

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES – FEBRUARY 10, 2025

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on February 10, 2025. Mr. Coyle called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Those present:

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

Others: James Majewski, Community Development Director  
Dan McLoone, Planner  
Maureen Burke-Carlton, Township Solicitor  
Pat Foley, Township Engineer  
Daniel Grenier, Supervisor Liaison

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Gill moved, Ms. Torbert seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of the January 13, 2025 meeting.

#### #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. Ken Howie and Ms. Michelle Stambaugh were present.

Mr. Majewski stated the Applicants went through the review letter provided by the Township engineer and revised the Plans to address most of the comments. He stated there are a few outstanding issues one being the requirement for a wetlands delineation, and they are requesting a Waiver from that provision since they are not doing any construction work at this time. He stated the other item

is the requirement for a Right-of-Way Dedication along Woodside Road, and the Applicant has indicated that they are not planning to do any work at this time. Mr. Majewski stated the Township has no plans to widen the road in this area so he is not sure that Dedication of the Right-of-Way is necessary. He stated he would suggest that there could be a Right-of-Way Easement that would allow for the right-of-way to be obtained in the future if necessary, and this might be a good compromise as it does not change the acreage of the Lot and would satisfy any potential need in the future for the right-of-way.

Mr. Coyle asked if there is an updated letter or Plan; and Mr. Foley stated due to the timing of the re-submission, his office is still reviewing the re-submission and the comments that the Applicant provided. He stated Mr. Majewski noted a few Waivers, and his office would also recommend some additional Waivers. He stated one of them is the sizing of the trees for the woodlands shown in RVE's Comment #15. He stated the Applicant is requesting the setback for the shed to be counted as an existing non-conformity, and the new Lot Line is being proposed; and he would recommend further discussion on that as it is not an existing non-conformity since the shed is currently on an existing Lot, but the property line between the two parcels is proposed to be re-located.

Mr. Coyle stated he understands that Ms. Stambaugh is readying her property for sale; and Ms. Stambaugh stated it is currently off the market, and her concern is that the Dedication requested is on the front of the property and the Lot Line change is to the very rear of the property so it impacts her moving forward and is a "big ask" for a property owner to grant that excessive Easement unless everyone on Woodside Road is getting the same thing.

Mr. Coyle stated if they are still waiting for the Township engineer to provide comments, he would not be comfortable with the Planning Commission going through a review that has not been completed. He suggested that they discuss the shed location and the request with regard to the Dedication/Easement along the front of the property tonight, and they should then Continue the matter to the next Planning Commission meeting. This was acceptable to the Commission.

Mr. Coyle stated the Township was requesting that they consider Dedicating land at the front of the property so that there was access for utilities in the future, and that would involve the property owner granting the land to the Township. Mr. Coyle stated Mr. Majewski has now recommended that the property owner grant an Easement to the Township so that they are able to do maintenance on utilities in that space in the future if needed without

obtaining specific permission per incident from the property owner at that time. Mr. Majewski stated there are no existing utilities in that area. He stated if sewers were to eventually be run up Delaware Rim Drive to the property, we might need an Easement; however, the chances of that being needed are remote.

Mr. Coyle asked Ms. Stambaugh if she was amenable to granting an Easement for something that may or may not happen at a future date to be determined and appears not to be necessary at this time. Ms. Stambaugh stated she does not feel she would agree to anything without consulting with her attorney. She also noted that there are two hundred year-old trees out front as it is a historic farm property. She stated the potential of putting in an underground utility would probably not be feasible. She stated there is a walking path across the street.

Mr. Majewski stated the Ordinance is written more for a Minor Subdivision than a Lot Line Change such that when you are subdividing a property and creating an extra Lot, they should grant the Right-of-Way so that if in the future there is a need to go through there, the Township would have that right. He stated in this case, it is an over two hundred year-old property, and there are no utilities other than utility poles along the road. Mr. Majewski stated it is an Ordinance requirement which will need to be Waived or partially Waived.

Ms. Torbert stated she would recommend that the requirement be waived since it is a Lot Line change in the back of the property and nothing is affecting the front of the property. Mr. Coyle stated they are not creating a condition where a new property owner may come in and we would need to protect their rights, and the other Planning Commission members agreed.

Mr. Coyle stated with regard to the existing shed, it is located in the rear of the property and is conforming today, but with the proposed changes to the Lot Line it will place the existing shed within 3' of the new Lot Line. Mr. Foley stated a corner of the shed will actually be on the new Lot Line. Mr. Coyle stated the Township just revised the Ordinance with regard to setbacks for accessory structures, and he would not be in favor of granting a Waiver to an Ordinance that was just passed sixty days ago. Mr. Bush stated he would not want to create a problem for a subsequent property owner.

Mr. Majewski asked the condition of the shed, and if it could be easily moved. Ms. Stambaugh stated she understands that they do not want to set a precedent; however, this shed is probably 80 years old and will eventually fall down. She stated the stipulation would be that if her sales transaction were to go

through, the shed would be removed in the Agreement of Sale. Mr. Howie stated they have consulted with the survey group about this; and one of the issues that they noted was that in order to do a clean lot line shift that ties into an existing corner, it would need to be placed within 3' to 5' of the shed. He stated it could be moved over a little bit; but any further, it would create an angle so that part of the shed would still not be set back 10' to be tied to the existing corner, but part of it would. He stated they highlighted that as a potential issue. He stated it is an old shed that both he and Ms. Stambaugh view as a grandfathered piece of history, but not necessarily a selling point of the house; however, Ms. Stambaugh stated the end of the drive is and they liked where the line change is.

Mr. Howie stated they would be willing to take pictures to show the Planning Commission at the next meeting.

Mr. Coyle stated the issue is that they are currently in conformance with the Ordinance, and they are asking to be allowed for it to be a non-conformance. He stated if they are likely to take it down at the time of the sale, the easiest way forward would be for the shed to come down. Mr. Majewski stated they could put a Note on the Plan that the shed is to be removed. Ms. Stambaugh stated that was what she was anticipating; and if she chooses to put the house back on the market, that is how it would be. Mr. Gill asked if there would be a timeframe for that to happen. Mr. Majewski stated coincident with the sale would be good. Mr. Costello stated it does not seem that the shed is very useful, and he asked why they would not just take it down. Ms. Stambaugh stated it is an "old shed holding some old stuff." Mr. Majewski stated he feels if it indicates it is to be removed, it would be removed in a reasonable amount of time; and if it is not removed, the Township would have to cite the new owners to remove it.

Mr. Coyle stated while he is open to it, his concern is that the owner of the second property may sell that property; and if the new owners of the primary property never removed the shed, the Township would have to issue a citation. Mr. Costello stated he feels that they should either move the Lot Line or take down the shed. Mr. Gill stated he feels the Planning Commission's recommendation should include a requirement that they remove the shed.

Mr. Howie stated they will look for any additional comments from the engineer's review. He stated there are some other Waivers that have been requested including one for a full wetland evaluation and that would be pursued if there

were to be new construction on the property. Mr. Coyle stated he would not be comfortable discussing this without something in writing for the Planning Commission to review.

Mr. Costello moved, Mr. Bush seconded and it was unanimously carried to Table the matter to the next meeting of the Planning Commission.

#693 – 1511 LINDENHURST MINOR SUBDIVISION DISCUSSION AND CONTINUATION  
Sewage Facilities Planning Modules Component 4A – Municipal Planning Agency  
Review Individual and Community On-Lot Disposal of Sewage  
Tax Parcel #20-003-017 - 1511 Lindenhurst Road  
Subdivide Lot containing an existing single-family dwelling into 2 single-family  
Residential Lots (creating 1 new Building Lot)

Mr. Majewski stated last year the Planning Commission recommended approval of the Minor Subdivision for 1511 Lindenhurst Road to create one new Building Lot. He stated they have been working for the last year with Aqua trying to determine how to get sewers to the property. He stated Aqua has a policy where they do not like to have their sewer lines within Easements on private property whenever possible, and they prefer that they be in the right-of-way. Mr. Majewski stated they had been looking at extending the line up along Woodside Road 1,725' and the estimate for the construction of that was about \$320,000. He stated if the two properties along the way were to share in that cost, it would be between \$62,000 and \$80,000 for each of the properties to have public sewers. He stated there is also the cost to run the plumbing into the house.

Mr. Majewski stated there was discussion that if they were unable to work out the finances to make it practical to come up Woodside Road, would they at least be able to hook up the existing house that is adjacent to the Easement in the Dolington Estates II Development on Trowbridge Drive. Mr. Majewski stated that while Aqua did not necessarily have a problem with that, they expressed their discomfort in having a line going through their Sewer Easement on the property. He stated there was discussion about cutting short that Easement just to encompass their sewer line. This was shown in yellow on the Plan; and instead of the Easement where the orange and yellow is extending all the way to the property line for the new Subdivision, it would be cut short. This had been discussed with Ms. Kirk who indicated that if they were going to consider that, why could they not run two individual lines, one from the existing house into the manhole and a separate line for the proposed house through a private

Easement for Lot 2 through Lot 1 and running through what would be converted from Aqua's Easement to a private Easement for the benefit of Lots #1 and #2. Mr. Majewski stated that would get around the issue of having one line branching off to two houses, and it would be two separate lines fully under the ownership of each individual Lot. Mr. Majewski stated he discussed this with a representative of Aqua who had been discussing it in their office, and their initial thoughts were that this might work. Mr. Majewski stated there were questions as to how wide the Easements would have to be if there were two laterals going into the lines to the manhole and questions about the overlap between the two Easements where they tie into the manhole and whether that would create any problems. He stated there was also a question as to whether they would be allowed to use the Easement since it is going through the neighbor's property, and the solicitors will need to look into that. Mr. Majewski stated Aqua also had a question with regard to billing since there will be one line branching off.

Mr. Majewski stated if Aqua is in agreement with this solution, the Applicant would not need a Waiver or request that one of the Lots be on a private septic system; and both would be on the public sewer system as contemplated and required per Ordinance.

Mr. Coyle stated it seems that Aqua and the various landowners need more time.

Ms. Erika Miller, Attorney, representing the Applicant, was present. She stated she would prefer not withdrawing the Waiver request at this time; however, she understands that if the Waiver is not required they could go forward to the Board of Supervisors in a few weeks with the Planning Commission's previous recommendation assuming that this can be worked out in that time period.

Ms. Barbara Kirk, representing the Township in this matter, was present. She stated when the Planning Commission last discussed this, the Commission was hesitant to approve a Waiver in order to have even Lot #2 have an on-lot septic system. She stated Mr. Dumack, the project engineer, has indicated that the manhole has always been available for a connection for Lot #1. Ms. Kirk stated at this point Aqua seems amenable to this new solution; however, she feels it would require Mr. Dumack or Ms. Miller contacting the owner where the Easement currently exists so that the owner recognizes that the Easement will be converted from Aqua to a private owner. Ms. Kirk stated she does not foresee an issue, and it would solve the problem.

Mr. Coyle stated he recalls that at the last meeting, the matter was Continued to give the Board of Supervisors time to try to liaise with Aqua, and Mr. Grenier was going to work on that. Mr. Grenier stated he discussed this with the Public Works Director, Mr. Kratzer, and Mr. Majewski to have them work with Aqua; and it seems that they did continue the discussion with Aqua.

Ms. Kirk stated this project has been stalled because of all of the difficulty in getting Aqua to work with the property owner to allow the public sewer connection. Mr. Majewski stated Aqua was waiting for an estimate from the property owners' consultant.

Mr. Costello stated while the Waiver may not be needed, the request for the Waiver is still before the Planning Commission this evening; and he asked if the Applicants would prefer that the Commission vote on the Waiver this evening or Table the matter. Ms. Miller stated the solution being discussed seems very favorable; however, if Aqua will not approve it, they would be back requesting the Waiver and she could discuss that this evening and have the Commission consider it so that it is an option. She stated it has taken a long time to get to this point for a Lot Line change, and she would like to get before the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Coyle asked if everyone is amenable to the approach related to the sewers, will the Applicant need to come back before the Planning Commission. Ms. Kirk stated the Planning Commission could make a decision tonight indicating that based on the current proposed plan for public sewer connection the Planning Commission recommends that they proceed with the plan. She stated if that plan should not come to fruition, the Planning Commission could make a recommendation as to whether or not a Waiver should be approved for the on-lot system for the new Lot – Lot #2.

Ms. Kirk asked Mr. Dumack if they intend to proceed with the connection for Lot #1. Mr. Dumack stated that the intent has always been to connect the existing home on Lot #1 to public sewer. He stated the manhole and sanitary line has an Easement that goes to Lot #1.

Mr. Bush stated he feels that the Applicant should come back when they have something more concrete in hand. Mr. Coyle asked if the Township engineer is going to have a review letter with items that will need to be discussed for the Planning Commission to provide input on the re-routing of the sewer. He stated if it is felt that there will not be any matters for the Commission to review, he would be comfortable with a Motion this evening.

Mr. Bush stated that is not known at this time because they have not reached a final agreement yet.

Ms. Miller stated she does not believe that they would have to come back if the Waiver request were withdrawn. She stated the reason she is present is because it had been indicated that they would have to run 2,000' of line to a connection for Lot #2 which goes against what the Code indicates. She stated a Waiver would be appropriate for Lot #2 in that case. She stated she would be willing to continue the discussion on that tonight if the Planning Commission would consider voting favorably on a Waiver to allow an on-lot system so that they have it if it is needed.

Ms. Kirk stated when this was presented to the Planning Commission in December, 2023, the Township engineer issued a review letter dated November 10, 2023. She stated the Planning Commission's approval was Conditioned on compliance with the Township engineer's review letter which included providing legal descriptions for Lot #1 and Lot #2 variable width access Easement across Lot #2 and the Sanitary Sewer Easement across Lot #1. Ms. Kirk stated the problem is because Aqua would not allow those Easements originally, everything was delayed.

Ms. Miller stated she feels it would be appropriate to have the Commission consider the Waiver at this time so that they can move forward to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Dumack stated that given the fact that they found out this evening about Aqua's encouraging direction, he would like to explore that further and make sure that it is good and acceptable to the property owner. He stated in case that cannot be agreed to, it may make sense to argue the Waiver now to make sure that the Applicant does not have to potentially come back before the Planning Commission on this matter.

Mr. Majewski stated administratively, the time that the Board of Supervisors has to act on this project is up a week from Wednesday; and absent an Extension of Time from the Applicant, the Board of Supervisors will need to act on this at their next meeting so the Planning Commission should weigh in on this matter. He stated if the current proposal is not approved by Aqua since they just had the initial reaction of one Aqua representative, then it would be back to the Waiver request that was before the Planning Commission to have a septic system on Lot #2 with Lot #1 tying into the sewer system.



Ms. Miller stated they have provided numerous Extensions. She stated Lot #1, which is the existing property, currently has septic; and there is a line that runs very close to it put there by Aqua so that they could connect eventually. She stated that means that the proposed Lot #2 is within 1,500' of a public sewer; and the Ordinance requires that if you are within 1,500' you are to connect where practical. She stated the request from Aqua if they were to connect would not be to that line that is within 1,500', but would be to a different line; however, because they are within that distance, they have to comply with the Ordinance which is why they are before the Planning Commission. She stated Aqua is indicating that they should connect both Lots to the line that is 2,000' away, and it would cost \$62,000 for the existing Lot, \$79,000 for Lot #2, and \$62,000 for each of the two properties on Woodside. Ms. Miller stated that she does not represent those two property owners, but she knows that at least one has expressed interest in connecting as she believes that they might have issues with their septic. She stated a new septic system costs approximately \$35,000 to \$40,000, and they would be asked to almost double that cost. Ms. Miller stated the pricing includes having the two other separate property owners on board. She stated what Aqua is proposing is not practical financially for those two property owners or the Applicant's small Subdivision.

Ms. Miller stated it is her opinion that the Ordinance requires a practicality analysis by the Township, and that it is impractical to move forward with the connection Aqua is proposing so on-lot septic is preferred and the only practical option.

Mr. Bush asked Ms. Kirk if the Code indicates what "practical" means; and Ms. Kirk stated it does not. She added that it states that if the property is located within 1,500' of an existing public sewer connection, the property owner needs to connect to that sewer system. She stated the problem is that the Ordinance was written at a time when the Township owned the sewer system, and the Township had more leeway as to connections. She stated the system is now owned by Aqua; and even though there is an existing manhole within 300' of the new Lot, Aqua is not inclined to allow the connection which may be construed as a hardship to the property owner.

Mr. Costello stated this matter is still being discussed, and there is the potential that what is now being proposed could work so he would prefer not to vote on any other possibilities until we see what Aqua's final answer is. Ms. Miller asked if there could be a Condition that this plan would be the preferred option. Mr. Costello stated that would mean that if the alternate plan that was seen at the start of the discussion was not approved, the Planning Commission would

conditionally approve the Waiver. Mr. Costello stated the Commission would then be indicating that if the negotiations that they are currently involved in do not work out, they would approve the Waiver; and he is not inclined to do that. He stated he wants the Applicant to be at the negotiating table to make the alternate plan work. Ms. Miller stated what they are asking is whether it is practical to do the alternative option of connecting to a line that is not close by at over \$150,000 for a two-lot Subdivision; and she feels that it is not practical and necessitates a Waiver. She stated she will need to make this same argument before the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Torbert stated she agrees with Mr. Costello adding that this is a new situation with the Township no longer owning the sewers, and she is concerned about granting Waivers right now. Mr. Gill agreed adding that once there is a finalized plan, the Commission can vote on it at that point. Mr. Bush stated he feels the Township had the ability to negotiate whatever it wanted at the time that they sold the sewer system, and they did not address this situation. He stated this is a long-standing Ordinance, and he feels that an Extension of Time should be requested this evening.

Mr. Coyle stated the wording “where practical” is an issue since the Applicant’s argument is that it is practical to connect, but Aqua will not allow them to do so, so it is therefore not practical. Mr. Coyle stated he feels that there is a practical connection point within the confines of the Ordinance, and he would recommend rejecting a Waiver request based on the fact that there is a practical connection point looking at the Plans and the maps.

Ms. Miller stated it is not practical if they cannot do it. She stated she would request an Extension of Time.

Mr. Coyle stated they have not been provided an opinion from the Township’s counsel that practical applies here and they have received no opinion on “practical’s implication on the Ordinance.” Ms. Kirk stated this is a new situation which she has not come across before.

Mr. Costello stated he is encouraged with what has happened since the last meeting, but it is not yet finished; and the Planning Commission should not be voting on something that is not finished yet.

Ms. Miller stated she would like to maintain the Waiver at this point.

Mr. Coyle moved, Mr. Gill seconded and it was unanimously carried to Continue the matter to the next meeting of the Planning Commission.

#696 – WRIGHT FARM SUBDIVISION

Tax Parcel #20-016-012

R-1 Residential Low-Density Zoning District

1878 Yardley-Newtown Road

Proposed 47 Lot Single-Family Residential Subdivision with 12.67 Acres of Open Space

Ms. Torbert stated she will recuse herself from considering this matter since she is an owner of an adjacent parcel which is effected by this Development.

Mr. Majewski stated the property abuts Route 332 and has access out of the back of the property to Surrey Lane.

Edward Murphy, attorney, was present with Joe DeLuca, Jr. and Justin Geonnotti, the project engineer from Dynamic. Mr. Murphy stated DeLuca has an executed Agreement of Sale to purchase the Wright Farm from the Wright Family Trust. A little less than a year ago, fully-engineered Preliminary Subdivision Plans were submitted to the Township. He stated those Plans were the subject of the typical consultant reviews both inside and outside of the Township. Mr. Murphy stated they elected to revise and re-submit the Plans based on the initial round of review comments, and the Revised Plans were re-submitted. Updated review letters have been received from RVE, the Township's consultant, the EAC, the Farmland Preservation Corporation, and Bucks County Planning Commission. Mr. Murphy stated they also submitted a Waiver request that was updated to address potential Waivers associated with the Revised Plans.

An aerial Exhibit was shown which is the Existing Conditions Plan showing the Wright family farm complex in the center of the site. Mr. Geonnotti showed the yellow line of the property which is approximately 50 acres. He stated the site currently has access off a single point of access off of the Newtown By-Pass shown at the bottom of the page close to where the I-95 off-ramp comes off to the By-Pass. He stated Patterson Lane runs along the perimeter of the parcel going back to two parcels. He stated when they re-did the By-Pass, they left the small curb cut to allow traffic traveling westbound on the By-Pass to still be able to make a left into the site; but for the most part traffic is coming off of the eastbound movement and turning right into the parcel.

Mr. Murphy asked about the location of Surrey Lane and its relationship to the property. Mr. Geonnotti stated Surrey Lane is a dead-end street that exists as part of the Bridle Estates community. It was maintained with a little sliver of land between the two properties which was Dedicated to the future right-of-way

for anticipated connection to the Wright Farm property. He stated Lower Makefield Township owns that piece of land which is approximately 50' wide, and the connection to the new community would be made through extending Surrey Lane.

Mr. Geonnotti stated there have been a number of discussions with PennDOT, and the first iteration of the Plan showed a right-in, right-out access off of the By-Pass although not at the exact location where the existing Patterson Lane takes access but more centered between the new turn lane to Stony Hill Road and where the existing on-ramp/off-ramp to 95 comes in which is the center of the property. Mr. Geonnotti stated PennDOT indicated that was not a preferred location for access to the property. He stated the Applicant then considered a secondary option of creating a fourth leg to the intersection of the Newtown By-Pass and Stony Hill Road. He stated initially PennDOT was interested in this; however, once Plans were submitted with full engineering to PennDOT, they indicated they had no interest in that, and a very strong denial letter was received from PennDOT indicating that they would not be allowed to connect a fourth leg to the intersection adding that there would be a degradation of service based on what had already been constructed as part of the Wegmans' project. Mr. Geonnotti stated after considering all the options, the single point of access is now proposed to be from Surrey Lane.

Mr. Murphy stated there have been numerous discussions with staff, PennDOT, and neighbor groups. He stated they spent a lot of time talking about the ultimate treatment of Patterson Lane. He stated while it has a very limited purpose, it is a Township road; and the Township administration and staff have been interested in ultimately determining the future of Patterson Lane which impacts other elements of the Plan.

Mr. Geonnotti showed on the Plan the location of Patterson Lane which is off of the By-Pass and runs along the Wright Tract and dead ends to serve two parcels of land, one of which is a remnant piece of the Torbert Farm at a location he showed on the Plan which is vacant, and the other which is occupied with a single-family house. Mr. Geonnotti stated as part of the Application what is proposed is that Patterson Lane will remain, but it will be vacated as a Township street. He stated it will be used as an emergency access only to allow emergency vehicles to access the back of the site at a location he showed on the Plan. He stated the road will be absorbed into the community as part of the open space. Access to the parcel in the back that is occupied will be taken through the community and then through a dedicated new driveway to be proposed.

Mr. Geonnotti showed the location of the Surrey Lane connection which will be the single point of access to the community. He stated one of the iterations showed the Surrey Lane connections and a connection to the By-Pass, and there was a concern about it being used as a cut through by those coming and going to Quarry, etc.; however, that connection has been eliminated. He stated the only connection will be for emergency vehicles, and there will be a chain and bollard separating that and no residents will be able to come out through Patterson Lane onto the By-Pass.

Mr. Murphy stated there was discussion with the residents and the Township about construction vehicles, and he asked Mr. Geonnotti to discuss this as well as at what point Surrey Lane will be available to future homeowners in the new Subdivision. Mr. Geonnotti stated as part of the Agreement that they made with the residents of Bridle Estates, all construction traffic will take access and leave the property through the existing Patterson Lane off of the By-Pass, and they will not be going through the existing community to build the new community. Mr. Geonnotti stated the Surrey Lane connection will be made as part of the construction effort, but it will not be open until the model home is open for sales of the new community. He stated even at that point, construction vehicles will still be accessing the site through Patterson Lane; and at no point during the construction will there be construction vehicles entering through the existing community of Bridle Estates.

Mr. Murphy asked Mr. Geonnotti to discuss open space, and the discussions that were had with Farmland Preservation Corporation and the agreements that have been reached with them to date. Mr. Geonnotti noted the location of the proposed homes and the open space in the middle. He stated there is a large drainage swale that runs through the property which will be maintained. He stated stormwater will be centralized with a large basin that will create nice yards for some of the center homes, and will discharge out to the site.

Mr. Geonnotti showed the green area around the perimeter of the site which will be Dedicated open space. He stated he believes that this is one of the first large Subdivisions since the Open Space Ordinance. He stated more than 25% of the community will be preserved as open space. He stated there was a strong desire given the proximity to existing active farms to try to farm this land. Mr. Geonnotti stated they had some discussions with the Lower Makefield Township Farmland Preservation Corporation, and their main concern with being able to use this land was to make sure that they would be able to take farm vehicles from the existing farmland to the land on this property and not have to go through the area where the residences are located. Mr. Geonnotti

noted an area of 10 acres of open space which connects through Patterson Lane, and the farm vehicles will have access to that to access the existing farmland they are currently farming. Mr. Geonnotti stated when they were initially laying out the Development there was a desire to keep the viewshed from the By-Pass as rural as possible. He stated keeping that open and keeping it as an active farm will provide of view of active farmland and not the back of houses as you drive down the By-Pass.

Mr. Murphy asked Mr. Geonnotti if he is comfortable with the Remington & Vernick review comments that were in their February 4 letter; and Mr. Geonnotti stated he is, adding that they were either will complies or Waivers that will need to be discussed. Mr. Geonnotti stated this is also true with regard to Mr. Fiocco's comments with regard to traffic.

Mr. Murphy noted the November 15 review from PennDOT indicating that they would not entertain a fourth leg of the intersection. Mr. Murphy stated the DeLucas have had multiple discussions with neighbor representatives and discussed whether or not collectively we could get PennDOT to re-consider their position and allow that fourth leg. He stated they did make the effort to try to get PennDOT to agree to that, but PennDOT has refused.

Mr. Murphy stated the one review that is in conflict with certain items that have been discussed tonight are the comments of the EAC, and their review comments contradict the request of the Farmland Preservation Corporation. Mr. Murphy stated the Applicant felt that the Farmland desires took precedent over having an additional planted buffer. He noted that there are going to be street trees and a lot of other plantings on the site; however, they were not proposing to have a buffer between the Farmland area and the rear of the lots other than the typical Farmland Corporation fence.

Mr. Geonnotti stated Farmland Preservation has a strong desire to have limited shade trees over their farming properties which is in direct conflict with the EAC's mission. Mr. Geonnotti stated they have proposed street trees, designed the site taking into consideration stormwater management, and are taking into account a lot of EAC-type concerns; however, in order to keep it a functioning farm which is Farmland Preservation's mission, they were not able to address a lot of the EAC's concerns.

Mr. Coyle stated when they met in November for the site walk, there was discussion about “traffic shaping” at the connection of the existing Surrey Lane into the proposed neighborhood; and he asked what the proposal is to make sure traffic is slowed down on what will now be a much longer stretch of road. The Site Plan rendering was shown. Mr. Geonnotti stated at the entrance to Surrey Lane they have created a boulevard entrance, and there will be a 5’ to 7’ wide planted median in the center. He stated that will slow down traffic and create differentiation. Mr. Coyle asked if that will lead to slowing down if someone needs to move their car to the right to get around the island. Mr. Geonnotti stated when you have an island in the middle of the road, it creates a reason for the vehicles to slow down as they enter. He stated it will also be a gateway treatment for the new community to differentiate the two developments. He stated they worked with the traffic engineer to come up with this design, and it will have traffic-calming capabilities.

Mr. Coyle stated the traffic engineer requested that a mini round-about be explored as an alternative. Mr. Geonnotti stated the request was that this be explored at Surrey Lane and the first intersection of Patterson Lane, and the Applicant’s traffic engineer did look at that. Mr. Geonnotti stated the amount of traffic generated by 47 homes is insignificant, and it does not warrant a mini round-about at this specific intersection.

Mr. Coyle stated with regard to the existing Bridle Estates lay-out, he counted 69 properties that are likely to choose to enter/exit through Bridle Estates Drive. He asked if the traffic engineers reviewed and addressed the appropriateness of the existing Bridle Estates Drive now carrying a combined about 116 homes worth of traffic in and out of the neighborhood; and Mr. Geonnotti stated they did. Mr. Geonnotti stated they submitted a Supplemental Traffic Impact Study dated February 7, and it did evaluate that situation – the 47 homes with a single point of access through Surrey Lane and the impact it would have on the adjacent infrastructure of both Bridle Estates and Quarry Road to get to the By-Pass. He stated there was no impact to the Level of Service to the community.

Mr. Coyle noted the triangle of land in the northeast corner that they are going to Dedicate to open space. Mr. Geonnotti showed on the Plan the parcels of land being proposed as open space which include the connectivity of the farmland that the farmers were looking for. Mr. Coyle asked if that satisfies the bare minimum percentage of open space required by Ordinance, and Mr. Geonnotti stated it is a little bit extra. Mr. Coyle asked if it is enough extra that if Patterson Lane is taken out of the definition of open space it still meets the requirement, and Mr. Geonnotti agreed.

Mr. Coyle stated it was indicated that construction vehicles would be required to enter through the existing Patterson Lane, and he asked if there is a written commitment for signage at the entrance to Bridle Estates notifying contractors that they cannot enter there; and Mr. Murphy stated there will be. Mr. Murphy stated that detail is typically provided by the Township at the pre-construction meeting, and the signage will be at the developer's cost based on direction received from the Township. Mr. Coyle asked if there will be a physical barrier since it will not be opened until the model home is open, and Mr. Geonnotti agreed. Mr. Coyle asked if there will be a mechanism for fining contractors who go through the neighborhood. Mr. Murphy stated they will allow the Township administration to fine those people who violate the Agreement. Mr. Coyle asked if the Township were to position a license plate reader at that intersection, would the developer be comfortable with the Township fining any contractor or unauthorized person who enters through that neighborhood to get to the construction site; and Mr. Murphy agreed.

Mr. Bush asked if Patterson Lane dead-ends when it goes up alongside the right-hand side of the property, and Mr. Murphy agreed.

Mr. Coyle asked Mr. Majewski if Farmland Preservation is farming all of the surrounding farmland currently, and Mr. Majewski agreed.

Mr. Coyle noted a stretch of land that runs along 295 behind Jockey's Way and connects to Quarry Road, and he asked if that is privately owned by those who own the property on Jockey's Way or is that Township land. The aerial photo was shown, and Mr. Majewski stated going from Colt's Lane along Jockey's Way the first four or five homes back up to Farmland Preservation property. He stated the road then takes a slight bend and runs parallel to 295, and the next six or seven lots back up all the way to the 295 right-of-way. Mr. Coyle stated it would not be feasible to put a road behind Jockey's Way, and Mr. Majewski agreed.

Mr. Coyle stated the EAC has concerns with farming practices this close to Residential homes with regard to run-off from fertilizers, etc. He stated there is the conflicting desire to maintain this land as the gateway into the Township as representing the farming history of Lower Makefield.

Mr. Coyle noted Comment #1 of the EAC letter dated February 7 with regard to the dimensions of open space on Lot #51 indicating that most of the acreage proposed borders Yardley-Newtown Road and Patterson Lane and is narrower than what the new Open Space Dedication Ordinance provides for. Mr. Murphy



stated that is incorrect. Mr. Geonnotti stated while he is not sure if this was the intention or not, the way the Ordinance is written, it indicates that open space shall include parcels with a length to width ratio of less than four to one or less than 75' in width. He stated at no point is their open space less than 75' in width except where it goes around the portion of Patterson Lane where they will be using the roadbed of Patterson Lane. He stated the way that they configured the open space was intentional for Farmland Preservation to be use that land.

Mr. Majewski asked the width of the open space at its narrowest, and Mr. Geonnotti stated at its narrowest point along the By-Pass it is 125' in width from the back of one of the Residential properties to the property line, and there is more farming land than that 125' to the right-of-way line.

Mr. Grenier stated there is a triangular piece in the northeast corner which was highlighted as open space, but it looks significantly narrower; and Mr. Geonnotti stated it is, but that is the connection point for using Patterson Lane. He stated they were trying to configure the site so that it can be a farmable property. Mr. Grenier noted an area which he does not feel is truly farmable, and he feels that it should not be considered as open space. Mr. Geonnotti stated that is to provide the connectivity between the two pieces; and while they could eliminate that, that would eliminate the ability to connect from one piece to the next. Mr. Murphy stated Mr. Grenier is indicating that he just does not want to characterize it as open space. Mr. Geonnotti stated if that were done, they would still comply with the open space requirement. He stated that there is a 25' buffer between the Residential properties and farmable land with the buffer being on the farm property.

Mr. Grenier asked about the small rectangular piece on the far western side of the Plan. Mr. Geonnotti showed on the Plan the stormwater basin and what Mr. Grenier is referring to is where the point of discharge will be to maintain the existing discharge point out to the farm swale on the other property. He stated they are not calling that open space as it is a stormwater area.

Mr. Grenier stated between the fourth and fifth Lot in the north, there appears to be an Easement area; and Mr. Geonnotti stated that is for drainage coming down onto their property which will be drained into the basin and through the site, and it is not counted as open space. He stated it will be collected through a pipe and conveyed into the basin.

Mr. Grenier stated the Township is currently updating its Stormwater Ordinance, and it will be a significant update. Mr. Geonnotti stated their design meets the current standards, and they are aware that the Township is considering an update as is the DEP. He stated the stormwater design on site is robust, and he would be surprised if they are not able to meet the new Ordinance.

Mr. Murphy asked Mr. Geonnotti to show the buffer that is being added at the request of Farmland Preservation. Mr. Geonnotti stated when they had discussions with Bridle Estates, there was a portion that they wanted to have buffered even though Farmland Preservation did not want it buffered; and that buffer would screen the new homes from the existing homes. He noted on the Plans the areas which will have a planted buffer along the back which was added. Mr. Coyle stated that buffer will be on the private property of the private homes, and they would be able to remove it at a later time if they chose. Mr. Murphy stated an Easement could be established to insure that it always remains.

Mr. Grenier asked if they considered a linear tree buffer along the existing Patterson Lane that would not stretch very much into the Farmland area. Mr. Geonnotti stated there was not. He stated Farmland Preservation had an interest in using the roadbed of Patterson Lane to be able to access the farm. He stated what is not shown on the Plan is a pretty extensive buffer that exists today along 95 off of the Plan so the community is being buffered by that existing vegetation.

Mr. Coyle stated that at the time of the site walk in November Patterson Lane was not envisioned to be inside the area to be Dedicated to Farmland Preservation. He stated there was discussion at the site, and we did not want to run into a future condition whereby the HOA or someone who maintains Patterson Lane would run into a conflict with Farmland Preservation since they rely on it.

Mr. Grenier stated while farmland is a great feature to have, it requires a lot of fertilizer and other things that run off that have historically impacted our water quality in Lower Makefield. He asked about the grading. Mr. Geonnotti stated they designed it so that the fertilizer running off will not be running toward the residences. He stated currently there is 50 acres of run-off with no stormwater management, and they will be managing the vast majority of the site.

Mr. Grenier stated they are not managing the area that will remain farmland, and Mr. Geonnotti agreed. Mr. Grenier stated he does not know if they are required to, but trees planted in certain sections may be the only way to

treat and slow down stormwater in those areas. Mr. Geonnotti stated if Farmland Preservation is agreeable to adding trees, trees could be added; but they were against any vegetation being planted around farmland.

Mr. Grenier stated that will be for the Board of Supervisors to approve or not approve. Mr. Geonnotti stated the Plan was designed to satisfy the concerns of Farmland Preservation.

Mr. Coyle stated he believes that from the By-Pass it grades downward toward the farm before the land grades back up, and Mr. Geonnotti agreed. He added that they are maintaining the basin through the center of the site because that is where all the drainage goes currently and then discharges out through a farm swale.

Mr. Coyle stated he understands wanting to maintain the character of the farming community since there is a farm there today, but putting a house next to a farm is not always good as there is fertilizer and dust from harvest. He stated there was also concern expressed at the site walk about road noise from the Newtown By-Pass. He stated while there could be a buffer of crops there, the crops are not always high and there will then be no visual buffer or sound buffer to the new homes. Mr. Coyle asked if this land has been Dedicated to Farmland Preservation and if the Board of Supervisors has an opinion as to which direction to go with the open space. Mr. Grenier stated the Board of Supervisors has not gotten to that level yet, and they will consider how to manage the land the best. He stated farmland creates a bucolic nature which is already existing; however, it also presents some issues. He stated with creativity, he feels that they can provide a buffer, stormwater management, and additional farmland.

Mr. Murphy stated the Applicant does not want to be the arbiter between EAC and Farmland Preservation, and the Township needs to decide internally how they want to proceed with that. He stated he thought they were doing the directives that they had received which is why they focused more on farmland. Mr. Coyle stated now they are seeing the final plan, and they could not have had this discussion earlier. Mr. Costello stated he agrees that the Applicant should not be the arbiter; however, if they are trying to sell high-value homes, they should consider if they want a farm and access to a busy road or would the developer prefer to have more of a buffered area. Mr. Murphy stated they would not have proposed the Plan as they did if they did not believe it would be an attractive environment as designed; however, if there is a consensus that the Township does not want farmland and would prefer a large open, buffer,

they would proceed with that. Mr. Grenier stated the Applicants have access to great resources, and the Township would appreciate it if the Applicant could present some ideas. Mr. Murphy stated their concern is being asked to make a decision as to which group to pick, and he asked that the Township decide and tell them how they want them to proceed.

Mr. Bush stated he agrees that eventually it is something for the Township Administration to discuss, but he believes it is within the Planning Commission's purview to provide their opinion on this and make a recommendation whether it should be treed or farmland. He stated he understands why Farmland Preservation wants to have a contiguous farm especially since Patterson Lane goes up to additional farm pieces; however, the way the intersection and the Wegmans area has been developed, he feels there should be a treed buffer. He stated he would be in favor of it being heavily treed and not have it farmed. Mr. Costello stated he agrees that a much more dense woodland buffer would be more appropriate for these residents. Mr. Bush stated he feels the Planning Commission should let the Supervisors know their thoughts.

Mr. Grenier stated the Board has been trying to balance maintaining farmland with stormwater management and trees. He stated in this case, we may be able to do a little of both. He stated the Board of Supervisors would want to hear the Planning Commission's opinion on this. He stated while it is a relatively narrow small area to farm, it does provide connection. Mr. Grenier stated he feels it is important to maintain the open space and provide some kind of ground cover.

Mr. Bush moved and Mr. Gill seconded that Patterson Lane be preserved as access for Farmland Preservation, but for the open space buffering Route 332, the Planning Commission would have a preference toward tree planting as opposed to farming that section of the open space.

Mr. Costello stated if he were living here, he would want a vegetation buffer from the road; however, the developer seems ambivalent so having farmland there may not be an issue. He stated there are already farms in the area including Patterson Farm so the idea of farmland does make sense. He stated two different options have been provided from two different expert Committees, and he asked if they have met to discuss this, and Mr. Grenier stated he does not believe so. Mr. Grenier stated Farmland Preservation is an independent Corporation compared to the EAC which is an Advisory Committee.

Mr. Coyle stated currently there is a farm there which is beautiful; but if there is no longer a farm and there are 47 homes, he questions if we would want to be looking most of the year at low fields/stubble and then down into the development. He stated he feels what will best preserve the character of the Township would be to mask the new development as much as possible from the road which would involve dense plantings. He stated today there are currently fields and crops which absorb water running off 332; however, if that is gone and there would only be a small strip of farmland, there would be a need for trees to absorb the water. Mr. Costello stated he would be in favor of trees there.

Mr. Gill stated the Planning Commission is indicating they would want trees there, and he asked if that is a requirement of the Township. Mr. Majewski stated the Township looks for a recommendation from the Planning Commission; and if the Planning Commission feels that a wooded buffer between 332 and the Lots would be more appropriate than farmland, that is what the Planning Commission should recommend. He added that Farmland Preservation does have concerns about the farmability of that area in the front although they have spoken to farmers who stated that they would farm that area. Mr. Majewski stated he does not feel that they could do a hybrid. He stated if they plant trees that will impact the narrow area of farmland too much so it would have to be one or the other. He stated he knows that Farmland Preservation would be very pleased to keep Patterson Lane as their access to the farm piece that they own behind the development to the north. Mr. Bush asked if there is any other access for Farmland Preservation to that land, and Mr. Majewski stated they would have to go through adjoining properties/developments which would not be practical.

Mr. Costello stated it seems that this land is so narrow that they could not take a few feet and put a treed buffer in and not impact the farmland. Mr. Coyle stated he has talked to Farmland Preservation about it, and their concern is that when you plant any trees they cast shade onto the farm fields.

Mr. Coyle stated at this point he would like to hear from the residents not about whether or not the whole development should be approved or not but if the residents have a stated preference about how to treat the open space land which is buffering the proposed new development on 332.

Mr. Alex Davidoff, Bridle Estates Drive, stated he is speaking on behalf of a large number of his community members. He thanked Mr. Majewski, Mr. McLoone, Mr. Kratzer, and the Planning Commission who have been

very helpful, and to Vince and Joe DeLuca who spoke to the residents as “real people.” Mr. Davidoff stated Mr. Murphy lied about their representations, and no agreements were reached, although they were amenable to certain things that were suggested. He asked Mr. Murphy not to speak on their behalf without speaking to him or his lawyer first. He stated everyone is very concerned about traffic as it will connect to their development and will increase the traffic by 150%. Mr. Davidoff stated they agreed to a tree line on the northern edge of the Lot, but what is in the Plan is a quarter of a tree line which they did not agree to.

Mr. Davidoff asked how the land will be farmed with this Development, and Mr. Majewski stated Farmland Preservation has a Lease with a farmer to continue that 39 acres. Mr. Davidoff stated he knows that there is a problem with access and the farm vehicles would have to access through Surrey Lane. He stated Ms. Sharon Kimmel told him that she would permit Tanner Bros. who is farming her property to have access to this new plot of land from her land. Mr. Coyle stated the Motion before the Planning Commission is that the existing Patterson Lane would be maintained for access to the plot of land for the purpose of farming. Mr. Davidoff asked if the Board can guarantee the residents that there will be no farming access on Surrey Lane. Mr. Majewski stated farmers do not want to drive through that neighborhood to get to the farmland when they can come through the adjoining Kimmel property or through Patterson Lane. He asked if they have ever done that. Mr. Davidoff stated they have not; but when he spoke to Ms. Kimmel she stated that if they are not renting the land from her, they are not allowed on her property. Mr. Majewski stated they will then come through Patterson Lane as they have done in the past. Mr. Davidoff asked that it be put in the Public Record that there will be no farm vehicles accessing Surrey Lane, and Mr. Majewski agreed.

Mr. Davidoff stated there are concerns about water and drainage. He showed the location of 10 homes on the west side of Bridle Estates which have had their basements flooded twice. He stated he understands that the Township has done a lot of work on the west side of Lindenhurst Road. He asked if the addition of these 47 homes will cause flooding of the homes again. Mr. Majewski stated the homes that were affected by the flooding are upstream of this Development. Mr. Davidoff stated that is conjecture.

Mr. Davidoff stated they also want to know why this Development would be approved but the Torbert Development that was discussed in 2023 was not approved. He stated the Torbert Farm Development that was proposed did not connect to an existing Residential development, but this one does.

Mr. Majewski stated the Township just received Plans for that Development, and they will be uploaded to the Township Website shortly.

Mr. Davidoff asked if there is anything the Township can do to reduce the Lot count for this Development to make it more amenable. He stated none of them want to see the farmland go. He stated taxes were just raised for a \$15 million Bond, and he asked if the Township could buy some of these Lots and preserve some of space as open farmland and cut the Lot count to 15 or 20. Mr. Coyle stated while that is a question for the Board of Supervisors, if the Township were to purchase some of this land, it would compress the amount of developable land and change the 25% open space buffer.

Mr. Grenier stated with regard to buying more open space, the Township along with the EAC has repeatedly done analyses of various lots around the Township that they have tried to buy. He stated the Township is only allowed to purchase at the appraised value which is generally much less than what a property owner can get on the private market.

Mr. Gill asked if Bridle Estates was previously farmland also, and Mr. Majewski agreed.

Mr. Davidoff stated there are also concerns about crime as this will be a construction site for a number of years, and construction sites are known for attracting criminal elements. He asked what the Township will do to guarantee the safety of the residents in the area. Mr. Coyle stated the Township could discuss with the Police about signage and a license plate reader. Mr. Grenier stated any developer would want to protect their development, and it would be in their favor to provide some level of security. He stated they could work with the Applicant on that.

Mr. Coyle asked if there is a projected timeline for construction, and Mr. Joe DeLuca stated they anticipate a three-year build-out.

Mr. Robert Piper, 1209 Bridle Estates Drive, stated he faces the farmland. He stated he received an aerial map which misrepresents farmland-preserved property as Residential-Zoned property. Mr. Geonnotti stated that is a Zoning line, and you can have farmland-preserved land in an R-1 Zoning District. He stated that is the correct Zoning for that piece of land, and the ownership is under the Farmland Preservation Corporation.

Mr. Piper stated the Institution of Transportation Engineers (ITE) will be coming out with its 12<sup>th</sup> Edition of its Trip Generation Manual this summer, and it will include trip generation data from 2024. He stated rather than the Township relying on trip data from the Pandemic era, 2021 11<sup>th</sup> Edition of the Manual, he would encourage the Township to Table the Wright Farm Development decision until traffic volumes for Surrey Lane can be based on this far more relevant 12<sup>th</sup> Edition of the ITE Manual. He stated during the Pandemic everyone was encouraged to stay home. Mr. Geonnotti stated the ITE Manual has nothing to do with COVID, and it is a Manual based on historic data of trip-generation counts. He stated if you did a traffic count during COVID, that would have to be a factor applied since people were staying home, but the historic data that the ITE Manual is based on was not impacted by the Pandemic. He stated looking at the single-family detached home ITE Code and the trips generated by that Code, there is probably very little if any change to the data.

Mr. Piper stated an ITE representative told him that they look forward to having post-Pandemic data since it will be different from the Pandemic-era data. Mr. Geonnotti stated it will probably be less as people are working from home more. Mr. Piper stated companies are now requiring their employees to come back to work. Mr. Majewski stated this point was raised previously, and he looked at prior ITE trip generation well before COVID, and it was fairly consistent with what the current Manual shows. He stated if they are coming up with the Manual soon, he feels the Applicant could check their numbers to make sure that they are still valid.

Mr. Dan Seekins, 1209 Bridle Estates Drive, stated also at that time is when the Interstate going over the Delaware opened up and the Wegmans has since been developed. He stated he does not feel 2021 represents what kind of traffic this new Development will bring. He stated they feel that more modern data would be much more informative in terms of the safety risk. He stated children are playing in the street in their neighborhood, and people are walking in the street. He stated more risk is incurred with more traffic, and they should use the best data available in making this decision.

Mr. Piper stated the number of vehicles coming through the access will increase the probability of accidents on Surrey Lane, Bridle Estates Drive, Quarry Road, and Lindenhurst Road. He noted the problem of deer in the area.



Mr. Piper stated Section 178-38 of the Ordinance requires safety to be addressed. He stated the additional traffic volume through Surrey Lane will create a number of safety threats to those in the Bridle Estates neighborhood. He discussed other safety issues on surrounding roads in the area and the impact from additional traffic from this proposed Development. Mr. Coyle stated if there are concerns about traffic and safety on Quarry Road and other roads in the area that issue could be discussed with the Township's Citizens Traffic Commission as that is not a matter that the Planning Commission can discuss under this particular Application.

Mr. Piper stated with regard to the issues between the Environmental Advisory Council (EAC) and the Farmland Preservation Corporation, preserving natural features of the site is mentioned in Section 178-87E. Mr. Piper stated the EAC recommended saving the large trees, and he hopes that the Planning Commission will agree that those trees should be saved. He showed a picture of the trees that the EAC wants to keep which will retain water and help with drainage issues.

Mr. Coyle asked the Applicant if they were amenable to looking at an option to preserve those trees. Mr. Murphy stated if the trees depicted on the photo being shown are interspersed among the existing Wright Farm building complex, it is likely that they will not be saved. Mr. Geonnotti stated he could not provide a definitive answer without knowing exactly where the trees are located. He stated they designed the site taking into account the drainage concerns. He stated if they are able to save a tree, they will. He added that they are developing the site in accordance with the Ordinance and replanting it in accordance with the Ordinance as well.

Mr. Geonnotti stated they heard repeated concerns about drainage; and it is a misconception that farmland is good for drainage as it is not and has a very high water run-off rate. He stated in the existing condition there is a significant amount of impervious with the farm structures and farm fields and there are no stormwater controls. He stated by developing the property and installing stormwater controls that meet current regulations, there will be an improvement. He stated that this property is downstream from Bridle Estates and nothing from this property flows upstream which could affect basements. He stated the flow from Bridle Estates flows through this property a large portion of which they are managing through their site as it does flow north to south from the preserved land onto this site. He stated it will then be detained in the basin and slowly released through the site. He stated they will be improving the Township's watershed in this area.

Mr. Coyle asked if the Applicant would commit to taking a look as they move forward whether there is the possibility of preserving any of the mature trees, and Mr. Geonnotti agreed.

Mr. Piper asked who decides whether the developer will pay a Fee-In-Lieu of Recreation or is it a joint decision with the Township. Mr. Coyle stated the developer requests that they be able to pay a Fee-In-Lieu of placing recreation, and the Board of Supervisors votes on whether they are amenable to accepting that. He stated generally the Fee-In-Lieu is accepted as opposed to a developer being required to create active recreation facilities on their site. Mr. Piper stated that means the Township is in favor of putting up residences instead of recreational property. Mr. Coyle stated that is incorrect; and instead of the developer dedicating as much of the land as they are to open space, they would hold back some of that space and create recreational facilities there. Mr. Majewski stated it is decided on a case-by-case basis. He stated if this property were to adjoin a Township park, the Township may prefer to add acreage to that park to allow more recreational amenities. He stated a number of years ago when the Township had very little to no recreation land, some developments did dedicate recreation land and improve it as part of their obligation for the development, and they did not pay a Fee-In-Lieu. He stated in this instance, he feels that the Township would not feel that there was a need for recreation land at this site and would prefer accepting the Fee-In-Lieu, and that money would go toward improving other pieces of land that the Township already owns.

Mr. Coyle stated this matter was also considered when the Township was discussing the Open Space Ordinance last year. He stated this development will be under an HOA, and they would restrict non-residents from having access to recreation land on the property; and it is felt that it is best for the Township to have an open parcel of land instead of a park that would only be accessible to 47 homes. He stated an HOA cannot be legally required to provide access to those who do not live in their development so it would not be available to the children in the neighboring development.

Mr. Piper stated the children in his neighborhood have no park that they can bike to. Mr. Coyle stated the matter before the Planning Commission is the right of the landowner to develop the land, and they are doing the best that they can to manage that against the Township's interest in open space. He stated if the Board of Supervisors is interested in acquiring some of this land in order to build a neighborhood park, that would be their purview;

and those in Bridle Estates could lobby them to do that. He stated the Planning Commission cannot instruct the developer that they have to build a public park on this land.

Mr. Piper stated he is concerned that the developer is maximizing the number of homes they can put on the property, and there is no compromise as to recreation space in this area. Mr. Gill stated the Planning Commission cannot require this of the Applicant, and it is up to the Board of Supervisors to decide. Mr. Piper asked if the Planning Commission is working with the developer to come up with an agreed upon amount as to the Fee-In-Lieu of recreational space. Ms. Carlton stated the Fee is dictated by the Ordinance. Mr. Piper stated he is asking who makes the decision as to the amount of homes that can be built in lieu of recreation space. Mr. Murphy stated that has nothing to do with the Fee-In-Lieu of Recreation. He stated there is an Ordinance that calculates density and there is another Ordinance that deals with a per lot recreation payment in lieu of providing active, on-site recreation.

Mr. Coyle asked the Applicant if the Township were to indicate that they wanted on-site recreation space would they build less homes or Dedicate less open space to the Township. Mr. Geonnotti stated as Mr. Murphy noted, there is a density calculation; and since there are no natural resources on the site, it is the 25% open space required that dictates the design, and that is how you come up with the 47 allowed homes. Mr. Coyle asked that they discuss with staff where they might place active recreation space if the Township wanted that to be included on-site.

Mr. Piper again asked about saving the trees he had shown in the picture, and Mr. Geonnotti stated they agreed to evaluate whether any of the trees could be saved. Mr. Murphy stated they are not expecting that they are going to save those trees although they will look into to see if they can incorporate any of them around the current design.

Mr. Murphy stated there was an earlier comment made by the first speaker about the extent of the buffer along the northern boundary line, and the developer had indicated earlier in tonight's presentation that they were going to provide a buffer for the first four to five homes before you get to the drainage easement; but that the current Plan did not contemplate a buffer around the balance of that where it abuts the actively-farmed farmland which is farmed by the Farmland Preservation Corporation. He stated Farmland Preservation was adamant about not having a buffer in that area and only wanted the required fence there; and that is why the buffer

was not extended. Mr. Geonnotti stated there will be a split-rail fence which is a requirement as a demarcation between the actively-farmed farmland and the Residential Lots. The Plan was shown and the first four Lots were noted with the planted buffer along the back of the property as well as the fence. He stated once you are past the fourth Lot, it will just be the fence. He stated that was a compromise with Farmland Preservation to incorporate a buffer to screen the existing Surrey Lane homes and also maintain the request/criteria of Farmland Preservation. Mr. Murphy stated unlike the balance of the site which may be in flux as to what is going to happen with regard to farming, that area in the north being discussed will continue to be farmed.

Mr. Coyle stated Farmland Preservation's concern is that there are currently no trees in that area, and they do not want shade to impact their crops.

Mr. Coyle asked the location of the existing farm buildings, and these were shown on the Existing Features Aerial Plan. Mr. Geonnotti stated there are trees in that area, and they are able to take them down with the provisions of the Ordinance. He noted the area where a large portion of the stormwater management and the road network needs to be. He stated they have indicated that they will see if any of the trees can be saved, and if they can they will do so. He stated they are planting street trees and trees will need to be planted in place of trees being taken down.

Mr. Coyle asked if Farmland Preservation were amenable, would the developer be amenable to putting in a privacy fence along the back yards as opposed to a split rail fence; and Mr. Murphy stated they would.

Mr. Rohit Moghe, Surrey Lane, stated he works from home and there are multiple trucks currently on Surrey Lane including delivery and repair trucks and that number will increase when these 47 homes are built. He expressed concern with the safety of children playing in the neighborhood with this added traffic and the speeds traveled. Mr. Coyle suggested that the neighbors speak to the Citizens Traffic Commission about the speeding.

Ms. Karin Moore stated she has lived on Surrey Lane for over twenty-five years, and she thanked the Planning Commission for hearing their concerns. She stated comments have been made about preserving the farmland; and since the voters just voted in favor of Open Space, she asked that this space be preserved. She stated they already have Wegmans in the area and adding 47 houses to the traffic already on Surrey Lane is a significant amount. She expressed concern for the safety of the children in their development. She stated she does not feel that

that the infrastructure can handle this additional traffic as there is a dip in Surrey Lane and she has had to call the Township twice to fix it. She stated there are also additional dips in Bridle Estates. Ms. Moore stated she hopes the Township will verify everything being proposed by the developer with regard to the drainage. Ms. Moore stated she and her neighbors are concerned that Surrey Lane is going to become a speedway.

Ms. Moore stated she does not know how the developer can install a median since the current neighbors sometimes park their cars on the street. Mr. Coyle stated they are concerned about controlling traffic from the extension of Surrey Lane into the existing Surrey Lane. He stated the developer is not making a change to the existing Surrey Lane. He stated the developer was asked during the site walk in November to make sure that in the new piece being built south of the existing homes that something be put in place such as an island to force drivers from the new development to slow down before crossing into the existing Surrey Lane; and that is the median that they are proposing, and it will be wholly within the new development.

Ms. Moore asked that the Township seriously consider preserving most if not all of the Farm or reduce the number of houses. She stated 47 houses is significant, and she asked that it be 15 or 20. Ms. Moore stated she is concerned as well about her safety with there being a construction site for three years at the end of her street.

Mr. Jeff Sawyer, 1162 Ascot Court, stated his home is the original farmhouse which Bridle Estates was built around. He stated his biggest concern is water run-off from the preserved farmland as currently there is a lot of flooding and pooling that occurs where Patterson Lane ends at the fence of his property. He asked what will be done to prevent additional flooding from occurring as he currently gets water in his basement. Mr. Sawyer stated there is an Easement that runs between his home and the home next to him, and he asked where the facility hook-ups will be for the new community. He stated if it is between the two homes he is concerned since when they were expanding the lanes at 295 and putting up the sound barriers there was a lot of construction rumble which resulted in a lot of cracks in his stone home, and they had to pay a lot of money to have that fixed. He stated he is concerned about digging to connect utilities, and he asked who would be responsible for repairs to their homes if damage were to concern. Mr. Sawyer asked with regard to the view including the fence line, trees, and the farmland what input do the residents have. He stated he bought the home to have the beautiful view of the farm;

and while he understands that the property owners have the right to sell their property, as taxpayers this is impacting their quality of life. He stated he would like to see additional trees blocking the view of the new community as well as large privacy fences.

Mr. Sawyer showed the location of his home on the aerial and where the flooding he spoke about currently occurs. Mr. Geonnotti stated Mr. Sawyer indicated that the water is coming off the preserved farm and not the Wright farm causing the issue, and Mr. Sawyer agreed. Mr. Geonnotti stated the developer does not have control over that. He stated there is a portion of the existing farm which drains onto the Wright Farm, and what the developer is required to do is manage the water that is coming onto their property; and he explained how that will be managed. He stated they will not be able to fix Mr. Sawyer's issue as part of their development. Mr. Sawyer asked if Mr. Geonnotti is indicating that what they will be doing will not increase the water issue he is having. Mr. Geonnotti stated the Township's engineer and the State's authority, PADEP, review the Plans, and he added they already have their Permit from the PADEP. He stated they are significantly reducing per the Township's Ordinances, the amount of run-off that is coming off the Wright property. He stated they will have no impact on what is happening at Mr. Sawyer's property.

Mr. Coyle asked where the utilities will be coming into the new development. Mr. Geonnotti stated between Mr. Sawyer's house and his neighbor's house there is a 15' to 20' piece of land which is not part of the neighborhood but is part of Farmland Preservation property. He stated within that is a Utility Easement currently owned by Aqua PA, the sewer provider. He stated there is no sewer in it at this time. He stated through discussions with PA America they are asking them to loop the water main, and that will be the water main that will connect the 47 new homes. Mr. Geonnotti stated PA America does not want there to be dead ends; and if there is an opportunity for them to loop the water main, they ask that to be done. He stated there would be a connection to the water main which exists in the cul-de-sac through the existing Easement between the two properties. He stated it will be an 8" water main.

Mr. Sawyer asked how the farmers will access the preserved farmland without going through the neighborhood. Mr. Coyle stated the Motion to the Board of Supervisors being considered is that the Board insure that the existing Patterson Lane that connects to 332 and goes around the perimeter of the perimeter be preserved as an access road for Farmland Preservation to reach the preserved farmland. Mr. Majewski showed on the aerial how the farm vehicles would reach the farmland. Mr. Sawyer expressed concern with the

potential of others making use of this access, and Mr. Geonnotti stated that there will be a chain at the entrance off the By-Pass and it will be signed for emergency access. He stated there will also be a secondary chain at the end of the re-aligned Patterson Lane within the community indicating that the residents cannot go past that point; and the chain and bollard will be there for emergency vehicles. Mr. Geonnotti stated traffic would be significantly more if there were a connection point back to the By-Pass and it could become a cut-through from Quarry.

Mr. Sawyer asked about someone taking the chain down. Mr. Coyle stated there are chains like that throughout the Township. Mr. Majewski stated there have not been issues with people cutting the chains. Mr. Sawyer stated he is concerned with the chain on 332 which is a very highly-traveled road right off of 295. Mr. Bush stated he lives in Hidden Oaks where something similar to what is occurring now happened there where Hidden Oaks had a neighborhood added on, and there was a chain installed where it goes onto Stony Hill Road, and there has never been a problem with that. He stated the proposal is not to have direct access onto 332, and it is only through Surrey Lane which he agrees will have more traffic on it. He stated he is in favor of installing some kind of median to slow down the rate of speed.

Mr. Bush asked if the house on the other end of Patterson Lane that sits by itself is occupied, and Mr. Sawyer stated it is. Mr. Bush asked if the homeowner is a farmer farming the land around there, and Mr. Sawyer stated the homeowner is not.

Mr. Bush stated he understands that the road was going to be for Farmland Preservation purposes; and Mr. Majewski stated it would not be a publicly-acceptable road, and it would only be acceptable for the farmer and emergency vehicles. Mr. Bush asked if the resident of the home they just discussed would use it as well, and Mr. Majewski stated the resident of that home would use the portion from their home where it ties into the development. It would be beyond where the chain is, and it would be free access from their house into the proposed road that is re-aligned. He stated if you continue from their house on Patterson Lane after the re-alignment, that is where the chain will be, and you could not get through to 332; and you would have to go through the neighborhood for that last segment.

Mr. Geonnotti showed on a Plan where the two chains and bollards would be located and how they would restrict access to Patterson Lane.

Mr. Richard Arcieri, 1113 Surrey Lane, stated he moved here three years ago because it was a dead-end road where his child could be safe. He stated currently he has only four houses that would pass him on his street, but now he will have another 48. He stated he understands that the Wrights should be able to do what they want with their land, but he is concerned with the traffic going through; and he feels they should fight more to try to get PennDOT approve it or make the entrance through Patterson Road. He stated others making a profit should not at the expense of other people. Mr. Arcieri asked if the resident they were just discussing knows that they will no long be able to access their property the way they are now, and they will have to go through the Bridle Estates Development. It was noted that they are aware of that.

Mr. Arcieri stated he has been on Patterson Road with his electric dirt bike, and there is not enough sound barrier for the houses there.

Mr. Arcieri stated he does not want the new development to connect through Surrey Lane, and he feels that there has to be away that this can be done without disturbing the Bridle Estates community. He again expressed concern with the safety of the children and others who are walking in their community. He stated while they have discussed installing an island at the start of the new community, once drivers come past the island, they will speed up through the Bridle Estates community.

Mr. George Rusnak, 1264 Bridle Estates Drive, stated they are very concerned about the increase in traffic from these additional 47 homes. He asked what steps can be taken to mitigate that traffic either taking the new traffic out to 332 only or mitigate it through other means in Bridle Estates with speed limit signs, signs with lighted speed traveled, speed bumps, and Police with speed traps.

Mr. Coyle asked if Mr. Bush would agree to amend the Motion that the Planning Commission also requests that the Board of Supervisors work with the Township traffic engineer to look at a study on Bridle Estates Drive for current speeds, etc. to see if there are speed shaping or limiting actions that are appropriate for that street.

Mr. Bush stated he would agree to that. He stated Mr. Murphy had indicated that PennDOT had given a “hard no,” and he asked if the Township was a participant in those discussions; and Mr. Murphy stated they were. Mr. Murphy



stated he does not know if a renewed effort might be more successful; however, they felt they had brought a lot of political force to bear on the effort to convince PennDOT to think differently about this, but they chose not to.

Mr. Rusnak stated he thought that he heard that initially PennDOT encouraged them to consider the connection to 332 and then they flipped; but they would strongly appreciate the connection to 332 and not connect into Surrey Lane, and they would be willing to participate in that discussion. Mr. Coyle stated he has reviewed the letter from PennDOT, and it is very clear that they spent a lot of money on the existing intersection near the Wegman's; and given the amount they have invested they have zero interest in re-opening the traffic pattern there. Mr. Coyle stated we can recommend that the Township traffic engineer double check, but PennDOT was adamant in their resistance. He stated they have in fact recommended that the neighborhood go west through other existing farmland to connect to Lindenhurst which we cannot do.

Mr. Coyle stated the current Motion under consideration is that the Planning Commission send a letter to the Board of Supervisors recommending that a preference be given to planting trees as the buffer between the proposed new development and Route 332 instead of a preference toward farmed land, and that Patterson Lane be maintained for Farmland Preservation so that they have access to the existing land that they do farm. The Planning Commission also recommends that the Township perform a Traffic Study on Bridle Estates Drive to study speed and traffic patterns to see if there is something that can be done there to increase the safety of that street.

Mr. Grenier asked if the Applicant would be willing to do a Traffic Study there. Mr. Murphy stated Mr. Geonnotti indicated earlier that the most-recent revised amendment to the Study included an analysis of the impact of this project on the internal streets of Bridle Estates. Mr. Geonnotti stated there was a Traffic Impact Assessment submitted, and the counts were done January 29<sup>th</sup> and Saturday, February 1<sup>st</sup>; and they did a full analysis of the impact of the proposed neighborhood on the adjacent road network.

Mr. Coyle stated it seems that the residents are indicating that there may already be existing speed concerns on Bridle Estates Drive not related to the developer's Impact Study of the number of trips. Mr. Murphy stated he would encourage the Township to reach out to Mr. Fiocco and have him make any recommendations. Ms. Karin Moore stated Mr. Geonnotti had indicated earlier that it was an insignificant amount of additional traffic.

Mr. Geonnotti stated when they do an analysis of the impact on the adjacent roadway network based on ITE counts and the impact of a neighborhood of 47 homes, they apply the same calculation that they would on a full Traffic Study; and what was determined was the impact of the 47 homes on the adjacent roadway network would have not adversely impact the Level of Service. He stated that was the analysis that they were required to do in accordance with the Township's Ordinance. Ms. Moore stated the residents would support the Planning Commission's Motion to do an additional safety study.

Mr. Grenier stated when they did the Traffic Study, they were focused on counts, and he asked if they did any speed studies; and Mr. Geonnotti stated they did not. Mr. Grenier stated the speed study coupled with the counts are what drive additional traffic-calming safety measures.

Mr. Joe Fiocco, the Township's traffic engineer, stated that traditional Traffic Studies evaluate volume and delays. He stated the residents are concerned about the safety on the road. Mr. Fiocco stated with regard to the roundabout, they looked at the volumes and indicated that because they were so low, they did not meet a Warrant; however, you cannot have too little traffic going into a mini roundabout. He stated the boulevard may reduce traffic to some degree; but from an engineering standpoint, the roundabout will reduce traffic passing through the intersection. He stated his office had recommended a mini roundabout at the first intersection of the development which will go a long way as far as people leaving and coming into the development. He stated the existing roads that are within the existing development have their own concerns, but the developer cannot come in and fix problems that are there. He stated if the roads that are there are encouraging higher speeds than desired for a Residential road, it would make sense to look at it for potential traffic calming; however, that would be on the Township and not on the developer for those concerns.

Mr. Fiocco stated with regard to the request to access 332, there is more traffic on 332 than there is on I-295 so to have a driveway with direct access to 332 is not desirable from the State or the Township's standpoint. He stated adding a fourth leg to the existing traffic signal at Stony Hill will degrade it for all the traffic that is using it and all the improvements that were done.

Mr. Coyle stated they are not asking the Applicant to pay for a Speed Study on Bridle Estates Drive, but it does seem to be a recurring concern that there are speed issues on that road.

Mr. Bush and Mr. Gill agreed to the amended Motion.

Mr. Geonnotti stated Mr. DeLuca will agree to pay for the Speed Study.

Ms. Alice “Lisa” Perry, 1221 Bridle Estates Drive expressed concern about the safety of children playing in the street with more cars coming into their development.

Mr. Coyle stated since Mr. DeLuca has agreed to pay for the Speed Study, he believes that Condition can be removed from the Motion; and that would be a separate matter that the developer will do and provide the information to the Township. Mr. Murphy stated he assumed the Planning Commission wanted their own consultant to do the Speed Study so it does not present an issue with bias.

Mr. Glen Firestone, 1268 Bridle Estates Drive, stated he lives on the main straightway that has been discussed, and added that the traffic does tend to go faster there. He stated with the new development, that will increase the traffic. He stated adding the round-about on Surrey will do nothing to impact the other road since once they come to a stop at the end of Surrey, they will make a left and then go on the long stretch of Bridle Estates where the cars go fast. He stated the number of houses in the new development is no longer 32, and it is now 47. He stated he has not heard any solutions for the existing residents. He stated they should either cut down the number of houses or re-visit the Traffic Study to find out PennDOT’s reasons for turning down what was proposed and why they could not use technology and sensors so that they only work when someone pulls up. Mr. Firestone stated once all the houses are constructed, there will still be trucks coming into the new neighborhood for various services and that drives the traffic up.

Mr. Coyle stated he does not feel they will be able to go through all of the points in the review letter; and once they have heard all of the public comment, he would suggest Tabling this matter until there is a chance for the developer to reduce the number of items to review and bring it back before the Planning Commission. Mr. Murphy stated their Extension runs until mid-June, and they would like to accomplish this within that timeframe.

Mr. John Backus, 1236 Bridle Estates Drive, stated it was indicated that the construction vehicles would not be permitted to go into Bridle Estates, and he would like to make sure that the fines are significant enough to stop trucks from doing that. Mr. Backus stated Bridle Estates Drive has a number of cracks, and it is not expected to be repaved for another 15 to 20 years. He stated the increase in traffic coming from the new development should be considered so that the road is paved sooner.

Mr. Murphy stated there needs to be direction given from the Township as to whether they want there to be farming or open space. Mr. Coyle stated that is part of the Motion, and the decision will be made by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Costello stated with regard to the buffer along the road, that is all on the north side of the property so there would not be a shadow cast on farmland by any trees. He stated the Township does not have to discuss the competing priorities but there may be a way to put in a buffer and still have farmland. Mr. Coyle stated he feels it is incumbent on the Board of Supervisors to be the coordinating voice among the differing opinions of the various Commissions. Mr. Murphy stated he is asking that there be some liaison between the Township Administration and the Applicant so they get feedback on these questions which they can then incorporate into any Revised Plans.

Mr. Grenier stated when it comes to a formal approval/guidance on the issue of farming versus planting or a combination, that does not come formally until the Board has a formal vote on the Plan. He stated he could speak to the staff and the groups to try to get a “feel on the matter.” Mr. Murphy stated he is just looking for someone to report back to them what they should be doing. Mr. Bush stated that is not an unreasonable request, and is part of their Motion. Mr. Majewski stated a discussion can be arranged with those involved.

Mr. Mike Lederer, 1225 Bridle Estates Drive, stated he is concerned about the safety of the children in the neighborhood and the speed of the traffic going down Bridle Estates Drive and the addition of 47 additional houses.

Mr. Richard Arcieri stated there was an intersection presented to PennDOT, and they said “no.” He asked if there was ever a proposed plan of using Patterson Road for this development alone. Mr. Coyle stated there has been a lot of discussion for some time about all of the options to get into and out of this development. He stated the Planning Commission wants to hear from the residents, but the residents also need to trust them. He stated the general consensus related to using Patterson Lane is related to the safety of cars pulling off of 332 into Patterson Lane to enter a neighborhood and slowing, coming into conflict with cars coming off 295. He stated all of the letters related to this are available on the Township Website, and the residents will have an opportunity to come back when the Applicants comes before the Planning Commission again.

Mr. Arcieri asked with regard to construction vehicles and others being prohibited from going through Bridle Estates and Surrey Lane while the new development is under construction, are they going to post someone there every day to watch. He also asked what the fine will be and who it will be paid to if trucks do come in there. He asked if that fee will be going to any of the residents living on those streets who are being impacted. Mr. Coyle stated how the access is monitored will be between the Applicant and the Township staff as will the level of fine to be assessed. Mr. Majewski stated a fine is meant to deter or encourage behavior; and once someone gets a fine, they will not repeat the behavior for which they received the fine. Mr. Coyle stated the Applicant has committed to placing signage at the entrance to the existing development indicating that no construction traffic is allowed, and they made the commitment that until the model home is complete, they will physically block the connection on Surrey. Mr. Arcieri stated signage does not work. He stated there is work being done on Lindenhurst Road currently, and the way the road is blocked, it is not clear and it is unattended. Mr. Coyle stated the Planning Commission is doing everything they can, and the residents comments are being recorded for the Record. He stated recommendations have been made that the entrance be monitored and that fines be put in place, and there is nothing more that the Planning Commission can do.

Mr. Arcieri stated he wants the property owners to be able to sell their land and the developers to be able to make an investment and make money on it, but he does not want the existing residents to be burdened by it. He asked that they try to keep Bridle Estates totally out of it.

Mr. Alex Davidoff stated he represents close to 100 homeowners. He asked what are the next steps. Mr. Coyle stated the next step is to approve the Motion which is a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. He stated they have also asked the Applicant to allow us to place this Application on hold for the consideration of the Planning Commission until the Applicant has a chance to respond to the review letters from the Township engineer and pare down the letter. The Applicant will come back to the Planning Commission, and Mr. Coyle stated he assumes they will be requesting Preliminary and Final Approval. He stated they will then go to the Board of Supervisors for their approval of the Plans. He stated the residents would therefore have at a minimum two more times to make comment.

Ms. Karin Moore asked if the Planning Commission is going to ask the DeLucas to change the number of houses to less than 47. Mr. Coyle stated the Applicant has been asked at multiple points during this process to reduce the number of homes although they are not required to under the Ordinances, and what they are proposing is permitted by Law. Mr. Coyle stated the only body that would have any ability to stop any development is the Board of Supervisors, but even then the Law constrains them. Ms. Moore asked the DeLucas if they would consider reducing the number of homes based on what they have heard. Mr. Murphy stated they would not consider that, and their expectation is that when they come back with a Revised Plan, it will show 47 homes as it does now. He stated while it was stated earlier this evening that at one point there were 32 homes, that is not true; and there was always this number of homes. He stated they intend to have a Variance-free Plan; and they want to comply with the Ordinance and have 47 homes.

Mr. Coyle noted that the Motion before the Planning Commission is to recommend that a letter be sent to the Board of Supervisors that rather than Dedicating the land to the south of the new development solely to Farmland Preservation, that a tree buffer be placed on that land. Further that the existing Patterson Lane be maintained so that Farmland Preservation has access to reach the farmland to the north of the proposed development without having to go on the private roads or transit private property. Additionally the Planning Commission is asking that the Township's traffic engineer perform a Speed Study on Bridle Estates Drive in order to assuage any concerns residents have raised regarding speeding through the neighborhood. Mr. DeLuca has offered to reimburse the Township for that speed Study.

Motion carried unanimously. Ms. Torbert recused herself from the vote.

A short recess was taken at this time.

The meeting was reconvened at 11:24 p.m.

KNESSET HASSEFFER INFORMAL SKETCH PLAN  
Tax Parcel #20-016-073-001  
R-2 Residential Medium-Density Zoning District  
1237 Edgewood Road  
Proposed 14,730 square foot Synagogue with 61 parking spaces

Mr. Majewski stated the property owner for the Knesset Haseffer has submitted an Informal Sketch Plan for review by the Planning Commission to get some input before they go into any hard engineering. He stated currently it is a small Synagogue in the house at the round-about opposite Schuyler.

Mike Meginnis, attorney, was present with Rabbi Blecher and Matt Landro from Bohler Engineering. Mr. Meginnis stated the project has been the subject of some staff meetings; and at the conclusion of the most-recent staff meeting, the Applicant felt it would be beneficial to come to the Planning Commission before moving onto the Zoning Hearing Board. He stated they understand that any recommendations are not dispositive as it relates to the Zoning Hearing Board, but they would take the feedback from the Planning Commission members and finalize their Application before moving onto the Zoning Hearing Board. He stated they wanted to have the design criteria and their view for the project vetted now so that they would not have to potentially go back to the Zoning Hearing Board at a later date if there was a concern raised by the Planning Commission then.

Mr. Meginniss showed the location of the Lot on the Site Plan. He stated the gross acreage is just over 5 acres, and there are a number of environmental features to the rear of the site; but they are not disturbing any of those features with this Application. Mr. Meginniss stated they are proposing the construction of a new Synagogue which will be approximately 14,000 square feet. He stated about 25% of the members of the Synagogue are Orthodox who walk to the site. He stated there are a number of pedestrian improvements off-site which make this an ideal location for an expansion.

Mr. Meginniss stated the initial iteration of the design had flipped the parking improvements. He stated they retained TPD as their traffic consultant to do more investment than they typically would since they wanted to get this correct at the beginning knowing that traffic, parking, and circulation are always important for any religious institution. He stated as a result of those conversations and input from the Bohler team, they flipped the orientation since they felt that they could make better use of the round-about with the proposed parking facilities.

Mr. Meginniss stated they have to be in close proximity to a number of the Residential communities in which the members of this congregation currently reside to access the site. He stated given the Zoning constraints, looking at other properties was not possible since current members of the Congregation would still need to be able to walk to the facility.

Mr. Meginniss stated the regular Saturday services average approximately 50 people including men, women, and children with a maximum of 75 on a typical Saturday. He stated there are 61 parking spaces proposed on site so they feel they have plenty of parking.

Mr. Landro stated they wanted to make the best use of this piece of land since it is the best piece of land for the community that the Synagogue already serves. He stated there are constraints on Lot dimension and some of the existing setbacks that are in the R-2 Zone. He stated there is a 10' wide stretch of land in the middle of the building which is the developable area that is permitted within the R-2 Zone so there is no ability for them to put in anything that would comply within that envelope. He stated there are also other elements that the Code do not allow for a use such as this, and that is why they will be going before the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Meginniss stated they are not present tonight to have the Planning Commission weigh in on the validity of any of the Variances that they are going to need to procure. He stated they would like to get from the Planning Commission their thoughts on the best design for this site, and they will then go before the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Landro stated with regard to traffic access, there is really only one viable place to tie into the existing round-about that is located along the frontage of Edgewood Road. He stated they know the number of parking spaces that they will need to operate the facility at full capacity. Mr. Landro stated they are proposing a two-story building. He stated the parking proposed can service all of the individual uses that will be at the Synagogue.

Mr. Landro stated initially their proposal had a driveway a little bit further to the east side of the building from what they are showing with parking spaces along that eastern property line. He stated one of the benefits of shifting to the lay-out now being shown is that they were able to eliminate the parking stalls up against that property line for headlight-screening purposes and traffic coming in and out of those parking spaces. He stated with what they are proposing now, the neighboring properties to the east will be less effected by the Plan. Mr. Coyle stated those properties would be northeast of the property, and Mr. Landro agreed.

Mr. Landro stated they have done some geo-technical investigation and performed some engineering design even though it is not reflected on the Plan that was submitted. He stated they have also looked at grading and stormwater management.



Mr. Meginniss stated the Rabbi contacted his office nearly two years ago. He stated they own the site, and their community wants to make a serious investment on the front end to show that they are serious about delivering the best product they can. He stated they brought on Mr. Landro as well as a traffic consultant and their reports will be provided to the Zoning Hearing Board.

Rabbi Blecher stated he is a resident of Lower Makefield, and this Synagogue is for the community. He stated their congregation is on Edgewood Road and at the VFW on Yardley-Newtown Road where they rent, and the plan is to merge the two locations into this one location on Edgewood Road. He stated he knows the biggest concern of the Township is always traffic and parking, and this is why they brought in TPD. He stated he does not want there to be a problem with their congregants getting to the Synagogue or to cause problems for the neighbors. He stated many of their congregants walk on Saturday to the Synagogue so they are limited as to the location where they could have their Synagogue. He stated there are already sidewalks and crosswalks in the area.

Mr. Bush stated it was noted that they would have the entrance by the traffic circle on Edgewood Road. He asked if it is an issue to have an entrance to a parking lot off of a traffic circle. Mr. Fiocco stated ideally the fourth leg of the round-about would be the place to put the entrance with the limited frontage that they have on the property. He added this is actually a mini roundabout, and it is somewhat shifted to the north of the center of the intersection which was done to save costs. He stated the mini roundabout was installed there as an effort to address the Sandy Run traffic needing to make lefts in and out of Sandy Run Road. He stated since there will be a lot of people walking to the Synagogue, if we want to make Edgewood Road better for pedestrians, we would want to shift the round-about south so that people who are going eastbound on Edgewood Road are at more of a deflection.

Mr. Fiocco stated what makes a roundabout so safe is that you have to slow down to go into the roundabout. He stated due to cost savings and the fact that we did not have the right-of-way, the roundabout was shifted to the north. He stated he knows that the property to the west is also under consideration at this time so between these two properties we may be able to make the roundabout much more efficient and balanced as far as speeds going down Edgewood Road which would make it much safer for everyone using Edgewood Road and the pedestrian multi-use trails that exist there.

Mr. Bush asked if that would involve expanding the roundabout and moving it toward the property, and Mr. Fiocco stated expanding it is one option; but Bohler could look at the options to see what is the least expensive. He stated you want traffic going eastbound on Edgewood Road toward the Township Building to deflect right and back to the left to stay on Edgewood Road. He stated currently it is such a minor deflection, he is sure that speeds are much higher there than we would like to have. Mr. Meginniss stated moving it south, anyone making the maneuver to go toward the Township Building would have to decrease their speed more, and Mr. Fiocco agreed. Mr. Bush stated that would presumably help going in and out of the parking lot, and Mr. Fiocco agreed.

Ms. Torbert stated she is concerned that people are still getting used to roundabouts. She stated coming from the McCaffrey's toward the Township Building, you are just entering into the round-about and there could be a lot of rear end collisions at times when people are entering the parking lot. She stated she is also concerned that the Railroad tracks are in the area; and when there is a freight train that causes five to ten minute delays, she does not know if there could be a back-up around the mini round-about. She asked why the entrance to the Synagogue could not be put further down to the east. Mr. Meginniss stated they originally had it further down toward the Township Building before they had the traffic engineer involved; and it was his suggestion to have the driveway closer to the round-about based on driveway separation, traffic engineering, access design. He stated he will explore that further with the traffic engineer and provide him with the feedback received tonight from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Majewski stated he believes that if the round-about were to remain where it is now, Mr. Fiocco would be comfortable with a design similar to this subject to reviewing it and finalizing the details. Mr. Fiocco stated currently it is almost at the round-about; however, they should remember that they have been trying to get the Harris Farm to the west developed for a long time. Mr. Fiocco stated while the primary purpose of the round-about was to facilitate left turns in and out of Sandy Run, a secondary benefit was to slow traffic down on Edgewood Road coming into the area where the ballfields, library and the Pool are located. He stated he would like to see the round-about shifted or made bigger so that traffic coming from McCaffrey's heading toward the Township Building will have to go down to between 20 to 25 miles per hour.

Mr. Majewski stated his question was that if it cannot be moved by the joint venture of this project and the one next door, would Mr. Fiocco have an issue with the location proposed now with some minor fixes. Mr. Fiocco stated he feels they can work; but it should be remembered that the round-about was a temporary fix for the sight distance, and it was not a permanent round-about installation. He stated it has been working, and he has not heard any reports from the Police Department about crashes; but it is not ideal since where they are proposing to put the driveway the speed of the traffic will still be much higher than 25 which is not what you want.

Mr. Costello stated he sees this project as a potential opportunity to work with the Township to help fix a problem that the Township sees with the current design of the traffic circle. Mr. Meginniss stated if the Township has information about the Harris property, he would be willing to discuss it with their representatives. He stated the more people involved in help defray the costs, would be better for everyone. Mr. Majewski stated he will be meeting with representatives for the Harris Farm soon to discuss the Zoning Hearing Board Application that they will be submitting.

Ms. Torbert stated she would not want to see this Applicant held up to work with the Harris Farm developer since that property has been in development for many, many years. She asked if they have resolved the dump question, and Mr. Majewski stated they still have a lot of issues to work out. He added that is why he asked Mr. Fiocco if, absent moving this in a cooperative effort, he would be comfortable with what is proposed by this Applicant with some modifications to what is currently being shown; and he believes that Mr. Fiocco indicated he would until they could get something better.

Mr. Coyle stated when he made the drive from McCaffrey's to the Township Building for this meeting, he barely had to slow down at the traffic circle. He stated his concern is for pedestrians which could involve even more people than currently with the expansion who would be crossing an unlighted pedestrian crossing at a spot where traffic is moving very quickly. He stated impervious surface is also an issue given the flooding we have been dealing with; and if they are proposing 61 parking spaces where currently there is essentially a driveway, they would want to know how that would get mitigated especially with the building footprint that is proposed.

Ms. Torbert asked if the current house will be demolished, and it was indicated that it will. Ms. Torbert asked how long it has been a Synagogue, and Rabbi Blecher stated he believes it has been there since the mid to late 1980's.

Ms. Torbert asked if there is any grandfathering involved in terms of the use. Mr. Majewski stated the Use was previously approved by the Board of Supervisors, but they will have to go to the Zoning Hearing Board to re-authorize the Special Exception since they are expanding what had previously been approved. Mr. Majewski stated they also had authorization approved to have the property as it is now with a Lot line change to acquire more property from the adjoining neighbor to the east which will allow what they are proposing now.

Ms. Torbert asked about uses on days other than Saturday, and she asked if there will be an educational component. Rabbi Blecher stated it is a Synagogue with an Accessory Use for a day care that they hope to open for the children of their members, but it would not be open to those who are not members of the Synagogue. He stated they have Bar Mitzvahs that take place as part of the Sabbath services. He stated during the week there is adult education and prayer services with the main prayer service on Saturday morning. He stated during the week the prayer services are much smaller with ten to twenty people. He stated prayer services would not be when they have the day care, and vice versa. He stated adult education is at night. He stated there would be multiple uses at the Synagogue but not all at the same time so there would not be overlap as to parking.

Ms. Torbert asked if there is a drop-off/pick-up area in the front or does everyone have to park and go inside; and it was noted that there is no designed drop-off area, and if there was it would occur adjacent to the handicap stalls.

Mr. Coyle asked if given that there is not a turn-around within the parking lot, and people would be exiting the parking spots, would there be a concern with the spots closest to the circle itself backing out which could halt traffic coming in and would back up the circle. Mr. Landro stated they feel that the driveway separation and the frequency of those stalls being used would most likely not be an issue. Mr. Coyle stated if that was felt to be a concern, moving the entrance to the building further to the south would make those more southern parking stalls more likely to be used than the ones closest to the entrance and exit.

Mr. Grenier asked about an evaluation in terms of emergency services; and Mr. Landro stated they know that a fire vehicle can circulate. He stated there is no secondary point of egress so they cannot go through the site. He stated this is why they have the stiped area on the far south side furthest away from the building which allows for trash pick-up and circulation if needed as well as for turn-around potential for vehicles. It was noted that this has not yet gone before Fire Services.

The location of the trash pick-up area was shown. Mr. Landro stated this is arbitrary at this point until they finalize the exact location of the parking stalls and the building design. Mr. Landro stated they are trying to maximize the parking as close to the building as possible.

Mr. Grenier asked if the day care would be all internal to the building or would they have a playground. Rabbi Blecher stated on both sides of the proposed patio in the back of the building there will be some playground facilities. Mr. Coyle stated if they were to use the parking lot for some of the day care activities, they would need to re-locate the trash service so that they could allow trucks in and out. He stated at another development there was an issue where the trash trucks needed space to be able to turn around without needing to use the parking stalls as part of the contemplated space for them to make their turns.

Mr. Foley asked with regard to connectivity are they planning to connect their sidewalk along the frontage of Edgewood or crossing to get over to the left side in the parking lot area. Mr. Landro stated they have discussed that with the Matt Hammond, their traffic engineer, and they would prefer to have the access come into the site and do any internal crossings further away from the street to minimize the proximity to the road. He stated depending on where the majority of the congregation is walking to and from, they may want to put a sidewalk along the frontage too; and they know that will be an important consideration when they get to the Land Development Plan. He stated there will be some level of pedestrian connectivity off-site possibly in both directions.

Mr. Fiocco stated currently the only crossing on Edgewood is on the west side of the roundabout. Mr. Meginniss stated he feels that more than the normal Development Application, pedestrian safety and off-site improvements to facilitate that are going to be of paramount importance as they enter the Land Development phase.

Ms. Torbert asked if there is a sidewalk on the other side of the Edgewood, and Mr. Coyle stated there is an asphalt bike trail. Mr. Majewski stated in conjunction with the round-about we added a pedestrian crosswalk from the northwest side of the intersection to the southwest side of the intersection and added a sidewalk up to the property line of the Synagogue, and they would need to extend that and carry it into the site so that they could access the building. Mr. Majewski stated we put a light there too to illuminate the area for early morning and late evening walkers. Ms. Torbert asked if consideration could be given to flashing lights on either side of the crosswalk. Mr. Majewski

stated he is not sure how that would work with the roundabout, and the traffic engineers could look into that. Rabbi Blecher stated during the week everyone would drive and walking would only be on Friday night and Saturday morning. He stated the only services when there would be walkers would be Friday evening around sunset and Saturday mornings around 9:30.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:05 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Adrian Costello, Secretary