

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES – APRIL 29, 2025

A meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on April 29, 2025. Mr. Coyle called the meeting to order at 7:37 p.m. and called the Roll.

Those present:

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

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

Absent: Tejinder Gill, Planning Commission Vice Chair

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Bush moved, Ms. Torbert seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of the March 10, 2025 meeting.

#696 – WRIGHT FARM SUBDIVISION – APPROVAL OF PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAN
AND RECOMMENDATION TO LOOK INTO VIABILITY OF RIGHT-TURN ONLY EXIT

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

Mr. Majewski stated this was last before the Planning Commission on February 10. The Plans have been revised and new review letters have been issued.

Mr. Edward Murphy, attorney representing the DeLuca organization, was present with Mr. Joseph DeLuca, Jr., and Mr. Justin Geonnotti, engineer. Mr. Murphy stated since February they have been addressing comments and concerns that were raised during the public discussion. He stated the Plans were updated, and they incorporated some of the design changes that they had been asked to consider. Mr. Murphy stated even though all of the Waivers had been covered, they updated the Waiver letter, and they tried to simplify the review letter of the Township engineer to only highlight the remaining issues to the extent that there are any that require additional public comment.

Mr. Murphy stated they also prepared a sketch that might address some neighbor concerns about the fear of cut-through traffic from Surrey Lane, and this should be discussed to see if it is felt that they should pursue any additional level of PennDOT consideration for that sketch.

Mr. Geonnotti stated a number of Commission members and the public were concerned about the use of the required open space. 25% of the Lot area is required to be Dedicated open space. The placement of the open space is wrapping around the perimeter of the By-Pass and also on the adjoining property which is existing farmland which will remain. He stated according to the Ordinance there is to be no perimeter trees or landscaping buffers for Farmland Preservation since shade effects the crops. He stated they were told after the meeting that there was a desire for trees and not as much farmland so they should maximize the buffer and the viewshed from the By-Pass.

Mr. Geonnotti showed on the Revised Plan the open space which will not be used for farmland, but will be Dedicated open space. He noted an area which adjoins the preserved farmland area on the property. He stated the remainder will be open space, and there will be street trees lining the entire perimeter and also along the back of the lots to buffer those houses from the By-Pass.

Mr. Geonnotti stated they are still maintaining the existing Patterson Lane, but it will no longer be a Township road; and it will be absorbed into the property as an emergency-access only and an access for Farmland Preservation as the farmers use it to access one preserved farm to the farm that is north of the property. Mr. Geonnotti stated it will be chained and bollarded.

Mr. Geonnotti stated the majority of the Plan revisions addressed the comments from the Township engineer, Township traffic engineer, the Planner, the Fire Marshall, and the Police Department. He stated there are still some outstanding items. He stated while the Planning Commission had indicated at the prior

meeting that they wanted to see a shorter Township engineer review letter, Remington Vernick never takes comments out of their review letters, so the Commission will never see a shorter letter; but 80% of the comments in the review letter have been addressed.

Mr. Murphy stated there was a question previously about the health and quality of the trees that surrounded the Wright homestead in the middle of the site. Mr. Geonnotti stated an on-site meeting was scheduled with an arborist after the prior meeting, and that Licensed arborist walked the property and analyzed all of the trees on the Plan that were to be removed as part of the project. The arborist indicated that the trees were not in good condition, and that report was submitted to the Township and should have been in the Commission's packet. Mr. Geonnotti stated the trees will be removed and replaced with a substantial amount of trees as part of the project.

Mr. Murphy stated Patterson Lane is currently a Township road. He asked Mr. Geonnotti to explain how Patterson Lane will be absorbed once the right-of-way is vacated. Mr. Geonnotti stated currently Patterson Lane is a Township road even though it only serves two properties at this time. He stated the original proposal was to remove Patterson Lane, but it will now be kept in place and used as an emergency access as a second point of access to the community and also for the farmers to use to access the adjoining farms. He stated the right-of-way is going to be eradicated and absorbed back into the project area, and Patterson Lane will be maintained by the community. He stated it will no longer be a Township road.

Mr. Murphy stated there was previous discussion about a bike path, and Mr. Geonnotti stated the Commission agreed that there was no benefit for a bike path along the frontage of the property and that it could be a safety issue. He stated the funds for that path will be allocated elsewhere.

Mr. Coyle asked if they are proposing a passive recreation use for the open space. Mr. Geonnotti stated the open space will be for passive recreation. He stated there are sidewalks proposed on both sides of the community streets. Mr. Coyle stated he does not see an area delineated for pedestrian access to get to the recreation space. Mr. Geonnotti stated they will show access to the passive open space if it is the Commission's desire to have that. Mr. Coyle stated he feels that there should be a defined access to the open space so that there is not an issue in the future.

Mr. Grenier asked if there will be an HOA established which will be responsible for the open space, and Mr. Murphy agreed. Mr. Grenier stated that there has been some discussion at the Board of Supervisors' level that instead of doing that, to potentially re-forest it versus open space; and that could be discussed at a future meeting.

Mr. Coyle stated if the intent is for it to remain as passive recreation/open space, if they were to use the Drainage Easements shown on the Plan between properties for access to the open space, he does not feel the HOA would be able to have a paved path over any Easement, and it would have to be unpaved.

Mr. Murphy stated there has been disagreement about how to treat the first intersection on the site after it leaves existing Surrey Lane. Mr. Geonnotti showed on the Plan the location on Surrey Lane where they connect to the existing community. He stated currently the design shows a median in the center of the road which is designed to be a traffic-calming measure. He stated the road width stays the same at 30'; and there is a median in the middle which narrows the lanes and slows down traffic, and serves as a gateway between the two communities. He stated this was done as a result of early discussions with Township staff and Township engineers on how to accommodate traffic-calming and a separation between the two communities. He stated according to the Fire Marshall review, there is a requirement that the lane width be no less than 20' wide which means that on both sides of the median, there should be at least a 20' wide paved surface for their vehicles to be able to access. He stated the conflict is that defeats the purpose of traffic-calming since having a median with two 20' lanes will not achieve a traffic-calming measure. Mr. Geonnotti stated they need to discuss whether they should keep what they have proposed or provide what the Fire Marshall is requiring.

Mr. Coyle asked if expanding the median and creating a "diamond" would slow down the traffic. Mr. Geonnotti stated if they were to make the lane width 20' on either side, it will not have the traffic-calming effect.

Mr. Majewski stated he spoke with the Fire Marshall about this issue; and since there are a number of other islands in the Township laid out this way with the island in the middle, the Fire Marshall said 18' would be acceptable to get a fire truck through. Mr. Majewski stated that would provide the traffic-calming effect needed. Mr. Murphy stated if that is the recommendation, they will implement that. Mr. Bush stated he would be in favor of that as he feels it is important to have traffic-calming from the new part of Surrey Lane to the old part. Mr. Costello agreed.

Mr. Murphy stated there was concern with cut-through traffic and the lack of PennDOT acknowledgement of an appropriate point of access on the By-Pass. He stated Mr. Geonnotti has prepared a sketch as to where a potential point of right-out could be located on the property frontage if PennDOT would entertain the idea and if the Township was interested in having the developer pursue it. Mr. Geonnotti showed the proposed location on the Plan for the right-out only movement onto the By-Pass at the corner of Surrey Lane. He stated it would be west of the signal at the By-Pass and Stony Hill Road.

Mr. Geonnotti stated they had originally tried for a right-in/right-out movement to occur at a point he showed on the Plan centered between the off ramp of 95 and where the turn lanes onto Stony Hill Road start. He stated PennDOT did not look favorably on this, and they also did not like the ability for traffic exiting to go to the signalized intersection and make a u-turn, and crossing two lanes was also frowned upon by PennDOT. Mr. Geonnotti stated they also looked at adding a signalized fourth leg to the intersection; but since there was a lot of money spent on the improvements related to the Wegmans project, the addition of that leg to the signal would deteriorate the work that was done, and PennDOT was not in favor of that.

Mr. Geonnotti stated after hearing from the neighbors at the last meeting about their concerns with the amount of additional traffic that would go through the existing Surrey Lane and exit out through Quarry Lane and down to Lindenhurst, this option being presented was an attempt to alleviate some of that traffic that was heading west on the By-Pass to exit the community and get right onto the By-Pass. Mr. Geonnotti stated this would still need to be approved by PennDOT. Mr. Geonnotti stated the location for this exit would have to be after the signal, and this was the only option they could come up with.

Mr. Coyle thanked the Applicants for considering the concerns of the residents that Surrey Lane could be used as a cut-through. He asked if PennDOT does not approve this are there are any other options, and Mr. Geonnotti stated they do not feel there are any other options for another point of egress from the neighborhood.

Mr. Coyle asked what the Commission is being asked to approve. Mr. Murphy stated they would ask that the Planning Commission make a recommendation on the pending Plan that is before the Commission tonight with the understanding that the Applicant would make a good faith effort in concert with the Township to amend that Plan to provide for the right-out movement onto the By-Pass; but failing PennDOT approval of that concept plan, they would expect

that the Planning Commission would recommend the underlying Plan that is before them tonight. Mr. Murphy stated he would like a recommendation on the formal officially-submitted Plan. He stated they have provided an option that they are not sure is permissible by PennDOT, but they are willing to make that effort in concert with the Township to get that approved; however, if that fails, he does not want to have to come back to the Planning Commission to deal with the underlying Plan. Ms. Carlton stated the Plan would be approved with the understanding that the Applicant, with the cooperation of the Township, would approach PennDOT and discuss the alternative egress from the community. She stated absent either a response or approval by PennDOT, with a timeframe set as to when we would expect a response from them, the Plan as presented without the new egress would be recommended if the Planning Commission is so inclined. Mr. Murphy stated the Applicant would agree that they would not appear before the Board of Supervisors until they got a response from PennDOT to the concept plan if it was felt that was an important step to take.

Mr. Costello asked why this should go to PennDOT if we are not sure that this is what the Township wants. Mr. Murphy stated they would be in favor of the Township considering this before they went to PennDOT. Mr. Grenier stated the Township has a traffic engineer as well. Mr. Murphy stated they would support whatever Township analysis needs to be done. He stated if the Township concludes that this does not make sense, they would not go forward with it.

Mr. Grenier asked if the access to Patterson Lane for the farmers will be maintained, and Mr. Geonnotti agreed that will remain and is also an emergency access and will be chained off. He stated it will not be used for access to the community. Mr. Grenier asked how the farmers will get to the other side if Patterson Lane is chained off. Mr. Geonnotti stated they met with Farmland Preservation prior to the meeting with the Planning Commission in February, and they worked out how the chains and bollards would work. He showed on the Plan how the farmers will access the farmland, adding that the bollards are to prevent people from using Patterson Lane to access the community.

Mr. Grenier stated if it is decided that the Township wants them to re-forest what is being shown as open space, the access for farmland would go away; however, Mr. Geonnotti stated he feels that they will be able to work something out to allow them to still maintain the access. Mr. Majewski reviewed other ways that the farmers could access the farmland. Mr. Geonnotti stated Farmland wanted to make sure that they would maintain the access point he showed on the Plan, and Mr. Geonnotti stated that access point is not on the

developer's property as it owned by the Township. He also showed another piece which is owned by Farmland Preservation. Mr. Majewski stated Farmland Preservation wanted to keep access through Patterson Lane since the other access would be through a neighborhood. Mr. Bush stated a neighborhood would not want farm equipment coming down their street so they need to keep Patterson Lane as it is needed by Farmland Preservation.

Mr. Grenier stated with regard to the right-out only they would want to make sure that there is no ability to make a left turn. He stated he does not feel PennDOT will be in favor of the proposal from a safety perspective. He asked if this could also create more cut-through traffic through Bridle Estates since people would not want to go all the way to Lindenhurst. Mr. Geonnotti agreed that it is going to provide an opportunity for a cut-through. He stated this would only be for people who want to head west along the By-Pass. Mr. Grenier asked how wide the road would be, and Mr. Geonnotti stated it would be 15' wide with a 25' right-of-way which is half the width of the internal road. It will be a single lane. Mr. Geonnotti stated it is meant to alleviate some of the concerns they heard from the neighbors who stated they did not want people trying to access the By-Pass going through their community to get to Quarry and Lindenhurst to get to the By-Pass. Mr. Grenier stated he is concerned that this will have the opposite effect. Mr. Murphy stated while they recognize that, they were trying to identify another solution that was not specifically submitted to PennDOT. He added that this option was raised only because this particular location unlike Patterson Lane or the four-legged intersection had not been presented to PennDOT for their commentary. He stated he shares the concerns Mr. Grenier has raised, but some people may see that this has some marginal benefit.

Mr. Grenier stated he leans negative to this option. He stated before it goes to the Board of Supervisors it must be indicated that it is absolutely safe and will absolutely alleviate the cut-through concerns. He stated he understands that it has not been vetted yet by PennDOT or the Township staff. Mr. Murphy stated if the internal staff concludes that this is not well-founded, he does not feel they should broach the subject with PennDOT. He stated if the Township indicates that it is worth exploring with PennDOT then they will.

Mr. Bush commended the Applicants for coming in with the plan as there were quite a few residents who came in at the last meeting and spoke about how this new development would increase traffic for the existing neighborhood, and this

is a way of alleviating a portion of that traffic. Mr. Bush stated there may be some who view this as a cut-through who are not in either the existing neighborhood or the new neighborhood, but he does not feel that there would be too many the way this is set up. Mr. Bush stated he understands safety is a high priority, but he feels if it is designed properly with barriers going down some distance, he feels it can be made safe. He stated if it addresses the neighborhood's concerns, he feels it is a good idea. He stated the developer has indicated that they heard the neighbors' concerns, and they have tried to address those concerns.

Mr. Costello stated he is opposed to this as he feels it is unsafe, and he would not approve it without expert opinions on it. Mr. Bush stated at this point they are only considering pursuing this idea which means that the Township would look at it. Mr. Costello stated the way it was indicated was that if this is approved by others, it would not come back to the Planning Commission to give their opinion on what the final plan would be. He stated he is skeptical enough about it that he would not agree to something when he is not going to see the final product.

Mr. Grenier stated this does need further vetting including by the Township's traffic engineer, and that means the Township would incur more expenses in reviewing another set of Plans.

Mr. Bush stated it had been brought up about putting in more trees in the open space where it had previously been considered for farming, and at the last meeting the consensus was that they did want trees there. He stated the Supervisor liaison is now stating that there is talk about re-foresting that area and doing more than just open space with some trees. Mr. Bush asked Mr. Grenier to clarify the Board's thoughts on that. Mr. Grenier stated there has not been a formal discussion or vote about that although there have been one-on-one conversations as to what they would like to see and listening to what the Planning Commission, EAC, and Farmland Preservation have asked for.

Mr. Grenier stated Patterson Lane access is "number one," and they would lean toward more unfettered access so the idea of "chaining it up is a little disconcerting." Mr. Grenier stated with regard to the area between the development and the By-Pass, in discussions with Board members it sounds like they are leaning toward putting in more trees which could include strategically locating specific trees to get a forest to come in although a whole forest would not be planted. He stated this would result in a good buffer between a heavily-traveled area and the

Residential neighborhood. Mr. Grenier stated while they could probably have something there which would be more passive and would be a benefit, they need to consider that the HOA would have to maintain that. He stated they also want to make sure that there is clear access if there is some active open space. He stated any paths, etc. would have to go before the Disability Advisory Board as to whether there would be the need for paved trails, and there could be a forested area with a path through it. He stated the Board of Supervisors would have to discuss this.

Mr. McLoone asked if a certain buffer width would be needed for tractor access, and Mr. Geonnotti stated the Landscaping Plan shows that there will be no trees along the existing farmland to the north of the property. Mr. Geonnotti stated he believes the buffer Mr. McLoone is speaking about occurs on the farmed property, and that will remain along the whole perimeter since there is an existing gravel path off the Applicant's property that is to remain. He stated he met with a member of Farmland Preservation, and he was satisfied with what is proposed.

Mr. Coyle asked Mr. Grenier if the question of the level of forestation needs to be resolved before the Planning Commission makes a recommendation or can that be addressed at the Final level with the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Grenier stated he believes that it can be addressed at the Final level with the Board. He stated the Planning Commission can make a recommendation; but if there is a recommendation for a path through a forested area or open space with a path, there should be clear access and it should be reviewed by the Disabilities Advisory Board so they have an opportunity to provide feedback.

Mr. Grenier stated if more trees are put in, he feels that would be a better buffer for the neighborhood. Mr. Coyle stated he would be in favor of either usable passive recreation space or that it be more heavily-buffered.

Mr. Coyle asked Mr. Costello if he is not in favor of the option of approving or denying the Plan as shown with the recommendation that the Township, the developer, and PennDOT work together to try to make the right-out work. Mr. Costello stated he is not in favor of that if it is not going to come back to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Coyle moved and Mr. Bush seconded to recommend that the Board of Supervisors review and accept the petitioner's request for Preliminary and Final Approval for the Plan which has been presented to the Planning Commission. It is recommended that the Township staff work with the

petitioner to determine the viability of a right-out onto the By-Pass; and if viable, to work with PennDOT to see if that can be incorporated into the Final accepted Plan.

Mr. Robert Piper, 1209 Bridle Estates Drive, showed a picture of the trees that should be saved which are the large trees on both sides of the home which are what he and the EAC want preserved. He stated tonight he spoke with the arborist, Richard Mallory, who indicated the only thing he listed in his report were the unhealthy trees, and the ones that Mr. Piper and the EAC want to protect which are almost 4' in diameter are not in the arborist's letter. Mr. Piper stated the developer had indicated that the arborist's letter says no trees on the site are to be protected because they are not healthy enough, and that is a "misimpression of the truth" according to developer's own arborist. Mr. Piper stated preserving the trees that he and the EAC want to see preserved would be consistent with the Township Ordinance.

Mr. Piper stated safety needs to be addressed if they are going to access the back of the current neighborhood. He stated there are a number of families on Surrey Lane, Bridle Estates, and Nursery Lane who have small children riding their bikes in the street. He stated Bridle Estates Drive also has cars parked at the curb. He stated this is not the place to send over 100 to 200 cars per day from the access on Surrey Lane through Bridle Estates Drive. He stated the entrance to Bridle Estates Drive, which is the entrance to the Bridle Estates neighborhood, is off Quarry Road; and there are groups of deer on either side of Quarry Road which can cause extensive vehicle damage, injury, or death; and he does not feel additional cars should be brought into this area.

Mr. Piper stated when making a left out of Bridle Estates onto Quarry Road there is a hill going up to Cemetery Ridge with bicycle riders causing cars to have to go into oncoming traffic which cannot be seen because it is behind Cemetery Ridge. He stated coming from Lindenhurst you cannot see the traffic coming up the hill to Cemetery Ridge on the other side.

Mr. Coyle stated at the last meeting there were public comments related to the safety of traffic already in Bridle Estates, and the Township's traffic engineer has already started a study. He stated Mr. Majewski could take Mr. Piper's concerns about the safety of Quarry Road to the Traffic engineer and the Public Works Department to look into those matters as well. Mr. Majewski stated there is a 15 mile per hour warning sign at the sharp curve at the cemetery, and that is why years ago they lowered the speed limit along Quarry Road to 25 miles an

hour. Mr. Piper stated when he goes 25 miles per hour cars are on his bumper on a regular basis. Mr. Coyle stated they could recommend some additional traffic enforcement in the area. Mr. Piper stated there are numerous safety issues; and if they allow the additional 100 to 200 vehicles per day to come through Bridle Estates Drive or Surrey Lane a child on a bicycle, someone getting out of their parked car at the curb, or a jogger could be hit. He stated this is not the place to add additional vehicles through the Surrey Lane access.

Mr. Piper again spoke about his concerns with the tree removal. He encouraged the Planning Commission to recommend that the trees he has shown in his photo be saved.

Mr. Grenier asked if there was a formal tree survey completed at the site; and Mr. Geonnotti stated there was, and there were only unhealthy trees which is why that is all that is in the report. Mr. Geonnotti stated the new EAC letter has no mention of the trees because all of the trees that are on the Plan to be removed are allowed to be removed and are dead, diseased, or in a dying state. Mr. Geonnotti stated there is a survey that shows all existing trees above a certain diameter that the Township regulates, and the arborist report evaluates all of those trees based on that survey. Mr. Piper stated the arborist's report does not go to the healthy trees. Mr. Grenier stated he is asking if there is a Survey Plan that shows all of the trees, and he asked Mr. Geonnotti if he can cross reference the arborist's letter to every tree that is on the Survey Plan. Mr. Geonnotti stated he can do that. Mr. Grenier stated before they come to the Board of Supervisors, they should have a Tree Survey Plan that shows all of the trees, not just the unhealthy ones, and then make sure it cross references the arborist's report. He stated he also wants to see that they have addressed anything that the EAC has issued.

Mr. Piper stated for weeks he requested a copy of the arborist's report, and he received it from Mr. Majewski yesterday when the date of the letter was April 7. He stated the homeowners should have this information earlier than one day before the Planning Commission meeting. He stated the homeowners should be provided with this kind of report two weeks prior to the meeting. Mr. Grenier asked when the letter was received; and Mr. Majewski stated it was received on Saturday, and forwarded/put on the Website on Monday morning. Mr. Majewski stated the trees are all cataloged with their sizes on the Demolition Plan. Mr. Geonnotti stated before they appear at the next public meeting, they will have an Exhibit matching up the report and the survey.

Mr. Murphy stated they are complying with the Tree Ordinance of the Township, and they are not requesting any Waivers or modifications. Mr. Grenier stated when the Ordinance discusses replacement of trees it is whether they are dead, dying, or decaying; and a question has been raised about the health of the trees. Mr. Geonnotti stated their replacement tree calculations do not take into account dead, diseased, or dying trees which is a straight replacement; and they are replacing them based on their caliper whether they are dead, diseased, or dying.

Mr. Grenier asked if they are replacing on site in the open area, and Mr. Murphy stated they are. Mr. Geonnotti stated there was a concern from a resident about the health and quality of the trees, and they had an arborist go on site. He stated while they could have stated that they were not going to replace the dead, diseased, and dying trees, which would have been justifiable under the MPC and how the Code works, but they are not doing that, and they are replacing the trees.

Ms. Amy Wright stated while she is not a Township resident, she is an owner of the property. She stated she is familiar with the trees and has a degree in ornamental horticulture. She stated the picture of the tree shown by Mr. Piper was from her parents' back yard. Ms. Piper stated they dug up trees from their property in the Poconos and planted them at this property 32 years ago so the trees are not old. She stated the only older tree in the yard is a pin oak tree near the front of the house which has sustained a significant amount of damage and is not viable. She stated there are no other trees with a 4' diameter on the property. She noted the number of trees that had been on the property which were either damaged, diseased, or died. She stated the only trees that would have any livelihood are the ones from the Poconos.

Mr. Alex Davidoff, 1232 Bridle Estates Drive, stated he has a Petition signed by 87 of the resident against opening up Surrey Lane because of traffic concerns. He thanked Mr. Costello for his comments about the right-turn out since that is something that none of the existing residents will want. He asked that the Planning Commission vote not to consider that. Mr. Bush stated at the last meeting there were comments from other residents about all of the traffic going on one road which is what the developer was trying to address with this option. Mr. Bush asked if the Petition is against this, and Mr. Davidoff stated it is against opening Surrey Lane; however, the biggest concern all of the residents had with opening Surrey Lane was connecting to 332. He stated no one will want a connection to 332, and they will fight that "extremely hard."

Mr. Davidoff stated he previously expressed their preference to having a lot count reduction. He stated the Planning Commission is granting a lot of Waivers, and they feel that the Planning Commission does not have to grant all of those Waivers; and they could require more open space by reducing the lot count which would alleviate a lot of the traffic concerns. Mr. Davidoff stated he personally is very concerned about traffic since he has a young family. He stated wants to see the land developed by these developers; however, he does not want 47 homes.

Mr. Davidoff stated there was previously discussion about trees lining on the north side of the property, and he understands that it is not on the property line; however, he feels that the Planning Commission can ask to have trees planted on the properties themselves as he has trees he paid to have planted in his back yard to add a buffer, and he feels that the developers could pay to do that on their properties that they are developing on the north side of the property.

Mr. Davidoff stated on behalf of about 60 to 70 residents of his neighborhood, they would like the front entrance of Bridle Estates to have some kind of landscaping done as part of whatever work they are doing with the HOA. He stated they do not want any traffic-calming at all on Bridle Estates Drive on the portion of Surrey Lane that has already been developed. He stated he does not feel that will do anything but “be a nuisance.” He stated the majority of those currently living on Bridle Estates Drive do not want any traffic-calming in the existing development.

Mr. Coyle stated he does not believe that there is any proposed changes to the existing roads in the existing neighborhoods, and Mr. Geonnotti agreed. Mr. Davidoff stated he just wants to make sure that there are not going to be any proposed changes in the future as well. Mr. Majewski stated was discussion about exploring possibilities for that such as putting up speed limit signs; however, the neighborhood was not in favor of that. He added the in general for traffic calming you want about 70% of the neighborhood to buy in before any traffic calming is done.

Mr. Costello asked with regard to the trees along the back row of houses, was that a conflict with the Farmland needs; and Mr. Geonnotti stated it was adding that is active, existing farmland, and there was a request to not put any large trees along that perimeter. Mr. Costello stated he recalls that the first five or six houses have the trees being added; and Mr. Geonnotti agreed that they

are buffering the houses closest to the existing homes which would be impacted most directly by the viewshed, but the compromise with Farmland Preservation was to keep the rest of it open.

Mr. Davidoff stated he understands that they would not put trees right on the property line, but trees could be put on the property itself. He stated he put trees on his property, and they could put trees on the properties on the north side. Mr. Grenier stated there will not be a Deed Restriction on the lots that says they cannot put trees in their own back yard, and Mr. Murphy agreed. Mr. Davidoff stated he is saying that the developer should plant those trees, and the Planning Commission could recommend that. He stated the eventual homeowners could take them down, but he would want to see them put in as part of the Plans.

Mr. Grenier asked the Applicants if they own any land to the north of the development that is part of the HOA but not part of the Lots, and Mr. Geonnotti stated they do not. Mr. Grenier stated the trees would therefore have to be on someone's lot. Mr. Davidoff stated they had talked about planting trees, and he feels that is an easy way to do it, and it would make the homes more desirable to sell. Mr. Grenier stated sometimes people want to do what they want to do with their own homes, although he understands Mr. Davidoff's point.

Mr. Bush stated the Planning Commission has not seen the Petition that Mr. Davidoff referred to. Mr. Davidoff stated he e-mailed it to Mr. McLoone and Mr. Majewski and he can have them send it to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Edna Dilliplane stated she is a 75-year resident of the Township. She stated she wants to protect her property rights. She stated the Patterson Lane was necessitated to maintain access to the properties adversely effected by the construction of the Interstate. She stated current proposals threaten access to Yardley-Newtown Road, reduction of service quality including utilities, deliveries, and emergency vehicles, and encroachments on the use and enjoyment of her property. She stated the proposed impacts on her property are unacceptable.

Ms. Dilliplane's property was shown on the aerial. Mr. Geonnotti stated Patterson Lane dead ends at Mrs. Dilliplane's property. He stated the existing Patterson Lane served two properties – the parcel that is undeveloped and the Dilliplane parcel at the end of Patterson Lane. He stated Patterson Lane

will remain in its current state, and they are not proposing to rip up any of the road bed. He stated the only material change will be that it is not a Township-owned road which was at the request of the Township.

Mrs. Dilliplane stated that means that she will not be able to exit onto Yardley-Newtown Road and the road will no longer be plowed as it is now. Mr. Geonnotti stated that is incorrect, and the plan is that she will maintain the access she has today to her property. He stated there will be a supplemental access through the community, but there is no plan to change the way Mrs. Dilliplane accesses her property today. Mrs. Dilliplane asked about the chains and the bollards; and Mr. Geonnotti stated they will be installed so that the residents cannot use that access to access their community, and that was at PennDOT's request so that it does not become a second access to the By-Pass. He stated it will remain an access for emergency vehicles and to Mrs. Dilliplane's property.

Mrs. Dilliplane asked if it will still be maintained by the Township. Mr. Geonnotti stated it will not, and it will be maintained "most likely by the developer." Mrs. Dilliplane stated she would like to see that in writing, and Mr. Murphy stated it will be. Mr. Grenier stated with the alternative approach with the right-out only it was indicated that there would be a chain across Patterson Lane. Mr. Geonnotti stated Patterson Lane will not be chained at the entrance, but will be chained off from the new community. The location of where the chains will be located was shown on the map. Mr. Geonnotti stated Patterson Lane will be an emergency access and used by farm vehicles and Mrs. Dilliplane. He showed where it will be left open and signed for emergency vehicles only and resident access and where the chain will be located. Mr. Geonnotti showed the extension which will go through the new community, and he stated that if Mrs. Dilliplane wants to come through the new community and access her driveway there, she can do so. He stated PennDOT does not want Patterson Lane to be a new access point for the community.

Mr. Piper asked from the audience if there is going to be access off of Patterson Lane as there is today; and Mr. Geonnotti stated while there will be physically, it will be restricted to emergency vehicles, farmland vehicles, and the Dilliplane property access. Mr. Piper stated from the audience that the chain would block off people from getting in through the development, and Mr. Geonnotti stated it is to restrict residents from using Patterson Lane for access to the community.

Mr. Coyle stated with regard to the responsibility for maintaining and plowing that road, he assumes the developer writes the original HOA Agreement; and Mr. Murphy agreed. Mr. Coyle asked if the developer would be amenable to putting a Covenant into the original Agreement that the HOA is responsible for maintaining and plowing the road to the Dilliplane property and may not amend that particular provision without the approval of the Board of Supervisors or the Township, and Mr. Murphy agreed that is always the case. Mr. Majewski stated it is always good to have it spelled out clearly in writing which it will be. Ms. Carlton stated it is a Recorded document. She stated it will be prepared by the developer, reviewed by her office, and will be Recorded. Mr. Grenier stated if the HOA does not get it plowed and there is an emergency situation and the Township has to plow it, the Township would plow it and then issue the HOA a bill as has been done with other property maintenance issues.

Mr. Steve Dilliplane stated he is a third generation Township resident. He noted where access is proposed to stop at a location he showed on the Plan which is not an unchained access to the Dilliplane property. Mr. Geonnotti stated Patterson Lane as you access it today will be completely unchanged, and they will be able to get from the By-Pass to the Dilliplane house with the exact same points of access. He stated what Mr. Dilliplane is referring to on the Plan is the emergency vehicle access turning into the new community and also the ability for the Dilliplanes to access their driveway through the new community as well. Mr. Murphy stated there will be no impediments to using Patterson Lane as the Dilliplane family does today.

Mr. Dilliplane asked who will own Patterson Lane and who will be responsible for it. He stated a point was made that if it was not plowed, a bill will be issued; but he asked what will be done about emergency services that cannot get through that result in injury or death. Mr. Majewski stated the Township would send out their forces to clear the access and then send the HOA the bill for the Township doing the plowing.

Mr. Dilliplane stated the responsibility for access to the lots at the end of Patterson Lane should be through the Township. Mr. Murphy stated the Township asked the developer to accept responsibility for Patterson Lane as the Township no longer wants to own or maintain Patterson Lane, and the developer has agreed to do so. He stated if Mr. Dilliplane has an issue with this, he should speak to the Township.

Mr. Dilliplane asked for clarification on the Motion and if it is just an “up or down vote” recommending that all of the Waivers be granted. Mr. Coyle stated there are not many Waivers that have been requested at this point, and many of the Waivers being requested are related to items that either the Township has asked for or in some ways are improvements. He noted the Waiver request for road width requirements so that they can achieve less impervious surface. He stated when the developer originally came before the Planning Commission, they presented a by-right plan which means that as best that they can, it complies with the Ordinances that are on the books. Mr. Coyle stated what we can get the developer to change is relatively limited. He stated the developer’s engineer and attorney have indicated that Mr. Dilliplane’s concern about access to his property will not be altered with the exception of the ownership of the road as there will be a different entity legally responsible for maintaining it. Mr. Majewski stated the Township would still have the right to go in and maintain it in the event that that HOA does not follow through on their responsibility.

Mr. Dilliplane asked if Patterson Lane will be a public road, and Mr. Murphy stated it will not as the Township does not want to own that roadway any longer. He stated the Township asked the developer to accept responsibility for it which they have, and he does not believe that the Township wants to re-own it or take Title to it after the developer takes it. Mr. Dilliplane stated that leaves the lots on the far end as flag lots that do not have access to a public road which is encumbering both the use and the value of those lots.

Mr. Coyle stated they understand Mr. Dilliplane’s point, but the position of the developer is that Patterson Lane will be a private road that will be maintained for the access of the Dilliplanes and kept in its current condition. He stated he feels Mr. Dilliplane has delivered a clear message to Mr. Grenier, the Supervisor liaison, that his preference would be that the Township maintain responsibility for Patterson Lane; and the Board of Supervisors could consider that when the Plan goes before them. Mr. Dilliplane stated the piece that Mr. Coyle did not mention is maintaining public road access to the existing lots. Mr. Coyle stated the road as it exists today will be maintained for the benefit of the Dilliplanes for their use, and it will do so through the Covenants of the Homeowners’ Association; and the Homeowners’ Association will not at a later time be able to restrict Dilliplane access to their property from 332 without the consent of the Board of Supervisors. He stated he understands that it is a difference between a private road and a public road, but in as many ways as they possibly can, there are protections and Covenants for the Dilliplanes to access to the road.

Mr. Grenier asked that prior to this being brought to the Board of Supervisors the reasoning and justification for changing it from a public road to a private road maintained by the HOA be provided to the Board of Supervisors as the Board of Supervisors has not had that discussion and does not know all of the arguments for and against. Mr. Bush stated the Applicant has indicated that the Township asked them to do this, and this is what they have done. He stated if the Township states that they do not want them to do this, the Applicant will not do it. Mr. Grenier stated the Board of Supervisors did not ask them to do it.

Mr. Bush asked who asked the Applicant to do it. He stated the information that Mr. Grenier is asking for should come from the Township staff. Mr. Majewski stated there are two houses accessing Patterson Lane – the Wright family house and the Dilliplane House. He stated there is also one other vacant lot that was owned by the Torbert family that has since been bought by DeLuca. He stated with the Wright's selling, there was a 2,500' long driveway for a single house that the Township would have to plow, maintain, and repave. He stated based on the Township's request, the developer offered to take over those obligations from the Township which would save the Township money. He stated the way the Plan evolved, he feels they have now addressed some of the main concerns from the Dilliplanes about maintaining their access as is. Mr. Majewski stated prior to going before the Board of Supervisors it would be good if the legal language as to how all of that would work could be drafted so that the Board of Supervisors could evaluate that and make a decision they feel is appropriate once they have more complete information.

Mrs. Dilliplane asked if she would be required to join the Homeowners Association to have her road taken care of; and Mr. DeLuca stated she will not have to join the HOA, and it will be part of their maintenance and obligations as part of the new development, and she will not owe any fees or maintenance costs.

Mrs. Dilliplane asked why the Township decided to give up that portion and she asked if it was just so the developer could have enough for open space so he could "squeeze" 47 houses into 50 acres. Mr. Majewski stated that did not factor into their calculations, and it is to no advantage to the developer. He stated it was a financial obligation that the developer agreed to take on for no benefit to them. Mrs. Dilliplane stated it created more open space; however, Mr. Majewski stated it did not.

Mr. Grenier asked if the HOA documents will be clear that if there are any issues and Mrs. Dilliplane or anyone who owns the home in the future needs to contact someone what their recourse is and the procedures for doing so, and Mr. DeLuca agreed they will be. Mr. DeLuca stated there will also be an Easement Recorded against the property to give the homeowner access to that road forever.

Mr. Dilliplane stated the indication with regard to the Motion is that there will just be one vote around all Waivers without discussion of any of the individual Waivers. He stated he feels some of the 20 Waivers are quite substantial. Mr. Coyle stated the Applicant has come before the Commission a number of times to discuss the Waivers, and he is not aware of any new Waiver requests. Mr. Geonnotti stated the only new Waiver evolved out of the last meeting. He stated they were originally designing the Plan to have farmland, and the configuration of the open space did not come into play. He stated the Township's Ordinance has a requirement that the open space be a ratio of 4 to 1 length to width, but the Plan was at a state where they were not able to re-configure that open space; and while they have still provided the open space required, it is not in the required length to width ratio. He stated it is in the location they believe everyone wants. He stated while that does require a Waiver, he does not feel there is much they can do to avoid that.

Mr. Coyle stated from a process standpoint if the Planning Commission were to vote to approve the Plan tonight, they would just be proceeding to the Board of Supervisors; and the Board would then have their input and vote on Final approval or denial of the Plan. Mr. Majewski stated a few of the Waiver requests are related to stormwater, and our Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance has some antiquated requirements for stormwater management that have been cleaned up somewhat with our newly-adopted Stormwater Management Ordinance. He stated we still have to go back and clean up SALDO to eliminate those requirements that are now superseded by the Stormwater Management Ordinance. He stated we have also gone to all electronic submissions with limited amounts of paper; however, the Ordinance currently states that we want 25 sets of everything. He stated that is the nature of many of the Waivers that they have.

Ms. Aroniss noted the Waiver request for SALDO Section 178-20E9 on page 2 which is requesting that they not show the electric, gas, and communication data. She stated Remington and Vernick feel that it would be good to show that on the Plans since it can effect where the water, sanitary, and stormwater is laid out. Mr. Geonnotti stated they can show it, but it "will be a cartoon and

will not be real.” He stated utility authorities like to do the mapping themselves, but he can show it on the Plan to show that it can work. He stated they have gone through this process enough with all of the utility providers to know that they are actually in control of the design, and his seal on the Plan says that they know that it can be done safely, and there is enough area to do so.

Mr. Geonnotti stated he would still request the Waiver, but if they want to see a “cartoon” on the Plan, they can do that. Ms. Aroniss asked if the utilities have given a Preliminary Sketch as to where they want these to be located, and Mr. DeLuca stated they will not provide a Sketch until there is Final approval by the Township. Mr. Majewski stated cooperation from utilities to get them to tell exactly where they are going to put them, is non-existent. Ms. Aroniss stated if Mr. Geonnotti is confident that they can all fit and not have an impact on the storm, sanitary, or water that is shown on the Plan, she would feel comfortable with that.

Ms. Aroniss noted the Waiver request for SALDO Section 178-93F3F for the reduction in the minimum pipe velocity and slope. She stated in general for some of the stormwater items she noticed in the PCSM Report that there is some gutter spread and inlet spread. Mr. Geonnotti stated the Township’s Road Design Ordinance is antiquated and impossible to comply with. He stated it is a standard that far exceeds PennDOT requirements as the PennDOT requirement is that the spread off of a curb line cannot exceed one half of a lane width, and the Township’s is 95% inlet capture. He stated you would have to have an inlet every 50’ along a typical Township roadway, and he does know of a design that can meet that or a developer who will put in an inlet every 50’. He stated they will comply with PennDOT standards. He stated he has designed roads in the Township, and they have all functioned very well based on that criteria. Ms. Aroniss stated since some of them had a spread of 10’ to 15’, they were concerned if it would go 15’ in the roadway. Mr. Geonnotti stated they can comply with one half of the lane width which is the PennDOT standard.

Ms. Aroniss noted the cover on some of the pipes for the HDPE and the Waiver request for 178-93F3H for a reduction in the minimum pipe cover. She stated she would like to see them explore some of the other options such as elliptical concrete. Mr. Geonnotti stated while they will still need the Waiver, they can work with the Township engineer. He stated their justification is that the cover over the HDPE pipes may not meet the Ordinance standards, but it does meet the manufacturer’s specifications; and the manufacturer’s specifications mimic

PennDOT's as well so they are providing a safe design. He added the site is flat, and they are trying to make a lot of the basins work. Mr. Majewski stated that Ordinance was written prior to when HDPE pipe was available.

Mr. Grenier stated a new Stormwater Ordinance was just passed, and he asked if any comparison was done of this design with the new Ordinance to see if it complies with that; and Mr. Geonnotti stated he did review that. Mr. Geonnotti stated they are not required to comply with the Ordinance, but they did look at how they could comply based on their design; and they do meet the new rate control requirements and about 76% of the volume requirements. He stated the Ordinance is more robust and exceeds the DEP requirements. Mr. Grenier asked that they look to see if they can get closer to the metrics before they come before the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Dilliplane stated it seems that there are some Waivers that are relatively trivial and the Planning Commission might be prepared to have a Motion to address those in bulk. He asked if it is the Planning Commission's position that all of the other Waivers have received adequate public deliberation and the Planning Commission will be ready to vote on the rest of them at this point.

Mr. Coyle stated he feels that the Planning Commission has gone through the Plan multiple times, and there are no substantial changes other than the potential for the one-way exit onto 332. He stated he is comfortable with the Waivers being requested which Mr. Majewski has explained are largely due to the fact that our Ordinances are out of date or because they wanted to make the road less wide as noted earlier to reduce the amount of impervious surface.

Mr. Dilliplane asked about the Waiver to have only one public road access to the development of more than 25 dwelling units. Mr. Majewski stated that is why they originally put in the entrance/exit out onto Route 332 but ultimately PennDOT determined that was not feasible. Mr. Majewski stated there is no other option other than to go through preserved agricultural land, the farm to the west of the Wright farm, or to cut across Farmland Preservation property and condemn land to put in a second entrance. He stated in case of an emergency, there is an emergency access to get to the development; and with the emergency access using Patterson Lane, they have satisfied the meaning and intent. He stated everyone feels that the Waiver is acceptable in that they have provided a means for access in the event of an emergency from more than one location.

Mr. Dilliplane asked if there will be a reading of what the Waivers are as part of the Motion. Mr. Coyle stated there will not be a reading of the Waivers, and they are all written and posted in the public record. He stated the Applicant has been before the Planning Commission a number of times, and the Planning Commission had requested them to make revisions and changes which they have made. He stated in prior appearances the Applicant had the ability to ask the Planning Commission for a vote, but they have asked for Extensions so they had time to work on the requests. Mr. Coyle stated if the Planning Commission votes tonight to approve the Plan, it will proceed to the next step which will be for the Applicant to go to the Board of Supervisors and will involve more engagement from staff in the interim.

Mr. Grenier stated he believes Mr. Dilliplane is trying to understand if the Motion is going to be an up or down vote on the original Plan versus a vote on the condition related to the right-out alternative. Mr. Dilliplane stated it also seemed that the response to a number of the Waivers referenced having further discussion, and that does not seem to be consistent with the Motion to have an up or down vote without those additional discussions. Mr. Coyle stated the Motion is for an up or down vote on the original Plan presented with the additional recommendation to see if the exit onto 332 is viable. He stated the items of continued discussion are customary and involve the engineer or, as Mr. Grenier indicated, asking for more detail before it gets to the Board of Supervisors; and the Township staff will continue to work through those things.

Mr. Dilliplane asked how does an up or down vote at this point without addressing those additional discussions give the Planning Commission another chance to review the issues to be addressed. Mr. Costello stated what they are voting on tonight is the Plan presented, but the “one question mark” in the Plan is what the developer was asked to look at; and they came up with what they felt was the only workable solution to what the Township asked them for.

Mr. Dilliplane asked if that is including the things that were posted in the last day or two or is it what would have been available at the last meeting on the 14th that got cancelled. Mr. Bush stated it includes all of the information that they have as today. Mr. Dilliplane stated that was not necessarily reviewed the same way “the previous stuff was.” Mr. Bush stated he does not feel that is accurate, and the Township staff has reviewed that information. Mr. Dilliplane asked if there is a review letter. Mr. Bush stated they heard from the engineer this evening. Mr. Dilliplane stated he is asking if the information that was

posted recently had a corresponding review from the various groups that normally review this. Mr. Majewski stated what was posted just recently was the response letter where Mr. Geonnotti indicated that they had pared down the Remington Vernick letter to just the items that were still in question and the arborist's letter about the trees, and they will make some revisions to more clearly show how that report matches to the plan that shows all of the trees to be removed. He stated the EAC also provided an updated review letter on Friday/Saturday which was in the packet.

Mr. Coyle stated they have provided Mr. Dilliplane a significant amount of time to speak, and he would like to give other residents the opportunity to ask questions as well. He stated if Mr. Dilliplane has any questions on process and procedures, those can be addressed with the Township staff, and there will be further opportunity for public comment before the Board of Supervisors if this matter proceeds forward out of the Planning Commission tonight. He stated if it does not move forward out of the Planning Commission, the matter will be back before the Planning Commission, and there will be further opportunity for public comment at that time.

Mr. Dilliplane stated he feels that there seems to be several issues that have not been resolved well enough to take to the Board of Supervisors such as the proposed Dedication of things such and abandoning the road; and he does not feel that is well understood by the Applicant or the Planning Commission.

Mr. Coyle stated he has not heard anyone who was enthusiastic about the option of exploring an additional exit from the neighborhood onto 332 in an attempt to reduce traffic volume into Bridle Estates. Mr. Coyle stated he would withdraw his Motion to approve the Plan as presented with the option of the exit unless Mr. Costello has changed his mind; and Mr. Costello stated he is still opposed to the exit.

Mr. Bush stated we heard from one person tonight indicating he was adamantly against the exit and also indicated he believes that most of his neighbors were as well; however, at the last meeting the Planning Commission heard from a number of people that they were not happy about what it would mean with all of the back and forth traffic from the new development through the existing development, and they were looking for an answer. Mr. Bush stated tonight we heard an option which may or may not be agreed to by PennDOT; but he still feels it worth having the Township look into whether the Township thinks it would work since there were people at the last meeting who wanted a

different alternative. Mr. Costello stated he felt the impetus for that was if we could get the entrance on Yardley-Newtown Road, they would not have to connect Surrey.

Mr. Coyle asked Mr. Costello if the Applicant were willing to come back before the Planning Commission after going through the investigation before going before the Board of Supervisors, would he be amenable to proceeding in that fashion. Mr. Coyle asked Mr. Costello if his concern was the Plan itself or that they would not be coming back to the Planning Commission. Mr. Costello stated personally he feels the exit onto 332 is a bad idea, and he would need more information to vote yes on that. He stated if the Applicant was to come back to the Planning Commission, that means that the Commission would not be voting on this tonight. Mr. Bush stated what they are voting on is just to have the Township explore it first. Mr. Costello stated he would agree to recommending to the Board of Supervisors that they explore this as an option; and they would then come back and review it.

Mr. Grenier stated the Planning Commission is to recommend Final Land Development approval; and if they are not comfortable doing, they could recommend that something be studied before the Final approval. He asked that the Planning Commission do a full vetted review of this so that the Board of Supervisors has clear direction from the Planning Commission. Mr. Costello stated he feels there should be two different Motions – one approving the Plan as is without the access and then have another Motion recommending that the Board of Supervisors might want to look into this as an option if it is something they want to explore with the developer. Mr. Bush stated that is the pending Motion.

Mr. Murphy stated he could withdraw the Concept Plan with the right-out option so that they would only vote tonight on the merits of the Plan that was formally submitted, and informally the Applicant would continue to pursue the option and consult with the Township staff. He stated if there is merit to it and there is PennDOT support of it, they will come back to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Bush suggested that they separate the Motion and make two Motions which would reach the same result.

Mr. Grenier asked Ms. Carlton if the Board of Supervisors retains the right to indicate they are not in favor of investigating it and that they will go with the original Plan and not expend Township funds looking at the right-out only option.

Mr. Bush stated the Board of Supervisors can ignore any recommendation that the Planning Commission makes. Ms. Carlton agreed that the Planning Commission is a recommending body, and the Board of Supervisors can choose to accept their recommendation or ignore their recommendation. She stated if the Board of Supervisors chooses not to accept the Planning Commission's second recommendation of exploring the alternative egress, they can just go with the first recommendation.

Mr. Costello stated he would vote yes now if it is just for the Plan as presented.

Mr. Coyle withdrew his Motion.

Mr. Coyle moved and Mr. Costello seconded to approve the original Official Plan as presented by the Applicant for Preliminary and Final Approval inclusive of the comments this evening and assurances made by the developer about the trees, the maintenance of Patterson Lane, the Tree Survey, that access to the open space be delineated if that is to be maintained as passive recreation, and recommending acceptance of the Waivers.

Mr. Dilliplane stated at previous meetings there was a Motion to send a letter to the Board of Supervisors about whether they had a preference for trees or buffers or farmland, and he asked if that occurred. Mr. Grenier stated the Planning Commission made that recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, and he as the Liaison brought that back to the Board. He stated the Board of Supervisors has not yet discussed this project as a Board since they were waiting for tonight's meeting; however, because the Planning Commission is making the recommendation to the Board it also goes to the staff which shares the information with the Applicant. He stated if this moves forward, it will be on the Board of Supervisors' Agenda in the near future, and those topics will be covered again and a Motion made with all the Conditions considered.

Mr. Majewski stated part of the discussion was that the EAC would talk with Farmland Preservation and Township staff as to whether there should be farmland, trees, etc.; and after discussion with both entities, it was determined that the viability of farming that area with some trees made it so limited that Farmland no longer cared to have that piece of property in the front, and that is how they arrived back at making it regular open space with woods.

Mr. Dilliplane stated he felt the point of the Motion at that time seemed to be to garner deliberative response from the Board of Supervisors addressing that question and that the response could affect the proposed Plan, and they would then come back and vote on the Waivers at that point. Mr. Bush stated the recommendation was acted on as Mr. Majewski has just stated. He stated Farmland Preservation decided it was not worthwhile to maintain that as farmland, and that is how they came back with more trees there. Mr. Costello stated he feels it is a much different looking Plan than it was previously. Mr. Majewski stated by default going to the Board of Supervisors for their input was not necessary since Farmland decided they were not interested in the property.

Mr. Dilliplane stated he was just trying to follow through on what the outcome was of that Motion since he did not see any indication of it. Mr. Bush stated the consequence can be seen as the Plan was changed. Mr. Dilliplane stated he expected that it would be part of the public record such as a letter being posted and the response being posted. He stated it sounds like there was no public deliberation by the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Dilliplane stated it sounds like it was because the Farmland Preservation withdrew their consideration, but there was no public documentation of that fact. Mr. Coyle stated the documentation is the public record of these meetings and the discussions. Mr. Grenier stated the Meeting Minutes are part of the public record.

Mr. Costello stated the Board of Supervisors needs to deal with every issue in the Township, and the Planning Commission, EAC, Historical Commission, and Farmland Preservation are all Advisory Boards to the Supervisors. He stated the Planning Commission asked that the EAC work with Farmland Preservation on the issue before it went to the Board of Supervisors, and they came up with a solution which has been presented which was a good change and addressed what was discussed previously. Mr. Costello stated the Plan is public record.

Mr. Alex Davidoff, 1233 Bridle Estates Drive, stated with regard to the right-turn out, the 87 homeowners are unanimously of the opinion that they do not want the cut-through. He stated they will “fight very bitterly and take the matter up with PennDOT, they will hire counsel, and will do whatever is necessary to stop that.” He stated they would appreciate it if the Planning Commission would vote to take the right turn out.

Mr. Bush asked what the Petition says that Mr. Davidoff has been referring to, and Mr. Davidoff stated it says no opening of Surrey Lane and in particular there are concerns with the access to 332. He stated he will provide the full

text of the Petition to the Planning Commission. Mr. Grenier stated if there is anything additional to what it currently states that they want to call out, including the right-out, that should be presented to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Davidoff stated the Petition they have covers that, and he will show it to Mr. Grenier.

Mr. Davidoff added they would appreciate it if the Planning Commission would put it to a vote to take out the right-turn out since none of the residents want it, and they agree with the concerns that it is dangerous.

Ms. Carlton asked that the Petition be provided to the Township. Mr. McLoone stated he believes that it was provided to the Township a year ago. Mr. Davidoff stated he will scan it and send it to Mr. McLoone to forward it on.

Motion carried with Ms. Torbert abstained.

Mr. Coyle asked Mr. Costello if he wanted to make an additional Motion, and Mr. Costello stated he is not sure why we would want to make a recommendation to the Supervisors to look at the right-turn only connector out since the residents do not want it and it does not seem like a good idea. He stated if the Planning Commission wants to recommend that the Supervisors look at it, we could do that although he is not sure it is the best use of their time.

Mr. Murphy stated whether the Planning Commission makes a Motion or not, he will commit to that they will look at it.

Mr. Coyle stated he understands that there was a resident this evening who was representing some residents who are saying that they are against this idea; however, at the last several meetings, there was a lot of concern about residents from the new neighborhood transiting through Bridle Estates to exit; and what the developer has done is to come forward with something that represents a reduction in those vehicles. He stated there were more residents at a prior meeting, and he feels we should not just accept that all 87 residents are opposed to a Plan that they have not seen. He stated whether the Planning Commission recommends that the Township studies it or not, it seems that the developer is going to look into it anyway.

Mr. Costello moved and Mr. Bush seconded to recommend to the Board of Supervisors to direct staff to look into the viability of a right-hand turn only idea that the developer has come up with.

Mr. Alex Davidoff stated he just asked the Planning Commission to vote on the opposite as he made it very clear that none of the residents want this. He stated they will hire counsel if the Township goes this route.

Mr. Dan Seekins, 1209 Bridle Estates Drive, stated he was one of the signers of the original Petition; and he appreciates that the developer was trying, but he feels that the right-hand turn will turn into the very thing that they were opposed to which was a cut-through, and he would not support going forward.

Mr. Dilliplane stated he is concerned that in response to the residents not wanting a cut-through, there is a proposal to do a reverse cut-through; and it does not make sense.

Motion carried with Ms. Torbert abstained.

#696 – WRIGHT FARM SUBDIVISION

Approval of Sewage Facilities Planning Modules Component 4A
Municipal Planning Agency Review

Mr. Majewski stated as part of the Review, there is a form that is filled out by the Township, and he reviewed the questions and responses as follows:

Is there a Municipal Comprehensive Plan – Yes

Is the proposal consistent with that Plan – Yes

Is the proposal consistent with the use, development,
and protection of water resources – Yes

Is it consistent with Municipal Land Use Plan relative
to prime agricultural land preservation – Yes

Does this project propose encroachments, obstructions,
or dams that will effect wetlands – No

Will any known historical or archeological resources be impacted by the project – No

Will any known endangered or threatened species of plant or animal be impacted by the project – No

Is there a Municipal Zoning Ordinance – Yes

Is this proposal consistent with that Ordinance – Yes

Does the proposal require a change or Variance to the existing Comprehensive Plan or Zoning Ordinance – No

Have all applicable Zoning Approvals been obtained – Yes
(there are no Zoning Approvals necessary)

Is there a Municipal Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance – Yes

Is this proposal consistent with the Ordinance – Yes

Is the Plan consistent with the Municipal Official Sewage Plan – Yes

Are there any wastewater disposal needs in the area adjacent to this proposal that should be considered by the Municipality – No

Has a Waiver of the Sewage Facilities Planning requirements been requested for the residual tract of the Subdivision – No
(there is no residual tract)

Mr. Majewski stated if the Planning Commission is amenable, they can make a Motion to approve it and have it signed. He stated the DEP wants to make sure that the Township is aware of the development and the proposal for the treatment of sewage and has a chance to weigh in on whether they believe it is consistent with the Township Ordinances and Plans.

Mr. Grenier asked if Aqua as the owner of the Township's sewage system has to comment on this. Mr. DeLuca stated after the Planning Commission it will go to the Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority for review and signature, then to Aqua for review and signature, and then to the Philadelphia Water Department for review and signature. He stated after all of those agencies have reviewed and approved it, it will come to the Board of Supervisors for review and signature. Mr. Grenier asked if that has to occur at the same time that the Board considers the Site Plan, and Mr. Murphy stated it does not.

Mr. Bush stated it appears that Mr. Majewski is satisfied that all the requirements are acceptable to the Township, and Mr. Majewski agreed.

Mr. Bush moved and Mr. Costello seconded to approve the Wright Farm Subdivision Sewage Facilities Planning Modules Component 4A. Motion carried with Ms. Torbert abstained.

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Adrian Costello, Secretary