

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES – JULY 13, 2020

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held remotely on July 13, 2020. Mr. Bryson called the meeting to order at 8:03 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  
    Frederic K. Weiss, Supervisor Liaison

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Costello moved, Mr. Bruch seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of May 19, 2020 as written.

ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF PROPOSED MIXED-USE OVERLAY DISTRICT ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT

Mr. Majewski stated he sent the final draft of the Mixed-Use Overlay Ordinance to the Planning Commission on Thursday, and this is an acknowledgement that the Planning Commission received it. He stated the time clock for the Planning Commission starts now, and the Planning Commission has thirty days to review the Ordinance and make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Majewski stated on July 2 the Ordinance was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission, and they will be conducting their review simultaneously. Mr. Majewski stated their comments should be back beginning next month, and the Lower Makefield Township Planning Commission should make their recommendation to the Board of Supervisors shortly thereafter.

Mr. Bryson stated the Planning Commission will need to have their meeting on August 10 in order to meet the thirty-day requirement. Mr. Majewski stated they could change the date if necessary, and he asked that he be advised if a Planning Commission member is not available for the August 10 meeting.

Ms. Stern asked if they would need to have comments by August 10 or should they have them before that time. Mr. Majewski stated there would be two meetings when this could be discussed, one the end of July and one subsequently when they need to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Bryson stated they would therefore also need to meet on July 27, and Planning Commission members were asked to advise Mr. Majewski if they can attend the July 27 and August 10 meetings.

#643 – ERIN DEVELOPMENT DOBRY ROAD FINAL SUBDIVISION & LAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL  
Tax Parcel 20-012-028 (16.57 acres)  
C-3 General Business/Industrial  
1685 Dobry Road  
Proposed 76 Single-Family Attached Dwelling Age-Qualified Community

Mr. Edward Murphy, attorney, was present with Mr. Mark Havers, engineer. Mr. Murphy stated this is the Final Plan, and the Preliminary Plan was approved last fall. He stated it contemplates the re-development of the Site which is slightly more than seventeen acres on the north side of Dobry Road for nineteen age-qualified quad units. Mr. Murphy stated the Plan has been pending in the Township for at least five years; and in the course of that time, it has gone through many revisions. He stated all of the design issues have been resolved with the Township and the neighbors.

A colored rendering of the Plan which was approved last fall was shown.

Mr. Murphy stated they have received the Final Plan review comments from the various Township consultants including Mr. Pockl's review of June 5. Mr. Murphy stated they submitted a formal response to that in early July. He stated they will comply with the comments raised adding there are several new Waivers that the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors did not act upon last fall that have come up in the course of the Final review. Mr. Murphy stated they also have seen the review comments of the EAC, Fred Ebert, the Township Sewer consultant, and the Township traffic consultant, SAFE Highway Engineering LLC.

Mr. Murphy stated he has been told by Mr. Majewski and Mr. Havers that one of the comments of the EAC will require a revision to the size of the stormwater management area by 1,000 square feet or less which they will agree to do, and any recommendation would include that agreement to modify the basin size.

Mr. Murphy stated the property is across Dobry Road from the Caddis Assisted Living facility which is under construction and will be nearing completion later this summer. He stated part of the Agreement between Caddis and Erin is for the complete re-construction of Dobry Road from the Railroad track all the way forward to the point of interconnection with Oxford Valley Road, and that is being undertaken now as well.

Mr. Murphy stated they are looking for a recommendation tonight from the Planning Commission so that they can appear before the Board of Supervisors which he understands is tentatively scheduled for August 5.

Mr. Bryson stated the Plan has not changed much since it was approved as a Preliminary Plan. Mr. Pockl stated Mr. Murphy had indicated that there was a Plan revision that would be required. Mr. Pockl stated the Zoning Code requires a minimum setback distance from wet ponds 20,000 cubic feet and over. He stated he believes that it is the Applicant's intention not to reduce the size of the basin, but to reduce the volume of retained water within that system so that the wet pond is not 20,000 cubic feet or over. Mr. Bryson stated they are re-designing it in order to avoid that Variance, and Mr. Pockl agreed. Mr. Pockl stated he is in agreement with what the Applicant is proposing, and he feels there is sufficient volume within the basins and the rain gardens to meet the stormwater management requirements of the Code.

Mr. Bush stated Item 12 of the June 5 Township engineer's review letter indicates that there are sidewalks on one side of the street, and he asked what portion of the road will have sidewalks on one side of the street. Mr. Havers noted on the Plan where the internal streets will have sidewalks on one side, and he stated they have provided sidewalks on their side of Dobry Road as well. Mr. Bryson stated the sidewalk links to the public spaces, and Mr. Havers agreed.

Ms. Kirk stated she has reviewed the Preliminary Approval letter that was sent to the Applicant, and there are four new Waivers being requested that were not previously addressed. She noted #8 regarding the Environmental Impact Assessment Report, #9 regarding the re-construction of Dobry Road, #18 regarding otherwise required eleven infiltration test pits, and #23 regarding pipe cover to be less than 2' at the interface with pre-cast concrete end walls.

Mr. Pockl stated he would be in support of the Waiver for Item #23 regarding the pipe cover.

Mr. Pockl stated he would not support the Waiver for Item #18, and he believes that additional infiltration testing should be required in the areas for the rain gardens. Mr. Havers stated they did discuss this, and they were going to do those during construction so that they could find out what the actual rates are, and Mr. Pockl agreed. Mr. Bryson stated that would not really be a Waiver since they will be required to do it during construction, so that Waiver could be eliminated; and Mr. Pockl agreed. Mr. Havers stated they may not do the eleven additional tests, but they will do additional testing as needed. Mr. Pockl stated he is comfortable with not requiring all eleven, and he feels there should be a partial Waiver that there be additional infiltration testing as directed by the Township engineer. This was acceptable to Mr. Murphy.

Mr. Pockl stated with regard to the re-construction of Dobry Road, they are currently working toward that being re-constructed. Mr. Murphy stated it will ultimately be dedicated to the Township once it is completed. He stated the only issue involves the amount of reimbursement between Caddis and Erin. He stated Caddis is doing their portion of the work now, and the Agreement is to get all of it done; and then Caddis and Erin will account to each other for their proportionate share.

Ms. Kirk stated the reason she brought this up was because it does not say that in the review letter so she assumes that would be a partial Waiver. She stated looking at the Preliminary Land Development Approval letter it was a partial Waiver for not having to re-construct the entirety of the road but to do it in proportion with whatever was worked out with Caddis. She stated she is not sure whether that needs to be re-worded in Mr. Pockl's review letter.

Mr. Bryson stated they meet the spirit of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. He asked if they need a partial or full Waiver for this or a Waiver at all, and Mr. Pockl stated he feels a partial Waiver would be in order if not a full Waiver because they would still have some responsibility for re-constructing a portion of Dobry Road. Mr. Bryson stated he assumes they will therefore need a partial Waiver, and Ms. Kirk agreed.

Ms. Kirk stated the other Waiver relates to the Environmental Impact Assessment, Mr. Murphy stated the Waiver is actually not to do a Traffic Assessment for the EAC as they have already submitted that Report to the Township Traffic Consultant who has already issued his review. Mr. Murphy stated the conclusion of this was

that Dobry Road needed to be re-constructed which is being done. Ms. Kirk asked Mr. Murphy if he wants to withdraw that Waiver request. Mr. Murphy stated the Township should decide, given the circumstances, whether it is needed.

Mr. Murphy stated he would defer to Mr. Pockl on 8A. Mr. Pockl stated that would be dry weather samples of outfalls within 1000' downstream of the site. He stated given the fact that downstream of the site collects run-off from Dobry Road and the Caddis site which are two on-going construction projects, he does not feel they will get an accurate base line. He stated he would be in support of a Waiver for this.

Mr. Bush asked what the end of Dobry Road will look like where it currently dead-ends at the Railroad tracks. Mr. Majewski stated the Plan shows that there will be gravel so that the Railroad can access their site, and there will be signage noting that the road ends. He stated he has been talking with Public Works about what additional signage might be needed in the area. Mr. Bryson asked if there would be gates. Mr. Bush stated there are no gates there now. He stated he went to that area the end of May, and the house that had been on the other side of the Railroad tracks is no longer there; however, you can still cross the tracks, and there is no gate. Mr. Bush stated there was a "Jersey barrier," but it was off to the side. He stated if someone wanted to drive over the tracks, they would have no problem doing so. He stated he did not see any signage. He stated while no one is driving down there now, at some point this could be a safety issue.

Mr. Havers stated they will put up "No Outlet" signs, but he is not sure what Caddis is doing. He added he felt that there was going to be some kind of barrier, and he felt that was up to the Railroad to do; and he is not sure Erin can do anything about that since the Railroad needs to maintain access. Mr. Havers stated they would have "No Outlet" signs or whatever Public Works would like to have there. Mr. Havers stated the house is no longer there, and he believes that the Railroad bought that property.

Mr. Costello stated without a chain or something across the road, someone could inadvertently drive across there. Mr. Murphy stated he feels that Public Works needs to reach out to the Railroad and coordinate whatever gate, barrier, etc. is appropriate. Mr. Bryson stated the Township could not mandate anything that restricts access to someone's property, and they to sign it as best they can.

Mr. Majewski noted Item #9 of the traffic engineer's review letter which states: "Please coordinate with CSX regarding whether additional measures are necessary to separate Dobry Road traffic from the rail crossing."

Mr. Majewski stated sanitary sewer service will be provided to the properties across the street from this project where there are several homes and businesses. He stated laterals will be installed to allow them to tie in. He stated the developer will also extend the lateral down to the east of the project to the Quinn property so that Mr. Quinn can hook his property up in the future when he chooses to do so.

Mr. Pockl stated there is also the issue with the wetlands buffer averaging calculation and the justification for that. Mr. Havers stated the original wetlands were much smaller, and he showed the hatched area on the Plan. He stated the Township had been mowing the wetlands, and the developer had asked them to stop doing that once it was realized that it was the developer's property and that they were wetlands. He stated Dobry Road is being re-constructed, and they are piping additional water into the area; and because of that, the wetlands have expanded somewhat. He stated the wetlands buffer averaging is due to the fact that the wetlands have grown because of stopping the mowing as well as additional water being piped into that area. He stated he provided the buffer averaging calculations to Mr. Pockl, and he believes that Mr. Pockl agrees that they meet the buffer averaging. He stated they are also providing additional buffer area in the wooded area to the left on the slide shown; and while this is not a required buffer, they are including that in the Easement area, and it will all be protected. Mr. Pockl stated he agrees that the calculation is correct for the wetland buffer averaging.

Mr. Bryson asked if they will be cutting any water off the wetlands with the basin to dry them up, and Mr. Havers stated they are not. He stated the water will still be going there. He added that because of the re-construction of Dobry Road, some of the run-off is increased and part of that will be diverted into their basin.

Mr. Majewski stated the Ebert Engineering letter had some questions about the lateral configuration, and the Applicant supplied a Sketch to the Sewer engineer who has since sent an e-mail indicating that he is satisfied with the configuration.

Mr. Alan Dresser stated he is a member of the Environmental Advisory Council, and they submitted their comments on June 10. He stated with regard to the wet pond and their comment about the 50' buffer that has to go around it, that applies because the pond is 20,000 square feet in size, and it is not the 20,000

cubic feet in volume. Mr. Dresser stated he assumes that they are going to reduce the size of the pond now because of this and get it below 20,000 square feet, and Mr. Havers agreed. Mr. Dresser asked how they are going to do that, and he asked if they are going to reduce the permanent water level. Mr. Havers stated if they move the contour in about 6" to 8" it will get down to 19,000. Mr. Dresser asked if that will not change their Stormwater Management Plan since it appeared that they were trying to take some credit for the volume storage in the pond between the permanent water level and the higher outlet level. Mr. Havers stated there was quite a bit of excess water quality volume so it will not really impact it at all. Mr. Dresser stated he feels that is confusing as it seems that the amount of volume they would retain on site when a storm occurs would be between the permanent water level which was 146' above sea level and the outlet pipe which was about one foot higher, and that foot of storage "was it." Mr. Dresser stated he looked at the Stormwater Management documents, and it seems that in at least one of them they appear to take credit for the whole volume of the pond, which he does not feel "makes sense." Mr. Dresser stated in pond 2, the smaller pond, it appeared that the permanent water level was at the height of the outlet to the pond so they would get no storage in that pond. He stated when the EAC looked at this, they got a much smaller amount of storage than the Applicant did; and it was well below what the Applicant got. Mr. Dresser stated he would like to see a response to the EAC comments on this. Mr. Havers stated the water surface elevations were wherever the outlet pipe is. Mr. Dresser stated they are keeping the permanent water level at the outlet level, and Mr. Havers stated that is how it works. Mr. Dresser stated they would get no stormwater volume credit for the pond. Mr. Havers stated the Conservation District reviews and approves the NPDES Permit, and they allow them to take credit for a wet pond. Mr. Dresser stated the developer did infiltration testing of the ponds, and they did not find any infiltration.

Mr. Murphy stated they will defer to Mr. Pockl's review, the NPDES, and the Conservation District. Mr. Dresser stated they do not have the NPDES Permit yet. Mr. Havers stated they do. Mr. Dresser asked if it is the one from last year. Mr. Havers stated it is still valid; however, Mr. Dresser stated it was not valid. Mr. Dresser stated he spoke to someone at the Bucks County Conservation District. Mr. Havers stated he did see Mr. Dresser's e-mail, and it is common that developers get a Permit, and if there are revisions, they then get an update. Mr. Dresser stated they do not have it yet so they should not be telling the Planning Commission that they have the NPDES Permit.

Mr. Bryson stated there is a NPDES Permit that is issued for the property based on certain parameters. Mr. Dresser stated it is from April 11, 2019. Mr. Bryson stated he works with NPDES Permits that are four to five years old. He stated NPDES Permits are good for five years, and Mr. Pockl agreed. Mr. Bryson stated based on the parameters of the Permit, if they change the design or the limit of disturbance, they have to go back and get it revised. He stated the Permit itself is still good for the property. Mr. Dresser stated he spoke to the Bucks County Conservation District, and they stated they would have to re-submit their revised Stormwater Management Plan because they changed it since April; and Mr. Murphy stated that is correct. Mr. Bryson stated if they do not meet the parameters of the NPDES Permit, they will not get one, and they could then not construct. Mr. Dresser stated it is “up in the air.” Mr. Bryson stated they will submit, and if it does not work, they will go back until they can get it to work; and if they do not meet the parameters of the NPDES Permit, they will not get their revision.

Mr. Pockl stated he understands where Mr. Dresser and the developer’s design engineer are coming from. Mr. Pockl stated he did an independent analysis that shows that they have sufficient stormwater storage volume within the two basins, the rain gardens, and the underdrains proposed under the rain gardens as well as the volume credits for the proposed amount of street trees which they did not take credit for. He stated they are also allowed to take credit for 10% of the amended soil volume at the bottom of each rain garden, and they did not take credit for that. He stated he did an independent analysis accounting for all of that; and based on that criteria and the amount of storage volume with the two ponds provided, he believes that they meet the volume requirement in the Township Ordinance.

Mr. Dresser asked if he looked at the volume storage in the ponds between the permanent water level (146’ for pond #1 and 143 ½’ for pond #2) and the outlet pipes. Mr. Pockl stated he compared the bottom of the outlet pipe to the bottom of the basin. Mr. Dresser asked Mr. Pockl why he did that since that would be assuming that the basin is empty when the storm comes, and the basin has to be at the permanent water level by Code. Mr. Dresser stated the ponds will be at 146 for pond #1 and 143 ½’ above sea level for pond #2. He stated if that is the permanent water level, then the amount of storage is going to be between that and the outlet pipe which will be above it. He stated for pond #1 it is 1’ above it, and at pond #2 it looks like it is right at the permanent water level. Mr. Dresser stated he does not see storage there.

Mr. Dresser stated with regard to the rain gardens, they are in poor soils for infiltration, and 60% to 70% of the site has poor infiltration in the soil. He stated they have not done any infiltration testing where these rain gardens are going to be. He stated he feels there will be “trouble with standing water.” He stated there was “trouble at Scammel’s Corner, and he would not want to repeat that.”

Mr. Dresser stated these are important factors of stormwater management, and he hopes that the Planning Commission takes that into account. He asked if the Planning Commission received a copy of the EAC comments, and it was noted that they did. Mr. Dresser asked that they look at those since he feels they raised some valid concerns. Mr. Dresser stated with regard to the buffer averaging for the wetlands, they did save some vegetation; however, the previous Plans before they did the buffer averaging showed those were going to be preserved already, and they did not add any vegetation that they are going to preserve. He stated the EAC looked at it, and felt that they just did the buffer averaging so that they could put the parking lot in next to the wetlands. Mr. Dresser stated there seem to be two Stormwater Plans, and it is confusing; and they should all be tied into one document so that they can review that to see if they meet the requirements. He asked the Planning Commission to take the EAC comments into consideration.

Mr. Costello stated he understands that they have a Permit for stormwater management that has a five-year expiration, and they are still able to use that even though the Plan is not final; however, there would still be a final approval at some point, and they will not get that until the final plan for stormwater management meets the criteria. Mr. Bryson agreed. Mr. Bryson stated they will have to amend their existing Permit. He added that Lower Makefield Township’s Ordinance is actually more stringent than what DEP requires. He stated they will have to amend their NPDES Permit and get Mr. Pockl’s approval as well. Mr. Bryson stated he feels comfortable that this will be resolved. Mr. Costello stated while he feels Mr. Dresser brought up some valid concerns, the way the process works, those concerns will be addressed at a later point in time or they will not get a Permit; and Mr. Bryson agreed.

Mr. Costello moved and Mr. Bruch moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the Final Land Development Plan as set forth by the Applicant subject to compliance with the Conditions in the Township engineer’s review letter dated June 5, 2020, the SAFE review letter dated June 22, 2020, and subject to compliance with the Conditions set forth in Ebert Engineering’s e-mail of July 9 and review letter of June 18, 2020. Subject further to re-designing

the pond as discussed. It is recommended that the requested Waivers and recommendations provided by the EAC be deferred to the Board of Supervisors to ascertain whether to be granted or not.

Motion carried with Ms. Stern abstained.

**#677 – HESTON HALL IN THE FLOWERS FIELD AT EDGEWOOD MINOR SUBDIVISION  
PLAN DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL**

Tax Parcel 20-012-005 (3.68 acres)

TND Traditional Neighborhood Development Overlay Zoning District

1790 Langhorne-Yardley Road

Proposed Subdivision to create one Lot containing the existing Heston Hall building and future building addition #2, and a second Lot containing the proposed Commercial buildings 3 through 10 on the previously-approved Flowers Field at Edgewood Plan

Mr. Edward Murphy, attorney, stated this is a Lot Line change that involves Heston Hall which is a piece of the larger Flowers Field at Edgewood Mixed-Use Development in the Village of Edgewood. He stated this Plan was reviewed previously and was most recently the subject of a Zoning Hearing Board Application where some Variances were granted. Mr. Murphy stated this Minor Subdivision Plan followed the action of the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Murphy stated this will create some small Lot line adjustments. He stated currently the Residential portion of the Mixed-Use Development is nearing its completion. He stated the Commercial section of that development that almost entirely surrounds the Residential section has not started. He stated at the present time there is no new Commercial development proposed. He stated at the far western end adjacent to I-95 is the Heston Hall Complex that exists today. He stated that includes the existing two-story building and all of the associated parking that was shown on a slide of the Site. He stated what is shown in yellow on the slide currently exists.

Mr. Murphy stated as part of the Plan that was approved a number of years ago that created the Mixed-Use Development, there was a small addition to Heston Hall that was shown on the slide in the amount of 3,600 square feet.

Mr. Murphy stated all they are proposing to do with this Subdivision is to create a line between what is shown on the slide in yellow and what is shown in blue. He stated they are proposing this because the lender for

the Commercial project would like to have segregated what is existing (Heston Hall) from the undeveloped portion of the site that is shown in blue. He stated the Zoning Hearing Board had no issue with this. Mr. Murphy stated there are no new improvements beyond that which was already approved years ago contemplated at this time, and it is strictly to provide a separate Lot for financing purposes for the Heston Hall piece that exists. He stated there will be Cross Easements to enable everyone to be able to use the parking as it was originally designed. He stated there will not be any barriers between the parking areas, the yellow area, or the blue area.

Mr. Bryson stated this is an actual Subdivision Line and not just a Financial Subdivision Line, and Mr. Murphy agreed. Mr. Bryson asked if the lender would not be satisfied with just a Financial Subdivision, and they had to do the actual splitting of the parcel; and Mr. Murphy agreed. Mr. Murphy stated they had multiple conversations with the lender discussing exactly what Mr. Bryson has suggested, and the lender indicated they wanted a separate subdivided Lot upon which their mortgage can be placed segregated from the blue area that has yet to be developed. Mr. Bryson stated this is just a simple line to split one parcel into two for financial reasons, and Mr. Murphy agreed.

Mr. Pockl stated in their review letter they noted Section 178-55E of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance that excessively irregular Lots are to be avoided, and he asked if there is any need for having the Lot Line where it is as opposed to bringing it to the rear portion of the Residential Lots and just carrying the line straight down from the rear Residential Lots down to meet the Commercial area. Mr. Murphy stated they tried not to change the Plan that was already approved too much. He stated as to the irregularity, it is already irregularly shaped. He stated those are spaces that exist today that support Heston Hall, and they felt it made sense to maintain the current condition the best they could with the least amount of modification.

Ms. Kirk asked Mr. Murphy if they were to do what Mr. Pockl suggested, would they have to get other Zoning relief with respect to off-street parking for Heston Hall. Mr. John Richardson, engineer, stated the way they set this up it would not require additional parking Variances because there are going to be Cross-Easements. He stated the original Development had all the parking shared among all the Uses, and that will continue to be the case. He stated the reason they could not “jog” it around the island was because the owner expressed concern

about the sidewalk and the handicap ramp that is there that comes through the island, and they tried to not go through any significant feature with the property line.

Mr. Pockl noted Comment #1 where a Variance may be required because the front setback from the ultimate right-of-way on Building #9 is shown on the Plans as being 4.9'. Mr. Richardson stated he believes that was a drafting error. He stated these Plans have been through multiple engineering firms. He stated the building is 5' away.

Mr. Murphy stated the other comments in Mr. Pockl's review letter are all will comply.

Mr. Costello asked if there are any potential longer-term risks doing it this way that the Township could be leaving itself open to, and Mr. Pockl stated there are not to his knowledge. Ms. Kirk stated at the Zoning Hearing Board there were concerns about being able to maintain the current, existing parking so the Zoning Hearing Board's Approval for Variances was subject to the Condition of the Cross-Easements being put into effect and Recorded. Mr. Pockl stated he has that in his review letter as being a Condition of Approval.

Mr. Majewski stated the other item besides the Cross-Easements would be other parts of the overall Approval and how they are going to be implemented and the cost shared between the blue and yellow sections of the Development.

There was no Public Comment.

Mr. Bryson moved, Ms. Stern seconded and it was unanimously carried to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the Plan subject to compliance with the Conditions as set forth in the Township engineer's review letter dated 7/9/20 with two specific Conditions that the Cross-Easements as recommended and approved by the Zoning Hearing Board be signed and duly Recorded with the apportionment of costs between the two remaining Commercial Lots and that the issue of the requested Waivers be deferred to the Board of Supervisors for their review and approval.

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

Mr. Bryson stated they are going to discuss this at the next meeting and then meet again in August to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors within the thirty-day period that starts this evening. Mr. Bryson stated the next Section to be discussed was the one that Mr. Bush was working on. Mr. Bush stated he e-mailed Mr. Majewski that he has some information put together, and he can send out an e-mail on this to everyone in a day or two. He stated his Section was with regard to circulation and parking. Mr. Bryson stated he would like to discuss that at the next meeting, and Mr. Bush stated he can provide the information in time for that meeting.

SHENNARD PROPERTY SEWAGE FACILITIES PLANNING MODULE APPROVAL  
Tax Parcel 20-032-008-002  
C-3 General Business/Industrial  
1667 Dobry Road

Mr. Majewski stated the property was the outparcel from the Caddis Subdivision includes a historic, stone house that was carved out from the Caddis Development. He stated they wanted to hook up to the sanitary sewer system, and they need to have Sewage Planning Module approval from the DEP. He stated one of the requirements is to get a sign-off from the Lower Makefield Planning Commission that is consistent with the Lower Makefield Township Planning Guidelines. He stated this property would connect to the line that goes from Caddis out to Oxford Valley Road, underneath, and out to the line across the street. He stated the Application is consistent with the Act 537 Planning, and a Motion is needed to recommend the signing of Component 4A of the Planning Module.

Mr. Bryson asked the amount of flow, and Mr. Majewski stated it is one house. Mr. Majewski stated it may be 2 EDUs since they have a detailing business so it is actually two structures.

Mr. Bryson moved, Mr. Bruch seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve moving forward with the Full Planning Module with the DEP for the subject property.

July 13, 2020

Planning Commission – page 14 of 14

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tony Bush, Secretary