

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

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on November 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 (joined meeting in progress)
 Chad Wallace, Secretary
 Craig Bryson, Member
 Charles Halboth, Member

Others: Richard O'Brien, Keystone Municipal Services
 Barbara Kirk, Township Solicitor
 Judi Reiss, Supervisor Liaison

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Bryson moved, Mr. Wallace seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of November 14, 2016 as written.

Ms. Burke joined the meeting at this time.

DISCUSSION AND MOTION ON TREE PRESERVATION ORDINANCE

Ms. Kirk stated Ms. Judith Stern Goldstein of the Township engineer's office will be discussing updates to the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance with respect to what trees may be required as part of a Land Development approval. Ms. Kirk stated there have been questions in the past as to the caliper of trees, how many should be provided, and how they deal with the issue of trees as far as the Zoning and SALDO Ordinances define woodlands and natural resources.

Ms. Goldstein stated before the Planning Commission in their packets is a memo she prepared based on an analysis of different methodologies used for tree replacement in similar-type Townships with different ways of calculating how many trees can be disturbed during development, how many trees need to be replaced as a result of development, and methodologies for that. Ms. Goldstein stated the Township's Tree

Replacement Ordinance seems appropriate in formulas, but the basic difference between what the Township has in Lower Makefield right now and what some other Municipalities have done is that there is no level of tree removal by right in conjunction with Subdivision and Land Development; and currently in Lower Makefield right now, every tree that comes down 10" and greater needs to be replaced in some manner, however, the Zoning Ordinance permits 30% of the woodlands to be removed so that even though 30% of the woodlands can be removed, every tree that comes down needs to be replaced based on a formula on the size of the tree. She stated in the packet she included information on the Doylestown Township, Montgomery Township, Newtown Township, and Wrightstown Township's methodology. She stated Doylestown Township has a woodland protection in the Zoning Ordinance of 50%, and in their Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance there are different categories of trees 6" to 12", 12" to 18", 18" to 24" etc.; and for each category of trees, you add up the total caliper inches of those trees on the site, and then the Ordinance permits a certain disturbance of that. As an example, she stated the 6" to 12" has a 60% protection. She stated once you exceed that, there is a certain amount you can compensate for additional removal by tree replacement. She reviewed the formula for tree replacement in Doylestown which shows how many trees you need to have. She stated it is 60% protection for the 6" to 12" trees, 70% protection for the next category, and 80%, 90%, and then 100% protection of 48" plus.

Ms. Goldstein stated in Montgomery Township it is similar, although all of their tree protection is in the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance; and there is no Zoning Ordinance component to it. She stated there is a similar-type formula but a little greater on the tree disturbance as Montgomery Township is more of a developed Municipality, and it has been adjusted for that.

Ms. Goldstein stated in the Jointure, the Joint Municipal Ordinance, which is Newtown Township, Wrightstown Township, and Upper Makefield there are woodland protection ratios in the Zoning Ordinance; and 50% of woodlands in certain Districts need to be protected while other Districts do not have any woodland protection in them. She stated in Newtown Township it is just a Zoning Permit for tree removal. She stated in Wrightstown Township the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance has additional standards for tree protection and what needs to be protected and replacement.

Ms. Goldstein stated she looked at the Lower Makefield Ordinance and everything that was done in 2014 with the EAC and their presentation, and their reasons for doing tree protection makes sense; and the only thing she would suggest now is that the pendulum has gone a little too far towards protection. She stated before it was not protected enough, and now she feels it might have gone a little too far.

Ms. Goldstein stated if someone has a lot that is fully wooded, by Ordinance they are permitted to disturb 30% of the woods, but if they built on that portion they would have an astronomical number of tree replacement just to build what they are permitted to do by right. She stated there needs to be something fair as it is not fair to the environment to have all the trees cut down, and it is not fair to the landowner to not permit any trees to be cut down. She stated if they are really looking at trees as opposed to dollars in replacement, they need to look at what really can fit on the site. She stated while you cannot replace the biomass of a 48" or a 60" tree with 3" trees, there should be something that is fair.

Ms. Goldstein stated in looking at the Ordinance, they could keep everything the way it is with the exception of permitting disturbance of each of the categories of the trees to a certain amount. She stated the smallest category should require 70% protection, 30% disturbance maximum. She stated the next category should require 80% protection, and then 90% protection. She stated when you run those numbers it makes sense. She stated she compared this to Doylestown which is a fair Ordinance, and the number of trees would be very similar.

Ms. Goldstein stated in Lower Makefield the Ordinance requires that each tree between 10" to 18" that is going to be removed be replaced with four trees measuring 2 ½" to 3" in caliper; and if she took that same 10" tree and compared it to Doylestown, it would be two trees and an 18" tree would be four trees. She stated Doylestown has been challenged a lot before, and they passed the fairness test. She stated in Doylestown, you would have the right to move up to 40% or protect a minimum of 60% of the trees in the 6" to 12" category, and in Lower Makefield the lowest level is 10" to 18".

Ms. Goldstein stated they could consider starting at 70% for the 10" to 18" trees, go to 80% protection for the 18" to 30", and 90% protection for the 30" plus. She stated in theory someone would have the right to disturb up to 10% of the caliper inches of trees. She stated they would not be throwing out what they have in place, rather it is taking what they have and massaging it to present more of a fair way of allocating tree replacement, yet still requiring a significant amount of tree preservation.

Mr. Bryson asked what she would recommend, and Ms. Goldstein stated she would recommend what she just said. She stated she would recommend 70% protection for the 10" to 18", 80% for the 18" to 30" and 90% protection for the 30" plus.

Ms. Burke asked about the wooded area, and Ms. Goldstein stated they should leave it as they have it in the Zoning Ordinance currently; and you have to preserve 70% of it, and 30% can be disturbed. She stated she does not feel that is overly onerous, and it fits in with the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan, the Open Space Plan, and it is consistent with all the other planning documents they have in the Township. She stated while it is higher than many other Townships, it fits in with the goals and objectives of Lower Makefield.

Ms. Reiss asked if there is a way to put something in the Ordinance that if there are trees that have historical significance and are older, the Township gets a historical arborist in so that they can avoid the issue they have had in the past where a historical tree in William Penn's design for the Township is cut down. Ms. Reiss stated she has a solution in a category she has not discussed yet. She stated Doylestown Township and many other Municipalities have a threshold by which you reach a certain limit, and you are not permitted to take any trees down by right. She stated Doylestown Township sets it at 48" or larger in caliper inches. She stated if a developer wanted to take down such a tree, they would need a Waiver from the Board of Supervisors in order to take that tree down; and in that case, they could have the discussion about the historic significance and the ability to talk to them about modifying the design in a way that would preserve the tree. Ms. Goldstein stated Lower Makefield does not have that category currently, rather they have to replace every category; but they do not have something that says they cannot take a certain size tree down without permission.

Ms. Goldstein stated in Lower Makefield for the 100% protection, they could start at 48" or make it 54"; and she would recommend 48" for discussion because the Board of Supervisors with the Planning Commission's recommendation could waive that.

Mr. Tracey asked if she would stay with the 50% protection overall; and Ms. Goldstein stated currently they have a requirement of 70% protection in the Zoning Ordinance, and she would suggest staying with that because it meets the Township's goals and objectives, and she would not relax that based on the all the work the Township and the EAC has done over the years to maintain the tree cover. Mr. Tracey stated there are other Townships that have it at 50%, and Ms. Goldstein stated many have it at 50%. Mr. Tracey stated she is recommending that they maintain the present 70% overall, and Ms. Goldstein stated she is only because it meets the Township's planning goals and objectives. She stated Lower Makefield has a different set of goals and objectives from other Townships which is unique to Lower Makefield, and she feels that is important.

Ms. Kirk asked Ms. Goldstein if she is suggesting that both provisions in SALDO and the Zoning Ordinance be mirrored language, and Ms. Goldstein stated she is not. She stated in the Zoning Ordinance it is dealing with woodlands protection. Ms. Kirk stated that would be kept the same, and they would modify SALDO with respect to the preservation of the certain calipers. Ms. Goldstein stated she is recommending that they include another Section with the minimum required preservation and anything above that is replaced in accordance with what they have already at the ratios she mentioned. Ms. Goldstein stated she proposing a modification.

Ms. Floss Trinsey, 1218 Quarry Hill Court, stated they are talking about taking down more trees, and she would like to know what they are doing about ground erosion and drainage. She stated being a victim of flooding due to trees being removed, she would like to know what kind of protection they are giving people who are surrounded by trees.

Mr. Tracey stated the discussion is for the purpose of presenting information to move forward on changes to the Tree Ordinance. He stated this item of business is specifically about the Tree Ordinance in Lower Makefield Township.

Mr. Jeff Benedetto, Supervisor, provided information about the DeLorenzo's proposal where they had to take twenty trees down; and while they were going to install parking lot and street trees, they were required to replace the twenty trees they were taking down with one hundred and nine trees. He stated he feels the Ordinance is punitive. Mr. Benedetto stated the Pennsbury School District also had to replace more than the number of trees they took down and had to pay the Township \$40,000 to the Tree Bank. Mr. Benedetto stated many times developers have to replace more trees than will fit on the property so the Ordinance does not work. He stated they are trying to change this to make it more reasonable.

Ms. Reiss stated when you take down a 10" caliper tree, although she does not know the exact amount of water that size tree would suck up out of the ground, when you replace it with a 2" to 3" caliper tree it does not suck up as much water. She stated the idea of replacement is that if they pay the fee-in-lieu and do not replace the trees on that particular property, the Township has the money to replace the trees in areas where there is erosion or where planting trees might hopefully solve some of the flooding problems.

Mr. Benedetto stated he does not feel there was any rhyme or reason for the required replacement of four, seven, or ten trees. Ms. Burke stated she felt they could get a Waiver from the requirement. Mr. Benedetto they can but the problem is the Board keeps granting Waivers; and he would prefer that they have a rule that they can require to be followed. He stated when the rule is to replace twenty trees

with one hundred and nine trees, developers just take down the trees and pay the fine. Mr. Benedetto stated he feels it is punitive. Ms. Burke stated she feels they should stick with granting Waivers in particular circumstances; however, Mr. Benedetto stated the Board is criticized for granting Waivers. Mr. Benedetto stated everyone is asking for a Waiver; and Ms. Burke stated in certain circumstances it should be granted like DeLorenzo's, and in others it should not.

Ms. Burke stated she is concerned that once they change it, it is done. Mr. Benedetto stated the School District had to pay \$40,000 to the Township, and they will just be passing that cost on to the residents. He stated churches and other non-profits have to adhere to it as well. He stated he wants to come up with something that works that is not punitive like other Townships have. Ms. Reiss stated before they had an Ordinance, developers would just come in and clear cut. Ms. Reiss stated she feels this Amendment might make it where there are fewer Waivers.

Ms. Goldstein stated the four, seven, and ten could appear to be arbitrary, but it is close to the formula that they use a lot; and once you get close to the percent that you need to protect is 60% of the caliper inches, and if you apply that to a 10" tree, it is two trees, if you apply it to an 18" tree, it is four trees. She stated in the category of 10" to 18" it is a big spread so if you have four 10" trees right now it would be sixteen trees being replaced; but if you did it with 60% caliper it would only be eight trees being replaced. She stated instead of having a specific number for each category, if they did 60% of the caliper inches which is .6 times the total caliper inches beyond which you are permitted to disturb by right would be replaced, that would deal with some of the issues so that it does not appear to be arbitrary. She stated she understands what was done when they developed the Ordinance as they were trying to come up with an easy way to assign how many trees, but she agrees that there is no magic to the numbers four, seven, and ten; and maybe a 60% protection would be more fair when you have situations like a significant number of the trees are on the low end of the category. Mr. Benedetto stated he feels that makes sense.

Mr. Wallace stated there was obviously a reason why the Tree Ordinance was set up the way it was, and he asked if they know why the decision was made to set these parameters. Ms. Goldstein stated there is an excellent power point on the EAC's section of the Township's Website which goes through the process they went through in 2014 when they came up with this. She stated the EAC wanted to protect the tree canopy and the biomass of trees within the Township. She stated she respects all of the reasons; but she appreciates that landowners have a right to do what they are permitted to do on their land, and to penalize someone who is meeting the Zoning Ordinance requirements by having overly onerous fees is creating a situation where they could be ripe for a challenge. Mr. Wallace asked Ms. Goldstein if it is her opinion that the fee should be lowered; and Ms. Goldstein

stated she is not talking about the fee, she is talking about the number of trees required. She stated she feels the fee of \$315 per tree is fair as she has seen that fee be between \$285 to \$350 per tree.

Mr. Halboth stated he does not feel that Ms. Goldstein has presented a non-financial reason to change the current Ordinance. Ms. Goldstein stated it is a question of fairness. Mr. Halboth stated if the issue is financial, they should change the cost and the fees rather than changing the tree counts; and he does not feel Ms. Goldstein has made a point as to why the changing of the tree calculations should be done. Ms. Goldstein stated she is not coming at this from a financial standpoint. Mr. Halboth stated Mr. Benedetto has indicated that is the Supervisors point of view; however, Mr. Benedetto stated that was not what he stated. Ms. Goldstein stated she was asked to look at it from a standpoint of fairness and what would be appropriate, and based on property owners' rights as property owners do have inherent rights to use their land. She stated she looked at what is in the Zoning Ordinance which is the 70% protection and then looked at the SALDO which requires that either everything be protected or they start having replacement for every tree above 10". She stated she was coming up with what she felt was a fair and rational solution, not based on monetary reasons.

Mr. Halboth asked if this is just based on Ms. Goldstein's opinion, and Ms. Goldstein stated it is based on significant studies for the last twenty-four years. She stated she worked on Doylestown Township's in the early 1990s, and they did a lot of studies on biomass just as Lower Makefield's EAC did. She stated she looked at it as a planner, balancing property owner rights with Township regulation, and the environmental cost of land of doing development. She stated if someone is permitted to develop their site, they have the right to do so; but they need to consider how far is far enough on tree removal and what guards the Township's goals and objectives for planning purposes. She stated it is a balancing act.

Mr. Tracey stated he feels Ms. Goldstein's memo dated November 16 is well researched, and she has taken the statistics and numbers from the surrounding Townships and Municipalities. He stated he would be in favor of a more reasonable Ordinance, basically "tweaking" what they have making it more in compliance with ownership rights, etc.; and he feels this makes sense.

Ms. Goldstein stated what is being considered at this time is that the Zoning Ordinance would stay as it is, and the preservation in the SALDO would be the categories, 70%, 80%, 90%, and 100% 48" or greater and replacement based on 60% of the total caliper inches so that they are not being penalized for having the smallest trees in the category. Mr. Tracey stated he feels the original proposal of 70% would be changed to 60% more in keeping with ownership rights in the Commonwealth; and Ms. Goldstein stated it would be the percentages they talked about tonight with the 60% of the caliper inches in the calculation.

Ms. Kirk stated unless there is further discussion it would be the Planning Commission's duty to either make a recommendation to proceed as proposed by Ms. Goldstein, not proceed, or take no action.

Mr. Tracey moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that they proceed with Ms. Goldstein's recommendation. There was no Second.

Mr. Bryson moved and Ms. Burke seconded to leave it the way it is and take no action.

Mr. Benedetto stated at the Supervisors meeting Ms. Tyler made a comment that currently the Ordinances require trees in the parking area and street trees, and she had asked if there could be an offset for those trees being planted on site. He stated at DeLorenzo's eighteen trees had to be planted on the site, and there was no offset. Ms. Goldstein stated currently the Ordinance specifies that they are not permitted to have an offset so that would be a change to permit an offset; and if someone had to provide one hundred fifty replacement trees, and they had to plant one hundred trees on the site already, an offset would give them credit for those trees.

Ms. Kristin Tyler, Supervisor, stated the reason they put the Tree Ordinance before the Planning Commission is because they wanted them to look at the existing Ordinance versus the suggestions by the Township engineer, and to formulate their analysis of the veracity of the current Ordinance and make suggestions as to what changes, if any, should be implemented. She asked if anyone was present from the EAC this evening, and it was noted that no one was present from the EAC. Ms. Tyler stated the Board was looking to the Planning Commission to delve into the Tree Ordinance, compare it to neighboring communities, and make sure it is an enforceable Ordinance.

Ms. Kirk stated it is within the realm of the Planning Commission to make a recommendation that if there is to be a comprehensive review of the Tree Ordinance, some sort of summary should be prepared by the EAC and the Township engineer as to those aspects that seem to be punitive or need to be modified to reflect offsets.

Mr. Bryson stated the EAC worked hard to come up with a Plan. Mr. Bryson stated if you want to do business in Lower Makefield, although his "heart goes out to" a Church or other non-profit organizations, they have to comply with the same rules as the developers. He stated the idea of these Ordinances is to maintain or enhance the tree canopy for bio evaporation and other things that happen. He stated if they do not meet it on site, they pay a Fee-In-Lieu, and it goes into an environmental bank; and the Township can then replace stream banks and other environmental

things with that money. He stated there are also extensive Stormwater Management Ordinances, and they have to meet a certain criteria. He stated they do not have people trying to shorten the stormwater management regulations because it is a set Ordinance, and it is just as important with these trees. Mr. Bryson stated the Board recommended this in 2014, and they have wasted a lot of time with this tonight; and he feels they should stick with them. Mr. Bryson stated a Lower Makefield Township Board came up with these recommendations which were adopted and are now in our Ordinances. He stated if you want to do business in Lower Makefield, you have to follow the rules. He stated it is all for the good of the environment.

Mr. Wallace stated the question is are the Ordinances today too punitive. Mr. Bryson stated DeLorenzo's would still have to pay 50% or 75% of the fee. Mr. Wallace stated Ms. Goldstein has indicated that they may be out of line with what neighboring Townships do, and the Tree Ordinance has gone too far. Mr. Bryson stated he could come up with Ordinances which are worse than this, and there are other Townships that are a lot more severe than ours. Ms. Goldstein stated she believes that based on the Zoning Ordinance provision of 70% protection and based on the Township's goals and objectives in the Comprehensive Plan and other planning documents, it has gone too far on the replacement requirements and the way it is done. She stated there is no number of trees on the site that you could take out by right in the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance without replacement. Mr. Wallace asked if Ms. Goldstein would recommend that the Township open up a new study and re-analyze whether the Tree Ordinance should be changed. Ms. Goldstein stated that was what she was asked to do, and what she presented to the Planning Commission tonight.

Ms. Reiss asked the difference between what they have and what it would be modified to. Mr. Bryson stated it is all dynamic, and it would depend on the site, and it would depend on how many trees you have. Ms. Goldstein stated if a site had one hundred 10" trees, under the current Ordinance if you are going to disturb 30% of them, you would have to replace thirty 10" trees with one hundred and twenty trees. She stated under the new Ordinance if you were taking that same 30% you could do it by right; but if you were going to take out 50%, before you would have had to replace two hundred trees, and now you would have to replace forty trees. Ms. Goldstein stated you would still have tree replacement, but they could have done 30% clearing by right so it is not punitive. Ms. Reiss stated currently there is also not an offset if they are putting in trees. Ms. Goldstein stated currently the Ordinance reads the replacement trees may be planted within but not in place of the required buffers. Ms. Reiss stated if they are putting in trees, they should allow that to be an offset which should take a lot of the punitive level out; and it would be more of a trade off. Ms. Goldstein stated if they are relaxing the standards as she proposes, they may not even need an offset; and they could still look at that. She stated if they are not relaxing the standards at all, she would say that an offset would meet goals and objectives.

Mr. Tracey called the question and the Motion to leave it the way it is and take no action carried with Mr. Bryson, Ms. Burke, and Mr. Halboth in favor and Mr. Tracey and Mr. Wallace opposed.

DISCUSSION OF SNIPES TRACT ATHLETIC FIELDS PRELIMINARY LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Mr. Tracey stated the presentation will be made by Boucher & James. He stated he realizes that everyone in the audience is interested in this, and he asked that they let the engineers make their presentation in full; and the Planning Commission and others seated at the front will ask their questions first, and then they will open it up to the general audience.

Ms. Kirk stated the Snipes Tract is two parcels of land located at Dolington and Quarry Roads across from the Afton Elementary School. She stated it consists of thirty-six acres. The Township has been studying the use of this land for athletic fields, and a recommendation was made by the Township Park & Recreation Board to move forward with the proposal for the conversion of the property which is presently used by the Township as a Public Works site where there is storage of leaves and other things, and there is an existing salt shed on the property. Ms. Kirk stated they would like to move forward with the conversion into an Municipal athletic field complex. She stated Boucher & James has conducted the review as well as the proposed request for the Preliminary Land Development. She stated a Zoning Hearing was held on November 15 with respect to two Variances that the Township requested regarding setbacks based on collector and arterial roads, and those Variances were granted. Ms. Kirk stated the Township is awaiting the formal written Decision from the Zoning Hearing Board, but would like to proceed with the presentation of the Preliminary Land Development application tonight.

Mr. Mark Eisold, Township engineer introduced Ms. Maryellen Saylor who is with Boucher & James and was the design engineer for the project. He also introduced Mr. Bob Zoeller, Musco Lighting, a technical consultant who designed the lighting lay out for the project. He introduced Ms. Goldstein who they just met who is also with Boucher & James and is head of Boucher & James Landscape Architecture and Planning Department, and she was involved in the lay out and working with the Park & Rec Board to put this together. Mr. Eisold introduced Mr. Phil Worsta and Mr. Bill Zadrovicz both from the Township traffic engineer's office – Traffic Planning and Design; and they had completed a Traffic Study of the area of the site, and they had some recommendations of what should be done with regard to the driveways as well as some recommended improvements to the intersection of Dolington and Quarry Roads. Mr. Eisold stated they have tried to look at this from a lot of different viewpoints.

Mr. Eisold stated this project has been a point of discussion in the Township for quite some time; and in fact it goes back to 1995 when there was a plan of action put together to seek additional recreation space in the northern part of the Township. He stated in 1998, the Township purchased this property consisting of thirty-three acres for additional athletic fields. He stated as early as 2006/2007 the Lower Makefield Township Park Board made continued recommendations to the Board of Supervisors to develop this site as an active recreation area. He stated this project has been discussed by the Board of Supervisors in 2014, 2015, and as recently as the Budget Work Sessions to get the funds to build this site. Mr. Eisold stated there have been many meetings with the Park & Rec Board over a number of years, and more recently to fine tune what was needed there. He stated they have also had discussions with many of the Athletic Associations especially the Lower Makefield Football Association and the YMS Soccer Association as they are partly effected by the development of these fields. He stated they were trying to get what works best for the Township to try to segregate the different sports in different parts of the Township.

Mr. Eisold stated they also met with the Lower Makefield Police and the traffic safety group. He stated the traffic engineers met last week and went over some of the traffic safety issues to make sure everything was addressed. He stated the Police who are familiar with the history, accident counts, etc. were able to lend some guidance and some background on what they saw as far as moving forward.

A rendering of the plan was shown. Ms. Goldstein stated this Plan shows the two parcels, one of which is a small parcel where there is a small field shown adjacent to Dolington Road. She noted on the Plan the location of Quarry and Dolington Roads. Ms. Goldstein stated the entire site together has a net lot area of 32.86 acres which is the area once the ultimate right-of-way and resource protected areas have been subtracted.

Mr. Tracey stated there was an earlier proposal in 2007/2008 to basically fill the entire parcel with fields, and this is a significant improvement environmentally and in a number of other ways. He stated for those who may have been present at that time and may recall that earlier proposal, he feels they will find this to be an improvement. Someone from the audience asked about lighting. Mr. Tracey asked that they let the engineers proceed, and the public will then have their say.

Ms. Goldstein stated this is the former nursery site, and is known as the Snipes Tract. She stated they are showing three full-sized flat fields which are large rectangular fields suitable for football, lacrosse, soccer, and field hockey. She stated there is also a small field which could also be used as either a practice field or for smaller age groups. In addition below the entrance road of the Plan coming off of Dolington, there is a 25' by 50' pavilion, and the next brown rectangle

is a combination restroom/concession stand. She noted the gray square on the Plan to the right of the pavilion and concession stand/restroom, and that is a future skate park.

Mr. Eisold showed on the Plan the existing location of the salt shed which they propose to move back and fence in. Ms. Goldstein also showed on the Plan three small brown rectangles which are proposed equipment sheds for the sports associations that would be using the fields to store their equipment.

Ms. Goldstein stated the Plan also includes a stormwater management area which will be naturalized, and that is close to the corner of Dolington and Quarry Roads. She stated in dark green on the Plan these are areas of existing vegetation to remain. She stated this is a former nursery site, and it was a cash crop of trees, and those trees will remain. She stated in the area where the sports fields are proposed, they will be working with a tree service on relocating trees from the internal portion of the site which will be removed out to the edge and using them for buffer trees which she showed along Dolington and Quarry Road where they have noted “buffer trees to be relocated and transplanted from trees on site.” She added that not all of the trees will be suitable for transplant, although there are some great specimens that can be relocated.

Ms. Burke asked if the buffer will go all around, and Ms. Goldstein stated it will be along Dolington Road and Quarry Road. Ms. Goldstein stated the dark green is the existing vegetation to remain. She stated the road at the top of the site is I-95.

Ms. Reiss stated there are also walking paths. Ms. Goldstein stated there is a multi-use trail that will be traversing through and around the site, and part of the concept is so that the driveway around the site will be outside of the ball fields and parking so that people can get to the fields. She stated there is also a pedestrian pathway that circumnavigates the entire site and also comes along and down Dolington, and down Quarry to the entrance and comes into the site at the two entry points.

Ms. Burke stated the entrance point is on Quarry Hill Court and Dolington. Ms. Goldstein showed the entrance off of Dolington and the entrance off of Quarry Hill Court.

Ms. Goldstein stated in 2007 ten soccer fields had been proposed, along with a playground and a skate park so it was much more intense recreation on the site.

Ms. Goldstein stated on April 5, 2016 they had a meeting at the site and looked at what would be appropriate as to orientation of fields and the carrying capacity of the site. She stated she was then directed to prepare some Concept Plans, and she met with the Park & Rec Board on April 12, 2016. She stated she went back to their May meeting with some revisions to the Plan, and the Park & Recreation Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors to proceed as conceptually designed. Ms. Goldstein stated on June 1 they went to the Board of Supervisors who gave the go-ahead to have the Traffic Study performed, start work on the detailed Land Development Plans, and to continue to work with Park & Rec to make this happen.

Mr. Bryson asked if this is an official Application for Preliminary Land Development Approval, and Mr. Eisold stated it is. Mr. Bryson stated the Applicant is Lower Makefield Township based off a recommendation by the Board of Supervisors, and Mr. Eisold agreed. Ms. Goldstein stated the Board of Supervisors directed them to do the Preliminary Land Development Plans.

Mr. Tracey asked if this is a Preliminary or Preliminary/Final; and Mr. Eisold stated it was submitted as a Preliminary Plan, but at some point the Township may wish to request Preliminary/Final. Mr. Eisold stated at this point it is being submitted as a Preliminary Plan for everyone's comments, and it will go to all the Boards and Commissions for their input; and it would then be determined whether it was in a position to receive Preliminary or Preliminary/Final.

Mr. Bryson stated he wants to make sure it is clear that they are asking tonight for a recommendation for Preliminary Land Development Approval, and Mr. Eisold agreed.

Mr. Eisold asked Ms. Saylor to go over the design issues of the project including some of the stormwater improvements that have been done. He stated they have received some concerns with run off; and in fact, there was a time when the front area had been farmed, and there was quite a bit of run off coming off of the fields. Mr. Eisold stated Ms. Saylor can describe some of the designs she has put into the Plan that will minimize the run off.

Ms. Saylor stated presently the site runs from the top where I-95 is and one large portion comes toward Dolington Road and down to the intersection, and the other goes toward Quarry Road and toward the intersection. She stated everything basically ends up at the intersection. Ms. Saylor stated they did infiltration testing all over the site wherever they wanted to put infiltration trenches and where they wanted to put the detention basin. She stated they looked at the Ordinance as to how many test pits they needed. She stated their environmentalist went out and conducted test pits and infiltration testing, and they found some nice infiltration areas on the site. She stated they are proposing a detention basin just above the

intersection where the water all naturally drains, and they will for the most part keep the drainage patterns in place on the site. She stated they are also proposing infiltration trenches along the low side, downstream ends of the loop road that would be parallel with Quarry Road and also along the loop road that runs along Dolington Road as well. Ms. Saylor stated these infiltration trenches will catch the run off, infiltrate it and treat it for water quality, and permanently remove the excess run off that would be generated from additional impervious surface from the roadways, the facility, and the sidewalks. She stated they will be permanently removing the two-year storm before it even hits the basin. She stated any overflow from the large storms would be handled as they are putting perforated pipe in the bottom of the trenches so that whatever was not infiltrated will be carried in the pipe into the detention basin where it will be stored and let out at a controlled rate.

Mr. Eisold stated the Zoning allows 18% impervious on the site. Currently there is approximately 2% on the site, and with this Plan they will bring that to approximately 12% so they are well under the allowed impervious surface for this site. He stated they have also designed the stormwater to meet all the Township stormwater requirements, and there is quite a reduction in the different storms. He stated the Township Ordinance requires you to reduce the two-year run off pre-development back to the one-year so you have to actually discharge a lot less after you do the design than what was running off before.

Mr. Tracey stated the fact that they have maintained the mature tree buffer goes a long way to accomplishing that goal. Mr. Bryson noted the Tree Ordinance, and Ms. Goldstein stated this was a nursery which is a cash crop and it is not a woodlands.

Mr. Eisold stated they are reducing the flow for each storm from 37% to 64% of what runs off the site today; and the run off will be reduced in accordance with the Ordinance requirements.

Mr. Bryson asked if they will be natural turf fields, and Mr. Eisold agreed that they will be grass fields. Mr. Bryson asked if these were to be converted to an artificial surface, have they considered how they would handle stormwater since from a stormwater consideration 80% to 90% of the time the artificial turf fields are treated as impervious. He asked if they could easily accommodate for that or not. Ms. Saylor stated there were directed to design for natural turf; however, with respect to the question, there is now artificial turf that acts as pervious with a full under drain system. Mr. Bryson stated the answer is that if this were to be put in as an artificial turf, the stormwater systems would be installed as part of that field; and Mr. Eisold stated that is correct.

Ms. Saylor stated they feel they have met the stormwater goals of rate reduction, they have implemented best management practices, and they are infiltrating as well as they can, and are controlling the stormwater as well as they can, and reducing peak outflows after development.

Mr. Worsta stated they prepared a Preliminary Traffic Study that Mr. Zadrovicz distributed this evening. Mr. Worsta stated this will act as a submission to PennDOT more so than the Township, and it lays out the parameters of the design associated with the driveways that will be installed. Mr. Worsta stated in the spring, they met with Boucher & James to go over the lay out and concept, and their task was to provide adequate access for safe ingress and egress at this location. Mr. Worsta stated they were also going to take a look at the intersection of Dolington and Quarry. He stated Dolington is a State highway, and Quarry is a Township road. Mr. Worsta stated access along Dolington Road and any improvements associated with Dolington and Quarry are subject to PennDOT approval through a Highway Occupancy Permit. He stated what this entails is that whenever a land development takes access or a Township street takes access to a State highway, PennDOT has to approve the Plans to make sure there is safe ingress and egress at those locations.

Mr. Worsta stated starting at the top of Plan coming from I-95 as you are driving, you would come down Dolington Road, come across the hump at I-95, and they will build a deceleration lane so that people will be able to get out of the way and make a right turn into the site which is directly across from Elm Lowne. He stated they will have one ingress lane and one egress lane. He stated they are working with PennDOT right now with regard to whether they will put in a left turn lane; and while they are leaning into doing that from a safety perspective, traffic volume is not really there to warrant a specific left-turn lane. He stated any time they can fit a left-turn lane in on a road like Dolington, it allows people to get out of the way and slow down before you enter any site; and they feel this would be a significant safety improvement. He stated the reason this is not shown on the Land Development Plan is because it is subject to PennDOT approval, so there will be a Note placed on the Land Development Plan referring to the Highway Occupancy Permit Plans; and that will dictate what the actual entrance will look like.

Mr. Worsta stated at Dolington and Quarry they looked at a number of options at that location. He stated the first one was to align Creamery Road and Dolington Road to go straight across. He stated this would severely impact the site; although this was not a consideration of theirs, as theirs was one of practicality, cost, and safety. He stated they aligned a conceptual road across the site to make it a T-intersection essentially eliminating the Quarry Road and Dolington Road intersection. He stated this would cost over \$1 million as it is almost 900 feet of new road, and this would be a State highway which would have to be built to State standards. He stated it also would cause more traffic at the location at

Creamery Road. He stated that traffic is essentially on the road anyway, but being directly across from Creamery, they would have to decide if they should put in a traffic signal, a four-way stop, or a two-way stop. He stated the traffic volumes associated with those roads are not that great to be a cost benefit associated with that amount of money and the improvement that would happen. He stated they then looked at the existing intersection to see what they could do, and Mr. Zadrovicz came up with a simple solution which was to just re-align the existing road with very little paving and paint to make it more of a right angle intersection. He stated people making a left would now come straight into the intersection so you would be able to see much better to the right and to the left down Quarry and down Dolington; and it would also allow for people coming up Creamery to make a hard left rather than a swinging left across traffic. He stated this would tighten up the intersection and should be a significant improvement. He stated this would not involve a lot of cost, and they felt this would be a better solution. He stated Levels of Service are very high in this location, and either one of the improvements will not impact the delay that is already out there or the improvement to traffic flow in the area.

Mr. Worsta stated the other access is off of Quarry Road across from Quarry Hill Court for access into the field area. He stated this will also have a deceleration lane; but because of the speed on Quarry Road which is posted at 25 miles per hour and the School location, they felt that they really did not need to widen that road for a left-turn lane. He stated smaller is better for Quarry as it is a Township road, and they do not need it to be a big, wide road like a State highway would be. He stated the amount of lefts would really cause no delay. He stated this will also be two lanes – one lane in and one lane out. He stated the deceleration lane will be as you come up Dolington Road to make a right into the site if you chose to do that or you could continue down Dolington Road and make a left or you could make a left turn from Creamery Road go into a small right-turn lane and go into the site.

Mr. Worsta stated they feel that this lay out distributes traffic very well, and the two entrance/exits are appropriate. He stated they also feel from an emergency access perspective if something happens at one entrance, there will be a second access available.

Mr. Worsta stated once the Supervisors approve the Land Development Plan, they will submit to PennDOT with their official Plans for these intersections as he described.

Ms. Burke asked if they took into account in their study the people coming from the homes or the School coming up to Quarry Road, and Mr. Worsta stated they did. He stated the traffic is fairly light on Quarry Court.

A gentleman called out from the audience that they should be there when the School is out and School is coming in.

Mr. Tracey asked that they allow the engineers to continue their presentation. He stated they still need to hear from the lighting consultant as well.

Mr. Worsta stated Quarry Court and the interaction with the ball fields are not really going to come into play because there is very little volume associated with the ball fields and there is not a lot traffic on Quarry Court during normal hours of operation for the Park. Mr. Worsta stated the one gentleman spoke up about the Schools, and that is an existing issue associated with the Schools. He stated the only delay that came across in their counts which were taken during the morning peak hours, the pm peak hours, and Saturdays, was the back up from the left turn from Creamery Road and the back up on Quarry Road going toward the Schools and the return of some of the drop-off people. He stated they looked at that as a separate issue not related to the Park, but clearly something they could look at to address. He stated they thought of the opportunity of possibly a four-way stop which would meter traffic better for Dolington Road; however, most of that issue when dealing with the School has to do with the School operation and infrastructure laid out for that type of drop off. He stated this is clearly an issue of School traffic, and if this was a new School site, it would be accommodated through infrastructure allowing locations to have drop offs and proper queuing associated with that traffic.

Mr. Bryson stated Mr. Worsta is saying that he has identified an issue with the School during certain timeframes which are the morning drop offs and afternoon pick up; however, as it relates to the fields, the traffic generated by the fields is mostly Saturday mornings, weekends, and evenings when School is out so the Park should not cause more problems for the existing traffic due to the timing of the use of the Park and the timing of the School. Mr. Worsta agreed.

Mr. Eisold stated the last presentation is by Mr. Bob Zoeller, from Musco Lighting; and he is a technical consultant and has provided the lay-out design for the proposed field lighting.

Mr. Zoeller stated they were tasked to put together a lighting design to light the athletic fields to meet recreational standards for play in accordance with the Illuminating Engineering Society Standards. He stated they were also tasked to light the driveway area and the parking area that surround the fields and the two entryways into the Park. He stated the lighting design proposed is very simple and is very standard, and for the larger multi-use fields there are four poles surrounding the fields aiming lighting fixtures across the fields. He stated in between the fields because of the distance between the fields, there are common poles so the pole will have lights toward one field, and it will have lights toward the other field on the same pole. He stated there will be eight total light poles to illuminate the three large fields. He stated as to the height of the light poles the outer two poles in both cases are 70' and the inner four poles are 80'. He stated for the small field at the upper right-hand corner of the drawing, they will have the same configuration with four 70' poles, two on each side. He stated the reason they have to use 70' poles is driven by the Illuminating Engineering Society which sets forth in their document, "Lighting for Exterior Environments" that when you have an aerial sport, you have to have enough light above the field to be able to see the ball as it travels through the air; and they have established 70' as a minimum for pole height for fields that have aerial sports being played on them. He stated this is consistent with the fields that are throughout the Township such as Macclesfield and the fields by the Pool area.

Mr. Zoeller stated they also took advantage of these poles, and they are providing lighting off of these poles to light almost the entire area of the driveway and the entrances into the athletic facility. He stated only up in the upper left corner of the facility where the fields come closest to the highway, they have to have a pole in the corner which he showed on the Plan to make sure they are directing light away from the highway; and because of the length of the entrance from Quarry Road, they will have 30' poles with single LED lights just to be able to provide some lighting on the entryway into the facility. He stated they will have an average of 1.5 foot candles over the drive in the parking area, and 30 foot candles on each of the four fields.

Mr. Zoeller showed a picture of the lighting fixture they are proposing which is the latest in lighting technology which is an LED lighting technology. He stated it is virtually a full cut-off fixture which means it cuts off light above the horizon. He stated looking at the lighting fixture itself, you cannot see the actual light source within the fixture which is the main source of glare. He showed renderings of lighting fixtures over the years showing the progression of less and less of the source to be viewed and less and less glare with the last fixture which they will use having no glare and no sky glow as all of the light is directed down onto the field.

Mr. Zoeller stated to determine the lighting impact, they turn on all the lights on all four fields, and turn on all the lights on the driveways, the entranceways, and the parking areas; and they then take measurements of what the values will be on the right-of-way line which surrounds the property. He stated they calculate horizontal foot candles which means taking a light meter and pointing it straight up in the air; and looking at all those values, it is 0.0, and there is no spillage at all. Mr. Zoeller stated these values are calculated without considering any kind of foliage, trees, structures, or anything that would also decrease the light and light spillage; and it is as if the whole property was one flat piece of property with nothing else. He stated they were told that there should be no light trespass at all off the property so they did a calculation where they take the meter and instead of pointing it straight up in the air they point it right back at the lights; so if there is any light coming off that property, the meter would pick up the light. He stated once again along the entire right-of-way line, they had 0.0; and there will be no light trespass off of this property with all the fields, the parking area, and the driveways illuminated. Mr. Zoeller stated the Township also has the ability to turn on only the fields that they need and just the driveways and parking area when they need it. He stated even with them all on, without any foliage or any trees, they still get zero light trespass off the property.

A gentleman from the audience began speaking out and asking questions; and Mr. Tracey asked again that they allow Commission members to speak, and they will then get to the audience questions.

Ms. Kirk asked Mr. Eisold to go through the requested Waivers and explain for the Planning Commission what is being asked.

Mr. Tracey advised the audience that they will get to their questions, but he wants to make sure that they get to hear the complete presentation before they do so.

Mr. Eisold stated there a number of Waiver requests, and Ms. Saylor will review them. He stated a lot of them are standard ones that they see on a lot of different projects.

The Waivers requested from the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance are listed in the Township engineer's letter dated November 18, 2016. Ms. Saylor stated the first is not to be required to show significant manmade features within two hundred feet of the site. She stated instead what they have done is to provide an aerial photograph which essentially shows everything.

Ms. Saylor stated they are also asking not to be required to provide a tree inventory of existing mature trees onsite since this is a former cash cut nursery. She stated they do have plans, as Ms. Goldstein stated earlier, to transplant a lot of the better specimen trees along the buffer areas. She stated they are also, as noted earlier, proposing to save large portions of trees all around the site at the existing buffers.

Ms. Saylor stated the third Waiver request is not to be required to provide core samples of adjacent roads as they are Township-maintained roads. Ms. Burke asked for a further explanation, and Ms. Saylor stated the Ordinance requires that if a developer comes in, the Ordinance requires the developer to take a core sample which is a cut-through 6" diameter circle to look through the paving section to see if it needs any work, resurfacing of the road, or if the use will cause more wear and tear on the road. Mr. Eisold stated PennDOT just recently overlaid Dolington Road, and he believes Quarry Road along the frontage of the site is due to be paved within the next couple of years with the Township Road Paving project. Ms. Kirk stated generally when a private developer comes in the Township would be concerned about any additional costs for maintaining and improving roadways; and this is why they ask the developer to provide the core samples so that the cost is borne by the developer to make those improvements rather than the Township later.

Ms. Saylor stated the next Waiver request is to not be required to provide an Environmental Impact Assessment of the site since the Township owns the site, and the Township is aware of the physical features, Zoning of the site, etc.; and has considered all of these factors in the site selection for the recreational fields.

Ms. Saylor stated the next Waiver request is to allow lighting fixtures for the athletic fields with a mounting height exceeding twenty feet in order to light the fields effectively as the lighting designer engineer has explained.

Ms. Saylor stated the next Waiver request is to not be required to provide a thirty foot wide easement for the storm and sanitary sewer line since the Township owns the site and has full access to the site. She stated Easements on other Land Development sites are to allow the Township to come in if they need to; and since the Township owns this site, they feel that this is not necessary.

Ms. Saylor stated the next Waiver request is to be permitted to install a paved bike path within an existing, unused, sanitary sewer easement that runs through the site. She stated the easement was created, but there is no sanitary sewer in it right now; and they are asking to be able to run the bike path over it. Mr. Eisold showed the location of the easement on the Plan; and he stated it is an easement that was established, and while they are not sure what the purpose of it was, there is no sanitary sewer there.

Ms. Saylor stated the next Waiver request is to not to be required to provide groundwater mounding analysis for the proposed infiltration areas. She stated this appears twice – once in SALDO and once in the Stormwater Management Ordinance. She stated they are providing infiltration trenches, and they got fairly good infiltration rates. She stated they are also providing perforated pipe in all the trenches. She stated if the water from the larger storms is not infiltrated down, it will have an overflow route through the pipe into the basin. Mr. Eisold stated as noted earlier all of the design from the stormwater standpoint meets the Township and latest DEP BMP requirements.

Ms. Saylor stated the next Waiver request is to be permitted to use a 15 inch diameter storm sewer pipe where an 18 inch diameter is the Township Ordinance minimum. Ms. Saylor stated the 15 inch diameter is a common pipe to be used now, and it is more appropriate to use that size in certain areas of the trenches; and the 18 inch would be “over kill” to carry the water. Mr. Tracey stated as she mentioned previously, their impervious surface ratio is so favorable that they do not really need it for conveyance purposes; and Ms. Saylor agreed.

Ms. Saylor stated the next Waiver request is related to the previous one. She stated the Ordinance requires a 6 inch pipe change when you are going up and increasing your pipe size to carry the flow, and they are asking to be able to be allowed to use a 15 inch diameter pipe and then to go up to the next size which would be 18 inch so that would be a 3 inch increment. She stated this is standard accepted engineering practice for stormwater management.

Ms. Saylor stated the next Waiver request is to be permitted to provide less than 2 feet of cover over the storm sewer in grassed areas. She stated 2 feet of cover in unpaved areas is greater than standard engineering practice so they are asking for a Waiver in certain areas.

Ms. Saylor stated the next Waiver request is to permit grading at less than 2% slope. She stated grassed areas in the Ordinance are required to be at a 2% slope for proper surface drainage. She stated they are asking for less than 2% slope for the fields adding it is standard practice for athletic fields to have 1% slope for play. She stated they are also asking for this for the skate park since that will probably be a paved surface as well as in the swales for Best Management Practices.

Ms. Saylor stated the next Waiver request is to not be required to provide a 6 inch drop within 15 feet of the building. She stated they have a concession stand and a pavilion, and there is sidewalk all around. She stated if they were to provide within 15 feet a 6 inch drop, they feel the slope of the sidewalk would be adversely effected so they are asking for this Waiver. She stated this also is for ADA. She stated generally this requirement is more for houses to make sure water drains properly away from houses in a Residential development.

Ms. Saylor stated they are asking for Waivers from the Stormwater Management Ordinance one of which was already covered related to the groundwater mounding analysis, and the other is to not require the detention basin to have to have to empty over a period of twenty-four hours. She stated this is for water quality purposes, and theirs empties in less than twenty-four hours; however, they have infiltration trenches around the loop road that will treat the water prior to it reaching the basin. She stated if they were to design the basin to go to twenty-four hours, they would have to squeeze down the outlet opening. She stated currently they have a 6 inch diameter opening, and they would have to squeeze it down to something less than 3 inches; and this could clog easily, so they are not in favor of that. She stated because they are treating the water for water quality in the infiltration trenches, they are requesting a Waiver from that requirement. Ms. Kirk stated if the basin drains quicker than twenty-four hours, that would prevent standing water for a period of time; and Ms. Saylor agreed.

Ms. Burke asked for further explanation about the Waiver regarding 2 feet of coverage. Ms. Saylor stated when you put a pipe underground you put a soil cover on top of it to protect it from being smashed by tractors, foot traffic, etc.; however, the pipe they are using is strong plastic, and they feel a foot of cover will be more than adequate. Mr. Eisold stated the manufacturer's requirement is that they have a foot of cover over the plastic HDPE pipes. He stated the 2 foot is an older requirement that was probably put in the Ordinance thirty years ago, and it is not current with current piping design standards.

Mr. Halboth asked if they really believe that will be adequate in case of wheel loading running over the pipe; and Mr. Eisold stated he has seen it on construction sites with big equipment going over these pipes, and the manufacturer says that with a minimum foot of cover, load will be dispersed such that it will not effect the pipe. Mr. Tracey asked the schedule on the pipe, and Mr. Eisold reviewed the type of pipe to be used.

Ms. Burke asked if it prohibitive for them to put 2 feet above, and Ms. Saylor stated it is only in some cases. She stated in most cases, they are providing at least 2 feet of cover. Mr. Eisold stated it is only in the grass areas where they do not have the high vehicle load. He stated it could take a tractor or a lawnmower. Ms. Saylor stated even in the grass areas, most of them have at least 2 foot of cover, but they ran into one or two areas where it was less than 2 feet; and they felt in those cases it would be acceptable.

Ms. Burke asked about the water testing, and she asked if that has to do with the water draining and whether it will cause surrounding areas to flood. Ms. Saylor stated it does not, and they have addressed the peak run off and permanent reduction of volume. Ms. Saylor stated the surface run off is controlled and significantly reduced. Ms. Saylor stated this has to do with the water table, and it is really directed more to infiltration/detention basins; but since they are putting in infiltration trenches, they felt they would ask for the Waiver. She stated it has to do with when you are infiltrating water down into the ground, it eventually finds its way into a water table. She stated if the water table does not accept it as readily, it can start to mound underground; and if you have a septic system above or a house in close proximity and no relief for that water, then maybe it could become an issue. Ms. Saylor stated they have woods there and the flat, perforated overflow pipes that will direct any water that is not infiltrated into the detention basin underground.

Ms. Burke stated she is confused about the Waiver since she assumes what is required is that you do certain tests to make sure it does not infiltrate into surrounding areas. Mr. Bryson stated you usually do that test to see that it does not impact a house or a septic system, and they have none of that in this case. He stated if it were to mound, it would not matter since it would not hurt anything. He stated he does not feel it will mound; but if it does, it will not have impact on anything. Ms. Burke asked if there are any houses close enough that would be impacted, and Mr. Bryson stated there is nothing around it. Mr. Eisold stated the extensive soil testing they did for the stormwater shows that it has not mounded; so while they did not do the specific study required in the Ordinance, all the tests they did do show that it is not an issue. Mr. Bryson stated it is a very expensive test; and the point is that you do not damage something of value, and they would not damage anything here if it mounds so the test is pointless. Ms. Burke stated her concern is that if the water gets so high that it does infiltrate to the homes, and Mr. Bryson stated groundwater will not do that. Mr. Tracey stated they also have the natural gradient where the groundwater will go to the detention basin anyway, and there is a buffer with the mature trees. Mr. Bryson stated he feels that what Ms. Burke is thinking is that if they put water into the ground and it saturates, it will start working its way out; and he stated they did test for that. He stated mounding is a different phenomenon within that same type of structure, but he feels they will be okay.

Mr. Tracey stated since Mr. Eisold has concluded his presentation, he would like to open it up to commentary from the audience. Mr. Tracey stated all those who wish to make commentary should provide their name and address to the Recording Secretary.

Mr. Charles Lombardo, 1511 Laurie Lane, stated he feels they are giving a lot of Waivers to these folks that they do not give to most of the developers; and he feels they should think about that. Mr. Tracey stated that is not actually the case, and Mr. Lombardo replied “whatever,” and that he would not argue about that. Mr. Lombardo stated the street is incredibly narrow, and it has ditches on the side of the proposed project and the two Schools. He stated he goes by there every day, and it is difficult to travel up the road coming off of Creamery and at the corner of Dolington. He stated if there are buses, you can barely get two buses going in opposite directions on the road. He stated there are also children walking up and down there, children playing, children on bicycles, cars, and trucks; and it is hugely congested a few times during the day particularly in the morning and when the Schools are let out at various times as they are not all let out at the same exact time. He stated there is nothing but a big trench on one side of Dolington which he showed on the Plan. He also noted an area where Dolington is very narrow. He stated cars come “flying down” Dolington all the time. He also stated with regard to water he has seen a significant amount of water coming down. He stated cars slam on their brakes because of the stop sign; and it is a hard turn because you cannot see very well to the right so you have to “sneak out” a bit; and it is very dangerous. Mr. Lombardo stated they should not save money, and they should cut through if they want to do it right. He stated ten years ago, they were planning to cut through; and they came to his property which he showed on the Plan, and told him they would be filling that all in, and he felt he would then have a much bigger front yard which was fine with him.

Mr. Lombardo stated they should stop talking about saving money, and they should talk about saving children. He stated he has a list of every teacher at the two Schools including their e-mails and their addresses which he will hand out to anyone who needs it; and he will see to it that every teacher in both Schools know all the names of the Planning Commission and the other Council members’ names. He stated if anyone is hurt in an accident or killed, it will be “on your heads.” Mr. Lombardo stated the most important thing is the lives of the children. Mr. Tracey stated the traffic engineer talked about this. Mr. Lombardo stated the traffic engineer probably did a study based over time. He stated if the traffic engineer will study this at the “let-out” times only, he will get much different results.

Ms. Burke stated she believes that Mr. Lombardo is right as her daughter just got in a car accident right at the corner.

Mr. Lombardo stated there are accidents every week.

Ms. Burke asked to be able to speak, and she stated the cars all park where they should not park. Mr. Lombardo stated this is correct. Ms. Burke stated then you cannot see, and the cars coming up Creamery cannot see. Mr. Lombardo stated they park on the lawns whenever there is an event at the Schools, and all the lawns are filled with cars.

A number of people were calling out from the audience.

Ms. Burke stated she feels the proposal is a wonderful idea, but she feels something needs to be done with traffic and safety. She stated possibly a light or a light at Quarry Hill should be installed.

Mr. Lombardo stated a light would not hurt, and it will help a little bit. He stated this is already the most congested area he has seen in town. He stated it is a terribly dangerous place. He stated these are Elementary School kids who are not smart enough to know that they should not run across the street all the time. He stated he has seen and heard accidents from his home. He stated this is a very dangerous area, and the entire plan is “really, really, dumb.” He stated they should find another place for it before they lose some lives. He stated every teacher will know all the various Councilmen’s names from all the Councils and their phone numbers, and notifying all the parents is his goal; and he feels the Schools are going to send letters to all the parents, and the Township can deal with that especially if someone is hurt.

Ms. Floss Trinsey showed on the Plan where she lives on Quarry Hill Court. She stated some people who have children who play baseball probably know her as the “old lady on the corner yelling not to park here.” She stated nobody uses the parking lot, and they fill up the street first. She stated they have talked to the Township and she has made 411 calls; and the only parking ticket that was given out was to one of her family members from Maryland who did not notice that she had parked in the circle, and nobody else has ever gotten a ticket.

Ms. Trinsey stated when they have all these baseball people and football people, she asks where they think they are going to be. She asked if they took into consideration on Saturdays and Sundays when they play their games that they will have all of these fields, and she questions how much impact they want the neighbors to have here. She also asked if they really need three football fields. She stated her boys played football, and they played off of River Road; and she questioned why they need this as no one has given any reason why. She also asked how much it is going to cost and what it will do to the taxes because right now she is retired and does not know how she can afford any more. She stated there should also not be lighting, and they are going to make this look like Northeast Philly; and it will no longer look like Bucks County, the rural area that she moved into. She stated she does not want lighting, and she wants it moved.

Ms. Trinsey asked if they took Quarry Hill Court into consideration, and she asked if they went there on a Saturday and a Sunday; and Mr. Worsta stated they did. Ms. Trinsey stated on Saturdays she has people in the area from 8:00 in the morning until 7:00 or 8:00 at night. Mr. Worsta stated they did videos and traffic counts for weeks with regard to all of these issues. He stated he is not going to say that there is not an issue associated with the Quarry/Creamery connection as he already stated there was. He stated with regard to the site, the site has very little interaction with the problem times there are at Quarry and with the School. He stated when they do a Traffic Study, they look at the site with regard to the impact on the road, the amount of the traffic it will take, and the amount of parking to make sure that Boucher & James were correct with regard to what would be the parking needs for people to the fields so as to avoid exacerbating the problem that you have there now.

Ms. Trinsey asked how many parking spots they have, and Ms. Goldstein stated there are 156 parking spaces. Ms. Trinsey stated there could be three games scheduled there, and they would have 156 cars going in and out all day long.

Someone from the audience called out and asked whether there was a time study counting cars for a twenty-four hour period.

Mr. Worsta stated they have videos during the A.M. peak hours, the P.M. peak hours and almost the whole day Saturday.

Mr. Lombardo stated there is an accident there almost every weekend. He continued asking other questions, and making several statements from the audience.

Mr. Worsta asked to be able to answer Ms. Trinsey's question first. He stated what they normally do is to look at the site to see what the impact is. He stated when they look at traffic counts, they look to see if there is anything else going on because they want to know if there are problems. He stated they saw the Quarry Road School problem. He stated while they were there they also did traffic counts at Dolington and Taylorsville Roads because they needed data there to see what they could do with the back up associated with Dolington and Taylorsville Roads. He stated while this is unrelated to the proposed site, they want to get information. He stated their data shows that there is not going to be an interaction between the Park and their problem times on the road.

People from the audience began calling out questions.

Mr. Worsta stated they are restructuring it so people coming down Dolington Road over I-95 are now going to come in to a right angle and stop rather than park on the curve and continue to fly through the intersection. He stated to the right they are still going to go up the hill and over I-95. He stated his point with regard to Quarry Road and the School is that this is their next step, and they were thinking about what they could do to reduce the queue.

More people began calling out from the audience, and Mr. Worsta asked to be able to finish.

Ms. Kirk stated this is a meeting and it is not where anyone stands up and gets the opportunity to comment whenever they want to. She stated everyone will be given an opportunity to be heard, but they have to do it in an orderly fashion so that everything is properly recorded for future reference. She stated this is why the Commission has asked each member of the public to come up and make their comments and then go to the next person in the audience. She stated they cannot keep standing and arguing back and forth. She stated they may not like the results of what the traffic engineer has indicated; but this is his presentation to the Board, and it is understood that there is opposition. She stated they need to keep this in an orderly fashion.

Ms. Trinsey stated they will be impacting the area with 156 cars every three hours on Saturday and Sunday; and she asked if this is right. She stated this will be 156 more cars than what she has ever seen.

More people continued to call out from the audience.

Ms. Kirk stated audience members are not listening as she had asked that everyone in the audience wait until their turn, and they cannot have a “free for all.”

Mr. Worsta stated what they are saying is that the parking on site will be adequate to handle it. Ms. Trinsey stated he is not hearing what she is saying. Mr. Worsta stated there might be traffic on Saturday coming out but it will not be 156 cars at one time. Ms. Trinsey asked how he knows that since there are three football fields. Mr. Worsta stated the start and stop times for games will be staggered; and a game will end and those players will leave, and then others will come in. Ms. Trinsey stated they are putting 156 more cars on the street than there have ever been, and she asked if that is right. Mr. Worsta asked what street she is referring to, and Ms. Trinsey stated they will be on Quarry Hill.

More people began calling out from the audience.

Ms. Kirk stated there is a whole room of people who wish to speak. Mr. Tracey asked that Mr. Lombardo please sit down. Ms. Kirk stated she understands what Ms. Trinsey is saying, and that her position is that there are 156 more vehicles that will be effecting her property; and the Township traffic engineer is disagreeing with her position. Ms. Kirk stated she feels Ms. Trinsey's point has been made to the Board of what her concern is. Ms. Trinsey stated there will be 156 cars parked there at one time which is 156 cars more than she has ever had. Ms. Kirk stated she feels the Board understands that is her position.

Ms. Trinsey stated the other issue was who pays for this and how much is it. Ms. Kirk stated this is being paid for by the Township, and the money has already been budgeted for this project. She stated she does not know the exact amount, but she advised that this has been in discussion by the Township Supervisors since at least 2004 where monies were always proposed as to what it would cost for the development of this project. Ms. Trinsey questioned why they have this huge project, yet Ms. Kirk does not know what it would cost. Ms. Kirk stated she is not a member of the Township Supervisors, and she is legal counsel for the Township. She stated she does not want to quote a number that is inaccurate.

Ms. Trinsey asked if the engineer could speak to this, and Mr. Tracey stated he would like to hear from some other people; and he asked that next person please come forward.

Ms. Chris Gray-Faust, 1509 Dolington Road, showed her property on the Plan. She stated this will impact their property. She stated she does feel they all want to know how much it will cost, and they would like to get that number from somebody. She stated her concern is that it was stated this project was in the planning since 2004, and she asked if there is a study from the Parks Board as to how many kids really need this. She stated she would like to know the need as she has not seen any sort of proposal or plan that says all the other fields are really overwhelmed so they need this here. She asked if the other fields in the Township are being utilized to their full ability.

Ms. Kirk stated they have information from the Director of Parks & Recreation that in 1995 there was a Plan of Action provided that indicated additional recreational land was required. She stated in 1997 there was a follow-up from Parks & Recreation that a Plan of Action needed to be implemented. In 1998 the Township purchased this tract with the target of additional field space, and it goes on and on. Ms. Faust stated those kids from 1999 have already grown up. Ms. Kirk stated Ms. Faust had asked for a history, and she was providing it; however, Ms. Faust stated she would like to know about current numbers.

A number of people began calling out from the audience.

Ms. Kirk stated it has been ongoing through 2007, 2009, 2014, and 2015.

A gentleman from the audience questioned what numbers they have now rather than reciting years; and they should just say the number of kids who need to use the fields.

Ms. Faust stated that is a good question, and she would Second that.

The gentleman stated he will stand up and his name is Gerald and he lives on Heller Drive. His full name and address could not be heard as numerous people were calling out. He stated he is listening to Ms. Kirk “spout numbers,” while there was a question asked about what is the necessity for these fields.

A number of people were all calling out at the same time.

The gentleman named Gerald stated this is a YMS-driven project. Others advised that this is not a YMS project. The gentleman stated it is so YMS can use Macclesfield for its exclusive use and to put the football fields in this section of the Township.

Ms. Faust stated she would just like to know the numbers if they could be provided.

The gentleman was asked to sit down but refused. Numerous people were yelling out and a number of people advised the gentleman that he was out of order but he responded by stating “I don’t care.”

People continued to yell out, and Ms. Kirk stated the meeting needed to be shut down. Mr. Tracey adjourned the meeting at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Chad Wallace, Secretary