

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES – MAY 8, 2017

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on May 8, 2017. Mr. Tracey called the meeting to order at 7:40 p.m.

Those present:

Planning Commission:      John Tracey, Chair  
   Dawn DiDonato Burke, Vice Chair  
   Chad Wallace, Secretary  
   Craig Bryson, Member  
   Charles Halboth, Member

Others:                              Jim Majewski, Director Planning & Zoning  
   Barbara Kirk, Township Solicitor  
   Mark Eisold, Township Engineer  
   Jeff Benedetto, Supervisor Liaison (left meeting  
   in progress)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Bryson moved, Mr. Wallace seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of April 10, 2017 as written.

#658 – SNIPES TRACT ATHLETIC FIELDS – PRELIMINARY/FINAL LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOLINGTON ROAD & QUARRY ROAD – DISCUSSION AND MOTION TO CONTINUE

Mr. Tracey stated the last meeting on this that took place in front of the Planning Commission was in November, 2016, and it became unruly. He stated for those who were patiently waiting to give testimony, he apologized for the abrupt adjournment of that meeting. He stated in keeping with what he hopes will be a reasonable discourse on this issue, he asked those who wish to present their concerns or support to limit their testimony to approximately three to five minutes so that all of those present can make their voices heard. Mr. Tracey stated he wants to maintain decorum during this meeting.

Mr. Tracey stated they have received numerous correspondence from engineering firms that have either been retained for this project or who have submitted auxiliary consultant viewpoints and concerns, and those will be addressed. He stated he would first like to have Mr. Eisold and Ms. Saylor from Boucher & James provide an update as to what has transpired between November, 2016 and now. Mr. Tracey stated meetings have taken place subsequent to the Planning Commission's meeting in November to the Board of Supervisors and the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Mark Eisold and Ms. Maryellen Saylor from Boucher & James were present with the Township traffic engineer from Traffic Planning & Design, Mr. Bill Zadrovicz, who is working on the improvements along the roadway frontages which Mr. Eisold stated is a little different from what the Planning Commission saw in November. Mr. Eisold stated Mr. Bob Zoeller, Musco Lighting, is also present; and Mr. Eisold reminded the Planning Commission that he previously presented an overview of the proposed athletic lighting for the fields, and he can answer any questions with regard to lighting.

Mr. Eisold stated that since November they submitted the Plan to the Conservation District, the DEP for the NPDES Permit, and the Bucks County Conservation Adequacy approval. He stated they received those approvals, and they did require some minor changes to the Plan since November; and they were reflected in the Plans dated January 31, 2017. Mr. Eisold stated all the Permits were received by March.

Mr. Eisold stated they have also been working closely with TPD and the Township Police Department looking at the driveways where they enter the existing roads as well as accel/decel lanes in addition to some improvements at the point where Quarry Road comes into Dolington Road which TPD has looked into quite extensively and has Plans to show this evening with recommended improvements that will make the situation a little better.

Mr. Eisold stated the Township retained an outside consulting engineer to review the Plan, and the letter from that engineer can be reviewed this evening in detail. Mr. Eisold stated he also has the comments from the EAC which have been addressed. Mr. Bryson asked about the letter from the EAC; and Mr. Eisold stated the EAC had prepared a review, and Mr. Eisold's firm had prepared a response to that. Planning Commission members indicated they did not have that response, and Mr. Majewski provided it to the Planning Commission this evening.

Mr. Eisold stated there were two issues with regard to Zoning that had not been fully resolved when the Planning Commission saw the Plan in November.

Mr. Eisold stated these issues were with regard to the placement of the potential future skate park along Dolington as well as the relocation of the salt shed along the I-95 corridor, both of which were within the prescribed setbacks for those roads. Mr. Eisold stated the Township has since received those Variances, and the Appeal period has expired; and there were no Appeals to either of those Variances.

Mr. Eisold stated the Plan is otherwise basically the same as what the Planning Commission saw previously. He stated some minor changes were made recently to address some of Carroll Engineering's minor cleanup issues; and Plans highlighting those changes are available for review this evening.

Mr. Eisold stated the list of requested Waivers is essentially the same with some minor changes which they can review. Mr. Tracey asked if Mr. Eisold was referring to the SALDO Waivers, and Mr. Eisold agreed. Mr. Tracey advised the audience that SALDO stands for Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. Mr. Tracey stated part of the Planning Commission's charter is to review the Ordinance and when there is a request for Waivers, it is within their purview to make recommendations on those Waiver requests.

Mr. Tracey asked if there was a representative present from Carroll Engineering, and Mr. Christopher Peterson stated he was present from Carroll Engineering. Mr. Tracey asked if his firm and Boucher & James have worked together to effectuate responses to the concerns that have come forward, and Mr. Peterson stated they have. Mr. Tracey asked Mr. Peterson if he was comfortable with Mr. Eisold's review of the recommendations and the resolutions to those recommendations, and Mr. Peterson stated he is.

Mr. Eisold noted the Carroll Engineering review letter dated May 4, 2017. Mr. Eisold stated the letter includes a description of the project and the Zoning Variances that were granted. Mr. Eisold noted B.1 with regard to the Zoning Ordinance on Page 2 which relates to the Natural Resources Plan and the existing trees on site. Mr. Eisold stated there has been a lot of discussion as to how to deal with the trees. He stated the site was all shown as nursery stock at one point. Mr. Eisold's stated his position at this point is that his Land Planning Department evaluated it and determined that it falls under a requirement known as Agricultural Operations which is basically a law that allows cash crops to be protected from certain requirements. Mr. Eisold stated there is aerial photography from as early as 1938 up to 1971 that shows the complete tract being farmed at one point. He stated after that point is when the nursery came onto the site and planted nursery stock. He stated the property was purchased by the Township in 2000.

Mr. Eisold stated Pages 3 and 4 list the Waivers being requested, and Carroll Engineering did not provide an opinion on those Waivers.

Mr. Eisold stated under the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Item D.1 is a request by Carroll Engineering that they provide the appropriate foot candle diagrams to detail the lighting requirements in accordance with the Township Ordinances. Mr. Eisold stated the requirements are that they provide enough light for the parking lot and that they have zero foot candles registered at all boundary property lines. Mr. Eisold stated the lighting consultant is preparing this, and it will be part of the documentation provided.

Ms. Burke asked if that will eliminate the requested Waiver for lighting; and Mr. Eisold stated the Waiver for lighting is related to the pole height requirement. He stated the Township has a height requirement typical for a shopping center, etc.; however, in this case the fields have a need to have higher poles to adequately light the fields. Ms. Burke asked how high they will be since the Ordinance permits 20'. Mr. Eisold stated the design shows 80' for the lighting on the fields themselves. He stated the lighting around the parking lot will be 15' to 20' high.

Mr. Eisold stated under E – Stormwater Management – these are both Waiver requests.

Mr. Eisold stated with regard to F1. the engineer has made a comment about some additional testing of the ground for stormwater management. Mr. Eisold stated while he is comfortable with what they have done, they have indicated to the Carroll engineer that they will provide some additional information. He stated they will complete the testing on Wednesday. He stated he believes the trenches and basin as designed will not be effected by the additional tests, and they have enough infiltration for what they have tested already to provide the infiltration required by the DEP; and that has resulted in the approval of the NPDES Permit which they have already received. Mr. Tracey asked if it is a percolation test, and Mr. Eisold agreed. Mr. Eisold stated the Ordinance requires one every so many feet; and while they did not do that many, they had enough percolation for the tests they did do so that the DEP was able to issue the Permit because they met the requirements even though they had not done the exact number of tests that the Township Ordinance required. Mr. Eisold stated that they will still do the additional tests requested by Carroll Engineering, and they are very confident that they will still be fine with regard to the run off and meeting requirements.

Ms. Burke asked about the Waiver request listed as E.1; and Mr. Eisold stated the Ordinance requires the basin empty between twenty-four and seventy-two hours, and the basin they have designed is slightly under twenty-four hours to drain which

is why they are requesting the Waiver. Ms. Saylor stated that is separate from the infiltration test that Mr. Eisold just discussed. Ms. Saylor stated with regard to that Waiver, the Ordinance requires that the detention basin empty from a storm in a period not less than twenty-four hours but not more than seventy-two hours. Ms. Saylor stated for the basin they want to control all the storms per the Ordinance, so they have very small openings on their outlet structure and at the bottom for the lower storm it is only 6" in diameter; and in order to stretch it out to be more than twenty-four hours, they would have to restrict the opening, and you would then have a clogging risk. She stated they would like to keep the opening at 6" minimum and ask for a Waiver that the basin be allowed to empty within twenty-four hours.

Mr. Tracey stated that Waiver would cover all eventualities whether it is a two-year storm, a fifty-year storm, etc.; and Ms. Saylor agreed.

Mr. Eisold noted Item #2.a. on page 5. Mr. Eisold stated the basin as designed is not designed as an infiltration basin, as they have trenches that do the infiltration portion. He stated they have not taken any credit for any infiltration in the basin. He stated they did some testing of the basin; but it was not infiltration testing, rather it was testing as to the depth of the bedrock. Mr. Bryson stated they will be getting all of the infiltration out of the trenches, and Mr. Eisold agreed. Ms. Saylor stated what they have done is actually a more conservative design; and Mr. Eisold stated they assumed that no water in the basin is infiltrating into the ground, an even though chances are that some will infiltrate, they have not taken credit for it.

Mr. Eisold noted Item #2.b. which has to do with the separation distance, and they are doing some additional testing. He stated they will resolve this technical issue. Mr. Tracey asked if this is related to changes in elevation as to the discharge piping, and Ms. Saylor stated it speaks of limiting zones. Ms. Saylor stated there were a few test pits where because of the topography and the depth to bedrock, they were not meeting 24". She stated at the trench between Inlet 21 and Inlet 22 they encountered bedrock a little closer than they would have liked; however, they got such good infiltration at the next section downstream that will be connected, it was able to infiltrate all of the water. She stated they will do additional testing, but it does not seem to be an issue as to infiltration.

Mr. Tracey stated he feels this is an important point especially for those who may be concerned about stormwater run off. He stated it seems that they are getting the infiltration they want and a more consistent discharge. Mr. Eisold stated they are going to do additional testing to see where the bedrock is.

Mr. Eisold stated Item 2.c. is a similar situation with regard to the bedrock, and they will do additional testing.

Mr. Eisold stated Page 6, Item G deals with the Transportation Impact Study. Mr. Bill Zadrovicz stated his report was a draft report, and they will make some minor modifications to it to show the additional improvements they have been coordinating with Boucher & James, the Township, and the Police Department.

Mr. Zadrovicz stated Comment #1 has to do with trip generation for the site, and the value he was showing was 121 trips on a Saturday peak hour; and the reviewer would like to see 122 which is a rounding recommendation on their end. He stated with regard to Comment #2 on trip distribution, it is just moving some trips around and seeing what percentages fit better with the roadway network surrounding the Park. He stated this is a minor modification, and is a “will comply;” and it will not trigger any additional improvements along the roadway network.

Mr. Zadrovicz stated with regard to the G.3 which deals with the Levels of Service, Mr. Zadrovicz stated they had a draft report which the engineer reviewed; and b. through e. are minor typographical errors which will not have any effect on roadway improvements within the study area.

Ms. Burke stated it stated that “the summary does not match the information from the analyses,” and she asked Mr. Zadrovicz if he corrected the analyses. Mr. Zadrovicz stated they will correct it once they submit the final report. Ms. Burke asked when they expect that will be, and Mr. Zadrovicz stated they will do it with the PennDOT HOP (Highway Occupancy Permit) process. He stated it was a typographical error such that they had a Level of Service A, but it might be a B in the analyses; and this would be a minor two or three second Level of Service difference.

Mr. Tracey asked for more detail on the HOP, and Mr. Zadrovicz stated Dolington Road is a State road so they have to go through PennDOT since they are encroaching on their right-of-way. He stated PennDOT will have a chance to review the Plans and studies to confirm what is being presented to them will work in the field and meets their requirements.

Mr. Eisold asked Mr. Zadrovicz to show on the Plan the proposed improvements on Dolington Road and Quarry Road. Mr. Zadrovicz showed on the Plan the Dolington Road access to the Park. He stated coming over I-95, they wanted to be able to get vehicles out of the way if they were entering the Park so that they were not disturbing the flow on Dolington Road. He stated they will have a right-turn lane going into the site, and on the opposite side there would be a left-turn lane trying to get vehicles out of the way. He stated it does not meet warrants per volume, but it is more of a safety improvement for Dolington Road and those using the Park.

Mr. Zadrovicz stated for the access onto Dolington, they will have a left-turn lane and a separate right-turn lane out of the Park onto Dolington Road; and this was a request by the Police Department.

Mr. Zadrovicz noted the intersection where they will be doing some minor improvements. He stated as you approach Quarry on Dolington, they will take cars perpendicular to Quarry Road which will improve the sight distance left and right. He stated they also added in a small channelized right turn at the request of the Police Department which is a small, minor capacity improvement. Mr. Zadrovicz stated to cut down on the large, sweeping radius which he showed on the Plan, they will add a painted island, and make it a yield movement; and vehicles coming from Quarry making the left on Dolington will have a more defined roadway and will not be just sweeping out onto the shoulder. He showed where they added a crossing at Creamery so that all the neighborhoods will have the ability to come up on the existing sidewalk and trails and cross into the Park at a mid-block crossing.

Mr. Zadrovicz noted the Quarry Road access where they will install a westbound right-turn lane into the site which is to keep the vehicles out of the way for people traveling on Quarry Road. He showed where they will cross further into the site, adding they are still coordinating that with Boucher & James and the Police Department. He showed where the trail will go along the entire frontage; and at the end of the frontage it will tie back into the site. He stated they will also have another mid-block crossing at a location he showed on the Plan which will help if the School has an event and additional parking is needed, and they could use the Park and walk across Quarry Road to the School. He stated if there is a Tournament or larger event at the Park, they could use the parking at the School and walk across.

Mr. Zadrovicz stated there will be two entrances to the Park which is good as there will be an emergency access if one of the accesses gets closed off.

A woman from the audience asked about the entrance across from Quarry Hill Court, and Mr. Zadrovicz stated that Park entrance will align with Quarry Hill Court. Ms. Burke stated they had discussed the fact that they were going to look into that again. Mr. Eisold stated he understands that during School hours there is a lot of traffic in front of the Schools, but the Traffic Study bore out that the times of heavy School traffic would not coincide with the heavy use of the Park. Ms. Burke stated the suggestion was made to move that entrance down a bit so that it would not be directly across from Quarry Hill Court and interfere with any neighborhoods; and she asked if they complied with this request of the residents. Mr. Eisold stated he believes the Police had input on this and requested that it be aligned with Quarry Hill Court, but he could verify that.

Others in the audience began calling out questions, and Ms. Kirk stated they will need those speaking to provide their name and address. Mr. Tracey stated he would like the presentations to be completed, and they can then get into public comment. A woman stated she was not in favor of that since last time they waited until the end of the presentations, and there was no comment. Mr. Tracey reminded everyone what occurred at the last meeting. He asked that the engineers be able to complete their presentation. He stated they do not need the lighting engineer to make a presentation this evening. Mr. Tracey stated he is asking that those wishing to make comments to do so in a reasonable amount of time such as three to five minutes as he feels there are probably a number of people who would like to make comments.

Mr. Eisold stated Page 7, Item H of the Carroll Engineering letter provides some Value Engineering items for discussion. Mr. Eisold stated the first item was that there could be some cost savings by eliminating the loop roadway and providing parking in a more compact area. He stated this was discussed early on with the Park & Rec Board and the Police Department, and the overwhelming preference was to provide the loop. Mr. Eisold stated while money could be saved by making changes, the Plan has been vetted out for a number of years to determine that they would prefer the loop road.

Mr. Eisold stated Item 2 discussed reducing the scope with regard to the lighting. Mr. Eisold stated it was suggested that some of the organizations should fund the lighting as lighting is a big part of the project. Mr. Eisold stated the Township has included the cost in their project even though this was a good suggestion to help reduce costs.

Mr. Eisold noted Page 8 – General Comments. He stated they will comply with Item #1 where they have asked for additional details; and they will do this. He stated Item #2 was a suggestion that trench plugs be used in certain circumstances in the trenches, and they are evaluating that now to determine if that makes sense and what the costs are. He stated if that has merit and is at a reasonable cost, they will make those adjustments. Mr. Eisold stated they will comply with Item #3. He added that Musco is providing a lot of the information, and they will have other needs for electric on the site besides the lighting itself. He stated they will need electric for the snack bar, the wells, and service to the existing salt shed/Public Works area which is back along I-95. Mr. Eisold stated that Musco is focusing on the lights so he has spoken to an electrical engineer to do more design for the electricity for the rest of the facility.

Mr. Eisold noted Page 8, J – Cost Estimate. Mr. Eisold stated the engineer had a question on one quantity they saw differently with regard to Item D.3 and they also felt the inlet cost was a little high. Mr. Eisold stated these are just estimates at this point, and if/when the project goes out to Bid the costs will be finalized before awarding the Contract.

Mr. Eisold stated earlier it was discussed that there was an EAC letter, and he asked if they wished to review that at this time; and Mr. Tracey stated at this time, he would like to hear from the public. Mr. Tracey stated in reviewing the EAC letter and the Carroll Engineering review, he feels a lot of the concerns have been addressed. He stated members of the EAC are present this evening if they wish to make comments.

Ms. Burke noted an individual provided documents to her prior to the start of the meeting, and she believes that his name was Mr. Calabria. She advised him that only two copies of two documents were provided to her, so she will share those.

Mr. Don Faust, 1509 Dolington Road, was present. Ms. Burke stated Mr. Faust sent in a letter. Mr. Faust provided pictures to the Planning Commission this evening which he stated were taken last Friday which depict a normal, spring rainfall. He stated he has a culvert coming into his yard. He stated he and his wife are not anti-football or anti-Park, and they see things about the Park that interest them provided it is built truly for the community and not just for those who play ball. He stated their biggest concern is the environmental impact and the water run off. He stated he understands that the design is supposed to decrease the amount of run off that the land has currently; however, he feels all the checks and balances need to be done so that it is correct. He stated his property is at the lowest land directly across from the Park. Mr. Faust stated he feels they should go through all of the points in the EAC letter since he understands the design of the project is in contrast to what he read in the EAC letter which points out certain deficiencies and design issues.

Mr. Faust stated he lives on the south side so there will be a buffer, but he would like to see a bigger buffer where the water retention is. He stated if he lived on Dolington Road he would be upset with a single row of trees; and he feels there could be some solutions like moving buildings etc. to satisfy some of those residents. Mr. Faust stated initially he and his wife did not like the project, but since November they have come a long way. He stated at this juncture it should be about compromise; and those who want the fields will hopefully get most of what they want, but also the residents' concerns should be addressed so that they get some of what they want as well.

Mr. Faust stated the traffic engineer discussed a “painted median,” and he asked if it is elevated, and Mr. Zadrovicz stated it will just be painted and will not be elevated. Mr. Faust stated he would like to know if there is truly a walking path on the Plan as he feels this is an amenity some of the neighbors in the area would support. Mr. Faust stated he did not hear in the Traffic Study if traffic lights were needed. He stated he also does not understand why SALDO is Waived, and asked why these items would not be needed.

Mr. Faust stated he printed off the traffic study that Mr. Benedetto uploaded to the Facebook group, and Table 3 is a manual traffic count of the information on the traffic times. He stated 4/5ths of the traffic counts were taken in June so School was not in session, and he feels this would bias the results.

Mr. Zadrovicz stated with regard to traffic lights, they are not needed. He also stated that when they performed the traffic counts, they did so when School was in session.

Ms. Bethann Mueller-Benninghoff, 1324 Dolington Road, stated she lives across from the Dolington side of the tract on Elm Lowne. She stated she understands that they are addressing the road, and she stated at the “Y”-intersection as you are coming up Dolington and making a right you are “ramping up to the speedway, and people are flying up the road.” She stated she is concerned with the left turns and the fact that the intersection is still prevalent to creating an environment where people are going to want to drive up, and they will then have to stop because they have to make a left-hand turn. She stated she does not feel the intersection is a solution. She stated the run off is also a big concern, and she has seen flooding. She stated as the trees are taken down, this will be a concern. She stated she is trusting that whoever is doing the engineering will be taking that into consideration.

Ms. Benninghoff stated she is surprised that there are not any sidewalks. She stated people are walking and jogging up and down Dolington; and on her side of the property, there is a drop off. She stated on the left side it is also difficult. She stated if they want community access where people can walk to it, the sidewalks end as you go up on the right on Dolington and then there is nothing across. She stated this encourages everyone to drive there so children who of an age that they could bike here will not be able to safely get there, and they will have to be driven there which encourages more traffic on an already well-travelled road.

Ms. Benninghoff stated she is also concerned about the curb appeal. She stated she overlooks this tract everyday, and there will potentially be a bathroom and a “shack for snacks,” which she does not feel is appealing. She stated the buildings should be pushed back since this is a huge tract of land. She stated there is a lot of open green areas, and the buildings should not be right along the road.

Mr. Eisold stated with regard to walking paths, there are paths currently shown along the frontage of both roads on the tract side of the property. He stated the section along the bottom along Quarry is not shown on the Plan yet; but it is in discussion by his office, the traffic engineer, and the Police to determine exactly where it will be. He stated there will be a path from the north where they are near I-95 all the way down, around the basin, and it will continue all the way along the full frontage of Quarry to the far end, and probably cross in front of one of the Schools at that point. Mr. Tracey asked if they have gotten to the point where they have determined whether it will be gravel or macadam, and Mr. Eisold stated it will probably be a paved, bituminous path. He noted there is a sharp drop on Quarry as noted by one of the residents; and it will probably be up on the top of that plateau into the site a little bit so that it will be along the road, but not right along the edge of the road.

Ms. Kathy Hirko, 1450 Dolington Road, stated she is a preservationist and is in favor of preserving historic homes and open space in LMT. She stated she is speaking on behalf of the many neighbors and residents who live near the proposed Snipes Tract and also for many residents of LMT in general. She stated the neighbors have significant concerns about drainage, light and noise pollution, as well as the safety of the intersection of Dolington and Quarry Roads. Ms. Hirko stated residents are also asking for larger and longer trails and trees at the proposed site. She stated she has only noticed sidewalks that they are calling “trails.” She stated she does not see a trail inside the Park where you could walk. Ms. Hirko stated the neighbors are user groups just as much as any organized League.

Ms. Hirko read from a letter written by a friend who gave her permission to use it which indicates that the problem with the discussion is that they are trying to ask for “tweaks” to the Snipes sports complex for other purposes; where it should be seen as Snipes Park where some people are asking to put athletic fields there. Ms. Hirko stated they should do this in a way that everyone can win.

Ms. Hirko stated she read an article about this project in the Bucks County Courier Times yesterday, and there was a quote by one of the Supervisors stating that “the Environmental Impact Study will be done.” Ms. Hirko stated she found out today that the Township Manager had ordered the Environmental Impact Study with Boucher & James prior to the last BOS meeting which was a meeting where the residents “poured their hearts out asking for the Study.” She stated the Township Manager never said a word, and she would like to know what other information is being withheld from residents by the Township Manager.

Mr. Eisold stated they were asked to prepare the Environmental Impact Assessment, and they have a Draft that will be released to the Township tomorrow or the next day. He stated as they had done when they did the Samost property across the street from the Municipal Building, they had originally requested a Waiver from that line item; however, given the concerns, he spoke to the Township, and they agreed that the Township engineer should prepare the document which was done. Mr. Tracey stated the document was in preparation, but it had not been completed; and Mr. Eisold agreed.

Ms. Kirk asked if that means that Item C3 in the Carroll Engineering review with regard to a Waiver for the EIA is being withdrawn, and Mr. Eisold stated that is correct. He stated he does have an updated SALDO Waiver request list, and this is one which was removed. He stated there is also a minor Waiver request that they have added.

Mr. Benedetto asked who authorized the EIA. Mr. Eisold stated he believes that it was a combination of both Mr. Majewski and Mr. Fedorchak who authorize them to do it. Mr. Benedetto asked the timeframe. Mr. Eisold stated Mr. Fedorchak was away for awhile, so it was probably when he returned which is probably over the last week or so. Mr. Eisold stated this required gathering a fair amount of data although most of the information was shown on the Plans already; and it was a matter of putting it in a narrative form, providing charts and figures, etc. He stated it will be fine tuned and released tomorrow or the next day. Mr. Benedetto asked Mr. Majewski if he has further clarification on this matter since it was not discussed at a public Board meeting. Mr. Benedetto stated until today he felt the EIA was still going to be a Waiver request. Mr. Majewski stated he believes it was requested when Mr. Fedorchak returned from vacation, and they discussed the need for the EIA; and they determined that in order to resolve any residents' concerns about environmental issues on the property, that eliminating the Waiver and preparing the EIA would probably be best for the Township, the Board of Supervisors, and all the residents.

Ms. Hirko stated the residents were at the Board of Supervisors meeting on Wednesday and asked repeatedly for this study, and they were not told that it was being done. She asked why the residents were allowed to beg for the study, and no one had the courtesy to tell them that it was already in the works. She stated she feels this is totally wrong and is hiding things from the residents which is unacceptable. Ms. Hirko asked if Mr. Majewski was present and the Board of Supervisors' meeting, and Mr. Majewski stated he was away on vacation. Ms. Hirko stated Mr. Fedorchak was at that meeting. Mr. Majewski stated he does not recall exactly when it was determined to do the EIA. Ms. Hirko stated it was before the Board of Supervisors meeting, and they allowed the residents to ask repeatedly for that study.

Mr. Richard Gagnier, 1371 Heller Drive, stated he lives in Makefield Chase which is adjacent to the property. He stated when he left to come this evening a SUV drove past him at 60 miles per hour on Dolington Road, and this is indicative of what happens on these roads. He stated there are very active Schools in the area with a lot of children. He stated someone had indicated earlier that there is a School schedule; however, Mr. Gagnier stated there is no School schedule, and the Schools are running all the time with ball fields, tennis courts, three playgrounds, and evening programs. He stated they cannot take the Schools out of play ever. He stated he feels the Quarry Road entrance is wrong. He stated Quarry Road is a lane, and it is not even a road. He stated he feels the Quarry Road entrance will be the favored entrance, and he would prefer that it not exist as it is not needed. He stated the other two Parks have one entrance, and they seem to do okay. He stated some people say that is a problem sometimes; but he could live with that problem for the safety of the children which is most important. He stated there are no street lights. He stated it was indicated that they could use Quarry Hill for overflow parking, but he asked what the Principal feels about that. Mr. Gagnier stated he knows the Library is not “thrilled” with that since when there is an event at Edgewood, the Library puts up signs saying “No Event Parking,” as they do not want all that traffic in the parking lot because there are a lot of children.

Mr. Gerald Arth stated he lives in Makefield Chase. He stated they just found out that the EIA actually exists, but there is not even a draft that has been circulated; and he feels that should prevent the Planning Commission from taking any action this evening. He stated the EIA should be published, and the residents should be given an opportunity to review it and comment on it at the next Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Arth stated he feels this is a proposal to build “Macclesfield North” in his neighborhood. He stated he has lived in Makefield Chase for twenty-four years when it was a very rural neighborhood and it has changed to one that is highly developed in terms of housing. He stated he remembers when Snipes was acquired by the Township, and the Township Supervisors at that time said that there would not be lights on that property; and that is what they fear is coming to pass. He stated he does not feel they are going to be able to address the issue of light pollution entirely or the sight pollution of seeing 80’ poles sticking up. He stated the noise and the traffic will also be a concern specifically because there is going to be use of the property at night. He stated they will have intense traffic use coming up Dolington Road, Quarry Road, and Creamery Road at night. He stated his children have played at Macclesfield for years so he knows this will go to at least 9:30 at night, every night of the week; and he strenuously opposes this.

He stated it is fine if the Township wants to have a passive recreational use or use during the day. Mr. Arth stated he does not feel there is any justification for having it used at night, and it is just that people want to have “Friday Night Lights.” He stated he does not want it, and all it is going to do is increase the traffic and noise issues that they have already dealt with for the I-95 project and the increase of the Residential use in their neighborhood. He stated having this with hundreds of cars on the roads every evening and on the weekends as well is unacceptable. Mr. Arth asked that Mr. Benedetto talk to his colleagues and the people who were on the Board before such as Mr. Ron Smith as well as Mr. Fedorchak who was there at the time who will tell that they were promised that there would be no lights on this property.

Mr. Alan Dresser, 105 E. Ferry Road, stated he is a member of the Environmental Advisory Council (EAC). Mr. Dresser stated the EAC sent a comment letter to Boucher & James on January 22, 2017, and they did not get a response until 5:00 p.m. tonight. Ms. Burke asked the date of the letter from Boucher & James, as she stated her letter was dated May 8 which is today. Mr. Dresser stated he has not had a chance to fully review it.

Mr. Dresser stated the EAC is charged with insuring that all the environmental regulations in the Township are complied with by the developments, and they also make suggestions on how to reduce the environmental impact of a proposed development; and it is low-impact development that they are after. Mr. Dresser stated they do this with all the developments. He stated one possible way of reducing the environmental impact of this project would be to reduce either the number of fields or the size of the fields. He stated this is why in their comments they asked for a demonstration of need memo or report. He stated he feels they could add that to the Environmental Impact Assessment. Mr. Dresser asked if the Township has verified that they need a facility this size both now and in the future. He stated this is a big project of \$3 million, and the only thing he can remember over the last twenty years that comes close to this amount is the Community Center. He stated he feels the Township, Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors should be given this information to make this decision. He asked if over the last several years has there been an increase in the number of participants involved in football, soccer, Lacrosse and anything else they plan to hold at this property to make the construction of this facility necessary. Mr. Dresser stated he feels they should give figures on overall participation and another of the Lower Makefield Township residents’ participation. He stated if they are building the fields so that they can have non-LMT people come here to play, that is a different matter; and while they may feel it is justified, this is the kind of information that should be made available to everyone so they can make an educated decision.

Mr. Dresser stated he called the Pennsbury School District Pupil Service, and he asked for the number of First Grade students in Lower Makefield Township's four Primary Schools. Mr. Dresser stated ten years ago there were 448 First Grader students, in 2010 it was down to 391, 2012 it was 320, 2014 it was 302, and this year it is 312. Mr. Dresser stated this is a 30% decline since 2006 so he feels it is a reasonable request to look into this closer and make it part of the Environmental Impact Assessment.

Mr. Dresser stated with regard to the woodlands calculation, there is a Zoning Ordinance that requires 70% of woodlands to remain undisturbed as Resource Protected land. He stated woodlands is defined as "a quarter acre or more of wooded land where the largest tree measured is at least 6" in diameter at a height 4 ½' above the ground." Mr. Dresser stated the reason given for Boucher & James not doing this is the site is an existing tree nursery, and he does not feel "this holds water." He stated it was a tree nursery, but it has been seventeen years since the Township bought it in 2000; and the Township has never treated it as a tree nursery, and it was treated as passive open space or a Park where you could walk. He stated for the Township to try to get this through without getting a Zoning Variance for that is irresponsible, since if the Township does it, the developers should be able to do it too. Mr. Dresser stated the stormwater management report assumes nineteen acres of woodlands on the site so he feels it qualifies as woodlands. He stated if they want to do this, they should do it the right way and get a Variance from the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Dresser asked if they could make pervious pavement a Bid Alternate for the parking spots. He stated while pervious paving would increase the cost, it will also generate less stormwater so maybe the stormwater management system could be downsized which would save money. Mr. Eisold stated they agree with doing the pervious pavement; however, it would be an additional cost, and it would have to be done at the direction of the Township and the Supervisors.

Mr. Tracey stated he feels they could modify the project in ways that reduce cost and reduce the "angst" of the public; and if they deleted the lighting from the cost of the project they would save costs, reduce some of the need for added hours of Policing, and there would be a more reasonable use. Mr. Tracey noted Item #1 of the Boucher & James' response letter to the EAC which states, "the size and lay out of the fields were determined and directed by the Township Park & Recreation Department to meet the needs of the Township youth organizations." Mr. Tracey stated there are a number of drivers here; and he feels there are still things that need to be done, and there is room to address all of the concerns.

Ms. Rupal Patel, 343 Pondview Court, stated she is a stormwater engineer and volunteers with the EAC to look at stormwater plans. She stated from their perspective, this project is not adequate in managing stormwater on site. She stated she reviews stormwater plans on a daily basis for “progressive” Townships that have very stringent stormwater rules. She stated Lower Makefield has “pretty good Ordinances,” but she does not believe that they were applied in this instance. She stated the recreational fields have quite a large footprint, and she does not believe the amount of volume that they are generating is going to be managed adequately in the stormwater systems that have been put forth. She stated the large size of the football fields are being managed by infiltration trenches, but they will not adequately manage the stormwater as they say they will as there is a lot of run off draining to a very small footprint. She stated the infiltration trenches drain to a very large detention facility that has a very large footprint as well. Ms. Patel stated they are going to be removing a lot of trees to put in a detention facility. She stated the Township has the tools to be able to do low-impact development stormwater management systems, and the recreational fields provide a very good opportunity to be able to manage stormwater within their footprint without having to build a large detention facility.

Ms. Patel stated the EAC stated in their letter that they will likely have to dig out bedrock in order to handle the capacity of all the volume since most of the site drains to the detention facility. She stated that detention facility does not infiltrate due to the bedrock and its design. She stated the detention facility has a spillway where water would overtop and outlets directly towards the intersection that is in question. She stated that intersection will act as a dam in that location because none of the water can infiltrate; and in large storm events it will overflow over the spillway. Ms. Patel stated Ms. Saylor is correct that you do not want to make the orifices too small or it will create the potential for clogging; however, she would recommend that there are simple fixes for this. Ms. Patel stated the detention facility is acting as a conduit for all of the water, and the water will be draining the site quickly because of the size of the orifices; and this has a direct impact on the water resources in the community as this drains eventually to Buck Creek. Ms. Patel stated large detention facilities are an archaic system, and they are not a low-impact approach typically done in modern communities. She discussed a site she visited with similar ball fields where they were able to put the stormwater facilities under the recreational fields; and while this may increase costs, they may be able to eliminate the pervious paving option, get rid of the large footprint of the detention basin, and preserve the trees that are there.

Mr. Dan Grenier, 3 Highland Drive, stated he is a member of the EAC. He stated he has worked in site plan development, watershed management, and stormwater management for the last eighteen years. He stated he was asked by the EAC to present some potential alternatives to address a lot of the concerns. Mr. Tracey stated this is not a design meeting, and the Planning Commission is here to address what has been presented to them. He stated they cannot recommend alternative designs. Mr. Grenier stated what he has to present are simple examples.

Ms. Burke stated she disagrees with Mr. Tracey and she feels Mr. Grenier is here to present an alternative; and there are a lot of people in the community that want an alternative.

Mr. Halboth stated the problem is that the Planning Commission could not vote on any of these alternatives if they wanted to, and he does not feel this is a good use of everyone's time.

Ms. Kirk stated the Planning Commission's function is to hear the Application that is before it and make a recommendation whether to approve, deny, approve with Conditions, or not make any recommendation. Ms. Kirk stated Mr. Grenier's suggestions would be better served at Park & Recreation or another level of the Township that started this process.

Ms. Burke stated this process has been going on for fifteen years, and she feels what Mr. Grenier is proposing goes to this Board and this Board's determination as to whether or not they would approve the Plan. She stated if there is an alternative that is a better alternative, she feels the Planning Commission should hear about it. Mr. Wallace stated he agrees.

Mr. Grenier provided a copy of his alternative suggestions this evening. He stated a popular method today is to break the stormwater management system into a few different systems. He stated because of the elevation of the bedrock with respect to where the systems are located now, they looked at distributing the stormwater management system at a few different locations throughout the site. He noted the two blue polygons on his handout that are in the northeast corner of the site as well as the central eastern portion of the site in the area where the skate park has been proposed. He stated all of this would be subject to engineering analysis. He stated this would allow for the removal of the larger stormwater basin at the southeast corner. He stated if they were to put the basin in the southeast corner, they would eliminate any chance for the potential re-alignment of Dolington Road to line up with Creamery Road which had been discussed although he is not proposing that they do this re-alignment at this point.

Mr. Grenier stated he would also recommend looking into moving the north/south access road on the eastern edge of the property between the concession stand and what is now shown as the skate park closer to the fields and relocating the concession area to either the north or south of possibly the middle field so that it is more centrally located for users of the concession stand so that they do not have to walk across the Park. Mr. Grenier stated this would have the added benefit of allowing for more space between the north/south access road and Dolington Road for use as both a detention basin and a substantially greater number of trees for screening for both noise and any potential light that may escape the fields.

Mr. Grenier stated he understands that the access from Dolington has been adjusted a bit from previous designs, and Mr. Eisold stated he believes it was shifted somewhat to the north; and Mr. Zadrovicz stated it was adjusted to align across from one of the private driveways. Mr. Grenier stated he runs the intersection all the time, and the sight lines from the entrance on Dolington are not very good; and cars are traveling at a high rate of speed there. He stated the concern would be allowing enough time to turn in and out of the fields. He stated this potentially allows for them to rotate the smaller field 90 degrees which would potentially allow for another smaller basin in that corner and provide for natural gravity drainage because of the existing topography which is higher in the west going down to the east. He stated they could also add more trees and additional basin areas.

Mr. Grenier stated he does not see on the Plan a lot of areas for picnicking or to find shade during a game/Tournament; and he would recommend that they add a few of these areas. Mr. Grenier stated while he understands that some people have issues with the small field in the northeast, if they do construct that field, he feels it will be used for tent space for teams that are traveling as well as for warm ups, and screening would be helpful.

Mr. Grenier asked Mr. Eisold if the interior sidewalk was included in the impervious surface calculations. Mr. Grenier stated adding a perimeter trail through the woods that would be a natural trail and not macadam, stone, or paving would benefit a lot of people. He stated he feels this could be a mile long, and he feels they could have a cross country tournament there. Mr. Grenier stated he is not opposed to the fields as he feels they provide a great benefit, but he would like them to take a closer look at some of these issues.

Mr. Tracey stated he feels Mr. Grenier's proposal has merit, and it would be in everyone's benefit to give it due consideration.

Mr. Eisold stated as with any stormwater design, there are infinite solutions as to what could be done, and this is another solution that could be possible. He stated there were some design parameters that his firm worked with early on; and one of them was that the Park & Rec Board specifically wanted a central gathering area for the concession stand and pavilion, as well as an open area where people could gather at Tournaments or for awards. Mr. Eisold stated on Mr. Grenier's proposal it seems that the skate park has been eliminated from the site, and the skate park was a definite design requirement that Park & Rec had indicated to the Township engineer. Mr. Eisold stated with regard to the concession stand location proposed by Mr. Grenier, it would take down a few more trees than what the current Plan shows, and it appears to be right off the driveway which may not be the best situation. Mr. Eisold stated cost was a consideration for the project; and anytime you change the stormwater, you have to make sure that the water gets to where it needs to go. He added that whenever you split things up and make a number of basins, typically the cost increases. Mr. Eisold stated if they make changes to the stormwater management, they would have to obtain new Permits, and make sure that it works based on both the Township Ordinances and the NPDES requirements. He stated he knows that the one he has proposed works, but they do not know if what Mr. Grenier has proposed would work although it is possible that it could.

Mr. Mike Marinelli, 527 Winchester Drive, Vice President of Lower Makefield Football, read into the record a joint statement from Lower Makefield Football, Lower Bucks Lacrosse, Pennsbury Athletic Association, and Yardley Makefield Soccer. (copy attached to the Minutes.)

While Mr. Marinelli was reading the statement, a number of those in the audience began calling out comments. Mr. Tracey asked if it was Mr. Marinelli's intent to read the four-page document, and Mr. Marinelli agreed. Mr. Jason Simon stated they have been waiting to make this public statement, and he feels they should hear from the athletic groups; and this was specifically put together so that it could be read into the Record. A number of people in the audience called out that the statements were only to be three to five minutes; however, Mr. Simon stated the three to five minutes have been violated all night. Mr. Tracey asked that Mr. Marinelli continue to read his statement, which he did

Mr. Walter Billia, 1487 Brookfield Road, stated they may want to put a no left turn into the Park from Dolington Road; and when you exit the Park, also put in a no left turn onto Dolington as it approaches the I-95 overpass. Mr. Billia stated if they purchased this property and it was a tree farm, and they have not changed the Zoning, it should still be Zoned Agricultural, so they should not have to go through a "lot of aggravation" for re-Zoning since it is trees, and it has been a tree farm since before it was purchased by the Township. He stated this is a leaf composting facility, and it is not a Park. He stated there are no passive trails, and there is nothing in

there. He stated there is a fence that is padlocked. He stated as far as he knows only the Township is using this area. He stated he spoke with the Police, and they use it for training.

Ms. Chris Gray-Faust, 1509 Dolington Road, thanked the Township for listening to the concerns. Ms. Faust stated she and her husband understand that there will be development at Snipes, but the first time they heard about this was in November. She stated while people have stated that the project was “in the works” for a long time, she lives across the street from the property, and there was no notification sent to them until they got a notification about a Zoning meeting in November. She stated they never got a notification about the Board voting on it in June, and she feels that is why the November meeting was so “heated.” She thanked Mr. Tracey for apologizing for having the meeting shut down as it can be seen that many people want to speak about this.

Ms. Faust stated she is also happy to hear that an Environmental Impact Study is being done, and she agrees with Ms. Hirko that they wished that they would have been told about this on Wednesday when they came up and requested it. Ms. Faust stated she would like to reiterate what her neighbor stated earlier that no decision should be made on this tonight until they get the Environmental Study and are able to see what is in there. Ms. Faust stated they feel like they have not had all the documents, and she feels the neighbors have been “in the dark.” She stated if it were not for Mr. Benedetto posting a lot of these documents on the Facebook page, the neighbors would have never had them. Ms. Faust stated this is a project for the community, but their homes are “in the bull’s eye of a stormwater system that is wrong.” Ms. Faust stated it is also their cars that are going to be side swiped by speeding traffic, and it is their view every day that will now have 80’ lights. She stated many of those in the room are the ones who will be directly effected by this on a daily basis, and she asked that the Planning Commission consider this as they move forward. Ms. Faust stated she hopes that they delay action until all of the documents are out there, and they can all review them.

Mr. Tony Kehoe, 476 Liberty Drive, stated he wants to see the fields go in, and he feels Mr. Grenier’s proposal provides all the fields they want. He stated he hopes that they can publish Mr. Grenier’s design, and he hopes that it gets serious review as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment.

Mr. Kehoe stated with regard to the stormwater management, there have been four significant hurricanes here in the last eighteen years; and he would like to see a before and after analysis of Snipes which he feels would alleviate a lot of concerns. He stated this would show the current configuration and what is proposed for “Hurricane Floyd.” He stated he would like to see where the water is going now and where it will go with the proposed new system. Mr. Kehoe stated while this

may not be the appropriate design case to examine, it is a relevant one.

Mr. Bryson stated they provided that. Mr. Kehoe stated he has not seen it, and the residents have not seen it. Mr. Bryson stated the hydraulic experts have, and they addressed it. Mr. Kehoe stated he feels they should give a presentation to the residents to show how the tributaries are being effected which he feels will allay 90% of the concerns. He stated that information has not been conveyed to the public in a manner that they can understand easily.

Mr. Eisold stated with regard to stormwater management, there are two areas you need to satisfy; and they spoke earlier about the infiltration and what is known as the 2" run off which is required by the NPDES Permit by the State of Pennsylvania. He stated they have gone through their calculations, they made some comments which were addressed; and the Township satisfied all of their requirements and received their approval. He stated this is from a water quality standpoint. He stated the laws are that you need to take the 2" run off, infiltrate it, and cleanse it through infiltration before it runs off the site based on the additional impervious surface. He stated the other issue is the pre/post flow. He stated the Township Ordinance specifically requires a certain methodology as well as certain calculations to show what is coming to a design point currently and what would be coming to that exact design point after all the stormwater facilities are in place. He stated they have met all of those requirements. He noted the report shows that for each of the storms, afterwards it dramatically decreased from what it was before. He stated for the one-year storm it is a decrease of 48.5% with the basins and trenches as shown. He stated for the two-year storm it is decreased by 64.4% so that the water that comes off the corner of the property where the low design point is, is reduced by 64%. Mr. Eisold stated for the five-year storm it is 64%, ten year 37%, twenty-five is 32%, fifty is 37.9%, and the one hundred-year storm is 44%. He stated the requirements are that you go back to the previous storm so after you build your facility, the two-year storm run off on the site can only release what was released before development for the one-year storm, he stated the two goes to the one, the five goes to the two, etc.

Mr. Tracey stated they ran the calculations for the two-year storm all the way up to the one hundred-year storm; and Ms. Saylor added they actually started with the one-year storm, and did one, two, five, twenty-five, fifty, and one hundred. She stated they had to make sure that they complied with the regulations for all of those storms. She stated they have to take the two-year post-development storm rate all the way down to the one-year pre-development for water quality, and they have done that. She stated after that they matched storm for storm – five post has to be less than or equal to five pre, etc. She stated in addition they have significantly reduced the rate of run off from the site. She stated they have taken a conservative approach in that probably it will be reduced more if you calculated in the infiltration trenches, and they have used the infiltration just to make sure they

met the NPDES two-year volume permanent removal on site; and that will also help decrease the water to the basin. She stated they did not take credit for those even though they will help. She stated they are basing their reduction strictly on the detention basin meeting and exceeding what they are supposed to.

Mr. Kehoe stated while there has been a lot of good technical information provided, he does not feel they have put it in terms that Mr. and Ms. Faust can understand very clearly. He stated he feels they should tell them what they would have had currently with Hurricane Floyd, and then tell them what will happen afterwards; and to let them know that the creek that flows through their property will not flood their property. He stated that is what he is asking them to do. Mr. Eisold stated he did meet with Mr. Faust today, and went through the information in detail. Mr. Eisold added that Civil engineers do not design for hurricanes, and they need to follow the regulations in the Ordinance and what the typical modeled storms provide.

Mr. Kehoe stated from that data it appears they handled Hurricane Floyd pretty well. He stated the standards are minimum design standards, and if they want to do it right, that is the minimum; however, that does not mean they could not go above it. He stated his key point is that Mr. Eisold talking to the Faustus alleviated some concerns; and he feels communication could have been better through this whole process, and it would have been a lot smoother.

Mr. Eisold stated the other issue was to have a second engineer review the Plans since it is very technical in nature; and he feels the engineer has verified that they have reviewed the calculations, and they are in agreement with the calculations except for some minor changes.

Ms. Rupal Patel stated the EAC made very detailed comments in their review letter which were not adequately addressed in the review letter that was sent back to them today. She discussed the bedrock and the infiltration facilities. She stated what is proposed will not allow for adequate management of the amount of run off that the fields will create. She discussed the impervious area loading ratio which is almost threefold what it is allowed to be per PA requirements. She stated the NPDES should not have been issued.

Mr. Eisold stated they followed the Township requirements and the NPDES requirements and were issued a Permit by the State. He stated he feels their design is actually conservative in many ways, one being the basin is not an infiltration basin even though some water will obviously infiltrate so that will cut it back. He stated they also designed the trenches at the most conservative situation as Ms. Saylor indicated, and they will also accept more water.

Mr. Majewski asked that they let the audience know what a one hundred-year storm or a two-year actually means in terms of rainfall. Mr. Eisold stated the one year starts at 2.64" of rainfall, two year is 3.36", and for the one hundred year it is 8.4"

Ms. Beth Cauley, 1355 James Court, stated this is the first time she is hearing of the proposal. She stated Makefield Brook is a quiet neighborhood which is why she enjoys living there. She stated her parents live on Yardley Road above Macclesfield; and when she goes to their home at 9:00 at night, she sees the lights through the trees and hears "screaming," as they are playing, and there is a lot of noise. She stated they are bringing the same things up into this part of the community rather than utilizing Macclesfield, and she feels these fields should be shared. Ms. Cauley stated this will be diminishing her quality of life to have 80' light poles on until 9:00 at night, and she does not want to look at light pollution. She stated they already have the light pollution from Patterson Farm with the greenhouse that illuminates the sky with a "tinge of orange." She stated she also does not want screaming in her back yard until 9:00 at night. She stated the 80' light poles will diminish the value of her property, and she does not feel most people would want this in their back yard.

Ms. Cauley stated the traffic at Macclesfield is horrendous when they have Tournaments, and she asked how many cars they are proposing when there is a Tournament. She stated she thought the 160 parking spots seemed really excessive, and she asked if they will have 300 or 400 cars when there is a Tournament.

Ms. Cauley stated she feels a project of this magnitude should possibly be put on as a Referendum to see if taxpayers want \$3 million going to something like this. She stated this is a huge amount of money that benefits a very small number of people in the Township. She stated 3,000 children is minimal compared to the number of residents who are paying for this. She stated she would like to see her tax money go to a beautiful Park that benefits her without having fields. She stated all the Parks in the Township are noisy and have fields; and she asked what is wrong with just a beautiful Park with picnic, ponds, and things of that nature. She stated when they are spending \$3 million of taxpayer money, it should be put on as a Referendum.

Ms. Cauley stated all residents within a certain radius should be apprised of the fact that they are going to have 80' high lights glowing in their yard until 9 p.m. She stated this is very irresponsible of the whole Township to not notify people within a radius. She stated this is in her back yard, and this is the first time that she is learning it. She stated she feels if they send a notification to every resident who is impacted by the lights, they would get some feedback. She stated she feels it is "sneaky" the way everything is done, and you just happen to find out about it perchance.

Ms. Cauley stated she believes that the Township purchased the Guzikowski Farm, and she feels the fields should be put down at that end of the Township since Macclesfield is already up at the Yardley Borough end. Ms. Cauley stated near the Guzikowski Farm they are already off of Route 1 where they have a lot of lights. Someone called out that the Township did not buy the Guzikowski Farm.

Ms. Cauley stated she would like to see it as a Referendum if they are spending \$3 million, and she feels it is very unfair how all the members on the different Boards who vote on this get to decide how \$3 million of taxpayer money is going to be spent.

She stated everyone within the radius should be notified in a letter sent from the Township or e-mailed as to the impact with traffic and lights in their own back yard because she does not want her property value plummeting and she does not want her quality of life impacted as she likes having a quiet neighborhood. She stated she already deals with the I-95 sound which can be loud, and she does not want her property value plummeting, and she does not want to be looking at huge, 80' pole lights, and hearing screaming all the time. She stated she feels \$3 million is a huge amount of money, and she feels it is very unfair for such a small segment of people to have \$3 million put toward what their interest is. She stated everybody has a special interest, and she feels it is very unfair that people are not able to vote on whether this is what they want their tax dollars spent on.

Mr. Todd May, 1242 Quarry Hill Court, provided a copy of a letter he sent to the Board of Supervisors in December. Mr. May stated one of the points not brought up tonight is the fact that in July, 2015 for the Scudder Falls Bridge project a decision was made not to put a sound barrier along the entire area from Dolington over to Quarry Road. He stated the assumption was when they did the study, that based on the buffers with the trees there would be no noise; however, now that they are cutting all those trees down, it will be completely open to I-95. He stated he feels this is something that needs to be considered.

Mr. May stated Lower Makefield's under eighteen population has been decreasing by 6% and eighteen and over has been increasing by 2%. He stated others have discussed putting in more of a "leisurely-type" Park in the area. He stated the south side of the Township has Five Mile Woods which buffers up against Route 1 to prevent noise there, and they should have a "nice leisurely Park" in the north.

Mr. May stated there was also a mention about Bright Farms, and he feels this Park should be put near Bright Farms since it is already “lit up like a Christmas tree.” He stated there would be no trees to cut down there. Someone called out that it is a Farm; and Mr. May stated they could get an Ordinance or a Variance since there are already a lot of other Variances.

Mr. May stated at Macclesfield Park which is 90 acres there is only one entrance, and he stated this site is only 30 acres so he is not sure why they need the second entrance on Quarry Hill Road. He noted a resident on Heller Drive discussed the School and the traffic and the children so he feels the second entrance is something that is not needed.

Ms. Virginia Loebel, 1396 Heller Drive, stated lights were never envisioned; and it was promised there would not be lights. She stated she does not know when that promise was broken, and no one likes a broken promise from “folks with whom they have imbued with their trust and their fiduciary responsibility to look after all the residents.” Ms. Loebel stated they have all “envisioned the glow of Mac from New Jersey.” She stated unlike Macclesfield those homes were not there when Macclesfield was put up. She stated people have lived in her community with no lights, and they would have not bought there if there were lights. She stated it is a different situation from Macclesfield, and they are not analogous properties.

Ms. Loebel stated her children have participated in both YMS and Lacrosse; and in over fifteen years of participation they have never had a practice cancelled because there was not a field or there were not lights. She stated that was when the population was actually larger than it is now in a declining period. She stated with regard to Lower Bucks Lacrosse, this was the one sport that was commented on that they had 69% Lower Makefield participation since it is mandated that you have to play within your School District. She stated she would like to know how many of the football players and YMS players are actually from this community.

Mr. Dean Curtis, Lower Bucks Lacrosse, stated it is not true that you have to play in your local District. Ms. Loebel stated she recalls that they had to get Waivers to play for Lower Bucks Lacrosse. Mr. Curtis described how they can grandfather some players in.

Ms. Loebel stated her children had to play at Middletown Community Park because YMS never made it possible for them to play at Macclesfield. Mr. Curtis stated that is incorrect. He stated when they started Lower Bucks Lacrosse, they were at Macclesfield.

Ms. Loebel stated she feels the Park is larger than it needs to be, and it impinges on their quiet enjoyment of the community. She stated they do not need the lights, and they do not need more fields lit up no matter how few lumens there are. She stated it was not envisioned, and it should not pass.

Mr. Lawrence Schwalm, 26 Houston Road, stated he is a forty-eight year resident of Houston Road north. He stated his remarks are his own and are in no way those of his employer for over forty years or those of the Bucks County and Lower Makefield Associations that he belongs to. He stated it is frowned upon to speak opinions in a forum such as this, but he is in a unique position to present facts and information that reflect not just his personal feelings as a resident who will be adversely effected by this project if approved, but also as a person who for over a fifty-year period has been on these streets on a daily basis and worked at all hours of the day when called upon to serve.

Mr. Schwalm stated he is concerned about safety, ease of travel, and quality of life as a whole which will suffer if this project is approved or at the least not extremely reduced in scope. He stated it is difficult not to feel like a “second-class citizen” in a community that has been up in arms over the noise and hazard of the planes flying over us, the Railroad crossing noise and hazards, the installation of a sound barrier along Inter-State 95, the closing of a main route of travel due to safety concerns of line of sight, and the “ruckus” over the request by a Church for additional parking that will alleviate traffic issue with their growing Congregation but is deemed harmful to the environment. He stated somehow the destruction of a preserved open space, idle Christmas tree farm and the major negative impacts it will create by the destruction of the soil and vegetation, pollution of the sky with bright lights, pollution of the air with exhaust fumes, excessive loud noise by vehicle and people, water run off effecting the lower elevations, and an increase in traffic on the roads and intersections that are already overburdened hazards that are adjacent to this project are of no concern. He stated theirs homes, families, quality of life, and peace of mind are being threatened; and they should be heard from. He stated he understands the intent to do something good for our youth, but it is misguided in this proposal.

Mr. Schwalm stated line of sight is a problem at all the intersections – Woodside at Dolington, Dolington at Quarry, Creamery at Quarry, and Creamery at Taylorsville Road/North Main Street. He stated there is a problem with traffic that has been going on with a debate between the Township and the Borough to try to get a traffic light installed that has not ever been addressed. Mr. Schwalm stated due to traffic and parking problems Creamery Road was reconfigured, the speed limit was lowered on Quarry Road, and turn restrictions are now posted on Yardley-Newtown Road and Creamery and at Lower Hilltop and Dolington. He stated turn and access restrictions have also been put in place on Taylorsville Road because of problems.

He stated increased volume brought by this project will present a myriad of other issues of health and safety. He stated the Police Officers have had to be used for traffic control for the increased number of frustrated motorists who exceed the speed limit and make illegal turns through the neighborhoods due to current conditions. He stated adding additional traffic will increase the frustration and the possibility of accidents. He stated they also need to factor in the impact these area roadways are going to experience with the major bridge project once it starts. He asked that they respect the rights of a majority of the citizens, and cancel this project.

Ms. Floss Trinsey, 1218 Quarry Hill Court, stated she was at the Planning Commission meeting in November and addressed her concerns to the traffic consultant that it would be much safer for the whole neighborhood and the Schools if they moved the proposed entrance going into Quarry Hill Court further down possibly in front of the tennis courts where there are no houses or a road. She stated she is upset that was not addressed, and the reply they got tonight was that the Police said they could not do it. She stated she would like to see the report and know the reason why they cannot do it. Ms. Trinsey stated the water coming off Snipes field during a rain going down Quarry Hill Court is like a river. She stated she does not know how a road will help with drainage there.

Ms. Trinsey stated she understood these were to be football fields and she asked where Lacrosse and Frisbee came from. Mr. Tracey stated these are to be multi-use fields. Ms. Trinsey stated they said they were going to be football fields. Ms. Burke stated she feels it keeps changing, and Ms. Trinsey agreed. Mr. Benedetto stated that is incorrect, and it was always part of the discussion to have Lacrosse, and they were not to be just football fields. He referred to the meeting Minutes from the Planning Commission meeting that was shut down where the presentation discussed the potential for Lacrosse and field hockey.

Ms. Trinsey stated she was told that there were 160 parking spots, and she was told not to worry about it since not all of the spots would be used; however, tonight she heard the “run off may be Quarry Hill Court which she feels is a ridiculous statement.” She stated she has to put up with all of baseball and all of Quarry Hill activities.

Mr. Benedetto asked Ms. Trinsey if the stormwater was adequately addressed based on the studies and the review by the two engineers who have looked at it, would she be in favor of the project then; and Ms. Trinsey stated she would not. She stated she would be in favor if there was a “lot of trim down” – two fields and no lights. She stated she has enough light pollution with Quarry Hill and does not want it up the street from her, and she feels it is unfair of the Township to ask all of them in the area to put up with this. She stated the noise level will also be unbelievable.

Mr. Jason Simon, 514 S. Ridge Circle, stated he has held a number of positions in the Township including serving as a Supervisor in 2009 which gives him historical perspective on this project which was originally brought forth to be completed starting in 2010; however, Budget circumstances changed this. Mr. Simon stated he would like to correct some factual inaccuracies about a number of things which have been stated. He stated he recognizes that this is an emotional issue for those who live near the Snipes Tract, but there are a number of people in the Township who have been working on field development for quite some time so they are equally invested in this.

Mr. Simon stated he feels the project has been very public. He stated on June 1, 2016 the Board of Supervisors passed a Motion to proceed with this project. He stated he did a Google search in both the Bucks County Courier Times and the local Bucks papers on-line versions which ran articles on June 2, 2016 about this. He stated in addition this has been in the public view since 2009 and before that when he served on the Board of Supervisors, and additionally this topic has been a major discussion point at Parks & Rec Board meetings for the last several years. He stated he believes there was a Parks & Rec meeting in November, 2016 where the Plans were shown; and aside from the members of the Parks & Rec Board, the Supervisor Liaison, and the Recorder, he was the only member of the public at that meeting. He stated he was able to participate in the discussion; and he believes that had anyone else been in the room with him that night, that opportunity would have been afforded to them as well.

Mr. Simon stated he read the EAC's letter that started out with an opinion based upon football numbers; and to his knowledge, Mr. Dresser has never contacted the President of the Lower Makefield Football Association to verify those numbers. Mr. Dresser stated that they never contacted the EAC or came to a meeting.

Mr. Simon stated PAA works very closely with the Township's Park & Rec Department; and they submit annually and seasonally their Registration and residency numbers to the Township, and they also pay User Fees. He stated they pay \$15 per Resident and \$36 per non-Resident. He stated he believes that in the last fiscal year, the combined User Fees, not counting light fees, from the Leagues was in excess of what was actually spent by Parks & Rec to maintain the fields. He stated that does not include the amounts that the Leagues themselves expend on additional support for the fields including groomers, rollers, and all the equipment that goes into running the Leagues.

Mr. Simon stated he believes that Rivergate existed when Macclesfield Park was built, and they could verify that so that they will know that there were residents that were there. Mr. Majewski stated residents were there when they expanded Macclesfield and put in the lights.

Mr. Simon stated he spent time with Musco learning about modern light systems, and it is important to know the difference between the lights at Macclesfield Park and the new lights that would come into any environment. He stated it is also important to listen to what they read into the Record earlier this evening about the availability of volunteers and daylight when it comes to coaching and executing the programs. He stated they would not build fields in the modern day without lights for fall sports in particular. He stated they want to use these fields for multi-purposes to expand the programming that would be available for the youth in the community, and he is now finding out that people are saying that they should only be used for football. He stated that would not be a good use of tax money, and they should be building the fields for multi use.

Mr. Simon stated he lives near fields and can hear them at his home sometimes, but this Park and the opportunity to expand is something they need from an inventory standpoint. He stated they constantly hear at the public sessions that they do not need the fields or they need smaller fields. He stated the biggest problem the Leagues have is scheduling use of the fields. He stated they really have between 5:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m. so there is a limited window. He stated there is significant amount of expansion and options of different sports for children to play.

Mr. Simon stated the Township does have a Park in the Township that is a passive Park that was specifically built to be used that way which is Memorial Park. He stated it is a non-Permitted Park. He stated it is specifically left out of the inventory for use by the sports programs so that any person can go and use that facility. He stated he is well informed about the Township's inventory, and the Township is sixty-eight acres below the National recommendation for active Parks, not passive Parks, in the community which is based upon ten acres per one thousand residents, even if Snipes is completed. He stated the Township has approximately thirty-five thousand residents, and the Township is not fully built out. Mr. Simon stated he agrees there are ups and downs in resident numbers, but Lower Makefield is a largely bedroom-community located sixty-five miles from New York City and thirty miles from Philadelphia. He stated when houses flip in his neighborhood, they are being bought by mostly young families with young children. He also stated that the property values in proximity to Parks increase. He stated they are trying hard to work with the community, and they did reduce the number of fields from ten to four; and this was a 50% reduction in active land use. He stated this has been in the public eye for a long time. He stated he wanted to correct the Record on some items so that they can be accurate for the Planning Commission to make a decision.

Mr. Tracey stated he feels they should have a Continuance since this cannot proceed until the EIA has been distributed to all the residents. Mr. Simon stated he has not heard discussion among the Planning Commission. He stated the last meeting was stopped, and now Mr. Tracey is calling for a Continuance. He asked if the Planning Commission has discussed the Continuance or is this just Mr. Tracey's decision. Mr. Tracey stated the Commission would have to vote on a Continuance. Ms. Kirk stated Mr. Tracey is making a Motion; however, Mr. Simon stated he did not hear a Motion made.

Mr. Tracey stated there is an EIA that has been prepared and the public was not aware of it. Mr. Tracey stated the Planning Commission was also not aware of the fact that it had been prepared, and he feels it is within the public's interest to see it and assess it since it is an important part of what they are doing to make sure that all the residents are well informed. He stated he understands that there is a lot of concern as well as hope that these fields will be completed; and in all likelihood they will whether it is in this present configuration or something that looks quite similar; however, he feels it is also incumbent on the Planning Commission that they give everyone the right to assess any and all information that is presented and is a public matter.

Mr. Tracey moved that based on the fact that the EIA document has been prepared and has not been disseminated and based on the fact that we have received documentation from a variety of sources that needs to be assessed and addressed, it is proposed that there be a Continuance of the Snipes Tract.

Ms. Burke stated she feels what the Chairman is suggesting is that they Motion to adjourn this pending the Environmental Impact Assessment; and in addition she would like to add to that the response from Boucher & James regarding the demonstration of need which says, "The planning of this athletic recreation Park has been thoughtfully considered, determined, and directed by the Township Park & Recreation Department in conjunction with the Township youth organizations." Ms. Burke stated in conjunction with the EIA, there needs to be a demonstration of need. She stated this development was purchased about fifteen years ago, studies were done then, and funds were borrowed last year to develop this. She stated in order for the Planning Commission to properly recommend this, somebody needs to show them that the Township needs this and not just select groups. She stated she wants the demographics. She stated she feels the demographics of children are declining, not growing. She stated she is in favor of sports and if they need it, that is great; but they need to be shown they need it. Ms. Burke stated she wants to add that to the Motion.

Ms. Burke was asked what wording specifically out of all her comments she wanted added to the Motion; and Ms. Burke stated the Motion should state, “there should be a demographic study demonstrating need.”

Mr. Halboth stated he feels the demonstration of need Ms. Burke is talking about also goes to the point that some of the speakers have made with respect to scheduling. He stated they have discussed the availability of fields. He stated that type of evidence is what needs to be presented so that everyone can see that there is really a need. Mr. Simon stated they have gone over this at Park & Rec meetings numerous times, and they can provide it. Mr. Halboth stated it should therefore be well documented, and Mr. Simon agreed that it is. Ms. Burke stated it has not been made available to the residents. Mr. Simon stated they are public meetings. Ms. Burke stated they cannot make the decision based on the Township youth organizations; and even though they do a great job, it cannot be the decision of the Township youth organizations, and the information is just coming from the youth organizations. She stated she feels there should be a independent feasibility study.

Mr. Benedetto stated a policy decision was made by the Board of Supervisors in consultation with Park & Rec that there is a need. He stated they just heard tonight a presentation that was made about National standards and acreage in the Township. He stated it is fine if they want to review the EIA and have time for the public to review it; but the decision that was made by the Board of Supervisors was that there is a need for this. He stated there are groups in the Township that do not even play on any of the Township fields currently much less the inventory need that was expressed by PAA and YMS. He stated now they are saying that there is a need to go back and do a feasibility study to determine if there is a need. Mr. Benedetto stated the Planning Commission is an advisory board, and the Board of Supervisors dictates what the need is based on their consultation with the Park & Recreation Board. Mr. Benedetto stated the Planning Commission does not have to think there is a need, and they do not have to agree with it; and the Board of Supervisors, which is an elected body, made that decision. Mr. Benedetto stated the Planning Commission can take time to review this and has every right to say they do not have all the information before them; however, part of that information is not another study to determine if there is a need as that decision has been made by the Board of Supervisors. He stated additional evidence does not include a demonstrated need for fields in this Township as that was a decision that was made by the Board of Supervisors to borrow money to finally fund a project that has been considered and has been in the Comprehensive Master Plan for probably the last twenty years. He stated they will listen to everyone’s views, but they are not going back and say that this is not a need as that is an opinion that has been “debunked.” He stated the Planning Commission is an advisory board to the Board of Supervisors which has made a policy decision that the need is real and that it has been demonstrated by the Park & Rec Board through their discussions, and

this is not a review by the Planning Commission to see if they need to build the fields. Mr. Benedetto stated the Planning Commission can make recommendations or turn it down, but they cannot state that they need to see a demonstrated need as that need has already been dealt with and determined by the Board of Supervisors in consultation with the board that determines that need which is the Park & Rec Board.

Someone from the audience asked if they could see this, and Mr. Benedetto stated it is in meeting Minutes. He stated PAA, YMS, football, and Lacrosse have just discussed this evening the needs in the Township and the National standards that indicate that they should have 330 acres.

A number of people in the audience began calling out.

Mr. Benedetto stated there is a demonstrated need; and if someone wants to improve the project as far as stormwater management, dealing with traffic, or dealing with lighting that is up for discussion; however, to say they do not need the fields that is a decision that has already been made by the Board of Supervisors; and this is not in the purview of the Planning Commission.

Ms. Burke stated she made a Motion and it is up to the rest of the Board to respond to it. She stated they were informed a few weeks ago that the law requires the Planning Commission as an advisory board to listen to the residents and make a written recommendation. Ms. Burke stated it is not in the best interest of the Board of Supervisors to proceed with this matter without the written recommendation or the written decision of the Planning Commission.

Ms. Burke stated she made a Motion that part of the Continuance in addition to the Environmental Impact Study is to include a Feasibility Study. She stated she understands that the Board of Supervisors has determined there is a need; but as a member of the Planning Commission she questions that need based on the information provided to her and demographics provided to her from the Environmental Advisory Council.

Mr. Simon asked if Ms. Burke is discounting the information they provided as for field usage, and Ms. Burke stated she is not discounting anything. She stated she is asking for a Feasibility Study because there are two different things that have been provided to her. She asked how she could make a recommendation when there are “two opposite ends of the spectrum.” Mr. Simon asked if the Planning Commission requires Feasibility Studies for everything that comes before it for Planning approval; and Ms. Burke stated for something that is impacting the residents this much. Mr. Simon stated he is asking the Chairman if this is a standard; and Ms. Burke stated it is a case-by-case basis, and

Mr. Tracey agreed. He stated what they are asking for is a Continuance, and they are asking for the EIA Study to be published. A woman from the audience asked where that would be available; and Mr. Tracey stated it would probably be on the Website. She asked why people cannot be informed as to the lights that are going to be shining in their back yards as not everyone goes on the Website. She stated she does not think it is fair as she lives in the back yard, and she just found out about this. She stated people have a right to be informed about what is going on in their back yards.

Mr. Tracey called the question and the Motion was read as follows: “Moved that based on the fact that the EIA document has been prepared but not discussed and based on the fact that the Planning Commission has received documentation from a variety of sources tonight to be assessed that there be a Continuance of the Snipes Tract Discussion with an Amendment that there also be a demographic study demonstrating need.

Mr. Tracey stated he feels the Amendment would have to be stricken. Mr. Halboth stated he feels there should be two separate Motions.

Mr. Wallace stated he feels there would have to have been information provided to the Board of Supervisors when they made their decision, and Mr. Benedetto stated there were multiple opportunities for the Board of Supervisors to make that decision including the National standard piece he discussed, and the Hearing that the Park Rec had; and the Board made a policy decision on this. He stated he understands the disagreement, but they just heard the National standard that 330 to 350 acres is needed for their residents. He stated they also just heard from YMS, Lacrosse, field hockey, and football talking about capacity issues. He stated while they can disagree, those things have already been discussed. Mr. Benedetto stated he was at the Park & Rec meeting that Mr. Simon discussed in November and no one else was there. A number of people called out from the audience that they did not know about it.

Ms. Kirk stated what they have is a Motion for a Continuance pending receipt and review of the Environmental Impact Study with an Amendment requested by Ms. Burke for an demographic study of need. She asked if there is a Second to that Motion that was Amended, and Mr. Tracey seconded the Motion.

Mr. Tracey and Ms. Burke were in favor, Mr. Halboth and Mr. Wallace were opposed.

Mr. Bryson stated he did not know what they were voting on. Ms. Burke stated the Motion is to Continue for the Environmental Impact Analysis as well as a Feasibility Study to show the demographics. Mr. Tracey stated that study exists.

Ms. Kirk stated the Motion has failed. Ms. Burke stated Mr. Bryson did not vote. Mr. Bryson stated he is Abstaining. Ms. Kirk stated the Motion has failed.

Mr. Majewski stated the lighting consultant, the representative from Carroll Engineering, and the representative from TPD are present this evening; and he asked if the Planning Commission has any questions of those three individuals, that they ask them tonight so that if a decision is not rendered tonight, they will not have to come back. Mr. Tracey stated they listened to a very thorough presentation from the lighting consultant in November; and he demonstrated that with the new high tech lighting, while you would see the 80' poles, there is no light spill.

Mr. Wallace asked that they hear the rest of the public comments this evening.

Mr. Dean Curtis, 23 Aspen Road, stated next season will mark twenty-five years of Lower Bucks Lacrosse which was started at Macclesfield Park and combined the neighboring Townships – Bristol Township, Lower Makefield Township, the Council Rock School District, and Neshaminy. Mr. Curtis stated they have grown from twelve players to as high as 450 although they are now down to 350 mainly due to the fact that at the peak they had all the High School players playing with them as well. He stated Lower Bucks Lacrosse is responsible for the development of Lacrosse at the High Schools - Council Rock North, Council Rock South, Pennsbury, Neshaminy, and Truman.

Mr. Curtis stated he would like to discuss several items that were noted which he feels were incorrect. He stated they have canceled twelve practices this year because of poor field conditions due to rain; and if they had fields that would drain the number would be less. Mr. Wallace asked when their season started, and Mr. Curtis stated they started March 1. He stated each Team practices only three times a week, and some Teams have missed 50% of their practices. Mr. Curtis stated they spent \$4,000 of their Budget to go indoors at a facility in New Jersey just to get in some practices. He stated they Budgeted \$3,000 for that; and the additional \$1,000 of this they charged back to their members.

Mr. Curtis stated without lights their organization would be 50% of its size. He stated their boys in Grades 5 through 8, which accounts for about 60% of their membership, all practice at Middletown Township Park; and their practices range from 6 p.m. to 9 p.m., and the end of those practices are under the lights. He stated the girls program in Grades 7 and 8 would be 50% of its size without lights because the Coaches they have are not available to coach until 7:30 p.m. He stated their program would not exist if they did not have lights.

Ms. Jeannette Kelley, 1 Austin Road, Pine Brook Farms, stated she appreciates how much Mr. Benedetto has made the plans available on the Website where people know where to look. She also thanked the Chair and the Vice Chair for trying to delay this so that they can get the information. Ms. Kelley stated she has lived in her neighborhood for five to seven years although her husband has been there twenty-five years; and she has talked to her neighbors about this project and a lot of people did not know that it was called the Snipes Tract. She stated when the Supervisors voted on it last June, a lot of her neighborhood did not know, and they had no idea until November when some of them found out about it when they were watching about Bright Farms and learned that they were putting in ball fields at Snipes. She stated she feels a large number of people in Pine Brook Farms still do not know about this. She stated she believes the rules are advising people who live within 500', but that is not very many homes because of the way that area is built. She stated she feels there is a large of proportion of people who would like to have something to say about this issue and do not have any idea that this is going on.

Mr. Ron Cancelliere, 1615 Fairfield Road, asked that they consider all that has been said as far as stormwater, pedestrian safety, traffic, and lighting, etc. He stated it is clear that this whole project is driven by the youth sports; and while this is a good thing, there are a lot of other residents that are not being served by something like this. He stated they discussed tonight how little is done as far as the "Park" part. He stated this is a very unique parcel of land. He stated he feels it is obvious the Supervisors are going to say that they will have fields; however, they should talk about "Park," and he does "not want to hear about a passive park and an active park as that is recreation." He stated that is nothing more than "rubber-stamped fields." He stated it is not something unique. He stated they should step back and look at the design and do something that will make them stand out from the rest of the communities that have nothing more than "stamped fields." He stated they should get the "Park" part of it in here. He stated they talked about walking trails and picnic areas and for Senior citizens there should be something that they can use and be proud of and not just a lot more fields with 80' lights. He stated he agrees that is needed, but they have heard that there are a declining number of students coming into First Grade. He stated they will never have enough fields to appease youth groups because the more fields you have, the more need they will show; and the more types of activities like Frisbee and skate board parks. He stated he moved to the community because of the Township's commitment to open space. He stated he is an educator and a coach and does understand the need for sports, but they need to weigh this against the design of this Park. He stated he would like to see no lights but that will severely limit what the youth groups desire in terms of more facilities and usage. He stated he feels they should take a step back and design something that they can be proud of. He stated they should look at buffers, and they should not put a refreshment stand near the road where people can see it; and it should be put

back in there somewhere. He stated he feels if they step back and make this unique, they will be able to come to an agreement that people will embrace to a certain extent; but not just again a rubber-stamped sports field.

Mr. Steve Severino, 1374 Revere Road, stated he is the President of Yardley Makefield Rookie Rugby which just started as an organization last year; and there were no fields available in the Township. He stated they were able to work closely with YMS who has been helping them get field time. He stated as they continue to grow, they will need more fields; and he feels Snipes will be an awesome multi-use facility not just for football, but also for rugby, Lacrosse, and many other sports.

Mr. Sean O'Hara, 360 Robin Hood Drive, stated he is President of YMS. He stated with regard to current and future needs, with the fields they currently have available to them, there are four to six teams playing on a field trying to get practices in because they do not have enough fields. He stated they share Field H at Macclesfield with football and baseball. He stated last year in the fall, one day they had all three sports playing on the same field – baseball playing in the infield while soccer and football were practicing in the outfield which he feels shows that there is a need for more fields. He stated 30% of YMS members do not even play on a Township field even though they pay User Fees for all the players of YMS. He stated they also pay to use Pennsbury School District fields. He stated they do not have enough fields for their current inventory of players, let alone their future needs.

Mr. Doug Krauss, 811 Queens Drive, stated he is a member of the Park & Rec Board; and he invited everyone to attend their meetings which are held once a month on the second Tuesday of the month. He stated their meetings are listed on the Lower Makefield Township Website. He stated they have a meeting tomorrow evening. Mr. Krauss stated the Township could still be built out by 10,000 more residents, and this could potentially add thousands of children. He stated when you look at demographics nearly 40% of the households are age 45 plus so as those houses are sold, more young families will be moving in as this is a bedroom community. He stated spending money today is an investment in the future for the Township as well.

Mr. Krauss stated he also represents the Ultimate Frisbee Club which is growing. He stated currently the boys and girls play on School District fields which are not in very good condition. They do host Tournaments, and they play other teams from other towns. He stated bringing people into the Township is good for the Township and raises funds for their organization. He stated they used to play on Memorial Park as an exception as it was not Permitted, but now there is a walking path and an Arboretum there now for those who like to walk so that Park does have the amenities that people have indicated they are looking for.

Mr. Krauss stated those amenities did remove the availability of flat field space. He stated last month their team hosted a Tournament, and they had to play in Ewing, Mercer County Community College, which was the only place they could get flat fields to host sixteen teams. He stated there is a demonstrated need.

Mr. Bryson asked if the design being shown for Snipes was developed by the Parks & Rec Board. Mr. Krauss stated it was a combination of all the different user groups that come in based on their need, and the Park & Rec Board worked with the engineers and the Supervisors. Mr. Krauss stated he has been on the Park & Rec Board for approximately a year and a half and this Park has been long in development before he was on the Board. Mr. Bryson asked if the Park Board dictated the program that is shown that there would be three fields, a small field, a concession stand and a skate park. Mr. Krauss stated he does not know that the correct word would be “dictate,” although they did provide input.

Mr. Bryson asked who they gave input to as he is trying to determine who did the programming and why it is three fields. He stated he is “lost” because they have this Plan, and Mr. Eisold kept referring to the fact that the Park & Rec Board directed him to do it this way; but Mr. Krauss has indicated that he just had input. Mr. Bryson asked who came up with the programming on the fields. Mr. Eisold stated the Park & Rec Board determined what needed to be put on the site. Mr. Bryson stated Park & Rec dictated to Mr. Eisold what would go on the Plan. Mr. Bryson asked Mr. Krauss what the Park & Rec Board used to come up to say that they needed three fields, a small field, a skate park, etc. He asked if they were just maximizing everything they could get on the site or were they using an analysis of what they needed for LBL, Frisbee, rugby etc.

Mr. Krauss stated Park & Recreation takes input from the various user groups based on understanding their needs and where the gaps are in the Township based on space allocation. He stated prior to his joining the Board there were probably other discussions on the design. Mr. Bryson stated they work with the user groups, and the need is then evaluated; and then either the decision was made by Boucher & James, or the Park & Rec Board said “this is what you are going to do,” or he asked if someone from the Supervisors said this is what they want. He stated this is where he is getting lost.

Mr. Jason Simon stated this is an involved process because there are other fields within the community that they use. He stated Macclesfield Park is the primary park used for soccer. He stated there is an inventory problem at Macclesfield Park that they have heard about from football, Lacrosse who are not there, PAA, and soccer. Mr. Simon stated there is a problem at Macclesfield getting access to the rectangular multi-purpose fields which can be used by soccer, football, rugby, Lacrosse, and field hockey.

Mr. Simon stated everyone has an inventory challenge. He stated YMS is condensed because they need more fields to be able to support their National programming which is requiring them to use smaller sided fields for younger ages which creates an inventory problem across the spectrum. He stated football cannot get everything in, and Lacrosse was pushed out of the community because there was no space. He stated the reason there is no space is because all of them can only practice and play in these windows of time during their designated seasons. He stated in order to alleviate all the pressure on the space, the Parks & Rec Board met with the user groups to talk about the opportunity to provide inventory relief at Macclesfield Park and at the same time be able to increase opportunities for use of the fields for the user groups that have been pushed out. He stated this was a collaborative effort based upon their current numbers, what they felt their anticipated growth will be, and anticipated new user groups coming on.

Mr. Simon stated the original plans for Snipes had ten fields on them in 2009. He stated they were different sized small sided fields. He stated what is now being shown is a down-sized modified version. He stated when all of the user groups got together, they looked at this configuration of three full-sized fields and the small sided single field; and everyone felt this would relieve the pressure they have on being able to schedule events at Macclesfield Park.

Mr. Bryson stated what bothers him is Mr. Simon saying, “we feel.” Mr. Simon stated there are hard numbers. Mr. Wallace asked if they can give the Planning Commission the hard numbers, and Mr. Simon stated he can. Mr. Simon stated he has 800 players in his League. He stated across the street there are three small sided baseball fields, and he has four age groups playing on them plus three hours a week which they donate to the Magik Program which is for autistic children. Mr. Simon stated he can only play one game a night at a time on each of those three fields. He stated when they go through their scheduling they cannot get all 29 teams scheduled inside of that three or four hour window when they are playing their games. Mr. Bryson stated he understands that for baseball.

Mr. Bryson stated the user groups came up with an analysis that dictated to the Parks & Rec Board; however, Mr. Simon stated “dictated” is not the correct word, rather they collaborated with them. Mr. Bryson stated then the Park & Rec Board engaged Mr. Eisold’s firm to do this Plan with the Township Supervisors’ blessing.

Mr. Benedetto stated it is exactly as Mr. Simon has described it with the use groups, with Park & Rec, and they all collaborated in public.

Mr. Bryson stated it should then be easy to get the Planning Commission the analysis on the fields they need. Mr. Simon stated these analysis have been done, and they are in the Minutes of the Park & Recreation Board. Mr. Simon stated there is also a Park & Recreation Department in the Township that they work with. Mr. Simon stated what they are asking for is validation that there is a need for these fields, and they have been at this for years before tonight. He stated they need this inventory added to the system. He stated he has been involved in public life in the Township for a long time, and this Snipes project has been designated for sports fields.

Mr. Curtin stated with regard to Lacrosse, on Monday they have twelve hours of field needs over three fields to account for all their teams that need to practice on Monday. He stated on Tuesdays they have seven and a half hours of practice scheduled. On Wednesdays they need nine hours, Thursdays ten and a half hours, Fridays an hour and a half although if something happens in the middle of the week they use Friday to reschedule so there are usually more hours used on Friday than an hour and a half. On Saturdays, they need fourteen and half hours, and on Sundays four and a half hours.

Mr. Wallace stated he understands that the Board of Supervisors has approved this to move forward, and Mr. Benedetto agreed. Mr. Wallace stated the Planning Commission's task is to determine how it is built, and they are not here to discuss whether or not it is going to be built as that decision has already been made by the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Benedetto stated the Planning Commission can make a recommendation one way or another. He stated if the Planning Commission indicates that they are not going to approve the Plan as is, the Board of Supervisors will make a decision based on that recommendation. He stated this has been in the Master Plan, and a policy decision on this was made by the Board of Supervisors. He stated it is very clear that the current Board of Supervisors for close to a year has made a decision that this project is a priority for them, and they want to build fields. He stated they want to do it the right way, do it responsibly, and be good neighbors; but they want to build the fields. He stated with regard to the need, YMS lost a field when they built the Dog Park; and now they have less fields than they had. He stated PAA has baseball fields on the Macclesfield facility and football uses Macclesfield as well. He stated Lacrosse, field hockey, and rugby are not even playing in the Township because there are not fields for them to play on. Mr. Wallace stated the Board of Supervisors passed a policy that they have "green-lighted" this project.

Mr. Benedetto stated the Board of Supervisors prioritized Snipes as part of the \$15 million borrowing for the Bond Issue. Ms. Burke stated that could be re-allocated. Mr. Benedetto stated they specifically designated Snipes as part of it, and they specifically stated repeatedly that Snipes was a priority which has been talked about

talked about at Park & Rec meetings and by the Board of Supervisors. He stated this is not a determination that they are not sure that they want to do it, and he stated the only reason it came back to the Planning Commission was because previously it could not be determined by the Planning Commission to make a recommendation.

Mr. Benedetto stated they have now had Carroll Engineering look at it, and they want to move the project forward. He stated the Planning Commission can make a recommendation of yes or no, and they want to follow the process; but the Board of Supervisors wants to do this project. He stated all five Supervisors voted to borrow money to get this finally funded. He stated they do want to do it responsibly. He stated people have indicated that they are okay with the fields provided it is done responsibly, but now he feels that they would “rather it just go away;” but that is not going to happen since the current Board of Supervisors have determined that they want to proceed with this project. He stated they are also not going to put it up for a Referendum, as that is not how it works in Government. Mr. Benedetto stated people are elected to make decisions for them, and there would be no need for a Board of Supervisors if everything were put out to a Voter Referendum; and this is not how it works in the Second Class Township Code.

Ms. Floss Trinsey stated she sees that they need this, but she feels that all of the neighbors in her area are being “railroaded” with this. She stated they just found out about this in November. Mr. Benedetto stated this has been discussed and in the Master Plan for ten to fifteen years. Ms. Trinsey stated there were no lights.

Ms. Burke stated she feels there was no notice. Mr. Benedetto stated he has had issues with notice by the Township in the past, but in this particular instance there has to be some personal responsibility by residents. He stated they had their opportunity in November, December, and again now.

Ms. Trinsey stated the Township wants this, but the neighbors do not; and she feels they should have some concessions. She stated they know they need it because of the numbers, but they should be given concessions. Mr. Benedetto asked what the concessions would be, and Ms. Trinsey stated no lights. Mr. Benedetto stated they cannot do that because they cannot have fields without lights. Mr. Benedetto stated they can make sure that they will not have a stormwater management issue and that the traffic flows correctly at the intersection. He stated this property was purchased for the purpose of putting in fields.

A number of people in the audience began calling out despite being asked a number of times to stop. Ms. Kirk stated this is what occurred at the last Planning Commission meeting when it was shut down, and she asked that those present calm down adding the Planning Commission still has another item on their Agenda they need to discuss.

Ms. Burke stated she is hearing from the athletic associations that they need and want their fields, but she is conflicted when she sees the other chart showing the decrease in the population and the decrease in the number of children. Ms. Burke stated it seems that the athletic organizations and the Park & Recreation made this decision, and she feels that an independent decision should be made that shows that they are actually needed. Mr. Simon stated they have followed the process, and they have been very public about it.

Ms. Kirk stated the Motion to Continue with the request for the Feasibility Study died. Mr. Bryson stated the Addendum died. Ms. Kirk stated they need another Motion.

Mr. Bryson moved to Continue the meeting.

Ms. Kirk asked if they are scheduling it for a date certain.

Mr. Wallace stated he does not feel the meeting should not be held until the Environmental issues have been “flushed out.”

Mr. Bryson asked what happens if the Planning Commission takes no action and asks for a Continuance, and he asked if the Board of Supervisors could still take action on it as the Planning Commission is just an advisory board. Ms. Burke stated she believes that they could; and they could waive the requirement that the Planning Commission hear public comment and render an advisory opinion, but she does not feel that it would be in their best interest. Ms. Kirk stated she does not feel that is what the Board of Supervisors wants to do which is why it is back in front of the Planning Commission again. Mr. Bryson stated it is 11:00 and they have another item to discuss; and while this is all “healthy-engaged” discussion, they have to Continue this as he does not feel they are going to work this out tonight. Ms. Kirk stated the Planning Commission can make a recommendation to Continue, they can make a recommendation to approve what was presented, they can make a recommendation to deny what was presented, or they can make a recommendation to make no recommendation whatsoever.

Mr. Eisold stated with regard to the Environmental Impact Assessment, the issues that have been discussed tonight will be in that report, and will say basically the same thing. He stated all of the important issues have been discussed tonight and in November at length. He stated he does not feel anything will come out of the report that will surprise anyone, and it will be what they have discussed just in a written format. He stated the Assessment is what is typically required for projects of much larger scope such as large housing and commercial developments.

Mr. Bryson stated the issue he is having is that if the Planning Commission makes a number of recommendations, he questions who will make sure that they will do them. Mr. Eisold stated the Board of Supervisors will have the ultimate say. Mr. Eisold stated when the baseball fields were designed across the street, they asked for a Waiver of the EIA; and it was granted for that. He stated they originally requested a Waiver for this project; but then based on recent discussions with the Township staff and the issues he was hearing coming out, they felt it for this project it was appropriate to do the study. He added there is still nothing earth shattering that will surprise anyone; and the study will talk about lighting, traffic, and other things that have already been discussed.

Mr. Bryson moved, Mr. Wallace seconded and it was unanimously carried to Continue the meeting to May 22, 2017.

Mr. Benedetto left the meeting at this time.

#### #652 – ARTIS SENIOR LIVING LLC – PRELIMINARY/FINAL LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL

Mr. Edward Murphy, attorney, was present with Mr. Eric Britz, Project engineer. Mr. Murphy stated the project has been before the Township Boards and Commissions since March, 2016 when the first Sketch Plan was submitted. He stated since that time there have been multiple appearances before the Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors, and the Zoning Hearing Board. He stated they obtained Zoning relief from the Zoning Hearing Board last October, and they commenced with the engineering and submission of the Land Development Plans that are before the Planning Commission this evening. He stated they appeared briefly before the Planning Commission in January, 2017 to advise that the Plans had been resubmitted, and that they would appear before the Planning Commission once review letters had been received. He stated most recently they had a meeting at the PennDOT offices two weeks ago with the Township traffic consultant to discuss issues regarding frontage improvements.

Mr. Murphy stated they have seen the April 20, 2017 Boucher & James review letter, the May 3, 2017 letter from the Township traffic consultant that summarizes where they were following the meeting with PennDOT, and as of 5:00 p.m. this evening he was provided a copy of the May 8, review from the Township's sewer consultant. Mr. Murphy stated they have no issues with any of those review letters. He stated tonight they are requesting Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan approval subject to compliance with the review letters.

Ms. Kirk stated in the April 20, 2017 letter from Boucher & James, there are fourteen Waivers being requested, and Mr. Murphy agreed. He stated they have discussed all of them previously during public discussions in the earlier part of the project, and he believes that Mr. Eisold's office supports them.

Mr. Majewski stated the Application was just for Preliminary Land Development approval; and Mr. Murphy stated they had always intended to request Preliminary/Final, and he renewed that request this evening. Mr. Majewski stated he assumes they will pay the Application Fees for Final, and Mr. Murphy agreed.

Ms. Burke stated she is concerned about the Waivers on replacement of trees to permit less trees than required and the size of the storm drainage pipe. Mr. Eisold stated with regard to the storm pipe, that requirement has been in the Ordinance for many years. He stated it was a requirement of PennDOT for State roads. He stated 15" pipe is a standard that is used everywhere, and this part of the Ordinance should be changed because there are applications when it is better to use 15" pipe rather than the 18" pipe even though the Ordinance stated that the minimum size must be 18".

Ms. Burke asked about the slope - Waiver request #11. Mr. Murphy stated this is not a problem as it is gravity, and the head pressure will push the water through the pipe.

Ms. Burke asked about the trees – Waiver #9. Mr. Britz stated they are required to replace 175 trees, and for that specific requirement they are providing 91 trees; however in total for the project they are providing 177 trees. He stated there are 86 trees that are being provided that do not count toward the requirement as they count toward other requirements in the Code. He noted street trees do not count toward replacement trees. Mr. Bryson state the Code does not allow them to "double dip." Mr. Eisold stated they cannot count as a replacement tree a tree that is required as a street tree or a buffer.

Mr. Majewski stated this is another part of the Ordinance which he feels definitely needs to be changed. He stated the Tree Replacement Ordinance was passed a few years ago, and included a provision that trees that are replacement trees do not count toward tree replacement which makes no sense. Ms. Kirk stated that was the Ordinance that was before the Planning Commission in the fall that they had issues with when they tried to do a comparison.

Mr. Tracey moved , Mr. Bryson seconded and it was unanimously carried to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the Preliminary and Final Land Development Plan for Artis Senior Living consistent with:

- 1) Applicant's compliance with comments provided by Traffic, Planning & Design, Inc. in their letter dated 5/3/17;
- 2) Compliance with the requirements as set forth in the Boucher & James letter dated 4/20/17 including the Waivers;
- 3) Compliance with the 5/8/17 review letter from the Township sewer engineer.

#### 2016 PLANNING COMMISSION ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. Tracey stated according to the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, Planning Commissions are required to provide an Annual Report. He stated Mr. Majewski has put one together for the Planning Commission's review; and Mr. Tracey stated he feels that the Planning Commission should review it, and at the next meeting they can approve it.

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Chad Wallace, Secretary

