

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES – JANUARY 13, 2025

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on January 13, 2025. Mr. Bush called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. and welcomed new member, Virginia Torbert.

Those present:

Planning Commission: Colin Coyle, Chair
 Tejinder Gill, Vice Chair
 Adrian Costello, Secretary
 Tony Bush, Member
 Virginia Torbert, Member

Others: Dan McLoone, Planner
 Maureen Burke-Carlton, Township Solicitor
 Barbara Kirk, Township Solicitor (joined and left
 meeting in progress)
 Pat Foley, Township Engineer
 Daniel Grenier, Supervisor Liaison

REORGANIZATION

The meeting was turned over to Ms. Carlton who asked for nominations for Chair of the Planning Commission for 2025.

Mr. Bush moved, Mr. Costello seconded and it was unanimously carried to elect Colin Coyle as Chair of the Planning Commission for 2025.

The meeting was turned over to Mr. Coyle.

Mr. Bush moved, Mr. Costello seconded and it was unanimously carried to elect Tejinder Gill as Vice Chair of the Planning Commission for 2025.

Mr. Bush moved, Mr. Coyle seconded and it was unanimously carried to elect Adrian Costello as Secretary of the Planning Commission for 2025.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE 12/09/24 MEETING

Mr. Costello moved and Mr. Gill seconded to approve the Minutes from the December 9, 2024 meeting. Motion carried with Ms. Torbert abstained.

#693 – 1511 LINDENHURST MINOR SUBDIVISION – DISCUSSION AND TABLING
Sewage Facilities Planning Modules Component 4A-Municipal Planning Agency
Review

Individual and Community On-Lot Disposal of Sewage & SALDO Waiver Request
Tax Parcel #20-003-017

Subdivision Lot containing an existing single-family dwelling into 2 single-family
Residential Lots (creating 1 new Building Lot)

Mr. Coyle stated this matter was before the Planning Commission in October requesting a sewer hook-up into a neighboring Subdivision on the Lot to be subdivided. He stated there was difficulty getting Aqua to do so without a significant re-route of the proposed sewer and water services. Mr. Coyle stated they are now before the Planning Commission requesting permission to put a well on site and on-site septic.

Mr. Heath Dumack, engineer, was present. He stated they are the engineers of Record for the Minor Subdivision that was previously approved by the Planning Commission. He stated after approximately ten months of negative interactions with Aqua, they are back before the Planning Commission looking for the Sewer Planning Module approval as well as the potential Waiver for utilizing a proposed well and septic instead of running a new sanitary line.

Mr. Dumack stated Dolington Estates is behind the existing single-family home, and they have a sanitary line/summit manhole along with an Easement that was intended in the late 1990's to service the existing house. He stated the house has an existing septic system, and Aqua wanted to connect the existing house to that manhole as was foreseen almost thirty years ago. He stated the issue they have been having with Aqua is that they will not permit them to access the manhole for proposed sanitary for the new Lot. He stated they are instructing them to run 1,700' of force main to an existing manhole where Triumph Building Group built seven to eight homes a few years ago. He stated the intent of that line was to service two other existing homes that have failing septic that have expressed interest in connecting into the Aqua sanitary.

Mr. Dumack stated they got an initial cost estimate and proposal from Shanahan, and those numbers were extreme with a total cost without extras or potential problems of \$317,000 which came out to approximately \$79,000 per home to run the sanitary line and connect.

Mr. Dumack stated in discussions with Mr. Majewski and the client, the suggestion was to come back before the Planning Commission for a Waiver of the Sanitary Sewer Ordinance to allow them to put a new septic system in for the new building lot.

Mr. Coyle stated in the Waiver request letter from Obermeyer it indicates in 2A2 as follows: “If public sewer facilities are not available, the developer shall provide for sewage disposal on an individual lot basis according to the rules, regulations, terms, definitions, and conditions of the Individual Sewage Disposal System Application and Certification Procedure for the County in accordance with the regulations of the County Department of Health.” Mr. Coyle asked why they are requesting a Waiver from that requirement. Mr. Dumack stated they are not, and they are requesting a Waiver from the Public Sewer requirement, and they are willing to do the septic system as per the County of Bucks.

Mr. Coyle stated the letter they have been provided indicates that they are requesting the Waivers, and one of them relates to a private sewage disposal system on lot. Mr. Dumack stated he does not know why that was indicated since they are not requesting a Waiver from septic, rather they are requesting a Waiver of the public sewer requirements. He added that the Ordinance requirements are that as long as there is public sewer within 1,000’ of the property, they are required to connect to it.

Mr. Coyle asked Ms. Carlton if it is correct that 2A1 would be the correct Waiver request which is a Waiver from the requirement to connect, and 2A2 and 2A3 would not be salient; and Ms. Carlton agreed. Mr. Coyle asked if the Planning Commission should reject Waiver requests 2A2 and 2A3 or request that the Applicant re-submit the request for Waivers without 2 and 3. Ms. Carlton stated she would recommend a request for a re-submittal.

Barbara Kirk, attorney, joined the meeting at this time and stated she is present on behalf of the Township on this matter. Ms. Kirk stated the actual Waiver is from 178-103 2A1. She stated technically there is a sewer line within 1,500’ of the property and would otherwise be required for connection. She stated the issue is that Aqua is refusing to allow that connection to the sewer line within the 1,500’. She stated if the Township insists that the developer proceeds with

connection as Aqua is demanding by constructing a force main, the Township may run afoul of some current Case Law that prohibits making a developer construct post off-site improvements.

Mr. Coyle stated Item #2 references Section 178-103 and he asked if A1, 2, and 3 is just a copy and paste from our Code, and Ms. Kirk agreed that they copied the entirety of the Code dealing with public water and public sewer.

Mr. Coyle stated it appears that the request from the Applicant is a Waiver from the entirety of 178-103 A which would be a Waiver to not have to provide any sewage disposal related to the Subdivision. Ms. Kirk stated that is not accurate, and it would have to be just a Waiver from 2A1 for connection within the public sanitary sewer. She added that the engineer here for the developer is proposing both a well and a septic system in lieu of the public connection. She stated she feels that the attorney just cut and pasted the applications, and did not realize that she had to clarify for the Planning Commission the specifics of what they were asking.

Mr. Coyle asked if this is being considered a request for two Waivers or a request for five Waivers where we can reject individual Sub-Sections which is favorable to the Applicant. Ms. Kirk stated if the Planning Commission would feel more comfortable because the attorney cited the entirety of the Ordinance, she would suggest doing it in parts approving the Waiver request for 2A1 and denying Waivers for 2A2 and 2A3.

Mr. Coyle asked Mr. McLoone if the Township is in favor of approving this; and Mr. McLoone stated he feels in light of how far away the sewer is, it makes sense.

Mr. Grenier stated as the Board Liaison who voted on the Policy and these rules, the Board of Supervisors has generally been clear about the Policy they would like to enforce moving forward. He stated while he does not know how the Board of Supervisors would vote on this specifically, there is still a lot going on with the sewer system. He stated we are still going through the Act 167 Plan several years later. He stated what is being discussed tonight is something that the Board of Supervisors will consider in addition to everything that the Planning Commission has discussed.

Mr. Costello stated over the years when wells, septic, and private systems come before the Board of Supervisors, the Board has been clear about their feelings on that. He stated he would not be in favor of this Waiver, but would recommend to the Board of Supervisors because this is a new situation, to see if the Board could do anything and get involved to rectify with Aqua to help with this development.

Mr. Dumack stated they have been working with Mr. Majewski from the Township since August trying to get a meeting set up with Aqua to discuss options, but Aqua has been unresponsive and declined to meet. He stated it was an enormous effort to bring sanitary in initially for the existing home on the existing Lot and the proposed Lot, and then Aqua wanted them to be responsible for connecting two additional homes that had failing septic systems. He stated at the time, the best offer they gave was an additional \$15,000 to \$20,000 per home for compensation for the effort to run that sanitary line 1,700 plus feet. He stated that does not include the engineering design and having to go to the DEP for the General Permit because there is a stream crossing. Mr. Dumack stated he believes that when they get down to Dolington Road, that is a PennDOT road, and they will have to deal with PennDOT and the Highway Occupancy Permit process to connect to the sewer system in the PennDOT right-of-way.

Mr. Costello stated while he empathizes with the position the developer is in, his feelings are personally still the same.

Mr. Bush asked Ms. Kirk to elaborate on the Case Law she noted which could create some issues for the Township. Ms. Kirk stated in that Case a developer was being asked to construct improvements off site of the actual property, and the Commonwealth Court indicated that they could not do that and the Municipalities Planning Code did not allow them to do off-site improvements of that nature. Ms. Kirk stated the situation being discussed this evening is unusual in that the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance as created by the Township dealt with the public water and public sewer connections because at the time the Township had a Water and Sewer Authority. She stated that system has since been sold to another entity – Aqua – which is still a public utility that is now making a demand for a developer to construct what in effect is an off-site improvement by running a lateral force along Dolington Road up toward the Triumph Building home site. Ms. Kirk stated she does not know if the Board of Supervisors approves that requirement how the Township would fare in a Court

review of that instance. She stated the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance does allow for a private system if public sewer facilities are not available, which technically they are not in this case because Aqua is refusing the connection. She stated she does not see how a developer would be “punished” by the Courts for wanting to put in a septic system.

Mr. Gill asked if Aqua has denied any other cases. He stated while there is not a lot of development right now, there are a few Subdivisions that will be happening and some new developments. He asked if they are going to have the same issue with Aqua. Ms. Kirk stated she is not aware of any since she does not know if there are many new development applications that have been submitted to the Township. She stated this is the only one that she has heard of where Aqua has not been cooperative in allowing the connection. She stated the connection for the existing house is allowed, and it is only the second Lot being created that would be going into the existing connection. She stated it is not a development of thirty to fifty homes trying to connect.

Mr. Dumack stated their original design included sanitary for the existing house and sanitary for the new proposed lot going into the summit manhole behind the existing house. He stated Ebert Engineering and ultimately Aqua both said they would not allow it.

Mr. Bush asked if under the Agreement to sell the sewer system by the Township to Aqua there is a mechanism for resolving these types of issues in that Agreement. Mr. Grenier stated what we have experienced to date is that if there have been any issues at all with Aqua, when the Supervisors have reached out to Aqua, they have been very responsive. He stated they have been very responsive to e-mails or phone calls from members of the Board of Supervisors and members of our local State delegation. Mr. Grenier stated he would be willing to help the developer with this issue to help make the connections.

Ms. Kirk stated she was involved with the acquisition of the appropriate Easements and Titles to transfer the line, but she is not sure of the exact terms as to what Aqua should do in the event that a new Land Development project comes along.

Mr. Grenier stated a question about existing homes that have on-lot septic was specifically asked of all of the Bidders, and he recalls that their responses were positive towards assisting in getting those connections updated to the public system although how that works in practice could be different.

Mr. Coyle stated there is an existing home that is served by septic. He asked Ms. Kirk if that septic were to fail, and the property owner needed to install a new septic system, would they need to come before the Planning Commission for a Waiver from the sewer requirement or would they be permitted to just replace the failed septic system. Ms. Kirk stated they would be able to replace the system because it would not fall within the Township's Subdivision and Land Development Application at that time. Mr. Coyle stated they are not talking about maintaining the use of the existing system, rather there is an Applicant requesting that we permit them to subdivide into two separate lots; and in order to create additional value, they are now requesting a Waiver from a standing Ordinance that he is not aware that we have waived in the past. He stated he is not comfortable granting that first Waiver without a strong hardship reason from the Applicant.

Mr. Gill asked if we should see if the Board of Supervisors could assist with this first; and then if they have exhausted all channels and the only way to proceed would be to spend \$317,000 to connect the sewer system, that could be the hardship.

Ms. Torbert asked if it matters how many people will live in each of the houses. She stated when private septic companies come out, they want to know how many people are going to live in a house. Mr. Dumack stated it is normally rated on bedrooms. He stated they will probably have a four to five-bedroom home which is fairly standard for what homeowners are looking for in this era. Ms. Torbert asked if the system for the current house has been evaluated and rated, and Mr. Dumack stated he believes that the existing septic needs repairs.

Mr. Coyle stated the Planning Commission could accept the Waivers as discussed earlier as to how that might be structured in favor of the Applicant, deny the Waivers, or Table the matter to give the Board of Supervisors time to see if they could engage Aqua. Mr. Dumack was asked his preference of these three options; and Mr. Dumack stated he would be in favor of seeing if they could get Aqua to engage, although for over nine months they have been trying to do that giving Aqua a number of options.

Mr. Grenier asked that he be provided with the information so that he can see what the Board of Supervisors can do.

Mr. Costello moved and Mr. Bush seconded to Table the request to give the Applicant time to work with the Board of Supervisors and the Township to try to work with Aqua one more time to see if they come up with a better solution that works for everybody.

Mr. Costello stated this is an important decision because if we were to give a Variance, we are setting a new policy. He stated this is the first time that it has come up in this new arrangement, and we may have to change our perspective on what our Township rules are. He stated we have to make sure that we try everything; and if it does not work, and we have no way to get it done, we need to consider what our new policy is since this could happen every time.

Ms. Torbert agreed that this would be setting a precedent. She added that there are a lot of single-family homes on two to five acres throughout the Township, and she agrees it is worth another effort to try to work something out. Mr. Grenier asked Mr. McLoone to look into how many homes are on septic in the Township which could be impacted by this.

Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Kirk left the meeting at this time.

#697 – HOWIE LOT LINE CHANGE – DISCUSSION AND TABLING

Tax Parcels #20-008-049, #20-008-075, #20-048-075-001

R-2 Residential Medium-Density Zoning District

1566 Woodside Road & 1515 Rolling Green Road

Proposed Lot Line Change & Lot Consolidation

Mr. McLoone stated they are proposing a Lot Line Change and Lot Consolidation transferring .165 acres from Tax Map Parcel #20-8-49 to Tax Map Parcel #20-8-75-1

Mr. McLoone stated TMPs 1 and 2 will be consolidated with the resulting acreage of the parcel ending in 49 being 1.798 acres and the resulting acreage of parcel 1 will be 1.77 acres. He stated both contain single-family detached dwellings, and the one along Woodside contains a shed. He stated both Lots will continue to be served by on-lot water and sewer facilities.

Mr. Ken Howie was present with his neighbor, Ms. Michelle Stambaugh.

Mr. Howie stated he purchased his property at 1515 Rolling Green Road in 2020, and Ms. Stambaugh has lived at her property on Woodside for a

couple decades. He stated Ms. Stambaugh was in the process of listing her property for sale last year, and he had approached her about acquiring part of her property that is to the rear of a three-car garage that was built by the previous owners of his property. He stated that property would add to his yard area with the intended purpose of providing a flat open area for his children to play. Mr. Howie stated he and Ms. Stambaugh came to an agreement that they would carve off the .16 acre parcel and do a Lot Line Change on an existing piece of his property.

Mr. Howie stated they received feedback from both Bucks County and Lower Makefield Township which was provided by Mr. Majewski.

Mr. Howie stated they just received the list of additional requests presented by the Township engineer today. He stated he and Ms. Stambaugh took a quick look at that and will be following up with Cavanaugh, the surveyor, to make sure that they are addressing the issues. He added that they do have some questions which he is not sure should be addressed tonight or should be discussed off-line between Mr. Majewski and Cavanaugh.

Ms. Stambaugh stated she and Mr. Howie had questions about Points #2, #3, and #4 regarding access on her end on Woodside. She stated there is a typo on Points #2 and #11 which state Woodlands Road. Ms. Stambaugh stated this is a straight-forward Lot Line change for a small part of her property that they have not used in a while that Mr. Howie and his family can utilize as a flat parcel that is adjacent to their carriage house.

Mr. McLoone stated letters were provided to the Planning Commission from the Bucks County Planning Commission and RVE for review. He stated the letter from Bucks County Planning Commission is more administrative addressing some editorial matters, and they also had the comment that a single-family house is a use by right and not a non-conformity.

Mr. Coyle stated in the Bucks County Planning Commission letter they talked about the shed setback being 75', but we just made an Ordinance adjustment to reduce that. Mr. McLoone stated that is correct, and he was confused by that as well. He stated any shed greater than 200' needs to be 10' from the property line and less than 200' needs to be 5' from the property line.

Mr. Foley stated once the Applicants have discussion with Cavanaugh, they can reach out to him to go over some of the comments in more detail. He stated he did include in the review letter, relocating the shed since it is now on the proposed rear property line. He stated he also discussed the Dedication of Woodside Road since currently the parcel goes up to the approximate center line of Woodside Road. He stated the third item to discuss is the Easement because the existing stone driveway occurs on the two subject parcels and also the parcel to the west as well. He stated they were looking for clarification on that. Mr. Coyle stated the Plan indicates an asphalt driveway; and Mr. Foley stated the asphalt driveway from Woodside Road turns into a stone driveway once you get past the dwelling close to the existing shed. Mr. Foley stated it extends a little bit further north into the new portion of the property for the Rolling Green Road parcel as well.

Mr. Howie stated with regard to the shed, there was a comment from Bucks County and also from Mr. Foley. Mr. Howie stated Mr. Foley had indicated that the shed should be relocated, and the suggestion from Bucks County was to note that as an Easement for the shed since it is an existing structure. Mr. Howie stated he and Ms. Stambaugh would be comfortable with just granting the Easement because it does not have the setback, and he asked if that would be reasonable. Mr. Foley stated they are proposing a new Lot Line and creating a non-conformity. Mr. Coyle asked if the Lot Line could be moved back 10'. Mr. Coyle stated he would rather not Record an Easement and force that relationship onto any future neighbors who may occupy these properties. He stated he feels that it is a better choice at this point to request that the Applicant either agree to move the shed or make a small 10' adjustment into the Lot Line. He stated he understands that there are costs involved either way. He added that we have to consider potential future property owners who may not get along as well as Mr. Howie and Ms. Stambaugh do.

Ms. Stambaugh she has had this property for over twenty years, and that shed has been there for twenty-five to thirty years. She stated it will eventually fall down and any potential owners have been positioned from a marketing perspective that it is a "grandfathered-Easement shed." She stated she does not personally want to put money into removing it, and she would appreciate this being just a simple Lot Line change.

Mr. Coyle stated it is grandfathered under the current parcel and any adjustments to the parcel. Mr. Costello stated he feels the three options are to move the Line, take down the shed, or move the shed.

Mr. Coyle stated they would need to clarify #10 with regard to the stone drive. He stated they would not need an Easement if the Applicant on Woodside does not want to retain right of access to that small wedge of gravel, and it would just convey with the new Lot. Mr. Howie stated this is in Point #4 and Point #10, and there was a question about the right-of-way and the relevance to the Lot Line change that they are proposing. He stated they would like clarification on Point #10.

Ms. Stambaugh stated she had a question about any Easement rights from Woodside Road to the Rolling Green side as it is really not necessary. She stated the back of her driveway is gravel and has been. She stated it is a historic farm which was originally parceled out where Mr. Howie's property is. She stated there is also another parcel to the left. She stated she had questions when she read through the 23 points for "this friendly Lot Line change."

Mr. Coyle asked Mr. Foley if the right-of-way relates to access along Woodside Road and not the driveway itself, and Mr. Foley agreed it is from Woodside Road. Mr. Foley stated the driveway extends back through the property right where the property lines change. Mr. Coyle stated he is questioning Item #4 on the RVE letter. Mr. Foley stated what they are talking about in #4 is Woodside Road, and they are looking to Dedicate the 40' to the Township.

Ms. Stambaugh asked if it is not Dedicated to the Township already. She stated she has been there over 20 years, and the Township has access to the utility lines on the property line anyway. She stated there is no right-of-way access for Mr. Howie's property to come through. She stated they all have their own independent access. Mr. Coyle stated he believes that this relates to the frontage along Woodside Road, and Mr. Foley is just trying to address what he sees as an issue with the right-of-way of Woodside Road; and Mr. Foley agreed. He stated traditionally the parcels used to be described to the center line of the road with a public right-of-way Easement that was within the parcel. He stated what they are requesting here is for that particular piece of right-of-way to be Dedicated to the Township so that it does not become the homeowner's responsibility at this point.

Mr. Coyle asked Mr. Foley if the Township does not currently have a right-of-way; and Mr. Foley stated there could be fundamentally an Easement or an ultimate right-of-way. Mr. Foley noted the two interior iron pins found, and he stated they are not really 40' from the property line. He asked if there is any additional documentation that their surveyor could share with him regarding the right-of-way width in front of the parcel. He stated traditionally as these parcels get

re-developed, this frontage usually gets Dedicated to the Township. Mr. Coyle asked if Mr. Foley is indicating that there is a utility that has been located within that space, and he is asking that instead of an Easement that was probably Recorded, that the frontage be Dedicated to the Township so that the Township would be responsible for any damage or repair to that utility rather than the homeowner; and Mr. Foley agreed. Mr. Foley stated the request is that the Township have that frontage property.

Ms. Stambaugh stated Mr. Jim Bray could attest that there are at least five or six two hundred year-old sycamore trees on that part of Woodside Road. She stated she does not know how that is handled from an engineering perspective. Mr. Coyle stated he does not believe that anyone is requesting any changes to that area, and it is just about Dedicating that portion of land to the ownership of the Township so that the Township would be responsible for any buried utilities that would require repair or maintenance rather than Ms. Stambaugh.

Mr. Coyle asked if this will be a requirement for the adjustment of the Lot Line or just a recommendation that is being made. Mr. Foley stated the Right-of-Way offer for Dedication is proposed and it is up to the Township whether they want to accept it for Dedication or they could decline the Dedication and it would then just revert back to the owner how it is currently. He stated the first step is the offering of that Dedication to the Township. Mr. Coyle stated he would recommend that the Township speak with the landowners off-line to clarify this.

Mr. Howie stated he understands that they will need to clarify all of these points including the three options with the shed which were discussed this evening and provide an updated set of drawings and legal descriptions to reflect the comments. Mr. Howie stated they also received some comments from Bucks County, and he asked if those are requirements as well or should he be following Mr. Foley's list as the primary set of revisions to make. Mr. McLoone stated the Bucks County letter is not a requirement, and it is more just recommendations provided to the Township. He stated it is a requirement of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Code that the Plan be sent to Bucks County so it is more of a Statutory requirement that Bucks County review it.

Mr. Coyle asked about #13 in Mr. Foley's letter with regard to the ponds. Mr. Foley stated since the property was coming before the Township, they wanted the property to be understood from a historical standpoint regarding stormwater management; and it is more of a clarification. Mr. Grenier stated if it is a Waters of the State, it is regulated by Pennsylvania Code, Title 25, Chapter 105 so it would be good for the landowners to know if those are regulated Waters of the State and inform them of what they could or could not do without Permits from the State. He stated if it is a stormwater management facility, it is regulated differently than a pond. He stated the Township is going through a Stormwater Ordinance change, so it would be good for the Township to know as well.

Mr. Coyle asked if this is applicable even though the Lot Line that they are moving is nowhere near the ponds. Mr. Grenier stated in our Code an Existing Conditions Plan is required so there can be an informed decision.

Mr. Coyle stated the Applicant could withdraw the Application for review at this time to make the corrections or the matter could be Tabled which effectively is the same thing.

Ms. Stambaugh stated as the homeowner of the Woodside property who is selling the back portion of the flag lot, this seems like a lot. Ms. Stambaugh asked how much property would she be losing. Mr. Foley stated she would be losing the 40' of frontage. Ms. Stambaugh stated that is a lot of frontage. Mr. Foley stated that area is also part of the roadway and utility system as well. Mr. Howie asked if that is calculated into the total square footage of the Lot, and Ms. Stambaugh stated it is. Mr. Foley stated if it gets Dedicated, it would be subtracted from Ms. Stambaugh's frontage. He stated be subtracted from Ms. Stambaugh's frontage. He stated it is also a restriction as well since she is not able to put a building on there or do any improvements. Ms. Stambaugh stated there is a tree line on the front.

Ms. Stambaugh stated the way the driveway was created, it is not a shared driveway, but they are asking for access on the driveway portion. Mr. Coyle stated the driveway piece he saw was related to #10 which indicates that just a very small triangle of Ms. Stambaugh's stone driveway on the Plan would now be on the property of Mr. Howie. He stated they were just asking for clarification if an Easement is being Recorded or has Mr. Howie agreed that Ms. Stambaugh would have access to that portion of the driveway. He stated they are not asking for public access to the driveway or guaranteed access from the driveway to other neighboring lots.

Mr. Coyle moved, Mr. Costello seconded and it was unanimously carried to Table the matter to allow the Applicants time to speak further with the Township and get clarifications on some of the points from Remington Vernick's letter.

2024 ANNUAL REPORT – DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL TO PUBLISH

Mr. McLoone stated this Report is provided to satisfy the requirements of Section 207 of Pennsylvania Act 247 of the Municipalities Planning Code. He stated it provides a summary of all of the action taken by the Planning Commission last year. He stated there are links to each of the meetings referenced, and those will take those interested to the Meeting Minutes. He stated with the Planning Commission's approval the Annual Report will be put on the Township Website to meet the requirements of the MPC.

Mr. Bush stated the Report referenced that in August the Planning Commission discussed the updated draft Sign Ordinance, and he asked for an update on this. Ms. Carlton stated it is still in process as new Case Law came forward which required a subsequent revision to the Ordinance. She stated it will be coming back before the Planning Commission sometime this year once it is revised.

Mr. Costello moved and Mr. Gill seconded to publish the 2024 Annual Report. Motion carried with Ms. Torbert abstained.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. McLoone stated our consultant, HRG, will be sending an updated Stormwater Management Ordinance. Mr. Grenier stated the Township has an Ad Hoc Stormwater Management Committee to review that Ordinance, and that Committee will review it before it comes to the Planning Commission.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Adrian Costello, Secretary