

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES – MARCH 9, 2020

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on March 9, 2020. Mr. Bryson called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

Those present:

Planning Commission:                    Craig Bryson, Chair  
    Ross Bruch, Vice Chair  
    Tony Bush, Secretary  
    Adrian Costello, Member  
    Dawn Stern, Member

Others:                                        James Majewski, Director Planning & Zoning  
    Barbara Kirk, Township Solicitor  
    Andrew Pockl, Township Engineer

Absent:                                        Frederic K. Weiss, Supervisor Liaison

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Costello moved and Mr. Bush seconded to approve the Minutes of February 24, 2020 as written. Motion carried with Mr. Bruch abstained.

SALDO ORDINANCE AMENDMENT DISCUSSION ON DESIGN GUIDELINES IN OFFICE/  
COMMERCIAL/MIXED-USE DISTRICTS

Mr. Bryson stated tonight Ms. Stern will present the Public Realm Design Features of Commercial and Residential Mixed-Use Development. Ms. Stern stated she separated this between Commercial and Residential with Commercial broken down to General Public Space and Dining Areas. She stated what she has provided to the Planning Commission is conceptual in nature.

Ms. Stern stated open spaces, plazas and gathering areas shall:

- 1) Be integral to the design and as a focal point of the development;

- 2) Be centrally located within the development and visible and conveniently accessible from all Residential and non-Residential buildings;
- 3) Be linked with overall development sidewalk and walkways;
- 4) Be sized in proportion to the desired intimacy of the overall development and each gathering space;
- 5) Blend together with landscape plantings (year-round and seasonal) and hardscape elements;

Ms. Stern stated with regard to #5, she had a notation “exclusive of checkerboard blocking patterns,” because she feels that looks too Corporate. Mr. Majewski asked if that would be excluded as opposed to being mono-colored, and Ms. Stern agreed. Ms. Stern stated she provided pictures on the second page of the material she provided, and she felt what this shows would be more preferable than the Corporate-type theme. Mr. Pockl stated they could indicate that the hardscape should be consistent with other locations found throughout the Edgewood Village District. Mr. Bush stated from viewing the picture, he would agree with Ms. Stern.

Ms. Stern continued with the Guidelines as follows:

6. Create spaces with visual interest including water features, public art, seating opportunities;
7. Provide for smaller gathering spaces or nodes which can be along primary circulation routes or set in between building groupings but also visually and conveniently accessible to pedestrians;
8. Provide for shade coverage utilizing a variety of trees, trellises, gazebos, and other similar attractive shade structures;
9. Have unobtrusive trash containers, benches, attractive decorative pedestrian lights, and so forth;
10. No parking areas shall abut any open public areas;
11. Provide for playgrounds and child play areas;

12. These spaces shall not be in utility or stormwater management areas or behind buildings;
13. Be generally flat and unconstrained and at grade level with sidewalks/walkways and at most a three foot differential between sidewalk and the public space to allow for physical definition;
14. Provide for trails, paths, and sidewalks to be clearly marked and separated from vehicular traffic;

Ms. Kirk stated Ms. Stern had put in developing it in conformance with the overall sidewalk and walkway network, and she asked if they will make a recommendation as to a bike trail. Ms. Kirk stated she feels people may want to use bikes to get from Residential areas to the Commercial areas in the compound. She asked if this should be considered as part of the Public Realm. Mr. Bryson stated he feels bike trails should be encouraged. He stated they should consider if they want to encourage bike lanes within the vehicular travel lanes or make it wide enough in the pedestrian section to accommodate bikes and pedestrians in the same path. Ms. Kirk stated that is why she has raised the issue since if something is not designated, she feels people biking along the sidewalks; and she asked if that will defeat part of what the Planning Commission wants to do. Ms. Stern stated she feels a bike lane would be good for this type of development.

Mr. Bryson stated if they want to encourage internal bike access from Commercial to Residential, they should identify one primary path for bikes to get to “Hubs A, B, and C,” that would discourage pedestrian traffic. He stated that could be in the travel lane for the vehicles or a designated bike trail. He stated the next issue to consider is if they want to incorporate a bike trail that leads to a more regional bike trail. Mr. Majewski stated that is required by the Township’s Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. He noted with regard to the proposed Wegman’s/apartment project, they will have to put in the bike trail along Stony Hill Road. He stated the one that is along the South Campus will be continued through the frontage of the Wegman’s/apartment project. Mr. Majewski stated that developer asked for the density bonus for the Mixed-Use Overlay because they will put in a safe connection across the bridge.

Mr. Majewski stated he met with the developer's traffic engineer and the Township's traffic engineer about how to get safely over that bridge; and he feels that they have come up with something that will work, and the developer will be discussing that with PennDOT.

Mr. Bryson asked about crossing over to the South Campus, and asked if they will upgrade the signals to accommodate this. Mr. Majewski stated they will have to connect across the street. Mr. Majewski stated the bike path runs along Shady Brook Farm but it stops short of 777 Township Line Road. He stated you can cross Township Line Road at Shady Brook Farm, and then you could go over bridge. He stated currently there is a "Share the Road" symbol on Stony Hill Road, but ultimately there will be an off-road pedestrian walkway. He stated if you bike, you can bike on the road; and if you walk, you could walk safely separated from the road. He stated going across the bridge where it is a little narrower, they will probably have an attractive barrier-type system so that pedestrians are completely separated as they go across the bridge.

Mr. Bryson stated the designated bike area over the bridge would be in the roadway, and Mr. Majewski agreed. Mr. Bryson stated the shoulder there is a little wider than he had thought.

Mr. Bryson stated he feels in this document there should be language to say that there is designated bike circulation internally that "hits the major pieces," and then also ties into the regional bike path. Ms. Kirk stated she made a notation that they should clearly identify an internal bike trail from the different areas exclusive of walkways that connect to the public bike path.

Ms. Stern stated the last item for this Section is:

- 15) Have no parking, loading, or vehicular access that is located in or on the open space, other than for emergency or maintenance vehicles

Ms. Stern asked if they should consider some kind of ratio of plaza/open space to gross floor area of the developed space. Mr. Bryson stated this needs to be considered based on the fact that there are already open space requirements within SALDO. Mr. Majewski stated he believes 10% to 15% would be what has been called Neighborhood Open Space in the Mixed-Use Overlay which would be the plaza area the Wegmans Applicant had proposed between the historic house

and the barn where they have proposed the fountain, amphitheater, and green space. He stated that is different from general open space elsewhere in the development. Mr. Majewski stated he had discussions with the Applicant since initially he felt the 10% to 15% number was low; however, they explained that does not include all of the open space. Mr. Majewski stated they also did not include the pool area and open space outside of the clubhouse which he feels could be called Neighborhood Open Space.

Mr. Bryson stated for the proposed Wegmans/apartment project, the apartments would have a community center. He asked if there is any other dedicated outdoor space other than the pool for those living in the apartments. Mr. Majewski stated they have proposed a triangular area behind the pool.

Ms. Stern stated what she was discussing at this point was just for the Commercial portion, and she wrote a separate section for the apartments.

Mr. Majewski stated they do need to consider if there should be open space requirements for the non-Mixed-Use Overlay since currently the Township does not require any open space for any Commercial/Office development. He stated he feels the Township should require something with regard to a gathering place/open space similar to what is being done at the South and North Campuses which they are doing voluntarily. He stated he feels there should be some requirement in this regard if there is a re-development opportunity or one of the last few pieces of land are developed. He stated he feels they should mandate a ratio for a common area as that would be a good amenity.

Mr. Pockl asked if there is a recommendation in the Comprehensive Plan for pedestrian/public space access; and Mr. Majewski stated it does discuss connectivity, and one of the goals is to try to connect the bike path system. He stated the Township has a very extensive bike path system. He stated he was at a meeting today discussing the fact that Bucks County received a Grant to study how to link up all of the trails among the area Townships. He stated when they looked at the map it showed that Lower Makefield has by far the most extensive trail system of any Town in the area. He stated the Township has approximately twenty-five miles of trails, although there are a number of gaps where either we do not have the right-of-way, there are physical obstacles, or we do not have the money to make the connections. He stated Bucks County wants to try to connect Lower Makefield to the other Towns and vice versa.

Mr. Majewski stated the Park & Recreation Board has also been looking at a Trail Maintenance Plan to refresh the trails that are in need of paving, and they are also looking at the gaps in the system so that they can plan which ones are feasible to close as funding becomes available.

Ms. Stern stated she also wanted to have the Planning Commission consider whether any of the plazas or greens needed to be of a minimum square footage. Mr. Majewski stated he does not feel they could call a 10' by 10' area a plaza, and they should consider if there should be a size requirement.

Mr. Majewski added that a small open area of 20' by 25' with some benches and a trellis over it could be a very nice amenity.

Mr. Bryson stated they are thinking of this in terms of a large site; however, in some instances if there is a re-development, this could apply to a smaller property. He stated for a smaller site 100 square feet would be a lot compared to a larger site. He stated he feels it should be based on a percentage of the site. He suggested a 5% relationship of building area.

Mr. Majewski stated they could have a number of buildings with a few benches and a gazebo on one side and on the other side there could be a more park-like setting.

Mr. Costello stated he still feels that there should be a minimum amount they should be required to provide or they may get a "lot of little pockets all over" and it would still add up to 5%. Mr. Bryson stated that small pockets of open space may not be bad as that would encourage small-space interaction where a few people can congregate as opposed to one large area that would accommodate multiple people. He stated he would not want to discourage small pocket areas of open space. Mr. Pockl stated they need to phrase it so that they are not counting every planted island within the parking area as open space.

Mr. Costello stated while he agrees some small pocket areas could be nice to have, they are still trying to plan for a relatively significant public space to handle a lot of people, and lot of small areas which would provide two- person seating areas is not conducive to what the Planning Commission had been discussing. He stated he feels they should put in some kind of minimum amount that prevents the worst-case scenario.

Ms. Stern asked if there should be a requirement for at least one plaza of a certain square footage, and Mr. Costello agreed.

Mr. Bush stated this is for the Mixed-Use Overlay, but it also could be for an Office Park in the future. He stated the Planning Commission recently approved the work being done at the North and South Campuses; and while they are putting in amenities there, even those amenities do not measure up to what he sees going in at a lot of Office Parks today including basketball courts, outdoor beach volleyball, and putting greens. He stated they need to consider what would be open space, and whether it would be benches and a trellis or would it be something else. He stated he feels that they need to think beyond just the proposed Wegmans parcel. Mr. Majewski stated he feels that they could consider all of that, and it is “not one size fits all.” Mr. Majewski stated he feels they need to consider this further, and then discuss it again.

Mr. Bryson stated the Zoning Code dictates that there be large open tracts of open space, but within that open space they could put in active recreation.

Mr. Pockl stated theoretically they could count much of what is around the perimeter which they are not going to disturb as far as woodlands as their large amount of open space. He stated he likes what Mr. Costello has suggested that we require at least one public gathering area of a minimum size that would allow for an amphitheater, a food truck event, etc.

Ms. Stern stated she did include some pictures of what she felt looked good.

Mr. Bruch asked if the expectation is that these are just guidelines or are they going to be requirements. Mr. Bryson stated if they are listed as guidelines, they would not be requirements; however, he feels the guidelines do show the spirit of what the Township wants developed. Mr. Majewski stated if they use the word “shall,” it would be considered a requirement.

Ms. Kirk stated they could state “shall include but not limited to.” She stated that way the developer would have to hit certain components although not every one. Mr. Bryson stated there should be something in SALDO that encourages them to incorporate the Guidelines within the design, and that would give enough “teeth legally.” Ms. Kirk stated the best way to do this would be to “hook this into the SALDO provisions” so that there are enforcement mechanisms. Mr. Bryson stated the Applicants would have to ask for Waivers if they did not want this to apply. Mr. Majewski stated he feels they will need to work on the wording.

Ms. Stern stated the second part of the Commercial Public Realm has to do with outdoor dining, cafes, and restaurants, and she listed the following:

- 1) Dining areas shall be designed in enjoyable spaces with attractive landscaping and hardscaping and pedestrian-scaled features;
- 2) May be designed as common areas or be associated with specific eateries/restaurants/cafes;
- 3) May be located in adjacent areas such as a patio extension of a specific eatery or along a common sidewalk along the eatery façade;
- 4) When located along the sidewalk adjacent to an eatery a minimum sidewalk clearance of 6' shall be maintained for safe passage of pedestrians;

Ms. Stern asked if 6' is typical, and Mr. Bryson agreed. Mr. Pockl stated he has seen it as little as 4' in the City of Philadelphia. Mr. Majewski stated 6' is the recommended amount. Mr. Costello stated this is indicating how wide the sidewalk needs to be if they have tables there, and Mr. Majewski agreed.

Ms. Stern continued with the Guidelines as follows:

- 5) Shall have maximum direct sunlight with shade provided by trees, canopies, and trellises;
- 6) The use of moveable furniture shall be permitted in eatery specific dining areas;
- 7) Secure furniture in common outdoor dining areas;
- 8) Umbrellas and pergolas may contain specific graphics for specific eateries;
- 9) For take away/self-serve outdoor dining areas, trash and recycling receptacles to be provided;

- 10) Where waitstaff is utilized no trash collection is required and would be handled by the waitstaff;
- 11) Outdoor dining areas shall be well lit with energy-efficient, night-sky friendly fixtures;
- 12) No drive-through dining will be permitted but a minimum number of parking spaces shall be established for call-ahead/take-away dining establishments;

Mr. Bryson asked if she would recommend eliminating drive-through for banks, and Ms. Stern stated she would not.

Mr. Majewski stated he knows Starbucks now likes to have a drive-through.

Ms. Kirk stated she felt the whole concept of the Design Guidelines was to create a Village-like atmosphere as opposed to a Commercial area where you have drive-throughs. Mr. Costello stated they have discussed this previously; and if Starbucks or Dunkin' Donuts would indicate they have to have a drive-through, they could ask for an exception. He stated they are trying to design this the way the Township feels it should be with sit-down areas, and drive-throughs are conducive to just driving through. He stated if it is included that you cannot have a drive-through, an Applicant could come in and request an exception and there is a process in the Township for that. Ms. Stern stated if this is to be a "Main Street/Town Center Village" that would not be a place where drive-through establishments are. Mr. Bryson stated while he agrees with that they are going to allow a Wegmans that is a 100,000 square foot box which he feels "kills any sense of Home Town/Main Street."

Mr. Costello stated he has seen enough areas where there are Wegmans and they try to encourage pedestrian traffic with residences close by, and you do not see a lot of drive-throughs in areas like that. He stated he does not feel it is good for pedestrians to have a line of cars at a drive-through even if there is a crosswalk in the road.

Mr. Bryson stated if the Township were to allow them, they would have to be done in a safe way although drive-throughs are difficult in terms of pedestrian safety. Mr. Majewski stated that is why he feels it is good to have what Ms. Stern has recommend; and if a developer were to come up with something that makes sense, they could request a Waiver. Mr. Majewski added that Wegmans does not allow fast food restaurants to be in areas where they are located.

Ms. Kirk stated often the queuing at a drive-through is an issue depending on the positioning, and the queuing is often considerably worse than what had been anticipated.

Mr. Costello stated while he feels there is a place for drive-through restaurants for what they are trying to create here, he does not feel it is something that should be included. He stated they could always request an exception.

Mr. Bryson asked about serving alcohol should that eventually be permitted in Lower Makefield. Mr. Costello asked if this is something that the Planning Commission should even comment on. Mr. Bryson stated in other Townships, they are allowed to have an outdoor, secured area where alcohol can be served; but it cannot be open to the sidewalk. Mr. Bryson stated he would encourage this as he feels it would be good for those who want to have outdoor dining. He stated the Planning Commission may want to include that if there is to be alcohol, it should be in an enclosed area.

Mr. Costello asked what is legally allowed currently, and Mr. Majewski stated it is not permitted except for Shady Brook Farm and Makefield Highlands. Mr. Costello asked if they should define the type of area that would be permitted to serve alcohol. Mr. Bryson stated they could state “should establishments serve alcohol, outdoor dining should be segregated from the general public” or something similar to that. Mr. Bush asked if there would be a drinking area and a non-drinking area. Mr. Costello asked if it were a BYOB restaurant with tables outside, would someone be allowed to bring a bottle of wine and sit outside. Mr. Bryson stated the question is do they want it outside in a segregated area.

Ms. Stern noted the picture she had included in the hand-out where there is an area roped off or there could be some type of enclosure.

Mr. Costello stated people in the Township expect to be able to bring a bottle when a restaurant does not serve alcohol. He suggested that they have a requirement that if there is the ability to serve a certain number of people and alcohol is available, they need to meet certain standards such as a fence or some other barrier that does not allow mixing of pedestrians and people drinking alcohol. Mr. Bryson stated this exists at the current time at Shady Brook.

Mr. Costello again asked if this is the purview of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Bruch asked what would be the detriment of having the area be open and what would be the advantage of having the area segregated. Mr. Bryson stated at the proposed Wegmans/apartment project, they will have an open amphitheater where there could be a concert, and adults could be drinking outside on the public sidewalk with young people having access to the alcohol. Mr. Bush stated there are public open container laws. Mr. Bruch asked how segregating of the restaurant addresses that issue. Mr. Bryson stated if it is blocked off, it is not considered public. Mr. Bruch stated he does not feel that the Township should have that requirement, and the restaurant should decide this.

Mr. Costello stated there could be a concert or event at the amphitheater, and he asked if the Planning Commission should be planning for that since it is a large, open, public space that would be open to the public. Mr. Bush stated he feels the sale of alcohol in a public space like that would have an issue with the open container laws unless they had obtained a Permit. Mr. Bruch stated he feels there is enough regulation in place already so that this would not be the place to include that.

Mr. Majewski stated if someone wanted to have a restaurant, they would have to go through Land Development Approval. He stated if someone wanted to have a brew pub with a beer garden area, the Township could indicate that they would like it elevated so that there is some separation. Mr. Majewski stated there could be controls at the Land Development stage.

Mr. Pockl asked if they want to add any language about fire pits. Mr. Bryson stated he feels they could have the kind using gas and also the space heaters. Mr. Costello asked if someone would have to apply for a Permit if they wanted to have an open flame/fire pit/bon fire, and Mr. Majewski stated the Code allows for a fire for the purpose of cooking or entertainment. He stated they cannot burn newspapers or leaves as that would be open burning. Mr. Majewski stated there are also requirements as to how far you must be from a structure.

Mr. Costello asked if there is any reason why we would want this to be more restrictive than current Township regulations; and all present stated they did not feel it should be. Ms. Stern asked if this is just for the restaurants or for the general public. Mr. Majewski stated he does not feel any corporate entity would want to have a fire pit in the middle of the open space because of the liability. Mr. Majewski stated if someone were proposing one, it would have to be shown during Land Development.

Ms. Stern stated the last item in this Section is:

- 13) Outdoor dining spaces to be linked with the overall development sidewalk networking.

Ms. Stern stated the next Section is for the Residential Open Areas.

Mr. Majewski stated the first sentence indicates “non-profit facilities,” and an apartment complex would be a for-profit facility so that would need to be re-worded. Ms. Kirk stated she feels Ms. Stern was referring to a business such as the NAC coming in. Mr. Bryson stated Ms. Stern is indicating that the park, playing field, playground, etc. would be non-profit.

Ms. Stern listed the Guidelines as follows:

- 1) Central greens shall contain open grassed-areas, formally-landscaped areas, pedestrian sidewalks, paths, benches, and gazebos. At least 60% of the central green shall be landscaped with trees, shrubs, and seasonal flowers;

Ms. Stern stated she is not sure whether 60% is the standard.

Ms. Kirk stated she assumes that they would be required to use trees and shrubs that are on the approved Township list, and Mr. Majewski agreed.

Mr. Majewski stated he feels the 60% number is a little high because they may want an area where people can take part in an activity such as volleyball, throwing a baseball, etc. so they would need an open green area. He stated 60% being landscaped with trees, etc. seems high. Mr. Majewski stated he is not sure that they want to include an exact percentage, and they could just state that the central green should be landscaped with trees. Mr. Pockl stated they could state 60% should be landscaped with trees and lawns.

Mr. Majewski stated on the proposed Wegmans/apartment complex Plan, there is a central green; and although it is not exactly in the center of the project, it is central to the Commercial area in that it is a focal point with items around it. Mr. Bryson stated what they are looking at in this instance is for the Residential portion. He stated he would like to see that the apartments can look out into an

open, central green. Mr. Majewski stated that is what they have on their Plan for the Residential portion with the clubhouse, the pool, and behind that an area for some activities. He showed the Planning Commission the proposed Plan.

Mr. Bush asked if there is an existing term defined anywhere in any Ordinance with regard to this, and Mr. Majewski stated there is not.

Mr. Bryson stated when he thinks of a central green, he feels that there should be an open courtyard in the middle of the buildings. He stated he would not be opposed to a vehicular drop off at each building, but he would prefer having the buildings looking onto a central green as opposed to a “field of parking.”

Ms. Kirk stated they could just indicate that is to be a common green area.

Mr. Bryson stated he feels they should state that a majority of the apartment buildings should look out onto a central green area.

Ms. Stern stated the next item under Guidelines states:

- 2) Central greens shall include water features, fountains, gazebos, sculptures, play areas, etc.

She added that there may not be that much space available.

- 3) Walking trails to be installed located in prominent areas with visual interest, the primary part of the trail not to be constructed along private yards, must connect with the developer’s Retail area via a sidewalk or pathway;

Ms. Stern stated she has also included sections on picnic areas, playgrounds, playing fields, play courts, basketball, tennis courts, and the clubhouse.

Ms. Stern stated she has listed a proposed dog park although she is not sure that there is a spot for that. Mr. Bryson stated he feels that would be an excellent idea.

Ms. Kirk noted (f) where Ms. Stern questioned limiting the size of “playing fields,” and Ms. Stern asked if that is something that the Planning Commission is concerned about. Mr. Majewski stated he does not feel they need to include a size limitation as he does not feel any developer would construct anything of any great size since that would take away from the number of apartments they want to put in.

Mr. Bryson stated he feels a walking trail/bike trail is probably the best feature. He noted a number of developments along Oxford Valley Road which were constructed in the 1980s/1990s which have tennis courts, softball fields, etc. and he has never seen any of them used. Mr. Majewski stated they are used a little, but it not as much anymore. Ms. Kirk stated a recent developer put in a bocce court. Mr. Majewski stated at the Edge at Yardley which was the former Cornerstone Development, there were tennis courts there and one of the tennis court areas was changed to a central gathering space with seating, gazebos, and a bocce court. Mr. Majewski stated it was felt that this was a better selling feature than the tennis courts.

Mr. Costello stated there were notations about “only during daylight hours” and he asked if they are limiting all outdoor activities to daylight hours. Mr. Bryson stated he feels the owners/developers would set the guidelines. Ms. Kirk stated if they were to eliminate the notation about only being used during daylight hours, would that open the door for them to install lighting for night time use. Mr. Bryson stated they could limit it to site safety lighting. Mr. Bryson noted that Shady Brook which is lit up at certain times of the year is across the street from the proposed Wegmans/apartment Plan. He noted in addition to the Christmas display, they have concerts which are loud and have lights on late into the night.

Ms. Kirk stated they should have a notation about restricting the type of lighting so that the stadium-style lighting is not installed. Mr. Pockl stated they could limit it to 15’ in height. Mr. Majewski stated there are Township lighting standards. Mr. Pockl stated they could add that the lighting should be decorative/ornamental.

Mr. Bryson asked if the Wegmans would be open twenty-four hours, and Ms. Kirk stated she is not sure that the Zoning Code allows for that. Mr. Majewski stated while the Code does allow for that, our three supermarkets are not open for twenty-four hours because of Court Ordered Stipulations or Zoning Hearing Board Decision limitations. Mr. Majewski stated our Zoning does not prohibit twenty-four hour Retail facilities.

Ms. Stern stated with regard to lighting, she had included picnic tables, playgrounds, and playing fields to be used only during daylight hours, and maybe that should be limited just to the playgrounds and playing fields so if people are out with a fire pit, etc. that would be permitted. Mr. Bryson stated he feels in this Section it should just state playing courts are encouraged, and the developer would then come in with a proposal.

Mr. Majewski stated with regard to playgrounds, it is indicated that they should be at least 100' from streets and parking areas. He noted a playground in Yardley Borough with a sidewalk linked to it and tables in the area; and even though it is right on the road, it is fully fenced in. He stated Newtown Borough also has a playground right near the road so he does not feel the 100' distance is necessary. Mr. Costello stated Kids Kingdom may be within 100' of the road. Mr. Majewski suggested that the number be eliminate and language be included that it be physically separated from streets and parking areas.

Ms. Kirk stated they could leave the language as is and add "unless such area is separately enclosed."

Mr. Bryson stated with regard to (g) Playing Courts, he would take out the first two bullet points about tennis courts and basketball courts. Mr. Majewski stated it is possible that they may want to have pickle ball courts. Mr. Bryson stated they also may want to put in a half-court basketball court. He suggested that changes be made with regard to the lighting, and Ms. Kirk stated it could indicate "lighting may be provided for night time use of courts in accordance with other applicable regulations."

Ms. Kirk asked if the Planning Commission wants to follow the format that was set up in the sample that was provided for the Promenade at Granite Run. She stated she can start working on the two Sections that have been reviewed to date. Mr. Bryson stated he feels Ms. Kirk can organize it as she feels is appropriate. Mr. Majewski stated he feels they need to go back and review what Mr. Bryson presented at the last meeting. Mr. Bryson stated he feels they can have Ms. Kirk edit it per the comments made, and they will then go through it all again. Mr. Bryson stated he feels they should get through each of the parts first and then Ms. Kirk can format it.

Mr. Bush stated he will do the next Section on parking and circulation and have that ready to be reviewed at the next Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Costello stated he will get together with Mr. Bruch to work on the hard-scaping and landscaping and be ready to present that in April.

Mr. Bryson stated he will be unable to attend the meeting on March 23.

Ms. Kirk stated she will also be unavailable for that meeting, and she had asked if there was anything else on that Agenda other than this since she is having a difficult time finding another attorney who would be available to attend that

meeting. Mr. Majewski stated he does not believe that there will be anything else on the Agenda other than to continue with this. Mr. Bryson asked if the next meeting should be canceled; however, Mr. Majewski stated he feels they should continue on. He stated if Mr. Bush can circulate something, those who cannot attend could comment on it.

#### OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Majewski stated they received a set of Land Development Plans for the Pennsylvania American Water treatment plant across the street. He stated they were before the Planning Commission for the Special Exception, and they have now prepared Land Development Plans to amend their prior approval from over twenty years ago. He stated Plans are available this evening, and he will also upload the information in the near future. Mr. Majewski stated PA American Water also submitted to a Waiver of Land Development for their other facility that the Planning Commission also reviewed for a Special Exception. He stated in that instance they are taking their below-ground facility at the Snipes Tract at Creamery and Dolington Roads and putting it in a building. He stated they came to the Board of Supervisors for a request for a Waiver of Land Development; however, the Board of Supervisors wanted them to go through the process with the Zoning Hearing first. Mr. Majewski stated they did notify everyone within 1,000 feet of the Snipes Tract about that project, and they had one telephone inquiry and no one came to the Zoning Hearing Board meeting. Mr. Majewski stated he does not feel that the Planning Commission had any issues with the project. He stated if the Board of Supervisors does not grant the Waiver, it will have to come back to the Planning Commission

There was an individual present in the audience who did not identify herself but indicated that she lives close to the proposed Wegmans/apartment project and advised the Planning Commission that “they only get one chance to do it right.” She asked that as they work on the updates to the Overlay, that it be posted and made public. Mr. Majewski stated the Township has endeavored to put all matters of public interest on the Planning Commission Web page and on the bulletin board in the Municipal Building. He stated it will also be posted on Facebook as to where information is available.

March 9, 2020

Planning Commission – page 17 of 17

There being no further business, Mr. Bruch moved, Mr. Costello seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tony Bush, Secretary