

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES – MARCH 28, 2016

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on March 28, 2016. Mr. Tracey called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Those present:

Planning Commission:     John Tracey, Chair  
                                  Dawn DiDonato-Burke, Vice Chair  
                                  Chad Wallace, Secretary  
                                  Dean Dickson, Member  
                                  Charles Halboth, Member

Others:                     Steve Ware, Keystone Municipal Services  
                                  David Truelove, Township Solicitor  
                                  Maryellen Saylor, Township Engineer  
                                  Michael Shinton, Township Traffic Engineer  
                                  Judi Reiss, Supervisor Liaison

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Dickson moved and Ms. Burke seconded to approve the Minutes of November 9, 2015 as written. Motion carried with Mr. Halboth and Mr. Wallace abstained.

Mr. Dickson moved and Ms. Burke seconded to approve the Minutes of January 11, 2016 as written. Motion carried with Mr. Halboth and Mr. Wallace abstained.

Mr. Wallace moved and Mr. Dickson seconded to approve the Minutes of January 25, 2016 as written. Motion carried with Ms. Burke and Mr. Halboth abstained.

PENNSBURY SCHOOL DISTRICT LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE MIDDLE SCHOOL CAMPUS DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Mr. Peter Amuso, attorney, Mr. Tom Beach, engineer, Mr. Owen Hyne, engineer, and Mr. Scott Millward, Director of Facilities, were present. Mr. Amuso stated they received all the Variances they requested from the Zoning Hearing Board. He stated tonight they are asking for approval for the Plan for the Middle School Campus.

Mr. Beach stated the Pennwood School was constructed in 1952 with an addition in 1972, and it is approximately 214,000 square feet with 53 existing classrooms. He stated it did have a pool which has been removed. He stated 852 students were enrolled in the 2014/2015 School year. Mr. Beach stated since 1972 there have been no major renovations done to the School.

Mr. Beach stated Pennsbury did a District-wide facilities study in 2014, and they identified two areas that needed immediate work one being a major renovation for Pennwood School and the other was campus site improvements. Mr. Beach stated at Pennwood they are going to add five classrooms to the School mostly so that they can enlarge some of the other classrooms as well as to have areas where they can do staging since the construction will be going on during the School year, and they will then be able to isolate certain sections of the School as they proceed. Mr. Beach stated they will install new HVAC, electrical, plumbing, a new roof, and new windows as well as bring it up to date with ADA.

Mr. Beach stated with regard to the campus site improvements, there are a number of items they will discuss in more detail as they go through the presentation.

He showed a slide of the overall campus with Pennwood in the NE corner, Charles Boehm in the center on the south side of the site, and William Penn in the NW corner. Mr. Beach showed the locations of Big Oak, Makefield, Roelofs, and Derbyshire Roads which are the major roads in the complex.

Mr. Beach stated the areas in green are areas where most of the improvements will go, and they have highlighted some of the green space they were able to add on to the site.

Mr. Beach showed the existing Pennwood School, and he showed where there is existing bus storage in the SW corner as well as problematic parking areas along the front of the building along Makefield Road. Mr. Beach showed an area in the back where there is parking and tennis courts, and they will reduce that asphalt and install a smaller parking lot and green space. He stated they will also align the entrance into the site with Ramsey Road which joins Roelofs Road. He stated they will expand the size of a parking lot he showed on the Plan and make it the passenger drop off. He stated they will eliminate the drop off along Makefield Road which is a major safety issue. He showed where parents would drop off their children at the School by entering at the Ramsey Road entrance, and then come back out onto Roelofs Road. He stated at the corner of Makefield and Roelofs Road, they propose to add a right-turn lane so there will now be a dedicated left and a dedicated right along Makefield Road. He stated they will also add a new visitor-only parking area in the front of the School. He stated visitors would drive in, park, and then go back out onto Roelofs Road. He noted the green strip where they are eliminating the parking, and they will put in new curbing and have a grass area.

Mr. Beach showed where they will have a dedicated bus drop-off point, and the entrance off Makefield Road will be for buses only. This will allow the bus drivers to come in, drop the students off, and then go either onto Roelofs Road or enter the inner road that goes around to the other Middle Schools. He stated where they could they tried to add green space to reduce impervious coverage.

Mr. Beach showed a rendering of the drop-off area at Pennwood. He noted where School buses were stored, and he stated buses will no longer be stored at Pennwood as part of the project; and they will be stored at Charles Boehm. He showed a rendering of the view on Roelofs Road with the new expanded parking lot and drop-off center as well as some of the landscaping they anticipate along Roelofs Road to try to buffer the parking lot as much as they can from Roelofs.

Ms. Reiss stated she would like them to leave the sidewalk on Makefield Road. She stated she agrees they should not have the parking on the street as it is dangerous. Mr. Beach stated the parking there is a major safety issue. Mr. Beach stated there is a sidewalk there now that goes along the front of the School on Makefield Road. Mr. Dickson asked how they will stop parents from using that as a drop-off if they keep the sidewalk, and Mr. Tracey agreed. Ms. Reiss stated they will have to educate the parents not to do that. Mr. Dickson stated he feels if they leave the sidewalk there, the parents will not use the drop-off area; and they will stop on Makefield Road and drop their children there. Ms. Reiss stated they will do that with or without a sidewalk there.

Mr. Tracey stated he is not in favor of keeping the sidewalk on Makefield Road. He stated they need a buffer area between the road and the bus drop off. He stated they have had accidents before, and to put back in the sidewalk on this side of Makefield makes no sense from a public safety perspective. He stated there is already a sidewalk on the other side of Makefield. He stated to put the sidewalk back in just because it was there before makes no sense.

Mr. Dickson stated there was a sidewalk because of the diagonal parking. He stated he feels that parking was a safety issue. He stated if they put the sidewalk back in there, it is going nowhere since there are no sidewalks south on Makefield Road to Falls Township and none north on that side of the road all the way to Main Street and there never will be. Ms. Reiss stated she disagrees as they are looking for a Grant. She stated she feels when there is a School, you have an obligation to have sidewalks. She stated it will be a re-education process for the parents not to drop their children off on Makefield Road. She stated many parents have told her that they want sidewalks, and they want to get Grants for sidewalks.

Mr. Beach stated they would rather not put in the sidewalk. Ms. Reiss stated the Board of Supervisors has indicated they want the sidewalks. Ms. Reiss stated she feels they should put in a good buffer there.

Mr. Dickson stated when you get to the south end of that sidewalk, you have to cross over, and there are no sidewalks from the south end of the property all the way down. He stated they would be putting in a sidewalk that goes nowhere. Ms. Reiss stated there is a lot of that in the Township. Mr. Dickson stated the way that Makefield Road is laid out with all the existing properties, there will not be sidewalks on Makefield Road on that side since it is not physically possible. He stated putting that sidewalk back in would be creating a safety problem. He stated when you take out the spaces and put the sidewalk back in, the parents are going to use that rather than the designated drop off on Roelofs Road. He stated he is concerned that there are going to be accidents, and there will be litigation.

Mr. Amuso stated the School District has a similar concern about this as well, and they do not want to put that sidewalk in.

Mr. Tracey moved, Mr. Dickson seconded and it was unanimously carried that for the purpose of this meeting the Planning Commission will adhere to the proposed Plan without the sidewalk adjacent to Makefield Road on the School side.

Mr. Beach showed a slide of existing conditions at Charles Boehm. He showed the existing School bus storage area as well as a parking lot. He stated the School is bordered by Big Oak Road, which is a PennDOT road, and Rock Run which runs along the back of the School putting most of the School inside the floodplain.

Mr. Beach showed a slide of the proposed improvements at Charles Boehm. He stated on the north side they propose a gated pedestrian crossing which will allow the students to go from the School to the playing fields without encountering any traffic at all. He stated at certain times of the day, the gates will be closed; but at other time of the day they will be open depending on student activities.

Mr. Beach stated they will remove the old fueling station at the north side of the site, and they are proposing to move it to the left side where the School bus parking is. Although they will not expand the asphalt, they will restripe it so that they can store additional buses. He stated this area is also fenced in, and the fueling station will be inside the fenced-in area.

Mr. Beach stated as part of the SALDO requirements, where they could they put in additional landscaped parking islands so that there were not too many consecutive parking spaces before there is a break. He stated they also added some green space at the rear of the School. He stated along the front of the School, they are proposing a new Visitor parking area. He noted the drop-off area and where cars would enter on the SE corner, go across the front, drop off the students at the front of the School, and then go out the second entrance onto Big Oak Road. He stated currently there is a small area in the front with on-street diagonal parking, and they are eliminating that; and it will be a landscaped area with curbing, grass, and trees.

Mr. Tracey noted the response letter from Boucher & James dated 3/15/16; and in that response letter it references a Boucher & James letter dated 2/2/16. Mr. Tracey stated the Planning Commission is in receipt of a Boucher & James letter dated 3/24/16, and there are a number of items in that review letter. He noted there is also a letter from Gilmore, the Lower Makefield Township Police Department, and one from the Bucks County Planning Commission dated 2/3/16. Mr. Tracey stated he is concerned about the number of items listed in the 3/24/16 Boucher & James letter which he feels were raised about the Revised Plans, and Ms. Saylor agreed. Mr. Tracey stated he would like Ms. Saylor to discuss some of her issues. He asked if the Applicant has had a chance to review her letter of March 24; and Mr. Beach stated they received it last Thursday and reviewed it, and he feels if there is one more meeting between the two engineering firms, he feels they will be able to resolve all of the issues.

Mr. Amuso stated they would also like to advise the Planning Commission what they are proposing for William Penn, and then they could review the engineer's review letter.

Mr. Beach showed a slide of the existing William Penn site. He stated currently the buses drop off in the front of the School, and they then have to make a 180 degree turn, and then a right-hand turn to get to Derbyshire Road where they can go north or south. He stated they propose a major improvement shortening this up so that now the buses will be able to pull out from in front of the School, and make a left-hand turn directly out to the entrance and then go either north or south on Derbyshire. He showed an area which is already paved, and they are just taking away some of the parking and re-distributing it along the border with Roelofs Court so they will not be adding any impervious coverage. He stated they will then be able to make the islands in front of the School a little larger which increases their green spaces.

Mr. Beach noted an existing parking lot on the east side which goes up against the athletic fields, and they are proposing to put in a sidewalk and a fence to protect and separate the students from the parking area. He also noted an area on the south side (shown in gray) which is currently green space, and they propose to add parking spots in that location.

Mr. Tracey asked about their timing. Mr. Beach stated they Plan to start construction at the end of the School year, and they are close to being able to go out to bid for the entire renovation project including the site work. He stated because of the construction activities and the amount of work to be done, it will probably take approximately two years. He stated they will have phasing, and there will be temporary lots constructed at various locations as they move through the site.

Mr. Tracey stated based on the number of items in the latest Boucher & James letter, he feels that their drawings are going to need to be revised; and he hopes that this will not impact their scheduling. He stated he feels the likelihood of approving the the Plans this evening is limited given the number of items in the 3/24/16 letter from Boucher & James. Mr. Beach stated he would request that the Planning Commission go through the discussion with Ms. Saylor this evening, and maybe they can discuss this later this evening as they are on a tight timeline.

Ms. Saylor stated she feels a majority of the items are “cleanup items,” and a number of them are recurring comments from the previous letter; and they should not be difficult to address.

Ms. Saylor noted the Waiver requests on the Notes and Legends Plan where a number of the references were not matched up properly with the Waiver request. She stated typically they see an 8 ½” by 11” sheet submitted with the Plans that indicate what Waivers they are requesting and the Sections. She stated this should be on the Record Plan as well. She asked that they clean up the Waiver requests on the Record Plan. She stated there were also duplicate requests and they need to correct that so that the Township knows exactly what Waivers they are asking for and the number of Waivers they are requesting.

Ms. Saylor noted the impervious surface ratios that were shown on the Notes and Legends Plan. She stated while she agrees that they are slightly reducing the overall impervious surface and that they are under the 40% allowed by previous Zoning decisions, the numbers in the break down chart do not appear to be correct for two of the Tax Parcels; and they should confirm the numbers. Ms. Saylor stated she feels that for one of them, they differed by between 5,000 and 10,000 square feet when they did some spot checks. She stated they need to confirm these numbers. Mr. Beach stated they are confident with their numbers, and they would be happy to share how they came up with them.

Ms. Saylor noted Natural Resources, and they need to include the Natural Resource Protection Table from Site Capacity Calculations; and that chart takes into consideration overlaps. She stated you put down whatever is the most restricted area, and then subtract out the other areas. She stated the other chart that needs to be included is the Natural Resources Inventory Chart; and that will show the total number of woodlands, total acres of wetlands, and total acres of buffer, and you do not worry about the overlap. She stated they need to show that they are not disturbing more than 30% of the trees or disturbing any of the wetlands.

Mr. Beach stated they did have one chart on there; however, Ms. Saylor stated they need both charts. Mr. Beach stated this should be easy to do since they have all the calculations.

Ms. Saylor stated with regard to the clear sight triangles, there is a reference once in the letter under the Zoning Ordinance and twice in the SALDO so that is a recurring comment. She stated they need to show the clear sight triangles on the Plans in accordance with the way the Ordinance wants them shown. Mr. Beach stated they were working with the traffic engineer as to the correct way to show those, and there were some shown on the Plans. Ms. Saylor stated she feels there may have been an issue with the CAD layers, as there were some being shown in the middle of the parking lot. Mr. Beach stated he feels they can correct this; and he feels if they have one more meeting between the two engineering firms, they will be able to clear up all these items.

Mr. Tracey asked Ms. Saylor if there was an issue where there were CAD layers missing, and Ms. Saylor stated she does feel there was an issue with the CAD drafting that needs to be addressed on the Plans.

Ms. Saylor stated with regard to parking space dimensions, they noted that the Board of Supervisors can approve reduced sized parking spaces. She stated 10' by 20' is required by the Ordinance, but the Supervisors have the authority to reduce those without a Variance. Mr. Beach stated most of them are 10' by 20' but there are some 9' by 18'. Ms. Saylor stated the handicapped spaces are supposed to be 13' by 20', and there are some of these that need to be adjusted on the Site Plans.

Ms. Saylor noted the SALDO comments Item #7, and she stated the Plans need to be numbered. Mr. Beach stated they would agree that at the end once they got all the approvals, they would revise all the Plans in case they had to add another sheet. Ms. Saylor stated one of the issues of not numbering them consecutively is that in the Index it was referencing some items that were not in the set of Plans, there were Plans that were not referenced in the Index, and there were duplicate numbers that

were not the same Plans. She stated it would make it easier if they were numbered consecutively. Mr. Beach stated this would be easy for them to comply with, and the next set of Plans will be revised.

Ms. Saylor noted Item #8 which is a comment that could be addressed with the Final Plans. Mr. Beach stated they did discuss that the Final set would be signed. Ms. Saylor stated typically the Preliminary Plans come in with the Title Sheet signed and sealed.

Ms. Saylor stated the Township road numbers need to be corrected on the Plan. Mr. Beach stated he feels they took the numbers off an old road map, but it would be easy to change the numbers. Ms. Saylor stated it is on the PennDOT map that can be accessed from the Website.

Ms. Saylor stated the right-of-way widths and cartways seems to be a CAD issue. Mr. Beach stated they did put them on the main roads, but he feels they missed them on Ramsey Road. Ms. Saylor stated the font and text were very small, and there were overlaps. She stated these need to be more legible.

Ms. Saylor stated with regard to the Existing Conditions Plan, this a comment from the last letter, and the contours and elevations need to be corrected; and Mr. Beach agreed.

Ms. Saylor stated the wetland areas need to be noted in the Existing Resource Map.

Ms. Saylor stated with regard to Item #12, she believes that they are asking for a Waiver from this Section to identify the size and the species of the existing trees to be removed, and Ms. Saylor stated they would recommend that they not get the Waiver since if they do it, they will then be able to do their replacement tree calculation which requires that if you remove a certain size tree, you need to replace it with a certain number of trees either on site or into the tree bank. Mr. Beach stated they did catalog the size, but the species is difficult sometimes at this time of the year without any foliage. Ms. Saylor asked if they are then asking for a partial Waiver just for the species, and Mr. Beach agreed. He added he feels the size is already indicated on the drawing. Ms. Saylor stated they would not recommend a full Waiver so that they can do the tree calculation. Mr. Beach asked if she is okay with not doing the species, and Ms. Saylor stated she feels the EAC would want to weigh in on this.

Ms. Saylor noted Item #14 with regard to the square footage of the building addition, and she stated this would be an easy item for them to put on the Plans. Mr. Beach stated they did have the square footage on the addition; but Ms. Saylor stated it was not legible. Ms. Saylor stated the Plans they had, the font was very small. She also noted that they were also missing a lot of sheets from the series, and they were missing Phase IV, V, and VI of the Site Plans. Mr. Hyne stated the phasing has been revised. Ms. Saylor stated the Index referenced Sheets 200 to 211.

Mr. Tracey asked if they feel the new phasing has been finalized, and Mr. Hyne stated it has. Ms. Saylor asked if they are just doing Phases I, II, and III now; and Mr. Hyne agreed.

Ms. Saylor stated they are asking for a Waiver from the Environmental Impact Assessment since this is a developed tract and they are just making improvements; and while she understands that, she feels the Waiver request is one of the ones that needs to be corrected on the Notes and Legends Sheet.

Ms. Saylor stated General Note #2 on the Record Plan needs to be revised to correspond to the new numbering of the sheets that they have now that they have changed the phasing. She stated the Plans, the Index Table, and the Notes all have to match.

Ms. Saylor noted Item #17, and she stated for private streets, the Ordinance requires that they have to be designed to meet Township standards; and they have to be adequate for emergency vehicles. She stated because of this, they had asked for a template and one was provided for going into Big Oak Road and some of the major entrances, but they also wanted to see that emergency vehicles could get through the site if necessary. Mr. Beach stated they were not really making any improvements to that road that goes between the three campuses. Ms. Saylor stated anywhere that they changing, they want to make sure that emergency vehicles can negotiate the turns.

Ms. Saylor noted Item #22. She stated they are asking for a Waiver from minimum cover of two feet over a storm sewer, and they would recommend that if the Waiver is granted that they provide at least one foot of cover over the pipe. Mr. Beach stated he feels they have proposed eighteen inches.

Ms. Saylor noted Item #23, and for the building addition the Ordinance requires a fifteen foot protection slope around the building and some of the spot elevations satisfied this, but some did not so this should be looked at.

Ms. Saylor stated an Operation and Maintenance Agreement needs to be signed with the Township for all stormwater management facilities and BMPs.

Mr. Beach asked if this would be part of a final document that they would sign off on, and Ms. Saylor agreed. Ms. Saylor stated there is an Appendix in the Ordinance that is a good template.

Ms. Saylor noted with regard to Items #27 and #28, they could not read the Utility Plans, and Mr. Beach agreed they were “microscopic.” Ms. Saylor stated there are a number of comments about this.

Ms. Saylor stated they want a specific detail for each of the outlet structures for the stormwater management facilities and a generic detail was on the Plan. She stated they want it more specific to the actual facility.

Ms. Saylor stated with regard to Item #30, inverts at existing storm inlets and manholes must be determined in the field; and this should be done at least by Final Plan Approval to make sure that the storm design will work. Ms. Saylor stated she understands that they have a contractor out there trying to find them. Mr. Beach stated that there are a few in the middle of the existing traffic which have been paved over, and they cannot go out and do it at this time although they know that before they do the construction they need to determine that.

Ms. Saylor noted Item #31. She stated in their last letter they noted inconsistencies on the Plans and the Storm Report for the inverse length of pipe slopes for some of the proposed storm sewers, but the Utility Plan was too small to read. She stated this also relates to Items #32 and #33.

Ms. Saylor stated for the Stormwater Management Report there were two tables that seemed to be the same thing, and she feels this was put in twice instead of the second table. Ms. Saylor stated she knows they are asking for a Waiver from the minimum pipe diameter, but one of the pipes was shown to be 4” diameter, and they need to discuss this. Mr. Beach stated he is not aware of what that pipe is at this time, but they will look into this.

Ms. Saylor noted Item #36, and she stated the Plan Index needs to be updated to reflect the Plan numbers and the list of Waivers.

Ms. Saylor noted Item #38 and she stated while they have good details of the curb ramps, they need to be labeled better so that you can tell where they are on the site. She stated there should also be more spot elevations along the sidewalk to show that they are ADA compliant.

Ms. Saylor stated there are still trees that are shown close to underground utilities, and they recommend ten feet between trees and utilities.

Ms. Saylor stated Item #40 is a clean up item to label the one hundred year flood boundary on the sheets.

Ms. Saylor stated before Building Permit Application for the wall, they will need a structural detail and a sign off on it; and Mr. Beach stated they have that done, and they can submit that. Ms. Saylor stated they would like to have it submitted before Building Permit Application.

Ms. Saylor stated Items #42, #43, and #44 relate to other Permits, and Mr. Beach stated they are aware of these.

Ms. Saylor stated she does not feel there are any major issues although there is a lot of clean up to be done. Mr. Beach stated he feels they can complete this at one more face-to-face meeting; and the drawings can be cleaned up quickly.

Ms. Lizanne Wilkinson, 860 Roelofs Road, asked about the basketball courts; and Mr. Millward stated the back boards and rims are being replaced. Ms. Wilkinson stated during construction they are going to relocate the buses near her home; and she asked when this will be done and how long it will be that way. Mr. Millward stated assuming the project moves forward as they would like it to, they would start construction this summer; and the bus lot would be moved this summer. He stated Charles Boehm would be completed next summer so it would be approximately twelve months that they would be temporarily storing those buses. He stated next summer when they complete the work, they would be moved back down.

Mr. Truelove asked that they generally describe what the phases are and the timeframes for each of those.

Mr. Hyne stated the project will take place over two years for the site work. He stated they will start with site work on the south side of Pennwood Middle School and a new addition is planned for the south side of Pennwood, and they need to clear out some of the space. He stated the south side will be under construction during the summer of 2016. Mr. Hyne stated they will be looking at a temporary bus lot along Roelofs Road. He stated in 2017, they will be looking at doing the large parking lot on the north side of Pennwood Middle School. He stated they will also eliminate the parking stalls on Makefield Road. He stated at Charles Boehm they will also do a large amount of the site work during the summer of 2017.

He stated there will also be minor improvements done during the summer of 2017 at William Penn Middle School. He stated there is also some site work that will be done during the School year.

Ms. Wilkinson stated she was previously told that she should raise her questions about lighting at this meeting. She asked about the profile of the lighting particularly the bus lots. She showed the area she was concerned about on the Plan. Mr. Beach stated the lot she is indicating will be made smaller, and the lighting that would be there would meet Township standards and will be less intense. Mr. Millward stated it will be LED and more down lighting and it will be switched separately so that they can be timed differently.

Mr. Tracey stated he understands they want a resolution this evening, but he feels it makes sense to have as many of the issues that were brought up in the Boucher & James letter of March 24 resolved in the drawings before it is approved by the Planning Commission. Mr. Tracey asked if it is possible to have either all or most of those issues reflected on the drawings by April 11 which is the next meeting of the Planning Commission. Mr. Beach stated they would like to have the Planning Commission grant approval tonight contingent on the issues being cleaned up on the drawings since he does not feel that there are any major problems on the drawings. He stated they wanted to go to the Board of Supervisors on April 6, and they would make sure that their drawings would be completed prior to the April 6 meeting. He stated it is important that they be able to schedule a meeting with the Township engineer to go over all the issues to make sure they understand what the Township engineer is looking for.

Mr. Tracey stated because of the number of comments in the letter, he feels these need to be reflected on the drawings before the Planning Commission moves it forward to the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Burke stated she does not have a problem with recommending approval contingent on them making the changes since Mr. Beach will meet with the Township engineer who will make sure that the changes are made, and it is on record that the Planning Commission is only approving this contingent on the Applicant making the changes necessary. She stated she does not feel it is necessary for them to come back to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Amuso stated he does not believe that there are any substantive problems. Mr. Dickson stated he feels they have indicated they were all “will comply,” and Mr. Amuso agreed.

Mr. Halboth stated he would agree with moving it forward since he feels the items which were brought up were quality control issues in the production of their documents, and they were not concept disagreements or scope problems with the project.

Mr. Tracey asked Ms. Saylor if she feels it is reasonable for the Planning Commission to move the project forward, and Ms. Saylor stated she feels it would be reasonable and would help the School Board stay on schedule. She stated they will need to be clear on the Waivers requested and the Section numbers.

Ms. Burke moved, Mr. Dickson seconded and it was unanimously carried to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the Preliminary Plan subject to compliance with the comments in the 3/24 Boucher & James letter to Mr. Ware.

Mr. Tracey asked the Applicant if they are sure that they will have the revisions and comments reflected on their drawings in time for the April 6 Board of Supervisors meeting, and Mr. Beach stated they will. Ms. Saylor noted that she will not be able to review the Revised Plans prior to that meeting. Mr. Truelove stated if April 6 does not work out, the next Supervisors meeting would be April 20.

Mrs. Bittner, Big Oak Road, stated she understands that more buses will be parking at Boehm than are there now. She also stated when the children are being dropped off, the vehicles will be exiting where the buses are. Mrs. Bittner stated between 7 a.m. and 8 a.m. those living on Big Oak Road cannot get out of their driveways. She stated a Police Officer comes there at least once or twice a month to control traffic, and the only time people obey the way it is supposed to be is when the Police are there. She stated the School District did put up a stop sign but no one observes it. She stated it is only approximately five feet high, and the buses are much higher than that. She is concerned when she hears that even more buses are going to be there. Mr. Beach stated more buses are going to be stored there, but they will not all be coming out onto Big Oak Road. The Pennsbury School District traffic engineer was present, and he stated that they will correct the size of the stop sign so that it is visible by the buses.

Mr. Hyne stated with the new improvements at Charles Boehm, the parents can drop off in front of the School and continue out to the west entrance onto Big Oak Road. He showed on the Plan another option they are considering for movement by vehicles dropping children off at the School.

Mrs. Bittner stated it is currently a very dangerous situation, and the Police advised her one time that someone was going to get hurt at this location; and she feels they will because the Police are not there every day.

March 28, 2016

Planning Commission – page 14 of 14

Ms. Barb Santucci, 1515 Makefield Road, stated her property is next to Pennwood; and she would like to see details of the driveway and the exits and entrances.

Mr. Hyne stated they will be segregating the buses from the other vehicles, and he showed the entrance and exit which are just for the buses. He also noted that the vehicles will no longer be backing in and out as they are doing currently on Makefield Road.

Mr. Tracey stated when the Applicant goes before the Board of Supervisors, he feels there should be presentation boards that specifically address traffic flow since there will probably be a number of residents present at that meeting who have similar concerns as those expressed this evening.

There being no further business, Mr. Dickson moved, Ms. Burke seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Chad Wallace, Secretary