. Eisold stated at this point only the Sketch Plan has been changed, and Mr. Koopman stated he understands that they are prepared to modify the Plans in accordance with the Sketch Plan, and Mr. Eisold stated that is correct provided everyone is in agreement with this.

Ms. Friedman asked if there is a way to make sure the garbage collectors do not come until after 9:00 a.m., and Ms. Tyler stated they have moved the dumpster. Mr. Eisold stated he feels the Township could have some say on pick up time provided they had a requirement on the hauler. Ms. Tyler stated Mr. Kall would look into this once they select a hauler. Mr. Eisold stated it is possible that the trash may not need to be emptied more than twice a month depending on the use.

Ms. Friedman stated she would like to understand the other uses that will impact this site. She stated at Fred Allan, there is one Tournament a year where they use the overflow parking. She asked how many times during the season they need the overflow parking for regular games. Ms. Denise Cramer, 1150 Waterwheel, stated it is more than once or twice a year but not regularly. She estimated that it may happen ten times a year. She stated there could be other solutions than having the overflow parking such as busing people. Ms. Friedman stated this was her thought as they were indicating that they were addressing some of the issues on this site because of all the overflow parking, and she has not really known there to be that much overflow parking so to design a site for overflow parking when there is not that much she feels is unusual.

Ms. Lisa Booth, 1180 Long Meadow Lane, stated she is across the street from the Fred Allan Fields; and it is more than ten times a year that they need more parking and they park on the berms and on the grass. She stated there are also times when the Police post “no parking” signs, but people park in their neighborhood anyway.

Mr. Joe Parrel, 612 Brandywine, stated he is involved with the big Softball Tournament; and they do not allow people to park at the actual Fred Allan complex during that Tournament other than the people working there because the refreshment stand and the restrooms are separated from the fields by the parking, and they do not want cars going in and out of that area because of safety concerns.

Ms. Friedman asked if there is a Mission Statement that will ensure that the Seniors have priority use. Ms. Tyler stated the Seniors currently get priority use of the existing Township meeting room, and it will be the same way in the new building. She stated they will have a set schedule to be followed although occasionally they may get displaced, and they would not have exclusive use. She stated while this sometimes happens in the current meeting room, she does not foresee it happening at the new building. Ms. Friedman stated she understands it will be up to the person doing the scheduling so that person should know that the Seniors would have priority, and Ms. Tyler stated it will be the same as they do now. Ms. Friedman asked if that will be in writing, and Ms. Tyler stated she does not feel that it would have to be in writing in a Contract. Ms. Friedman stated she feels something should be in writing in case the “players change.” Ms. Tyler stated “players” have changed in the past, and the Seniors have had priority use, and shall continue to.

Mr. Dickson stated he feels there should be a Mission Statement to state the purpose of the Center. Ms. Friedman stated they should know that there are to be no rentals to outside sources. Ms. Tyler stated this would come from Park & Recreation since they will have to narrow the scope of the use of the building so there is not twenty-four hour use.

Mr. Dickson stated with regard to overflow parking, the way it is worded in the letter of 9/12 indicates “an access has been provided within the front parking areas to allow for overflow parking along Oxford Valley Road...” ; and he asked how far this goes. Mr. Eisold stated while you cannot see it on the Plans, the area opens up quite large as you go further north, and it can handle quite a few cars. He added he believes that they have used that area for parking previously. Mr. Parrel noted they did use it for the first time this year because the new ball fields impacted the parking situation.

Mr. Dickson stated it is very close to the infiltration basin, and Mr. Eisold stated there will be a change in grade and plantings around the basin so he feels it will be clear that people should stay away from that basin.

Ms. Friedman asked why they are not considering either now or in the near future depending on funding, putting in the extra pervious spaces on the Fred Allan tract where the playground is. Mr. Eisold stated while they could be connected in the future, even though it is not far away, it is not that close; and even putting in the driveway will be a cost. He stated they are discussing possibly putting in some Community Center spaces in reserve; and while in the future there could be a connection and the spaces put in, he does not feel it is practical for the use of the building initially. Ms. Friedman stated she is bringing this up for a separate reason, and she asked why they are not considering putting spaces on Fred Allan at any time, and Mr. Eisold stated this was not their direction and should be asked of the Township if it is felt that there is a need.

Mr. Eisold originally there was a list of Waivers, but during discussions some of them have been eliminated. He provided this evening a new letter dated 9/22 with the listing of Waiver requests. He stated no additional Waivers have been requested.

Ms. Friedman noted the Waiver to not require the establishment of a bike path, and she stated she felt they were going to advocate for connectivity throughout the site. Mr. Eisold stated the discussion was that the bike path and the sidewalk had to be looked at on a global basis for the same site, and he feels that may be a direction in the future that the Supervisors want to look at; however, at this point, that has not been done for this immediate site. Ms. Friedman asked Mr. Eisold if he has

heard about a timeframe of ever looking at this, and Mr. Eisold stated he has not heard a timeframe although he has heard that there is an interest in this. Ms. Friedman asked if there is any potential for funding in the future, and Ms. Tyler stated there is not yet. She stated usually they would do this as part of the road paving, and there is not enough to include this as the roads take priority over bike paths. She stated they are actively looking for recreation money to pay for this.

Mr. Dickson noted Waiver #17 to not be required to provide replacement trees, and he stated he feels the Environmental Advisory Council had some strong objections to this Waiver. Mr. Eisold stated the EAC also made a recommendation that the base plantings around the building be provided in lieu of the replacement trees per se; and he feels this will enhance the building quite a bit and make it much nicer. He stated he is optimistic that this is one of the things that will be included in the final construction.

Mr. Tracey stated he likes that the new Plan provides for additional plantings in the front of the building which increases the buffer area and increases the number of plantings. He feels the reduction in disturbance to trees in the back of the building will also help ease some of the concerns expressed by the Environmental Advisory Council. He stated he does not have a problem with the requests for Waivers.

Ms. Friedman stated Mr. Bush was not able to attend this evening and sent an e-mail which Ms. Friedman read into the Record as follows:

“I don’t know what all of you intend to do tonight but for my two cents, even if the new Sketch Plan is accepted, I would only give it a Preliminary not Final Approval because it is only a Sketch Plan, still has not really addressed the concern about access to the building from the road, and importantly, despite this being the fourth meeting about it at the P/C level we have still not seen a Master or Strategic Plan as to the intended use of the building. We have heard from Kristin and also Jeff about some of the things that won’t happen there, but they will not always be Supervisors; and whoever follows them or any other Board members, might have different ideas. Critically, how the building will be used now and in the future should be reflected in its placement and design.”

Mr. Pazdera asked if they are going to go back and revise the drawings before they go to the Board of Supervisors. He also asked if they are going to come back to the Planning Commission with the revised engineering Plans and new review letters. Mr. Eisold stated while this is up to the Board of Supervisors, it was his understanding that the changes that the Planning Commission asked for which were shown on the Sketch, will be reflected on the Plans. He stated it seems that most of the Planning issues have been addressed in the Sketch Plan, and this was their goal.

Mr. Pazdera stated he is concerned about the Planning Commission passing it on now as a Preliminary/Final without seeing the Revised Plans and having another set of review letters to make sure everything is done. He stated his concern is that if it goes to the Supervisors in this form, and they Approve it, there could be another "red flag" that comes up when the review letters come back. Mr. Eisold stated he feels it would be up to the Supervisors how they wish to proceed. He stated he knows they want to get to a point where they can at least release the architect to complete the drawings since he has not done that yet. He stated this could take up to three to four months; and if they wait too much longer for that, this will be an issue. He stated they wanted to be in a position to go out to bid in January or February.

Mr. Dickson asked Ms. Frick if the paper presented this evening is considered a Preliminary/Final or a Sketch Plan for her purposes; and Ms. Frick stated the one page sheet is a Sketch Plan. Mr. Eisold stated the Preliminary/Final Plans will have to be revised for construction, but how they would proceed would be up to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Dickson stated he feels the Planning Commission should only approve this as a Sketch Plan.

Mr. Koopman stated he assumes the Board of Supervisors would like it approved at least as a Preliminary Plan so that they can move forward. Ms. Tyler stated she is looking for the Planning Commission to provide a recommendation since they have been presented with fully-engineered plans and a Sketch Plan. She stated they have also just made representations to the Planning Commission that the re-drawn Plans will be in accordance with the Sketch Plans, and she does not see any substantial changes that would bring a negative impact from review letters. Ms. Tyler stated other than another EAC review, she does not feel any of the changes would result in any new comments from any other reviewing body. Mr. Koopman stated he feels the EAC has probably already reviewed it, and Mr. Eisold stated they had reviewed it and are going to comply with all their comments in their Plan when they revise the Plans. Ms. Frick stated they reviewed the full set and not the Sketch, and Mr. Eisold agreed. He stated the Sketch Plan is so close to the original, there is not a lot that will change that would generate new comments. He stated he does not see the need to go back to all the reviewing bodies and ask for new comments on Plans that are basically 98% the same as the first Plan.

Mr. Pazdera stated they have lost another two months because they did not follow the process outlined in all the Ordinances. Ms. Tyler stated she does not feel it is correct that they did not follow the process since this is a unique situation where the Applicant is also the Township. Mr. Pazdera stated there is a process that is outlined that they are supposed to follow even if it is the Township since they are still the Applicant. Ms. Tyler asked Mr. Pazdera if he would have preferred a Sketch Plan rather than a fully-engineered Plan. Mr. Pazdera stated two years ago they asked for the Sketch Plan. He stated typically when you design a new building on a site, the first thing you need to do is analyze the site, establish which areas are the best to be built on, and then design a building to fit the site. He stated in this case they took a building that was designed fifteen years ago, and “wedged” it onto a site and manipulated things to make it work.

Ms. Tyler disagreed. She stated the placement of the building was based on the engineering studies and the topography of that area of land. She stated the Supervisors selected that area of land based upon the recommendation of the Site Selection Committee. She stated once the site was selected, then engineers went out, and they placed the building based upon engineering standards and where it would best fit on that tract of land.

Mr. Pazdera stated they are supposed to do the Site Analysis and then bring it to the Boards to review before hand which they did not do.

Mr. Pazdera asked why they are asking for more than twenty Waivers, and Ms. Tyler stated many building plans have Waiver requests; however, Mr. Pazdera stated they do not ask for the ones being requested here. Ms. Tyler stated this is the fourth time the Planning Commission has seen this, and at this point she feels they should do what they feel is within the best interest of the Township within the province of the Planning Commission.

Ms. Friedman stated she feels they are back to “square one” where they are going to make a decision on a Sketch Plan with a list of promises which is why they are in conflict.

Mr. Dickson stated they have a Sketch Plan and not a Preliminary/Final. Ms. Tyler stated they have both. Mr. Dickson stated he feels they should pass it on to the Board of Supervisors as a Sketch Plan. Ms. Tyler stated they have been presented with a fully-engineering Plan. She stated they had comments on that Plan, and now they have been presented with a Sketch taking into account the concerns presented by the Planning Commission and have been told that the Plans that they have already seen will be re-drawn with the “tweaks” on the Sketch Plan. Ms. Tyler stated she feels it would be inappropriate for the Planning Commission to say that they have only been presented with a Sketch Plan of this facility.

Mr. Tracey stated they have a full set of Plans that are sealed by the engineer and a revised Sketch Plan with a Revised Set Lay out which refers to the full set of Plans. He stated he feels they have a concrete paper trail that has been thoroughly engineered. He stated while he is a new member of the Planning Commission, he feels they have a very concrete Plan.

Mr. Pazdera stated if the Supervisors vote on it next week, and if the revisions are not made to the Plans before they go to the Supervisors, the original Plan can be approved, and they can ignore the Sketch. Mr. Koopman stated the Planning Commission is a recommending body, and he assumes that the Planning Commission will recommend that the fully-engineered Plan be modified in accordance with the Sketch Plan. He stated he also feels the Board of Supervisors is looking for the Planning Commission to make a recommendation as to the Waiver list as well. He stated it is then up to the Board of Supervisors if they wish to follow the Planning Commission recommendation.

Mr. Eisold stated the Planning Commission could also comment on how much of the overflow parking should be done.

Ms. Friedman stated the Planning Commission will take a short recess so that the Planning Commission can consider how they are going to address this issue.

The meeting was called back to order.

Mr. Dickson moved, and Mr. Tracey seconded to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the Preliminary/Final Plans for the Community Center dated 6/27/14, Plan #12-77-012-L adhering to the recommendations/changes from the Planning Commission as noted in the Boucher & James letter dated 9/12/14 along with support of the Revised Site Lay out/Sketch Plan dated 9/12/14 in accordance with the following letters:

Tri State dated 7/9/14
Captain Roche dated 7/1/14
James Yates dated 7/21/14
Bucks County Planning Commission dated 8/6/14

With particular attention to the below-mentioned comments:

The Planning Commission does not support Waivers #6 and #8. With regard to Waivers #10 and #11, the Planning Commission would like to see connectivity throughout the site. The Planning Commission would support Waiver #17 if foundation landscaping and Plan Bid Alternatives are adhered to. The Planning Commission also recommends holding in reserve twenty parking spaces.

The Planning Commission would like them to comply with the Township Green Building Ordinance to build according to LEED Standards and to complete additional green parking on the Fred Allan site in the future.

Ms. Denise Craft, 1150 Waterwheel Drive, stated she appreciates the work that has been done; and she thanked the Planning Commission for taking into account the views and concerns of the local community and the neighbors. She stated with the re-positioning of approximately fifteen parking spaces, she is unable to ascertain from the drawing how far back the parking goes. She stated she appreciates the reserve of twenty spaces, but this does not mean that they will never be built close to her home. Mr. Jackson showed her on the Plan where the parking is in relation to her home. Mr. Jackson stated originally it was 300' and now it is 150' closer. Mr. Jackson stated the Planning Commission had suggested that the extra spaces be 9' by 18' rather than 10' by 20'. Ms. Craft stated she will be looking out at eighty parking spaces which were not there when she bought her home. She stated they have heard a lot of discussion that there will be nice buffering and trees along the roadway and they have re-positioned everything to send all the pavement down the field. She stated she has not heard any discussion about environmental impact and water run off. She noted an area on the Plan which is very wet, and now they will potentially send all the rain water toward her home and her other neighbors who already have water issues.

Mr. Jackson stated there is a water easement adjacent to the Waterwheel property line so putting buffering up against the property line is not possible since the water service goes along the property line through Fred Allan and back into Waterwheel. He stated with regard to the stormwater concern, while it is true the drainage in the area is low, it is the natural drainage channel for the region of the Township. He stated it goes to a stream in the northwestern corner of the tract. He stated with regard to water generating from this particular property, it has been addressed such that the paving proposed in that area is porous pavement; and there will not be any run off from this site, and it will go directly into an infiltration system directly under the parking area. He stated there will be no run off to Ms. Craft's neighborhood from this development since it will all stay on the site. He showed the location of the infiltration system on the Plan.

Ms. Craft stated she finds it hard to believe that if there is a downpour all of the water will go through the pavement. Mr. Jackson stated while there could be a very significant storm, this is porous pavement which is not a new technology and there are videos showing how it drains. He stated the system has been sized to handle the volume of storms according to the Ordinance.

Ms. Craft stated the neighbors across the street on Oxford Valley Road will not have to see this because there are already buffers on Oxford Valley Road, and they are going to get more buffers on Oxford Valley Road. She asked that they find some way to avoid using the twenty spaces and to provide some buffer for those who are going to have to look out at this in their immediate back yard.

Ms. Craft stated while she appreciates the concept of linking, if they are going to run pavement from the ball fields, they are inviting ATVs, motor bikes, and skateboarders.

Ms. Friedman asked how green paving will look, and Mr. Eisold stated porous paving looks like regular paving, but it is not compacted as much, and there are voids.

Mr. Jeff Benedetto stated the entrance still remains immediately across Oxford Valley Road from a resident's driveway. Mr. Benedetto also stated that a neighbor of his, Sarah Spengler-Camponella, was told that there was going to be a formal traffic study. He stated her concern, which he agrees with, had to do with the Quiet Zones coming down Edgewood which will by default direct more traffic to Oxford Valley Road and now having this Commercial structure. Mr. Benedetto suggested that there be a formal traffic study. Mr. Benedetto stated he feels that they have provided too many parking spaces for the number of Seniors that will use this. He stated he has seen Middletown Township's Community Center with parking in the front and side, and it is a very unattractive building. He stated he feels there will be fifty cars at most and the rest of the time it will be empty so he feels they should not build all of the parking.

Ms. Friedman stated the Ordinance mandates eighty-three spaces, and this is why the Planning Commission is recommending that there be parking put in reserve. Mr. Eisold stated the Ordinance requires eighty-three spaces for maximum capacity of the building. He stated to officially reduce that, they would have to go the Zoning Hearing Board; but to do reserve, they would not have to do so. He stated they are showing the full build out.

Mr. Benedetto stated he would prefer that the spaces be moved closer to Oxford Valley Road rather than back on Waterwheel. Ms. Tyler stated to accommodate the people on Oxford Valley Road, they have now inconvenienced those on Waterwheel.

Mr. Benedetto stated as to the use of the building, he has had a conversation with one of the Police Officers and they are “bursting at the seams.” He stated there is no plan, and he does not understand why they do not have one when the Planning Commission has asked for it repeatedly. He asked that the Planning Commission just give Preliminary approval. He stated without a plan, they have no idea how the space will be used. He stated the Police could take over certain areas in the Municipal Building, and there seems to be no coordination between what the Municipal Building is going to be and what there will be at the Community Center. He stated the Park & Rec Department could move over there and the Tax Collector could be in a different space. He stated they are going to build the Community Center and then figure out what they will do with the space. He stated he feels they should just have Preliminary approval and have an actual Mission Statement as to use that is written since Supervisors and Township Managers change. He stated he feels they should amend the Motion to just give Preliminary approval until there is a Mission Statement.

Mr. Parell stated he feels this is a “done deal.” He feels the Planning Commission is looking out more for the community than is the Board of Supervisors; and this is a “shell game” between the Supervisors and the Planning Commission. He stated he does not feel this was the right spot for this use. He stated the parking will be within 100’ of peoples’ houses. He stated this is a commercial building and parking in a residential area, and it does not fit. He stated there should have been an aerial view of the entire site showing the ball fields and the cut through.

Ms. Craft stated she feels it would have been advisable to bring this back as a Final Plan so that they could see what it will look like. She asked that they re-think the parking.

Ms. Friedman stated the Planning Commission is doing this with a “heavy heart;” adding they are an advisory board and they have done the best they can do. She apologized to those who are going to be unhappy. She stated they are squeezing something onto a piece of property that was supposed to be tennis courts in a proposal she saw years ago.

Ms. Friedman asked if they should do something about a traffic study. Mr. Dickson stated he checked with Captain Roche and the CTC, and he has not seen any recommendations for a traffic study.

Mr. Benedetto stated this was mentioned at a Board of Supervisors meeting by Sarah Spengler-Camponella. He stated her concern was directed around the railroad Quiet Zones which will increase traffic in the area of the Community Center.

Ms. Tyler stated Quiet Zones would have no impact on volume of traffic, and Ms. Camponella's concern was about the increased volume on the CSX tracks because of the opening of the Philadelphia ports, and the fact that the gates will likely be down longer if there is more train traffic.

Mr. Eisold stated this was discussed previously and the traffic engineer did not recommend a traffic study for this project basically because you are not really generating more traffic per se because the Seniors are currently coming to the Municipal Building, and they will instead be going to the new building which is a quarter mile away. He stated there could be a little more traffic on Oxford Valley, but it is not generating a lot of traffic like a normal residential or commercial use would generate.

Mr. Benedetto stated he feels this can be addressed when the Quiet Zones come in probably early next year.

Ms. Friedman moved and Mr. Dickson seconded and it was unanimously carried to amend the Motion to add the letter from the Bucks County Conservation District dated 8/6/14, changing the date of the Tri State letter to 7/29/14, adding the Gilmore letter dated 7/23/14 and adding that the twenty parking spaces that are to be in reserve be 9' by 18'.

Ms. Friedman stated she is in serious conflict about this. She stated they are an advisory Board, and the final decision will be made by the Board of Supervisors.

Motion as Amended carried with Mr. Pazdera opposed.

Mr. Benedetto thanked the Planning Commission for looking at this as rigorously as they did and asking the hard questions.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Frick stated the Planning Commission will not have their first meeting in October because it is a holiday, but they will have the second meeting; and she hopes to have the Master Plan on that Agenda. Ms. Friedman suggested that they discuss one third of the Plan at that time.

September 22, 2014

Planning Commission – page 15 of 15

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Dean Dickson, Secretary