

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES – AUGUST 25, 2014

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on August 25, 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
Tony Bush, Member

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

Absent: Dan McLaughlin, Supervisor Liaison

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Pazdera moved and Mr. Dickson seconded to approve the Minutes of April 28, 2014 as corrected. Motion carried with Mr. Bush abstained.

COMPREHENSIVE MASTER PLAN UPDATE SECOND DRAFT DISCUSSION

Ms. Lisa Wolff and Ms. Gail Friedman from the Bucks County Planning Commission were present. Ms. Wolff stated last week they sent out the second draft and recognize that the Planning Commission has not had a lot of time to review this. She stated the Planning Commission did not previously see the Introduction. She stated the 2003 Plan has a brief Introduction of two to three pages, and they revised and updated that Introduction. She stated they also added a paragraph to focus on the need for maintenance and management of the Township's infrastructure and resources. She stated this is because the Plan points to the fact that the Township has seen a lot of development, and previous Comprehensive Plans really focused more on growth management. She stated while there are still areas that can be developed, at this point they have already seen a lot of development; and it is more critical to focus on how they will sustain the resources and infrastructure they have in the Township.

Ms. Wolff stated the Park & Recreation Chapter took a lot of time, and there were a lot of revisions. She stated in the first draft one of the items that was blank were numbers talking about potential future development in terms of potential dwelling units on currently uncommitted land, and with that they factor in how many potential recreation acreage they could get. She stated in the 2003 Plan there is a map entitled, "Developable Open Space," and they have re-titled that "Developable Open Land." She stated in updating that map they looked at the map that was in the 2003 Plan and pulled all the records on Subdivisions and Developments that Bucks County had reviewed and verified certain items with Ms. Frick and then updated the developable land component. Ms. Wolff stated once they did this, they could use the GIS system to pull the acreages of those developable parcels and factor in the acres of natural resources on those parcels. She stated they then applied the appropriate density factor. She stated in the current Plan there was not an explanation as to how a lot of things were obtained. She stated in this Plan there is an added Appendix which is an explanation, and it basically follows the Township's Site Capacity calculations.

Ms. Karen Friedman asked if they considered the Golf Course as recreation. She stated she also does not see Woodside Park with the Garden of Reflection, the Golf Course, or the Canal area even though that is not the Township's land. Ms. Friedman stated she is referring to Table 26 on Page 81. Ms. Wolff stated some of that should be in that Table. She added that the Golf Course and Five Mile Woods were not put on there although there is discussion about them before or after that Table. She stated when they discuss the second draft, they can look at this closer.

Ms. Wolff stated the maps were put in the back of the document even though the current Plan has them throughout the document with each Chapter. She stated when they prepare the Final Plan, they can have them however they want them. Ms. Wolff stated the Planning Commission saw Map 4, Land Cover, which they call a Land Use Map at the Bucks County Planning Commission. Ms. Wolff stated when this was discussed with the Lower Makefield Planning Commission, they felt it was more a Land Cover, so they retitled it to "Land Cover." Ms. Wolff stated Map #5 is the Developable Land Map which is an update of what the Township currently has. Ms. Wolff stated the Planning Commission has not seen any drafts of the other maps, and they tried to replicate a lot of them; however, when you review those maps with those in the existing Plan, they mixed some things up since they felt it made more sense to have Land Resources on one map and hydrology on another map.

Ms. Gail Friedman stated she feels the draft reflects the Sections they have been showing the Planning Commission at previous meetings. She stated the Planning Commission had requested that some of the information on historic resources be relocated into the Appendix, and she did that.

Ms. Wolff asked that the Planning Commission review the draft and they can come back to the Planning Commission at a later time. Ms. Karen Friedman agreed to have Ms. Frick contact them when they are ready to have them come back to the Planning Commission. Ms. Gail Friedman acknowledged the efforts of their administrative staff at the Bucks County Planning Commission.

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

Mr. Eisold was present with Mr. Ron Jackson from his office and Mr. George Hibbs, the architect. Mr. Eisold stated last month they discussed a number of items with the Planning Commission, and hopefully they can answer a lot of those questions this evening. He stated they did put together responses to the review letters that they received, and many of these are “will comply.”

Mr. Eisold stated they looked at the size of the spaces in the parking lot, and they have determined that 10' by 20' is probably the safer way to go for the parking spaces even though it creates a slightly larger parking lot and makes sense given the nature of the people who will be utilizing the facility.

Mr. Eisold noted the sanitary sewer review letter from Tri-State engineers, and he stated that most of these items requested some additional details on the Plan; and most of these are “will comply.” He stated these issues are technical sewer items which are minor in nature and easy to address.

Mr. Eisold stated the Historic Commission had no comments in their letter.

Mr. Eisold noted the letter from the fire protection consultant, and Mr. Eisold stated most of these are “will comply.” Mr. Eisold stated they had asked them look further into the turning radius coming in, and they have provided a 20' radius whereas only 15' is required by the Ordinance. Mr. Eisold noted Comment #5 with regard to the fire sprinkler system, and Mr. Eisold stated this will be addressed by the architect.

Mr. Eisold stated with regard to traffic safety, they were was a letter from the Police. He stated originally they had shown four handicap spaces, and it was recommended that they provide an additional four for a total of eight in the front of the building;

and they will do this. Mr. Eisold stated Item #2 relates to mountable curbs so that they could park emergency vehicles, and Mr. Eisold stated this had been discussed last month. Mr. Eisold stated while the Police had proposed it to the right front of the building, the basin is there and the grades are not good for that area; and he recommended that it be put behind the building, and they could put a stabilized base in so that if it is used as a shelter, emergency vehicles could park right behind the building. Ms. Friedman stated they will address this again when they discuss the building. Mr. Eisold stated Item #3 relates to traffic flow, and they added a third stop sign to increase the safety of the traffic flow.

The EAC letter dated 8/21/14 was noted. Mr. Eisold stated the first comment speaks to the pervious paving parking lot and the maintenance requirement, and they will add that detail on the Plan. He stated Item #1 b) is a maintenance issue, and they will add some Notes to clarify some things.

Item #2 related to the Tree Inventory Ordinance which they discussed previously. He stated they will measure the trees before they are removed; and when they have the exact limit of disturbance, they will measure the trees that are involved, and what the replacement numbers will be. Ms. Friedman asked if this also relates to Item #4, and Mr. Eisold agreed. He stated the EAC had recommended that the Foundation Landscape Plan be implemented. He stated he had the landscape architect that did the required plantings on the site, but they did a detailed planting to make the building look nice; and they do recommend that be done. He stated they had listed that as an Alternate, and hopefully there will be the funds to do that; and this will be a financial decision to be made by the Supervisors.

Mr. Bush stated currently the Ordinance states that if you take out trees of a particular diameter, you have to replace them; and in lieu of that they are going to put landscaping around the front of the building. He stated this would not be "apples to apples" so he questions how they will calculate what they need. Mr. Eisold stated they have not measured the trees yet that are coming out, but the EAC indicated that they would recommend accepting the Foundation Planting Plan which is quite extensive in lieu of, but he agrees that there is really no comparison of what would equal taking out a certain amount of trees. Mr. Eisold stated while they do not yet know what the removal number will be, they will calculate that. He stated they will be able to equate the trees at that point probably based on the value. He stated they can value out the Foundation Planting Plan; and when they get the number of trees, there is typically an accepted value for trees of a 2 ½" caliper. Mr. Bush asked if this is what they would normally do if there was a private Applicant making the same inquiry, and Mr. Eisold stated it is. He stated if there is a difference, somehow they would make it equal in some way. Mr. Bush asked how they would propose to address this, if there were an imbalance, and

Mr. Eisold stated the Ordinance discusses creating a tree bank which is a value bank for trees, and they could include this in the bank; and it would be up to the Supervisors when they approve the Plan if they feel there is an inequity, and what should be done. Mr. Eisold stated the Tree Replacement required is pretty stringent compared to other Municipalities, and other developers have come before the Township and pleaded not to match the full percent.

Ms. Friedman stated she feels it is important with the removal of trees versus the new concept of replacing them with shrubs and gardens, to recognize that this does not take into account maintaining the canopy in the Township; and she hopes they will consider this. Mr. Eisold stated they are proposing a lot of larger trees as well.

Ms. Friedman she is concerned with the wording in the response that indicates, "The Township will consider installation of this Alternate..." which she does not feel sounds like they are committed to the Alternate. She asked that this be solidified. Mr. Eisold stated they can recommend that Alternate be selected, but ultimately it is up to the Board of Supervisors what they propose to do. He stated this will make the building look a lot better from the road. He stated hopefully the Bids will come in under Budget, and they can make additions. Mr. Bush asked if they could not state, "The Township will install..." and if there is an issue with price, it can be addressed then. Ms. Friedman stated the Planning Commission can include this in their Motion.

Mr. Eisold noted Item #5 which has to do with the bike path, and he stated there has been a lot of discussion about the paths around the whole Park. He stated he knows that there is a desire to have bike paths connecting all the facilities in that area and this has to be looked at as a whole. He stated they are doing some of this with this project, but not everything that has to be done; and whether that can be part of the project would remain to be seen when the numbers come in.

Mr. Dickson stated he feels the response for #5 should be modified to say "The future sidewalk will be revised to reflect a bike path connection" and not "a proposed bike path connection." He stated there has been concern in the past that when things are proposed, they do not get done. Mr. Eisold stated he feels the Planning Commission could include this in their recommendation as well.

Mr. Eisold stated Item #6 is a clarification since they used a conservative number when they did the field testing of the infiltration to insure that it would work, but the soils will actually infiltrate quicker than what they showed. He stated if it works for the conservative number, it will work with what is actually out there.

Mr. Eisold stated Item #7 has to do with Ordinance #380 related to LEED Certification. Mr. Hibbs stated the building is not required to be LEED Certified, but they are looking at sustainable elements within the Community Center but not to achieve any level of Certification with regard to the paperwork submission. He stated at the last Supervisors meeting they attended, they were directed that the building should be as environmentally-sustainable as possible, and utilize green building concepts; but that they would not be adhering strictly to any level of LEED.

Ms. Friedman asked if the Environmental Advisory Council has discussed this, and Mr. Hibbs stated he has not met with them. Mr. Pazdera stated while they do not have to physically get the LEED Silver rating, he felt that according to the Ordinance they still had to design it to meet that level. Mr. Hibbs stated what they have done so far is to talk about being sustainable. He stated if the Ordinance requires what Mr. Pazdera has indicated, they will discuss it with the Supervisors. He stated there are several items they should be able to obtain; but when they get near the level of Certification, there are going to be items that will be cost drivers. He stated he feels in general they should be able to get close to Certification. Mr. Pazdera stated that does not meet the Ordinance requirement which states, "It does not require that an official Certification of LEED Silver rating be obtained. The designated Green Building Administrator is required to verify the documentation needed to achieve at a minimum the LEED Silver Rating has been properly completed and processed...." Mr. Eisold stated he is not aware of any projects that have gone through this since it was adopted. He stated it is not required for a house. Mr. Pazdera stated it was passed November 4, 2009. Mr. Pazdera stated he feels it was passed specifically for Township buildings. Ms. Friedman stated they were starting with the Township as a model toward efficiency in the future and lower costs. Mr. Hibbs stated between now and the next Board of Supervisors meeting they could provide a list of elements that they feel would meet that level of the LEED Silver rating and provide the costs to meet that level, and it could be a topic of future discussion. He stated with sustainable design there are long-term benefits lowering the maintenance costs of the building, but there are typically higher up-front costs. Ms. Friedman stated she feels that within five years, they can recover quite a bit of the costs, and going forward they are saving money; and it is a very short return time. Mr. Pazdera stated this is not always the case. Mr. Hibbs stated it depends on the options that are selected. Mr. Pazdera stated the Supervisors adopted the Ordinance to make the Township a leader; and if it comes down to costs, the Supervisors need to make the decision to follow the Ordinance even if it means taking off a wing of the building. Mr. Eisold stated Mr. Hibbs will get some costs so everyone has a better idea of the items and the costs. Ms. Friedman stated she feels the Board should follow the Ordinance because it was adopted for this specific reason. Mr. Pazdera stated the Township was going to be the leaders, and then adopt it for others to follow as well.

Ms. Tyler asked if they have any concerns with run off issues with respect to the pervious pavement such as has been seen at the ball fields that may impact the land surrounding the Community Center. Mr. Jackson stated there should not be any run off issues because of the grading. He stated the underground system itself has been sized for the one year flow storage. Mr. Eisold noted the area at the ball fields area where the path is narrow and designed as a conduit where the water all flows; but at the Community Center they have the whole width of a parking lot with stone that will take water. He stated they also have a basin right next to it. Mr. Jackson stated the overflow area in this case goes into the wooded area surrounding the water tower, and there should not be any issues.

Ms. Tyler asked if they have done Bids where LEED Certification is a Bid Alternate, and Mr. Hibbs stated that would be too broad.

Mr. Eisold noted Item #8 regarding parking lot lights. He stated ten poles are proposed in the parking lot. He stated the EAC wanted to insure that they did not disturb the neighbors; and Mr. Eisold stated typically there is a requirement that the foot candles be at .5 at the property line which would be along the street, and insure that the lighting is focused downward so as not to have glare. He stated you will see lights as you drive by, but the goal is to focus the lighting into the parking lot.

Ms. Friedman asked if there is any idea how late the lights will be on, and Mr. Eisold stated this would be a decision made by the Township. He stated the Police will have input as to safety. Ms. Tyler stated the Pool is closed 9:00 p.m. and the basketball and Macclesfield shut down at 10:00 p.m. Ms. Friedman stated she would not want the lights to be on at Midnight every night. Mr. Eisold stated he does not feel the Township would want to pay undue electric costs if they do not feel they are absolutely necessary for safety.

The traffic engineer review letter dated August 21, 2014 was noted. Mr. Eisold stated the first comment has to do with the size of the parking stalls which they did look at and will be revised so that they are all 10' by 20'. Mr. Eisold stated under Ordinance Review Comments Item #1 relates to the Transportation Act 209 Fee; and he stated they will put the size of the building on there, but as to the Fees in reality a lot of the same people who will be using the new building are currently using the Township Municipal Building so it should not add that much. He stated the Fee is really for the Township to upgrade their overall facilities so he does not feel that this would be necessary to pay although this would be a decision for the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Eisold stated Item #2 is with regard to the stormwater BMPs, and there was a question as to maintenance of the pervious pavement; and they will add Notes about the maintenance required.

Mr. Eisold stated Item #3 is with regard to the sidewalk connection to the baseball field, and he believes that the Township will strongly consider this. He stated now that the Community Center is in place, he feels this is an opportunity to look at both properties and all of the fields to see what is the best way. Mr. Dickson stated he would again like to change the wording that the Township “will” construct the proposed future sidewalk/bike path as this has been recommended by multiple sources. Ms. Tyler stated there is nothing to connect paths to yet. She stated there is a vision to loop from Samost up Edgewood, up Oxford Valley, around the back of the softball fields and back to Samost and to provide interconnectivity to various spots with walking trails, etc.; and while this is something they want to do, there is nothing to connect it to yet.

Mr. Bush stated at Samost the Planning Commission recommended this as a board; and when it was approved for the baseball fields, part of that was that it was going to be in this year’s Budget with the road paving. Ms. Tyler stated she felt it was just the paving. Ms. Tyler stated she feels the paths they are discussing are an independent project tying in the four assets together. Ms. Friedman stated they want to make sure that the Community Center, ball fields, and everything on that side are all interconnected so the children can travel to the various locations. Ms. Tyler stated the Planning Commission could make this recommendation. Mr. Pazdera stated he feels everything should be connected from “Day One.”

Mr. Eisold noted Item #4 which has to do with the location of the trash refuse area. He noted on the Plan where they are showing it all the way to the left at the end of the parking which they felt was out of the way and easier to maintain. He stated this could be discussed further.

Ms. Laura Falcon, 1154 Waterwheel stated she feels this is close to her home.

Mr. Eisold stated they will comply with Item #5.

Item #6 was noted, and Mr. Eisold stated the traffic engineer had not been provided a copy of the Infiltration Report, and they did provide this.

Mr. Eisold noted the Item which requested that the amount of the square footage of the Community Center be put on the Plan, and they will include the square footage of 7,584 square feet. Ms. Friedman asked how they came up with this number and asked if this is because this is what would work within the purview of the Grant.

Mr. Hibbs stated this equates to the Approved Plan based on a dollar per square foot calculation, based on a 7,600 square foot building which was Option #3 which was approved by the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Hibbs stated multiple Options were presented, and Option #3 was selected by the Board of Supervisors to proceed with.

Mr. Eisold stated there is a request that the Township consider providing a crosswalk on Oxford Valley Road at Countess Road, and Mr. Eisold showed this location on the Plan. Ms. Friedman asked if the Supervisors are planning on making it very obvious where the crosswalks are located. She stated in Newtown, they have done them in brick. She stated this is a very recreational area. Ms. Tyler stated she is not sure. She stated where they get foot traffic from children is at the baseball field on Edgewood Road which is where they have flashing lights. She stated she is not sure what kind of volume they will have crossing Oxford Valley Road into the Community Center. Ms. Friedman asked if they have people crossing Oxford Valley to get to the ball fields, and Ms. Tyler stated they do not. She stated if they make a bike path and are directing bike traffic back and forth, they will need to consider this further.

Mr. Eisold noted #3 which discussed signs in front of the building to slow people down; and apparently there was a concern that they would be knocked over, and the traffic engineer wanted to see more permanent mounted signs, and they will look into this.

Mr. Eisold noted Item #4 which was a request to look at the possibility of creating one-way circulation around the parking lot as opposed to having two-way circulation which could be considered. Mr. Jackson showed on the Plan the proposed entrance drive and how the traffic would flow. He stated there has been a suggestion to have it go one-way, and he showed how this would work on the Plan. Mr. Tyler asked the width of the driveways, and Mr. Jackson stated it is 24' wide. Mr. Eisold stated this would be wide enough for cars to go both ways. Ms. Friedman asked if there is documentation to indicate that going one way makes it safer. Mr. Hibbs stated he does not feel a one-way traffic loop would be a good solution for a number of reasons. He stated leaving it two-way is actually safer.

Ms. Friedman stated with regard to the building she is not sure why the Planning Commission received a complete set of blueprints when normally the process is addressed as a Sketch Plan, and they are given a chance to review it and provide input as to what is most favorable dealing with the Master Plan and for the residents. Mr. Eisold asked Ms. Friedman what she is referring to when she noted "blueprints," and Mr. Pazdera stated they were provided a fully-engineered Plan.

Ms. Friedman showed a one-sheet paper and stated the Planning Commission should have been provided this one sheet of paper to discuss. Mr. Eisold stated what was presented was a Development Plan. Ms. Friedman stated she does not feel they know the Planning Commission's feelings about the building; and they may feel it should have a smaller footprint, relocated parking lots, etc. which would have changed everything they have done in the Plan presented. Mr. Eisold stated they were going on the basis of the Option selected by the Supervisors. Ms. Friedman stated while she understands this, normally the process starts with a Sketch Plan; and she feels it would have been simpler if they went that route since now there are pre-determined ideas in the Plan.

Ms. Friedman stated she feels that this started as a Senior Citizen Center, and they are turning it into a Community Center. She stated she understands that the Grant that is allowed for the Township is requiring it be a Community Center and not just a Senior Center. Ms. Friedman stated she would like to prioritize the Seniors' needs in the building first, and work the Community Center into it, around it, and with it so at least for the first time in the history of Lower Makefield, the Seniors might have what they have been asking for. She stated she is concerned that this is not going to be what they were hoping to have. Ms. Tyler stated the Seniors are aware of the Plans, and she has been working closely with them for two and a half years. Ms. Tyler stated she met with Mr. Hibbs and discussed the Seniors' desires and needs. Ms. Tyler stated this design is driven by the priorities of the Seniors. Ms. Friedman stated she has done field research so they can compare comments. Ms. Tyler stated the Seniors went to a number of Senior Centers and brought back floor plans, and there has been a dialogue for some years on their "wish list."

Ms. Friedman stated there had been consideration of turning the Library into a Senior Center, and Ms. Tyler stated this was considered. Ms. Tyler stated behind the Library and the way that the wetlands back up to the building, they would have had 7,500 square feet of developable space; however, they would not have been able to add parking or enhance the exterior which required that it would have had to be a second floor project which would have involved the cost of an elevator in the amount of \$180,000 to \$250,000. She stated they also tried to have a dialogue with the Library with regard to their future plans recognizing that they have a ninety-nine year Lease. Ms. Tyler stated she felt that possibly they would be shrinking their footprint as digital books came in; however, they were unable to have a dialogue with them.

Mr. Bush stated the State Grant requires that this be for a Community Center and not a Senior Center. He stated originally the money was intended to rehabilitate an existing building and not build a new building which makes sense given the size of the Grant since if it were for a new building, the Grant would have been for more money. Ms. Tyler asked where the conclusion came from that this was for a rehabilitated building, and Mr. Bush stated it was from Mr. Santarsiero who secured the Grant. He stated this was the clearly-stated intention at the outset although this was not required.

Mr. Bush stated at the Site Selection Committee they talked about the Library although it was an afterthought. He stated the prior engineer did come up with a Plan that put a 7,500 square foot building on the Library and added twenty parking spaces taking the wetlands into account. He stated he understands now “that ship has sailed.”

Mr. Bush stated the Planning Commission has been discussing the Ten Year Master Plan, and one of the things they discussed was Township-owned facilities including the Library. He stated digital needs are expanding, but the Library's need for interior space is shrinking. He stated the Township has an interest in that property since it is across the parking lot from the Municipal Building, and they do not want to see an empty building there. He stated he spoke to Mr. Fedorchak approximately two weeks ago about this, and Mr. Fedorchak indicated he has not talked to the Bucks County Library for years about this. Mr. Bush stated he advised Mr. Fedorchak that he needs to be persistent about this. Mr. Bush stated looking at much of Suburban America, the future of libraries is to serve as a Library/Community Center. He stated if they are not going to do this, they need to do something with that building. Ms. Tyler stated the Township cannot do anything with the building since it is under Lease. Mr. Bush stated while it is under Lease, the Library has too much space, and they know they have too much space. He stated he feels something can happen if they connect with the right people.

Mr. Bush stated it appears the intention of the Supervisors is to build a new building, and they need to build it right and make sure everything is accounted for now and not build a structure that no one is happy with.

Mr. Bush stated he appreciates the work that has been done since the last time they were before the Planning Commission last month, and they did make a lot of changes. He stated he feels there is still a fair amount of missing information from the last meeting, and there were a lot of suggestions that came from members of the audience as well as the Planning Commission that were not addressed at all.

Mr. Bush stated Ms. Friedman had discussed moving the building to the front and putting the parking behind. He stated there is also a resident whose driveway is immediately across the street from the Community Center driveway who had asked that the driveway be moved, but they did not hear that this was considered.

Mr. Eisold stated they did evaluate this, and from the beginning they considered three options at locations he showed on the Plan. He stated the location they have proposed is a much safer condition to get to the extra parking. Mr. Bush asked how they will address the resident's concern; and Mr. Eisold stated on a daily basis, there should not be a significant number of cars and that resident's home is set quite a ways back. He stated there will be a number of cars during big tournaments, and Mr. Hibbs stated that is happening now already. Mr. Eisold stated he feels at most during the day when the building is in use it would be fifty to sixty cars at most. He stated he does not feel this volume will create a problem for the resident.

Mr. Bush stated Ms. Friedman had previously discussed putting on a different type of façade on the building to make it fit more into the community. Mr. Eisold stated Mr. Hibbs will present this tonight. Mr. Bush stated they had also heard that there was going to be a kitchen that could accommodate up to 250 people, and they questioned if this was going to be used as a catering hall with some regularity; and Ms. Tyler stated it will not.

Mr. Bush asked if any other potential user groups were spoken to with regard to the interior space, and Ms. Tyler stated they believe that PAA, Football, and YMS will have a shared office in the building to hold meetings as well as space for uniform storage, etc. She stated she also foresees some of the more informal Township Boards holding their meetings at the Community Center. She stated there are also presentations currently held in the Township Building Meeting Room which could be held at the Community Center as well. She stated they hope that Scout Troops will meet there as well after School.

Ms. Friedman asked if they anticipate a lot of the meetings to take place in the evening, and Ms. Tyler stated some could such as PAA. She stated she feels Scouts would be after school which would not conflict with the Seniors scheduling.

Mr. Pazdera asked when the building was finally placed on the site and who made this decision. Mr. Eisold stated they received from the architect the footprint of the building, and they looked at ways they could orient it on the site; and they felt this was the best way to do it. He noted areas on the site they wanted to keep open for future parking. He showed on the Plan where there is an ideal location for a basin which minimized the excavation costs. He stated they did not want to set the

building too close to the road and wanted to have convenient parking in the front. He also showed on the Plan where they have tucked parking into a wooded area further away from the road.

Ms. Tyler stated initially the proposal was to put it closer to the water tower, and Mr. Hibbs noted another location on the site they had considered. He stated when you are in the building, you also want to be able to look out into green space; and this was considered as well.

Mr. Pazdera asked when these decisions were made. Mr. Eisold stated there were three Options, and the Board of Supervisors picked Option #3 approximately one year ago. Mr. Pazdera stated when the ball fields come in almost two years ago, the Planning Commission had recommended looking at a Sketch Plan for the whole area to see how it could be integrated; and now two years later, they are provided with a fully-engineered Plan without ever having any input on what they might feel the arrangement should be. He stated the Township has established procedures for developers to follow, but the Township itself does not follow them.

Mr. Pazdera stated normally a developer will come in with a Sketch Plan before spending significant money on a full set of Plans. He stated they have a dialogue with the Planning Commission, the engineer, and the residents, etc. to see what makes the most sense. Mr. Pazdera stated now they have spent money on these Plans, and he feels it is too late to have this dialogue.

Mr. Dickson stated when the Planning Commission asked for this two years ago, they did not know where the Community Center was going to go; but they had to get the ball fields in so they were seeded in time to use them by 2015.

Mr. Pazdera asked if they considered access through Fred Allan and placing the building at the end of that when they were looking at locations for the building and combining the parking for the two. Mr. Pazdera showed on the Plan where he felt the building could be placed, adding he does not feel anyone considered that as an option. Mr. Hibbs stated with the location proposed by Mr. Pazdera, the run of utilities would be significantly longer. Mr. Pazdera stated he is more concerned about how it relates to the community and the residents. Ms. Tyler stated they would then be back against Waterwheel. Mr. Hibbs noted on the Plan where there would be setback issues from the water tower property. He stated they did look at placing the building further back, although not exactly as suggested by Mr. Pazdera, but it was impacted by the cost of utilities, length of utilities, and placement of the parking closer to the residents at an area he showed on the Plan.

Mr. Pazdera stated his concern is that no one came to the Planning Commission with a series of options so that they could have a discussion before it was fully engineered to see what made the most sense for the residents, the community, and the Township.

Mr. Pazdera asked the cost per square foot that was put on the building, and Mr. Hibbs stated it is approximately \$200 a square foot. Mr. Pazdera asked the typical cost per square foot to do a LEED Silver project without the cost of actually filing for the LEED Certificate. Mr. Hibbs stated he would need to put a list together noting that there are certain items such as the pervious paving which is already included in the Plan and certain fixtures. Mr. Pazdera asked for an estimate based on similar projects Mr. Hibbs has already done, and Mr. Hibbs estimated it could be \$15 to \$40 per square foot. Mr. Pazdera asked the impact on the Budget if this were added in, and Mr. Hibbs stated the building would have to get smaller. He stated if they also include the bike paths, the building would get smaller as well.

Ms. Tyler asked Mr. Pazdera's problem with the proposed Plan, and Mr. Pazdera stated they are not going to be able to afford it. Ms. Friedman stated they are not going to be able to make it what it should be. She stated they will have a "skeleton" building that will not address the full needs. She stated they will not be able to put the amenities on the site that need to be put there to make it the way it should be.

Mr. Pazdera asked about furnishings, and Ms. Tyler stated the Seniors have saved approximately \$54,000 that they are going to put toward furnishings and other amenities within the building, and the Township will have to put in additional money if needed. She stated this will depend on where they come in when they go out to Bid.

Mr. Pazdera stated normally when you start a project you set the parameters, and one of the parameters was the LEED Silver which was not factored in even though it is part of the Ordinance. Ms. Tyler stated LEED adds about 25% to the price, and Mr. Pazdera stated they would have to cut the building. Mr. Pazdera asked when they have to have this in the ground before they lose the Grant, and Ms. Tyler stated next year. Mr. Pazdera asked when they plan to go out for Bids, and Ms. Tyler stated they hope to go out in January or February. Mr. Pazdera asked what they will do if the Bids come in over, and Ms. Tyler stated they would rely on the professionals to tell them. Mr. Hibbs stated they could look at Alternates and areas of the building. Mr. Pazdera asked if they are going to do this as part of the Bid, and Mr. Hibbs stated they are.

Ms. Friedman stated tonight she would like to review what the building is supposed to be, its purposes, how the rooms are going to be framed out, and who gets to use those rooms.

Mr. Hibbs showed the Plan based on a 7,600 square foot building. He stated at the March 5 Board of Supervisors meeting the Board reviewed Options #1 to #4; and while Option #3 was the consensus selection, the Supervisors wanted certain things removed from Option #3. He stated they wanted the overall 7,600 square foot building but they did not want an exercise room as they had security and liability concerns. He stated with regard to the game room and fixed gaming equipment the Board commented that this would limit the multi-use purpose of the room so the game room was removed from the project. He stated what is now being shown is the end result of those pieces being removed but the overall square footage remaining.

Mr. Hibbs showed the vestibule/entry lobby, the office/reception area, the meeting/conference room and corridor which remain the same as before. He stated you then go directly past the entry vestibule into the large multi-purpose room and the square footage for this room has not changed. With regard to the kitchen space, Mr. Hibbs stated the kitchen was located further down on the plan; and it has been pushed further back so that they have access off the side parking area for deliveries so that there are not deliveries of food stuffs, etc. from the front of the building. He stated all the waste is also occurring out the side and out the back. He stated mechanical space has been located directly adjacent to the kitchen and multi-purpose room in terms of utility runs and Fire Department connections so that there is a direct connection off the side rather than off the front.

Mr. Hibbs showed on the Plan the location of the restrooms, classrooms/multi-purpose spaces, and a storage room. He stated in each of the rooms they had to utilize furniture that can be stored, tables that can be folded, and chairs that can be stacked so that each group can set it up how they like to set it up.

Mr. Hibbs noted the reception area and office so that as soon as someone comes in there is a presence. Ms. Friedman asked if they are having someone watch the building 24/7; and Ms. Tyler stated while it will not be 24/7, they will staff it either with an existing Township employee or hire a part-time employee. Ms. Friedman asked if they will do then even when the Seniors are there, and Ms. Tyler agreed.

Mr. Hibbs noted the capacity of the multi-purpose room is approximately 125.

Ms. Friedman stated she wants to address the needs of the Seniors. She stated she has done field research and found that there are 283 active members even though it used to be 700, and she feels it will elevate again. Ms. Friedman reviewed the Senior activities including book reviews, a health fair, movies, yoga, and line dancing. Ms. Friedman stated she feels those activities are conducive to the huge, multi-purpose room. She stated she would like to see

that room be able to be halved down the middle, and Mr. Hibbs stated it is. She stated she also feels that it would be a benefit that one of those sides could be halved again so that there could be three rooms – two small and one large so that there could be a number of activities at the same time. Ms. Tyler stated there are other small rooms; however, Ms. Friedman stated she is concerned about the money and is trying to come up with the least number of rooms so that they do not have to spend money on rooms that they do not need. Ms. Tyler asked if she is trying to cut square footage, and Ms. Friedman stated she is. Mr. Pazdera stated he feels they are going to have to.

Ms. Friedman stated the other set of activities are BINGO, bridge, mahjong, etc.; and in her discussions with Barbara who schedules the rooms, a lot of times they need two game rooms because there are two sets of people that want to do two different things. She stated she feels 851 square feet for a game room would be nice, and there would then be another smaller room. Ms. Friedman stated they also need an arts and crafts room with storage cabinets for materials to be under lock and key, and she feels the community could also use this as well for art. She stated that room should have a vinyl floor for clean up of paint.

Ms. Friedman stated she feels that this is all they need as this was all she was told about in terms of internal building activities.

Ms. Friedman stated she feels the office/reception concept seems redundant, and she does not know what the office would do that the reception could not do. Ms. Tyler stated the receptionist would be a greeter, and the office position would be a person who performs the office job. Ms. Friedman stated she feels that could be right at the front desk. She stated to save space she feels they could condense those two rooms into one room.

Ms. Friedman stated originally there was also a computer room set aside. Mr. Hibbs stated one of the issues with the computer room is the ability to have fixed stations centralized or to have a perimeter concept. He stated in a perimeter concept you can actually have a different function in the center versus if it is laid out as a typical computer classroom which is then all that it can ever be. He stated with regard to Ms. Friedman's discussion about art classes, in the multi-purpose room the plan is to have secured cases so that they are under lock and key; and there would be a series of closets which are designated for certain groups.

Ms. Friedman stated she is looking to reduce the footprint, and she questions why they need a computer room since most people have home computers and the Library has them available as well. She stated she is concerned that if they have a computer room, they will have to have Internet, maintenance, concerns about theft, etc. Mr. Hibbs stated they will have data ports and power, but there will not be a computer lab.

Ms. Friedman stated from what she was told for their basic needs all the Seniors need is the large multi-purpose room which could be divided up, two extra rooms for game rooms, and an art room.

Ms. Friedman stated she feels the kitchen is oversized. Ms. Friedman stated she asked the Seniors if they wanted to make food for other Seniors or have cooking classes, and she was told no. Mr. Hibbs stated the size of the kitchen was based on capacity, and what they are proposing are residential-style fixtures and not to compete with any commercial establishments in the area.

Ms. Friedman stated when she spoke to the Seniors they had indicated they would like a bocce court and a picnic facility on the premises. Ms. Friedman stated because the Plan never came to the Planning Commission they never discussed what kind of amenities might be surrounding the building. Ms. Tyler stated they may move the existing bocce court from its current location. She stated they also want to put in a small putting green and a community garden. Ms. Friedman asked who will maintain a putting green so that it is effective, and she asked who will mow it. Ms. Tyler stated it will be Astro-turf. Ms. Tyler stated the idea was you would go out the back of the building where they would have picnic tables and the recreational activities including possibly horseshoes. Ms. Friedman stated she feels the more that is on the premises, the better since they would not have to ride all over; and she feels the bocce court should be moved there if it is not too expensive.

Ms. Friedman stated she was thinking of a two-story building where the Seniors would have the base floor, and the Community Center part would be on the top with the meeting rooms, extra storage, and a back staircase. She stated in this way the Seniors would not be completely disturbed, and they would have a small area that they could call their own. She stated the way it sounds, she feels the Seniors are going to be competing for the space. Mr. Hibbs stated they cannot afford a second floor as it would need an additional means of egress and an elevator. Ms. Tyler stated the way the Seniors currently use the Municipal Building, the hours that they occupy it do not conflict with other types of meetings. She stated she has been the Liaison with the Seniors for some time; and while they have been told that they are not guaranteeing the Seniors exclusivity to any portion of the building, they will have an area to lock up their things as they do now. Ms. Friedman asked what would happen if a play group wanted to use the facility, as she feels the Seniors would then have to compete for the space. Ms. Tyler stated the Seniors will be given priority on scheduling.

Mr. Bush stated if the kitchen is not going to be used for catering, he questions why they even have a kitchen. Ms. Tyler stated the Seniors bring food in and out, and there are two pots of coffee put on every morning. She stated they also have lunch when they play cards on a regular basis. Ms. Tyler asked the square footage of the kitchen, and Mr. Hibbs stated it is 14' by 22' which is 358 square feet. Mr. Bush stated in their current use of the Township space, the Seniors do not prepare any food so he feels the size of the kitchen could be reduced. Ms. Tyler stated she does not feel that 14' by 22' is that large. She stated if they are bringing in trays, etc. they may need the room.

Ms. Tyler asked Mr. Hibbs if the building is designed such that they could pull off pieces if need be; and Mr. Hibbs stated while they can, it could be part of the bidding strategy, and they may need to prioritize such that whatever the lowest priority is could be an alternate. He stated they can then review this when the bids come in.

Ms. Friedman stated she does not know why they have a conference room since they could make a fourth of the multi-purpose room into a conference room. Mr. Hibbs stated it is not specifically about the labels, and everything is really about the space.

Ms. Friedman stated she feels the façade should be made to look like the rest of the neighborhood. Mr. Hibbs showed a front and back façade and a three-dimensional sketch. He stated it is a 7,600 square foot building which is all one story. He stated it is cost effective and is stick-frame construction, slab on grade; however, because it is a large footprint, they want to break the scale down. He stated the multi-purpose room is a story and a half, and on either side there are gables framing in. He stated to allow additional light to come in there are windows at the top of the story and a half space in the back. He stated at the back there is a patio with double doors on either side and windows going into the multi-purpose space. He stated they wanted the building to have a traditional flavor with materials to fit in with the Township and the neighborhood. He noted wood columns at the front of the building. He stated they also want to ground the building. He stated they want to use traditional materials such as a stone base to the building that will wrap around and become the base of the columns.

Ms. Friedman asked if they considered solar panels, and Mr. Hibbs stated this is an added expense.

Mr. Pazdera asked if they considered a covered patio area in the back, and Mr. Hibbs stated this would be an added cost. He stated the Budget is very tight, and they are trying to keep the architecture very simplistic. He stated they do not want to have steel framing as they want to be as cost conscious as they can be. Mr. Pazdera stated he feels if they are doing this, he feels they should do it right even if they have to scale back the size of the building.

Mr. Pazdera asked if they are approving a Township Public Recreation Facility or a Community Center. Mr. Eisold stated while everyone has referred to this as a Community Center, by the Zoning Ordinance, it does not fit the definition of a Community Center; rather it fits the definition of a Public Recreation Facility. Mr. Pazdera stated he feels the documents should be consistent then. Mr. Eisold stated "Community Center" is just a name; but as far as the Zoning and the use it is a Public Recreation Facility. Mr. Eisold stated he discussed this early on with Mr. Garton, and according to the definitions it was a Public Recreation Facility. Mr. Eisold stated according to the definition, a Public Recreation Facility is Township-owned; and a Community Center is not Township-owned but owned by another entity.

Ms. Maryellen O'Connor, 1066 Victory Drive, stated she is concerned with run off, the location of the parking, and trash, and the impact on the resident's driveway across the street. She stated she does not feel the design fits in with the community. She stated she would be in favor of using the Library. She stated she does not feel the Seniors need this elaborate of a Community Center, and she feels this is more for other people than it is for the Seniors. She stated this will effect their taxes so that it will be very difficult to stay in the Township. She stated they are taking down the canopy and land from the animals.

Ms. Friedman stated the Seniors do have basic requests, but the Grant requires that it be a Community Center which is why it is becoming more than what the Seniors originally asked for. Ms. O'Connor asked who applied for this Grant, and Ms. Tyler stated the State Representative secured a \$2 million Recreation Grant, \$1 million toward the Community Center and the other \$1 million went toward baseball fields, resurfacing of the tennis and basketball courts, and an inclusive playground that is currently under construction at Memorial Park. An individual in the audience questioned why they are rushing with the Community Center; and Ms. Tyler stated this particular project has been many years in the making, and the idea and concept of the Community Center for Lower Makefield is more than thirteen years old. She stated Mr. Hibbs is the same architect who has been working on this for those thirteen years. Ms. Tyler stated she feels this will be a wonderful place which will be used by more than just the Seniors. She stated she does have sympathy for those who live in the surrounding area and their concerns

for how this may change their daily life. She stated they are designing with the residents in mind. She stated they are concerned about Countess, and the adjacent driveway and the lights.

Mr. John Oberkofler, 587 Saxony, stated he is concerned about lights being on after 10 p.m. Ms. Tyler stated she feels the building will largely be a daytime use although there could be evening meetings. She stated use of lights in the evening will depend on the use. Ms. Tyler stated she feels some lights may need to be on for security purposes.

Ms. Catherine Beath, 1049 Countess, stated she has seen lights on at other Township facilities in the area at 2:00 a.m. She feels this area is becoming like Sesame Street North. She stated she understands that Option #3 is already a half million dollars over the amount of the Grant; and if they are going to spend \$500,000, they should consider using money for landscaping and things that will help the existing residents. Ms. Beath expressed concern with the parking in front of the building.

Mr. Eisold stated from the road, the parking will be sitting down, and the building will be up. He stated they will also have trees on the road and a berm with additional plantings along the road to further hide the parking lot. He stated the parking needs to be close to the building for the Seniors.

Ms. Beath asked how far the parking lot is from the road, and Mr. Jackson stated it is thirty-two feet. Ms. Beath asked the number of parking spaces, and Mr. Eisold stated they are showing eighty-five. He stated this is for the maximum capacity, and this could be cut back.

Ms. Beath stated she is concerned with the use of the building and she had sent a letter to Ms. Frick. She stated if they are going to have Flea Markets, those events should take place at the Township Municipal Building and not at this new Building. Ms. Beath stated she hopes that they will have a schedule, and Ms. Tyler stated they will. She stated there is someone in the Office now who handles the scheduling of the existing Township meeting room. Ms. Beath stated she feels the existing Township meeting room will be vacant 50% to 60% of the time with the Seniors moving out.

Mr. Bush asked if there was any discussion about Flea Markets, car washes, etc., and Ms. Tyler stated the only thing they discussed out of the ordinary was to have Opening Day Baseball since it ties in with the baseball facility.

Ms. Beath stated she would also like to see the Rules of Operation for the facility.

Ms. Maryellen O'Connor asked about the operation of the kitchen noting all the tables set up on the Plan showing the large multi-purpose room. Mr. Hibbs stated it was just showing four person tables to get a general count. Ms. O'Connor asked why they need doors on the side if they are not going to have catering; and Ms. Tyler stated the Seniors bring in food every day, and the point was to keep the food out of the vestibule so it was not tracked throughout the building. Ms. O'Connor stated she does not feel under any circumstances should tents be put outside and items outside on the lawn, and Ms. Tyler stated she feels they will follow the current Park & Recreation procedures and protocols as far as approving or disapproving activities within Township-owned properties.

Ms. Beath stated she understands that people come to the Township to request Permits, and she would ask that they never have tents or big activities at this new facility since they have a parking lot at the current Township Building. She stated she would also like to be part of any committee putting together rules as there should be resident input.

Ms. Anna Kitces, 1015 Yorkshire Drive, asked why she received notice of the meeting, and Ms. Frick stated she went beyond the requirements for notification. Ms. Kitces stated she appreciated the notice adding she did not know anything about this project and feels others would like to know about it as well. She feels there was a lack of communication. She asked about the demographics and asked if they are planning for the future. Ms. Tyler stated the Township's population is aging, and she believes the Senior population is between 11% and 14% of the total population within the Township. Ms. Tyler stated the total population of the Township is approximately 35,000.

Ms. Kitces stated she is concerned about the infiltration basin. Mr. Jackson stated the stormwater management facilities on site are designed to accept the rainfall from a one hundred storm and keep it on site and infiltrate into the ground rather than letting it run off. Ms. Kitces stated she is concerned about the underwater infiltration and the maintenance plan for this. Mr. Eisold stated there is 3' of stone under the complete rear parking area. He stated the Plan meets the current BMP requirements. He stated there will be a maintenance program in place, and it will be a Township cost moving forward.

Ms. Kitces stated she feels this is a piecemeal plan for the area, they are not planning properly, and there is a lack of communication. She stated it would be safer to have multi use of the parking spaces. She stated she feels there should have been better communication with the Library about use of that facility. Ms. Tyler stated there was a Site Selection Committee that came to the Board of Supervisors with a short list of locations, and this site was recommended. Mr. Bush stated he was on the Committee, and there was a split decision – three to three. He stated this

was one site and the other was Veterans Square. Mr. Bush stated at the last minute they also brought up the issue of the Library that was not presented to the Committee as an option until about one week before. Ms. Tyler stated the Library was not a feasible option because of the size, the legal obligations to the Library under the Lease, and the need for the second floor. She stated it was very difficult to get the Library to return calls so there was a lack of communication as well. She stated it was not engineeringly feasible and it was not cost efficient.

Ms. Laura Falcon stated she feels a smaller project with solar panels, etc. will make it a less expensive project in the future and more manageable. She stated because the building is isolated, they are now going to have to hire a receptionist. She stated what is being shown looks like the existing Municipal Building which she feels is horrendous. She stated it does not look like the neighboring properties. She stated she also does not want a huge dumpster 300' from her property given the amount of taxes she pays. She stated she is concerned about the noise from the dumpster being emptied at 6 a.m. She stated the view in the Township is that the Board of Supervisors are going to do whatever they want. She stated she feels the Planning Commission is looking at the way it should be looked at and wants to take into account the concerns of the residents. She stated none of the comments from the residents at the last meeting were taken into consideration. She also expressed concern with safety on the roads and the potential for a road being cut through.

Ms. Kitces asked about the need for a computer room, and Ms. Friedman stated when she spoke to the head of the Seniors group, computers were not something that concerned them much. Ms. Tyler stated she does feel that they have to design for data ports and have the lines in there so that there is the ability to plug in. Ms. Friedman asked why they would not have data ports at the Township Municipal Building. Ms. Tyler stated at the Community Center one of the other groups may want to use data ports, but others in the audience stated they could use them at the Township Building. Ms. Tyler stated they do not have computers at the Municipal Building for public use. Ms. Friedman stated possibly the Township Municipal Building could have space for data ports since they have the space.

Ms. Mary Cosaboom, 1090 Victory Drive, asked if the Library is shrinking could they move the Library. Ms. Tyler stated the Library is under a ninety-nine year Lease, and it goes decades into the future. She stated the Township has no right to use any portion of that building. Ms. Tyler stated she went to the Library Board meetings to ask these questions, and they had no definite plans to shrink the footprints of their buildings. She added that the Lower Makefield Library is the only one they do not own, and the Library owns all their other buildings. She stated she did try to have a dialogue with them but was unsuccessful.

Ms. Rosemary Good, 1083 Victory Drive, asked if the Township could rent space back from the Library. Ms. Tyler stated she does not know that they have extra space that they are not using; however, Mr. Bush stated he feels that they do have extra space. He stated the demand for in-person library space is shrinking.

Ms. Tyler stated when she spoke to the Library Board, there was no interest in discussing this. She stated they did not say that they had extra room, and they did not say they were planning to shrink their space.

Mr. Bruce Cosaboom, 1090 Victory Drive, stated they watched the ball fields go in, and they did not move here to listen to megaphones and screaming crowds. He stated he is even more concerned about parking, and he asked if the Planning Commission has been advised about the number of vehicles from the large tournaments. He stated in the past there was overflow and people were parking in their neighborhood and bringing in trash. He asked if the Planning Commission has ever received any traffic counts when these facilities go in. Mr. Cosaboom asked who has the authority to put up the "No Parking" signs along Oxford Valley since this does not occur in his neighborhood to prevent that from happening.

Ms. Tyler stated she is not sure who puts up the signs, she has discussed this issue with Chief Coluzzi; and he has indicated that they are public roads and people are allowed to park on them. She stated she is not sure why they are allowed to have these signs on Oxford Valley Road but feels it may be for pedestrian safety and sight distance. Ms. Tyler stated there has been discussion about busing people in using shuttle buses to get to these events. Mr. Cosaboom stated he feels this project will take away from where they always park and will aggravate the situation, and Ms. Tyler stated this is why they had the dialogue about using shuttles for these large events. Ms. Tyler stated they have designed the parking lot for as much parking as they can.

Ms. Laura Falcon asked if they considered other properties which are not so congested already, and Ms. Tyler stated they considered Patterson Farm. Mr. Bush stated they also considered the Snipes Tract. Ms. Tyler stated it came down to the cost of running the utilities and the problem of putting up a building and pavement at the Patterson Farm. She also stated to rehab the house at the Patterson Farm was cost prohibitive and there was a small square footage. Ms. Tyler stated at the Snipes Tract, it was up north; and the desire was to have it at the Township center.

There was discussion about tree removal, and Ms. Tyler stated they are trying to keep the property as intact as possible. Ms. Falcon stated she is concerned that the area will turn into Macclesfield Park. She stated she recognizes that this was a risk she took when she purchased her home adjacent to this Township-owned area. She stated she does not feel the proposed building is attractive.

Mr. Pazdera stated he feels they have added another \$100,000 in site work by putting the building where they have. He stated they have pushed the building to the steepest slope on the site, and there is ten feet of fill in the one corner. He showed on the Plan where he feels they could shift the building. Mr. Eisold stated they wanted to orient it toward the road. Mr. Pazdera stated he is concerned about the cost of the fill. Mr. Pazdera stated he feels the cost for additional site work will be \$100,000. Mr. Eisold stated some of the additional costs are for the increase in parking as initially the site had very few parking spaces on it, and this could be cut back. He stated when they did the original Sketch, they did not have details on the stormwater and when you add the basin, pervious paving, and stone, this increase the costs. Mr. Pazdera stated his concern is that once the Bids come in, they will be taking things out and compromising the whole project.

Mr. Pazdera also expressed concern with pushing off locating the trees since they would not allow a developer to do this. Mr. Eisold stated what they have proposed is much more cost effective to the Township, and it will be quick and easy to do this during construction, and will save the Township a lot of money. Mr. Pazdera stated from a planning perspective it makes sense to have the site features established so that when they place the building, they know what is there. Mr. Pazdera stated anytime you start cutting in and have that much fill, every tree along there will be impacted. Mr. Eisold stated they do have to protect the canopy. Mr. Pazdera stated his concern is that they require the developers to do things for a reason; but when it is the Township, they do not do it.

Mr. Bush asked about the annual maintenance costs, and Ms. Tyler stated this would depend upon staffing. Mr. Bush asked about the maintenance costs aside from the staffing, and Mr. Eisold stated he does know that there are maintenance requirements for the pervious pavement. Mr. Hibbs stated they could look at what they spend on the existing Township Building. Mr. Bush stated the Township has a number of nice facilities; but some of the facilities long-term have been problematic from a maintenance standpoint and have been expensive. He noted specifically the Golf Course and the 9-11 Memorial. He stated he feels it would be helpful to know what the costs will be for this building.

Mr. Bush stated he feels they have been too focused on the Seniors' present needs as opposed to their future needs. He stated when you look at aging populations, Seniors are more active and typically more tech savvy; and he feels going forward, they are less likely to use this type of facility. He stated this is what the history has been in places like Florida. He stated he does not feel there has been a lot of consideration about the future needs. He stated there has been consideration about the current needs, but he feels they should build it for the future.

Ms. Falcon stated she voted twice in a Referendum about a Community Center. Ms. Tyler stated there were two Referenda – one for approximately \$7 to \$8 million. Ms. Falcon asked if the public gets to vote now on whether they do this, and Ms. Tyler stated they do not.

Ms. Friedman stated there was a question about the number of Seniors and in 2010 there were approximately 9,000 Seniors or 28% of the population. This would be those fifty-five and older.

Ms. Friedman asked, since they are restricted to the \$1 million Grant, if any thought has been given to make the building in such a way that they could add onto it in the future if they apply for another Grant; and Ms. Tyler stated that is part of the design. Mr. Hibbs showed a corridor on the Plan where potentially in the future they could add onto the building. Ms. Friedman stated she was discussing having a building with a smaller footprint at this time, and then adding to it at some future time if it found it is needed. Mr. Hibbs stated when they discuss Bid Alternates, they could establish Alternates so that there would be a base project and then different Alternates.

Ms. Friedman asked what is expected from the Planning Commission this evening, and Ms. Frick stated the Board of Supervisors is meeting on 9/3 about this Preliminary/Final Plan if the Planning Commission would like to make a recommendation. Ms. Friedman stated she is not ready to vote on this tonight because she needs time to consider this as she is unhappy with so many elements of what they are dealing with. She stated she is concerned that they are constrained by the Grant and a building that will be cheap and nothing that the public was expecting.

Mr. Bush asked if the Board of Supervisors could consider this at their second meeting in September so that the Planning Commission can consider it again at their meeting on September 8, 2014. Ms. Tyler stated the Board of Supervisors is going to look for something from the Planning Commission at their next public meeting on September 3 since the Planning Commission has met on this twice. She asked that the Planning Commission make whatever recommendations they have from a planning perspective that they feel the Board of Supervisors needs to consider.

Ms. Tyler stated if they need access to the architects and engineers, they would be made available to the Planning Commission. Ms. Friedman stated she does not feel she is able to make those recommendations tonight because she may have more recommendations as she digests the information.

Mr. Pazdera stated he feels they should have had this discussion two years ago.

Mr. Dickson stated two years ago they gave into PAA because they wanted the ball fields. Mr. Dickson stated at that point they should have gotten a Sketch Plan for the whole area before they approved the ball fields. He stated they were pressured because they wanted to get the seed in for 2015.

Ms. Tyler stated she feels the Planning Commission should identify for the Board of Supervisors the planning concerns they have.

Mr. Bush stated a lot of issues have come up this evening including moving the driveway and moving the location of the building which are two huge issues as well as a number of smaller issues. Mr. Bush stated they would like to have more time and consider moving things around including the parking lot. Ms. Tyler stated at last month's meeting, they discussed items they wanted addressed, and some of those were addressed in the Plan; however, Mr. Bush stated there were other items that were not addressed. Ms. Tyler stated she would like the Planning Commission to list the items they are still concerned with so that they can tell the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Pazdera stated because they did not have a Sketch Plan, he is not convinced that this is the best building location. He is also concerned about the access point location and whether the project is even feasible within the Budget. He stated the Planning Commission was never presented the Options to discuss with the public. Mr. Pazdera stated they did not follow the normal procedures that they would make a developer follow. He stated he is also concerned that the trees were not located like they make the developers do so that they could see the impact. He stated the Board of Supervisors also has to make the commitment to meet the LEED Silver requirements since it is in the Ordinance. Mr. Dickson stated he is concerned about the sidewalk and bike paths. Mr. Pazdera agreed and stated from Day One, this building should have interconnectivity to the other two facilities.

Ms. Friedman asked if they should see where the gardens and picnic area will go; however, Ms. Tyler stated that will not be part of this construction in Phase I. Ms. Friedman stated depending on where that is located, it could compromise how they put those things on the site; and she is concerned about doing this piecemeal. She stated there is no cohesiveness taking place on many levels.

Mr. Bush stated they only heard about this tonight for the first time, and they do not know where on the site it would be even if the building were to remain exactly where it is. Ms. Friedman stated this is not how the Planning Commission does business.

Mr. Fox stated the three options for building placement were presented and a location was chosen by the Board of Supervisors months ago at a public meeting, and Mr. Eisold agreed. Mr. Fox stated from a legal and planning perspective, they have complied. Mr. Fox stated if the Planning Commission is going to make a recommendation, they should list out the concerns they feel the Board should have considered. He stated he understands that in terms of the Options, the Planning Commission would have liked to have had input in choosing the Option. Mr. Pazdera agreed.

Ms. Friedman stated they are also not happy with what is being presented, and they are not being given the time to show the Board how they really want it; and she particularly noted the parking lot. She stated she feels this would take another meeting, and they are not being given the opportunity to have another meeting. Mr. Pazdera stated that is why you have a Sketch Plan and not consider all this at Final.

Mr. Bush stated they could indicate to the Board of Supervisors that they would like additional time, but also list their concerns. Mr. Bush stated when the Supervisors selected the location, they did not have all the same information that they have today and may not have considered items such as the amount of fill needed or the concerns of the neighbors.

Ms. Friedman stated the façade is institutional looking with the vinyl siding and does not blend in with the community. She stated it is located in the heart of a residential community, and it should look more residential.

Ms. Tyler asked what information the Planning Commission is lacking this evening in order to make a decision, and Ms. Friedman stated she would like to have the time to look at an aerial view now knowing the size of the building so that she can determine if this is how the building should be positioned and how to address the parking lot and the number of spaces. She stated they might consider having grass parking as they ask other developers to put on their property.

Mr. Bush stated he would like to see an alternate Sketch Plan moving the building back as suggested by Mr. Pazdera. Ms. Tyler stated it would be too expensive to move it back and it would have pushed it into the Waterwheel community. Mr. Pazdera stated he feels they may just be able to flip it. He stated he needs to be shown that what is proposed makes the most sense. He stated he needs a Sketch Plan showing the other options so he can see that what is proposed makes the most sense and is the best and most cost-effective way to do this. Mr. Pazdera stated he would like to see the Sketch Plans showing the other Options and why they do not work and why this is the best. Ms. Tyler asked Mr. Eisold if he has the original three Options, and Mr. Eisold stated he does not have them this evening. Ms. Tyler asked that Mr. Eisold provide these to Ms. Frick so they can be delivered to the Planning Commission.

An individual from the audience asked if Ms. Tyler was going to honor the request to have two more weeks; and Ms. Friedman stated Ms. Tyler is the Liaison and cannot make that decision.

Ms. Friedman stated in order to make a decision she feels they need other Sketch Plans that deal with a more cost effective way of placing the building on the property as Mr. Pazdera has indicated.

Mr. Pazdera stated he would like to see a Sketch of "Option 4" which would be the drive coming through the Fred Allan Complex through the existing road and not having another road. Ms. Tyler stated she does not feel the access should go through the whole Softball complex which would involve cutting down the tree line. She stated she feels it needs to have its own access. Mr. Pazdera stated he feels this should have been looked at, and Ms. Tyler stated she feels all reasonable options were looked at. Ms. Tyler stated she does not feel they want the engineer to have to design all these different plans, and Mr. Pazdera stated this should have been done two years ago.

Mr. Bush stated when this site was selected by the Supervisors they did not have the information they have now. Mr. Eisold stated the Board selected a place to site the building, and everything else around it was made to work with the building. He stated the location of the building was selected by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Fox stated the Planning Commission is asking to see the alternative Plans presented so they can discuss why this location was chosen. He stated the Planning Commission may then want to recommend some of the other Options. Mr. Bush stated it may be a combination of the Plans. Ms. Friedman stated they also want to have more time for discussion to get to the best option they can come up with.

Ms. Friedman stated they are not happy with what they are looking at, and they would like the option to have more discussion and see more Options.

Ms. Tyler suggested that the Planning Commission schedule a meeting with Boucher & James and review the Sketches and building designs that have been done. She suggested that the Planning Commission have a special meeting as soon as possible to get the answers they want. Ms. Friedman stated due to the holiday, she is not sure they would be able to meet prior to the Board of Supervisors' next meeting. Mr. Pazdera stated they would have to advertise the meeting, and there is not sufficient time to do so.

Mr. Fox proposed that the Planning Commission provide in writing to the Board of Supervisors their list of concerns and what they need and suggest to the Board of Supervisors that this information be provided to the Planning Commission for consideration at their September 8 meeting so that they can consider it further to see if a recommendation is ready to be made based upon addressing these concerns and the additional information. Mr. Fox stated the Board of Supervisors could vote to continue this until their next meeting.

Mr. Bush moved and Mr. Dickson seconded that the Board of Supervisors be advised that the Planning Commission has the following concerns with the Plan:

- 1) The location of the building
- 2) Access to the building
- 3) Feasibility of the Budget for the project
- 4) Trees to be located and an impact study for the trees to be provided
- 5) Supervisors will commit to LEEDS Silver Certification as required by the Ordinance
- 6) Supervisors to commit to the installation of sidewalks and a bike path
- 7) Interconnectivity of other Township amenities to the Community Center
- 8) Parking lot issues

- 9) It is asked that foundation landscaping be installed and provide a plan for same as part of the construction
- 10) Contemplate the operating costs for the project going forward
- 11) The façade does not appear to be within the character of the neighborhood

In order to make a recommendation on these Plans, the Planning Commission would like to see the following:

- 1) An aerial view relative to the position and orientation of the building and how that could be modified
- 2) Parking lot location
- 3) The alternative Plans showing other locations
- 4) Review an access through the Fred Allan Softball Complex

Mr. Bush asked if they ever looked at an access through Fred Allan, and Mr. Eisold stated they never looked at this. Mr. Bush stated they would like to see this in a Sketch, and Mr. Fox stated the Board of Supervisors would have to authorize Mr. Eisold to do this.

Mr. Fox stated the Board of Supervisors could come back and say that the proper time to have made comments on the location and orientation were at their meeting. Ms. Friedman stated if they had been told this, she would have made herself available. Mr. Bush stated they now have additional information that did not exist at the time; and possibly if the Board of Supervisors knew about the issue that Mr. Pazdera raised, they would not have picked this site.

Ms. Tyler stated she would not be in favor of authorizing Mr. Eisold to engineer a road from Fred Allan to the Community Center as she feels the Community Center needs its own exit and entrance, and to try to filter the traffic for the Community Center through the existing Fred Allan Complex is not a good idea as it would be sending traffic through an active play area. She stated they would also be disturbing further wetlands, and she does not feel the Fire Marshall would permit this.

Mr. Pazdera stated the whole Samost Tract should have been planned two years ago for the ball fields and the Community Center so that there was a cohesive plan that made sense for the long term. Ms. Tyler stated even though they do not have this, they still need to move forward.

As part of the Motion the following was added:

The Planning Commission requests that they be able to review this on 9/8 and that the Board of Supervisors continue consideration of this at their second meeting in September.

Motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Friedman stated Edgewood Village was supposed to be a Colonial village and there are numerous signs on the sidewalk. She stated at the next Planning Commission meeting they should review this because she feels they are setting a bad precedent.

Ms. Tyler stated she feels that the Edgewood Café should have a permanent sign.

Mr. Dickson asked if there are Permits for these signs, and Ms. Frick stated she would have to check on this.

Mr. Dickson stated at the Edgewood Café there was a temporary sign which they were told to take down by Mr. Habgood.

Ms. Friedman asked that the pertinent Ordinance be made available for the next meeting or a future meeting.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Dickson moved, Mr. Pazdera seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 11:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dean Dickson, Secretary

