

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 8, 2025

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on September 8, 2025. Mr. Coyle called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Those present:

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

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

Absent:                         Tejinder Gill, Planning Commission Vice Chair  
                                      Adrian Costello, Planning Commission Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE 7/30/25 MEETING

Ms. Torbert moved, Mr. Bush seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes from the July 30, 2025 meeting.

DISCUSS AND APPROVE TREE REPLACEMENT SALDO ORDINANCE AMENDMENT

Mr. McLoone stated the Township worked on this with the EAC, and the contribution by the developer to the Tree Bank will go from \$374 to \$450 per replacement tree. He stated it indicates that the contribution per replacement tree will be adjusted to reflect the annual change in the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers CPIU for the twelve-month period ending each October as reported by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, and language is going to be added so that it is now specific for the Philadelphia/Camden/Wilmington area. Mr. Majewski stated other Fees we have are tied to the Index for Philadelphia/Camden/Wilmington so this will match; and we will not have to look up two separate indices to come up with what the inflation rate is for the purpose of establishing fees that are adjusted annually. Mr. Majewski stated this Fee will

be adjusted annually compared to previously when it was adjusted every three years. He stated it will be adjusted annually at the going price for what a tree costs. Mr. McLoone stated it is based on the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics rounded up to the next total dollar.

Mr. Bush asked what would happen if tree prices go up higher than the rate of inflation. He stated there could be a drought, and tree prices could skyrocket. Mr. Majewski stated we would have to adjust it like we are doing now. He stated the Fee proposed accounts for the price of the tree, deer protection fencing, and gator bags. He added that this will be memorialized in the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance which is available for review by developers. He stated the Ordinance indicates that the Fee is adjusted for inflation; and a developer can then go to the Fee Schedule, which is updated yearly.

Mr. Coyle asked if this language will limit it to being tied to the Consumer Price Index; and he asked if it would be more sensible to save time and attorney's fees not having to come back to modify SALDO in a given year when there is a unique event. He stated the language could indicate that annually the contribution per replacement tree will be adjusted by "no less than" the Consumer Price Index for this particular region. Mr. Majewski stated he is not sure that can be done legally as it could be seen as arbitrary. Ms. Carlton stated she believes that what has been proposed in the amendment provides direction and structure to the developers so that they have something to rely on. She stated while the cost of landscaping trees could outpace inflation, she would suggest that we do what Mr. Majewski just stated which is to come back to the Planning Commission if that is the case. She added the attorney fees were relatively minor for this.

Mr. Bush stated we need to make sure that someone continues to keep track of this and not have it "fall through the cracks" after a number of years.

Mr. Bush asked the rationale for including native ground covers and grasses in addition to trees. Mr. Majewski stated when trees are cut down in a wooded area, it disturbs the ecosystems; and part of that ecosystem is the understory – shrubs and ground cover. He stated this allows for replacement of a combination of trees, shrubs, and ground cover which has the effect of replicating what was the existing ecosystem.

Ms. Torbert stated she wanted to make sure that the developers will have to put in native trees and shrubs, and Mr. Majewski agreed. Mr. Majewski stated there was discussion about an Ordinance in 2021/2022, and a few Supervisors

wanted to have an allowance for non-native trees; but the EAC and the Planning Commission did not want non-native trees to be allowed. Mr. Majewski stated when it went to the Board of Supervisors, the Board Tabled it as they could not come to a consensus on whether or not there should be non-natives or no non-natives. He stated we are now considering it again, and everything will be native.

Mr. Coyle stated the current text just indicates the funds will be used for planting replacement trees, and there is no specification of native; but what is being reviewed now specifies that the funds should be used for the purpose of purchasing and planting native trees, native shrubs, native herbaceous perennials, and native groundcovers. Mr. Majewski stated this makes it even clearer.

Mr. Coyle asked if during Budget season the line item to raise the Tree Replacement Fee gets missed by staff does that mean we could not take advantage of CPI adjustments, and he asked if it is necessary for the Board of Supervisors to memorialize that change. Ms. Carlton suggested that this be “diaryed” for at least an every two-year review to make sure it is consistent with inflation, etc. She stated she does not believe that the Township is prohibited from making a mid-year change. Mr. Majewski stated years ago there was no consistency as to when fees were raised; however, when he started with the Township, he felt the fees were low, and many of the fees had not been raised in over twenty years which resulted in loss of revenue that would cover the cost of running the Department. Mr. Coyle stated higher catch-up fees are then necessary. Mr. Majewski stated while many of the fees were raised, many of them were still appropriate since they were tied to the cost of construction. He stated we also lowered and eliminated some fees that were either too high and discouraged people from getting Permits or were no longer required by the State or the locality.

Mr. Majewski reiterated that all fees are reviewed yearly to see if anything needs to be raised, lowered, eliminated, or added.

Mr. Coyle asked if we miss adjusting it one year and want to adjust it the next year, does the text allow us to look at inflation from the date the Ordinance is adopted to the date that the adjustment is being made or does it only reference a rate over the prior year. Ms. Carlton stated if we would miss one year it is not a waiver, and the Township would have the ability to look at the two-year differential. Mr. Majewski stated this has

happened in the past with a fee when they subtracted the amount instead of adding it, and he presented a spread sheet showing what it would have been if they had carried through the cost increase the way it should have been; and there was a catch-up for what the fee should have been if it had been calculated correctly.

Mr. Coyle asked what would happen if the CPI were to decrease, but the Township did not agree with the deflationary number. He asked if we have to lower it, and should we change the word “will” with “may.” Ms. Carlton stated there is latitude with the word “will,” but they could replace the word “will” with “may.” Mr. Majewski stated legally to be fair, the cost would go down if the CPI goes down. Mr. Coyle stated the CPI going down means a broad cross-section of goods for sale within the geographic area of Philadelphia and Camden have gone down; however, that may not be trees, gator bags, etc. Mr. Majewski stated there is not an index just for trees. Mr. Coyle stated he feels “may” gives a little more latitude.

Ms. Torbert asked if they should use the word “adjust” as opposed to “memorialize.” She stated if there is a situation where the price of trees and shrubs goes up in a particular year, she is looking for a way for the Board to make a one-time adjustment. Mr. Majewski stated he does not feel that could easily be done since every year they would have to revise SALDO to have a number, which would involve attorney’s fees and the Planning Commission; and he is not sure what would be gained.

Mr. Grenier asked the average amount of time between telling a developer what the Fee will be and having the money put into the Tree Bank fund. Mr. Majewski stated usually it is done at the time of Preliminary approval.

With regard to the use of “will” or “may,” Board members and Ms. Carlton indicated that “will” and “may” are the same, and they are not “shall.” Ms. Carlton suggested the language be changed to “will be no less than \$450 per replacement tree,” which would accommodate for a decrease in CPI so that it will never go below \$450. Ms. Carlton stated to address Ms. Torbert’s concern, she feels “less than” incorporates all of the discussion in that the amount of the Tree Bank contribution shall be memorialized by the approval of a Resolution by the Board of Supervisors which means that by Resolution, you could increase the dollar amount in the future as opposed to going through this once again.

Mr. Coyle stated the only change that Ms. Carlton is recommending is the “no less than;” and she is interpreting the Resolution by saying any Resolution could override this; and Ms. Carlton stated that is a possibility. She stated the other option is that we could do what we are doing now in two to three years from now. She stated having a dollar certain is important as that will save attorney’s fees if there is an issue with a developer in the future.

Mr. Bush stated he feels Lower Makefield should do some public education as to where and how Tree Bank funds are expended. He stated trees were planted in a few areas in the Township which look nice, and there should have been promotion about that and also where these funds come from and where trees are being planted. He stated he is on the Bucks County Free Library Board. He stated there were a number of mature, non-native Township trees taken down in front of the Library building on the property line. He stated a number of people came into the Library who were very upset that these trees had been taken down, and the Library had to explain that the Township took them down because they were non-native plants. He stated there were still a number of people asking why we were taking down what appeared to be healthy trees to put up other trees, and he feels there should have been public education about that.

Mr. Grenier stated those trees were on the Pennsylvania noxious weed list, and it had been announced at several Board of Supervisors’ meetings previously; although they did not specifically reach out to the Library. Mr. Bush stated he is not talking about just the Library, rather he is talking about the public at large. He stated a Newsletter is sent out four times a year, and there could be something included about what is being done and why. Mr. Grenier stated the original plan was to take them down in the fall and re-plant at the same time, but they were taken down early. Mr. Bush stated he is talking about announcing positive things as well. Mr. Grenier stated the Board just approved the fall, 2025 Planting Plan so there will be many trees planted in the Township this fall; and this information will be posted on the Township Website. He encouraged all Township representative to help spread the word since they have put information on the Township Website and social media. Mr. Grenier stated they are also going to make the Newsletter electronic and not hard copy which hopefully will get better readership.

Ms. Torbert asked if temporary signs could be put up when an extensive amount of trees are taken down or put up, and Mr. Grenier stated that is possible.

Mr. Coyle stated he was considering recommending that one of the permitted uses of Tree Bank funds be for promotion in communications. He asked Mr. Grenier if he feels that there is enough funding in the General Fund to cover that, and Mr. Grenier stated he feels there is sufficient funding for that. He stated as much as possible he would want to focus Tree Bank funds on trees.

Mr. Grenier stated he is not in favor of using Tree Bank funds for herbaceous vegetation. He reviewed his experience in this area. He stated one of the principles when doing mitigation is to replace in kind functions and values.

Mr. Coyle stated the text is not related to what a developer can do on a site when they remove a tree, rather it is giving the Township the authority to choose what they want to plant. Mr. Grenier stated if herbaceous vegetation was used, it would have to be actively managed for years; and the Township does not have the staff to do that, and it would not provide in-kind mitigation/benefit.

Mr. Bush stated while he does not have the experience to weigh in on the use of herbaceous vegetation, he did see that they were using Tree Bank funds for things other than trees. He stated if the Planning Commission is going to recommend approval, we should stress that this issue needs to be considered by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Coyle moved and Ms. Torbert seconded to approve the changes to the Tree Replacement SALDO Ordinance Amendment as presented before the Planning Commission tonight with the change that the text specifying the contribution by the developer to the Tree Bank at \$450 per replacement tree be amended to read “will be no less than \$450 per replacement tree;” and that given that the language allowing the Township to use Tree Bank funds more broadly than for the planting of trees themselves appears to be contentious with experts, that the Board carefully consider the experience and input of experts before deciding whether or not to adopt the language as it stands.

Ms. Carlton asked that the Motion be amended so that the last line that begins with “any increase in the amount of Tree Bank contributions shall be memorialized by the approval of a Resolution by the Board of Supervisors” have the word “future” added before the word “increase.” She stated that should alleviate coming back before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors for a nominal increase in the amount per replacement tree.

Mr. Coyle stated he felt the language as written already indicated that.  
Ms. Carlton stated that would solidify the language.

Mr. Bush moved and Mr. Coyle seconded to amend the Motion as articulated by Ms. Carlton.

Mr. Grenier stated every year during Budget season, there are many Fees that are updated; and he suggested that this Fee be included in that. Mr. Majewski stated that was the purpose of saying “memorialize it by the Board of Supervisors.” He added that the annually-adopted and updated Fee Schedule is the memorialization of this Fee with the increase. Mr. Coyle stated they are not specifying that it has to be its own separate Resolution, and it just says “a Resolution by the Board of Supervisors.”

Motion to approve the Motion to amend the original Motion carried unanimously.

Motion to approve the Motion as amended carried unanimously.

#### DISCUSS ORDINANCE TO AMEND PROVISIONS OF SALDO CHAPTER 178, ARTICLE XI – LANDSCAPE AND OPEN LAND REQUIREMENTS

Mr. Majewski stated in 2021 the Township looked to amend the Landscape Ordinance for size of trees. He stated at the time they were finding that a lot of developers were having trouble getting 3” caliper trees. He stated they looked at what other towns do and what other landscape architects recommend, and it is recommended to lower the minimum size of street trees to be planted to be 2 ½” caliper and the height of other evergreen trees go from 6’ to 5’.

Mr. Majewski stated there was also discussion with Farmland Preservation about the issue they have with the buffer. He stated there is only really one other potential parcel which could be considered as a Farmland Preservation subdivision. As currently written, the Type 3 buffer, which is the farmland buffer, requires a 25’ buffer to be planted with trees on the farmland property. He stated Farmland Preservation has found that they need to spend a lot of their funds maintaining the trees that are within that buffer. He stated the

recommendation is to make it a 35' buffer and have the planted part of the buffer be on the property owner's side; and the property owner would have to maintain the trees, and it would impact the farmland less.

Mr. Majewski stated originally the Ordinance had gone through the EAC, the Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors; and the EAC and the Planning Commission objected to the provision at that time which was to have a certain percentage of trees be non-native. Mr. Majewski stated the Planning Commission had recommended approval of the Ordinance except deleting the provision allowing non-native trees; however, the Board of Supervisors never came to a consensus on that, and the matter died. He stated this is now back before the Planning Commission with the amendment that had been recommended by the EAC and the Planning Commission. He stated the Board of Supervisors was in favor of the amendment other than the non-native issue which has now been taken out, and every tree that will be planted will be native.

Mr. Grenier stated with regard to allowing for different sized trees, bigger trees can be difficult to find, and sometimes the bigger the tree that is planted, the less likely it is to survive. He stated with regard to the non-native tree issue, the current Board, which has different membership than previously, would be strongly opposed to allowing for any non-native trees to be planted under an Ordinance. Mr. Majewski stated that was completely stricken from this draft.

Mr. Coyle asked how far in advance does the Township place orders for trees with funds from the Tree Bank, and Mr. Majewski stated it is not done too far in advance. He stated sometimes we have to do substitutions of what we had hoped to get. He stated we try to have a mix of trees so if a blight comes through, it does not wipe out all of the trees. He stated there are certain species that are readily available. He stated they are trying to do this earlier so that contractors/bidders have the option of getting more of a variety of trees.

Mr. Grenier stated at the last meeting the Board put out the RFP to buy trees as part of the Fall Tree Planting Plan, and this was a tighter window than we would have liked. He stated there is a planting list of natives that is usually based on what is typically available, but at the time of purchase you are at the mercy of the nursery so you need to be flexible and make the proper adjustments.



Mr. Coyle stated it may make sense for the Township to place our tree order well in advance if we want 3" trees and the developers would have some mechanism to take delivery of those. Mr. Majewski stated typically we would not do a 3" caliper tree unless there was a grove of trees that were all large, and we wanted an immediate impact.

Mr. Coyle noted with regard to the farmland buffer, by putting the buffer and the tree responsibility on the residential side, the trees would not be under Farmland Preservation's control; and if the homeowner decided to cut the tree down, we would have to sue the homeowner to have them replant trees. Mr. Coyle stated he is worried about the buffer responsibility being taken off of Farmland Preservation onto land under other ownership.

Mr. Majewski stated we do not have a Shade Tree Commission, and we have nothing to stop anyone from taking down a buffer tree. He stated the Farmland buffer was intended to benefit the homeowner and not necessarily for farmland. He stated the trees being planted on the homeowners' side would shield them from the impact of plowed fields stirring up dust, etc. He stated a homeowner may prefer to have the view of farmland and live with some of the inconveniences of that.

Mr. Grenier stated he feels there should be a better buffer around streams on farmland since farmland does not have stormwater regulations, and a lot of the stormwater just flows off of the farmland; however, the argument given is that every tree or buffer planted is a square foot that cannot be leased to a farmer to produce something. He stated this also results in less revenue to Farmland Preservation relative to what can be leased.

Ms. Torbert stated another concern is that when chemicals are being sprayed on the farmland if there is not a robust buffer to catch some of that, it goes onto the adjoining properties.

Mr. Coyle stated if the purpose of the plantings is to protect the residents from the impact of farming activity, he is not comfortable with Farmland Preservation not being required to maintain the buffer; and they cannot maintain a buffer that is not on land that they do not own.

Ms. Torbert asked Mr. Grenier if there are certain plantings that make better buffers; and Mr. Grenier stated while it is location specific, trees cover more area and taller trees can block more aerial spray. He stated most spraying happens in the spring so you want something that has cover in the spring, and you want layers; and with trees and shrubs you get different heights. He stated generally our Residential development buffer requirements look to do this as well as our Farmland buffer requirements. Mr. Grenier asked Mr. Majewski to look at the mix that is required in the buffers to make sure we have different cover types to address this, although he does believe that our buffer requirements do include thick layering.

Ms. Torbert stated from personal experience she has seen people adjacent to farmland putting up their children's playground on the edge of their property. She stated she knows that the Township has sent out letters about buffers to homeowners; however, she does not feel the message gets through all of the time. She stated she lived on a farm for years, and they collected hundreds of golf balls. Ms. Torbert stated some residents are very good about buffers, and one of the homeowners behind their farm planted a number of evergreens which kept anything airborne from getting onto their property, and it also absorbed a significant amount of water.

Mr. Grenier stated Farmland Preservation spends a lot of time on communication about buffer issues including sending out annual letters to adjacent landowners, and they are very proactive about talking to the landowners.

Ms. Torbert asked what is currently being planted in the buffers. Mr. Grenier stated it is mostly trees; but as you get closer to the buffers edge they do not want to have too much shade, and they try to do more shrubs so they can maximize the cropland. Mr. Majewski stated it is site specific. Mr. Majewski stated what is proposed would push the buffer a little further away from the farmland which makes more of the farmland usable.

Mr. Coyle stated while Farmland Preservation is doing a great job, he is not comfortable with shifting the responsibility for maintaining the buffer from Farmland Preservation onto the residents and moving a line 10' into the residents' yard since that limits what they can do with their property. He stated it could almost be seen as a back-door seizure of land as they are saying that the resident has to maintain the 10' with buffer plantings. He stated there are only three Board members present this evening; and if they were to vote on it this evening, he does not feel it would go in favor of putting the text forward.

Mr. Bush stated he agrees that it could be seen as a back-door taking of property; and while he understands the reason why they would want to do this to maximize farming space, he is not comfortable with the idea, and he would not recommend approving that piece of it. Mr. Grenier stated he also feels enforcement would be difficult.

Mr. Majewski stated this would be for new Subdivisions, and there may be one or two farms that this could apply to. Mr. Coyle stated while that is the case today, it would apply to any Subdivision; and there are some large properties that could be subdivided to have two or three homes that border farms, and this would be applicable to them as well. Mr. Majewski stated it would be for a Farmland Preservation Subdivision like Farmview and Heather Ridge which requires preservation of half of the land as farmland and cluster everything down on the rest of the property. Mr. Coyle asked Mr. Majewski if he is certain of that and that this would not be triggered by any Subdivision of land bordering preserved farmland, and Mr. Majewski stated he is positive.

Mr. Coyle asked Ms. Carlton her opinion on this. Mr. Coyle stated he still does not like putting the maintenance of the buffer on those homeowners whether it impacts existing homeowners or not. He stated if a resident decides to take down the buffer, it would impact neighboring yards as well.

Ms. Carlton stated often when we are doing this, particularly with the newer Subdivisions, it is on the Plans, and is built into the HOA documents as well. She stated this results on a two-fold enforcement mechanism either through the HOA itself and through the Township enforcing it through the HOA. Mr. Coyle stated while it would be in the HOA covenants, it still does not prevent a homeowner from cutting down trees. He stated the HOA would have to sue the homeowner to enforce the covenants, and that could take years to resolve to get the homeowner to plant trees. Ms. Carlton stated she agrees the mechanism to be enforced is only as good as the HOA behind it.

Mr. Coyle stated he will not agree to this change tonight. Mr. Majewski suggested that the matter be Tabled and discuss it again once there is a full Commission. Mr. Grenier stated there is a quorum present tonight, and he agrees with Mr. Coyle. He stated the Commission could vote on this tonight if they wish.

Mr. Coyle asked the other changes aside from the buffer and the tree caliper changes, which the Commission seems comfortable with. Mr. Majewski stated the other change is the reference at the end, and there are new titles and dates for standards for tree care and tree planting which have been updated.

Mr. Grenier stated the Planning Commission could recommend approval of the Ordinance as presented except for the buffer issue.

Mr. Majewski stated with regard to the issue of advertising the tree program, we have done some posts on Facebook about it; but he agrees we could do a better job. He stated we could have had a post in advance of taking down the trees advising that the trees were being taken down, and that new trees would be planted in the future. He stated that post was done the day the trees were taken down, and it would have been better to put it out prior to when they were taken down.

Mr. Bush asked for more information about the Tree Planting Plan. Mr. Grenier stated with regard to the Tree Planting Plan using Tree Bank funds, what we have been doing is working with the EAC and a consultant to develop a formal Tree Planting Plan for the spring and for the fall. He stated there are drawings and a plant list that go with it. He stated the EAC reviews the Plan and makes a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors who approves the Plan and then approves the Bid advertisement. He stated when the Bids come back the Board of Supervisors approves that separately. Mr. Bush stated he assumes it is the same for removal of trees as well. Mr. Grenier stated it is rare that we remove trees. Mr. Bush stated we just had this instance where trees were removed; and going forward if that were to happen again, he asked how they would proceed. Mr. Grenier stated it would be the same as when the trees were just removed. He stated the issue came up two years ago when they were discussing native trees at several meeting, and it was noted those pear trees were identified as something that should not be included on the plant list and should be removed at some point. He stated when it came time to execute their removal, it was discussed at a couple Board of Supervisors' meetings late winter/early spring. They were going to have a contractor do this, but Public Works indicated that they could do it, and the Board approved them executing it although they did it sooner than was expected. He stated in the future if trees are identified for removal whoever identifies them would make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors; and he believes it would be sent to the EAC for their review and to make a recommendation as well. He stated the EAC

would propose a plan for removal and replacement which would go before the Board of Supervisors for approval. He stated they would then consider if they need to have a contractor take it down or if Public Works can do it.

Mr. Coyle stated he feels that it would be a good idea to have temporary signs as was noted earlier indicating that replanting will be done in the area.

Mr. Coyle moved to recommend acceptance of the Ordinance to amend provisions of SALDO Chapter 178, Article XI, Landscape and Open Land Requirements presented tonight to the Planning Commission except that we reject the proposed Exhibit B specifically but not limited to the requirements under part D1 – the buffer width shall be 35' in which a 10' wide planted area is required on the Residential side of the property line.

Mr. Majewski stated he found the Motion as stated confusing.

Mr. Coyle withdrew the Motion.

Mr. Grenier asked Mr. Coyle if there is anything else in Exhibit B that he is not comfortable with; and Mr. Coyle stated he does not know that there is, and he would be comfortable limiting it in scope to the changes to the Type 3 buffer. He stated striking D1 would also impact D3. Mr. Majewski stated his suggestion would be to indicate 178D would remain as is in the current Ordinance. He stated it is for a 25' buffer all on the farmland side of the property.

Mr. Coyle moved, Mr. Bush seconded and it was unanimously carried to recommend approval of the Ordinance to amend provisions of SALDO Chapter 178, Article XI, Landscape and Open Land Requirements as presented to the Planning Commission tonight with the exception of the changes to 178-82 Section D the Type 3 Buffer, which shall not be recommended for approval.

#### OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Grenier stated at the last Board of Supervisors meeting, the Board announced that they will be initiating a master planning process to address potential future development in the corridor that extends from the By-Pass along Stony Hill Road through Edgewood Village and into the shopping centers. He stated we are doing this because there has been and will continue to be a lot of development and re-development pressure in that corridor. He stated

we have historically been slow to update Zoning “and other things,” so that by the time development plans come in, “our hands are tied.” He stated the Board is trying to be proactive so that we can put in place a vision that the Township sees for its own future. He stated a process has not been developed to move forward, but he believes there will be input from outside consultants to start to organize a process. He stated the plan is to get a lot of community involvement through formal meetings, presentations, and workshops. He stated it will include getting input from business owners and developers as well since they are an important piece of this. Mr. Grenier stated this will be on a future Planning Commission Agenda.

Ms. Torbert asked if the corridor will include Township Line Road. Mr. Grenier stated it probably will although the corridor study area has not been formally established. Ms. Torbert asked about the development in Middletown Township. Mr. Grenier stated the Middletown Development was approved for an Overlay conditioned upon Lower Makefield approving its portion of it. He stated the only means of ingress and egress for that development is through Shady Brook’s main entrance. He stated they want to build a private road, and the first several hundred feet of it is in Lower Makefield; and there is no ingress/egress to the development from Middletown Township into the development. He stated this would potentially come to the Planning Commission for a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Grenier stated the Board of Supervisors has written to Middletown Township expressing their concern with what has been approved and how it was designed. He stated the Township has not been approached to have this on an Agenda.

Mr. McLoone stated the next meeting of the Planning Commission will be on Tuesday, October 7 in light of the Columbus Holiday being on October 13.

Mr. Coyle thanked Mr. Grenier for starting the process of the “look-over planning.” He stated one of the issues encountered with the Torbert plan was a very dated plan that the Township had indicating where there should be a road located. He stated a lot of time was spent trying to adhere to that plan, which there was not a modern equivalent for. He stated having something more modern to rely on to guide what the Planning Commission does and how they look at the matter for re-development in that area would be great.

Mr. Grenier stated since Mr. Kratzer came on board, we have been looking to update our Zoning generally; and he noted the Open Space Zoning done, and trying to plan so that there is not tract housing since “nobody wants that.” He stated that is why we did the new Stormwater Ordinance since they are trying to modernize everything. He stated while the Township is largely built out, there are some opportunities for development and re-development in certain areas; and we want to be proactive about it so that we get what the Township would like to see that will benefit the residents.

Mr. Bush stated he is also in favor of what the Board is trying to do. He urged the Board that the process be sped up as quickly as possible, and Mr. Grenier agreed. Mr. Bush stated not only is the development in Middletown going on but there are other things that could take place, and we should try to get in front of them. He stated if there is a need or desire to coordinate with Newtown Township he feels it should be done before more development happens on 332. Mr. Grenier stated Holy Family is planning on building close to 300 apartments (dorms) on their property that back up to Lower Makefield, and he agrees we need to coordinate with our neighbors.

There being no further business, Mr. Coyle moved, Mr. Bush seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Colin Coyle, Chair