BUCKS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING

Wednesday, January 7, 2015
2:00 P.M.

Robert H. Grunmeier Room
1260 Almshouse Road
Doylestown, PA 18901

REVISED AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of Minutes of December 3, 2014
4. Report of Nominating Committee and Election of Officers
5. Executive Director’s Report
6. Presentation: New Comprehensive Plans for Solebury Township and Langhorne Borough – Cathy Gauthier, Planner
7. Act 247 Reviews
8. Old Business
9. New Business
10. Public Comment
11. Adjournment

Please remember to contact us at 215-345-3400 if you cannot attend. Thank you.

AGENDA SUBJECT TO CHANGE PRIOR TO MEETING
BUCKS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
December 3, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT:  Joseph A. Cullen; James J. Dowling; Raymond (Skip) W. Goodnoe; Edward Kisselback, Jr.; David R. Nyman; Robert M. Pellegrino; Carol A. Pierce; Evan J. Stone; Walter S. Wydro

STAFF PRESENT:  Charles T. McIlhinney; Lynn T. Bush; David P. Johnson; David A. Sebastian; Maureen Wheatley; Catherine H. Gauthier; Margaret A. McKevitt; Donna W. Byers

1. CALL TO ORDER
Mr. Pellegrino called the meeting to order at 2:05 PM.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
All rose for the pledge of allegiance.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 5, 2014
Upon motion of Mr. Dowling, seconded by Ms. Pierce, with the vote being 9-0, the motion carried to approve the minutes of the November 5, 2014 meeting.

4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT
Ms. Bush thanked the Board for their contributions for the holiday lunch.

Ms. Bush highlighted items from the Executive Director’s Report submitted to the board prior to the meeting. She commented on the issue of the PennEast pipeline that was reported in the newspapers recently. The interstate gas line is projected to cross an area in upper Bucks County. Ms. Bush said Chester County has hired someone to answer questions on pipelines, and she has learned from them and other communities that the pipeline is regulated under the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). Bucks County has no authority concerning the location of the pipeline. Mr. Cullen asked whether private landowners can oppose the location of the pipeline. Ms. Bush answered that the pipeline is operated as a utility that would grant the FERC the right of eminent domain. She added that the Delaware River Basin Commission is reviewing possible impacts of the pipeline to waterways. Mr. Cullen asked if eminent domain applies to preserved lands in Bucks County. Ms. Bush replied that she will check into; however, she believes there would be no local control.

Ms. Bush reported on the status of the Quakertown Area Planning Commission (QAPC). The QAPC has been in existence since 1972 and holds monthly meetings to coordinate growth and development in the Quakertown area. The QAPC comprises six municipalities as well as the Quakertown School District, and by working together can anticipate future school needs and assess impacts of development plans on school finances. William Harner, the superintendent for the school district, has recently informed the QAPC that the district is withdrawing from the group. Ms. Wolff, planner, contacted Dr. Harner who explained the school board questioned their expense to participate in the QAPC (approximately $700 annually). Ms. Bush wrote a letter to Dr.
Harner and provided him with the background of the QAPC and the importance of the school district’s role in the mission of the planning group. The QAPC is willing to find another location to hold their meetings so as not to burden the district. Mr. Cullen suggested Jeffrey Garton, the new solicitor for the school district contact Dr. Harner. Discussion followed on the activities of the QAPC and the importance of the school district’s involvement.

Mr. Dowling raised for discussion the expense of electronics disposal and asked whether the county will still hold electronics waste collection events. Ms. Bush explained that under state law certain electronics can no longer be disposed of with household trash. Televisions, up to a certain size, can be taken to Best Buy stores and other locations, but the law sets a limit on how much sellers of electronics are required to take back. Historically, Bucks County has held collection events, and up until this year, the county has contracted with a vendor to dispose of the electronics. Unfortunately, people are removing precious materials in electronics prior to bringing them to the collection events rendering them no value to the vendor and harder to dispose of. For this reason, the vendor will no longer collect electronics at no cost. Ms. Bush said she will learn soon if the County will contract with a vendor for next year. Discussion followed on contributions/funding for the collection programs, electronics disposal outlets, and the popularity of the collection events with county residents.

5. **Mill-Queen Anne-Black Ditch Creeks Trail Feasibility Study**

Paul Gordon, Planner, provided a PowerPoint presentation of the Mill-Queen Anne-Black Ditch Creeks Trail Feasibility Study. He presented on the project background and the study’s goals and objectives to determine the feasibility of establishing a multi-use trail designed to connect recreational areas to surrounding neighborhoods; determine easement and acquisition needs; identify potential cost for development of the trail; and recommendations for trail safety, maintenance, operations and accessibility. Mr. Gordon highlighted the Study contents and the proposed trail alignments. Probable cost for the trails that comprise 9 segments and 15.1 miles is estimated to be $13.6 million.

Mr. Pellegrino polled the board for questions. Mr. Goodnoe asked if Route 13 sections were part of the study. Mr. Gordon answered no. Mr. Pellegrino asked if the communities along the trail know what trails are being proposed. Mr. Gordon answered yes, that representatives for municipalities and other groups have attended the meetings. Mr. Pellegrino thanked Mr. Gordon for his presentation. Upon motion by Mr. Nyman, seconded by Mr. Stone, the board voted unanimously to recommend approval to the county commissioners.

6. **Act 247 Reviews**

The reviews of December 3, 2014 were mailed to the board for their review prior to the meeting. Upon motion of Mr. Wydro, seconded by Mr. Goodnoe, the motion carried to approve the December 3, 2014 Act 247 reviews. There were no abstentions.

7. **Old Business**

There was no old business.

8. **New Business**

*Nominating Committee*

Mr. Goodnoe, Mr. Kisselback, and Ms. Pierce were appointed to the nominating committee for 2015 officers.
2015 Board Meeting Schedule
Upon motion of Mr. Goodnoe, seconded by Ms. Pierce, with the vote being 9-0, the motion carried to approve the 2015 BCPC Board Meeting Schedule.

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS
There was no public comment.

10. ADJOURNMENT
Mr. Pellegrino adjourned the meeting at 2:40 PM.

Submitted by:
Donna W. Byers, Staff Secretary
Dennis Livrone Retirement – Dennis Livrone, head of our environmental planning section, retires on January 2, 2015. He has worked for the Planning Commission for more than 35 years. We had a low-key send-off for him at our staff holiday party. His future plans are to continue his teaching at Delaware Valley College and to expand his teaching at Temple. We have had internal discussions about future staffing, staff organization, and projects.

Elcon Recycling Facility Proposal – BCPC is being inundated with emails opposing a hazardous waste disposal facility called Elcon Recycling, in Falls Township. We have not yet seen the plans for the facility, but there is a DEP public meeting scheduled. Residents cite concerns about air quality, unknown hazards associated with pollutants, and the failure of Elcon’s only other facility (in Haifa, Israel) to meet water, air and environmental protection requirements.

PennEast Pipeline – We are hearing more about this proposed pipeline which would connect Luzerne County wells with natural gas markets in New Jersey and other east coast communities. Durham Township Board of Supervisors passed a resolution urging the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the agency with authority to approve the pipeline, to consider the potential environment impact of the pipeline. The letter notes that the pipeline would go through lands that are permanently preserved.

Lockheed Martin – We have been working with Newtown Township to see what could be done in the wake of the Lockheed Martin decision to vacate the Newtown site. The 56-acre site is for sale. The County and Township are applying to the U.S. Economic Development Administration for a grant to assess potential uses and markets.

County Housing Advisory Board selected – The Commissioners have selected a group to examine the many county housing programs and resources available to the county and to develop a strategic plan to ensure that we are coordinating and using resources to our best advantage. Many County departments – from Housing and Community Development to Behavioral Health to the Corrections system – have housing programs or funding. There is little coordination and no overall county strategy to use these resources effectively. BCPC staff will provide information as needed.
COMMUNITY PLANNING

> **Meeting Attendance**—Attended the regular monthly planning commission meetings of Buckingham and Milford townships and the Quakertown Area Planning Committee.

> **Northampton Township Village Commercial Design Guidelines**—Continued research and drafting report.

> **Richboro Village Master Plan**—Collecting background information on Richboro. Met with Northampton Township Economic Development Corporation to kick-start the project and discuss activities and initiatives occurring in the village.

> **Tinicum Township Comprehensive Plan**—Held 4th meeting with the comprehensive plan group to discuss second draft revisions.

> **West Rockhill Township**—Drafting the land use and transportation chapter of the Village of Almont study.

> **Cross Keys Study**—Producing narrative for the Land Use and Zoning, and Economic Development Conditions sections.

> **Solebury Township**—Coordinated revisions and final formatting of the Comprehensive Plan adopted by the Board of Supervisors at their public hearing on December 16th.

> **Springfield Township**—Provided land use, building permit, and population projection data to address a data request from the Palisades School District.

> **New Hope Borough**—Completed revisions to the draft floodplain regulations based on comments by DCED.

> **New Britain Borough**—Developed a detailed work outline for the New Britain Borough Main Street Study and began collecting background information.

> **Brownsville Road Corridor Study**—Researching feasibility of Transit Oriented Development between Trevose and Neshaminy Falls train stations as part of the corridor study for Bensalem and Lower Southampton townships.

Planning Information and Agency Coordination

> Provided information to the public on topics including demographic and socioeconomic data, development proposals, review letters, local zoning, and municipal regulations.

> Attended meeting of the Bicycle Task Force.

> Attended Bucks County Homeless Continuum of Care meetings.

> Continued to work on the creation of a plan implementation progress model handbook to track and monitor recommendations outlined in planning documents.

> Reviewed Act 14, 67, 68 NPDES permit applications.
Act 247 and 537 Review Activity  
> 9 Subdivision and Land Development Proposals  
> 2 Sketch Plans  
> 22 Municipals  
> 1 Sewage Facility Planning Modules  
> 2 Traffic Impact Studies

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

Poquessing Watershed  
> Conducted site visits within the Poquessing watershed to identify stream assessment locations for citizen monitors and areas to implement stormwater BMPs.  
> Established protocol for water quality monitoring.

Natural Resources  
> Assisted nonprofit agencies with Bucks County model ordinance language regarding natural resources protection.  
> Working with National Park Service regarding the Lower Delaware National Wild & Scenic River to identify open space areas, protection measures in place and natural and cultural resources ordinance language.

Integrated Water Resources Planning Work Program  
> Working with municipal and project partners regarding the development of citizen watershed monitors, educational outreach and workshops.

National Flood Insurance Program  
> Submitted final floodplain ordinance for Plumstead, East Rockhill, Haycock, Northampton, Lower Makefield, New Britain, and Bridgeton Townships and Yardley and Chalfont Boroughs for review by DCED and FEMA.

Coastal Zone Planning  
> Reviewed and ranked FY2015 Coastal Zone Management (CZM) grant applications.  
> Attended annual grant application meeting with PaDEP and Delaware Estuary CZM Steering Committee representatives, coordinated by DVRPC.

Bucks County Open Space & Greenway Planning  
> Attended meeting with representatives from Doylestown Bike & Hike Committee including Doylestown Township, New Britain Township and Chalfont Borough regarding proposed alignment along Bristol Road of the Neshaminy Creek Greenway Trail.  
> Attended Warrington Township and Doylestown Community Bike and Hike Trails Committee meetings.  
> Presented the Mill-Queen Anne-Black Ditch Creeks Trail Feasibility Study to the Planning Commission board and to the County Commissioners for adoption.  
> Conducted public meeting to present proposed trail alignment of the Lower Neshaminy Creek Trail.
Met with representatives from Norfolk Southern and Neshaminy School District relative to proposed alignment of Lower Neshaminy Creek Trail.

Attended meeting of PA Circuit Working Group of county representatives.

Continued site analysis for the Middle Neshaminy Creek Trail Feasibility Study.

Met with representatives from Bensalem Township and Pennsylvania Environmental Council relative to East Coast Greenway Trail planning and development.

Recycling and Solid Waste

Met with regional recycling coordinators at regular monthly meeting in Chester County to discuss impacts of new law on next years used electronic collection program. Several members of the State Assembly, or their staff, were in attendance.

Reviewed the Covered Devices Recycling Act (CDRA Act 108) and outreached to several key individuals and colleagues for guidance and clarification.

Scheduling next year's HHW events.

Finished one chapter of the Bucks County Municipal Waste Plan update.

Preparing the HHW site registration application to PaDEP.

Finished reports for 2014 HHW season.

Working on completing the recycling coordinator activities for the 2014 Section 903 grant.

Preparing the municipal solicitation for 2014 recycling data.

Working with DEP on the next steps for the BC Waste Capacity Plan.

Working on securing a new toner recycling firm to handle the county office toner cartridges.

Hazard Mitigation Planning

Awaiting the award of the PEMA RFP to the consulting firm that will assist in preparing the BC HM Plan Update.

Held a meeting with Bob Fink, the Bucks County Emergency Management Hazard Mitigation Specialist.

TRANSPORTATION AND GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM (GIS)

GENERAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

Attended Site Visit with Chalfont Borough and Doylestown Township to discuss potential rescoping of Upper Neshaminy Greenway Transportation Alternatives Program Project.

Attended PA Circuit Working Group Meeting. Provided recommendations for trail priorities within the county.

Attended Bensalem Township meeting to discuss East Coast Greenway Project.

Public Transportation

Reviewed SEPTA Board Meeting Materials.

Attended Bucks County Transportation Management Association Board Meeting.
Transportation Assistance to Planning Staff

> Discussed transportation related issues with staff for subdivision and land development reviews.
> Received 5 proposals for Cross Keys Land Use and Transportation Study. Coordinated with Purchasing Department regarding RFP review process. Attended RFP Evaluation Coordination Meetings. Reviewed 5 proposals and provided scores to Purchasing Department. Received turning movement count information from DVRPC.
> Coordinated with New Britain Township regarding contract issues related to New Britain Borough Transit Oriented Development TCDI Project.
> Continued developing computer-enhanced imagery for Almont Study. Continued production of Transportation section. Provided revised Transportation Section to Project Manager.

Transportation Improvement Program

> Provided Transportation Improvement Program information to various individuals and agencies.
> Attended Request for Proposals Evaluation Committee Meetings for Bridges #15/280. Reviewed cost information and provided scores to Purchasing Department.
> Attended Request for Proposals Evaluation Committee Meetings for Bridges #252/380.Reviewed proposals and developed proposal scores and “Pros and Cons” information.
> Attended meeting at BCTMA to discuss Transportation Improvement Program.
> Attended Croydon Route 13 Streetscape Phase II TAP Project Meeting.

GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS (GIS)

> Continued development of County-Wide Enterprise GIS program.
> Continued database development of site addresses and EMS, Fire, and Police response zones.
> Continued updating of Enterprise Geodatabase and ArcGIS Server.
> Continued coordination with GIS consultant on the Land Records and EMS projects.
> Continued development and support of County GIS Consortium efforts.
> Continued updating and editing of county Road Centerline database.
> Continued GIS technical software support to IT and GIS staff at Board of Assessment.
> Continued support of County hosted GIS web server connection and interface.
> Provided GIS technical support to Emergency Communication staff.
> Continued technical support for County GIS Web Viewer.
> Continued editing of county-wide data layers using GIS Data Reviewer tool.
> Continued editing procedures on land base parcel annotation features.
> Continued updating and testing of latest GIS software versions on desktop systems.
> Continued edge matching work on SE PA 9-1-1 GIS Shared Services regional datasets.
> Continued production of county Park and Recreation maps.
> Continued development of new GIS Web Viewer from Flex to JavaScript application.
> Attended Shared GIS Services Meeting at Chester County Emergency Management.
> Attended Information Resources Exchange Group meeting at DVRPC.
> Provided GIS data for Tinicum Township Master Park Plan.
> Provided updated GIS data for the ESRI Community Map Project.
> Attended ArcGIS Applications for Field-to-Office Webinar.
GIS Map Production
> Produced presentation maps for Community, Environmental and Preservation Planning units.
> Continued development of maps of county parks and facilities for print and web deployment.
> Produced Zoning map for Nockamixon Township.

GIS Transportation
> Continued development of Region-wide GIS Transportation initiative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number(s)</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeton Township</td>
<td>3-14-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>SALDO Amendment: Floodplain Ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeton Township</td>
<td>3-14-2</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doylestown Borough</td>
<td>8-14-1</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>SALDO Amendment: Landscaping Design Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rockhill Township</td>
<td>12-14-2</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>SALDO Amendment: Floodplain Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rockhill Township</td>
<td>12-14-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haycock Township</td>
<td>14-14-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haycock Township</td>
<td>14-14-2</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>SALDO Amendment: Floodplain Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivyland Borough</td>
<td>17-14-1R</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Contractor Offices and Shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Southampton</td>
<td>21-14-SD1</td>
<td>Neshaminy School District</td>
<td>21-32-2.21 &amp; -2.2</td>
<td>New Elementary School: 112,000 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain Borough</td>
<td>25-14-3</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain Township</td>
<td>26-14-3</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>26-5-2 &amp; -2-1</td>
<td>Zoning Map Change: I to C/R and RR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown Borough</td>
<td>28-14-1</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nockamixon Township</td>
<td>30-14-3</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nockamixon Township</td>
<td>30-14-2</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>SALDO Amendment: Floodplain Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton Township</td>
<td>31-14-3</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkasie Borough</td>
<td>33-14-7 (P)</td>
<td>Constitution Square, LLC</td>
<td>33-10-145</td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: R-1B to R-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solebury Township</td>
<td>41-14-5</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>SALDO Amendment: Floodplain Definitions &amp; Plan Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solebury Township</td>
<td>41-14-6</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Soils Definition and Flood Insurance Rate Map Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Southampton</td>
<td>48-14-CR1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>48-29-4</td>
<td>2 Institutional Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington Township</td>
<td>50-14-6</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: CBD Retail Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrightstown Township</td>
<td>53-14-1</td>
<td>Wrightstown Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Floodplain Ordinance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bridgeton Township Board of Supervisors
    Bridgeton Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance—Floodplain Ordinance
        Applicant: Board of Supervisors
        Received: December 3, 2014
        Hearing Date: Not set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 505 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 7, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the subdivision and land development ordinance to revise the definition of floodplain to be consistent with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) regulations and delete the following terms and associated definitions: Floodproofing, Floodway, Floodway Fringe, and Identified Floodplain Area.

COMMENTS

We recommend that the Township adopt the proposal as submitted since it appears to be consistent with the ordinance requirements as presented by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and FEMA.

Township officials should also consider amending the subdivision and land development ordinance to address the following concern:

- **Floodplain soils definition**—The current definition of Floodplain Soils in the subdivision and land development ordinance refers to the July 1975 Soil Survey of
January 7, 2015
BCPC #3-14-2

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bridgeton Township Board of Supervisors
Bridgeton Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Ordinance
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: December 3, 2014
Hearing Date: Not set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 7, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to comply with the updated floodplain regulations required by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

Proposed Zoning Provisions: A definition of floodplain, consistent with the requirements of FEMA, will be added to Section 202 Definitions. Section 515 will be amended to provide a description of floodplain consistent with the FEMA regulations; and require permanent protection of floodplains except for utilities, roads, and driveways crossing the floodplain that are approved by Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection and the Bridgeton Township Floodplain Ordinance (which is concurrently being revised to be consistent with FEMA regulations). Section 516 Site Capacity Calculations will also be amended require 100 percent protection of floodplains and floodplain soils. A new notation to the site capacity table will state that floodplain soils are not protected where a floodplain has been established in accordance with proposed Section 515A.

COMMENTS

We recognize that the proposal is consistent with the applicable comprehensive plan and municipal ordinances and commend the Township for amending the zoning ordinance to be in compliance with
January 7, 2015
BCPC #8-14-1

MEMORANDUM

TO: Doylestown Borough Council
    Doylestown Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Subdivision and Land Development—Landscaping Design Standards
    Applicant: Borough Council
    Received: November 26, 2014
    Hearing Date: Not indicated.

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 505 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 7, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend Section 520 Planting of the subdivision and land development ordinance by adding requirements for the use of native plants, revising the tree protection requirements, and revising the list of approved plants.

COMMENTS

We recognize that the proposal is consistent with the applicable comprehensive plan and the municipal ordinances, however, the commission recommends that the Borough not adopt the proposal until the following concerns have been addressed:

1. **Tree protection**—Section 520.1.4 of the proposed amendment is revised to specify that ‘a forty-eight-inch-high snow fence or other suitable material, mounted on steel posts located eight feet on center, shall be placed along the boundary of the tree protection area.’ However, the term ‘tree protection area’ is not clearly defined. Based upon the proposed language, it appears that the tree protection area corresponds to the dripline of a tree. The County’s Model Tree Protection Ordinance defines a Tree Protection Zone (Area) as an area that is radial to
4. **Editorial comment**—The proposed amendment adds Section 520.A Definitions but does not change the letter for the next subsection, General Requirements. As a result there are two subsections titled Section 520.A. and the following subsection letters would be incorrect. Also, the proposed amendment does not follow the format of the existing subdivision and land development with respect to the use of letters and numbers for the subsections.

We would appreciate being notified of the Borough Council’s decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 505(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

MMW:kjp

cc: Jordan B. Yeager, Esq, Borough Solicitor  
    John H. Davis, Borough Manager (via email)  
    Kelli Scarlett, Zoning Officer (via email)
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

January 7, 2015
BCPC #12-14-1

MEMORANDUM

TO: East Rockhill Township Board of Supervisors
   East Rockhill Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Regulations

Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: December 12, 2014
Hearing Date: Not Set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 7, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to comply with the updated floodplain regulations required by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

Proposed Zoning Provisions: Revise Section 27-1902 to remove the existing floodplain regulations that will be addressed by a newly proposed stand-alone floodplain ordinance and incorporate new regulations related to uses permitted by right and by special exception in the floodplain. The definition of floodplain in Section 27-220 will be amended to be consistent with the requirements of FEMA and Section 27-221 providing the term and definition of Floodplain Soils will be deleted. Section 27-246.a. will be added which will provide the term Soils on Floodplain with a definition consistent with Natural Resource Conservation Service Web Soil Survey. The natural resource protection standard for floodplain in Section 27-1900.a will be amended to provide consistency with the new stand-alone floodplain ordinance. Sections 27-1900.b and 27-1901.b.(2), c.(2), D.(2) relating to provisions for floodplain soil protection will be deleted.
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

January 7, 2015
BCPC #12-14-2

MEMORANDUM

TO: East Rockhill Township Board of Supervisors
    East Rockhill Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance—Floodplain Definition
    Applicant: Board of Supervisors
    Received: December 12, 2014
    Hearing Date: Not set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 505 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 7, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the subdivision and land development ordinance to revise the definition of floodplain to be consistent with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) regulations; revise the definition of floodplain soils to be consistent with Natural Resource Conservation Service Web Soil Survey; and delete the following terms and associated definitions: Floodproofing, Floodway, Floodway Fringe, and Identified Floodplain Area.

COMMENTS

We recommend that the township adopt the proposal as submitted since it appears to be consistent with the ordinance requirements as presented by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and FEMA.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Haycock Township Board of Supervisors
    Haycock Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Regulations
        Applicant: Board of Supervisors
        Received: December 9, 2014
        Hearing Date: Not Set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 7, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to comply with the updated floodplain regulations required by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

Proposed Zoning Provisions: Remove the existing floodplain regulations found in Section 507 that will be addressed by a newly proposed stand-alone floodplain ordinance and incorporate new regulations related to uses permitted in the floodplain. The definition of floodplain in Section 229 will be amended to be consistent with the requirements of FEMA and the terms and definitions of Flood Fringe in Section 228 and Floodway in Section 231 will be deleted. The environmental performance standard for floodplain in Section 504.a will be amended to provide consistency with the new stand-alone ordinance. The environmental performance standard for floodplain soils in Section 504.b will be amended to include provision for utilities, roads, and driveways crossing floodplain soils.

COMMENTS

We recognize that the proposal is consistent with the applicable comprehensive plan and municipal ordinances and commend the township for amending the zoning ordinance to be in compliance with
MEMORANDUM

TO: Haycock Township Board of Supervisors
    Haycock Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance—Floodplain Definition
    Applicant: Board of Supervisors
    Received: December 9, 2014
    Hearing Date: Not set

January 7, 2015
BCPC #14-14-2

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 505 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 7, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the subdivision and land development ordinance to revise the definition of floodplain to be consistent with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) regulations and delete the following terms and associated definitions: Floodproofing, Floodway, Floodway Fringe, and Identified Floodplain Area.

COMMENTS

We recommend that the township adopt the proposal as submitted since it appears to be consistent with the ordinance requirements as presented by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and FEMA.

Township officials should also consider amending the subdivision and land development ordinance to address the following concern:

- Alluvial and floodplain soils definitions—The current definitions of Alluvial Soils and Floodplain Soils in the subdivision and land development ordinance refer to the
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

January 7, 2015
BCPC #17-14-1R

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ivyland Borough Council
   Ivyland Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Contractor Offices and Shops
         Applicant: Borough Council
         Received: December 18, 2014
         Hearing Date: January 14, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 7, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to allow Contractor Offices and Shops as a conditional use in the L-I Limited Industrial District and the B-C Borough-Commercial District. The description and use regulations of Contractor Offices and Shops would also be amended. This is a revised amendment that addresses comments made by the Bucks County Planning Commission in a letter dated December 3, 2014.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: The proposed amendment revises the description and adds two additional use regulations to the Contractor Offices and Shops use. Above-ground fuel storage tanks not larger than 500 gallons would be permitted. Within the B-C Borough Commercial District, storage of equipment other than licensed vehicles shall be within an enclosed structure. A restriction on vehicle access was added to require that all truck or van access to the Contractor Offices or Shop entering or leaving the Borough must be made via Ivyland Road. Violation of the access requirement is the responsibility of the owner who will be the proper subject of enforcement proceedings in the event of violation. Signage must also be maintained by the property owner that expresses the access restrictions.

Existing Zoning Provisions: The existing Section 27-506 Table of Use Regulations permits by right Contractor Offices and Shops in the B-C Borough-Commercial District, I-C Industrial
January 7, 2015
BCPC #21-14-SD1

MEMORANDUM

TO: Lower Southampton Township Board of Supervisors
    Lower Southampton Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Tawanka Elementary School District
    TMP #21-32-2-2.1 and 21-32-2-2
    Applicant: Neshaminy School District
    Owner: Same
    Plan Dated: December 19, 2014
    Date Received: December 19, 2014

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 305 and 502 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 7, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct an 112,000-square-foot elementary school building with 57 classrooms and associated infrastructure on a 20.01-acre site. The existing Tawanka Elementary School building would be removed. The site is served by public water and sewerage.

Location: On Brownsville Road, approximately 800 feet from Bristol Road.

Zoning: The BT—Business Technology District permits Use 9 Public or private school by right with a minimum lot area of 2 acres.

Present Use: School.
We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors' decision regarding this matter.

MMW:kjp

cc: Paul Minotti, Neshaminy School District
    Thomas M. Hanna, Gilmore & Associates, Inc.
    Scott Malin, Spiezle Architectural Group
    John Genovesi, Township Engineer
    John McMenamin, Township Manager (via email)
    Carol Drioli, Township Zoning Officer (via email)
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

January 7, 2015
BCPC #25-14-3

MEMORANDUM

TO: New Britain Borough Council
    New Britain Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Regulations

Applicant: Borough Council
Received: December 17, 2014
Hearing Date: Not Set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 7, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Delete the existing language of Section 611 of the zoning ordinance and replace it with language requiring all persons, partnerships, businesses, and corporations to obtain a permit for any construction or development in the floodplain; and establishing minimum requirements for new construction or development in the floodplain.

COMMENTS

We recognize that the proposal is consistent with the applicable comprehensive plan and municipal ordinances and commend the borough for amending the zoning ordinance to be in compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program and Flood Insurance Rate Maps; however, we recommend that borough officials consider the following comments before adopting the proposal:

1. **Floodplain definition**—Section 201 of the borough zoning ordinance currently contains a definition for the term Floodplain that is inconsistent with definitions and descriptions within the proposed amendments. We recommend that this definition be deleted or revised to only reference the definitions contained in proposed Section 611.
8. **Format**—The proposed floodplain requirements contain the formatting of the state model floodplain ordinance. We understand from a conversation with the borough engineer that the proposed requirements will eventually be codified to fit with the current section numbering and lettering of the borough zoning ordinance.

We would appreciate being notified of Council’s decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

TAK:kjp

cc: Mark Hintenlang, Borough Engineer
    Michael Goodwin, Esq., Borough Solicitor
    Robin Trymbiski, Borough Manager (via email)
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

January 7, 2015
BCPC #26-14-3

MEMORANDUM

TO: New Britain Township Board of Supervisors
    New Britain Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Map and Zoning Ordinance
    Applicant: Board of Supervisors
    Received: December 22, 2014
    Hearing date: January 26, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal has been sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at its meeting on January 7, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

The twofold purpose of this set of zoning map and ordinance amendments, according to the township solicitor’s officer, is: 1) to rezone industrially zoned parcels for residential and public recreation use; and 2) to incorporate modifications to a proposed amendment of the floodplain overlay provisions of the zoning ordinance, as recommended by our agency (BCPC review #26-14-2, dated December 2, 2014).

Proposed Actions:

A. **Zoning Map Amendment**

Amend the zoning map to rezone a portion of TMP #26-5-2 from the I Industrial to the RR Residential District and another portion to the C/R Conservation and Recreation District and to rezone TMP #26-5-2-1 from the I Industrial District to the C/R Conservation and Recreation District. A sketch plan for residential development of the portion of TMP #26-5-2 proposed for rezoning to the RR- District depicts the construction of 59 attached single-family units as a B5 Planned Residential Development (PRD) use. That proposal has been submitted to the township, but not directly to our agency for review.
2. **Adjoining land use and zoning**—TMP #26-5-2 adjoins County Line Road and the Montgomery Township (Montgomery County) boundary on the southwest. The adjoining zoning district in Montgomery County along County Line Road is LI Limited Industrial, with corresponding land uses. The parcel adjoins SEPTA owned rail line to the northwest, and other properties zoned I Industrial, with corresponding land uses, on the west and south, plus one single-family residential use on the southwest (TMP #26-5-1). The subject site also adjoins a PRD development to the east (Meadow Ridge), on the other side of School House Road. TMP #26-5-2-1, to the north is vacant land zoned I Industrial, proposed for rezoning to C/R Conservation and Recreation at this time.

TMP #26-5-2-1 adjoins land zoned I Industrial with corresponding land use to the south. It adjoins industrially-zoned SEPTA-owned land to the northwest and a vacant parcel (on the opposite side of Walnut Street), zoned IO Industrial Office District. Land zoned C/R and occupied by the Township’s West Branch Park sits along the other side of School House Road, to the northeast.

To the south of the primary subject site, TMP #26-5-5 is the site of a manufacturing firm. TMP #26-5-6 is the site of a contractor’s business. TMP #26-5-7 is occupied by a food wholesale, storage, and warehousing firm. TMP #26-1-97 and -97-2 are occupied by a power equipment testing laboratory. TMP #26-1-98 is occupied by SEPTA-owned rail right-of-way.

3. **Comprehensive plan policies**—The land use map (Map 5) in the *New Britain Township Comprehensive Plan* (2005) depicts the parcels proposed for rezoning within the I Industrial District. The proposed rezoning to RR and C/R districts are not consistent with the comprehensive plan; however, the proposed zoning may be logical extension of the adjacent land use and zoning.

A change of zoning from industrial to residential or conservation/recreation, however, constitutes a shift in land use policy for the site and presents certain planning implications. Residential land uses can have a significant impact on school district budgets because families create demand for public education. Although residential land use contributes a significant portion of revenues to the municipality’s budget, it typically does not pay its own way since the costs to educate children are very high. Industrial uses are seen as uses that typically require relatively few township services while providing jobs and tax revenue. Ensuring that municipal zoning provides for an adequate supply of both residential and nonresidential land diversifies the tax base and creates economic opportunity. Collectively, zoning changes and the development of larger vacant parcels and redevelopment of existing parcels may present a shift in land use policy and also a shift in fiscal situation. Given these potential impacts, Township officials may want to consider conducting a fiscal impact analysis to determine potential impacts of the proposed zoning change including the loss of potential jobs and tax revenue.
We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

GF:kjp

cc: Peter Nelson, Township Solicitor
     Eileen Bradley, Township Manager (via e-mail)
     Montgomery Township, adjacent municipality
Municipal Sewage Facilities Plan: The Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan Update for Chalfont-New Britain Township Joint Sewer Authority Service Area (2005) indicates that the parcels associated with the proposed zoning map changes are presently served by public sewer facilities.
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

January 7, 2015
BCPC #28-14-1

MEMORANDUM

TO: Newtown Borough Council
    Newtown Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Regulations
    Applicant: Borough Council
    Received: December 15, 2014
    Hearing Date: January 13, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 7, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Delete the existing language of Section 508 of the zoning ordinance of Newtown Borough and replace it with language requiring all persons, partnerships, businesses, and corporations to obtain a permit for any construction or development; providing for issuance of such permits; setting forth certain minimum requirements for new construction or development within areas of Newtown Borough that are subject to flooding, and establishing penalties for any persons who fail, or refuse to comply with these requirements. The last sentence of Section 303 will be amended to reference the new Flood Insurance Study and Flood Insurance Rate Maps issued by FEMA. Section 506B will also be amended to change the reference of 100-year floodplain to Special Flood Hazard Areas to be consistent with FEMA terminology.

COMMENTS

We recommend that the borough adopt the proposal as submitted since it appears to be consistent with the ordinance requirements as presented by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and FEMA.
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

January 7, 2015
BCPC #30-14-3

MEMORANDUM

TO: Nockamixon Township Board of Supervisors
    Nockamixon Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Regulations
         Applicant: Board of Supervisors
         Received: December 5, 2014
         Hearing Date: Not Set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 7, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to comply with the updated floodplain regulations required by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

Proposed Zoning Provisions: Remove the existing floodplain regulations found in Section 507 that will be addressed by a newly proposed stand-alone floodplain ordinance and incorporate new regulations related to uses permitted in the floodplain. The definition of floodplain in Section 229 will be amended to be consistent with the requirements of FEMA and the terms and definitions of Flood Fringe in Section 228 and Floodway in Section 231 will be deleted. The environment performance standard for floodplain in Section 504.a will be amended to provide consistency with the new stand-alone ordinance. The environment performance standard for floodplain soils in Section 504.b will be amended to include provision for utilities, roads, and driveways crossing floodplain soils.
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

January 7, 2015
BCPC #30-14-2

MEMORANDUM

TO: Nockamixon Township Board of Supervisors
    Nockamixon Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance—Floodplain Definition

Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: December 5, 2014
Hearing Date: Not Set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 505 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 7, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the subdivision and land development ordinance to revise the definition of floodplain to be consistent with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) regulations.

COMMENTS

We recognize that the proposal is consistent with the ordinance requirements as presented by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and FEMA; however, we recommend that Township officials consider the following comments before adopting the proposal:

1. Related definitions—Township officials should consider deleting or revising the following existing terms and definition in Section 196-202 of the subdivision and land development ordinance since the same terms, some with different definitions, are contained in proposed “stand-alone” floodplain ordinance: Floodway and Floodproofing. The term and definition of Floodway Fringe should be deleted from the subdivision ordinance since this terminology is no longer used by FEMA and no contained in the proposed “stand-alone” floodplain ordinance.
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

January 7, 2015
BCPC #31-14-3

MEMORANDUM

TO:         Northampton Township Board of Supervisors
            Northampton Township Planning Commission

FROM:      Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Regulations
          Applicant: Board of Supervisors
          Received: December 15, 2014
          Hearing Date: Not Set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 7, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to comply with the updated floodplain regulations required by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

Proposed Zoning Provisions: Remove the existing floodplain regulations found in Part 7 and provide a reference to a newly proposed stand-alone floodplain ordinance. The definitions of Floodplain or Flood Hazard Area (or District), Floodplain soil, Floodproofing, Lowest floor, One-hundred year recurrence or intermediate regional flood, and Standard project flood in Section 27-201.4 will be deleted. Section 27-1402.5 pertaining to variance procedures for construction in floodplains will also be deleted.

COMMENTS

We recommend that the township adopt the proposal as submitted since it appears to be consistent with the ordinance requirements as presented by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and FEMA.

Township officials should also consider amending the proposed stand-alone ordinance to address the following concern:
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

January 7, 2014
BCPC #33-14-7(P)

MEMORANDUM

TO: Perkasie Borough Council
    Perkasie Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Private Request for Zoning Map Change—R-1B to R-3
        TMP #33-1-145 (portion of)
        Applicant: Constitution Square, LLC
        Owner: Same
        Received: December 17, 2014
        Hearing Date: Not Indicated

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 7, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requested Action: Rezone the portion of TMP #33-10-145 currently zoned R-1B Single-Family Residential Performance Standard Subdivision District to R-3 Multifamily Residential District. A small triangular portion on the northwestern side of the parcel that is zoned C-2 General Commercial would remain C-2.

Location & Size of Tract: The 7.92-acre tract is located on the northern side of East Walnut Street, across from Constitution Avenue. The East Branch of the Perkiomen Creek borders part of the western side of the parcel.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: R-3 Residential District permits the following uses by right: single-family detached dwelling, two-family twin dwelling, two-family duplex dwelling, townhouse, multiplex, cemetery, community center, public library or museum, religious place of worship, emergency services, and utility. Uses permitted by conditional use are housing for the elderly and library on borough-owned land. Uses by special exception include residential conversion, rooming house, community garage or parking area (for residential use), day care center, nongovernmental recreation facility, school, bed and breakfast, funeral home or mortuary. Required minimum lot area is 7,000
R-1B zoning districts, but one area may require a boundary adjustment to create a more consistent policy treatment of the borough's land use. The portion of R-2 zoning along East Walnut Street does not necessarily reflect the types of development found in other areas of the borough zoned R-2 which have a downtown feel. The plan recommends that consideration be given to extending the R-1B district to encompass TMP #33-10-145.

After adoption of the comprehensive plan, the R-2-zoned strip of land was rezoned to R-1B, upon a request by the applicant, and as recommended in the plan. Consequently, the entire parcel now falls under the Low Density Residential designation, except for the small triangle of land zoned C-2 and designated General Commercial.

The comprehensive plan designates the R-3-zoned area across East Walnut Street as Medium/High Density Residential. The plan recommends no policy changes in zoning district boundaries or zoning district purposes for the R-3 districts.

The requested rezoning from R-1B to R-3 is inconsistent with the recently updated comprehensive plan and contrary to Borough Council's recent rezoning of the site.

2. **Adjacent zoning**—The zoning to the north and east of the site is R-1B Single-Family Residential District, to the south across East Walnut Street is R-3 Multifamily Residential District and C-2 General Commercial District, and to the west is C-2, and A Apartment District.

The types of dwelling units permitted in the R-3 District—single-family detached, two- family twin or duplex, townhouse, and multiplex—generally would be consistent with dwelling types existing on surrounding parcels. However, R-3 zoning would be incompatible from an open space perspective, because R-3 does not require open space.

Based on the adjacent zoning, there is more support for maintaining the existing R-1B zoning of the site, which is contiguous with existing R-1B zoning on two sides of the site, than there is for rezoning the site to R-3, with the existing R-3 area located across East Walnut Street.

3. **Adjacent land use**—The land to the north and east is multifamily residential (Southgate Apartments), to the east along East Walnut Street is single-family residential, to the south across Walnut Street is single-family detached residential, multifamily residential, and commercial (American Heritage Federal Credit Union), and to the west is industrial (Lenape Tooling, Inc.), with the bike/hike trail, the East Branch of the Perkiomen Creek, and multifamily residential (Covered Bridge Apartments) beyond.

The site's existing R-1B zoning is more consistent with adjacent land use than R-3 would be, because a performance standard subdivision (which would include a townhouse development) under the existing R-1B zoning is required to provide open space. Designated required open space on the site could tie the development into the adjacent existing parkland and bike/hike trail along the East Branch of the Perkiomen Creek.

4. **R-1B District/performance subdivision standards**—The Constitution Square Petition to Rezone submitted by the applicant states, "Presumably the ordinance was written to incentivize developers to provide open space by means of a density bonus...The density bonus for providing open space turns out to be no bonus at all."

CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE
PERTINENT INFORMATION

Site Characteristics, Natural Features: The site is gently sloping, with 100-year floodplain along the western side of the parcel, wetlands on the northwestern portion, and wooded area along the western and northern site boundaries.

Existing Land Use: Vacant.

Surrounding Land Use:

   North: Multifamily residential.
   East: Multifamily residential.
   South: Single-family detached residential, multifamily residential, and commercial.
   West: Industrial and recreational, with multifamily residential beyond.

Surrounding Zoning:

   North: R-1B Single-Family Residential District
   East:  R-1B Single-Family Residential District
   South: R-3 Multifamily Residential District
   West:  C-2 General Commercial District and A Apartment District.

Zoning History: On July 21, 2014, at the land owner's request, a portion of the parcel located along the East Walnut Street frontage was rezoned from R-2 Two-Family Residential District to R-1B Single-Family Residential District, to eliminate the split-zoning on that part of the site.

County Comprehensive Plan: The Bucks County Comprehensive Plan (2011) designates the site as in a Town Center, which has unique history, character, and a sense of place and is typified by high-density land uses and mixed-use type buildings. Town Centers are pedestrian-oriented and may include SEPTA regional rail service and public services including hospitals, schools, and social services. The residential areas are traditional neighborhoods and the primary commercial areas are typical of "Main Street."

Municipal Comprehensive Plan: The Perkasie Borough Comprehensive Plan Update (February 17, 2014) designates the majority of the area requested to be rezoned as Low Density Residential, with the strip of land along East Walnut Street shown as Potential Change of Zoning from Medium/High Density Residential to Low Density Residential. The R-1A and R-1B Residential zoning districts comprise the Low Density Residential future land use category.

Municipal Sewage Facilities Plan: The borough's sewage facilities plan indicates that the site is in an area to be served by public sewerage facilities.
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

January 7, 2015
BCPC #41-14-5

MEMORANDUM

TO: Solebury Township Board of Supervisors
    Solebury Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance—Floodplain Definitions and Plan Procedures

Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: December 19, 2014
Hearing Date: January 20, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 505 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 7, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend Section 3.01 of the subdivision and land development ordinance to delete the definition Floodplain Soils and add the definition of Soils on Floodplains consistent with the term and definition recommended by the Natural Resources Conservation Service. The definition of Floodplain would be revised to be consistent with the description of same in a new stand-alone floodplain ordinance. The definition of Floodplain District will be deleted and replaced by a new definition Floodplain Conservation District with reference to Section 1404 Establishment of Floodplain Conservation District in the zoning ordinance.

Sections 4.01.B.3.B.5 and 4.03.J5 pertaining to procedures for plans and preliminary plans would be amended to provide reference to Section 4.01 Identification in the new stand-alone floodplain ordinance.

COMMENTS

We recognize that the proposal is consistent with the ordinance requirements as presented by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA); however, we recommend that township officials consider the following comments before adopting the proposal:
MEMORANDUM

TO: Solebury Township Board of Supervisors
   Solebury Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Soils Definition and Flood Insurance Rate Map Reference
     Applicant: Board of Supervisors
     Received: December 19, 2014
     Hearing Date: January 20, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 7, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend Section 201 of the zoning ordinance to delete the definition Floodplain Soils and add the definition of Soils on Floodplains consistent with the term and definition recommended by the Natural Resources Conservation Service. Section 1404, establishment of Floodplain Conservation District, would also be amended to reference the current flood insurance rate maps.

COMMENTS

We recommend that the township adopt the proposal as submitted since it appears to be consistent with the ordinance requirements as presented by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Township officials should also consider amending the zoning ordinance to address the following concern:

- The natural resources standards in Section 1504.A. regarding floodplain mapping as well as the definitions of flood, one hundred year, floodplain, floodproofing and floodway in Section
MEMORANDUM

TO: Upper Southampton Township Board of Supervisors
    Upper Southampton Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal for Churchville Cemetery Subdivision
          Applicant: Board of Supervisors
          Received: December 3, 2014
          Hearing Date: Not indicated.

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 502 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal has been sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 7, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Subdivide 1.59 acres (Parcel A) from the 12.36 acre Churchville Cemetery property for use as a Township stormwater management facility.

Location: On the west side of Bristol Road at its intersection with Bustleton Pike.

Zoning: The R-2 Low Density Residential District is intended to provide a place for detached dwelling units, giving maximum concern for the preservation of open space and natural features. The minimum lot area for lots without public sewer is 43,560 square feet.

On November 23, 2014, the Upper Southampton Township Zoning Hearing Board granted variances from the zoning ordinance to permit a lot width of 0 feet at the street line (Section 185-25), to permit 100 percent disturbance of the 8-15 percent slopes (Section 185-20.C.1), and to permit 100 percent disturbance of the 15-25 percent slopes (Section 185-20.C.2).

Present Use: Cemetery.
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

January 7, 2015
BCPC #50-14-7(P)

MEMORANDUM

TO: Warrington Township Board of Supervisors
    Warrington Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Private Request for Zoning Ordinance Amendment
         Applicant: Richard and Kathryn Held d/b/a R.H.H. Properties, c/o Robert W
         Gundlach
         Owner: Richard and Kathryn Held
         Received: December 15, 2014
         Hearing Date: Not indicated

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (MPC), this proposal has been sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 7, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the C-2 Commercial zoning district to permit Multifamily dwelling as a conditional use subject to the condition that a road, off-site traffic improvements, or a fee in lieu be provided to the Township. Required setbacks, buffer yard, and parking space standards will be reduced and building height will be increased.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: Section 1104-A, List of permitted uses in the C-2 Commercial District, would permit Multifamily dwellings conditioned upon one of the following:

(a) Construction of a road or bypass lane connecting two roadways,
(b) Off site traffic improvements are installed, or,
(c) A fee in lieu is contributed to the Township.

The property shall have access to an arterial road and a rendering of photos of the proposed building shall be provided.
(1) The proposed amendment would permit a building taller than and closer to any of its neighbors, which would not be consistent with development in the area.

(2) The applicant has provided an architectural rendering of the proposed multifamily dwellings. To be consistent with the intent of the Township’s comprehensive plan, the Route 611 Corridor Study the rendering should be expanded to include adjacent structures to assist in evaluating the appearance and setbacks of the building to determine its appropriateness of the scale and intent of the area.

If the Township adopts the amendment, we recommend that that policy in the comprehensive plan and C-2 district purpose be revised to accommodate the proposed use. The Corridor Overlay District should be amended to include the parcel so design standards would apply to new development.

We believe that all the issues raised above need to be examined to ensure that the redevelopment of this site will result in a development that matches the intensity and the appearance standards that the township’s plans and ordinance have set.

1. Use Regulations and Conditional Use process—The proposed ordinance would allow the Board of Supervisors to increase the maximum height permitted, reduce parking requirements, reduce the width of the required buffers, reduce the parking setback, and reduce the required front yard setback. What are the conditions that have to be met that would allow the supervisors to make these deviations for the zoning requirements? What conditions would have to be met for the Supervisors to reduce parking for multifamily in this location but not for the same use in other parts of the township? Nowhere else in your zoning ordinance or other ordinances do we typically find what is essentially a variance request, being set up as a conditional use decision without any defined conditions.

There are other ways to accomplish this, if it is the Township’s desire to allow for different uses in this area. Setting it up with essentially variable area and dimensional, parking, buffering, and other requirements, to be determined by the board at a hearing, means that there is no predictability for the applicant or for Township residents who have an interest in the application.

2. Lack of consistency with Township plans—The Township’s comprehensive plan and the Route 611 Corridor Study address the importance of design standards and of making this section of Easton Road primarily a small-scale commercial village.

a. Comprehensive plan—The Warrington Township Comprehensive Plan (2006) promotes commercial uses in the C-2 district and the zoning ordinance similarly promotes commercial and a mix of commercial and residential uses. The proposed ordinance amendment, however, would permit residential as a primary use, which is inconsistent with the plan and zoning ordinance.

Section 603(j) of the MPC requires that the zoning ordinance be generally consistent with the comprehensive plan. The comprehensive plan should be amended if the proposed zoning change is adopted.

b. Corridor study—The Route 611 Corridor Study (2003) classifies this area as part of the “Village Center” reach. This reach is the village of Warrington, which is comprised of

CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE
multifamily uses permitted in other districts is that the dimensional standards for the proposed use would be less restrictive in the C-2 district. The front yard, parking setback, and buffers will all be reduced to permit a large building on a lot within an area of small lots and small buildings. The combination of a large building and smaller setbacks will allow for the building to dominate the area and be inconsistent with the adjoining uses.

The C-2 district permits uses that may not be compatible with residential uses. The proposed amendment reduces setbacks and buffers in a district in which the impacts will be greater than they would be in a residential district. We recommend that the Township consider if the area and dimensional requirements are appropriate for a residential use in a commercial district adjacent to two major arterials.

6. **Permitted height**—The C-2 district does not specify a height requirement for residential uses, so the proposal to increase the permitted height is not properly defined. If the height is to be regulated, we recommend that a new Section 1105.1C be included to address height in the C-2 district for residential uses.

The proposed amendment will increase the permitted height from 35 feet to a maximum of four stories or 58 feet. The tallest buildings along the Easton Road corridor are the hotels of the Stone Manor Corporate Center which are five stories and are setback from Easton Road several hundred feet. The Stone Manor development does not abut small-scale residential development. The Township should consider what the maximum height should be in this area which consists of one and two-story buildings.

7. **Type of multifamily dwelling**—The zoning ordinance currently permits several types of multifamily residential apartment units: garden apartments, mid-rise apartments. The proposed ordinance specifies only multifamily. Part 27, Attachment 7 Chart 5 of the zoning ordinance contains area and dimensional regulations for Garden apartments and Midrise apartments. Each of the uses has minimum lot areas, maximum building coverage, and minimum off-street parking space requirements which differ based on the size of the specific dwelling unit. If the Township considers the amendment for adoption, we recommend that consideration be given to the two multifamily dwellings types, and the area and dimensional requirements in Part 27, Attachment 7 Chart 5.

8. **Table of Permitted Land Uses**—Zoning ordinance Table 400.3, Table of Permitted Land Uses by district, specifies the uses permitted in districts. The proposed amendment does not amend this table to include the proposed use. If the Multifamily use is approved, we recommend that the Table of Permitted Land Uses be amended to include the new Multifamily uses permitted.

9. **Parking requirements**—The proposed amendment would require 2 parking spaces per multifamily dwelling unit. Section 2102.A of the zoning ordinance, Parking Requirements, specifies 2.5 spaces per unit for low-rise and mid-rise apartment dwellings, 2 spaces for one bedroom garden apartments, and 2.5 spaces for garden apartments two bedrooms and up. We recommend that 2.5 spaces be provided to be consistent with the Township’s existing parking requirements for multiple unit dwellings. (We note that low-rise apartment is mentioned only in the parking requirements. This inconsistency should be corrected.)

CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE
We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors' decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

cc: Clifford Stout, P.E., PLS, STA Engineering
Robert Gundlach, Fox Rothschild, LLP
William Casey, Solicitor
Tim Tieperman, Municipal Manager (via email)
Francis Hanney, PaDOT District 6-0
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

January 7, 2015
BCPC #50-14-6

MEMORANDUM

TO: Warrington Township Board of Supervisors
   Warrington Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend to the Zoning Ordinance – CBD District Retail Use
         Applicant: Board of Supervisors
         Received: December 12, 2014
         Hearing Date: January 27, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal has been sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 7, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the CBD Central Business District to permit Retail use by itself, and not part of a Business Campus or Mixed Use Development. Video Game Arcade and Service Business uses will be permitted by right in the CBD and definitions will be added for both uses.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: The following sections are to be amended:
   Section 202, Definitions of Video Game Arcade - a place or business open to serve the general public where four or more coin-operated or slug-operated amusement machines are maintained.

   Section 1602.7, CBD standards for Retail use are amended to remove the words “Restricted to Business Campus or Mixed Use Development only.” This amendment will have the effect of permitting retail by itself, or as part of a Business Campus or Mixed Use Development.

   Add Section 1602.17 to the list of permitted uses in the CBD to permit Video Game Arcade by right in the CBD and Section 1602.18 to permit Service Business in the CBD by right. A Service Business is described as a business dealing with customers, beauty parlor, barber shops, shoe repair shops, dressmaking, travel agency, tailor, millinery, photographer, copy services, fax mailbox, photographic studio or similar shop.
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

January 7, 2015
BCPC #53-14-1

MEMORANDUM

TO: Wrightstown Township Board of Supervisors
    Wrightstown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Regulations

Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: December 26, 2014
Hearing Date: Not Set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on January 7, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Repeal the existing language of Section 905 and related appendices of the zoning ordinance related floodplain regulations. The township is proposing to adopt a new stand-alone floodplain ordinance.

COMMENTS

We recognize that the proposal is consistent with the applicable comprehensive plan and municipal ordinances and commend the township for taking steps to adopt a new stand-alone floodplain ordinance in compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program and Flood Insurance Rate Maps; however, we recommend that township officials consider the following comments before adopting the proposal:

1. **Natural Resource Restrictions**—Section 903.B.1 of the zoning ordinance addresses resource restrictions related to floodplains and floodplain soils and states that “No structures, filling, piping, diverting, or stormwater detention basins shall be permitted within the floodplain unless permitted as special exception with in Section 905.” Since Section 905 would be repealed by the subject proposal and the new stand-alone floodplain ordinance makes no
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number(s)</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Submission Level</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bensalem Township</td>
<td>11428-A</td>
<td>2-30-9</td>
<td>Home Depot Plaza Expansion</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 25,050 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham Township</td>
<td>8264-A</td>
<td>6-21-82-1, -82-3 &amp; -82-4</td>
<td>Schechter</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lot Line Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham Township</td>
<td>12052</td>
<td>6-23-55</td>
<td>Geerlings Florist</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1 Residential Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Agricultural Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doylestown Borough</td>
<td>12051</td>
<td>8-5-8-4</td>
<td>10 Atkinson Drive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 2,232 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Township</td>
<td>4615-L1</td>
<td>13-40-45-2</td>
<td>Kalimar Properties</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Industrial Land Development: 11,200 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilltown Township</td>
<td>11930</td>
<td>15-1-45-1 &amp; -36-4</td>
<td>Souderton High School Property</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>74 Mobile Home Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilltown Township</td>
<td>11008</td>
<td>15-22-79-1, -89, -78 &amp; -78-1</td>
<td>Bennett Tract</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>38 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Southampton</td>
<td>10095-B</td>
<td>21-14-129</td>
<td>The Shops at Emerald Walk</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 23,735 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford Township</td>
<td>6190-C</td>
<td>23-10-19</td>
<td>McDonald’s</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 4,492 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumstead Township</td>
<td>8284-C</td>
<td>34-11-26</td>
<td>Gayman</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinicum Township</td>
<td>11645-B</td>
<td>44-32-20 &amp; -21</td>
<td>90 Cafferty Road, L. P.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Institutional Land Development: 270 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table lists various proposals for subdivision and land development in different townships, including the municipality, BCPC number, tax parcel numbers, applicant, submission level, and a description of the proposal and its size in square feet.
December 22, 2014
BCPC #11428-A

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bensalem Township Mayor
Bensalem Township Council
Bensalem Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary/Final Plan of Land Development for Home Depot Plaza Expansion
TMP #2-30-9
Applicant: Paramount Realty Services, c/o Maurice Zekaria
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: November 21, 2014
Date Received: November 25, 2014

This proposal was reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a total of 25,050 square feet of retail space in two additions, consisting of 22,500 (Retail A) and 2,550 square feet (Retail B), to an existing grocery store on a 29.27-acre site. The site is served by public water and sewerage.

Location: West of the intersection of Woodhaven Road and Bristol Pike.

Zoning: G-C General Commercial District, which permits commercial uses on a minimum lot area of 7,200 square feet with a minimum lot width of 60 feet.

Present use: Retail commercial.

COMMENTS

1. **Variances**—The applicant is requesting a variance from Section 232-586(c)(3) of the zoning ordinance, to permit 1,481 total parking spaces for a major shopping center where 1,622 parking spaces are required.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Buckingham Township Board of Supervisors
    Buckingham Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Revised Final Plan of Lot Line Change for Schechter
          TMP #6-21-82-1, 6-21-82-3, and 6-21-82-4
          Applicant: Adam and Donna Schechter
          Owner: George and Cheryl Litzke, Adam and Donna Schechter, William F. And
          Deborah Covelus
          Plan Dated: October 3, 2014
          Last Revised: November 11, 2014
          Date Received: December 10, 2014

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which
has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning
Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Convey 1.07 acres of TMP #6-21-82-4 (entitled Parcel A) to TMP #6-21-82-3 and convey
1.642 acres of TMP #6-21-82-1 (entitled Parcel B) to TMP #6-21-82-3. There is no development
proposed at this time. As a result of the lot line changes, the net lot areas of TMP #6-21-82-1, 6-
21-82-3 and 6-21-82-4 would be 2.009 acres, 9.169 acres, and 9.751 acres (excluding driveway
land), respectively. Existing single-family dwellings are located on all three parcels. Individual on-
site water and sewerage facilities will continue to serve the dwellings.

Location: TMP #6-21-82-1 is located on the southwestern side of Pineville Road, approximately 750
feet southeast of its intersection with New Hope Road. TMPs #6-21-82-3 and 6-21-82-4 are
located on the southeastern side of New Hope Road, approximately 850 feet southwest of its
intersection with Pineville Road.

Zoning: AG-1 Agricultural 1 District, which permits the use B1 single-family dwelling on a minimum
lot size of 1.8 acres where the tract size is less than or equal to 10 acres, and where the tract is
greater than 10 acres and subject to a permanent preservation easement.

Present Use: Residential.
December 9, 2014
BCPC #12052

MEMORANDUM

TO: Buckingham Township Board of Supervisors
Buckingham Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for Geerlings Florist, Inc.
TMP #6-23-55
Applicant: Geerlings Florist, Inc., Mark Goldsmith, President
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: October 27, 2014
Date Received: November 19, 2014

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a 58.137-acre tract into 2 lots. Lot 1 would be 2.87367 acres (gross) in size and contain an existing two-story, single-family dwelling and a barn. Lot 2 would be 55.26333 acres (gross) in size and contain an existing intensive agricultural use comprised of several large temporary structure greenhouses, a potting building, and an office/warehouse/cooler building. Individual on-lot water and sewerage facilities would serve the lots.

Location: The property has frontage on Durham Road (Route 313), Pineville Road, and Holicong Road.

Zoning: AG-1 Agricultural 1 District, which permits use B1 single-family dwelling on a minimum lot size of 1.8 acres where the tract size is 10 acres or less. Where the tract is greater than 10 acres, use B1 single-family dwelling is permitted on a minimum lot size of 5 acres. A use B1 single-family dwelling is also permitted on a minimum lot size of 1.8 acres where the tract size is greater than 10 acres and subject to a permanent preservation easement.

Present Use: Residential and agricultural.
defer to the Knight Engineering, Inc. preliminary subdivision and land development plan review, and recommend that the applicant meet the applicable comments provided by the township engineer.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission materials for the January 7, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us copies of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

TAK: kjp

cc: Geerlings Florist, Inc., Mark Goldsmith, President
     Crews Surveying, LLC
     Dan Gray, P.E., Knight Engineering, Inc., Township Engineer
     Dana Cozza, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO:       Doylestown Borough Council
          Doylestown Borough Planning Commission

FROM:     Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT:  Preliminary Plan of Land Development for 10 Atkinson Drive
          TMP #8-5-8-4
          Applicant: Atkinson Ent, LLC
          Owner: Same
          Plan Dated: November 7, 2014
          Date Received: November 13, 2014

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a 2,232-square-foot addition to an existing retail and office building. The building would total 8,150 square feet. Public water and sewerage serve the site.

Location: The intersection of Veterans Lane and Atkinson Drive.

Zoning: RC-Retail Commercial District, which provides areas for modern office, retail, personal service and related uses. Standards are included to promote the grouping of retail and service uses to be compatible with adjacent shopping center development, and to help ensure an attractive setting for permitted land uses. There are no minimum lot sizes. The maximum lot coverage is 30 percent and the maximum floor area ratio is 40 percent.

There are existing nonconformities with respect to the minimum front yard and minimum rear yards.

Present Use: Retail and office use.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Falls Township Board of Supervisors
    Falls Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Kalimar Properties
        TMP: #13-40-45-2
        Applicant: Kalimar Properties
        Owner: Same
        Plan Dated: December 2, 2014
        Date Received: December 16, 2014

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: To construct a building consisting of 10,000 square feet designated for machinery service/repair use and 1,000 square feet of office space on a parcel of 4.0034 acres. The site is to be served by individual on-lot water and sewage disposal systems, according to the plan review application.

Location: Between Bristol Pike and Old Route 13, about 1,200 feet south of Mill Creek Road.

Zoning: LI—Light Industrial District, which permits a variety of industrial and commercial uses on a lot of at least 0.5 acres.

Present Use: Vacant

COMMENTS

1. Uses—Township officials should confirm that the proposed uses, machinery repair and associated office space, are permitted uses, since they are not specifically authorized under Section 209-27.B of the zoning ordinance.

2. Landscaping—At least the first 30 feet adjacent to any street line and 10 feet adjacent to any lot line shall not be used for parking or loading, and shall be planted in lawn cover or landscaped, according to Section 209-27.G.1 of the zoning ordinance. All improved portions of the property not occupied.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Hilltown Township Board of Supervisors
    Hilltown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Sketch Plan of Subdivision for Souderton High School Property
    TMP #15-1-45-1 and 15-1-36-4
    Applicant: School Lane Development, LLC
    Owner: Souderton Area School District
    Plan Dated: October 30, 2014
    Date Received: November 10, 2014

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a 24.02-acre parcel into a 74-lot mobile home park with 8.55 acres of open space. The site would be served by public water and sewerage.

Location: Eastern side of County Line Road approximately 700 feet north of Broad Street.

Zoning: Planned Commercial I District which is intended to provide for a wide range of commercial and service type uses in and along the Route 309 corridor and the south western portion of the Township. The PC-1 District is intended to be the “regional” service district for the Township and surrounding municipalities. The use and standards within the PC-1 District are intended to be complementary to the existing commercial development located in the immediate vicinity. Careful consideration is to be given to access and circulation patterns in this district with access provided by means of marginal access roads, reverse frontage roads and/or limiting the number and locations of access points where deemed appropriate by the Township.

While the purpose statement of the zoning district, as stated above, does not mention any residential uses, Use B6 Mobile Home Park and Use B7 Retirement Village are both permitted by right in the Planned Commercial-1 district.

Present Use: Vacant (former high school athletic fields).

Visit us at: www.buckscounty.org
3. Circulation and design issues

a. Traffic Impact Study—Although not required as part of the sketch plan submission process, Section 140-20.C.(1)(a) of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) requires that a traffic impact study be submitted for all subdivisions and land developments that contain 75 or more dwelling units. Section 140-20.C.(2) states that the Board of Supervisors may require any other subdivision or land development plan to be accompanied by a traffic impact study if they specify the reason for the requirement, citing the proposal’s location or existing problems or type of use. We recommend that a traffic impact study be required because this 74-lot subdivision is just under the threshold and is located adjacent to an industrial use and the existing commercial development along County Line Road and Broad Street.

b. Streets—SALDO Section 140-29.D(2) indicates that residential streets for lots having a minimum lot size of 50,000 square feet or less shall have a minimum cartway width of 32 feet (parking permitted on one side) or 36 feet wide (parking permitted both sides), with on-street parking requirements determined by the Board of Supervisors. The plan proposes a 28-foot-wide cartway, which is the minimum requirement where the minimum lot size is 50,000 square feet or greater and curbs are required. Future plans should show a cartway width of either 32 feet or 36 feet, as determined by the Board of Supervisors, to comply with the cartway width requirement and provide the required spillover parking for visitors, and delivery and maintenance vehicles, in addition to the required two on-lot parking spaces per dwelling.

c. Sidewalks—SALDO Section 140-36.A states that sidewalks are required along both sides of all existing streets unless waived by the Board of Supervisors, and sidewalks are required on all new residential streets where curbing is required. The sketch plan’s street and lot layout does not provide area for the required sidewalks. The proposed 4-foot wide trail around the perimeter of the site would not serve the same function as sidewalks because residents would have to walk in the street between houses, and residents of the interior lots would have to walk in the street to access a trail. Future plans should provide the required sidewalks.

In addition, future plans should provide a sidewalk along the site’s frontage, as required, to tie into the sidewalk along County Line Road in front of Harleysville Savings Bank.

c. Connections to existing nonresidential uses—Consideration should be given to providing additional pedestrian connections to the existing commercial development along Broad Street.

4. Open space and recreation

a. Open space—Since site capacity calculations were not provided, it is unclear how the open space area was calculated. In addition, future plans should include details about the proposed stormwater facilities so that it can be determined whether those areas would count toward required open space, per zoning ordinance Section 160-58.H
In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MMW/MW:kip

cc:  J. Edmund Mullin, Hamburg, Rubin, Mullin, Maxwell, and Lupin, PC (for School Lane Development, LLC)
     Kennedy & Associates
     C. Robert Wynn, Township Engineer (via email)
     Richard C. Schnaedter, Borough Manager (via email)
     Souderton Borough (Adjacent Municipality)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Hilltown Township Board of Supervisors
   Hilltown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Sketch Plan of Subdivision for Bennett Tract
   TMP #15-22-78, -78-1, -79-1, and -89
   Applicant: Orleans Homes
   Owner: William & Marguerite Bennett
   Plan Dated: October 10, 2014
   Date Received: October 27, 2014

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide an 87.22-acre parcel into 38 single-family residential lots ranging in size from 30,000 square-feet to 44,931.8 square-feet. Lot 38 would be 72,253.5 square-feet and contain an existing dwelling and pool. Two dwellings and their associated accessory buildings located on the site are to be removed. The site would include 48.6 acres of open space. The site is to be served by public water and sewer.

Location: Northeastern side of Fairhill School Road, approximately 1,150 feet southeast of its intersection with Fairhill Road. The site also has frontage along Keystone Drive and a small amount of frontage on Fairhill Road through a narrow strip of land.

Zoning: Rural Residential (RR) district which permits Use B3 Single-Family Detached Cluster on lots of 30,000 square feet when served by public water and sewer. The minimum open space requirements is 55 percent of the base site area.

Present Use: Residential.

COMMENTS

1. Subdivision layout and proposed road—The sketch plan shows the proposed internal road system continuing as a through road to Fairhill Road via the existing narrow access strip. In
to the site on TMPs #15-22-53-2 and 15-22-53-3 which was constructed as part of a previous subdivision. We recommend that consideration be given to interconnection of the subject development to the adjacent and nearby parcels. In lieu of sidewalks, pedestrian paths or trails, may also be appropriate for

6. **Planning module**—A planning module was submitted for this site in October 2007, in which our review cited that the proposed connection to the public sewer system was not consistent with the 1999 Hilltown Township Wastewater Facilities Plan. We are unaware of any approval of the planning module and reiterate our concern of the proposed connection to the existing public sewer system. Township officials should consider the potential impacts of the extension of public sewer into this area of the RR district and the use of public sewer capacity that may be earmarked for further development in the intended growth areas of the Township.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the January 8, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MMW:kJp

cc: Sam Carlo, Orleans Homes
    Jason L. Lang, P.E., Dynamic Engineering Consultants, PC
    Howard M. Brown, Esq.
    C. Robert Wynn, Township Engineer (via email)
    Richard C. Schnaedter, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Lower Southampton Township Board of Supervisors
    Lower Southampton Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Final Plan of Land Development for the Shops at Emerald Walk
        TMP #21-14-129
        Applicant: P & M Property Management, LP
        Owner: Same
        Plan Dated: November 6, 2014
        Date Received: November 10, 2014

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a 4,747-square-foot convenience store with a 4,800-square-foot canopy over 6 gas pumps, and a 14,188-square-foot retail commercial building on a 4.89-acre parcel. Public water and sewer serve the site.

Location: Northwestern side of the intersection of Street Road and Philmont Avenue.

Zoning: C-2 Heavy Commercial District which permits retail, bank, medical and professional offices on lots of 1 acre or more. Motor vehicle fueling station is permitted as a special exception.

The Lower Southampton Zoning Hearing Board granted, a special exception and the following variances (decision dated October 2, 2014) from the zoning ordinance:

Section 1723.A—Trash enclosure must be located in the rear yard.
Section 2307.A—Special exception expires after 6 months if land development plans and zoning permit not filed.
Section 1903.C—Electric car charging station must be provided one per 15 parking spaces.

Present Use: Vacant.
c. Pedestrian access—The plan shows a sidewalk connecting the site with the residential portion of Emerald Walk to the west. There is no sidewalk or pedestrian crossing shown across the driveway between the retail and convenience store. Also, the sidewalk along Street Road north of the access drive does not extend west to the retail stores and there is no crosswalk across the Street Road entrance. We recommend that the plan be revised to show complete pedestrian access and connectivity throughout the site.

4. Zoning information—Section 406.2.D of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that the current zoning classification on the subject tract and adjacent properties be shown on the final plan. The subject site is zoned R-4 Residential District and C-2 Heavy Commercial District. The plan does not show the district boundary line between the two zoning districts or the requirements for the C-2 District. It appears that several Wawa parking spaces may fall within the R-4 District. Use 52 Parking lot is not permitted in the R-4 District. We recommend that the plan be revised to show the district boundary line.

5. Sign details—Proposed signage is not shown on the plan for the Wawa convenience store and small retail center. We recommend that signage details be provided to allow for review of signage during the plan review process and to ensure compliance with Part 20 of the zoning ordinance.

6. Site design—The plan shows the traditional Wawa site design with the gas pumps in the front portion of the site and the store in the rear. This design does not promote pedestrian activity or improve the character of the streetscape. We recommend that the plan be redesigned to place the store along the front yard and the gas pumps behind the building. Transparent windows and doors should be provided to ensure visibility between the store, the pump islands, and surrounding streets. Signage and building architecture will inform customers of the presence of a store and gas pumps, so pumps along the street are not necessary.

7. Sewage facilities—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailing to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the January 7, 2015, public meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the Bucks County Planning Commission board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

DCZ:kjp

cc: P&M Property Management, LP
    Jason Englehardt, Langan Engineering and Environmental Services
    John VanLuvanee, Eastburn and Gray, P.C.
    John Genovesi, Tristate Engineers, Township Engineer
    John McMenamin, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Milford Township Board of Supervisors  
Milford Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for McDonald’s Restaurant
TMP #23-10-19
Applicant: McDonald’s USA, LLC
Owner: RKJ Investments, LLC
Plan Dated: November 5, 2014
Date Received: November 10, 2014

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a 4,492-square-foot restaurant with a drive-thru on a 2.35-acre site. The site will be served by public water and sewerage.

Location: Northeastern corner of Route 663 (John Fries Highway) and AM Drive.

Zoning: The PC—Planned Commercial District permits a variety of institutional, recreational, office, and retail and consumer uses with a minimum site/lot area and lot width of 1 acre and 150 feet, respectively. The maximum site impervious surface ratio is 0.85. Use E6, Drive-Ins and Other Eating Places is permitted by conditional use.

In a letter from the Milford Township Zoning Hearing Board (ZHB) Solicitor dated March 14, 2014, the ZHB approved several variances permitting the following: a loading area within the proposed drive-thru aisle; a direct ingress (right-in only) from Route 663; instructional signage exceeding 2 square feet (as specified); one 59-square-foot sign on Route 663 and one on Progress Drive; two freestanding signs where one freestanding sign is permitted (if certain conditions are satisfied).

Present Use: Vacant.
b. **Curbs and sidewalks**—The applicant is proposing a waiver from curbs on AM Drive and sidewalks on both AM and Progress drives. The applicant’s waiver letter dated November 7, 2014, indicates there is no pedestrian traffic present along Progress or AM drives. In the Township Engineer’s letter dated November 19, 2014 (SALDO-1.6 and SALDO-3), curbs and sidewalks are recommended along AM and Progress drives.

We acknowledge that the present level of pedestrian traffic in the area may be light, due in part to the current lack of sidewalks onsite. However, in the mid- to long-term timeframes, the Corridor will likely be more developed and the demand for pedestrian facilities greater, so providing sidewalks and curbs upfront will address current and future needs.

As shown in the current plan submission, there is an existing sidewalk along Progress Drive that ends at the northeastern property boundary of the subject site. As a result, there is no sidewalk connection along Progress Drive between the proposed restaurant and existing businesses on the adjacent lot. We recommend that a sidewalk be provided (either inside or outside the right-of-way) along the subject site’s frontage of Progress Drive, connecting into the existing sidewalk on the adjacent lot. Locating the sidewalk outside of the right-of-way (or street line) will require negotiating existing wetlands located in this area.

The current plan submission provides a separation of about 3 feet between the street line (ultimate right-of-way) of AM Drive and the proposed parking area. Due to the inherent environmental constraints on this site associated with wetlands and the need to create a usable area for land development, the applicant contends that a waiver is needed from Section 517.b(7) that requires the parking area to be setback 15 feet from the street line. Unless the layout of the site plan is redesigned to provide a greater separation between the parking area and street line, there does not appear to be adequate area for an on-lot sidewalk along AM Drive. Nevertheless, we recommend that the Township and applicant discuss the feasibility of providing a sidewalk (either inside or outside the right-of-way) along AM Drive.

c. **Street trees**—The applicant contends that a waiver is needed from the street trees required along Route 663 due to the proposed rain garden/bio-retention facility and limited site visibility that may be created by street trees. Street trees are present to the east of the subject site. To enhance the appearance and uniformity of the streetscape, we recommend street trees be provided on the subject site where feasible, excluding areas identified for the ‘site triangle.’

There appears to be adequate area (approximately 8 feet) to plant street trees between the edge of the right-of-way and the proposed rain garden/bio-retention area. Otherwise, an alternative would be to relocate the proposed rain garden/bio-retention facility away from the adjacent right-of-way line far enough to accommodate street trees. If smaller street tree species are provided, it appears that a limited number could be planted along the Route 663 frontage while allowing visibility of the business’ signage and building.
curbing, the plan should be revised to reference the mountable curb on the site plan, and Township officials should determine if this an appropriate alternative to having a separate bypass or escape lane.

8. **Truck delivery**—Sheet C-12 of the plan submission includes the Delivery Truck Calculation detail. The proposed layout of the parking lot and access drives will require very tight turning movements for truck delivery that may result in potential conflicts with curbs and parking spaces. Additionally, Sheet C-2 (Site Plan) identifies a 12-foot by 35-foot loading area (for illustration purposes only) that is located over a portion of the drive-thru lane. While we acknowledge that the ZHB granted a variance to locate a loading zone within the proposed drive-thru aisle, the proposed truck circulation on the Delivery Truck Calculation detail does not include the location of the loading area within the drive-thru lane. We recommend the plan be revised (if necessary) based upon a review by the Township Engineer for appropriateness.

9. **Internal sidewalk**—Sheet C-2 (Site Plan) identifies two designated bus parking spaces along the access aisle adjacent to Progress Drive. Since there is no sidewalk connecting the spaces to the restaurant, patrons would be forced to walk along access aisle or the Landscape Restoration Area and bio-retention area to reach the restaurant. For pedestrian safety, we recommend a sidewalk and pedestrian crossing striping be provided between the entrance of the restaurant and the bus parking spaces.

10. **Signage**—Section 905.b(3) of the zoning ordinance requires that signs greater than 6 square feet be setback at least 10 feet from sidewalks and curbs of a street. The plan proposes a McDonalds 90-40 ID sign (59 square feet) within inches of a proposed sidewalk. Therefore, the plan should be revised to satisfy Section 905.b(3).

We acknowledge that various variances were granted for instructional and freestanding signage. As noted in the Township Engineer’s letter, there are various other signs proposed for the subject site, so an evaluation should be performed to ensure all signs comply with the Township’s ordinances.

11. **Lighting**—Section 512 of the zoning ordinance states that no use shall produce a strong, dazzling light or reflection beyond its lot lines. Sheet C-8 (Lighting Plan) identifies footcandle levels. Plan Note #4 states that final adjustments to aiming angle/direction of fixtures may be required to eliminate light trespass or glare onto adjacent properties or roadways. If necessary, the plan should be revised based upon the review of the Township Engineer to determine if the intent of Section 512 is satisfied.

12. **Landscape restoration area**—According to the Site Plan (Sheet C-2), there is an area identified as a ‘Proposed Landscape Restoration Area’ at the northwestern corner of the subject lot. Since, the purpose of this area does not appear to be identified on the plan or plan notes, we recommend that the future plan submissions provide a notation describing the area’s intent.

13. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Material to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this
MEMORANDUM

TO: Plumstead Township Board of Supervisors
    Plumstead Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for Gayman
    TMP #34-11-26
    Applicant: Edward G. Gayman
    Owner: Philip E. Gayman & Edward G. Gayman
    Plan Dated: October 4, 2014
    Date Received: December 10, 2014

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a 13.928-acre parcel, currently enrolled under Act 319, into two lots. Lots 1 and 2 will be 11.928 and 2.0 acres, respectively. There is an existing dwelling unit and garage located on Lot 2, which is served by individual on-lot water and sewer facilities. Lot 1 will continue in agricultural use. No development is proposed.

Location: Northeastern corner of Curley Hill and Gayman roads.

Zoning: The RO-Rural Residential District permits single-family detached dwellings with a minimum lot area and lot width of 2 acres and 200 feet, respectively.

Present Use: Rural Residential/agricultural.

COMMENTS

The staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission recognizes that this submission is consistent with major ordinance requirements. It is recommended that the plan be approved if it meets all ordinance requirements, as determined through the municipal engineer’s review, and if the plan complies with the requirements of other applicable reviewing agencies.
December 30, 2014
BCPC #11645-B

MEMORANDUM

TO: Tunicum Township Board of Supervisors
   Tunicum Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Final Plan of Land Development for 90 Cafferty Road, LP
         TMP #44-32-20 and -21
         Applicant: 90 Cafferty Road, LP
         Owner: Same
         Plan Dated: December 2, 2014
         Date Received: December 11, 2014

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a 270-square-foot addition (for a new fire pump) to an existing 2-story frame building (which houses the water storage tank) on a 24.285-acre site (net). On-lot water and sewage disposal systems serve the site.

Location: Along the east side of Cafferty Road, 4,000 feet north of its intersection with River Road.

Zoning: RA Residential Agriculture District, which permits single-family detached dwellings with a minimum lot area of 2 acres and a minimum lot width of 200 feet.

Present Use: Pediatric specialty care.

COMMENTS

The staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission recognizes that this submission is consistent with major ordinance requirements.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the January 7, 2015, public meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number(s)</th>
<th>PaDEP Code Number</th>
<th>Plan Review Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Southampton Township</td>
<td>Emerald Pointe</td>
<td>9850</td>
<td>21-15-369</td>
<td>1-09006-145-3J</td>
<td>20080-0199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 16, 2014

Robert Cunningham
Holmes Cunningham Engineering
4818 Durham Road
Pipersville, PA 18947

RE: Emerald Pointe Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-09006-145-3)
BCPC #9850
TMP #21-15-369
Lower Southampton Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. Cunningham:

We have received a copy of the subject planning module regarding the connection of 32
townhouses and one existing single-family detached dwelling to the public sewer system with
sewerage conveyance through the Poquessing Interceptor. The sewage will be treated by the
Philadelphia Water Department’s Northeast Water Pollution Control Plant.

The 1970 Bucks County Sewerage Facilities Plan is the official Act 537 Plan for this portion of Lower
Southampton Township. The proposal to connect to the existing public sewer facility is consistent
with the official Act 537 Plan. The submission includes a letter from the Philadelphia Water
Department (PWD) that provides Poquessing Interceptor capacity certification for this project
under the City of Philadelphia’s PaDEP-approved Corrective Action Plan.

We also note that, although the planning module submission indicates that documentation is
attached regarding the Pennsylvania Historic and Museum Commission review letter and the
Pennsylvania Natural Diversity Inventory review, this information was not included in the copy of
the planning module packet submitted to our office for review.

Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection’s (PaDEP) Title 25,
Rules and Regulations, the subject planning module is a revision to the Lower Southampton Township Sewage Facilities
Plan. Therefore, the Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) and the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH)
 are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.
**SEWAGE FACILITIES PLANNING MODULE**
**COMPONENT 4B - COUNTY PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW**
(or Planning Agency with Areawide Jurisdiction)

**Note to Project Sponsor:** To expedite the review of your proposal, one copy of your completed planning package and one copy of this *Planning Agency Review Component* should be sent to the existing county planning agency or planning agency with areawide jurisdiction for their comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION A. PROJECT NAME (See Section A of instructions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Pointe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION B. REVIEW SCHEDULE (See Section B of Instructions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Date plan received by county planning agency. <strong>November 13, 2014</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency name: <strong>Bucks County Planning Commission</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Date review completed by agency <strong>December 16, 2014</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (See Section C of instructions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☒ 6. Does this project propose encroachments, obstructions, or dams that will affect wetlands?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☐ 7. Will any known historical or archeological resources be impacted by this project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☐ 8. Will any known endangered or threatened species of plant or animal be impacted by the development project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ ☐ 9. Is there a county or areawide zoning ordinance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☒ 10. Does this proposal meet the zoning requirements of the ordinance? <strong>N/A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BUCKS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING

Wednesday, February 4, 2015
2:00 P.M.

Robert H. Grunmeier Room
1260 Almshouse Road
Doylestown, PA 18901

AGENDA

1. Call to Order

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approval of Minutes of January 7, 2015

4. Executive Director’s Report

5. Presentation: Transportation Update
   Richard Brahler, Senior Planner

6. Act 247 Reviews

7. Old Business

8. New Business

9. Public Comment

10. Adjournment

Please remember to contact us at
215-345-3400 if you cannot attend. Thank you.

AGENDA SUBJECT TO CHANGE PRIOR TO MEETING
1. CALL TO ORDER
   Mr. Pellegrino called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
   All rose for the pledge of allegiance.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF DECEMBER 3, 2014
   Upon motion of Mr. Dowling, seconded by Ms. Pierce, with the vote being 9-0 the motion carried to approve the minutes of the December 3, 2014 meeting. There were no abstentions.

4. REPORT OF NOMINATING COMMITTEE AND ELECTION OF OFFICERS
   Mr. Pellegrino requested a report from the nominating committee. On behalf of the nominating committee, Ms. Pierce respectfully recommended nominations for 2015 as follows: Walter Wydro as Chairman, Evan Stone as Vice Chairman, and Joseph Cullen as Secretary.

   Upon motion of Mr. Kisselback, seconded by Mr. Goodnoe, the nomination of the slate of officers were approved unanimously by the board.

   Mr. Pellegrino asked if there were any nominations from the floor. Having no further nominations, Mr. Nyman made a motion, seconded by Mr. Dowling, to close the nominations.

   Mr. Pellegrino called for a vote for the election of the officers. The board voted unanimously to elect the slate of officers for 2015.

   Mr. Pellegrino congratulated Mr. Wydro, Mr. Stone and Mr. Cullen for their appointments. Mr. Wydro personally thanked the board members for their support and confidence and stated he would do his best.

   Mr. Pellegrino said it was an honor and a privilege to serve as chairman and thanked the board for their kindness. At this point, Mr. Pellegrino turned over chairmanship to Mr. Wydro for the remainder of the meeting.
5. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

The Executive Director’s Report was submitted to the board with the meeting packet prior to the meeting. Ms. Bush briefly summarized the highlights of her report.

In addition, she announced that beginning February 2, 2015, the Bucks County Recorder of Deeds will roll out their new electronic recording of final subdivision and land development plans. She will send out a letter the beginning of next week to all municipal managers and engineers with details about the new procedure. She stated that Bucks County will be the first in the state of Pennsylvania to implement electronic recording of final plans.

Ms. Bush reported that the elected officials of Lower Southampton and Bensalem townships will host a joint meeting at the Neshaminy Senior Center on Tuesday, January 13th to discuss the Brownsville Road corridor. As part of the Bucks County Municipal Economic Development Initiative, the BCPC will present an analysis of the roadway between Bristol and Old Street roads. She said the two communities will cooperate and decide how they would like to proceed.

6. **PRESENTATION: NEW COMPREHENSIVE PLANS FOR SOLEBURY TOWNSHIP AND LANGLEHORNE BOROUGH**

Ms. Gauthier gave a PowerPoint presentation and brief overview summarizing the Solebury Township and Langhorne Borough comprehensive plans. She reported that Langhorne Borough council adopted the plan on October 8, 2014 and Solebury Township’s plan was adopted on December 16, 2014. Highlights of her presentation included: regional size and location, existing land use statistics, vision statements, and planning elements. She described how both municipalities wanted to preserve and maintain their historic character. She detailed how she has given them the tools to implement the plans by providing a next step priority and planning progress workbook. She also has made a matrix specific to each municipality which includes prioritizing actions, selecting a project, assigning a person/committee, establishing process deadlines, noting outcomes/road blocks, and assessing further needs.

Ms. Gauthier polled the board for questions.

7. **ACT 247 REVIEWS**

Ms. Bush referenced BCPC review #27-14-2 for New Hope Borough pointing out that it is a proposal to amend the zoning ordinance – floodplain regulations and it was added to the January 7, 2015 reviews at the request of New Hope Borough. A copy of the review was handed out at the meeting.

Mr. Stone referenced BCPC review #6190C for Milford Township. He inquired about the street trees and suggested that they put the trees in the proposed rain garden.

Mr. Stone also informed the board about the Emerald Ash Borer attacking white fringe trees, not just ash trees.

Mr. Wydro polled the board for any questions on the reviews. On motion of Mr. Pellegrino, seconded by Mr. Kisselback the board approved the January 7, 2015 Act 247 reviews.

8. **OLD BUSINESS**

There was no old business.
9. **NEW BUSINESS**
Mr. Kisselback mentioned the holiday luncheon that was held in December, prior to the board meeting. Staff and board members reiterated that it was an excellent celebration and that the minutes should reflect the contributions of the board that enabled us all to get together as part of the holiday season.

Mr. Wydro recommended that Bucks County make a book with a compilation of the abundant historical resources within Bucks County as a whole. He stated that the book may increase heritage tourism. Board discussion followed about possibly obtaining federal funding for this project and obtaining information from other area counties such as Chester and Montgomery on their efforts to record information on historic resources.

10. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**
There was no public comment.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**
Mr. Wydro requested a motion to adjourn. Mr. Nyman made a motion, seconded by Mr. Stone that the meeting be adjourned at 2:45 PM.

Submitted by:
Patricia Stockett, Staff Secretary
COMMUNITY PLANNING

> **Meeting Attendance**—Attended the regular monthly planning commission meetings of Perkasie Borough, Buckingham Township, and the Quakertown Area Planning Committee.

> **Northampton Township Village Commercial Design Guidelines**—Continued research and drafting report.

> **Richboro Village Master Plan**—Scheduled town-hall style meeting with the township to discuss future of the village with residents, business owners, and officials.

> **Tinicum Township Comprehensive Plan**—Held meeting with the comprehensive plan group to discuss second draft revisions.

> **West Rockhill Township**—Continued drafting the land use and transportation chapter of the Village of Almont study. Preparing conceptual plans for the Lawn Avenue corridor within the village.

> **Cross Keys Study**—Producing narrative for the Land Use and Zoning, and Economic Development Conditions sections.

> **Solebury Township**—Began updating the Executive Summary of the Comprehensive Plan to make it consistent with the plan adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

> **New Britain Borough**—Continued collecting background information for the New Britain Borough Main Street study.

> **Brownsville Road Corridor Study**—Met with Bensalem Township Council and Lower Southampton Township Board of Supervisors to present an evaluation of the Brownsville Road corridor and discuss ways the two municipalities can work together to make improvements.

> **Lower Makefield Township Master Plan Update**—Attended the January 12th township planning commission meeting to discuss the commission’s comments on the second draft of the master plan update. Began to finalize revisions to the draft based on input from the township planning commission.

Planning Information and Agency Coordination

> Provided information to the public on topics including demographic and socioeconomic data, development proposals, review letters, local zoning, and municipal regulations.

> Research public comment letters to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regarding the proposed PennEast Pipeline.


> Attended meeting of the Bicycle Task Force.

> Attended Bucks County Homeless Continuum of Care meetings.

> Continued to work on the creation of a plan implementation progress model handbook to track and monitor recommendations outlined in planning documents.

> Reviewed Act 14, 67, 68 NPDES permit applications.
Act 247 and 537 Review Activity
> 9 Subdivision and Land Development Proposals
> 0 Sketch Plans
> 10 Municipals
> 3 Sewage Facility Planning Modules
> 1 Traffic Impact Studies

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

Natural Resources
> Continued to work with National Park Service regarding the Lower Delaware National Wild & Scenic River to identify open space areas, protection measures in place and natural and cultural resources ordinance language.
> Researched comments submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regarding the proposed PennEast Pipeline.

Integrated Water Resources Planning Work Program
> Working with Poquessing municipalities and identified specific locations for potential stormwater BMP project implementation.
> Developing future programming for public outreach efforts regarding naturalized landscapes, stormwater management and green infrastructure.
> Assist watershed partners with programming for community events.
> Coordinated efforts with county agencies regarding the development of the Bucks County Master Watershed Stewardship program with County agencies.
> Attended Municipal Stormwater Management Workshop.

National Flood Insurance Program
> Working with DCED regarding FEMA requirements.
> Reviewed final floodplain ordinances for Bedminster, Buckingham and Middletown Townships and Penndel Borough.

William Penn Foundation: Poquessing Watershed Cluster
> Attended public workshop regarding invasive and native plants, stormwater management and the importance of riparian buffers.
> Work with project partners regarding the development of citizen watershed stewards’ program, educational outreach and workshops.

Bucks County Open Space & Greenway Planning
> Attended meeting with representatives from SEPTA and Appalachian Mountain Club relative to potential extension of Saucon Rail Trail into Richland and Springfield townships.
> Attended Warrington Township Trails Committee meeting.
> Finalized mapping for Lower Neshaminy Creek proposed trail alignment.
> Began drafting narrative of the Lower Neshaminy Creek trail feasibility study
> Continued site analysis for the Middle Neshaminy Creek Trail Feasibility Study.
Recycling and Solid Waste

- Met with statewide recycling coordinators at a meeting in Harrisburg to discuss impacts of new law on next year's used electronic collection program.
- Reviewed the Covered Devices Recycling Act (CDRA Act 108) and outreached to several key individuals and colleagues for guidance and clarification.
- Scheduling next year's Household Hazard Waste (HHW) events.
- Working on the Bucks County Municipal Waste Plan update.
- Preparing the HHW site registration application to PaDEP.
- Finished reports for 2014 HHW season.
- Working on completing the recycling coordinator activities for the 2014 Section 903 grant.
- Preparing the municipal solicitation for 2014 recycling data.
- Working with PaDEP on the next steps for the Buck County Waste Capacity Plan.
- Secured a new toner recycling firm to handle the county office toner cartridges.

Hazard Mitigation Planning

- Held a conference call with the consulting firm Baker on the initial steps in preparing the Bucks County Hazard Mitigation Plan Update.

TRANSPORTATION AND GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM (GIS)

General Transportation Planning

- Attended in-house meeting to discuss Upper Neshaminy Greenway Transportation Alternatives Program Project.
- Processed contract paperwork for TMA Bucks Purchase of Services Agreement for Highway Safety Program.
- Attended Bucks County Incident Management Meeting.

Public Transportation

- Reviewed SEPTA Board Meeting Materials.
- Reviewed SEPTA City/County Meeting Agenda Materials.
- Reviewed Roosevelt Boulevard Better Bus Study and provided comments to DVRPC. Participated in project conference call.
- Attended meeting with SEPTA staff regarding FY 2016 Capital Budget.
- Attended Doylestown DART Committee Meeting.
- Reviewed Bethlehem Branch Ridership Modeling Study forecasting assumptions and provided comments to DVRPC.
- Met with TMA Bucks to discuss FY 2016 Work Program and Mobility Alternatives Program.

Transportation Assistance to Planning Staff

- Discussed transportation related issues with staff for subdivision and land development reviews.
- Continued to develop background information for Cross Keys Land Use and Transportation Study. Provided list of top three potential consultants to Purchasing Department.
> Coordinated with New Britain Township regarding contract issues related to New Britain Borough Transit Oriented Development TCDI Project.
> Continued developing computer-enhanced imagery for Almont Study. Attended meeting with GIS staff to discuss project mapping. Attended meeting to discuss potential additional sketches for document.

**Transportation Improvement Program**
> Provided Transportation Improvement Program information to various individuals and agencies.
> Attended DVRPC Board Meeting.
> Attended Local Bridge Coordination Meeting with PennDOT.
> Attended Regional Technical Committee Meeting.

**Geographic Information Systems (GIS)**
> Continued development of County-Wide Enterprise GIS program.
> Continued database development of site addresses and EMS, Fire, and Police response zones.
> Continued updating of Enterprise Geodatabase and ArcGIS Server.
> Continued coordination with GIS consultant on the Land Records and EMS projects.
> Continued development and support of County GIS Consortium efforts.
> Continued updating and editing of county Road Centerline database.
> Continued GIS technical software support to IT and GIS staff at Board of Assessment.
> Continued support of County hosted GIS web server connection and interface.
> Provided GIS technical support to Emergency Communication staff.
> Continued technical support for County GIS Web Viewer.
> Continued editing of county-wide data layers using GIS Data Reviewer tool.
> Continued editing procedures on land base parcel annotation features.
> Continued updating and testing of latest GIS software versions on desktop systems.
> Continued edge matching work on SE PA 9-1-1 GIS Shared Services regional datasets.
> Continued production of county Park and Recreation maps.
> Continued development of new GIS Web Viewer from Flex to JavaScript application.
> Attended Shared GIS Services Meeting at Montgomery County Emergency Management.
> Attended ESRI Community Map Program Workshop.
> Attended ArcGIS WebApp Builder Webinar.

**GIS Map Production**
> Produced presentation maps for Community, Environmental and Preservation Planning units.
> Continued development of maps of county parks and facilities for print and web deployment.

**GIS Transportation**
> Continued development of Region-wide GIS Transportation initiative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number(s)</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedminster Township</td>
<td>1-15-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Township</td>
<td>11-13-1R</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilltown Township</td>
<td>15-14-1R</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilltown Township</td>
<td>15-14-2R</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>SALDO Amendment: Floodplain Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Southampton Township</td>
<td>21-15-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain Borough</td>
<td>25-15-1</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Poultry Raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennedel Borough</td>
<td>32-15-1</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland Township</td>
<td>36-15-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Township</td>
<td>42-15-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Township</td>
<td>42-15-2</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>SALDO Amendment: Floodplain Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinicum Township</td>
<td>44-15-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>SALDO Amendment: Floodplain Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinicum Township</td>
<td>44-15-2</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Regulations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

February 4, 2015
BCPC #1-15-1

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bedminster Township Board of Supervisors
Bedminster Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Regulations
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: January 20, 2015
Hearing Date: Not Set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on February 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Add new language in the zoning ordinance as Article VI-A requiring all persons, partnerships, businesses, and corporations to obtain a zoning permit for any construction or development in the floodplain; providing for issuance of such permits; and setting forth certain minimum requirements for new construction or development within areas of the township which are subject to flooding. The existing language of Sections 613 through 620 of the zoning ordinance pertaining to floodplain regulations will be deleted and replaced by the word “RESERVED.”

COMMENTS

We recognize that the proposal is consistent with the applicable comprehensive plan and municipal ordinances and commend the Township for amending the zoning ordinance to be in compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program and Flood Insurance Rate Maps; however, we recommend that Township officials consider the following comments before adopting the proposal:

1. **Floodplain regulations**—The proposed amendment completely deletes Sections 613 through 620 of the zoning ordinance which currently provides the floodplain regulations. These standards would be supplanted by the new Article VI-A. Yet, existing Sections 601(1) pertaining to floodplain environmental performance standards and 601(2) pertaining to floodplain soils environmental performance standards refer to “Section 613 et seq.” pertaining
to the existing floodplain regulations. These section references must be changed to proposed Article VI-A (see also comment 3 below).

2. **Floodplain definition**—Existing Section 218 provides a detailed definition of floodplain that contains terms and definitions that are not consistent with proposed Article VI-A. We recommend that this definition be deleted, revised to only reference Article VI-A, or be revised consistent with the definition floodplain in Article VI-A.

3. **Floodplain soils**—Existing Section 601(2) pertaining to floodplain soils environmental performance standards currently refers to Section 613 et seq. pertaining to the existing floodplain regulations; however, these existing floodplain regulations contain no requirements relevant to floodplain soils. Moreover, the proposed Article VI-A contains no provisions or requirements related to floodplain soils. Township officials should determine how this environmental resource should be regulated.

Existing Section 218(a) of the zoning ordinance defines floodplain soils as follows:

Areas subject to periodic flooding and listed in the Soil Survey of Bucks and Philadelphia Counties, Pennsylvania, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, July, 1975, as being "on the floodplain" or subject to "flooding." The following soil types are floodplain soils:

- Alluvial land
- Alton gravelly loam, flooded (AlA)
- Bowmansville silt loam (Bo)
- Hatboro silt loam (Ha)
- Marsh (Mh)
- Pope loam (PoA)
- Rowland silt loam (Ro)

Based on discussions with a representative of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, we recommend Township officials consider changing the term Floodplain Soils to Soils on Floodplains and revise the definition as follows with no specific listing of soils:

Areas subject to periodic flooding or listed in the Official Soil Survey provided by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Web Soil Survey (http://websosilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/), as soils having a flood frequency other than none.

If the term Floodplain Soils is changed, other sections within the zoning ordinance using this term, particularly Sections 602.2(A)(2), 602.2(A)(2), and 602.2(A)(2) pertaining to site capacity calculations, should likewise be amended.

4. **Editorial Comments**—We recommend using outline format rather than bullets in proposed Section 6.01.4.c.(ii), (iii) and (iv), Section 6.04-A(2)(b), Section 603-A(2)e.(vii), 605-A(4)b.(i) and Section 607-A(2)f.(iii) so that these sections contain numeration or lettering in order to provide ease in formatting and referencing.

In addition, the last sentence of Section 605-A(2)e.(v) should read "...and the effects such materials and debris have on the base flood and flows;"

CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE
We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisor's decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

TAK/REM:kip

cc: Thomas J. Fountain, P.E., Keystone Municipal Engineering, Township Engineer
    Peter Nelson, Esq., Grim, Biehn & Thatcher, Township Solicitor
    Richard H. Schilling, Township Manager (via email)
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

February 4, 2015
BCPC #11-13-1R

MEMORANDUM

TO: Durham Township Board of Supervisors
   Durham Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance – Comprehensive Revisions
   Applicant: Board of Supervisors
   Received: January 28, 2015
   Hearing Date: February 26, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on February 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: The Board of Supervisors proposes a comprehensive update of the township's zoning ordinance. The proposed amendments address local concerns, current practices in land use regulation, case law, and amendments to the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

The zoning ordinance has been reorganized to be more user-friendly; provides a separate section for Floodplain District requirements; creates a new section specifying regulations specific to different zoning districts; establishes a new AP – Agriculture Preservation District which contains incentives to preserve agricultural land; and amends the RP – Resource Protection district to ensure the protection of valuable natural resource features.

The Bucks County Planning commission reviewed a previous version of the proposed ordinance update in October 2013 and assisted in analyzing the potential locations of an RAP Resources and Agricultural Protection District or an Agricultural Protection District. The subject ordinance update addresses the vast majority of the comments in our previous review and the zoning map change takes into consideration the previous zoning district analysis.

COMMENTS

We commend the township officials for undertaking this update of the township’s official zoning ordinance. We continue to believe the ordinance is well-prepared and should be a useful planning tool.
that, if used properly, will help guide future development in the township consistent with the 2006 Durham Township Comprehensive Plan. Specifically, the new Agricultural Preservation district, revised Resource Protection district, and revisions to the residential uses will effectuate the plan's land use recommendations.

The following minor comments are offered to help township officials to fine-tune the ordinance:

1. **Forestry**—We recommend that the Township Solicitor carefully review the requirements of Section 403A.3 as they relate to forestry and timber harvesting to ensure they comply with the provisions of the ACRE legislation, Act 38 of 2005. Certain setbacks and protection requirements, particularly "no logging" and "limited logging" buffer zones, may be considered inconsistent with the ACRE legislation.

2. **Parking requirements**—Off-street parking requirements should be provided for B-11a (Less than 5 lots and B-11b (5 or more lots), B-13 Subdivision Creating Large Lots, B-17 Farmland Lot, and F-4 Essential Services.

3. **Table of Use Regulations vs. district regulations**—Table of Use Regulations in Section 404 indicates that uses B14 Townhouse and B16 Village House are permitted uses in VC Village Center District; however, Section 606A.1 lists only use B14 Village House as a permitted use in the Village Center District. We believe that use B16 Village House was inadvertently listed as B14 in Section 606A.1 and that B14 Townhouse should also be listed in Section 606A.1.

4. **Riparian buffers**—Township Officials should determine if the lake/pond riparian buffer, wetland riparian buffer, and stream watercourse buffer should be included in the Natural Resource Protection Standards table in Section 508.A.3 and Natural Resource and Open Space Ratio table contained in Section 509.B.2 since they are discussed in the Natural Resources and Protection Standards of Section 508.B.

5. **VC Village Center District**—Section 606.B was revised to provide area and dimensional requirement tables that were not contained in the previous draft zoning ordinance update. These tables, however, are not inclusive of requirements for all uses permitted in the VC district. The first table specifies "Village Center" as a use type. The second table lists "Village Center," Single-Family," and "Agricultural Use A-1 thru A-7" as use types with two groups of area and dimensional requirements with no way of exactly determining which requirements associate with which uses. These two tables should be in a format similar to area and dimensional requirement tables in other district section of the ordinance.

6. **Floodplain plan review requirements**—Section 706E requires a copy of applications and plans for any proposed development or construction in any identified floodplain area to be submitted to and reviewed by the Bucks County Conservation District (BCCD). The BCCD Board of Directors voted not to conduct such reviews. Township officials may want to consider removing this requirement.

7. **Editorial comments**—The following editorial issues should be addressed:
The Table of Contents indicates that the title of Section 514 is SD Scenic Provisions, yet the title of this Section on page 173 is just Scenic Provisions. This inconsistency should be addressed.

The Table of Contents indicates that the title of Section 515 is Wellhead Protection, yet the title of this section on page 174 is WP Wellhead Protection. This inconsistency should be addressed.

The Table of Contents indicates that the title of Section 601 is AP – Agricultural Preservation District. Similarly, the draft zoning map indicates that the title of this district is AP – Agricultural Preservation. The title of this section on page 185 is AP – Agricultural Protection District. In addition, the district is titled Agricultural Protection in Section 304A. These inconsistencies should be addressed.

The page references for Sections 605 and 607 in the Table of Contents should be changed from 196 and 200 to 195 and 199, respectively.

The Table of Contents indicates that the title of Section 909 is ‘Identification Signs for Schools, Churches, Hospitals, and Other Exception’, yet the title of this section on page 248 is ‘Identification Signs for Schools, Churches, Hospitals, or Similar Institutions and for Fraternal Clubs, Lodges, Farms, and Estates; provided that: This inconsistency should be addressed.

The “Soils Survey, Bucks County 2002” reference after the listing of Agricultural Soils of Statewide Importance on page 11 should be changed to “Web Soil Survey (http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov)”.

Based on discussions with a representative of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, we recommend Township officials consider changing the term and definition of Floodplain Soils on page 17 to the following:

Soils on Floodplains, being those areas subject to periodic flooding or listed in the Official Soil Survey provided by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Web Soil Survey http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/), as soils having a flood frequency other than none.

If the term Floodplain Soils is changed, other sections within the zoning ordinance using this term should likewise be amended.

We would appreciate being notified of the board of supervisors' decision regarding this matter. If the updated ordinance is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

TAK:kjp

cc: Scott Mease, Mease Engineering, Township Engineer
    Peter Harrison, Township Solicitor
    Joe Kulick, Township Manager (via email)
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

February 4, 2015
BCPC #15-14-1R

MEMORANDUM

TO: Hilltown Township Board of Supervisors
    Hilltown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Ordinance
         Applicant: Board of Supervisors
         Received: January 9, 2015
         Hearing Date: Not Set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on February 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to comply with the updated floodplain regulations required by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

Proposed Zoning Provisions: Remove the existing floodplain regulations found in Article XI and Section 160-45 that will be addressed by a newly adopted stand-alone floodplain ordinance and replace them with a list of uses permitted by-right and by special exception in the floodplain. The definition of floodplain in Section 160-11 will be amended to be consistent with the requirements of FEMA and the following terms and associated definitions will be deleted: Flood Hazard Area, Floodway, and Flood Fringe. The definition of Soils, Alluvial/Floodplain will be deleted and replaced by the definition of Soils on Floodplain, consistent with U.S. Soil Conservation Service’s Web Soil Survey. Several sections will be amended or deleted to address issues related to the term floodplain soils. The environmental performance provision for floodplains in Section 160-28 will be amended to provide consistency with the new stand-alone ordinance.

COMMENTS

We recommend that the township adopt the proposal as submitted since it appears to be consistent with the ordinance requirements as presented by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and FEMA.
We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors' decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

TAK:kJp

cc:    Steve Harris, Esq., Harris & Harris
       C. Robert Wynn, P.E., Township Engineer (via email)
       Richard Schnaedter, Township Manager (via email)
CONFDIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

February 4, 2015
BCPC #15-14-2R

MEMORANDUM

TO: Hilltown Township Board of Supervisors
    Hilltown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance—Floodplain Definition
        Applicant: Board of Supervisors
        Received: October 30, 2014
        Hearing Date: Not Set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 505 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on February 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the subdivision and land development ordinance to delete the following terms and their associated definitions: Floodplain (General), Flood-proofing, Floodway, Floodway Fringe, and Identified Floodplain Area. The term “Floodplain” and its associated definition are posed to be added to provide consistency with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) regulations. The definition of Alluvial Soils (Floodplain Soils) will be deleted and replaced by the definition of Soils on Floodplain, consistent with U.S. Soil Conservation Service's Web Soil Survey.

COMMENTS

We recommend that the township adopt the proposal as submitted since it appears to be consistent with the ordinance requirements as presented by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and FEMA.
We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 505(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

TAK:kjp

cc:    Steve Harris, Esq., Harris & Harris
       C. Robert Wynn, P.E., Township Engineer (via email)
       Richard Schnaedter, Township Manager (via email)
BUCKS COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION

The Almshouse  Neshaminy Manor Center  1260 Almshouse Road
Doylestown, Pennsylvania 18901  215.345.3400  FAX 215.345.3886
E-mail: bcpc@co.bucks.pa.us

PLANNING COMMISSION:
Walter S. Wydro, Chairman
Evan J. Stone, Vice Chairman
Joseph A. Cullen, Jr., Esq., Secretary
James J. Dowling
Raymond W. Goodnow
Edward Kusselback
David R. Nyman
Robert M. Pellegino
Carol A. Pierce
Lynn T. Bush
Executive Director

CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

February 4, 2015
BCPC #21-15-1

MEMORANDUM

TO:        Lower Southampton Township Board of Supervisors
           Lower Southampton Township Planning Commission

FROM:     Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Ordinance
          Applicant: Board of Supervisors
          Received: January 12, 2015
          Hearing Date: Not Set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on February 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Delete the existing floodplain requirements in Part 15 of the zoning ordinance of Lower Southampton Township and replace it with language requiring all persons, partnerships, businesses, and corporations to obtain a permit for any construction or development; providing for the issuance of such permits; setting forth minimum requirements for the same; and establishing penalties for any persons who fail, or refuse to comply with, the requirements or provisions of the ordinance.

COMMENTS

We recognize that the proposal is consistent with the applicable comprehensive plan and municipal ordinances and commend the township for taking steps to adopt a new stand-alone floodplain ordinance in compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program and Flood Insurance Rate Maps; however, we recommend that township officials consider the following minor comments before adopting the proposal:

1. New construction—Proposed Section 1503.23 provides the definition of the term “new construction” containing the phrase “effective start date of this floodplain management ordinance.” We believe this phrase should be replace with the date “March 16, 2015,” which is the date the new Flood Insurance Rate Maps are to take effect.

Visit us at: www.buckscountry.org
2. **Boundary disputes**—Proposed Section 1520 states that the Lower Southampton Planning Commission shall make an initial determination on floodplain boundary disputes. We recommend that the zoning officer, who is assigned to be the floodplain administrator, be responsible for making the initial boundary determination.

3. **Reference**—Proposed Section 1523.A.2 references Section 4.02.C, which is the numbering used in the state’s model floodplain ordinance. This reference should be Section 1518.C.

4. **Incomplete requirement**—Proposed Section 1523.A.3 is incomplete. We believe this requirement could be deleted since it relates to AO Zones, which according to FEMA are not found in Lower Southampton Township. We note that requirements related to the AO Zone were not incorporated in other pertinent areas of the ordinance, most likely for that same reason.

5. **Repeated section number**—Proposed Section 1524 Development Which May Endanger Human Life should be Section 1525. Section 1524 is first used for the requirements related to Design and Construction Standards.

   In addition, proposed Section 1524.C. under Development Which May Endanger Human Life references Section 5.04(A), which is the numbering used in the state’s model floodplain ordinance. This reference should be Section 1525.A.

6. **Contradicting requirements**—Proposed Sections 1527.A and 1527.B related to special requirements for manufactured homes appear to contradict each other. We believe that one or the other should be selected and the three subsections that currently fall under Section 1527.B should be listed under the selected section. If township officials want to prohibit new manufactured homes in the identified floodplain area and only allow them through variance, then Section 1527.A should be retained. If township officials want to permit new manufactured homes in the identified floodplain area, then Section 1527.B should be retained.

We would appreciate being notified of the Borough Council’s decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

TAK:kip

cc: John Genovesi, P.E., TriState Engineers
    Michael Savona, Esq., Eastburn & Gray
    John McMenamin, Township Manager (via email)
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

February 4, 2015
BCPC #25-15-1

MEMORANDUM

TO: New Britain Borough Council
    New Britain Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Poultry Raising
        Applicant: Borough Council
        Received: January 13, 2015
        Hearing Date: February 10, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on February 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance by adding a new use, Poultry Raising, as a residential accessory use to be permitted by right in the R1 Residential District on lots with a single-family detached dwelling.

COMMENT

We recognize that the proposal is consistent with the zoning ordinance; however the commission recommends that the borough not adopt the proposal until the following concern has been addressed:

- **Table of Uses and Districts**—We recommend that the proposed amendment include a revision to the Table of Uses and Districts to incorporate Poultry Raising into the table.
We would appreciate being notified of Borough Council's decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

MMW:kjp

cc: Michael S. Goodwin, Borough Solicitor
    Robin Trymbiski, Borough Manager (via email)
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

February 4, 2015
BCPC #32-15-1

MEMORANDUM

TO: Penndel Borough Council
Penndel Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Regulations
Applicant: Borough Council
Received: January 9, 2015
Hearing Date: Not set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on February 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Add new language in the zoning ordinance as Article XV requiring all persons, partnerships, businesses, and corporations to obtain a permit for any construction or development; providing for issuance of such permits; setting forth certain minimum requirements for new construction or development within areas of Penndel Borough which are subject to flooding, and establishing penalties for any persons who fail, or refuse to comply with these requirements. Section 202 of the Codified Ordinance related to floodplain regulations will be repealed as it will be in essence replaced by the proposed amendment to the zoning ordinance.

COMMENTS

We recognize that the proposal is consistent with the applicable comprehensive plan and municipal ordinances and commend the Borough for amending the zoning ordinance to be in compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program and Flood Insurance Rate Maps; however, we recommend that Borough officials consider the following minor comments before adopting the proposal:

1. **Section references**—The following section references should be corrected:
   
   - On page 5, section numbers 405.109 and 405.110 are listed but the correct section numbers are 405.110 and 405.111, respectively.

Visit us at: www.buckscounty.org
• On page 11, Section 405.103.C.4.b. of the proposed ordinance, Section 405.94A is listed but the correct section is 405.111A.
• On page 11, Section 405.103.C.4.c. of the proposed ordinance, Section 405.94B is listed but the correct section is 405.111B.
• On page 12, Section 405.103.C.4.e. of the proposed ordinance, Section 405.95.F and Section 405.96 are listed but the correct sections are 405.117.F and 405.118 respectively.
• On page 12, Section 405.103.4.e.i. of the proposed ordinance, Sections 405.95.F and 405.96 are listed but the correct sections are 405.117F and 405.118 respectively.
• On page 12, Section 405.103.4.e.ii. of the proposed ordinance Section 405.96 is listed but the correct section is 405.118.
• On page 17, Section 405.116 references Article VIII two times, the correct reference is Part IX.

2. Alluvial soils and definition—Section 405-30.B of the zoning ordinance addresses resource restrictions related to alluvial soils and states that “Alluvial soils. In areas not covered by floodplain studies, no alluvial soils as defined by Interim Soil Survey Report, Volume I and II, Soil Conservation Service, 1970, shall be developed or filled.”

Based on discussions with a representative of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, we recommend Borough officials consider replacing the term and definition of “Alluvial Soils” to the following:

Soils on Floodplain. Areas subject to periodic flooding or listed in the Official Soil Survey provided by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Web Soil Survey (http://weboilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/), as soils having a flood frequency other than none.

We would appreciate being notified of Borough Council’s decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

REM:kjp

cc: Marie Serota, Borough Secretary (via email)
    Donald E. Williams, Esq., Borough Solicitor
    Carol Schuehler, P.E., Urwiler & Walter
MEMORANDUM

TO: Richland Township Board of Supervisors
Richland Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Regulations
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: January 9, 2015
Hearing Date: Not Set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on February 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Repeal the existing language of Section 27-521 Floodplain Performance Standards of the zoning ordinance, since the township is proposing to adopt a new stand-alone floodplain ordinance. Section 202 Definitions will be amended to revise the definitions of basement and floodplain, and add the definition for base flood. Section 27-511.B will be revised to amend the footnote to state; “Not to be used when base flood is delineated.” Sections 27-514.A, B, and C will also be revised to provide reference and consistency with the new stand-alone floodplain ordinance.

COMMENTS

We recognize that the proposal is consistent with the applicable comprehensive plan and municipal ordinances and commend the township for taking steps to adopt a new stand-alone floodplain ordinance in compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program and Flood Insurance Rate Maps; however, we recommend that township officials consider the following comments before adopting the proposal:

1. **Floodplain performance standards**—The proposed amendment completely deletes Section 27-521 of the zoning ordinance which currently provides the floodplain performance standards. These standards are now supplanted by the new stand-alone floodplain
management ordinance. Yet there are numerous sections within the zoning ordinance that reference this section. We recommend that Section 27-521 be retained but that it only reference the new stand-alone ordinance. At minimum, Section 27-521 could be revised to state; "See the Township's Floodplain Management Ordinance."

2. **Floodplain Soils definition**—Several sections of the zoning ordinance refer to the term floodplain soils. This term is currently defined/described Section 27-521, which will be deleted by the proposed amendment. Based on discussions with a representative of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, we recommend township officials consider changing the term Floodplain Soils to Soils on Floodplains and provide the following definition in Section 202 with no specific listing of soils:

Areas subject to periodic flooding or listed in the Official Soil Survey provided by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Web Soil Survey (http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/), as soils having a flood frequency other than none.

If the term Floodplain Soils is changed, other sections within the zoning ordinance using this term should likewise be amended.

We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisor's decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

TAK:kjp

cc: Mike Schwartz, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Inc., Township Engineer  
B. Lincoln Treadwell, Jr., Esq., Treadwell Law Offices, Township Solicitor  
Stephen Sechriest, Township Manager (via email)
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

February 4, 2015
BCPC #42-15-1

MEMORANDUM

TO: Springfield Township Board of Supervisors
    Springfield Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Regulations
        Applicant: Board of Supervisors
        Received: January 9, 2015
        Hearing Date: Not Set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on February 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to comply with the updated floodplain regulations required by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

Proposed Zoning Provisions: Remove the existing floodplain regulations found in Article 7 that will be addressed by a newly adopted stand-alone floodplain ordinance. Section 508.1 will be revised to provide a description of floodplain consistent with the stand-alone ordinance, provide a list of uses permitted by-right and by special exception in the floodplain, and general protection standards. The definition of floodplain in Section 201 will be amended to be consistent with the requirements of FEMA and the term Floodway will be deleted. Section 304.K pertaining to the Floodway Protection Overlay will be deleted. Also, Section 516 pertaining to Source Water and Well Head Protection will be revised to reference the new stand-alone ordinance regarding storage within an identified floodplain area.

COMMENTS

We recognize that the proposal is consistent with the applicable comprehensive plan and municipal ordinances and commend the township for taking steps to adopt a new stand-alone floodplain ordinance in compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program and Flood Insurance Rate Maps;
however, we recommend that township officials consider the following comment before adopting the proposal:

- **Floodplain district**—The proposed amendment completely deletes Article 7 of the zoning ordinance which currently provides the floodplain regulations. These regulations are now supplanted by the new stand-alone floodplain management ordinance. Yet there are numerous sections within the zoning ordinance that reference this Article. We recommend that Article 7 be retained, but that it only reference the new stand-alone ordinance. At minimum, Article 7 could be revised to state; “See the township’s Floodplain Ordinance.

We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

TAK: kp

cc: Terry Clemons, Esq., Clemons, Richter & Reiss PC
C. Robert Wynn, P.E., Township Engineer (via email)
Michael J. Brown, Township Manager (via email)
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

February 4, 2015
BCPC #42-15-2

MEMORANDUM

TO: Springfield Township Board of Supervisors
    Springfield Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance—Floodplain
Definition
    Applicant: Board of Supervisors
    Received: January 9, 2015
    Hearing Date: Not set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 505 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on February 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the subdivision and land development ordinance to add the definitions of floodplain and floodplain area to be consistent with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) regulations and delete the following terms and associated definitions: Floodplain (General Floodplain), Flood-proofing, Floodway, Floodway Fringe, and Identified Floodplain Area.

COMMENTS

We recognize that the proposal is consistent with the applicable comprehensive plan and municipal ordinances and commend the township for taking steps to adopt a new stand-alone floodplain ordinance in compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program and Flood Insurance Rate Maps; however, we recommend that township officials consider the following comment before adopting the proposal:

- Notice—Item 4 in Appendix B of the subdivision and land development ordinance addresses notices for floodplain identification that must be included on subdivision and land development plans. The first sentence of this notice uses the term "identified
floodplain area." Since this term is being deleted by the proposed amendment, township official should determine if this sentence should be revised accordingly.
We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 505(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

TAK: kjp

cc: Terry Clemons, Esq., Clemons, Richter & Reiss PC
    C. Robert Wynn, P.E., Township Engineer (via email)
    Michael J. Brown, Township Manager (via email)
CONFIDENTIAL—NOT FOR RELEASE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Tinicum Township Board of Supervisors
   Tinicum Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance—Floodplain Definitions and Associated Regulations
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: January 30, 2015
Hearing Date: March 3, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 505 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on February 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the definition of Floodplain (100 yr.) in Section 322 to provide consistency with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) regulations. The term Floodway will be added as Section 322A that will be consistent with FEMA regulations. The definition of Soils on Floodplain, consistent with U.S. Soil Conservation Service's Web Soil Survey, will be added; and this term will replace the term Flood Plain Soil Areas throughout the ordinance. The term Floodplain Areas will be replaced with the term Floodplain throughout the ordinance. The term Flood Fringe in the definitions of natural resources (Section 525) will be replaced by the terms and definitions of Floodplain and Floodway. A new Section 527 will be added to ensure that all plans comply with the Tinicum Township Floodplain Ordinance.

COMMENTS

We recommend that the township adopt the proposal as submitted since it appears to be consistent with the ordinance requirements as presented by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and FEMA.

Township officials should also consider amending the subdivision and land development ordinance to address the following concern:
• **Soil Survey**—Sections 409(c)(1), 410(c)(1), and 525(a)(1) of the subdivision and land development ordinance currently refer to the July 1975 Soil Survey of Bucks and Philadelphia Counties. Based on discussions with a representative of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, we recommend township officials consider changing this reference to the “Official Soil Survey provided by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Web Soil Survey [http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov](http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov).”

We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 505(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

TAK:kjp

cc: Steve Harris, Esq., Harris & Harris  
Thomas J. Fountain, P.E., Keystone Municipal Engineering, Township Engineer  
Linda McNell, Township Manager (via email)
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

February 4, 2015
BCPC #44-15-2

MEMORANDUM

TO: Tinion Township Board of Supervisors
    Tinion Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Regulations
         Applicant: Board of Supervisors
         Received: January 30, 2015
         Hearing Date: March 3, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on February 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to comply with the updated floodplain regulations required by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

Proposed Zoning Provisions: Remove the existing floodplain regulations found in Sections 804 through 804.25 that will be addressed by a stand-alone floodplain ordinance. A new section 804.01 will provide a list of uses permitted by-right and by special exception in the floodplain. The definition of floodplain in Section 215 will be amended to be consistent with the requirements of FEMA. The definition of Floodplain Soils in Section 216 will be deleted and replaced by the definition of Soils on Floodplain, consistent with U.S. Soil Conservation Service’s Web Soil Survey. Several sections will be amended or deleted to address issues related to the terms Floodplain and Soils on Floodplains.

COMMENTS

We recommend that the township adopt the proposal as submitted since it appears to be consistent with the ordinance requirements as presented by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and FEMA.
We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

TAK:kip

cc: Steve Harris, Esq., Harris & Harris
    Thomas J. Fountain, P.E., Keystone Municipal Engineering, Township Engineer
    Linda McNeill, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warrington Township Board of Supervisors
Warrington Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Private Request for Zoning Map Change and Amendments to Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan
Applicant: John J. Pileggi, Jr., Patricia Herbert, and Anna R. Pileggi Revocable Living Trust
Received: January 15, 2015
Hearing Date: Not indicated

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal has been sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on February 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requested Action: Amend the RA Residential Agricultural District to provide a Zero Lot Line Residential Overlay which permits zero lot line single-family dwellings on lots of 3,000 square feet or less. The overlay applies to 6 tax parcels and includes new district standards.

Location & Size of Tract: The 50.7-acre site lies behind frontage parcels along Limekiln Pike, Stump Road, and County Line Road. The parcels include TMPs #50-4-53, 50-4-53-1, 50-4-53-2, 50-4-53-3, 50-4-53-4, and 50-4-54-1.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: The Zero Lot Line Residential Overlay District would permit Single-Family Zero Lot Line Dwellings on lots of 3,000 square feet or more. One side yard shall be at least 10 feet wide, at least 25 percent of the total site area shall be open space, and the minimum site area required is 5 acres. The maximum permitted density is 5 units per acre.

Existing Zoning Provisions: The RA Residential Agricultural District permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 3-acres or more. Cluster development is permitted on sites of 10 acres or more with a minimum lot size of 7,500 square feet and density of 0.65 units per acre. Agricultural uses, public school, kennel, riding academy and nursery are also permitted.
Zero lot line single-family detached dwellings are permitted in the PRD Planned Residential Development District on an average lot area of 8,000 square feet at a density of no more than 3 units per acre.

COMMENTS

We note the following issues that the Township should address in its consideration of the ordinance amendment:

1. **Comprehensive Plan**—The *Warrington Township Comprehensive Plan* (2006) (p. 33-34) recognizes the importance of agriculture and identifies areas that are preserved or should be dedicated to preservation or low-intensity development (this is elaborated further on page 6 of the review). The Future Land Use Plan classifies the site as Residential Single-Family. To the west TMP #50-4-67 is classified as Agricultural. The large parcel across Limekiln Pike to the northeast is classified as Industrial. The parcels on all other sides are classified as Single-Family Residential.

   In a discussion of Development Capacity under current zoning (p. 34), the Comprehensive Plan states “Residential development in the western end of the Township has traditionally been of the single-family detached type served by on-lot water and wastewater disposal systems on large lots. These uses define the character of the western portion of the Township and should be retained by limiting extension of water and sewer lines and not permitting higher residential densities”. The proposed amendment for smaller lot single-family detached dwellings which would likely be served by public sewer would not be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

   Section 603(j) of the MPC requires that the zoning ordinance be generally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed amendment states the applicant requests an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan if it is determined that the overlay district would be inconsistent. The applicant has not provided any text to amend the Comprehensive Plan. The applicant should provide an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan if the Township proposed zoning change is adopted.

2. **Application of an overlay district**—The Zero Lot Line Residential Overlay District attempts to provide a unique remedy to a changing character in a portion of the Township which has occurred in the recent decade with the construction of the Route 202 Parkway and new nonresidential development both within a half mile of the site. The proposed overlay district is also being established based on a potential future development of nearby land for industrial uses.

   Overlay districts typically are established to address existing conditions and concerns such as a floodplain, riparian buffer, or a town center. The Commonwealth Court in *Main Street Development Group, Inc. v. Tunicum Township Board of Supervisors, et al.*, 19 A.3d 21 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2011), indicates that the purpose of an overlay zoning district is to create specific and targeted provisions that realize particular conservation or development objectives without unduly disturbing the expectations of the existing underlying zoning districts and that such overlay districts should supplement, not supersede existing zoning districts.
In addition, the RA district in Warrington contains 2,631.599 acres but only 50.7 acres are to be provided with the overlay standards which convey a higher density residential option. There is concern that the proposed overlay district, in effect, provides an economic benefit only to the subject tracts and no other parcel or tract in the Township. The subject site is also comprised of five parcels each owned by members of the same family.

Township officials could consider a potentially more appropriate application such as establishing a Zero Lot Line Development use, permitted in certain districts, which would include specific locational standards that would limit the application to appropriate areas. We recommend that the Township solicitor weigh the above issues and determine if a different application is warranted.

3. **Adjacent land uses**—Single-family detached residential uses on large lots adjoin the subject site to the north, east, and west. A plant nursery and landscaping firm (Montgomery Gardens) is located to the southwest of the subject site. The southeast portion of the site adjoins the large lot Muirfield single-family detached development. The average lot size for the area bounded by Limekiln Pike, County Line Road and Stump Road is 3.02 acres. The proposed intensity of uses and the proposed use does not appear to be consistent with the uses permitted by the underlying zoning district. The intensity and use composition must be such that they do not conflict with the intended land use of the area in which they are located.

4. **Adjacent zoning**—Parcels to the east across Limekiln Pike are zoned PI-1 which permits manufacturing, wholesale distribution, professional and business office facilities, miniwarehouse, commercial recreational facilities on lots of 2 acres or more. Lots to the north and west are occupied by large lot single-family detached dwellings. The balance of the surrounding area is zoned RA Residential Agricultural Districts which permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 3 acres or more. The proposed zoning would permit lot size and density significantly different from that existing.

5. **Zero Lot Line Dwelling standards**—Zero Lot Line Dwellings are permitted in the PRD Planned Residential district. The requirements for Zero Lot Line Dwellings in the PRD and as proposed in the RA district are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Setback Street</th>
<th>Side</th>
<th>Rear</th>
<th>Lot width</th>
<th>Lot area</th>
<th>Impervious Surface</th>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8,000 avg</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 ac/100du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000 min</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use is permitted by right in the PRD district with other similar uses such as patio dwelling, townhouse, multiplex, etc., at the same density for all dwelling types. The density for the proposed Zero Lot Line use is higher than the existing Zero Lot Line use in the PRD and the required lot size is smaller. The required open space is higher for the proposed use but the proposed standards would permit a higher density and smaller lot size in an area where the surrounding lot sizes are many times larger. The proposed standards for Zero Lot Line Dwellings are not consistent with the use requirements in the RA district requirements which
permit a density of 0.3 units per acre for single-family detached dwellings and PRD and are also higher than the use requirements in the higher density PRD District.

6. **Proposed revisions**—The application for the submission indicates that the proposal includes an amendment to the zoning map. The submission is an overlay district to be added to the RA Residential Agricultural District. Nothing is explicitly stated regarding a change to the zoning map. Overlay districts do not normally affect the zoning map, only the text. This amendment should be clarified.

   The amendment is to Part 4-A Section 459. Part 4-A is the RA Residential Agricultural District and Section 459 is the RA-4 Residential District. The proposed amendment does not fit correctly into the zoning ordinance. The amendment would be to Section 412 as it is an overlay to the RA District not the RA-4 District.

7. **District purpose**—The purpose of the RA Residential Agricultural District is to provide areas within the Township where a low-density residential atmosphere is preserved; to provide area where continued agricultural use of the land is feasible, particularly where prime agricultural soils have been identified; to discourage higher intensity uses which would make agricultural preservation and a rural residential atmosphere impossible; to discourage higher densities of development in areas where public utilities, particularly sewer and water, are neither available nor anticipated to be provided within the time period shown in the Comprehensive Year 2000.

   The purpose of the Zero Lot Line Residential Overlay District is to "recognize the evolution of portions of the Township zoned RA away from suitability for agricultural uses, to recognize the impact of nearby commercial and residential development and uses, to recognize the potential impact of the future development of nearby industrial-zoned properties, and to provide for small lot single-family detached residential uses in keeping with such impacts, which themselves provide environmental and other benefits to Warrington Township and its residents."

   The purpose of the proposed overlay district is not related to the underlying RA district and does not reflect any objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. Nearby office development is 1,000 feet away and retail commercial development is nearly 1/2 mile from the proposed district. Industrial development has not taken place in the last 20 years and the proposed TEVA development proposed several years ago was never built due to community opposition. The closest retail commercial development at Limekiln Pike and County Line Road is almost a half mile away.

   The proposed purpose is the antithesis of the RA district purpose which discourages small lot development and encourages agricultural and rural residential uses.

8. **Development of site**—The maximum permitted density in the RA district is 0.3 units per acre for single family detached dwellings and 0.65 units per acre with a single-family cluster development. The subject site comprises 50.7 acres of which 25 percent must be preserved for open space. The proposed density of 5 units per acre would permit more than 200 units.

   The township planning director supplied a list of proposed and occupied dwelling units as of January 23, 2015. Of the 545 units in line for construction, 73 percent are not occupied. This
figure suggests that the absorption of dwelling units by the marketplace is slow. Rezoning for additional new dwelling units that may not be needed for many years.

Summary

The area corresponding to the overlay has changed since the Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 2006. The Route 202 Parkway has been completed and new commercial development has been built at Limekiln Pike and County Line Road. Nevertheless, the predominant development is still large lot residential consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and higher density residential uses on small lots would conflict with the character of the area.

The Township’s Comprehensive Plan is explicit in its policy of discouraging new higher density residential development in the RA district. The current zoning overlay proposal is at odds with the stated purpose of the RA district to discourage higher intensity uses which would make agricultural preservation and a rural residential atmosphere impossible. The development pattern in the RA district has been established and new development should be consistent with the existing character which is comprised of uses and densities. These studies and ordinances should be reconsidered as development continues to advance on the corridor.

The proposed amendment may point to a larger issue, which is the need to reflect upon what the western half of the Township has become and what the Township wants it to be in the future. The policy and regulations for agricultural preservation and rural residential use has worked, but agriculture is declining and the TDR program has been suspended.

Because past Township plans and studies do not reflect the changes since 2006, we recommend that the Township reevaluate development policy for the RA district and consider adjusting the Comprehensive Plan to reflect the current trends, conditions and goals. A more comprehensive look at the western part of Warrington may be in order so that it can develop in accordance with Township goals, rather than in response to site specific applications.

We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

DCZ:kjp

cc: William Casey, Solicitor
Tim Tieperman, Municipal Manager (via email)
PERTINENT INFORMATION

Site Characteristics, Natural Features: The site is gently rolling with areas of woodlands and nursery trees with several single-family homes, nursery business, and accessory buildings.

Existing Land Use: Large lot single-family detached residential and agricultural commercial.

Surrounding Land Use:

- North: Single-family detached residential
- East: Single-family detached residential, agricultural
- South: Commercial (Montgomery Gardens landscaping firm)
- West: Single-family detached residential

Surrounding Zoning:

- North: RA Residential Agricultural
- East: PI-1 Planned Industrial
- South: RA Residential Agricultural
- West: RA Residential Agricultural

Municipal Comprehensive Plan: Agricultural Areas (p. 33-34) This plan recognizes the importance of agriculture and identifies areas that are preserved or should be dedicated to preservation or low-intensity development. The preserved farms between Bristol and Pickertown roads, the working farms and nurseries between Street and Pickertown roads, and the farmland along Lower State Road are shown as agricultural areas. This designation does not mean that development cannot occur, but it identifies the farming areas as lands appropriate for preservation and continuation of agriculture. These areas may be preserved in whole or in part through farmland preservation or through a development process that would allow a portion to remain open space. Present zoning will remain in place, but added incentives for preservation, such as transfer of development rights or conservation design may be offered.

County Comprehensive Plan: Emerging Suburban Areas are those areas with both planned and available public infrastructure and services intended for future development by municipalities. It is in these areas that that the mixed use, Smart Growth development types should be implemented. For example, the location of new public facilities should be steered towards underutilized sites (e.g., brownfields and grayfields), new development should be compact and built where existing infrastructure is adequate, and all development should be designed with the pedestrian in mind. Future development may include residential, nonresidential, and a mixed uses as part of planned developments.

Municipal Sewage Facilities Plan: The Warrington Township Act 537 Plan Amendment No. 5 (2005) calls for continued use of on-lot systems for the subject site. The Muirfield subdivision located to the southeast of the site is served by the Montgomery Municipal Sewer Authority sewage treatment plant in adjacent Montgomery Township. The Water and Sewer department director stated in an email 1/21/15 that any sewage flows from development on this subject site would be treated at the Warminster Township’s Log College STP.
Public water and sewer has been provided to the immediate area incrementally. The Muirfield development to the south of the site is served by the Montgomery Township STP. The parcels fronting County Line Road were provided with public sewer as part of the improvements of County Line Road.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number(s)</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Submission Level</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bensalem Township</td>
<td>12055</td>
<td>2-37-39 &amp; -40</td>
<td>Cruz</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 2,400 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalfont Borough</td>
<td>12056</td>
<td>7-6-75, -98, -99 &amp; -100-1</td>
<td>Patriot Station at Chalfont</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>68 Multifamily Units Commercial Land Development: 2,244 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Township</td>
<td>10581</td>
<td>11-5-59</td>
<td>Elaine J. Finney Trust</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Township</td>
<td>11224-C</td>
<td>13-28-88-2</td>
<td>Waste Gas Fabricating</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Industrial Land Development: 36,079 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain Township</td>
<td>6051-O1</td>
<td>26-1-100-8 &amp; -103.1</td>
<td>Lenape Properties</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Lot Line Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown Township</td>
<td>12054</td>
<td>29-9-3-1 &amp; -7</td>
<td>Wynmere/Karr</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>34 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkasie Borough</td>
<td>12053</td>
<td>33-9-4, -5, -6 &amp; -7</td>
<td>Perkasie Woods</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>145 Attached Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington Township</td>
<td>10876-B</td>
<td>50-25-18 &amp; 27</td>
<td>Padilla/KTMT (High Grove Manor)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Lot Line Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bensalem Township Mayor
    Bensalem Township Council
    Bensalem Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Jose Cruz
    TMP #2-37-39; 2-37-40
    Applicant: Jose Cruz
    Owner: Same
    Plan Dated: November 4, 2014
    Date Received: December 19, 2014

This proposal was reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a 2,400-square-foot building on a 0.67-acre site. The site is served by public water and sewerage.

Location: At the northwest corner of Street Road and Castle Drive.

Zoning: G-C General Commercial District, which permits retail uses on a minimum lot area of 7,200 square feet with a minimum lot width of 60 feet.

Present use: Residential.

COMMENTS

1. Waivers—The applicant is requesting waivers from the following sections of the subdivision and land development ordinance:

   • 201-41(d)(9), to not require all existing sewer lines, water lines fire hydrants, utility transmission lines, culverts, bridges, railroads, or other manmade features within 400 feet of the boundaries
• 201-108(c)(3)a, to permit a one-way access drive with a width of 15 feet instead of the required 24 feet.

• 201-108(c)(4)a to allow the northernmost curb radius to be 10 feet instead of the required 20 feet.

• 201-108(c)(6)(b)(1), to allow the proposed driveway to be 115 feet from Castle Drive instead of the required 200 feet.

• 201-111, to not require sidewalks along Castle Drive.

• 201-111(b), to permit the existing 3-foot sidewalk along Street Road to remain.

• 201-112(i), to not require all parking areas and access driveways to be curbed.

In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based and the minimum modification necessary. The final plan should list all granted waivers.

2. **Dimensional requirements**

   a. **Front yard setback**—The zoning table and the plan shows a 55.95-foot front yard setback along Street Road and a 20.73-foot setback along Castle Drive. Section 232-381(3)a of the zoning ordinance requires a 75-foot minimum front yard.

   b. **Rear yard setback**—The zoning table and the plan shows a 21.91-foot rear yard setback. Section 232-381(3)c of the zoning ordinance requires a 35-foot minimum rear yard.

   c. **Bufferyard setback**—The plan does not comply with the bufferyard and setback requirements of Section 232-592 of the zoning ordinance, which requires a 20-foot bufferyard and planting strip to be provided along each boundary which is opposite or adjacent to a residence district. In addition, the ordinance requires a 75-foot yard from rear of the 20-foot bufferyard and planting strip to the edge of the building.

3. **Loading space**—The loading space is located too far away from the building to effectively function as a loading space. Assuming that the truck would park “head-in” to allow unloading from the rear, a reverse movement toward the parking area would be required for the truck to leave the premises. Such a movement has the potential for a collision with a parked vehicle, especially since the aisle is proposed to be 15 feet wide, which is less than the required 24 feet.

4. **Tree protection**—Two 24-inch caliper trees, a 10-inch caliper pine, and a 6-inch caliper tree shown on Sheet 2 (Existing Features Plan) as remaining are not shown on Sheet 3 (Grading Plan with Erosion Control). Only the existing tree near the loading space has a chance to survive, if tree protection is provided, due to proposed grading and topsoil stockpiling. The plan should be revised to show all existing trees, except those along the western property line,
that will be removed. Sheet 3 should show the existing trees along the western property line and provide tree protection fencing for them.

5. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the February 4, 2015, public meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the Bucks County Planning Commission board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MAR:kjp

cc:  Jose Luis Cruz
        Dunack Engineering
        Ron Gans, Municipal Engineer, O'Donnell & Naccarato
        Loretta Alston, Bensalem Dept. of Building and Planning
        William Cmorey, Township Manager (via email)
January 23, 2015
BCPC #12056

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chalfont Borough Council
Chalfont Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary/Final Plan of Land Development for Patriot Station at Chalfont
TMP #7-6-75; -6-98; and -6-99
Applicant: JERC Partners XXV/JGP Co. Inc. - Gregory T Rogerson
Owner: Senior Lifestyles, Inc.
Plan Dated: December 15, 2014
Date Received: December 24, 2014

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Redevelop a 4.499-acre site comprised of three tax parcels as follows:

- Construct a 2,244 square-foot addition to an existing church that will be converted into a restaurant on TMP #7-6-99 (2.3 acres). A portion of the existing church will be removed.

- Construct a three-story, 72,027-square-foot apartment building with 68-units on TMP #7-6-75 (2.14 acres).

- Redesign an existing parking lot on TMP# 7-6-100-1 (0.7 acres).

Public water and sewer serve the site.

Location: Northeastern and southeastern sides of the intersection of Park Avenue and North Main Street.

Zoning: The R-2 Village Residential District permits single-family detached dwellings and life care facility uses on lots of 5,000 square feet or more. The existing place of worship and cemetery are nonconforming uses.
The Park Avenue TOD Overlay District permits multiplex, garden apartment, office, medical office, retail shop, service business, sit down restaurant, and indoor entertainment facility. A garden apartment may have a maximum density of 20 dwelling units per acre. The applicant is required to provide for and maintain a minimum of one by-right residential use and one by-right commercial or consumer use. No commercial use shall exceed 5,000 square feet. Maximum building coverage is 50 percent and impervious surface is 85 percent.

Present Use: Institutional - assisted living facility and vacant church.

COMMENTS

1. **Base site area and site capacity calculations**—Zoning Ordinance Section 27-511, Site Capacity Calculations, states Base Site Area is that which does not include road rights-of-way, utility rights-of-way, land which is not contiguous or which is separated from the parcel by a road... that acts as a major barrier to common use, or land reserved for open space. The plan shows that the site area is comprised of three parcels, one of which is separated from the other two by Park Avenue. Park Avenue separates the proposed apartment building site from the proposed restaurant site.

On Sheet 3 (Project Notes), Footnote 3 states that the site capacity calculations were based on two parcel areas being combined together since they are both part of a coordinated development. We are not aware of any explicit provision in the TOD Overlay District that permits combining the site areas of noncontiguous parcels separated by a public road and have not found the term ‘coordinated development’ in the district regulations. We recommend that the borough determine if the base site areas of two parcels may be joined for coordinated development purposes. Otherwise, the plan should be revised to provide separate site capacity calculations for the contiguous lots, one site that consists of TMP #7-6-99 and -6-100-1 and the other site consisting of TMP #7-6-75.

2. **Garden apartment use regulations**—If the borough determines that the base site area for two parcels separated by a road cannot be joined, the applicant’s proposal will not comply with the use regulations for garden apartments in Part 4, Section 27-407.G(1)(b) that requires a minimum lot area of 2,000 square feet for each dwelling unit. The total lot area required for 68 dwelling units is 3.1 acres. The parcel upon which the apartment building is proposed is only 2.14 acres. As proposed, TMP # 7-6-75 is not large enough to accommodate 68 garden apartments, and the plan should be revised accordingly.

We also not that Section 27-407.G(1)(f) permits a maximum number of units per building of 16. The plan shows 68 units in one building. The plan should be revised.

3. **Maximum floor area**—Section 27-709(6)1. of the zoning ordinance permits a maximum gross floor area for a commercial or consumer use of 5,000 square feet. The proposed restaurant is in an existing church building (2,942 square feet) with a proposed addition of 2,244 square feet. The total square feet will be 5,186. The plan should be revised to reduce the size of the addition.

Section 27-515.3.B(4), Protection of Historic Resources, prohibits any individual use from exceeding 5,000 square feet in gross floor area. The proposed restaurant and apartment building each exceed 5,000 square feet.
4. **Front yard setback**—Section 27-709(6).1.B of the zoning ordinance permits an alternative front yard setback for existing building alignment according to the area and dimensional requirements for the Park Avenue TOD Overlay District. A front yard setback distance is permitted of not less than the existing front yard setback with the existing structure on either side of the subject property.

The subject site containing the proposed apartment building is on a corner, so the closest existing structure is located across Chestnut Street on TMP #7-6-76. It is not clear how the alternative front yard setback would apply in this case where there is only one existing structure on the opposite side of the road.

The visual impact of the proposed apartment building along Park Avenue is much different from the existing building. The existing Brighten Place building is setback approximately 75 feet from Park Avenue and has existed on the site for more than 100 years, thereby establishing an historic context. The proposed building is setback only 16.3 feet and would be raised 7 feet above Park Avenue on fill. The visual impact of the building will be different from the existing building because of the height of the first floor, the 3 story building height, and the short setback. An option to lessen the visual impact would be to set the proposed building back farther which may lessen the need for fill and grading and allow for a shallower slope.

We recommend that borough officials determine what this area should look like. What is more important, to maintain the historic streetscape and setback, or maintain a uniform setback aligned with the adjoining building at the corner of Chestnut and Park avenues?

5. **Circulation and traffic impact study**—The site abuts the intersections of Park Avenue and Main Street and Main Street and Sunset Avenue. These two intersections are offset and plans have been discussed about how to improve circulation and congestion. The *Chaifont Borough Revitalization and TOD Plan (2013)* has a specific recommendation to reduce traffic congestion. Part 5.8.1 of the plan recommends eliminating offset intersections on Main Street and revise vehicular circulation for Park Avenue at Main Street to a one-way counter clockwise vehicular flow.

Concept Sketch Plan 5.9.2 shows a circulation pattern around the church/cemetery parcel. Traffic is directed eastward along Park Avenue and south and westward along a new street on the eastern and southern side of the church/cemetery parcel. The plan does not show any accommodation of the plan recommendations. We recommend that the applicant and borough determine the most effective means of implementing the recommendations in the *Revitalization and TOD Plan*.

Section 217-709(14) of the zoning ordinance requires that a traffic impact study be submitted. The plan submission did not include a traffic impact study. A TIS should be completed and submitted to the borough and this office to complete the submission. This TIS could include an evaluation of the intersection improvements discussed above.

6. **Buffering and screening**—The Park Avenue TOD Overlay District requires that district uses and parking areas be buffered and/or screened from adjacent uses in accordance with the following requirements:
a. **Buffer yard**—Section 27-709(8) of the zoning ordinance requires that all areas adjacent to existing residential uses have a class A buffer yard. To the north the site abuts single-family detached dwellings, to the east single-family and multifamily residential. Single-family and transportation (train station) uses lie to the west. The plan should be revised to show buffer yards adjacent to residential uses.

b. **Parking lot screening**—Section 27-709(7)12 of the zoning ordinance requires that all access drives/parking areas be provided with landscaped buffering and/or fencing and/or walls to screen the parking areas from adjacent properties. The parking area north of the proposed apartment building is screened with trees. The driveway between the existing church and adjacent apartment complex is screened by trees on the adjacent site. Trees do not always provide a sufficient screen due to the height of the tree canopies which are typically several feet from the ground. We recommend that the borough officials determine if additional screening measures (e.g., additional landscaping, walls, fencing) is necessary.

7. **Sidewalks**—Section 27-709,(10)1 of the zoning ordinance requires that sidewalks be provided along all roadways and/or accessways within the interior of the TOD Overlay District. The plan does not show sidewalks along the accessway connecting the parking lot adjacent to the former fire station and the proposed restaurant. Sidewalks should be provided between the sidewalk and the proposed restaurant.

Section 27-709(10)4 of the zoning ordinance requires that sidewalks be set back at least 5 feet from structures. Proposed sidewalks adjacent to the proposed church addition and the rear entrance to the apartment building are directly adjacent to the buildings. The plan should be revised to show the proper setback for the sidewalks.

8. **Site amenities**—Section 27-709(11) of the zoning ordinance requires that amenities such as benches and bike racks be provided. The plan shows unidentified furniture on the landing of the rear of the apartment building but no other amenities or detail drawings of any amenities are shown.

9. **Parking**—The plan indicates 129 parking spaces are required by the zoning ordinance but 178 spaces are provided. The plan shows 37 percent more spaces than required. Transit Oriented Development may diminish the need for motor vehicle travel and the proposed multifamily use often attracts smaller households such as older couples, retirees, and singles who own fewer cars per household. The extra spaces increases the impervious surface areas, as well as construction and maintenance costs. We recommend that the applicant provide a rationale for the parking spaces.

10. **Loading space**—Section 27-709(7) of the zoning ordinance permits shared loading spaces. The plan shows an existing vehicle pull-off area along the Park Avenue frontage of the church buildings but no loading space is shown for the apartment building. It does not seem practical to rely on loading space for the apartment building across Park Avenue. Apartment residents will receive packages by delivery trucks and will use trucks for furniture and household goods delivery. We recommend that the plan be revised to show separate loading space for the restaurant and apartment buildings.
11. **Plan submission**—Section 22-504 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that preliminary plans be submitted. Section 33-505 requires that preliminary plans be approved before final approval is granted. The plan should be submitted as a preliminary plan particularly in light of the numerous issues raised in the review.

12. **Cemetery easement**—TMP #7-6-99 contain an existing cemetery. Borough officials should determine if an easement should be provided to allow for visitor access.

The borough manager stated in a 12/29 telephone conversation that the cemetery may be subdivided from the restaurant. This action will provide some protection but additional issues would be raised. The zoning ordinance does not list cemeteries as a permitted use and setback from the from the proposed restaurant would have to be satisfied. If a subdivision is intended, we recommend that the borough discuss use, setbacks, and other issues with the applicant to minimize nonconformities.

13. **Historic structure**—The site contains the 1877 chapel and Patriotic Order Sons of America (Brighten Place) building and lies within the Chalfont historic district. The applicant must obtain a demolition permit for the church addition and PSOA building and certificate of appropriateness and the development of the site must be consistent with the historic district design guidelines.

14. **Archeological survey**—The plan shows a new addition and walkaway adjacent to the original sanctuary of the existing church building. We recommend that an archeological survey or other information that may confirm the grave locations be considered to determine if any graves will be located in the area to be improved.

15. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the February 4, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

DCZ:kjp

**cc:** JERC Partners XXV/JGP Co. Inc.-Gregory T Rogerson  
Bohler Engineering  
Pat DiGangi, CKS Engineers, Municipal Engineer  
Sandra Zadell, Municipal Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO:        Durham Township Board of Supervisors
          Durham Township Planning Commission

FROM:      Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT:   Preliminary/Final Plan of Minor Subdivision for Elaine J. Finney Trust
            TMP: #11-5-59
            Applicant: Brian Finney
            Owners: Finney, Elaine J. Retained Annuity Trust
            Plan Dated: December 29, 2014
            Date Received: December 31, 2014

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a 65.725-acre (gross) parcel into 2 lots. Lot 1 would contain 32.917-acres and Lot 2 would contain 32.808-acres (gross). A single-family detached dwelling is proposed to be built on Lot 1. The proposed dwelling unit on Lot 1 would be served by on-lot water and sewerage systems.

Location: The site is located on the northern side of Lehnenberg Road, approximately 1,900 feet north of the intersection of Lehnenberg Road and Coon Hollow Road.

Zoning: The RP—Resource Protection District permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 3 acres or more.

Present Use: Agricultural.

COMMENTS

1. **Stormwater management**—It should be noted that this site is within the drainage area of Cooks Creek, rated as an Exceptional Value stream by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection. Prior to final plan approval, the township should ensure that the proposed plan complies with all applicable township regulations regarding stormwater management, including Section 505(H) of the zoning ordinance, and the Durham Township Stormwater Management Ordinance, in order to protect this important resource.

Visit us at: www.buckscounty.org
2. **Shared driveway**—We commend the applicant’s proposal to use a shared driveway for access to these two lots as it reduces the number of access points along the road, and reduces the extent of impervious surface. It is recommended that the plan include a maintenance agreement so all property owners taking access from the shared driveway are aware of the financial responsibilities in the event that the driveway needs to be repaired or replaced.

3. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the subdivision review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the February 4, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

PWG:kjp

cc: Brian Finney
    Finney, Elaine J. Retained Annuity Trust
    Van Cleef Engineering Associates
    Scott Mease, Mease Engineering, Township Engineer
    Joe Kulick, Township Manager (via email)
January 16, 2015
BCPC #11224-C

MEMORANDUM

TO: Falls Township Board of Supervisors
    Falls Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development—Waste Gas Fabricating
         TMPs #13-28-88-2
         Applicant: Waste Gas Fabricating
         Owners: Same
         Plan Dated: December 18, 2014
         Date Received: December 24, 2014

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct an addition of 36,079 square feet to an existing warehouse building on an industrial parcel of 6.88 acres. The site is served by public water and sewer.

Location: Northeast side of Newbold Road between the Conrail yard and My Lane, in the Penn Warner Industrial Park.

Zoning: PIP—Planned Industrial Park District, which permits a variety of industrial and commercial uses on a lot of at least 0.5 acre. The maximum impervious surface ratio for lots of 3 to 8 acres in size is 70 percent. Warehousing is a permitted use in the district.

Present Use: Industrial.

COMMENTS

1. **Wetlands margin disturbance**—The plan proposes disturbance of wetland margin that exceeds the 80 percent maximum set under Section 191-52.1 of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO).

2. **Landscaping**—Section 209-28.G.5 of the zoning ordinance requires landscaping of all improved portions of the property not occupied by buildings or paving. Section 209-42.B(1) requires clustered plantings at least four feet high between off-street parking areas and any lot line or street line, except where a building intervenes or where the distance between such area...
and the lot line or street line is greater than 150 feet. Township officials should confirm that the plan complies with ordinance landscaping standards.

3. **Loading facilities**—Section 209-28.I of the zoning ordinance requires provisions for loading and unloading of materials in locations removed from streets and highways. Section 209-42.D of the zoning ordinance requires parking and loading area to be paved and to conform to SALDO requirements. Township officials should confirm that the proposal incorporates loading facilities that are functionally adequate and in compliance with ordinance standards.

4. **Parking**
   
   a. **Size of spaces**—SALDO Section 191-37.C requires the dimensions of 90-degree parking spaces to be at least 10 feet wide by 20 feet deep. The plan depicts spaces of 9 feet minimum x 20 feet.
   
   b. **Accessible spaces**—Parking areas of 51 to 75 spaces should provide three disabled-accessible spaces, according to the accessibility guidelines of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the township’s Design Details and Practices. The plan depicts two accessible spaces.

5. **Trash removal**—The plan should demonstrate compliance with SALDO Section 191-51.H, which requires provision of a screened trash collection station, if indoor collection is not provided.

6. **Waivers**—The applicant has requested waiver of the following three SALDO provisions, one provision of the stormwater management ordinance, and three provisions of the township’s Design Details and Practices:
   
   - SALDO Section 191.37.B, for exemption from the requirement to install parking area curbing;
   - SALDO Section 191-62.B, for exemption from the requirement to install curbs along both sides of the roadway;
   - SALDO Section 191-78 (c)(2), for exemption from requirements to provide information on existing features within 200 feet of the parcel proposed for development;
   - Section 191-48.A of the stormwater management ordinance, for exemption from the requirement to use infiltration facilities; and
   - Section 191-Appendix A of the township’s Design Details and Practices, for exemptions from three sections applying to basins, piping and inlets.

Under the requirements of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved and the minimum modification necessary. The final plan should list all granted waivers and variances.

7. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection to
determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the February 4, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

GF:kjp

cc: Waste Gas Fabricating, Inc.
    Phil Kashner, Showalter & Associates
    Jim Sullivan, T&M Associates, Township Engineer
    Peter Gray, Township Manager (via e-mail)
MEMORANDUM

TO:       New Britain Township Board of Supervisors
          New Britain Township Planning Commission

FROM:     Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT:  Preliminary Plan of Lot Line Change—Lenape Properties
          (New Britain Business Park Lot 12)
          TMPs: #26-1-100-8 and -103.001
          Applicant: Lenape Properties
          Owner: Mark One Properties
          Plan Dated: December 22, 2014
          Date Received: December 23, 2014

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Convey a 0.53-acre portion of Lot 1 (TMP #26-1-100-8) containing 3.83 acres to an adjoining parcel Lot 2 (TMP #26-1-103.001) containing 7.427 acres. The resulting parcels would be 3.3 acres (Lot 1) and 7.958 acres (Lot 2) in area. An existing industrial building occupies TMP #26-1-100-8. A preliminary plan for construction of a 60,000-square-foot office and warehouse building, a K18 flex space use, on TMP #26-1-103.1 was reviewed by our office in BCPC #11892, June 22, 2012. Public water and sewer serve the site.

Location: Southeast side of New Britain Boulevard, about 800 feet south of the Trewigtown Road intersection, within the New Britain Industrial Park.

Zoning: The Industrial Office District (IO) provides for industrial and commercial development on 3-acre minimum lots within industrial parks.

Present Use: Office and vacant.

COMMENTS:

1. Land development—We recommend that the plan be revised to depict the proposed office and warehouse building on the site, if the pending land development plan remains active.
2. **Resource protection**—The “Land With Resource Restrictions” table on Sheet 2 of the plan indicates that the proposed subdivision and conveyance would reduce the area of protected woodlands on TMP #26-1-100-8 to 0.344 acres, which is less than the 0.428 acre of protected land that had been required under Section 27-2400.f.2 of the zoning ordinance. Township officials should determine whether replacement, mitigation, or other measures are warranted.

3. **Lot area**—The lot area calculations on Sheet 1 of the plan state the gross lot area of TMP #26-1-100-8 as 3.83 acres before subdivision and conveyance. The zoning data table on the same sheet, however, cites the gross acreage of the existing parcel as 3.335. A consistent and accurate figure should be used throughout the plan.

4. **Gas line easement**—A gas transmission line easement appears to occupy much of the parcel proposed for subdivision and conveyance. The purpose of the proposal, according to the township, is to provide access to New Britain Boulevard to facilitate the development of TMP #26-1-103.00.1. We recommend the applicant provided correspondence from Texas Eastern to confirm that a future driveway would be permitted through their easement.

5. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed subdivision. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the February 3, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

GF:kjp

cc: Lenape Properties
    Mark One Properties
    Craig Kennard, P.E., Gilmore and Associates, Township Engineer
    Eileen Bradley, Township Manager (via e-mail)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Newtown Township Board of Supervisors
    Newtown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Tentative Plan of Planned Residential Development Subdivision for Wynmere/Karr Property
         TMP #29-9.7 and 29-9.3-1
         Applicant: Arcadia Holdings, Inc.
         Owner: Wynmere Hunt Associates I, LP and Karr Associates, LP
         Plan Dated: November 20, 2014
         Date Received: December 8, 2014

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a 19.2-acre tract into 34 single-family detached dwellings and 10.318 acres of open space as a Planned Residential Development (PRD) single-family cluster. Public water and sewerage facilities are intended.

Location: Western side of the Newtown Bypass, north of its intersection with Buck Road (S.R. 532). Access to the site is via the existing service road cul-de-sac that parallels the Bypass and intersects Buck Road.

Zoning: R-2 Residential High Density District permits a PRD single-family cluster (use B-15) on a minimum gross site area of 15 acres, minimum lot area of 9,000 square feet, maximum gross density of 1.85 dwelling units per acre, minimum open space ratio of 55 percent, and maximum impervious surface ratio of 30 percent.

Present Use: Vacant.

COMMENTS

The submission includes a by-right plan and two alternative plans. In a telephone conversation, the applicant’s engineer indicated that the BCPC should review the by-right plan, which was prepared according to the planned residential development (PRD) provisions of Section 707(4) of the
Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (MPC) regarding an application for tentative approval. Section 707(4) states that the provisions shall require only such information in the application as is reasonably necessary to disclose to the governing body or the planning agency certain aspects, as noted below.

1. **Open space**—MPC Section 707(4)(iii) requires information regarding the location and size of the common open space and the form of organization proposed to own and maintain the common open space. Sheet 5 indicates that 10.318 acres (55.2 percent) of open space is proposed, which is slightly greater than the 55 percent minimum open space ratio required by zoning ordinance Section 405.B. The proposed amounts of undeveloped open space (50.71 percent) and active recreational open space (10.1 percent) also are slightly greater the required minimums of 50 percent (zoning ordinance Section 1005.B.1) and 8 percent (zoning ordinance Section 902.B.3.b), respectively. Future plans should provide information so that the governing body can determine if all of the proposed open space areas are appropriate for the designated open space uses and can be counted as required open space. This determination would be based on regulations such as zoning ordinance Section 1005.A.5., which requires that designated open space shall not be merely leftover or unusable land and shall encompass a single land area or minimum number of land areas, and Section 1001.B, which specifies open space design standards. Issues such as the following should be considered:

   a. **Recreational open space**—Areas shown as active recreational open space include Open Space Area H, which is proposed to be offered for dedication to Newtown Township as a community park, Open Space Area E, proposed as a tot lot, and Open Space Area B, which is an irregularly shaped area between proposed Lots 22-26 with no specified use. Future plans should indicate what type of active recreation is intended for Open Space Area B so that it can be determined if the activities are appropriate on those relatively small areas, and how the activities and noise would affect the abutting dwellings.

   b. **Active open space**—The plan proposes an active open space designation for a number of remnant areas, including Open Space Area G, which is a boulevard median strip in Road A, Open Space Areas D and F, which are cul-de-sac islands, and two areas that are not identified by a letter: a small triangular area in Road A near Lot 3, and a small triangular remnant adjacent to proposed Lot 21 that appears to consist of driveway access for the outparcel TMP #29-9-5 (Lownes). It is unclear how those designated active open space areas are intended to be used by the residents or if they should be included in the required open space calculation. In addition, active Open Space Area C consists of a utility (the proposed stormwater management basins), and of a strip of land behind rows of dwellings along Road A, which would appear to serve as an extension of the back yards rather than as common open space.

   c. **Community park**—The plan states that Active Open Space Area H is to be offered for dedication to Newtown Township as a community park, and the remaining open space is to remain private and be owned and maintained by a homeowners association. Future plans should provide information regarding the intended facilities for the community park and how parking would be accommodated.
2. **Streets and parking**—MPC Section 707(4)(vii) requires information regarding the provisions for parking of vehicles and the location and width of proposed streets and public ways. The plan indicates that the streets will be public local streets with a 26-foot-wide cartway and 50-foot right-of-way. The required 3 parking spaces per dwelling unit (102 spaces total) would be provided by 68 driveway spaces and 34 on-street parking spaces. The plan should show the location of the 34 on-street spaces so that compliance with the parking requirement can be verified.

Subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) Section 504.17.B requires a 30-foot-wide cartway for local streets. In addition, zoning ordinance Section 803.B-15.7.c.2.c states that roads shall be widened by 6 feet on each side on which parking is to be used to meet the 3 parking space requirement. Future plans should address these requirements.

Clarification should be provided regarding access for the existing driveway for outparcel TMP #29-9-5. The driveway which crosses a proposed active open space parcel to access the proposed private Road A. The submission also should indicate the status of the existing path/accessway extending from the existing driveway, through proposed Lot 21 and the active Open Space Area C, to adjacent TMP #29-25-329.

3. **Stormwater and sewage facilities**—MPC Section 707(4)(v) requires information pertaining to the feasibility of proposals for water supply and the disposition of sanitary waste and stormwater. The submission includes letters from the Newtown Artesian Water Company and the Newtown, Bucks County, Joint Municipal Authority stating their ability to serve the proposal. We note that the applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed subdivision.

The plan shows two stormwater management basins in active Open Space Area C. Sufficient information should be provided so that the Township can determine the feasibility of the proposed stormwater management facilities for the development.

4. **Easements and covenants**—MPC Section 707(4)(vi) requires information regarding the substance of covenants, grants of easements or other restrictions proposed to be imposed upon the use of the land, buildings and structures including proposed easements or grants for public utilities. Compliance with this requirement should be indicated for all streets, common areas, facilities and utilities, as well as for the driveway access for the outparcel TMP #29-9-5. The submission also should address the rights and restrictions of residents of TMP #29-9-5 regarding access to the sidewalks, trails, and other facilities and open spaces of the proposed development.

The plan shows potential connections of the proposed trail to Newtown Crossing/Eagle Ridge to the west of the site and to the synagogue to the north. The rights and restrictions of the use of the development’s facilities by residents of Newtown Crossing and Eagle Ridge, members of the synagogue, and potentially other members of the general public, should be established.
5. **Modifications to regulations**—MPC Section 707(4)(viii) requires information in regard to required modifications in the municipal land use regulations otherwise applicable to the subject property. Comment 2 above notes that the plan does not comply with the cartway width requirements of the zoning and subdivision and land development ordinances. The plan should be revised in accordance with the requirements. If the plan is not revised to comply, the submission should identify the required modification. Additionally, as discussed in Comment 1, the plan may not meet the minimum open space requirements, which would require plan revision or a request for modification of the regulations.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the February 4, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MW:kip

cc: Arcadia Holdings, Inc.
    Robert Cunningham, P.E., Holmes Cunningham Engineering
    John VanLuvanee, Esq., Eastburn and Gray
    Jeffrey Garton, Esq., Begley, Carlin & Mandio, Township Solicitor
    Michele Fountain, P.E., CKS Engineers, Inc., Township Engineer
    Amy B. Kaminski, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Traffic Engineer
    Kurt M. Ferguson, Township Manager (via email)
    Martin Vogt, Township Zoning Officer (via email)
    Kristie Kaznicki, Municipal Services Secretary (via email)
    Micah S. Lewis, RLA, Boucher & James, Inc., Township Planner
    Northampton Township (Adjacent Municipality)
January 16, 2015
BCPC #9077-C

MEMORANDUM

TO: Nockamixon Township Board of Supervisors
   Nockamixon Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Brubaker
         TMP #30-15-2
         Applicant: Thomas Brubaker
         Owner: Same
         Plan Dated: December 10, 2014
         Date Received: December 15, 2014

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which
has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning
Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct 7,030-square-foot building on a 1.90-acre parcel for use E-1 Retail Trade and
Service. On-lot water and sewerage facilities are intended.

Location: Southeastern corner of Easton Road (S.R. 611) and Tabor Road, between Quarry Road to
the north and Foellner Lane to the south.

Zoning: C-Commercial District, which permits use E-1 Retail Trade and Service on a minimum lot
area of 20,000 square feet, maximum impervious surface ratio of 70 percent, and maximum
building coverage of 30 percent.

Present Use: Vacant.

COMMENTS

1. **Reserve parking**—The plan indicates that 36 parking spaces are required and 37 are provided,
with 23 spaces to be constructed and 14 spaces to be in reserve. Zoning ordinance Section
234-31.H states that, in order to the Board of Supervisors may allow for a portion of required
parking area to be built at a later date, provided that certain conditions are met. The supervisors
should determine if the conditions are satisfied, including whether the percentage of parking
spaces proposed to be constructed initially is adequate.
2. **Sewage facilities**

   a. **Septic system isolation distance**—The plan does not appear to provide the required 10-foot minimum isolation distance between the proposed septic system and the property line along the Easton Road right-of-way. Future plans should show compliance with the requirements of 25 Pennsylvania Code Section 73.13.

   b. **Planning module**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the February 4, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MW: kjp

cc: Thomas Brubaker  
Urwiler & Walter, Inc.  
C. Robert Wynn Associates, Inc., Township Engineer (via email)  
Arlene E. Eichlin, Township Secretary (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Perkasie Borough Council
   Perkasie Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Perkasie Woods
         TMP #33-9-4, -5, -6, and -7
         Applicant: Metropolitan Development Group
         Owner: Perkasie Industries Corporation
         Plan Dated: November 25, 2014
         Date Received: December 4, 2014

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct 145 townhouses on an 18.403-acre (net) tract. A total of 3.3132 acres of open space is proposed, of which 1.7072 acres (Open Space Areas A, B, C, and D) is “community open space” (proposed pocket parks and tot lot) and 1.606 acres (Open Space Area E) that includes a stormwater detention basin. Public water and sewerage facilities are intended.

In addition, the lot lines between the subject site and adjacent TMP #33-9-3 (Costa/Tsunami Karate) will be adjusted, and 11 parking spaces and a second access drive for TMP #33-9-3 will be constructed, with the new driveway accessing the proposed Drive A on the subject tract.

Location: Southeastern corner of Constitution Avenue and East Spruce Street.

Zoning: R-3 Residential District, which permits townhouses and multiplex units with a minimum lot size of 2,600 square feet per dwelling unit.

C-2 General Commercial District (TMP #33-9-3), which permits a range of nonresidential uses, including E-17 service business, on a minimum lot area of 6,000 square feet.

Present Use: Industrial.
COMMENTS

1. **Minimum lot areas/maximum lot coverage**—In a telephone conversation, the applicant’s engineer indicated that individual fee-simple townhouse lots will not be created, and that the lot lines and lot areas shown on the plan are intended only to show compliance with the required minimum lot area per dwelling unit. That information should be stated on the plan.

The applicant’s engineer also stated that the lot areas listed in the Lot Area Tabulations table on Sheet 6 are gross lot areas. We note that minimum lot area calculations should be based on net area. According to the definition of lot area in zoning ordinance Section 186-5, lot area shall specifically exclude the area of any easement within the lot lines, except for Borough electric department easements.

Proposed stormwater management subsurface detention basins # 2 and #3 are located on portions of 54 lots (Lots 34-87). The Borough typically requires stormwater management facilities to be placed under an easement to ensure the Borough the right to enter the premises for inspection and for maintenance, if necessary, in the event that a privately owned facility is not being adequately maintained and may be a public safety risk. The proposed lot areas should be revised to exclude the area of the subsurface basins and associated easement area needed for access to the facilities. Minimum lot areas also should exclude the area of common facilities such as the proposed parking and sidewalk areas along the proposed streets. Portions of parking areas and sidewalks are located on Lots 1, 33, 34, 47, 62, 63, 77, 78, and 87.

The proposed lot coverage figures in the Lot Area Tabulations table also should be revised, based on the net lot areas. It appears that a number of the proposed lots would not meet the minimum lot area requirement of 2,600 square feet per dwelling unit and/or the maximum lot coverage requirement of 40 percent for a townhouse or multiplex unit in the R-3 Residential District, as required by zoning ordinance Section 186-20.D(4).

2. **Adjacent TMP #33-9-3**

   a. **Nonresidential parking in residential district**—As shown on the plan, the majority of a proposed 11-space parking row and an access drive for adjacent TMP #33-9-3 (Costa/Tsunami Karate), which is zoned C2 General Commercial District, is located on the Perkasie Woods tract, which is zoned R-3 Residential District. This creates a nonconformity because a service business use (E17) and associated parking, is not permitted in the R-3 Residential District, according to zoning ordinance Section 186-20.D.1.

   b. **Lot area and easement**—The plan indicates that several property lines of adjacent TMP #33-9-3 (Costa/Tsunami Karate) will be dissolved and new property lines are shown. Additionally, as noted in Comment 2.a, parking spaces and an access drive for TMP #33-9-3 onto proposed Road A are to be located on the Perkasie Woods tract. In a telephone conversation, the applicant’s engineer has stated that the lot lines will be changed but the lot area for TMP #33-9-3 remains the same, and that an easement will be established over the proposed parking and access drive located on the Perkasie Woods tract. If the zoning issue noted in Comment 2.a is resolved, the plan should be revised to provide information about the lot area and easement, including an easement.
allowing access for TMP #33-9-3 via Drive A, which is to be privately owned by Perkaseie Woods.

3. **Restrictive covenant requirements**—The plan (on Sheet 1) lists “restrictive covenant requirements” regarding number of units, open space, and buffering. Additional information about the restrictive covenant should be provided on the plan, such as the parties involved in the covenant and when it was established.

4. **Environmental protection standards**—The plan should be revised to show compliance with the environmental protection standards of zoning ordinance Section 186-57 and subdivision and land development ordinance Section 164-41. The plan should indicate the amount of each resource existing on the site (e.g., floodplain, steep slopes, and woodlands) and the amount proposed to be disturbed, as compared to the required protection ratio for each.

5. **Street standards**—Cartway width and parking for the proposed private streets should be discussed. Subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) Section 164-19.I states that private streets are prohibited and will be approved only if they are designed to meet public street standards. The proposed 26-foot wide cartway, with perpendicular parking bays on some sections of the proposed streets, is not a standard cartway width required by the SALDO. Section 164-20.C. requires a minimum cartway width of 34 feet for primary and secondary streets in a Class A development (defined as a residential development of up to 5 dwelling units per acre) and 36 feet for primary streets in developments classified as B, C, or D (6 dwelling units per acre and greater, or nonresidential). The proposed density appears to be approximately 8 units per acre. Section 164-20.B states that additional street width may be required by Borough Council for public safety and convenience or for parking in areas of nonresidential or high-density residential development.

We understand that historically the 34-foot cartway width standard was intended to accommodate two moving lanes and parallel parking restricted to one side, not perpendicular parking bays, as proposed. It should be determined if the proposed 26-foot width is appropriate, including for Road C, which has driveways lining both sides of the street, but no perpendicular parking bays, and if the parking bays are conveniently located for all units.

6. **Layout and design**—The layout of the preliminary plan is essentially the same as that of the sketch plan previously submitted with the zoning change and zoning ordinance amendment request. As noted in the BCPC review of that request (BCPC #33-14-3, dated July 2, 2014), there are potential safety and aesthetic concerns with the proposed layout.

Potential safety risks are created by the bays of perpendicular guest parking spaces proposed along proposed Road A and Road B, with possible conflicts between vehicles backing out of the guest spaces and vehicles backing out of driveways, with vehicles traveling on the street, and with pedestrians. The effect is more like driving through a parking lot than on a residential street. The risk of conflict would be minimized by the provision of parallel parking spaces and/or separate guest parking courts.

The streetscape is also undesirable aesthetically, with rows of townhouses fronted by garage doors, an expanse of asphalt driveways, and on-street perpendicular parking bays, with few opportunities for street trees. The layout is not characteristic of Perkasie.
Front yards of townhouses fronted by garages are dominated by driveways with little space for street trees.

To improve the function and aesthetics of the development, we recommend incorporating village features such as alleys to the rear of the dwellings with access to garages and driveway parking. Providing access to garages and driveway parking via alleys would increase the curb appeal of the townhouses by eliminating the asphalt in front yard areas, increasing the area for street trees and landscaping, and allowing for parallel parking for guests in front of the dwellings.

Curb appeal is increased when a rear alley provides access to garages and driveways.

Attractive developments with alleys have been built in the county, such as Lantern Hill in Doylestown Borough, Arbor Pointe and Upper Mountain Estates in Buckingham Township, and Carriage Hill in Plumstead Township.

In Perkasie Woods, alleys would be part of the private street system, which will be owned and maintained by the homeowners association. The Borough would not be responsible for issues the residents might have with the streets, or other common areas or facilities.

7. **Sidewalks/pedestrian circulation/connections**

   a. **Sidewalks**—Subdivision and land development ordinance Section 164-20.C requires that sidewalks shall be provided along both sides of all streets, except in the opinion of the Borough Council with the advice of the planning commission that they are unnecessary for the public safety and convenience. The plan should be revised to provide the required sidewalks along Spruce Street. We recommend that a crosswalk be provided on Spruce Street connecting the new sidewalk to the existing borough trail on the opposite side of Spruce Street.
A sidewalk also should be provided on the northern side of proposed Drive A along TMP #33-9-3 as part of the proposed Drive A. We recommend that a crosswalk and signage be provided on Constitution Avenue from this sidewalk (or the sidewalk on the opposite side of Drive A) to connect the Perkasie Woods community to Lenape Park and the trail system.

b. **Connection to Perkasie Square Shopping Center**—We strongly recommend that a pedestrian connection be provided to the adjacent Perkasie Square Shopping Center for residents of Perkasie Woods. This would be similar to the connection provided between Meadow Wood and Perkasie Square when that development was proposed next to the existing shopping center. We recommend that a sidewalk or pedestrian trail be located in Perkasie Woods across from the break in the shopping center building, and that a crosswalk and signage be placed on the access drive to alert drivers of a pedestrian crossing. This will provide a convenient access for potential shoppers from the new development without requiring additional vehicular trips on Constitution Avenue, and allow children and other non-drivers easy access to the restaurants and other businesses.

Incorporating a path into the community’s design will ensure that it is properly located and that drainage, safety, and other issues are addressed and coordinated with construction of the development. If a path is not provided, most likely an ad hoc cut-through will be created by residents, which may not be in an ideal location, and possibly would cause conflict with adjacent homeowners or the shopping center owner.

8. **Open space**—The plan should clarify the intended use and development of the proposed Open Space Areas. Community Open Space Areas B, C, and D are labelled as “pocket parks,” but no park facilities are shown. On Open Space Area D, a proposed two to three-foot embankment slopes down into the pocket park from the proposed sidewalk and parking row. According to the steep slope legend on Sheet 10, there are existing areas of steep slopes of 8 to 15 percent and 15 to 25 percent, which may limit what activities can take place in the park, per the environmental performance standards of zoning ordinance Section 186-57. In addition, screening should be provided for adjacent Units 8 and 9 to establish park boundaries and so that noise from the park is not a nuisance to residents in the nearby units. Community Open Space Areas B and C also show no park facilities or screening of residential units. Both areas abut proposed subsurface detention facilities. It should be determined if there are any limits on public use of these areas. Appropriate screening and boundaries should be established for community Open Space Area A, which includes a proposed tot lot, to ensure safety for the users and privacy for the adjacent residences.

9. **Landscape plan/EAB**—The 20 *Fraxinus pennsylvanica* (green ash) trees proposed on Sheets 39 and 50 should be replaced with another type of canopy tree from the Borough’s plant materials list. Due to the discovery of the emerald ash borer (EAB) in Bucks County in 2012, *Fraxinus* species are not included on the plant materials list of zoning ordinance Section 186-54.E.3. The EAB is very destructive and once trees are infested, they will die without ongoing insecticide treatment.
10. **Water volumes**—According to subdivision and land development ordinance Section 164-68.D.23, the preliminary plan must state the estimated average and peak volumes of water needed to serve the proposed land development. An indication of the available water for fire flow and the water volume required to satisfy the Insurance Services Office (ISO) standards for fire protection also should be provided.

11. **Waiver requested**—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting a waiver from Section 164-70(A).5 of the subdivision and land development ordinance, regarding plan sheet sizes. In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved, and the minimum modification necessary.

12. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the February 4, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MW:kjp

cc: Michael V. Tulio, Metropolitan Development Group
    Robert E. Blue, Jr., Robert E. Blue Consulting Engineers, P.C.
    Erik Garton, Gilmore & Associates, Borough Engineer
    Andrea Coaxum, Borough Manager (via email)
    Brandy Mckeever, Code Enforcement Administrator (via email)
    Nate Fox, Begley, Carlin & Mandio, Borough Solicitor
January 20, 2015
BCPC #10876-B

MEMORANDUM

TO: Warrington Township Board of Supervisors
   Warrington Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Final Plan of Lot Line Change for Padilla/KTMT (High Grove Manor)
   TMP #50-25-27; 25-18,
   Applicant: KTMT HGM, L.P.
   Owner: William & Robin Padilla & KTMT HGM, L.P.
   Plan Dated: August 6, 2014
   Date Received: January 5, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Convey a 0.105-acre portion of TMP #50-25-27 (0.937 acres) to TMP #50-25-18 (9.2 acres).
   The lot line change will permit construction of a loop road connecting Easton and Bristol roads.
   As a result of the conveyance, TMP #50-25-27 will be 0.832 acres, and TMP #50-25-18, 9.305 acres.

Location: Eastern side of Easton Road (PA 611) between Dubree Avenue and opposite Park Road.

Zoning: The R-2 Medium Density Residential District permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 20,000 square feet or more by right and municipal uses by conditional use.

The Loop Road Overlay District permits townhouse dwellings, retail businesses, banks, and motor vehicle service stations, on a minimum gross acre tract of 10 acres. Residential uses are permitted on a minimum gross site area of 5 acres and minimum lot size per residential structure of 3,000 square feet. The maximum density is 12 units per acre. Nonresidential uses shall have a minimum lot size of 1 acre. TMPs #50-25-17; -18; -19; and 50-10-11 fall within the overlay district.

Present Use: Vacant and residential.
COMMENTS

The staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission recognizes that this submission is consistent with major ordinance requirements. We recommend that the plan be approved if it meets all ordinance requirements, as determined through the municipal engineer's review, and if the plan complies with the requirements of other applicable reviewing agencies. We also recommend that the township solicitor review the new deeds to ensure that a separate nonconforming parcel is not created.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the February 4, 2014 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

DCZ:kjp

cc: KTMT HGM, L.P.
T&M Associates
Tom Gockowski, P.E., Carroll Engineering Corporation, Township Engineer
Tim Tieperman, Municipal Manager (via email)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number(s)</th>
<th>PaDEP Code Number</th>
<th>Plan Review Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Southampton</td>
<td>Tawanka Elementary School</td>
<td>21-14-SD-1</td>
<td>21-32-2-2.1 &amp;-2-2</td>
<td>1-09006-143-3J</td>
<td>20080-0202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Spears</td>
<td></td>
<td>47-2-4-5</td>
<td>1-09948-340-2</td>
<td>20080-0203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford Township</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td>23-7-121</td>
<td>1-09930-447-2</td>
<td>20080-0204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 2, 2015

Thomas Hanna
Gilmore & Associates, Inc.
65 East Butler Avenue
New Britain, PA 18901

RE: Tawanka Elementary School Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-09006-143-3J
BCPC #21-14-SD1
TMP #21-32-2-2.1 and 21-32-2-2
Lower Southampton Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. Hanna:

We have received a copy of the subject planning module regarding the connection of the proposed Tawanka Elementary School to the public sewer system with sewerage conveyance through the Neshaminy Interceptor and Totem Road pump station. The sewage will be treated by the Philadelphia Water Department's Northeast Water Pollution Control Plant.

The 1970 Bucks County Sewerage Facilities Plan is the official Act 537 Plan for this portion of Lower Southampton Township. The proposal to connect to the existing public sewer facility is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan. The submission indicates in Section G.2.b that certification of capacity at the Northeast Water Pollution Control Plan is pending. Township officials should not approve the planning module until the certification statement is completed and signed.

If the township approves the planning module and thereby revises the official sewage facilities plan, the completed (signed) resolution and required supporting data (Components 3 and 4; transmittal letter; plans; narrative; and copies of the BCPC and BCDH review letters) should be sent to

1 Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection's (PaDEP) Title 25, Rules and Regulations, the subject planning module is a revision to the Lower Southampton Township Sewage Facilities Plan. Therefore, the Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) and the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH) are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.
Mr. Thomas Hanna  
January 2, 2015  
Page 2  

Elizabeth Mahoney, Supervisor, Wastewater Management, PaDEP Southeast Regional Office, 2 East Main Street, Norristown, PA 19401.

If you have any questions regarding this review, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Matthew M. Walters  
Planner

MMW:kjp

Attachment

cc: Scott Cressman, BCDH  
Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP  
Paul Minotti, Neshaminy School District  
John McMenamin, Township Manager (via email)  
Act 537 file
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
BUREAU OF WATER STANDARDS AND FACILITY REGULATION

SEWAGE FACILITIES PLANNING MODULE
COMPONENT 4B - COUNTY PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW
(or Planning Agency with Areawide Jurisdiction)

Note to Project Sponsor: To expedite the review of your proposal, one copy of your completed planning package and one copy of this Planning Agency Review Component should be sent to the existing county planning agency or planning agency with areawide jurisdiction for their comments.

SECTION A. PROJECT NAME (See Section A of instructions)

Project Name
Tawanka Elementary School

SECTION B. REVIEW SCHEDULE (See Section B of instructions)

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. December 19, 2014
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   Agency name Bucks County Planning Commission
3. Date review completed by agency January 2, 2015

SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (See Section C of instructions)

Yes No

1. Is there a county or areawide comprehensive plan adopted under the Municipalities Planning Code (53 P.S. 10101 et seq.)?
   ☒ ☐

2. Is this proposal consistent with the comprehensive plan for land use?
   ☒ ☐

3. Does this proposal meet the goals and objectives of the plan?
   If no, describe goals and objectives that are not met
   ☒ ☐

4. Is this proposal consistent with the use, development, and protection of water resources?
   If no, describe inconsistency
   ☒ ☐

5. Is this proposal consistent with the county or areawide comprehensive land use planning relative to Prime Agricultural Land Preservation?
   If no, describe inconsistencies:
   ☒ ☐

6. Does this project propose encroachments, obstructions, or dams that will affect wetlands?
   If yes, describe impact
   ☐ ☒

7. Will any known historical or archeological resources be impacted by this project?
   If yes, describe impacts
   ☐ ☒

8. Will any known endangered or threatened species of plant or animal be impacted by the development project?
   ☐ ☒

9. Is there a county or areawide zoning ordinance?
   ☐ ☒

10. Does this proposal meet the zoning requirements of the ordinance? N/A
    If no, describe inconsistencies
    ☐ ☒
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th><strong>SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW</strong> (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Have all applicable zoning approvals been obtained? N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Is there a county or areawide subdivision and land development ordinance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Does this proposal meet the requirements of the ordinance? N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe which requirements are not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14. Is this proposal consistent with the municipal Act 537 Official Sewage Facilities Plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15. Are there any wastewater disposal needs in the area adjacent to this proposal that should be considered by the municipality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, describe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16. Has a waiver of the sewage facilities planning requirements been requested for the residual tract of this subdivision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, is the proposed waiver consistent with applicable ordinances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe the inconsistencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17. Does the county have a stormwater management plan as required by the Stormwater Management Act?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, will this project plan require the implementation of storm water management measures?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Name, Title and signature of person completing this section:

Name: Matthew M. Walters
Title: Community Planner
Signature: [Signature]

Date: January 2, 2015

Name of County or Areawide Planning Agency: Bucks County Planning Commission
Address: The Almshouse, 1260 Almshouse Road, Doylestown, PA 18901
TelephoneNumber: 215 345-3400

**SECTION D. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS** (See Section D of instructions)

This Component does not limit county planning agencies from making additional comments concerning the relevancy of the proposed plan to other plans or ordinances. If additional comments are needed, attach additional sheets.

The county planning agency must complete this Component within 60 days.
This Component and any additional comments are to be returned to the applicant.
January 7, 2015

Mr. Daniel J. McFarlane  
Sewage Planning Specialist  
DeVal Soil & Environmental Consultants, Inc.  
4060 Skyrun Drive, Sky Run II, Suite A1  
Doylestown, PA 18902

RE: John Spears - Planning Module  
PaDEP Code #1-09948-340-2  
TMP #47-2-4-5  
Upper Makefield Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. McFarlane:

We have received a copy of the subject planning module\footnote{Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection’s (PaDEP) Title 25, Rules and Regulations, the subject planning module is a revision to the Upper Makefield Township Wastewater Facilities Plan. Therefore, the Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) and the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH) are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.} for the construction of an on-lot treatment facility to service a new single-family home and two (2) accessory dwelling units. The new community facility will replace an existing on-lot system servicing an existing dwelling. Both the existing single-family dwelling and existing on-lot system will be removed/abandoned in conjunction with the construction of the new single-family dwelling and accessory units. The projected sewage flow for the project is 1,400 gallons per day (gpd), based upon a sewage flow of 600 gpd for the new single-family home, and 400 gpd for each of the two (2) accessory dwelling units (800 gpd total for accessory dwelling units). The existing private well on site will serve all three units.

The Upper Makefield Township Sewage Facilities Plan is the official Act 537 sewage facilities plan for Upper Makefield Township. The proposal is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan since this plan indicates that the subject site is located within an area not intended for public sewer service. Given that the soils on the project site were determined to be suitable to support individual on-lot sewage disposal and that the proposal is consistent with municipal and state planning for the area, other sewage disposal options were not explored.
Mr. Daniel J. McFarlane  
January 7, 2015  
Page 2  

If the municipality approves the planning module and thereby revises the official sewage facilities plan, the completed (signed) resolution and required supporting data (Components 2 and 4; transmittal letter; plans; narrative; copies of the BCPC and BCDH review letters) should be sent to Elizabeth Mahoney, Sewage Planning Supervisor, Wastewater Management Planning, PaDEP, 2 East Main Street Norristown, PA 19401.

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]  

Paul W. Gordon  
Planner  

PWG:kjp  

Attachment  

cc: Scott Cressman, Bucks County Health Department  
Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP  
David Nyman, Interim Upper Makefield Township Manager (via email)  
Act 537 File
Note to Project Sponsor: To expedite the review of your proposal, one copy of your completed planning package and one copy of this Planning Agency Review Component should be sent to the existing county planning agency or planning agency with areawide jurisdiction for their comments.

SECTION A. PROJECT NAME (See Section A of instructions)

Project Name
Spears Property - 86 VanSant Road - Upper Makefield Township

SECTION B. REVIEW SCHEDULE (See Section B of instructions)

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. December 22, 2014
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   Agency name Bucks County Planning Commission
3. Date review completed by agency January 7, 2015

SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (See Section C of instructions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Is there a county or areawide comprehensive plan adopted under the Municipalities Planning Code (53 P.S. 10101 et seq.)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Is this proposal consistent with the comprehensive plan for land use?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Does this proposal meet the goals and objectives of the plan?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
   If no, describe goals and objectives that are not met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Is this proposal consistent with the use, development, and protection of water resources?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
   If no, describe inconsistency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Is this proposal consistent with the county or areawide comprehensive land use planning relative to Prime Agricultural Land Preservation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
   If no, describe inconsistencies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Does this project propose encroachments, obstructions, or dams that will affect wetlands?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
   If yes, describe impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Will any known historical or archeological resources be impacted by this project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
   If yes, describe impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Will any known endangered or threatened species of plant or animal be impacted by the development project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Is there a county or areawide zoning ordinance?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Does this proposal meet the zoning requirements of the ordinance?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
   If no, describe inconsistencies N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Have all applicable zoning approvals been obtained? N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Is there a county or areawide subdivision and land development ordinance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Does this proposal meet the requirements of the ordinance? N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>If no, describe which requirements are not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>14. Is this proposal consistent with the municipal Act 537 Official Sewage Facilities Plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>15. Are there any wastewater disposal needs in the area adjacent to this proposal that should be considered by the municipality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, describe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>16. Has a waiver of the sewage facilities planning requirements been requested for the residual tract of this subdivision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, is the proposed waiver consistent with applicable ordinances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe the inconsistencies N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>17. Does the county have a stormwater management plan as required by the Stormwater Management Act?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, will this project plan require the implementation of storm water management measures?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Name, Title and signature of person completing this section:

Name: Paul Gordon

Title: Environmental Planner

Signature: 

Date: January 7, 2016

Name of County or Areawide Planning Agency: Bucks County Planning Commission

Address: The Almshouse, 1260 Almshouse Road, Doylestown, PA 18901

Telephone Number: 215 345-3400

SECTION D. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (See Section D of instructions)

This Component does not limit county planning agencies from making additional comments concerning the relevancy of the proposed plan to other plans or ordinances. If additional comments are needed, attach additional sheets.

The county planning agency must complete this Component within 60 days.

This Component and any additional comments are to be returned to the applicant.
January 15, 2015

Scott Mease, PE
Mease Engineering, PC
516 W. Broad Street
Quakertown, PA 18951

RE: Williams Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-09930-447-2
TMP #23-7-121
Milford Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. Mease,

We have received a copy of the subject planning module\(^1\) regarding the proposal to add an in-law suite to an existing house served by an on-site sewage system. This project consists of the construction of a new sand mound system with sewage flows of 400 gallons per day (gpd) for the three-bedroom house and 400 gpd for the in-law suite, for a total of 800 gpd.

The *Milford Township Sewage Facilities Plan (2003)* is the official Act 537 Plan for this portion of Milford Township. The proposal to construct a sand mound system is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan, since this plan indicates that the subject site is within an area to be served by on-site sewage.

We note that the return receipt for submission to the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission was not included in the planning module application submitted to our office. This should be included with the Planning Module application. We also note that the Pennsylvania Natural Diversity Inventory review response from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service indicates an avoidance measure which the applicant has agreed to implement: Do not conduct this project/activity within 50 feet of any streams, rivers, creeks, or tributaries. This includes both perennial and intermittent waterways.

If the municipality approves the planning module and thereby revises the official sewage facilities plan, the completed (signed) resolution and required supporting data (Components 2 and 4; transmittal letter; plans; narrative; copies of the Bucks County Department of Health and Planning

---

\(^1\)Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection’s Title 25, Rules and Regulations, the subject planning module is a revision to the *Milford Township Sewage Facilities Plan*. Therefore, the Bucks County Department of Health and Bucks County Planning Commission are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.
Mr. Scott Mease, PE
January 15, 2015
Page 2

Commission review letters) should be sent to Elizabeth Mahoney, Sewage Planning Supervisor, Wastewater Management, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection Southeast Regional Office, 2 East Main Street, Norristown, PA 19401.

If you have any questions regarding this review, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

David A. Sebastian
Senior Community Planner

DAS:kjp

Attachment

cc: Scott Cressman, BCDH
   Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
   Jeffery Vey, Township Manager (via email)
   Act 537 file
### SEWAGE FACILITIES PLANNING MODULE
#### COMPONENT 4B - COUNTY PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW
(or Planning Agency with Areawide Jurisdiction)

**Note to Project Sponsor:** To expedite the review of your proposal, one copy of your completed planning package and one copy of this *Planning Agency Review Component* should be sent to the existing county planning agency or planning agency with areawide jurisdiction for their comments.

#### SECTION A. PROJECT NAME (See Section A of instructions)

**Project Name**
Williams

#### SECTION B. REVIEW SCHEDULE (See Section B of instructions)

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. **December 30, 2014**
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   
   Agency name: Bucks County Planning Commission

3. Date review completed by agency **January 15, 2015**

#### SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (See Section C of instructions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Is there a county or areawide comprehensive plan adopted under the Municipalities Planning Code (53 P.S. 10101 et seq.)?

2. Is this proposal consistent with the comprehensive plan for land use?

3. Does this proposal meet the goals and objectives of the plan?
   
   If no, describe goals and objectives that are not met

4. Is this proposal consistent with the use, development, and protection of water resources?
   
   If no, describe inconsistency

5. Is this proposal consistent with the county or areawide comprehensive land use planning relative to Prime Agricultural Land Preservation?
   
   If no, describe inconsistencies:

6. Does this project propose encroachments, obstructions, or dams that will affect wetlands?
   
   If yes, describe impact

7. Will any known historical or archeological resources be impacted by this project?
   
   If yes, describe impacts ***See attached letter***

8. Will any known endangered or threatened species of plant or animal be impacted by the development project? **Avoidance measure required (see attached letter.)**

9. Is there a county or areawide zoning ordinance?

10. Does this proposal meet the zoning requirements of the ordinance?
    
    If no, describe inconsistencies **N/A**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>11. Have all applicable zoning approvals been obtained? <strong>N/A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>12. Is there a county or areawide subdivision and land development ordinance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>13. Does this proposal meet the requirements of the ordinance? <strong>N/A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe which requirements are not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>14. Is this proposal consistent with the municipal Act 537 Official Sewage Facilities Plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>15. Are there any wastewater disposal needs in the area adjacent to this proposal that should be considered by the municipality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, describe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>16. Has a waiver of the sewage facilities planning requirements been requested for the residual tract of this subdivision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, is the proposed waiver consistent with applicable ordinances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>If no, describe the inconsistencies <strong>N/A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>17. Does the county have a stormwater management plan as required by the Stormwater Management Act?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>If yes, will this project plan require the implementation of storm water management measures?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Name, Title and signature of person completing this section:

Name: **David A. Sebastian**

Title: **Sr. Community Planner**

Signature: **David A. Sebastian**

Date: **1/15/15**

Name of County or Areawide Planning Agency: **Bucks County Planning Commission**

Address: **The Almshouse, 1260 Almshouse Road, Doylestown, PA 18901**

Telephone Number: **215 345-3400**

SECTION D. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (See Section D of instructions)

This Component does not limit county planning agencies from making additional comments concerning the relevancy of the proposed plan to other plans or ordinances. If additional comments are needed, attach additional sheets.

The county planning agency must complete this Component within 60 days.

This Component and any additional comments are to be returned to the applicant.

(See Attached Letter)
BUCKS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING

Wednesday, March 4, 2015
2:00 P.M.

Robert H. Grunmeier Room
1260 Almshouse Road
Doylestown, PA 18901

AGENDA

1. Call to Order

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approval of Minutes of February 4, 2015

4. Executive Director’s Report

5. Presentation: Bensalem Township Riverfront
   Matthew Takita, Township Planner and Zoning Officer

   Michael Roedig, Planner

7. Act 247 Reviews

8. Old Business

9. New Business

10. Public Comment

11. Adjournment

Please remember to contact us at
215-345-3400 if you cannot attend. Thank you.

AGENDA SUBJECT TO CHANGE PRIOR TO MEETING
BUCKS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
February 4, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT:  Joseph A. Cullen; Edward Kisselback, Jr.; David R. Nyman; Robert M.
Pellegrino; Carol A. Pierce; Evan J. Stone; Walter S. Wydro

STAFF PRESENT:    Charles T. McIlhinney; Lynn T. Bush; David Johnson; Timothy A. Koehler;
Maureen Wheatley; Richard G. Brahler; Margaret A. McKevitt; Donna W.
Byers

GUESTS:           The Redevelopment Authority of the County of Bucks: Robert White,
Executive Director; Jeff Darwak, Deputy Director; Allen Toadvine, Solicitor

1. CALL TO ORDER
   Mr. Wydro called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
   All rose for the pledge of allegiance.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF JANUARY 7, 2015
   Upon motion of Mr. Nyman, seconded by Mr. Pellegrino, with the vote being 7-0 the motion
   carried to approve the minutes of the January 7, 2015 meeting. There were no abstentions.

4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT
   Prior to the Executive Director’s report, Mr. Wydro revised the Agenda for The Redevelopment
   Authority of the County of Bucks (RDA) to present on the Bristol Pike Revitalization Area –
   Certified Redevelopment Area Plan as Item #5.

   No written Executive Director’s report was submitted to the board prior to the meeting as Ms.
   Bush was away.

   Ms. Bush reported that in early January she was asked by the Commissioners for an update on the
   PennEast pipeline. She shared the update with the board and provided them with maps
   highlighting the current and projected interstate gas line. The route of the proposed pipeline, that
   will carry natural gas and connect to existing lines, will cross over an area in upper Bucks County
   that would include one preserved farm (Pat Cook farm). The pipeline is regulated under the state
   Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). The pipeline operates as a utility and has the
   right of eminent domain. This would allow the pipeline to cross over the Cook farm, which was
   preserved with both county and state funds. FERC plans to conduct an environmental impact
   study. Ms. Bush said Durham and Solebury townships are weighing in against the pipeline. She
   added that Chester County has posted information on their website but is not taking a position
   on the other pipeline projects in the region that affect Chester County. Ms. Bush will attend the
   FERC meeting at the Bucks County Community College when it is rescheduled. Ms. Bush and
   Mr. Koehler have signed up with FERC to receive public comments. Discussion followed on the
   proposed pipeline crossing preserved lands and opposition to the pipeline from residents in New
   Jersey.
5. **PRESENTATION: BRISTOL PIKE REVITALIZATION AREA – CERTIFIED REDEVELOPMENT AREA PLAN FOR BRISTOL TOWNSHIP**

Jeff Darwak, Deputy Director for the RDA, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the proposed Bristol Pike Revitalization Area – Certified Redevelopment Area Plan for Bristol Township. The Bristol Pike Revitalization Area was certified as a Redevelopment Area on March 5, 2014. Mr. Darwak stated that the proposed Redevelopment Area Plan would promote redevelopment in the vicinity of Route 13 and the Pennsylvania Turnpike Interchange with mixed-use development; encourage and assist existing property owners to expand, revitalize and bring their buildings up to code and current design standards by providing loan, tax and grant assistance; eliminate substandard conditions of infrastructure; address underserved areas that lack adequate access to public water and sewer; bring properties into compliance with municipal codes; provide assistance in the redevelopment of long-vacant and underutilized industrial and commercial properties; and provide incentives, technical assistance and direction that addresses economic growth.

Mr. Darwak requested the board approve the Redevelopment Area Plan for the Bristol Pike Revitalization Area and the Plan’s approval to the Bucks County Commissioners and certify that said Redevelopment Proposal is in conformity with the Comprehensive Plan for the Township of Bristol and the plans for the neighborhood and district of which the subject is a part (Resolution, pg. 53 of the Redevelopment Plan).

Following discussion, Mr. McIlhinney proposed a motion be made to approve the resolution with the following language added to paragraph 2:

> ...subject to the following conditions: the Bucks County Planning Commission staff shall review and revise the sections on Proposed Zoning and Land Uses prior to submission to the Bucks County Commissioners…

Mr. Kisselback made a motion as presented by Mr. McIlhinney, seconded by Mr. Pellegrino. Mr. Wydro polled the board for comment. With the vote being 7-0 the motion carried to approve the resolution with the change to paragraph 2 as noted.

6. **PRESENTATION: TRANSPORTATION UPDATE**

Mr. Brahler, Senior Planner, gave a PowerPoint presentation on transportation projects. Mr. Brahler discussed the six-mile I-476 Widening Project between Clump and Steinsburg roads. The preliminary design began in 2012, and it will cost approximately $200 million to widen the roadway to three lanes in each direction, replace five bridges, and redesign the Quakertown Interchange. Bridge construction will start in 2015 and the mainline widening will begin in late 2017. Discussion followed on the redesign of the Quakertown Interchange and open tolling.

Mr. Brahler described the Route 611 Transportation Study. The study will examine land use and zoning, crash history, traffic volumes, origin-destination information, planned improvements, public transit opportunities, signal improvements, and intelligent transportation technology. The study area includes Doylestown, Warrington, Horsham, Upper Moreland, Abington and Cheltenham. Discussion followed on timing of traffic signals and the Willow Grove Interchange.

Mr. Brahler described the Roosevelt Boulevard Better Bus Study, stating that the purpose of the study is to develop a short-term, low-cost, enhanced bus service along Roosevelt Boulevard to
and from Northeast Philadelphia and Lower Bucks County. The project goals are to make the bus more comfortable for passengers, decrease end-to-end ride times and encourage new ridership. Discussion followed on parking and bus enhancements. Mr. Wydro polled the board for further questions and thanked Mr. Brahler for his good presentation.

7. **ACT 247 REVIEWS**

The reviews of February 4, 2015, were mailed to the board for their review prior to the meeting. Three walk-in reviews were included in the packet at the meeting:

- BCPC Review #11-13-1R—Durham Township Zoning Ordinance Amendment Update;
- BCPC Review #44-15-1—Tinicum Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Definition; and

Upon motion of Mr. Cullen, seconded by Ms. Pierce, the motion carried to approve the February 4, 2015 Act 247 reviews. Mr. Stone abstained from BCPC Review #10876-B—Warrington Township, Padilla/KTMT (High Grove Manor) Lot Line Change.

8. **OLD BUSINESS**

Ms. Pierce referenced last month’s New Business for the need of a book compilation of historical resources in Bucks County in an effort to add to tourism. The board discussed at the January meeting the possibility of obtaining information from Montgomery and Chester counties.

Ms. Pierce made a contribution to the effort with information on historical sites and other tourism items from Lehigh County. Ms. Bush and the board thanked Ms. Pierce for the contribution.

9. **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

10. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There was no public comment.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Wydro requested a motion to adjourn. Mr. Nyman made a motion adjourn the meeting at 3:30 PM. The motion carried.

Submitted by:
Donna W. Byers, Staff Secretary
This month’s report is a recap of our Municipal Economic Development Initiative, with some observations at the end of two full years of doing this.

**Municipal Economic Development Initiative – Status Report**

**What we do:**
- Voluntary
- Bucks County Planning Commission services at no cost
- Services tailored to local needs:
  - Visioning sessions and community outreach through meetings and surveys
  - Data collection and analysis
  - Transportation data – traffic, PennDOT proposed transportation improvements, pedestrian and sidewalk assessments
  - Land use surveys and assessments
  - Parking
  - Commercial and industrial usage and land availability
  - Assessment of zoning and planning tools
  - Information and connections to other agencies and groups
  - Information on what other agencies and groups are doing

**How we get started:**
- Outreach letter to all 54 townships and boroughs
- Meet with manager or designee
- Design work program and get started

**What we have learned:**
- 33 municipalities have signed on
- Program focuses attention on the economic vitality of municipality – much like our experience with open space – paying attention to the issue goes a long way.
- Even the few municipalities that already had economic development committees established have benefited.
- Biggest concerns expressed by municipal officials are:
  - Vacant or underutilized properties and buildings
  - Local tax base
  - Appearance of the community – downtowns and main roads
  - Still concerned about attracting new businesses instead of keeping and supporting current enterprises
  - Some concern about jobs

**What they need help with:**
- Identifying their biggest assets and how to build on these
- Understanding the money part – grants, what they can do without spending much money, how what they do will affect their fiscal profile, and how to utilize tax incentive programs
- What do other towns do and what are best practices?
- Where are their leverage points? What can they do?
- What could their Main Street look like if sites were developed/redeveloped and if there were improvements made? Need visuals.

What can municipalities do?
- Identify what they want to accomplish – through discussions, town hall meetings, surveys – and develop goals and strategies
- Revise local land use regulations – zoning, permitting, land development ordinances
- Infrastructure improvements – intersections or traffic controls, lighting, sidewalks, street trees, parking
- Tax incentives – use of LERTA program
- Quality of life improvements – parks, open space, historic preservation
- County and state agencies - Learn about how other groups can help them and work with them

Some results of the program so far:

**Bristol Borough** – A committee of dedicated hometown volunteers have worked for three years to generate real improvements on their Main Street. Results:
- Store front improvements
- Gateway entrance constructed
- Funds raised for physical improvements
- Developer acquisition and rehabilitation of a signature downtown building approved
- Grants received for riverfront development
- Good coordination between residents and elected officials on “Raising the Bar” in Bristol County role: Research and guidance, report organization and preparation, general assistance

**Sellersville Borough** – Coordinated effort by County, County IDA, County Redevelopment authority, and Borough officials on reclaiming a vacant industrial site and clearing the way for productive reuse. New subdivision plan includes 6 viable business lots that are now being marketed. Prepared their documents for the LERTA tax program.

**New Britain Borough** – Worked on revitalizing Butler Avenue and creating more of a “college town” by establishing a connection between the borough and Delaware Valley College. We used our two years of intense work with the borough as a selling point to secure a $100,000 grant to advance this cause.

**Perkasie** – Working with the Borough on their comprehensive plan, we focused on economic development and redevelopment of unused parcels. As the result, the borough has received several new development proposals that will increase the vitality of the borough and bring new residents to town and new businesses to the town center. By working cooperatively with the County Industrial Development Authority, one project has received financing assistance.

**Northampton** – Prepared a land use “vision” plan for the development and redevelopment of Holland, an area with traffic challenges and an iconic building that has been dilapidated for several years. Coordinated activities of township officials, local economic development council, and business community.

**New Hope Borough** – Served as mediators between the Borough Council and the Bucks County Playhouse to develop zoning regulations that were satisfactory to the borough, the community, and the investors in the Playhouse.
Springfield Township – Completed an in-depth assessment of the land they have zoned for commercial and industrial development which revealed many obstacles to the marketability of the area.

Cross Keys Area – Secured $100,000 grant to study traffic, street improvements, and land use patterns for an area encompassing four municipalities and which includes many large employers.

Newtown Township – Worked with their economic development committee to determine options for reuse of the Lockheed Martin site.

Lower Southampton and Bensalem townships – Working on Brownsville Road planning and zoning in a joint project.

Recent Additions:
Plumstead Township – Developing land use and streetscape plan for the village of Plumsteadville.

Warminster Township – Will work with newly-formed Economic Development Committee on vacant stress and underutilized properties.

Dublin Borough – Participated in the development of their Vision Plan and now working with them on zoning amendments to help implement the plan.
COMMUNITY PLANNING

> **Meeting Attendance**—Attended the regular monthly planning commission meetings of Perkasie Borough and the Quakertown Area Planning Committee.

> **Northampton Township Village Commercial Design Guidelines**—Continued research and drafting report.

> **Richboro Village Master Plan**—Conducted town hall meeting with the township to discuss the future of the village with residents, business owners, and officials.

> **Tinicum Township Comprehensive Plan**—Held meeting with the comprehensive plan group to discuss second draft revisions.

> **West Rockhill Township**—Completed draft of “Revitalization” chapter of the Village of Almont study. Prepared conceptual plans for the Lawn Avenue corridor within the village to be discussed with township staff.

> **Cross Keys Study**—Continued narrative production for the Land Use and Zoning, and Economic Development Conditions sections.

> **New Britain Borough**—Attended a joint meeting of the Borough Planning Commission and Doylestown Township Planning Commission to discuss development/redevelopment in the area near the campus of Delaware Valley College. Held kick off meeting for the New Britain Borough Main Street study with the steering committee.

> **Lower Makefield Township Master Plan Update**—Continued making final revisions to the second draft based on input from the township planning commission.

> **Plumsteadville Village Plan**—Met with the Plumsteadville Village Committee to discuss the next steps in creating a village plan.

Planning Information and Agency Coordination

> Provided information to the public on topics including demographic and socioeconomic data, development proposals, review letters, local zoning, and municipal regulations.

> Continued researching public comment letters to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regarding the proposed PennEast Pipeline.


> Attended meeting of the Bicycle Task Force.

> Attended Bucks County Homeless Continuum of Care meetings.

> Continued to work on the creation of a plan implementation progress model handbook to track and monitor recommendations outlined in planning documents.

> Reviewed Act 14, 67, 68 NPDES permit applications.

**Act 247 and 537 Review Activity**

> 8 Subdivision and Land Development Proposals

> 0 Sketch Plans

> 14 Municipals
> 1 Sewage Facility Planning Modules
> 1 Traffic Impact Studies

**ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING**

**Natural Resources**
> Reviewed Act 162 and 25 Pa. Code Chapter 102 and outlined key points and changes in regulation.
> Researched comments submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regarding the proposed PennEast Pipeline.

**Integrated Water Resources Planning Work Program**
> Assist watershed partners with programming for community events.
> Attended DEP MS4 training program which provided insight and guidance regarding new requirements with compliance and the development of MS4 plans and Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination plans.
> Attended a Penn Future/PEC sponsored program titled Opportunities for involvement in Pennsylvania’s Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permitting program. The program will focus on new public input requirements to the MS4 program.
> Researching funding opportunities for watershed-related projects.
> Review of 2014-funded CZM project applications and CZM program. Contacted DVRPC regarding participation in program and next steps.

**National Flood Insurance Program**
> Reviewed final floodplain ordinances and/or zoning and SALDO amendments for Bristol Township, Doylestown Borough and Perkasie Township.

**William Penn Foundation: Poquessing Watershed Cluster**
> Meet with Bensalem Township Council president, township manager, and public works staff, and Temple University’s Center for Sustainable Communities and PEC representatives to discuss priority stormwater management projects. Reviewed funding opportunities available, recent engineered studies conducted of a proposed stormwater naturalized basin design, and issues with extreme erosion and breached berm on Dinosaur Lake.
> Conducted site visits of problem areas and location for proposed naturalized stormwater detention basin in Bensalem Township.
> Work with project partners regarding the development of a quarterly digest documenting the health of the Poquessing Watershed, and citizen watershed stewards’ program.

**Bucks County Open Space & Greenway Planning**
> Met with representatives from Warwick Township and Heritage Conservancy relative to easements / acquisition targets for future development of the Neshaminy Creek trail.
> Attended Doylestown Community Bike & Hike meeting and provided an update as to the planned improvements to / completion of the trail in Peace Valley Park.
> Attended Warrington Township Trails Committee meeting.
> Finalized mapping for Lower Neshaminy Creek proposed trail alignment.
> Continued developing narrative of the Lower Neshaminy Creek trail feasibility study.
> Attended meeting of Regional Bike Committee to discuss improving bicycle access to local transit facilities.
> Met with representatives of Bristol Borough relative to proposed bike lane along Jefferson Avenue.

**Recycling and Solid Waste**
> Investigating methods to address the impacts of the new law on the used electronic collection program.
> Continued outreach to several key individuals and colleagues for guidance and clarification regarding the Covered Devices Recycling Act (CDRA Act 108).
> Scheduling next year's Household Hazard Waste (HHW) events.
> Working on the Bucks County Municipal Waste Plan update.
> Preparing the HHW site registration application to PaDEP.
> Working on the recycling coordinator activities for the 2014 Section 903 grant.
> Distributed the municipal solicitation for 2014 recycling data.
> Continued working with PaDEP on the next steps for the Buck County Waste Capacity Plan.

**Hazard Mitigation Planning**
> Coordinating details of the first Hazard Mitigation Plan Update meeting with municipal managers and emergency management coordinators.

---

**TRANSPORTATION AND GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM (GIS)**

**General Transportation Planning**
> Attended Regional Bike Committee Meeting. Met with Bristol Borough to discuss potential bike lanes in the borough.
> Processed contract paperwork for TMA Bucks Purchase of Services Agreement for Highway Safety Program.
> Attended DVRPC Congestion Management Program Meeting.
> Attended DVRPC Transportation Operations Task Force Meeting.
> Participated in Green Light Go Funding Program Webinar.
> Met with Commissioners Martin and Marseglia to discuss trail opportunities in the county. Researched potential request for proposals for development of potential trail segments. Contacted SEPTA regarding leasing of unused rail lines.
> Presented update on three Transportation Projects to Planning Commission Board.
> Sent PennDOT’s Local Technical Assistance Program information to all municipalities.

**Public Transportation**
> Reviewed SEPTA Board Meeting Materials.
> Attended Doylestown DART Committee Meeting. Researched Senior Fare Reimbursement Information for Bucks County Transport.
> Reviewed all proposed TMA work programs. Attended TMA Policy Committee Meeting.
> Attended TMA Bucks Board Meeting. Coordinated with TMA Bucks regarding FY2016 Work Program. Met with Joe McAtee to discuss TMA Bucks Outreach Seminar Program Agenda. Provided TMA with work program support letter.
> Attended New Hope Public Transportation Study Committee Meeting.

**Transportation Assistance to Planning Staff**
> Discussed transportation related issues with staff for subdivision and land development reviews.
> Continued to develop background information for Cross Keys Land Use and Transportation Study. Prepared and submitted TCDI Technical Assistance Package to DVRPC.
> Coordinated with New Britain Township regarding contract issues related to New Britain Borough Transit Oriented Development TCDI Project. Prepared and submitted TCDI Technical Assistance Package to DVRPC. Attended staff meetings to discuss project. Developed purchase of services agreement between county and New Britain Borough.
> Continued developing computer-enhanced imagery for Almont Study. Attended meeting to discuss potential additional sketches for document. Attended meeting with West Rockhill Township to discuss draft document.
> Attended review design meeting to discuss a 40,000 square foot addition to a school.
> Attended Richboro Study Town Hall preparation meeting. Participated in Town Hall Meeting for Village of Richboro Study.

**Transportation Improvement Program**
> Provided Transportation Improvement Program information to various individuals and agencies.
> Attended Quakertown Transportation Alternatives Program Project Meeting.
> Attended Request for Proposals Evaluation Committee Meeting to discuss county bridges 15 and 280.
> Attended Regional Technical Committee Meeting.

**Geographic Information Systems (GIS)**
> Continued development of County-Wide Enterprise GIS program.
> Continued database development of site addresses and EMS, Fire, and Police response zones.
> Continued updating of Enterprise Geodatabase and ArcGIS Server.
> Continued coordination with GIS consultant on the Land Records and EMS projects.
> Continued development and support of County GIS Consortium efforts.
> Continued updating and editing of county Road Centerline database.
> Continued GIS technical software support to IT and GIS staff at Board of Assessment.
> Continued support of County hosted GIS web server connection and interface.
> Provided GIS technical support to Emergency Communication staff.
> Continued technical support for County GIS Web Viewer.
> Continued editing of county-wide data layers using GIS Data Reviewer tool.
> Continued editing procedures on land base parcel annotation features.
> Continued updating and testing of latest GIS software versions on desktop systems.
> Continued edge matching work on SE PA 9-1-1 GIS Shared Services regional datasets.
> Continued production of county Park and Recreation maps.
> Continued development of new GIS Web Viewer from Flex to JavaScript application.
Attended Shared GIS Services Meeting at Montgomery County Emergency Management.
Attended the Texting to 911 presentation at the County Training Center.
Attend the ESRI Community Maps Update webinar workshop.
Began software updating of Staging and Development components of the Enterprise GIS System.
Provided demographic data to Health Department personnel.
Developed web mapping application of suicide incidents in Bucks County.
Began compilation of GIS data for the Bucks County Hazard Mitigation Plan.

GIS Map Production
- Produced presentation maps for Community, Environmental and Preservation Planning units.
- Continued development of maps of county parks and facilities for print and web deployment.
- Produced series of suicide incidents maps in Bucks County for Human Services Director.
- Produced series of engineering floor scans of the Justice Center for the Chief Fire Marshall.

GIS Transportation
- Continued development of Region-wide GIS Transportation initiative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number(s)</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doylestown Borough</td>
<td>8-15-1</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doylestown Township</td>
<td>9-15-1(P)</td>
<td>Buckingham Retail Properties, LLC</td>
<td>9-6-25 &amp; -26</td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Motor Vehicle Fueling Center Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Township</td>
<td>13-15-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Flood Hazard Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Township</td>
<td>13-15-CR1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>13-5-3</td>
<td>New Public Works Building: 55,205 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Makefield Township</td>
<td>20-15-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: HARB Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain Township</td>
<td>26-15-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Low Impact Assembly Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkasie Borough</td>
<td>33-15-1</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland Township</td>
<td>36-14-2R</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Airport Overlay District &amp; Airport Overlay Zoning Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverdale Borough</td>
<td>40-15-1</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Zoning Hearing Board Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Township</td>
<td>42-15-CR1</td>
<td>Bucks County Parks</td>
<td>42-22-60 &amp; -73</td>
<td>Lot Line Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick Township</td>
<td>51-15-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick Township</td>
<td>51-15-2</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>SALDO Amendment: Floodplain Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yardley Borough</td>
<td>54-15-1</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>SALDO Amendment: Code Adoption Ordinances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yardley Borough</td>
<td>54-15-2</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Code Adoption Ordinances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Doylestown Borough Council
   Doylestown Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Regulations

Applicant: Council
Received: February 6, 2015
Hearing Date: March 16, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on March 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Replace Part 12 of the zoning ordinance, Floodplain District Regulations, in its entirety, with language consistent with current FEMA National Flood Insurance Program requirements. In addition, Section 202 will be revised to modify certain definitions and add definitions consistent with the floodplain regulations.

COMMENTS

We recognize that the proposal is consistent with the applicable comprehensive plan and municipal ordinances and commend the township for amending the zoning ordinance to be in compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program and Flood Insurance Rate Maps; however, we recommend that borough officials consider the following comments before adopting the proposal:

1. **Missing section**—The floodplain regulations proposed to be added to Part 12 appeared to be based on a model ordinance that was prepared by the Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development. The state model ordinance contains an option for Section 7.02 Improvements that addresses “repetitive loss” when a municipality chooses to include a provision for repetitive loss in Section 3.03.C. Since the proposed amendments...
included Section 3.03C, proposed Section 7.02 should be revised to include a subsection G that reads as follows:

G. Any modification, alteration, reconstruction, or improvement of any kind that meets the definition of “repetitive loss” shall be undertaken only in full compliance with the provisions of this ordinance.

2. **Missing text**—The end of proposed Section 4.03 appears to be missing the following sentence that is contained in the state model:

See 5.01B for situations where FEMA notification is required.

3. **Definitions**—There are several existing definitions contained in Section 202 of the zoning ordinance that are slightly different than the definitions listed in the state model. Certain of these may be appropriate; however, there are a few that may need to be more consistent with the state model definitions. In addition, there are certain terms listed in the state model that are not included in the proposed amendment, but may be addressed by similar terms currently in the zoning ordinance. Borough officials should determine if the following terms should be changed or added:

- Existing Manufactured Home Park or Subdivision
- Expansion to an Existing Manufactured Home Park or Subdivision
- New Manufactured Home Park or Subdivision
- Identified Floodplain Area *(not the same as state model)*
- New construction *(not the same as state model)*
- Substantial improvement *(not the same as state model - this term should also include structures which have incurred "substantial damage" or "repetitive loss" regardless of the actual repair work performed.)*
- Uniform Construction Code (UCC)

4. **Editorial**—We recommend revising Section 8.02 Variance Procedures and Conditions to include a specific reference to Part 11, Section 119 of the zoning ordinance instead of just referring to Part 11.

We would appreciate being notified of the Borough Council’s decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

TAK:dwb

cc: Kelli J. Scarlett, Director of Building and Zoning (via email)
    John Davis, Borough Manager (via email)
    Jordan B. Yeager, Esq., Curtin & Heefner, LLP
    Karyn Hyland, P.E., Gilmore & Associates
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

March 4, 2015
BCPC #9-15-1(P)

MEMORANDUM

TO: Doylestown Township Board of Supervisors
Doylestown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Private Request for Zoning Ordinance Amendment—Motor Vehicle Fueling Center Use
Applicant: Buckingham Retail Properties, LLC
Received: February 9, 2015
Hearing Date: Not set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on March 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend zoning ordinance Section 175-175.16.E Retail and Services Uses by creating a new Use E-20 Motor Vehicle Fueling Center. Section 175-77.2.C would also be amended by adding Use E-20 Motor Vehicle Fueling Center and existing Use E-2 Large Retail Store as conditional uses in the C-4 Office and Medical Professional District. Special criteria applicable to these conditional uses is proposed to be added in a new zoning ordinance Section 175-77.5.

Proposed Zoning Ordinance Provisions: Use E-20 Motor Vehicle Fueling Center would be generally defined to include the sale of various food items, newspapers, tobacco, legal lottery sales, motor vehicle fuels and minor automotive accessories, and similar product lines. Conditional use provisions for Uses E-2 and E-20 would require that properties have frontage on an arterial road and a minimum lot size of 3 acres. The application of other zoning regulation for building and impervious coverage, parking, loading, landscaping as well as required area, width, and yard regulations shall apply to the entire lot. Required setbacks would be incorporated from street centerlines, lot lines, principal buildings, and trash enclosures.
Special provisions would be applicable to Use E-20 including 1 parking space for each 250 square feet of gross floor area, no drive-in windows, and the allowance for 24-hour operation provided deliveries and pick-ups do not occur between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. and that a minimum buffer or screen of 6 feet above grade is provided consisting of a decorative wall, fencing, or landscaping to screen adjoining residential properties and to inhibit light generated on site from traversing off the site.

Existing Zoning Ordinance Provisions: Use E-2 Large Retail Store (greater than 10,000 square feet of floor area) is permitted in the C-2 Commercial District on a minimum lot area of 2 acres. Use E-10 Service station (sale of petroleum, tires and automotive services) is permitted in the C-1 Commercial District on a minimum lot area of 1 acre. Convenience shopping is permitted as an accessory use provided that: 1) it is provided in lieu of the sale of tires and automotive services, 2) the use not occupy more than 50% of the service station building.

COMMENTS

We recommend that township officials consider the following comments prior to taking action on the proposed amendment:

1. **Area of C-4 district to allow uses**—The amendment as written appears to apply to all areas zoned C-4 as long as the proposed uses meet the dimensional standards and conditional use requirements. However, according to the zoning map shown on Appendix A of the petition, it appears that the proposed ordinance is intended to apply to only one area of the C-4 zoning district which contains two parcels (TMPs #9-6-25 and 9-6-26) consisting of approximately 9 acres located at the intersection of Ferry and Swamp roads. This zoning issue should be clarified by municipal officials since it appears other areas of the C-4 district could also accommodate these uses as proposed in the amendment, since many lots in the C-4 district have access to an arterial road (see comment 2 below).

2. **Intent of C-4 zoning district**—The intent of the C-4 Office and Medical Professional zoning district is to provide for professional offices and medical facilities needed to serve the Township and surrounding area. The proposal to add a retail component such as a convenience store provided within Use E-20 and Use E-2 Large Retail Store (10,000 square feet or more) by conditional use is not consistent with the intent of the zoning district nor with the existing uses already contained within the four general areas of C-4 zoning within the township (situated along Route 313 and in the vicinity of Route 202 and the Route 611 Bypass). The proposal for a motor vehicle fueling station is also inconsistent with the stated intent of the C-4 district.

We note that much of the land within the C-4 districts has been developed with offices and medical uses, and except for possibly some small-scale retail services, it is not clear from the proposal how the introduction of large retail businesses and fueling stations will complement the needs of office and medical facilities. We therefore recommend that township officials consider associated impacts that these proposed uses could have on existing uses within the C-4 district, as well as the surrounding area, especially given the proposal for 24-hour service of a motor vehicle fueling center/convenience store and its associated parking, lighting, and noise impacts, and large retail store with drive-through facilities. If it is determined that allowing some retail associated with the office and medical uses would be beneficial in the...
C-4 district, we suggest that the scale and integration of such use be considered and regulated accordingly.

3. **Use E-20 Motor vehicle fueling center**—Use E-10 Service Station is a similar use to proposed Use E-20 and is currently permitted in the township’s C-1 district. One difference between this use and proposed Use E-20 is that convenience shopping is allowed accessory to the service station (50% of the building area) and that proposed Use E-20 would not permit the auto repair service portion with a fueling station. No minimum building size is provided in the proposal for Use E-20, whereas the C-1 district permits a Retail Shop (Use E-1) with a limited building area of 10,000 square feet or less.

We note that there may be merit to adding a new use that permits both a fueling station and convenience retail store in keeping with current business development trends. We also note that here has been trend toward gas station cuisine, similar to the model used by Wawa. One of the driving forces for this trend is that eateries are looking to gas stations for low start-up costs and a little bit of kitsch\(^1\) while gas stations have been a low-margin business for a long time. Owners typically make their real profits not on fuel sales but on the snacks and other items customers purchase when they come inside the station. The latest gas station eateries are just taking that business model up a notch or two.\(^2\)

With these trends in mind, we suggest that township officials evaluate the need to provide for such use and also determine the appropriate zoning district(s) to permit said use in, either by right, special exception or conditional use. Since gas station and small retail shop (10,000 square feet or less) uses are already permitted in the C-1 district, permitting such use in this district may be appropriate verses the proposal to include it in the C-4 district.

4. **Other use regulations to consider**—If township officials decide to allow a new use E-20 or some variation thereof, and also to permit Use E-2 Large retail store in the C-4 district, we suggest the following issues be addressed:

   a. **Building size**—We recommended that a building size limitation be provided for Use E-20 since it does not appear a big box store with fueling station is the intended outcome. If permitted, we suggest limiting the size to that of use E-1 Retail shop or some other reasonable standard. We note that allowing Use E-2 Large Retail Store of greater than 10,000 square feet could result in a big box store type of development; and therefore, should be adequately addressed as part of the proposed zoning amendment.

   b. **Outdoor signage and audio advertisement at the fuel pump**—Many fueling stations contain printed and/or audio commercial signage on the pumping station for products other than fuel. Township officials should decide to what extent these messages should be permitted. In addition, if determined to be allowed, standards for

\(^1\) [http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/gas-station-restaurants-are-becoming-the-next-big-thing-in-cuisine/2013/09/28/a49a6124-26e9-11e3-ad0d-b7c8d2a594b9_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/gas-station-restaurants-are-becoming-the-next-big-thing-in-cuisine/2013/09/28/a49a6124-26e9-11e3-ad0d-b7c8d2a594b9_story.html)

 audible emitting signs or screens and all outdoor noise generators associated with the business (except as needed for disabled and the seeing impaired) should be identified by the applicant during conditional use permit review. Allowable hours of outdoor speakers and video/audio pump stations and sound signals associated with the fueling stations should be considered and possibly regulated to be turned off daily between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. similar to delivery and pick-up restrictions.

c. **Drive-through facility**—Drive-in windows are prohibited for Use E-20. However, the conditional use standards are silent regarding drive-in windows for Use E-2 Large retail store. Therefore, this issue should be clarified in any proposed amendment since it appears that drive-through facilities are only permitted in the township when associated with a restaurant or bank in the C-2 district.

We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

CHG:dwb

cc: Buckingham Retail Properties
    Eastburn and Gray, P.C.
    Jeffrey P. Garton, Esq., Township Solicitor (via email)
    Stephanie J. Mason, Township Manager (via email)
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

March 4, 2015
BCPC #13-15-1

MEMORANDUM

TO: Falls Township Board of Supervisors
   Falls Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Flood Hazard Areas

Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: February 18, 2015
Hearing Date: April 7, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on March 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to comply with the updated floodplain regulations required by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

Proposed Zoning Provisions: Remove the existing floodplain regulations found in Section 33 Flood Hazard Areas will be addressed by a stand-alone floodplain ordinance (Chapter 131 of the Township Code).

COMMENTS

We recommend that the township adopt the proposal as submitted since it appears to be consistent with the ordinance requirements as presented by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and FEMA.

Visit us at: www.buckscounty.org
We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

TAK:dwb

cc: Michael Clarke, Esq., Rudolph, Clarke, LLC, Township Solicitor
    James Sullivan, P.E., Township Engineer
    Peter Gray, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Falls Township Board of Supervisors
Falls Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Township Buildings
TMP#: 13-5-3
Owner: Falls Township
Applicant: Same
Plan Dated: No date
Date Received: February 5, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Section 305 and 502 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal has been sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The professional staff prepared the following review, which was endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at its meeting on March 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: The township proposes to demolish the existing municipal building and replace it with two new principal buildings and an ancillary building totaling 55,205 square feet: a municipal/police building, a public works building, and two pole buildings. The buildings are to be situated on a parcel of 13.671 acres, which is served by public water and sewerage systems.

Location: Along the south side of Lincoln Highway (Business Route 1), at Commerce Boulevard.

Zoning: IN Institutional District and HC Highway Commercial District. Government offices and other municipal uses are permitted uses in the IN district on a minimum lot of 40,000 square feet. The HC District allows a range of predominantly commercial uses, but government uses are not among the listed permitted uses.

Present use: Institutional
COMMENTS

1. **General information**—According to Section 209-48.1 of the zoning ordinance, a municipal building or use is permitted in any district subject to the specific requirements of the respective zoning districts. The subject plan should be revised to show how the plan meets the requirements of the IN and HC districts. In addition, the plan should be revised to comply with the general information standards of Section 191-77.B.4 of the subdivision and land development ordinances, specifically, information on zoning classification and boundaries of the parcel and dimensional requirements.

2. **Split zoning**—Part of the parcel apparently lies in the IN Institutional District, and the remainder in the HC Highway Commercial District. (The zoning of the parcel is not noted on the plan.) We recommend that the township consider rezoning the HC portion of the parcel to IN, if public use is anticipated. It is not clear whether the “future pole building” depicted on the HC section of the parcel is a permitted accessory use under the HC District regulations of Section 209-23 of the zoning ordinance.

3. **Lots**—Lots numbered 4, 5, 6, and 7 are labeled on the plan. It is not clear whether any future subdivision of the parcel is envisioned.

4. **Site capacity calculations**—The plan should be revised to include natural resource determinations and effective protection ratios in compliance with SALDO Section 191.52.1, so that compliance with natural resource preservation standards can be confirmed.

5. **Landscaping**—Township officials should confirm that project landscaping meets the following ordinance requirements.
   
   a. **General landscaping**—Under Section 209-22.F(2) of the zoning ordinance, the first 20 feet next to the street line shall not be used for parking and shall be planted and maintained as lawn, ground cover, or landscaped with evergreen shrubbery separated from the parking area by curbing. Parking lies within 20 feet of the Lincoln Highway street line. Under Section 209-22F(5) all improved areas not used for buildings, parking, loading, access aisles, driveways or walkways shall be landscaped with shrubs, ground cover, grass or similar plantings.

   b. **Parking area landscaping**—Section 209-22B(3) of the zoning ordinance requires each off-street parking area to have the equivalent of at least one parking space for every 30 landscaped with ground cover, trees or shrubs, and for such spaces to be distributed throughout the parking area. Sections 191-37.G.1 and 2 of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) requires the installation of curbed raised planting beds with one shade tree at intervals of no more than 20 parking spaces. SALDO Section 191-37.G.4 requires parking areas to have at least one tree of 1½-inch minimum caliper for every 6 parking spaces in single rows, and one for every 12 parking spaces in double-loaded rows.

   CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE
c. **Street trees**—SALDO Section 191-48.A requires street trees to be planted along the sides of all streets where suitable ones do not exist.

6. **Off-street loading**—The plan should be revised to depict off-street loading facilities in compliance with Section 209-22.H of the zoning ordinance.


8. **Traffic impact study**—SALDO Section 191-30.I(5) requires a traffic impact study for any institutional land development of 25,000 square feet or more of floor space. The study should include site access points and internal circulation as well as the impact on adjoining roads and intersections.

9. **Parking**

   a. **Number of spaces**—The basis for the parking calculations for this use is unclear, as the zoning regulations for the IN District reference the parking standards of Section 209-22.F of the zoning ordinance, which do not specify parking requirements for general institutional or governmental uses. Township officials should ensure that the number and location of spaces are adequate for staff, visitors, and any necessary parking and storage of township vehicles and equipment.

   b. **Accessible spaces**—Township official should confirm that the proposal includes enough disabled-accessible parking spaces according to the guidelines of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the township’s Design Details and Practices. Two of the accessible spaces depicted on the preliminary plan are not located directly next to the adjacent building. These spaces should be on an accessible pathway close to the nearest accessible door, in order for them to be usable by the drivers and passengers who need them.

10. **Sidewalk**—For pedestrian safety and convenience, we recommend that a walkway system be extended throughout the site, rather than confined to a section of the parking area nearest the main entrance.

11. **Stormwater management**—Township officials should confirm that stormwater management techniques will confirm to the water quality provisions and other requirements of the municipal stormwater management ordinance.

12. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.
We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter.

GF:dwb

cc: Tom Beach, Remington, Vernick & Beach
    Jim Sullivan, T&M Associates
    Peter Gray, Township Manager (via e-mail)
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

March 4, 2015
BCPC #20-15-1

MEMORANDUM

TO: Lower Makefield Township Board of Supervisors
Lower Makefield Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—HARB provisions
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: January 28, 2015
Meeting Date: February 18, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on March 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend Appendix B of the zoning ordinance pertaining to membership on the township’s Historical Architectural Review Board (HARB) regulations.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: Specifically, the proposed amendment would revise Appendix B, Sections 6, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, and 18 to replace references to the “Code Enforcement Officer” with the “Lower Makefield Township Building Inspector.” Also, Appendix B, Section 6 would be revised to state that the Building Inspector of the Township of Lower Makefield need not be a resident of the Township of Lower Makefield prior to or during the course of his/her appointment to the HARB.

Existing Zoning Provisions: Existing regulations in Appendix B list the Code Enforcement Officer of Lower Makefield Township as one of the seven members appointed to the HARB by the Board of Supervisors. Currently, the only HARB members not required to be residents of the township are the registered architect and the licensed real estate broker.
COMMENTS

We recognize that the proposal is consistent with the Pennsylvania Historic District Act (Act 167 of 1961, as amended), the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Act 247 of 1968, as amended), and applicable comprehensive plans. We recommend that the Lower Makefield Township Board of Supervisors adopt the proposed amendment with consideration of the following comment:

- The amendment proposes to remove any reference to “Code Enforcement Officer” as related to membership on the HARB, and in lieu thereof insert the words “Lower Makefield Township Building Inspector.” For consistency, it is recommended that Section 15 of Appendix B (Disapproval of application for building permit; appeal) also be included in the list of sections proposed to replace the reference from “Code Enforcement Officer” to “Lower Makefield Township Building Inspector.”

We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

LMW:dwb

cc: Terry Fedorchak, Lower Makefield Township Manager (via email)
    Steve Ware, Keystone Consulting Services
    Jeffrey P. Garton, Township Solicitor
MEMORANDUM

TO: New Britain Township Board of Supervisors
New Britain Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Low Impact Assembly Use

Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: February 9, 2015
Hearing Date: March 16, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal has been sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at its meeting on March 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Actions: Amend various sections of the zoning ordinance in order to add a new light industrial land use, Low Impact Assembly, as follows:

- Amend Subsection K of Section 27-305 of the zoning ordinance to include a definition, conditional use restrictions, building standards, dimensional requirements, nuisance impact regulations, and floor area standards for the new K20 Low Impact Assembly Use; and

- Amend Subsection 27-1801.c of the zoning ordinance and Attachment 2 to allow the Low Impact Assembly Use as a conditional use in the C-2 Commercial District, I Industrial District, and the IO Industrial/Office District; and

- Amend Subsection 27-2901.K of the zoning ordinance to add standards for the Low Impact Assembly Use to the list of off-street parking requirements for industrial uses.

The proposed amendment would also revise Attachment 2 of the zoning ordinance to correct a typographical error for the J11 Indoor Athletic Club Use.
COMMENTS

We recognize that the proposal appears to be generally consistent with ordinance requirements as presented by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, but we offer this comment for consideration by the township before the amendment is adopted:

- **Loading facilities**—Proposed Section 27-305.K.20.e of the ordinance amendment references a “loading dock.” Since it is likely that this light industrial use type will necessitate some form of off-street loading facilities, we suggest that the township consider the utility of adding greater specificity to the zoning ordinance standards for loading facilities for the use. For example, the J32 Neighborhood Commercial Center Use requires loading and unloading areas for each building to be provided “along the rear of the building, subject to approval by the board of supervisors during the conditional use hearing.” The K15 Industrial Park Use requires parking, loading facilities and outside storage to be located to the “rear or side of buildings.”

We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

GF:dwb

cc: Peter Nelson, Township Solicitor
    Eileen Bradley, Township Manager (via e-mail)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Northampton Township Board of Supervisors
    Northampton Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Sketch Plan of Land Development for Holland Middle School
    TMP #31-35-5
    Applicant: Council Rock School District
    Owner: Same
    Plan Dated: February 10, 2015
    Date Received: February 18, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 305 and 502 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on March 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct building additions totaling 40,596 square feet to the existing Holland Middle School on a 15.78-acre site. The site will be served by public water and sewerage.

Location: Southwest of the intersection of East Holland and Buck roads.

Zoning: The IP Institutional/Public District permits public schools by conditional use. Permitted uses in this district must comply with the most restrictive controls as required for the nearest adjacent and abutting zoning district. The most restrictive abutting zoning district is the R-2 Residential zoning district, which permits uses other than a single-family detached dwelling on a minimum lot area of 40,000 square feet with a minimum lot width of 150 feet.
Present Use: Institutional.

COMMENTS

1. **Conditional use**—The proposal requires conditional use approval in accordance with Section 27-802B.7 of the zoning ordinance.

2. **Impervious surface ratio**—The plan is proposing an increase in the impervious surface ratio to 16.6 percent, which is greater than the maximum required amount. Permitted uses in this district must comply with the most restrictive controls as required for the nearest adjacent and abutting zoning district. The most restrictive abutting zoning district is the R-2 Residential zoning district, which has a maximum impervious surface ratio of 12 percent (Section 27-406.2B of the zoning ordinance). The plan should be revised accordingly.

3. **Stormwater management**—The plan proposes an increase in impervious surface. The township should ensure that the applicant submits a stormwater management plan in accordance with Section 23-301 of the Stormwater Management and Grading ordinance.

4. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the March 4, 2015, public meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the Bucks County Planning Commission board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MAR:dwb

cc: Council Rock School District  
Schradergroup Architecture, LLC  
Terraform Engineering  
Consolidated Engineers, Inc.  
Mike Solomon, Director of Planning and Zoning (via email)  
Robert Pellegrino, Township Manager (via email)

CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE
MEMORANDUM

TO: Perkasie Borough Council
   Perkasie Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Regulations

Applicant: Borough Council
Received: February 6, 2015
Hearing Date: March 16, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on March 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Several sections of the zoning ordinance will be amended to provide consistency with revisions being made to Chapter 94 of the Borough Code of Ordinances, pertaining to floodplain regulations, which will ensure compliance with new FEMA floodplain regulations. Section 186-5 will be amended to remove the terms and definitions for Flood, Flood Elevation, Flood Fringe, Flood Line, 100-year Flood, Floodplain, Floodplains, Floodplain Soils, Regulatory Flood, Flood Way, and Flood Way Line. Section 186-10 will be revised to reference the new FEMA Floodplain Maps with an effective date of March 16, 2015, and remove the existing floodplain map. Section 186-11.B pertaining to floodplain district boundary interpretation and identification will be removed. Section 186-20.K will be revised to provide a new purpose statement with reference to Chapter 94.

COMMENTS

We recognize that the proposal is consistent with the applicable comprehensive plan and municipal ordinances and commend the borough for taking steps to adopt revised floodplain ordinance provisions in compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program and Flood Insurance Rate Maps;
however, we recommend that borough officials consider the following comments before adopting the proposal:

1. **Floodplain terms and definitions**—The proposed amendment deletes several floodplain related terms in Section 186-5 of the zoning ordinance; however, the terms Flood, Floodplain(s) and Floodplain Soils are used in several other sections of the ordinance, particularly in sections 186-56 and 186-57 pertaining to site capacity calculations and environmental performance standards. We recommend that these three terms be retained to ensure proper interpretation of the ordinance.

   Based on discussions with a representative of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, we recommend borough officials consider changing the term Floodplain Soils to Soils on Floodplains. If the term Floodplain Soils is changed, other sections within the zoning ordinance using this term should likewise be amended.

2. **Floodplain boundary**—The proposal indicates that Section 186-10 will be revised to reference the new FEMA floodplain maps; however it does not express the specific language that will go into this section. We recommend that the proposal be revised to specify how the revision to Section 186-10 will be written.

We would appreciate being notified of the Borough Council’s decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

TAK:dwb

cc: Gilmore & Associates, Borough Engineer
    Nate Fox, Esq., Begley, Carlin & Mandio, LLP, Borough Solicitor
    Andrea Coaxum, Borough Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Richland Township Board of Supervisors
    Richland Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Airport Overlay District and Airport Overlay Zoning Map
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: January 26, 2015
Hearing Date: Not indicated

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held March 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the township’s zoning ordinance by establishing an Airport Overlay District to regulate and restrict the height of newly built or installed structures and trees, and to otherwise regulate land use, in order to reduce the potential hazards to air navigation in the vicinity of the Quakertown and Pennridge airports. The township zoning map will be amended correspondingly to adopt an official airport zoning overlay map that incorporates regulatory features of the amendment to the zoning ordinance.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: A new zoning ordinance section, Chapter 27, Part 7, would be created. It includes provisions for definitions, airport zones, permits, variances, nonconforming structures, objects, or uses, and marking and lighting of potential obstructions to aviation. The supplementary zoning map would consist of Figure I: Part 77 Surface Areas, Quakertown airport surface Areas, and Pennridge Airport surface Areas.
COMMENTS

The proposed zoning ordinance amendment, a revised version of an airport overlay district amendment previously submitted to our office and reviewed as BCPC #36-14-2, December 3, 2014, serves to advance airport safety within the township and the region. It appears to be broadly consistent with the ordinance requirements as prescribed by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and applicable case law. Amending both the zoning ordinance and the map at the same time maintains consistency between the two sets of regulations and promotes compliance.

We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

GF:dwb

cc: Lincoln Treadwell, Township Solicitor
    Steven Sechriest, Township Manager (via e-mail)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Silverdale Borough Council
Silverdale Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Zoning Hearing Board Membership
Applicant: Silverdale Borough Council
Received: February 25, 2015
Hearing Date: Not indicated.

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on March 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend Section 340-96 of the borough zoning ordinance to revise the provisions for Zoning Hearing Board membership, terms of office, and alternate members.

Current Zoning Provisions: The current zoning ordinance does not provide for the appointment of alternate members.

COMMENTS

The proposed amendment appears to be consistent with the Zoning Hearing Board membership provisions as prescribed in Section 903 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code. Therefore, we recommend that the borough adopt the proposed revisions.
We would appreciate being notified of Borough Council’s decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

MMW:dwb

cc: Colby Grim, Esq., Grim, Biehn & Thatcher, Borough Solicitor
    Lisa Herrmann, Borough Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Springfield Township Board of Supervisors
Springfield Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan for Lot Line Change and County Land Acquisition
TMP #42-22-60 & 73
Applicant: William M. Mitchell, Bucks County Parks and Recreation
Owner: David H. Vickery and Suzanne A. Leeson
Plan Dated: February 10, 2015
Date Received: February 13, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 502 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on March 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Convey an area of 12.018 acres from TMP #42-22-73 (17.018 acres) to TMP #42-22-60 (1.968 acres). As a result of the conveyance, TMP #42-22-60 will be 13.986 gross acres and TMP #42-22-73 will be 5.000 gross acres (4.920 net acres). No further development is proposed at this time. Once the lot line adjustment is complete, TMP #42-22-60 will be acquired and preserved by the Bucks County Department of Parks and Recreation.

Location: Along Indian Way (private road), approximately 1,200 feet north of Buckwampum Road.

Zoning: The RP—Resource Protection District requires a minimum lot area of 3 acres. A 200-foot minimum lot width, 40-foot side yards (each) and 60-foot front and rear yards are also required.

Present Use: Residential/wooded
Existing Features: The area contained within the proposed TMP #42-22-60 is currently wooded.

**COMMENTS**

- **Access easement**—According to the plans, a stone driveway serving adjacent TMP #42-22-75 appears to traverse a portion of the proposed area for TMP #42-22-60. No access easement is shown on the plans. We recommend that if an access easement does not exist for TMP #42-22-75, one be formalized and included with the plan submission.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions concerning this land acquisition proposal.

RGB:dwb

cc: William M. Mitchell, Bucks County Parks and Recreation  
David H. Vickery  
Suzanne A. Leeson  
Mcase Engineering, P.C.  
C. Robert Wynn Associates (via email)  
Michael Brown, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warwick Township Board of Supervisors
    Warwick Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Ordinance
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: February 6, 2015
Hearing Date: March 16, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on March 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Remove the existing floodplain regulations found in Chapter 195, Article XXVI of the zoning ordinance that will be addressed by a newly adopted stand-alone floodplain ordinance going into effect on March 16, 2015. Section 9 will be amended to revise the definition of Floodplain and to add the definition of Identified Floodplain Area. Several sections will be revised to reference the new stand-alone floodplain ordinance. Several other sections will be revised to reference the term Identified Floodplain Area.

COMMENTS

We recognize that the proposal is consistent with the applicable comprehensive plan and municipal ordinances and commend the township for taking steps to adopt a new stand-alone floodplain ordinance in compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program and Flood Insurance Rate Maps; however, we recommend that township officials consider the following comments before adopting the proposal:

Visit us at: www.buckscounty.org
1. **Floodplain soils protection standard**—The amendment is proposing to revise Section 60.B to read:

   Floodplain Soils: Any alteration, regarding, filling, or building upon areas containing Floodplain Soils shall be done in accordance with the provisions of the Warwick Township Floodplain Ordinance.

   However, the new stand-alone Warwick Township Floodplain Ordinance does not specifically address floodplain soils. We believe protection of these natural resources should be addressed separately in the zoning ordinance when they are not part of a identified floodplain area. As such, we recommend that Section 60.B be revised to read as follows:

   Floodplain soils. All such areas shall not be altered, regraded, filled, or built upon. Roads and utilities may cross floodplain soils where design approval is obtained from the Township and the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection and where no other reasonable access is available. Floodplain soils shall not be used where a floodplain has been delineated in accordance with the Warwick Township Floodplain Ordinance.

2. **Floodplain soils definition**—Based on discussions with a representative of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, we recommend township officials consider changing the term “Floodplain Soils” in Section 195-9 of the zoning ordinance to “Soils on Floodplains” and revise the definition so that it has no specific listing of soils.

   Other sections within the zoning ordinance using this the term “Floodplain Soils” (e.g., Section 60.B – discussed above) should likewise be amended.

3. **Editorial**—We recommend that the term “Identified Floodplain Ordinance” in Section 60.A should be changed to “Identified Floodplain Area” consistent with the new term being added to the definitions section (Section 9).

   We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

   RM: dwb

   cc: Mary Eberle, Esq., Grim, Biehn & Thatcher (via email)
   Gail Weniger, Warwick Township Manager (via email)
   Kyle Seckinger, Assistant Township Manager (via email)
   Judith A. Algeo, Esq., Warwick Township Chair Board of Supervisors
   Bryan McAdams, P.E., CKS Engineers, Inc.

   CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warwick Township Board of Supervisors
Warwick Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance—Floodplain Definition
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: February 6, 2015
Hearing Date: March 16, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 505 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on March 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the subdivision and land development ordinance, Chapter 163, to revise and/or delete floodplain regulations and revise the amount of topsoil required for final grading and seeding. The definitions of Designated Floodplain District, Floodplain, Floodplain Soils, One Hundred-Year Flood and Regulatory Flood Elevation will be revised from Section 11 and Section 56 of the Warwick Township Code of Ordinances will be deleted in its entirety.

COMMENTS

We recommend that the township adopt the proposal as submitted since it appears to be consistent with the ordinance requirements as presented by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and FEMA.
We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 505(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

RM:dwb

cc: Mary Eberle, Esq., Grim, Biehn & Thatcher (via email)
    Gail Weniger, Warwick Township Manager (via email)
    Kyle Seckinger, Assistant Township Manager (via email)
    Judith A. Algeo, Esq., Warwick Township Chair Board of Supervisors
    Bryan McAdams, P.E., CKS Engineers, Inc.
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

March 4, 2015
BCPC #54-15-1

MEMORANDUM

TO: Yardley Borough Council
Yardley Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance—
Code Adoption Ordinances
Applicant: Borough Council
Received: February 4, 2015
Hearing Date: Not set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 505 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on March 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Adopt Chapter 22 Subdivision and Land Development as part of the Borough of Yardley Code of Ordinances.

Proposed Ordinance Provisions: The codification of Chapter 22 Subdivision and Land Development will incorporate the existing subdivision and land development ordinance provisions (Chapter 97 Subdivision of Land) and its amendments.

COMMENTS

The Bucks County Planning Commission commends borough officials for undertaking the organizational measures needed to update the entire Borough of Yardley Code of Ordinances. It appears the incorporation of the subdivision and land development regulations into the proposed Code of Ordinances is consistent with the requirements prescribed by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (PaMPC), applicable comprehensive plans, existing municipal ordinances, and applicable case law.

Through a general review of the entire Chapter 22 Subdivision and Land Development, it appears that the land use document is substantially consistent with the existing requirements and provisions provided in Chapter 97 Subdivision of Land, as amended. We note however, that our office copy of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance may not contain all of the integrated amendments.
provisions cited in the codification update. Therefore, the applicability of the following comments should be examined regarding any possible inconsistencies between the section regulations proposed to be contained in Chapter 22.

1. **References**—We note that some agency and section references appear to be incorrect pursuant to the PaMPC provisions. It is recommended that borough officials carefully review the entire Chapter prior to its incorporation into the code to ensure proper references are made to applicable agencies and section cross-references. The following provides some provisions borough officials may want to update or revise:

   - In Sections 201, 202, 411.2, and 522.5.H and Part 6 (Required Improvements) references are made to the county and borough planning commissions. Some of the references in these sections regarding the applicable planning commission are not correct. Also, in the instances that involve borough approval, we believe the council should be referenced, not the planning commission. In addition, Section 201.2 states a 45-day timeframe is provided for review of subdivision and land developments while the PaMPC permits a timeframe of 30 days for the county planning commission to provide comments to a municipality. Sections 602.2 and 801.1 states in part that the Yardley Borough Planning Commission may grant a variance.

   - We believe the reference to the borough planning commission under the term Re-subdivision in the definition Section 302 should be to borough council, since the council is the approval entity. In addition, the definition of streetline refers to Section 507. We believe the intended reference is 506. Likewise, Section 609.1 should refer to Section 506 rather than 507. We also believe the reference for fees in Section 422.A(3) should be 423 and not 424.

   - We believe that Ordinance 342 repealed Section 503.e(2) regarding standards for community facilities. This provision is contained in Section 503.5.B of Chapter 22. Also, we believe the wording in Section 511.2 of the chapter should read ...permitted natural watercourse, rather than natural permitted watercourse.

2. **County copy of plan**—Section 432.2.C should be revised to require only one copy of plan to be submitted to the county planning commission.

3. **Parking standards**—The 10-foot width indicated for a planting strip in Section 517.3 should be revised to 5 feet as previously amended and shown on the associated diagram. In addition, the parking standards (e.g., parking stall depth and width, driveway width) contained on the diagram and on the chart in Subsection 5 are not consistent with the requirements contained in Chapter 27 – Zoning, Section 1022. Therefore, we recommend that the parking standards in both land use ordinances be reviewed and subsequently revised to be consistent with one another. There may also be a benefit to deleting any duplication of parking regulations contained in both ordinances.

4. **Street trees**—We recommend that the street tree plant list in Sections 521.8 and 9 should be reviewed and updated as necessary. The Norway maple should be deleted due to its invasive nature and the White ash should be removed due to the spread of the Emerald Ash Borer in Pennsylvania.
5. **Record plan**—Section 705.2.C(7) requires the signature of the Chairman and Executive Director of the Yardley Borough Planning Commission. Since Subsection 4 already requires borough planning commission signatures, and the Executive Director is defined in Section 302 as the Executive Director of the Bucks County Planning Commission, we believe Subsection 7 is intended to require a signature from a designated person from the county planning commission indicating that the plan was reviewed as required. Therefore, we recommend that Subsection 7 be revised accordingly.

6. **Modification of requirements**—Sections 616.A through G relate to standards for modification of the subdivision and land development ordinance provisions rather than capped sewers. We believe these provisions are intended for inclusion in Section 706. The provisions of Part 8 should also be reviewed in conjunction with the modification requirements and procedures sections. We believe that the Sections 801, 802 and 803 may no longer be relevant given the reorganization and update to proposed Chapter 22.

We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 505(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

CHG:dwb

c: Jordan B. Yeager, Esq., Curtin & Heefner, Borough Solicitor
    John Boyles, Borough Manager (via email)
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

March 4, 2015
BCPC #54-15-2

MEMORANDUM

TO: Yardley Borough Council
    Yardley Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Code Adoption Ordinances
        Applicant: Borough Council
        Received: February 4, 2015
        Hearing Date: Not set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304, 608, and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on March 4, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Adopt Chapter 27 Zoning as amended as part of the Borough of Yardley Code of Ordinances.

Proposed Ordinance Provisions: The codification of Chapter 27 Zoning includes incorporation of the zoning ordinance (Chapter 122), zoning map (dated 2008), and adopted amendments. Minor clarifications and reference updates have been provided in various sections of the Chapter including definitions, natural resource revisions, signage, and violation and penalties.

COMMENTS

The Bucks County Planning Commission commends borough officials for undertaking the organizational measures needed to update the Borough of Yardley Code of Ordinances. It appears the zoning chapter update is consistent with the ordinance requirements as prescribed by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (PaMPC), applicable comprehensive plans, and existing municipal ordinances.

Through a general review of the entire Chapter 27 Zoning, it appears that the land use document is substantially consistent and up-to-date with the existing ordinance requirements and provisions, and includes previously adopted zoning amendments. We note however, that our copy of the zoning ordinance may not contain some of the integrated amendments provisions cited in the codification update. The comments provided below are intended to help point out possible inconsistencies.
between section regulations to ensure the correct standard is contained in Chapter 27 of the codified ordinance. The applicability of the following comments should be examined in conjunction with the codification and recommended updates:

1. **Comprehensive plan reference**—Section 27-101.F cites the previous borough comprehensive plan of July 11, 1989. The newly adopted plan should be referenced in this section. To avoid citing outdated documents in ordinances, we suggest that language be added to include as amended or revised to such noted documents.

   In addition, subsection C regarding the preservation of prime agriculture and farmland, should be reevaluated for inclusion under the borough’s zoning ordinance purpose since the updated comprehensive plan did not emphasize farming activities within the community.

2. **Definition of family**—We suggest that the definition of family in Section 111.2 (Ordinance 435), be reviewed to ensure it is compatible with applicable case law and the Fair Housing Act. The definition limits the number of unrelated individuals living together as a family to five, which may restrict non-traditional families.

3. **Uses**—We recommend that Section 603 Home Occupation be revised to include a no-impact home occupation as outlined in the PaMPC. Borough officials should also ensure that other legitimate uses (i.e., adult entertainment) required by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are addressed in the codified ordinance if they are not contained in the zoning chapter.

4. **General sound Standards**—The R-3A Traditional Neighborhood Development District should be added to the dBA rating table in Section 726.2.

5. **Plant material list**—We recommend that the screening standards plant list in Section J.748.B(2) be reviewed and updated to include native species of trees. Invasive plants should be deleted from this list, including the Norway maple, Bradford pear, winged euonymus and Glossy buckthorn. In addition, White ash should be removed due to the spread of the Emerald Ash Borer in Pennsylvania.

6. **Wireless Towers Facilities**—We recommend that Part 7.M and Section 1315.D(2) Cellular Towers Facilities be reviewed and updated as necessary to ensure compliance with the most recent Telecommunications Act.

7. **Political signs**—We suggest that Section 1213.A regarding political sign size and time-frame for posting be reviewed to ensure it is compatible with federal and state law.

We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 608 and 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

CHG:dwb

cc: Jordan B Yeager, Esq., Curtin & Heefner, Borough Solicitor
    John Boyles, Borough Manager (via email)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number(s)</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Submission Level</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedminster Township</td>
<td>12057</td>
<td>1-4-5-2</td>
<td>RVC Investments, LLC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2 Commercial Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham Township</td>
<td>6517-C</td>
<td>6-10-184-2</td>
<td>Watson's Creek</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Township</td>
<td>4589-C</td>
<td>13-28-22-4</td>
<td>Extra Space Storage</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>2 Commercial Lots Office Land Development: 1,200 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Township</td>
<td>12024</td>
<td>13-3-8-6</td>
<td>38 Cabot Boulevard</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Industrial Land Development: 14,115 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiltown Township</td>
<td>10152-A</td>
<td>15-17-79</td>
<td>Coulter</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain Township</td>
<td>12058</td>
<td>26-4-70-3</td>
<td>Worthington</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown Township</td>
<td>10285-A</td>
<td>29-10-40-1, -42, -05, &amp;-86</td>
<td>First Evergreen</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2 Commercial Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkasie Borough</td>
<td>5301-A</td>
<td>33-14-43</td>
<td>Hidden Meadow</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>48 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bedminster Township Board of Supervisors
   Bedminster Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for RVC Investments, LLC
         TMP #1-4-5-2
         Applicant: RVC Investments, LLC
         Owner: Same
         Plan Dated: October 17, 2014
         Last Revised: January 20, 2015
         Date Received: January 21, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a 5.371-gross-acre parcel that contains a restaurant and a garage use into two lots.

Lot 1, containing the garage, carport, and a shed, would be 4.21 net acres (excluding lane). No water or sewerage facilities exist or are proposed for Lot 1. Lot 2, containing the restaurant and 17 parking spaces, would be 0.89 net acres. Lot 2 is served by an on-lot well and sewage storage tank. A utility and access easement are proposed on portions of both lots along the existing driveway in the vicinity of new side lot line.

Location: Between Schott and Blue School roads on the northeastern side of Route 313, across from the municipal boundary with Hilltown Township.

Zoning: The AP Agriculture Preservation District permits farming activities and single-family detached dwellings on various lot sizes depending on the use option chosen.

The plan indicates that variances were granted by the Zoning Hearing Board on September 17, 2014, regarding the provisions for lot area, lot width, and flag lot standards.

Present Use: Commercial.
COMMENTS

1. **Nonconforming uses**—The existing uses are not permitted in the AP district (restaurant and garage) and therefore are nonconforming. Variances regarding the required lot size, lot width, and setbacks were granted to allow the subdivision of the parcel into two lots, each containing one of the existing nonconforming uses.

The plan also notes 74 parking spaces are required for Use G-7 Eating Place and only 17 spaces are provided on Lot 2. Although the existing amount of parking for the restaurant is noted as nonconforming, there is area to provide additional parking on the parcel as it currently exists. The reduction in lot size as proposed, will alter the amount that could be accommodated on Lot 2 in the future. Also, the existing parking will not meet the 15-foot setback required along all boundary lines after subdivision (Section 523.3.B of the subdivision and land development ordinance). Therefore, given the proposal to subdivide the property, township officials should determine whether the proposed parking arrangement is acceptable.

2. **Waivers**—The plan notes that waivers from numerous provisions are requested from plan information requirements (contour and soil information) and from required improvements (road, driveway, parking access, landscaping, and bikeway) of the subdivision and land development due to the nature of the existing uses and facilities. In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, township officials should determine if these waivers from the subdivision ordinance provisions should be approved in whole or in part. For example, township officials should evaluate the need to better define ingress/egress and parking on the site and determine whether or not supplemental improvements or plantings may be beneficial.

3. **Water and sewage facilities**—The plan notes that a planning waiver and non-building declaration is requested for Lot 1 since no facilities currently exist for the garage (Lot 1). However, the applicant should submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposal.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the March 4, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

CHG:dwb

cc: RVC Investments, LLC
Van Cleef Engineering Associates
Thomas J. Fountain, P.E., Keystone Municipal Engineering
Richard H. Schilling, Township Manager (via email)
Hilltown Township (adjacent municipality) (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Buckingham Township Board of Supervisors
    Buckingham Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for Watson’s Creek
    TMP #6-10-184 and 6-10-184-2
    Applicant: Georgiana Coles
    Owner: Same
    Plan Dated: October 4, 2013
    Last Revised: February 13, 2015
    Date Received: February 17, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide an 18.97-acre tract into a 2 single-family detached residential lots. Lots 1 and 2 would be 8.490 acres (gross) and 10.14 acres (gross), respectively. On-lot water and wastewater facilities would serve the development.

Location: Northwest side of the intersection of York Road (S.R 263) and Mill Road.

Zoning: R1 Residential District, which permits single-family detached dwellings on a minimum lot area of 1.8 acres.

Present Use: Vacant
COMMENTS

We recommend that the plan be revised to address the following comments:

1. **Natural resources**—The natural resource tabulation on sheet 4 of the plan should be revised to indicate 1.519 acres of steep slopes, 15 to 25 percent, proposed for protection and 3.903 acres of forest proposed for protection. The proposed protection for these two resources as shown in the table are the result of subtracting the proposed disturbance from the required protection acreage versus the total resource area.

2. **Wetland transition buffer**—Township officials should determine if the plan should be revised to relocate the post and rail fence and the sewage system proposed for lot 2 outside of the area designated as the wetland transition line in accordance with Section 9.42.E of the subdivision and land development ordinance. There are other temporary structures such as retentive grading berm, tree protection fencing, super silt fencing, compost socks, and the topsoil stockpile on proposed lot 2 that officials should also consider when assessing the plan’s consistency with this section.

3. **Subdivision and land development ordinance requirements**—The plan may not meet, nor conform to certain other requirements of the subdivision and land development ordinance. We defer to the Knight Engineering, Inc. preliminary subdivision and land development plan review, and recommend that the applicant meet the applicable comments provided by the township engineer.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for their March 4, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

TAK:dwb

cc: Georgiana Coles
    Dan Gray, P.E., Knight Engineering, Inc., Township Engineer (via email)
    Dana S. Cozza, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Falls Township Board of Supervisors
    Falls Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Revised Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Extra Space Storage
      TMP #13-28-22-4
      Applicant: David Plante
      Owner: Extra Space of Morrisville
      Plan Dated: December 23, 2014
      Date Received: January 12, 2014

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a parcel of 10.2032 acres into two lots: one of 6.8135 acres (Lot 1) and one of 3.3888 acres (Lot 2). An existing building spans proposed Lots 1 and 2, and nine storage units ranging in size from 1,218 square feet to 6,158 square feet sit on proposed Lot 1. In addition, an office building of 1,200 square feet is proposed for construction on Lot 1. Public water and sewer serve the site.

Location: The northeast corner of Business Route 1 (Lincoln Highway) and West Trenton Avenue.

Zoning: HC, Highway Commercial District. The district permits a variety of commercial space uses on a lot of at least 40,000 square feet, with a maximum impervious surface ratio of 70 percent.

Present Use: Commercial.

COMMENT

- **Variances and waivers**—The plan should be revised to list all granted waivers and variances, as listed in Township Resolution #2014-34.
This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the March 4, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

GF:kjp

cc: Extra Space of Morrisville
    David Plante, Ruggiero Plante Land Design
    John DiBenedetto, Associates Architects, Inc.
    Jim Sullivan, T&M Associates, Township Engineer
    Peter Gray, Township Manager (via e-mail)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Falls Township Board of Supervisors
   Falls Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Revised Preliminary Plan of Land Development—38 Cabot Boulevard
   TMP #13-3-8-6
   Applicant: 38 Cabot Blvd., LP
   Owner: Same
   Plan Dated: June 20, 2014
   Date Received: January 26, 2014

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct an addition totaling 14,115 square feet to an existing 159,300-square-foot industrial building on a tract of 7.6659 acres. Phase 1 of the building expansion would consist of 8,470 square feet and Phase 2 would consist of 5,645 square feet. The site is served by public water and sewer.

Location: South side of Cabot Boulevard East, between U.S. Route 1 and the rail tracks.

Zoning: PIP—Planned Industrial Park District, which permits a variety of industrial and commercial uses on a lot of at least 0.5 acres. The township’s zoning hearing board on June 10, 2014, granted variances from these two provisions of the zoning ordinance:

- Section 209-28.F, to allow a reduction in the front yard depth from 50 feet to 20 feet;
- Section 209-28.F, to increase the maximum impervious surface ratio to 78 percent.

Present Use: Industrial.

COMMENTS

1. **Landscaping**—Township officials should determine whether the plan meets the zoning ordinance landscaping standards, as noted below.
a. **General**—Section 209-28.G.2 of the zoning ordinance requires the 30 feet adjacent to any street line and 10 feet adjacent to any lot line not to be used for parking, and to be planted or landscaped. Section 209-28.G.5 of the zoning ordinance requires landscaping of all improved portions of the property not used for buildings or paving.

b. **Parking area**—Each off-street parking shall have the equivalent of one landscaped parking space for every 30, under Section 209-42.B.3 of the zoning ordinance. And the plan should depict clustered plantings at least 4 feet high between any lot line and the street line, except where a building intervenes or the distance is greater than 150 feet, according to Section 209.42.B.1 of the ordinance.

2. **Future building addition**—Record Plan Note on Sheet 4 of the plan states that the project consists of a building addition of about 15,000 square feet and that a “future potential addition is shown, but is not part of this application.” Township officials should clarify the nature of any potential future development proposal, since the intensity of the subject proposal has already necessitated variances and waivers in order to qualify for approval. What may be intended is an immediate Phase 1 expansion of 8,470 square feet, followed by a future Phase 2 expansion of 5,645 square feet, but this should be confirmed.

3. **Trash removal**—The plan should demonstrate compliance with Section 191-51.H of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO), which requires provision of a screened trash collection, if indoor collection is not provided.

4. **Waivers**—Sheet 4 of the plan lists requested waiver of the following eight SALDO provisions:

   - SALDO Section 191.36.D, to permit use of curbing materials to match existing conditions;
   - SALDO Section 191-37.B, to permit parking within 35 feet of the building;
   - SALDO Section 191-37.G.1, for exemption from the requirement to install curbed raised beds in the parking area;
   - SALDO Section 191-37.G.2, for exemption from the requirement to plant shade trees in curbed raised beds;
   - SALDO Section 191-37.G.4, for exemption from parking lot tree-planting requirements;
   - SALDO Section 191-48.A (misstated on the plan as 191-45.A), for exemption from the requirement to plant street trees;
   - SALDO Section 191-52.1B.3(b)(1)), to permit 40 percent disturbance of steep slopes in the 15 percent to 25 percent category; and
   - SALDO Section 191-78.C.2, to provide an aerial photo of the site and surrounding area in lieu of a survey of existing features.

Under the requirements of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved and the minimum modification necessary. The final plan should list all granted waivers and variances.

5. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection to
determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the March 4, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

GF: kjp

cc: 38 Cabot Blvd., LP
    Mark Havers, Pickering, Corts & Summerson
    Nate Fox, Begley, Carlin & Mandio
    Tom Beach, Remington, Vernick & Beach
    Jim Sullivan, T&M Associates, Township Engineer
    Peter Gray, Township Manager (via e-mail)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Hilltown Township Board of Supervisors
   Hilltown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for Coulter Tract
   TMP #15-17-79
   Applicant: Frank A. and Julia L. Coulter
   Owner: Same
   Plan Dated: January 9, 2015
   Date Received: January 22, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a 4.11-acre parcel into two lots. Lot 1 would be 2.376 acres and contain an existing single-family detached dwelling and frame shed. Lot 2 would be 1.734 acres. The site is served by public water and individual on-lot sewage disposal systems.

Location: North side of Seven Corners Road, approximately 150 east of its intersection with Firethorn Drive. The driveway for the existing single-family detached dwelling located on the parcel has access to Arrowhead Drive.

Zoning: The Rural Residential (RR) District is intended to serve low density residential development and permits use B1 Single-Family Detached Dwellings on lots of a minimum 50,000 square feet.

Present Use: Residential.

COMMENTS

1. Proposed septic area—The plan depicts a proposed septic area within the stormwater easement on Lot 2. Sections 140-49.D of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that nothing shall be permitted to be constructed, placed, planted, set or put within the area of any easement that will interfere with the intended use of the easement, the facilities for which the easement was established, or maintenance of the easement and/or facilities. Township officials should determine whether a septic area would interfere with the function of the existing stormwater facility.
2. **Natural resource protection standards**—Section 140-16.C.(6) of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that the natural resource protection standards shall be included on the plan. Therefore, the plan be revised accordingly.

3. **Sewage Facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed subdivision. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the subdivision review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the March 4, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MMW:dbw

cc: Frank A. and Julia L. Coulter  
Ron Klos, P.E., Bohler Engineering  
C. Robert Wynn, P.E., Township Engineer  
Richard C. Schnaedter, Township Manager (via email)  
East Rockhill Township (adjacent municipality) (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: New Britain Township Board of Supervisors
    New Britain Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for Worthington
    TMP #26-4-70-3
    Applicant: Natasha Worthington
    Owner: Same
    Plan Dated: February 4, 2015
    Date Received: February 6, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a 5-acre parcel into two lots for detached single-family homes. Lot 1 would consist of 2.21 acres (96,222 square feet) and Lot 2 would consist of 2.23 acres (97,213 square feet). An existing home sits on proposed Lot 2. Each lot is to be served by on-lot water and individual on-lot sewage disposal systems.

Location: Northwest side of New Galena Road, about 500 feet west of Route 313.

Zoning: The WS Watershed District permits Use B1, single-family detached dwelling, on a lot of at least 80,000 square feet with a maximum site impervious surface ratio of 12 percent.

Present Use: Residential

COMMENTS

1. **Natural resource protection**—The plan proposes protection ratios for watercourses and riparian buffers that are less than the minimum 100 percent protection ratio for each resource set under Section 27-505 of the zoning ordinance. The narrow riparian buffer delineated on the north side of the watercourse on proposed Lot 1 does not meet the standards of Section 27-2400.i of the zoning ordinance, which requires a Zone 1 buffer of 25 feet adjoining the edge of a watercourse, and an additional Zone 2 buffer of 50 feet adjoining Zone 1. Section...
27-2400.3.f of the ordinance prohibits sewage disposal facilities situated within a riparian buffer. The primary septic area lies within what should be a delineated riparian buffer totaling 75 feet in width.

2. **Waivers**—The plan lists requested waiver of seven provisions of the municipal subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO), as follows:

   - Section 22-502.D, requiring the depiction of existing features within 100 feet of the property;
   - Section 22-703.4.C, requiring parallel, concentric, radial, or right-angled lot lines;
   - Sections 22-705.3, requiring street improvements to meet township standards for right-of-way and cartway width,
   - Section 22-706.1.B, requiring the installation of curbing;
   - Section 22-706.2.B, requiring installation of sidewalks along the property frontage;
   - Section 22-713.4.A, requiring street trees to be planted along road frontages; and
   - Section 22-721.7, regarding the minimum distance between the primary and reserve septic areas.

The waiver requests for SALDO provisions regarding sidewalks and street trees are not fully outlined in the “Requested Waivers” table on Sheet 1 of the plan, and matched with their corresponding SALDO sections. Under the requirements of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved and the minimum modification necessary. The final plan should list all granted waivers.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the March 4, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

GF:dwb

cc: Natasha Worthington
    Leon McGuire, P.E., Van Cleef Engineering
    Showalter & Associates
    Craig Kennard, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer
    Eileen Bradley, Township Manager (via e-mail)
February 3, 2015
BCPC #10285-A

MEMORANDUM

TO: Newtown Township Board of Supervisors
Newtown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for First Evergreen
TMP #29-10-86, -40-1, 42-1, and -42-5
Applicant: 826 Newtown Associates, L.P.
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: December 19, 2014
Date Received: January 9, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Consolidate the four tax map parcels (Premises “A,” “C,” “E,” and “F,” totaling 20.8818 acres) and subdivide the property into two lots. Lot 1 is 14.0396 acres, comprising part of Premises “A,” “C,” and “E,” and Lot 2 is 6.4467 acres, comprising part of Premises “A,” “C,” “E,” and Premises “F.” A shared access easement is proposed through the proposed lots, between Newtown-Yardley Road and Friends Lane. Public water and sewerage facilities serve the site.

Location: Southwestern corner of Newtown-Yardley Road (T-563) and the Newtown Bypass, across from Upper Silver Lake Road.

Zoning: LI Light Industrial District, which permits a variety of nonresidential uses on a minimum lot area of 80,000 square feet (1.8 acres).

Present Use: Office buildings (Lot 1) and communications tower, transformer, parking, and vacant (Lot 2).

COMMENT

• Sewage facilities—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed subdivision.
This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the March 4, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MW:kjp

cc: First Evergreen
    Mark Havers, P.E., Pickering, Corts & Summerson, Inc.
    Edward Murphy, Wisler Pearlstine
    Michele Fountain, CKS Engineers, Township Engineer
    Martin Vogt, Township Zoning Officer (via email)
    Kristie Kaznicki, Municipal Services Secretary (via email)
    Micah Lewis, Boucher & James, Inc., Township Planner (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Perkasie Borough Council
    Perkasie Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for Hidden Meadow (aka Kratz)
         TMP #33-14-43
         Applicant: Hallmark Homes Group, Inc.
         Owner: Same
         Plan Dated: January 19, 2015
         Date Received: January 30, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a 28.92-acre (net) parcel into 48 single-family detached lots and 9.71 net acres (10.94 gross acres) of open space. Public water and sewerage facilities are intended.

Location: Eastern side of South Main Street, opposite Coventry Way.

Zoning: The R-1A Residential District permits an open space preservation Performance Subdivision II on a minimum site area of 10.01 acres, minimum lot area of 11,500 square feet, maximum density of 5.5 dwelling units per acre, minimum open space ratio of 30 percent, maximum impervious surface ratio of 35 percent, and maximum lot coverage of 35 percent, with an additional 5 percent lot coverage permitted per lot for future improvements.

Present Use: Agricultural.
COMMENTS

1. **Proposed use**—Under Site Data on Sheet 3, the proposed single-family residential use should be revised to indicate the Open Space Preservation Performance Standard Subdivision II use.

2. **Minimum lot area**—It appears that the proposed lots areas were calculated including the area of the proposed stormwater easements on Lots 18, 19, 22, 23, 30, 31, and 34 through 47. Zoning ordinance Section 186-5 defines lot area as, “The total area of a lot lying within the lot lines and shall specifically exclude the area of any easement within the aforesaid lot lines, except for Borough electric department easements.” The proposed lot areas should be revised to exclude the stormwater easement area. It appears that a number of lots do not meet the required minimum lot area of 11,500 square feet when the easement area is excluded.

   Additionally, Note 28 on Sheet 3 should be revised to add Lots 18 and 19 to the list of lots that contain stormwater easements and are subject to the terms of the easements.

3. **Environmental protection standards**—The environmental performance standards of zoning ordinance Section 186-57 specify the maximum percentage of each existing resource that is permitted to be altered, regraded, cleared, or built upon, with the remaining resource area to permanently remain undisturbed in existing natural cover as permanent open space. On Sheet 3 of the plan, the site capacity calculations indicate the amount of each existing resource on the site that is required to be protected, with a total of 8.853 acres of natural resources required to be undisturbed and permanently protected. The plan also should specify the amount of each existing resource that is proposed to be protected, so that compliance with Section 186-57 can be determined. According to the grading plan, a substantial amount of open space land with existing natural resources is to be regraded for proposed stormwater facilities and a proposed lane to the adjacent Stonycrest development.

   We note that the zoning ordinance recently was amended to add Section 186-58 Open space, which permits development of required open space for stormwater management facilities in an Open Space Preservation Performance Subdivision I or II development. “Naturalized stormwater management facilities” shall be permitted in the required open space, and additional stormwater management facilities, including retention basins, shall be limited to 20 percent of the required open space area on a site, at the discretion of the Borough Engineer. However, that section does not supersede the environmental performance standards of zoning ordinance Section 186-57. Therefore, the total 8.853 acres of natural resource land required to be protected, per Section 186-57, must remain undisturbed in existing natural cover.

4. **Open space**—Regarding open space calculations, the plan should use consistent terminology and define the terms that are used. The Open Space Provided chart on Sheet 3 includes a column titled “Non-natural cover” and columns with gross and net areas. The term, “non-natural cover,” is not defined on the plan or in the zoning ordinance, but in the chart it appears to mean the area of conventional detention basins. The Site Data table states that the open space ratio includes “non-structural stormwater management facilities,” a term which also is undefined. We question if this is the same as non-natural cover, and if so, we recommend that one term be used and defined on the plan, so that compliance with the open space requirements can be determined. As noted in Comment 3 above, zoning ordinance Section
168-58 permits a maximum 20 percent of the required open space to be used for additional stormwater management facilities, including retention basins.

Additionally, the plan proposes numerous rain gardens and other graded areas in the required open space. As noted previously, Section 168-58 permits required open space to include “naturalized stormwater management facilities” (another term not defined in the ordinance or in the PaDEP Best Management Practices Manual). However, the portion of the required open space that is resource protection land (8.853 acres) must be free of disturbance, including any altering, regrading, or clearing, for any type of stormwater management facilities.

5. **Soils**—The Existing Resource & Site Analysis Map (Sheet 2) shows soils boundaries, but does not provide a chart that identifies the soils and their characteristics, and that corresponds to the soil characteristics noted in the Soils Resolution notes. It would be beneficial to provide this information on the plan to help ensure that proper engineering techniques are implemented.

In addition, if basements are proposed for the dwellings, we recommend that appropriate waterproofing be provided throughout the development, particularly in areas that may have a seasonal high water table (e.g., CwB: Croton), to help ensure that water seepage in basements is not a problem for the homeowners.

6. **Access issues**

   a. **Proposed lane**—More information should be provided about the lane that is shown from proposed Connor Lane, along Lot 3, through Open Space 2, to the property line along the right-of-way of the Souder Lane cul-de-sac bulb in Stonycrest. The lane scales 14 feet wide, with proposed breakaway bollards at both ends, and a note stating, “Replace existing curb with depressed curb,” along the Souder Lane cul-de-sac bulb. The site details on Sheet 26 include an emergency access easement cross section with a 12-foot-wide bituminous lane and 20-foot-wide access easement, but there is no indication that this cross section pertains to the unlabeled lane, and the plan sheets do not show an access easement. If this lane is the walking trail referred to in Notes 31 and 32 on Sheet 3, it should be labelled as such on the plan.

   The proposed lane crosses natural resource protection land, including a small area of wetlands. As noted in Comment 3, the plan should show that any disturbance of natural resources, due to construction of the lane, is in compliance with the environmental performance standards of zoning ordinance Section 186-57.

   In addition, the proposed 20-foot-wide access easement should be shown on the site plan. The plan also should indicate if the off-site area between the Souder Way sidewalk and the proposed depressed curb will be paved, and coordinate the improvements with the adjacent lot owner in Stonycrest (TMP #33-14-42-6).

   b. **Street connections**—We recommend a permanent street connection to Souder Lane in the adjacent Stonycrest development, instead of an emergency access easement. This would disperse the expected trips from the 48 proposed dwellings and provide a second access for emergency vehicles. The fact that the Souder Lane cul-de-sac bulb
abuts the common property line indicates that the street was designed with the intention of being extended into the subject site. Additionally, instead of tying into Connor Lane approximately 32 feet from the intersection with Hidden Meadow Drive, we recommend realigning the road to tie into Hidden Meadow Drive at a 90-degree angle, west of Connor Lane. This would improve traffic flow and safety through the development.

We note that the plan proposes a cul-de-sac bulb at the intersection of proposed Connor Lane and Julianna Way with “future road expansion” into adjacent TMP #15-11-43 in Hilltown Township. Thus, the proposed street system with the single access point onto South Main Street potentially would be accommodating additional trips from future development on that adjacent, land locked parcel. This supports the need for a permanent street connection to Souder Lane.

7. **Visitor parking**—The plan provides the required two parking spaces per dwelling unit in the proposed driveways, but it should indicate how spillover parking for visitors and service and delivery vehicles will be accommodated in the development.

8. **Sidewalks**—Subdivision and land development Section 165-20.C requires that sidewalks shall be provided along both sides of all streets, except in the opinion of the Borough Council with the advice of the Planning Commission that they are unnecessary for the public safety and convenience. Sidewalks are not provided on the northern side of proposed Hidden Meadow Drive, from South Main Street to Lot 33 along Open Space 1, or along the site’s South Main Street frontage.

9. **Class C buffer**—It appears that a Class C buffer is required around entire site of an Open Space Preservation Performance Subdivision II use in the R-1A District, according to zoning ordinance Section 186-20.A(5). The landscape plan does not show the required Class C buffer along the southern site boundary (along proposed Lots 11, 12, 13, and 14, and Open Space 2), and along Hidden Meadow Drive to the west of Lot 1. The plan should be revised to provide the required buffer.

10. **Proposed trees**—The plan proposes *Liriodendron styraciflua* (sweetgum) trees as street trees. We recommend specifying the fruitless cultivar, ‘Rotundiloba’, because the species produces hard, spiked fruit that can be a nuisance, particularly if planted near sidewalks or streets.

    In addition, proposed street trees should be located an appropriate distance from proposed utility lines. Several trees are to be located less than ten feet from proposed utility lines.

11. **Lighting**—The plan should be revised to provide the information for the street luminaires detail on Sheet 27 so that compliance can be determined with the outdoor lighting standards of zoning ordinance Section 186-52.

12. **Recreation land**—The plan should indicate compliance with subdivision and land development ordinance Section 164-36.D(3), which requires that recreation land be provided for any residential subdivision or land development.
13. **Water volumes**—According to subdivision and land development ordinance Section 164-68.D.23, the preliminary plan must state the estimated average and peak volumes of water needed to serve the proposed subdivision. An indication of the available water for fire flow and the water volume required to satisfy the Insurance Services Office (ISO) standards for fire protection also should be provided.

14. **Waivers requested**—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance requirements:

   Section 164-21.G—Requiring a 50-foot tangent leading into all intersections; proposed Hidden Meadow Drive and Connor Lane intersect radially.

   Section 164-20.E(2)—Requiring a 150-foot centerline radius on all secondary streets; proposed Julianna Way has centerline radius of 125 feet.

   Section 164-701.A(5)—Regarding sheet size; plans are submitted on 24” by 36” sheet size.

   Section 164-68.C(2) and 164-70.C(2)—Requiring locating existing features within 400 feet of the site; an aerial photograph has been provided to show this information.

   In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved, and the minimum modification necessary.

15. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed subdivision.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the March 4, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MW:dwb

cc: Hallmark Homes Group, Inc.
    Jon S. Tresslar, P.E., P.L.S., Boucher & James, Inc.
    Nate Fox, Begley, Carlin & Mandio, Borough Solicitor
    Erik Garton, Gilmore & Associates, Borough Engineer
    Andrea Coaxum, Borough Manager (via email)
    Brandy Mckeever, Code Enforcement Administrator (via email)
    Hilltown Township (Adjacent Municipality) (via email)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number(s)</th>
<th>PaDEP Code Number</th>
<th>Plan Review Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Township</td>
<td>Tolson</td>
<td></td>
<td>42-9-127-2</td>
<td>1-09945-367-2</td>
<td>20080-0205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 6, 2015

Scott Mease, P.E.
Mease Engineering, P.C.
516 W. Broad Street
Quakertown, PA 18951

RE:  Tolson Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-09945-367-2
TMP #42-9-127-2
Springfield Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. Mease:

We have received a copy of the subject planning module\(^1\) regarding the installation of a new sand mound sewage system to serve a proposed addition to an existing two dwelling apartment. A total of three apartments will be served by the new system.

The *Springfield Township Act 537 Plan* is the official Act 537 Plan for this portion of Springfield Township. The proposal to utilize on lot sewage facilities is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan, since the plan indicates that the subject site is within an area to be served by on lot sewage systems.

We note that the planning module packet submitted to our office did not include the return receipt for submission to the Pennsylvania Historic and Museum Commission or the PHMC review letter. In addition, the Pennsylvania Natural Diversity Inventory search results from the PA Fish and Boat Commission and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service indicate a potential impact and that further review is required. The required documentation should be provided in the planning module application.

If the municipality approves the planning module and thereby revises the official sewage facilities plan, the completed (signed) resolution and required supporting data (Components 2 and 4; transmittal letter; plans; narrative; copies of the Bucks County Department of Health and Planning Commission review letters) should be sent to Elizabeth Mahoney, Sewage Planning Supervisor, Wastewater Management, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection Southeast Regional Office, 2 East Main Street, Norristown, PA 19401.

\(^{1}\)Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection's Title 25, Rules and Regulations, the subject planning module is a revision to the Springfield Township Sewage Facilities Plan. Therefore, the Bucks County Department of Health and Bucks County Planning Commission are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.

Visit us at: www.buckscounty.org
If you have any questions regarding this review, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Richard G. Brehler, Jr.
Senior Planner

Attachment

cc: Scott Cressman, BCDH
    Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
    Michael Brown, Springfield Township Manager (via email)
    Act 537 file
Note to Project Sponsor: To expedite the review of your proposal, one copy of your completed planning package and one copy of this Planning Agency Review Component should be sent to the existing county planning agency or planning agency with areawide jurisdiction for their comments.

SECTION A. PROJECT NAME (See Section A of instructions)

Project Name
Tolson

SECTION B. REVIEW SCHEDULE (See Section B of instructions)

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. February 2, 2015
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   Agency name Bucks County Planning Commission
3. Date review completed by agency February 6, 2015

SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (See Section C of instructions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Is there a county or areawide comprehensive plan adopted under the Municipalities Planning Code (53 P.S. 10101 et seq.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>2. Is this proposal consistent with the comprehensive plan for land use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>3. Does this proposal meet the goals and objectives of the plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe goals and objectives that are not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>4. Is this proposal consistent with the use, development, and protection of water resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>5. Is this proposal consistent with the county or areawide comprehensive land use planning relative to Prime Agricultural Land Preservation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistencies:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Does this project propose encroachments, obstructions, or dams that will affect wetlands?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, describe impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Will any known historical or archeological resources be impacted by this project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, describe impacts See Attached Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Will any known endangered or threatened species of plant or animal be impacted by the development project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>9. Is there a county or areawide zoning ordinance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Does this proposal meet the zoning requirements of the ordinance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Have all applicable zoning approvals been obtained? 

12. Is there a county or areawide subdivision and land development ordinance? 

13. Does this proposal meet the requirements of the ordinance? 
   If no, describe which requirements are not met

14. Is this proposal consistent with the municipal Act 537 Official Sewage Facilities Plan? 
   If no, describe inconsistency

15. Are there any wastewater disposal needs in the area adjacent to this proposal that should be considered by the municipality? 
   If yes, describe

16. Has a waiver of the sewage facilities planning requirements been requested for the residual tract of this subdivision? 
   If yes, is the proposed waiver consistent with applicable ordinances. 
   If no, describe the inconsistencies

17. Does the county have a stormwater management plan as required by the Stormwater Management Act? 
   If yes, will this project plan require the implementation of storm water management measures?

18. Name, Title and signature of person completing this section:
   Name: Richard G. Braehler, Jr. 
   Title: Senior Transportation Planner 
   Signature: 
   Date: February 6, 2015
   Name of County or Areawide Planning Agency: Bucks County Planning Commission
   Address: The Almshouse, 1260 Almshouse Road, Doylestown, PA 18901
   Telephone Number: 215 345-3400

### SECTION D. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (See Section D of instructions)

This Component does not limit county planning agencies from making additional comments concerning the relevancy of the proposed plan to other plans or ordinances. If additional comments are needed, attach additional sheets.

The county planning agency must complete this Component within 60 days.

This Component and any additional comments are to be returned to the applicant.
Bucks County Bike Task Force

OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND
The Bucks County Bicycle Task Force was created by the Commissioners in 2008. The first years were devoted to working with the Planning Commission and a consulting firm to create a Bicycle Master Plan draft for consideration by the county.

In January 2013, the County Commissioners approved the Bicycle Master Plan (http://bikebuckscounty.com/BucksCountyBikePlanFinal.pdf) which included the three initiatives described above,

Implementation is focused on three primary items:

- Promotion and implementation of the priority spines. Focus on developing all three priority spines, beginning with a spine that has the support, resources and recognition as an important county spine. The Doylestown to New Hope Spine emerged as the spine with interest and the greatest potential for successful completion.

- Promotion and development of municipal/multi-municipal bicycle plans. Once the progress is made on the planning and development of the spines, the local municipalities along those corridors will become more open to the idea of bicycle planning within their own community.

- Education and Safety. Ensuring the safety of motorists and cyclists as well as fostering the perception that bicycling is safe in Bucks County is essential to creating a bicycle-friendly place. Improving safety and public perceptions about safety involves three key elements: education of both bicyclists and motorists, enforcement of regulations related to the unsafe use of roads, and promotion of bicycle awareness.

2014 ANNUAL REPORT

The Bucks County Bike Task Force (BTF) met monthly and undertook several initiatives in 2014.

Education Committee
The Education Committee provides educational resources for both bicycle riders and motor vehicle drivers to keep Bucks County roads a safe place for all.

The Education Committee held bike rodeos in each of the following townships: Bensalem, Northampton, Quakertown and Upper Southampton. Five bicycle events involving education programs and helmet fitting, but no bike riding were held in Bristol, Bensalem, Middletown, Newtown, and at the Wrightstown Grange Fair. A small display was provided for the Central Bucks Bike Club Covered Bridge Ride in October. The committee received a $400 grant from Central Bucks Bike Club for safety education. A helmet fit educational display and helmets were purchased with the grant funds. BTF member worked with the SafeKids program child safety program at St Mary Hospital in Newtown.

Communications & Partnerships (C&P) Committee
The C&P Committee promotes coordinating bicycle planning with municipal government partners and providing information about bicycling in Bucks. Partnerships are essential to provide funding and support for facilities.

The BikeBucksCounty.com website launched in July 2014. The site provides resource information on all activities related to bicycling in Bucks County. The website provides information on the Master Plan, youth...
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and adult education and safety, bicycle routes, and information about bicycle resources. Out-of-state visitors have used site for travel and bike safety information. An intern will start working with Mindshuffle Marketing Jessica Federman in January 2015.

**Facilities Committee**
The Facilities Committee focuses on provision of on- and off-road bike facilities throughout Bucks County. The Bike Master Plan highlighted the following three main categories of improvements, implemented mostly by PennDOT or the municipalities:

1. **Travel routes on existing key roads called spines.** A priority spine is designated in lower (Woodbourne to Levittown), central (Doylestown to New Hope), and upper (Quakertown to Lehigh County) Bucks County. Route 202 bike facilities between Doylestown and New Hope have been identified as a major spine for bicycling. PaDOT consultant McCormick & Taylor developed a $3M cost estimate for improvement of bike lane and bridge widening/replacement. BTF has developed parallel bike routes which can be provided with signage and road markings.

2. **The BTF reviewed staff proposals and supported study of two routes by PaDOT for road markings for bike lanes along Woodbourne Road in Middletown Township, and Beaver Road in Bristol Borough.**

3. **Bicycle facilities within parks and other lands done under the leadership of the appropriate county agencies such as Parks & Recreation, Open Space Review Board, etc. Task force members served on steering committees of Upper Neshaminy and Mill-Queen Anne-Black Ditch Creek Lower Neshaminy Creek and Middle Neshaminy trail studies, and BCPC Next generation trails effort.**

Bike Task Force members have established a relationship with the Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia, which is a nonprofit with staff that promotes bicycling and bike facilities in the five-county area.
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BUCKS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING

AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of Minutes of March 4, 2015
4. Executive Director’s Report
5. Sellersville Redevelopment Area – Park 10
   Jeff Darwak, Deputy Director, Redevelopment Authority
6. Presentation: Trail Options
   Richard Brahler, Senior Planner and Paul Gordon, Planner
7. Act 247 Reviews
8. Old Business
9. New Business
10. Public Comment
11. Adjournment

Please remember to contact us at 215-345-3400 if you cannot attend. Thank you.
AGENDA SUBJECT TO CHANGE PRIOR TO MEETING
BUCKS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
March 4, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: Joseph A. Cullen; James J. Dowling; Raymond (Skip) W. Goodnoe; Edward Kisselback, Jr.; David R. Nyman; Robert M. Pellegrino; Carol A. Pierce; Walter S. Wydro

STAFF PRESENT: Charles T. McIlhinney; Lynn T. Bush; Timothy A. Koehler; David Johnson; Donna W. Byers; Richard G. Brahler; Gail Friedman; Andrew G. Heimark; Robert H. Keough; Margaret A. McKevitt; Rea Monaghan; Michael A. Roedig; David A. Sebastian; Matthew M. Walters; Maureen Wheatley; Lisa M. Wolff; David C. Zipf

GUESTS: Matthew Takita, Bensalem Township Planner and Zoning Officer

1. CALL TO ORDER
   Mr. Wydro called the meeting to order at 2:05 PM.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
   All rose for the pledge of allegiance.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 4, 2015
   Upon motion of Mr. Nyman, seconded by Ms. Pierce, with the vote being 6-2 the motion carried to approve the minutes of the February 4, 2015 meeting. Mr. Dowling and Mr. Goodnoe abstained as they were not present at the meeting.

4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT
   Ms. Bush submitted her Executive Director’s Report prior to the meeting. The report was a recap of the Municipal Economic Development Initiative, with some observations with the closing of two full years dedicated to the initiative. Ms. Bush said there is a lot of interest with communities for more walkable main street areas. There is also more interest than anticipated in tax abatement programs as well as assistance to communities in identifying their assets and strengths. The BCPC is moving into the second generation with additional municipalities.

   Ms. Bush updated the board on the resolution to approve the Redevelopment Area Plan for the Bristol Pike Revitalization Area and the Plan’s approval to the Bucks County Commissioners as presented by the Redevelopment Authority (RDA) at the last BCPC board meeting. She stated that while the board supported the project there was follow-up with some additional statements that needed to be included in the Plan. The RDA incorporated the changes and the Plan was adopted by Bristol Township council and the Bucks County Commissioners.

   Ms. Bush said the Commissioners have asked her to draft a comments letter on the PennEast pipeline. This will be included in next month’s board meeting packet.
Mr. Wydro polled the BCPC staff for comments on the Staff Report that was submitted to the board prior to the meeting. Mr. Koehler told the board the Lower Makefield Township Comprehensive Plan will be adopted by township supervisors and Mike Roedig is moving forward with the second draft of the Tinicum Township Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Wydro said he will ask for staff input on the Staff Report on a monthly basis.

Mr. Wydro polled the board for questions. Mr. Goodnoe asked Mr. Johnson if there will be a signalization study on the Route 611 corridor. Mr. Johnson responded that there are several projects in progress including a joint study with Montgomery County.

5. **PRESENTATION: BENSEALEM TOWNSHIP RIVERFRONT – MATTHEW TAKITA, TOWNSHIP PLANNER AND ZONING OFFICER**

Matt Takita, Planner and Zoning Officer for Bensalem Township, presented a video on the Revitalization of the Delaware Riverfront and Industry in Bensalem Township. The video provided impressive simulations proposed for the area. The 2018 Riverfront Redevelopment Plan and Regulating Code for Bensalem has not yet been brought before council, but they hope to have a draft to them soon along with procedural requirements, planning and code statutes. Mr. Wydro polled the board for questions. Discussion followed on form based codes versus conventional zoning, impacts on industry by smart growth, and current activity along the riverfront. Mr. Wydro thanked Mr. Takita for the video presentation.


Mr. Roedig gave a PowerPoint presentation and overview on the 2014 Annual Report of Review Activity. The report is based on reviews completed by BCPC staff in 2014. Mr. Roedig highlighted development trends and proposals and discussed comparative results with previous years’ development in Bucks County.

In 2014 the BCPC reviewed a total of 317 proposals submitted for subdivision, land development, and municipal actions. This was 30 percent greater than last year’s total of 243 reviews. Minor proposals decreased slightly, while major, sketch, and municipal proposals increased by 37 percent, 114 percent, and 30 percent, respectively. Land impacted by development was 531 acres which is the fifth lowest amount since recording such data and is 163 acres more than recorded in 2013.

The 2014 number of proposed residential units (780) is an increase of over 7 percent from last year’s 728 units; and for the fourth year in a row, there were no development proposals for age-qualified housing. The amount of proposed nonresidential area (nearly 1.2 million square feet) is a slight decrease of 10 percent from the amount reviewed in 2013. The majority of the proposed commercial development (46 percent) was located in lower Bucks, followed closely by central Bucks with 39 percent. The remaining 15 percent was located in upper Bucks.

The largest percentage of industrial development (55 percent) proposed in 2014 was located in lower Bucks and most of this was associated with four manufacturing facilities in Falls Township; 31 percent was located in upper Bucks and another 14 percent was located in central Bucks.

Mr. Wydro polled the board for questions and thanked Mr. Roedig for his good report.
7. **ACT 247 REVIEWS**
   The reviews of March 4, 2015, were mailed to the board for their review prior to the meeting. One walk-in review was included in the packet at the meeting:
   
   - BCPC Municipal Review #40-15-1—Silverdale Borough Zoning Ordinance Amendment

   Upon motion of Mr. Pellegrino, seconded by Mr. Dowling, the motion carried to approve the March 4, 2015 Act 247 reviews. There were no abstentions.

8. **OLD BUSINESS**
   Ms. Bush thanked Ms. Pierce for the information she provided on the historical sites and other tourism items from Lehigh County. Work is continuing on compiling historical resources in Bucks County.

9. **NEW BUSINESS**
   There was no new business.

10. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**
    There was no public comment.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**
    Upon motion of Mr. Nyman, seconded by Mr. Cullen, the meeting adjourned at 3:05 PM.

Submitted by:
Donna W. Byers, Staff Secretary
BUCKS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
Staff Report  
February, 2015

COMMUNITY PLANNING

> **Meeting Attendance**—Attended the regular monthly planning commission meetings of Perkasie and Sellersville boroughs, and Buckingham Township.

> **Northampton Township Village Commercial Design Guidelines**—Continued research and drafting the report. Finalizing first draft without illustrations/graphics and began compiling example illustrations and photos.

> **Richboro Village Master Plan**—Began follow-up on town hall meeting that discussed the future of the village with residents, business owners, and officials.

> **Tinicum Township Comprehensive Plan**—Continued second draft revisions.

> **West Rockhill Township Almont Village Plan**—Met with township staff to discuss conceptual plans for the Lawn Avenue corridor within the village. Further discussed the conceptual plan with Perkasie Regional Authority and PennDot to gauge plan feasibility.

> **Cross Keys Study**—Continued narrative production for the Land Use and Zoning, and Economic Development Conditions sections.

> **New Britain Borough Main Street Plan**—Began production of materials for April 9th meeting of the steering committee. A streetscape inventory, recommendations for a mixed uses ordinance, and discussion on financial incentives and programs are being prepared.

> **Lower Makefield Township Master Plan Update**—Continued making final revisions to the second draft based on input from the Township planning commission.

> **Plumsteadville Village Plan**—Began staff discussion on plan production and layout.

> **Brownsville Road Plan**—Began staff discussion on plan production using material already generated on the study area.

> **Quakertown Borough Downtown Parking Inventory**—Met with Quakertown Borough officials to discuss conducting a parking inventory of the Borough’s downtown area.

> **Hilltown Township Comprehensive Plan**—Began staff discussion on plan production.

> **Northampton Township Comprehensive Plan**—Began staff discussion on plan production.

> **Dublin Borough Ordinance Overview**—Began analysis of the borough zoning ordinance and subdivision and land development ordinance to determine necessary revisions in line with the borough’s revitalization plan.

Planning Information and Agency Coordination

> Provided information to the public on topics including demographic and socioeconomic data, development proposals, review letters, local zoning, and municipal regulations.

> Continued researching public comment letters to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regarding the proposed PennEast Pipeline.

> Attended meeting of the Bicycle Task Force.

> Attended Bucks County Homeless Continuum of Care meetings.

> Continued to work on the creation of a plan implementation progress model handbook to track and monitor recommendations outlined in planning documents.
> Reviewed Act 14, 67, 68 NPDES permit applications.

**Act 247 and 537 Review Activity**
- 18 Subdivision and Land Development Proposals
- 1 Sketch Plans
- 4 Municipals
- 4 Sewage Facility Planning Modules
- 2 Traffic Impact Studies

**ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING**

**Natural Resources**
> Continue to research comments submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regarding the proposed PennEast Pipeline.
> Spoke to Princeton Hydro practitioners and scientists regarding detrimental impacts stemming from linear development (e.g., gas and oil lines, in particular the PennEast Pipeline).
> Attended Bowman’s Hill Land Ethics Symposium.

**Integrated Water Resources Planning Work Program**
> Assisted watershed partners with programming for community events.
> Attended DEP MS4/TMDL training which provided insight and guidance regarding new requirements for compliance and the development of MS4 TMDL plans, and Design Detail Reports, municipal responsibility, and the potential for municipal collaboration.
> Continue to research funding opportunities for watershed-related projects.
> Researched regional efforts in the state regarding MS4/TMD planning.
> Assisted residents and municipal EAC groups regarding flooding, stream gage data, stormwater management, and wetlands.
> Assisted municipalities with Act 167 planning and compliance regarding new requirements for water quality (as of 2005).
> Assisted municipal engineers regarding new TMDL requirements and the county’s role moving forward.

**National Flood Insurance Program**
> Assisted municipalities with the adoption of floodplain ordinances and compliance.
> Assisted residents regarding floodplain insurance requirements and coverage.

**William Penn Foundation: Poquessing Watershed Cluster**
> Attended Upstream Philadelphia Delaware River initiative regional meeting to review progress regarding educational outreach efforts, future programming, grant projects and water quality issues.
> Work with project partners regarding the further development of the Streamwatch program and future training events.

**Comprehensive Plans**
> Developed a section of Tinicum Township’s Comprehensive Plan pertaining to stormwater management and the connection to the Delaware Canal.
Bucks County Open Space & Greenway Planning

- Met with representatives from Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission to discuss potential Newtown Rail Line Trail.
- Attended Liberty Bell Trail Workshop to discuss next steps for continued development of the trail.
- Attended Doylestown Community Bike & Hike meeting and provided an update as to the planned improvements to/completion of the trail in Peace Valley Park and next steps relative to Neshaminy Creek Greenway.
- Attended Warrington Township Trails Committee meeting.
- Met with Plumstead Township Board of Supervisors to discuss trails study the BCPC will be preparing for the township.
- Attended meeting of Quakertown Area Trails Committee to provide update on trails projects in the County including the Upper Bucks Rail Trail project.
- Submitted Request for Proposal for design and engineering of Upper Bucks Rail Trail.
- Continued developing narrative of the Lower Neshaminy Creek trail feasibility study.

Recycling and Solid Waste

- Working with a private student group and a local e-waste recycler to co-sponsor an electronic collection event.
- Submitting the site registration packet for 2015’s Household Hazard Waste (HHW) events.
- Working on the Bucks County Municipal Waste Plan update, including:
  - The advertisement, public notice, and the waste disposal questionnaire.
  - Completed update of Chapter 4 and revisions to the first draft of 6 other chapters.
- Submitting the recycling coordinator activities for the 2014 Section 903 grant.
- Compiling, analyzing, and submitting the municipal 2014 recycling data.
- Answering an increasing number of residential recycling inquiries in the absence of a receptionist.

Hazard Mitigation Planning

- Attended the first Hazard Mitigation Plan Update meeting with municipal managers and emergency management coordinators.
- Working on subsequent meetings and providing necessary data for the plan update.

TRANSPORTATION AND GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM (GIS)

General Transportation Planning

- Coordinated with four counties and Bicycle Coalition regarding Bicycle Occupancy Permit Issue.
- Developed Request for Proposals for conversion of Quakertown Rail Line to Pedestrian Trail. Coordinated with SEPTA regarding leasing of unused rail lines. Coordinated with Springfield and Richland Township regarding project.
- Attended site visit with DVRPC representatives regarding conversion of Newtown Rail Line to Pedestrian Trail. Coordinated with DCNR regarding funding for design work.
- Attended site visit of Delaware Canal Towpath Obstruction Project in Morrisville Borough. Met with DVRPC and DCNR regarding project.
Public Transportation
> Reviewed SEPTA Board Meeting Materials.
> Attended Doylestown DART Committee Meeting.
> Participated in discussions regarding TMA Bucks Outreach Seminar Program Agenda.
> Reviewed New Hope Public Transportation Study.

Transportation Assistance to Planning Staff
> Discussed transportation related issues with staff for subdivision and land development reviews.
> Continued to develop background information for Cross Keys Land Use and Transportation Study. Received contract from DVRPC and processed it for execution through controller’s office. Attended staff meetings to discuss project. Met with Gilmore and Associates to discuss traffic signalization modeling.
> Began development of background data for New Britain Borough Transit Oriented Development TCDI Project. Attended staff meetings to discuss project. Developed purchase of services agreement between county and New Britain Borough. Received contract from DVRPC and processed it for execution through controller’s office. Met with DVRPC to request traffic count data for Butler Pike.
> Continued developing computer-enhanced imagery for Almont Study. Attended meeting to discuss potential additional sketches for document. Attended meeting with West Rockhill Township to discuss draft future development options. Attended meeting with West Rockhill Township and PennDOT to discuss potential roundabout options.
> Reviewed information ascertained from public participation process at Town Hall Meeting for Village of Richboro Study.
> Attended meeting with Quakertown to discuss borough parking inventory study.

Transportation Improvement Program
> Provided Transportation Improvement Program information to various individuals and agencies.
> Attended Quakertown Transportation Alternatives Program Project Meeting.
> Attended Request for Proposals Evaluation Committee Meeting to discuss county bridges 282 and 358.
> Reviewed draft Route 611 Transportation Study.
> Developed support letter for Interstate 95/Street Road Interchange Project for commissioners.
> Attended Local Bridge Bundling Program Meeting. Coordinated with County Bridge Consultant to provide bridge data to PennDOT.
> Attended Upper Bucks Transportation Issues Task Force Meeting.
> Attended Regional Technical Committee Meeting.

Geographic Information Systems (GIS)
> Continued development of County-Wide Enterprise GIS program.
> Continued database development of site addresses and EMS, Fire, and Police response zones.
> Continued updating of Enterprise Geodatabase and ArcGIS Server.
> Continued coordination with GIS consultant on the Land Records and EMS projects.
> Continued development and support of County GIS Consortium efforts.
> Continued updating and editing of county Road Centerline database.
> Continued GIS technical software support to IT and GIS staff at Board of Assessment.
> Continued support of County hosted GIS web server connection and interface.
> Provided GIS technical support to Emergency Communication staff.
> Continued technical support for County GIS Web Viewer.
> Continued editing of county-wide data layers using GIS Data Reviewer tool.
> Continued updating and testing of ArcGIS 10.3 desktop software.
> Continued edge matching work on SE PA 9-1-1 GIS Shared Services regional datasets.
> Continued production of county Park and Recreation maps and web applications.
> Continued development of new GIS Web Viewer from Flex to JavaScript application.
> Attended Shared GIS Services Meeting at Berks County Emergency Management.
> Prepared updates for the ESRI Community Maps Program.
> Continued software updating of Staging and Development components of the Enterprise GIS System.
> Continued development of web mapping application of suicide incidents in Bucks County.
> Compiled and sent GIS data required for the Bucks County Hazard Mitigation Plan maps.
> Attended DVRPC sponsored GIS two-day training on GIS Web Development at Camden County Community College in Cherry Hill NJ.
> Attended the Suicide Review Committee meeting to discuss GIS applications and uses.
> Provided GIS data updates to GIS Consortium members Doylestown Borough and Newtown Township.

GIS Map Production
> Produced presentation maps for Community, Environmental and Preservation Planning units.
> Continued development of maps of county parks and facilities for print and web deployment.

GIS Transportation
> Continued development of Region-wide GIS Transportation initiative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number(s)</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newtown Township</td>
<td>29-15-SD1</td>
<td>Council Rock School District</td>
<td>29-3-1</td>
<td>Institutional Land Development: 180,000 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster Township</td>
<td>49-15-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>49-37-238</td>
<td>Zoning Map Change: GOV to R-2 Zoning Ordinance Amendment: New Use - Single-family Detached Cluster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Newton Township Board of Supervisors
   Newton Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Sketch Plan of Land Development for Newtown Middle School, Council Rock School District
         TMP #29-3-1
         Applicant: Council Rock School District
         Owner: Same
         Plan Dated: February 17, 2015
         Date Received: March 16, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 305 and 502 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on April 1, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct an 180,000-square-foot middle school building, with parking and play fields on approximately 35 acres. The site is served by public water and sewerage facilities.

Location: Northern side of Richboro Road, west of the Newtown Bypass (S.R. 413).

Zoning: EIR Educational, Institutional, and Recreational District permits use C-2 School by conditional approval on a minimum site area of 10 acres.

Present Use: Institutional (middle school)

COMMENTS

1. **Conditional use**—Use C-2 School is permitted as a conditional use in the EIR District by zoning ordinance Section 701.1.A.2. It should be determined whether conditional use approval...
must be obtained from the Board of Supervisors for this proposal to demolish the existing middle school and construct a new middle school.

2. **Natural resource restrictions**—A plan note states that the plan meets the environmental restrictions of zoning ordinance Section 904. Future plans should show the calculations confirming compliance with the natural resource restrictions of zoning ordinance Section 903 for all natural resources on the site.

3. **Maximum building height**—The plan’s Zoning Data indicates that the proposed auditorium will be 37 feet high, which exceeds the maximum 35-foot height requirement of zoning ordinance Section 701.1.B. In a telephone conversation, the applicant’s engineer has indicated that a variance will be sought. The planning commission should not make a recommendation on the plan to the Board of Supervisors until the zoning issue is resolved.

4. **Parking**
   a. **Amount**—The plan shows the required 220 parking spaces; however, the applicant’s engineer has indicated that relief will be requested to provide only 180 parking spaces. We note that Section 1001.G of the zoning ordinance allows for a conditional reduction in the nonresidential parking requirement if the applicant demonstrates that the required number of spaces is in excess of actual parking needs. The balance of the parking area conditionally reserved must comply with impervious surface, setback, and other requirements, and a landscaping plan shall be provided for the reserved area. Determination of parking need should take into account after-school events at the auditorium and use of the recreation facilities.

   b. **Setback**—Zoning ordinance Section 803.C-2.4 states that no parking area shall be closer to any lot line or street line than 100 feet and shall be screened as provided for in the ordinance. The easternmost bus parking space is within 100 feet of Green Lane (school district driveway). It should be determined if Green Lane is a street for the purposes of this requirement.

5. **Fire lane**—Subdivision and land development ordinance Section 511 requires that a fire lane be provided within 20 feet of a nonresidential building on a minimum of one side of each building, preferably the entrance side. The plan meets this requirement only at the loading dock area. Access for fire protection should be discussed and the plan should be reviewed by the fire marshal.

6. **Pedestrian circulation**—We recommend that additional sidewalk or path connections be provided to link the school and recreation facilities with the existing paths along Richboro Road and to the east of Green Lane (leading to the high school). The existing paths are part of the township’s trail plan, so this provides an opportunity to provide better access and encourage use of the trail system.

The proposed 10-foot-wide walkway from the southwestern part of the building could be extended to the path along Richboro Road that connects into Tyler State Park to the west and to the path along Green Lane, east of the site. Other pedestrian/bike connections to the path
east of Green Lane could be made from the proposed driveways for the new school, with crosswalks provided for safety.

7. **Recreation facilities**

   a. **Setbacks**—Zoning ordinance Section 803.C-2.3.b requires that any outdoor field, court, or play area be located no closer to any lot line or street line than 200 feet. Most of the proposed playing fields and courts do not meet this setback. Section 803.C-2.3.c specifies screening and buffer yard requirements. These issues must be resolved on future plans. It is noted that the site is in a unique location, with Tyler State Park abutting much of the site where the recreation facilities are proposed.

   b. **Orientation**—Generally, playing fields should be oriented approximately in a north/south direction so players are not facing the sun. The tennis courts and football field are oriented unfavorably, on an east/west axis.

8. **Stormwater management**—The sketch plan does not indicate how stormwater will be managed on the site. Future plans should comply with the township’s stormwater management ordinance.

9. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development.

We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter.

MW:dwb

cc: Jeffrey Garton, Esq., Begley, Carlin & Mandio, Township Solicitor
Michele Fountain, P.E., CKS Engineers, Inc., Township Engineer
Amy B. Kaminski, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Traffic Engineer
Kurt M. Ferguson, Township Manager (via email)
Martin Vogt, Township Zoning Officer (via email)
Kristie Kaznicki, Municipal Services Secretary (via email)
PERTINENT INFORMATION

Site Characteristics, Natural Features: Generally gently sloping land with wooded area bordering the northern, western, and southwestern parts of the site.

Existing Land Use: Institutional (Newtown Middle School)

Surrounding Land Use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Tyler State Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Vacant school district property, with Newtown Bypass beyond, and institutional (St. Andrew Church) and residential (single-family detached) beyond the Bypass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Tyler State Park, and single-family detached across Richboro Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Tyler State Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surrounding Zoning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>POS Park and Open Space District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>R-2 Residential 2-High Density District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>POS Park and Open Space District and R-1 Residential 1-Medium Density District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>POS Park and Open Space District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Municipal Comprehensive Plan: PP Public Purpose Area

Municipal Sewage Facilities Plan: The site is in an area where individual on-site sewage disposal systems, on-site community systems with subsurface or land application after suitable treatment or community package treatment with groundwater recharge mode, are permitted.
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

April 1, 2015
BCPC #41-15-CR1

MEMORANDUM

TO: Solebury Township Board of Supervisors
    Solebury Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Public Works Facility
    TMPs #41-13-62-1, -11 and -8
    Applicant: Solebury Township
    Owner of Record: Same
    Plan Dated: February 18, 2015
    Date Received: March 10, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Section 304 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal has been sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on April 1, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Demolish the existing public works maintenance building and restore the area as lawn. A new 14,240 square foot maintenance building, 3,600 salt storage building, 1,200 storage area, and 7 space parking area would be constructed on a 5-acre portion of the combined 27 acres parcels to replace it. On-lot water and sewage facilities serve the municipal site and will be provided to the new maintenance building.

Location: On the site of municipal building located on the northeastern side of Sugan Road, approximately 1,200 feet northwest of the intersection of Sugan Road, Phillips Mill Road, and Upper York Road (PA 263).

Zoning: MS Municipal Services District which permits municipal facilities on lots of 3 acres or larger.

Present Use: Institutional; municipal building and facilities.
COMMENTS

1. **Comprehensive Planning**—According to the Township’s 2014 comprehensive plan, the existing public works department building is in need of an upgrade and expansion to aid the staff in their activities and to provide adequate storage for the functions of the department. The stated policy for Community Facilities and Services in the Township is to “Provide or facilitate provision of adequate public facilities, services, and utilities, accommodating anticipated population growth while observing natural resource limits.” A recommended action step in the Plan is to provide a new public works facility to replace the current obsolete facility. Therefore, the proposal is consistent with the comprehensive plan’s policy and recommendations.

2. **Ordinance clarification and waivers**—Plan Sheet 2 of 16 notes that various waivers are requested from the subdivision and land development ordinance, including review plan stage, existing features within 500 feet, submission of planning module, roadway and sidewalk improvements, street trees, buffers, landscaping in parking areas, and tree replacement requirements. Since the proposal is for a public facility on municipal land, waivers are also requested from providing utility and conservation easements, refuse collection, dedication of recreation land/facilities, and fees. Several zoning ordinance clarifications are also needed regarding the proposed amount of parking for the maintenance building, and depending on whether or not landscaping waivers are granted, a screening and landscaping plan prepared by a landscape architect may be needed according to Section 1606 of the zoning ordinance.

In accordance with the requirements of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, township officials should determine if each waiver should be granted in whole or in part. We offer the following comments to consider when evaluating the waiver requests:

   a. **Tree protection and landscaping**—The maintenance building is proposed to be located within a wooded portion of the site. Plan sheet 2 indicates that it is in compliance with the woodland protection zoning standards and that waivers are requested from landscaping and tree replacements provisions. In this case, 152 replacement trees of various caliper would be required. However, there may be opportunity to restore the area where the existing facilities are located (to be demolished) to a planted area more environmental beneficial than a lawn. Unless the new lawn area is intended for a future recreation field, we recommend that township officials consider naturalizing the area of the existing facilities to be demolished into a passive green space.

   Supplementing the development (along new accessway and parking area, near the building foundation, and possible within along the streetscape) with appropriate plant material could enhance the public works building, especially given the native landscape provided at the administration building and the historic nature of Solebury Village. Developing a phased landscaping plan for these areas may be appropriate rather than granting the requested waivers as a whole.

   b. **Building and facility connections**—A waiver has been requested from the installation of sidewalks. We recommend that some sort of pedestrian connection be made between the municipal buildings on the site. In addition, the proposed plan does
not indicate building details such as proposed entryways or access for the handicapped. These details should be addressed to ensure that appropriate access is provided.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions regarding this application.

CHG:dwb

c:  C. Robert Wynn, P.E., Township Engineer
    Dennis H. Carney, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warminster Board of Supervisors
Warminster Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal for Zoning Map Change and Zoning Ordinance Amendment
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: March 18, 2015
Hearing Date: May 21, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal has been sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on April 1, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action:

A. Change the zoning of TMP #49-37-238 (the former WREC and Hart School site) from GOV Government Public to R-2 Residence.

B. Amend the Zoning Ordinance to permit a Single-Family Detached Cluster Development (Use 3(a)) as a conditional use in the R-2 district and modify area and dimensional requirements to the R-3 and R-4 Residence districts. The Use Regulations for Single-Family Detached Cluster Development use would be added to Section 1602.B, Residential Uses, and parking standards for Use 3(a) would be added to the Off-Street Parking Requirements.

Location & Size of Tract: TMP #49-37-238 (15.7 acres) is located southeast of Little Lane, approximately 360 feet south of its intersection with Barness Drive.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: A new Section will be added that permits Single-Family Detached Cluster Development use as a conditional use in the R-2 district.

Visit us at: www.buckscounty.org
The area and dimensional requirements and other use regulations for Single-Family Cluster Development to be added to Section 1602.B Residential Areas are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Requirement Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum gross tract size</td>
<td>10 contiguous acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum lot area</td>
<td>9,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum lot width</td>
<td>75 feet at building line; 70 feet at front property line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front yard</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side yard</td>
<td>10 feet each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear yard</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building coverage</td>
<td>35 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impervious coverage maximum</td>
<td>45 percent (40 percent at plan approval, 5 percent reserved for homeowner in future)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net tract impervious coverage</td>
<td>50 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building height maximum</td>
<td>35 feet, 2.5 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density maximum</td>
<td>2.6 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space minimum</td>
<td>20 percent of gross tract area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffers</td>
<td>35-foot buffer yard, fencing, and landscaped berms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public water and sewer</td>
<td>required and all utilities shall be underground.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 602 Area and Dimensional requirements for the R-3 Residence district would be amended to permit a density of three dwelling units per acre.

Section 702.A Area and Dimensional requirements for the R-4 district will be amended to include front, side, and rear yard setbacks for uses other than those specifically listed. The requirements are: 50-foot front yard, 25-foot side yards, 50-foot rear yard.

Part 16 Use regulations, Section 1602.B Residential Uses, will be amended to include a description of Use 3(a) Single-Family Detached Cluster Development and a requirement for buffer yards.

Part 16, Section 1602.B Residential Uses will be amended to reference 8, Mixed Use development standards in in Section 503.

Part 22, Off-Street Parking and Loading, Section 2200, Subsection A.3 will be amended to require two parking spaces per dwelling unit for Use 3(a) Single-Family Detached Cluster.

Existing Zoning Provisions: The R-2 Residential district permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 12,500 square feet or more. Mixed use development is permitted on sites of 18 acres or more. Public schools are permitted as a conditional use. The maximum density permitted is 2.2 units per acre.

The R-3 Residence district permits agriculture, single-family detached dwellings, and residential accessory uses on lots of 9,000 square feet or more. Similar yard requirements are provided for all permitted conditional and special exception uses. There are no maximum density standards.

The R-4 Residence district permits single-family detached dwellings and residential accessory uses on lots of 9,000 square feet or more. Yard requirements are provided for permitted residential
uses. There are no yard requirements for other uses permitted by condition or special exception. The maximum density for multifamily dwellings and townhouses is 5 units per acre.

COMMENTS:

We understand the goal of the township is to establish uses that can be located on vacated school sites that are compatible with the surrounding community. We note the following items for township’s consideration.

A. Zoning map change

1. Adjoining land use and zoning—The proposed rezoning to R-2 Residential is consistent with adjacent zoning. The Single-Family Detached Cluster Development permitted in the R-2 district would be slightly denser than the adjoining development, but the required open space and buffer yards should address any potential impacts.

The proposed use in the R-2 district would apply to all parcels in the R-2 district. Other existing or former schools are on sites zoned R-2 and are located amongst residential subdivisions. The proposed Single-Family Detached Cluster Development use may be appropriate for these sites.

The site is adjoined to the north and east by single-family detached dwellings on lots of approximately 10,000 square feet or more. Single-family dwellings on lots of 20,000 square feet lie to the south. A 6.7-acre open space lot adjoins the site to the west.

The areas on the north and east side of the parcel are zoned R-2 Residential which permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 12,500 square feet. The area to the south is zoned R-1 Residential which permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 20,000 square feet. The open space parcel to the west is zoned GOV which permits municipal, educational and other uses on lots of one acre.

2. Existing zoning—The site is zoned GOV Government/Public to permit the former township recreation center and public school. The recreation center and school have closed and the school district is selling the parcel.

3. Municipal Comprehensive Plan—The future land use map of the Warminster Township Comprehensive Plan Update 2004 designates the site as Government & Institutional. Section 603(j) of the MPC requires that the zoning ordinance be generally consistent with the comprehensive plan. The comprehensive plan should be amended if the proposed zoning change is adopted.

B. Zoning text amendment

1. Stormwater facilities in open space—The proposed Single-Family Detached Cluster Development use requires 20 percent of site to be preserved as open space but also allows stormwater management facilities to occupy part of the open space. In a section of the current township zoning ordinance (Section 2102.B.1.a), the township requires that open space meet one of the following purposes:

CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE
a. To conserve natural or scenic resources
b. To augment recreation or public open space opportunities
c. To preserve sites of historic, geologic, or botanic interest;
d. To enhance the value of existing parks, forests, wildlife preserves, nature preserves, or other public open spaces by preserving land abutting such existing parks

The proposed amendment conflicts with the open space requirements and permits open space to be used for stormwater management. Stormwater management areas are not open space but are necessary utilities required as part of the development process. The placement of a basin in open space can often seriously diminish the value and usefulness of open space if it is poorly located. It appears that neither the Mixed Use Development nor the Transit Oriented Development use include this flexibility with basins in open space.

This section also allows more than 25 percent of the open space to be used for stormwater facilities if a fee is paid. If the township is inclined to allow stormwater in open space, they should consider an upper limit on how much open space can be dedicated to stormwater. As written the amendment would allow all the open space to be used for the required stormwater management.

2. **Open space boundaries**—Proposed zoning requires that 20 percent of the site be devoted to permanent open space. The township’s subdivision and land development ordinance (Section 603.1.D) requires that access ways to open space that are located between or adjacent to residential lots be delineated with landscaping or fencing. In order to demarcate the open space so that residents don’t use public open space for private activities, we recommend that the ordinance require plantings or fencing between all open space areas and private lots, not just along the access ways.

We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

DCZ:dwb

cc: Mary Eberle, Esquire, Grim, Biehn & Thatcher, Township Solicitor
    Steven Weisner, Township Manager (via email)
PERTINENT INFORMATION

Site Characteristics, Natural Features: The site slopes to the west and has lawn around the existing building and woods to the southwest.

Existing Land Use: Former recreation center and former elementary school

Surrounding Land Use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Single-family residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Single-family residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>Township open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Single-family residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surrounding Zoning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Zoning Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>R-2 Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>R-2 Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>GOV Government/Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>R-2 Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

County Comprehensive Plan: The *Bucks County Comprehensive Plan 2011* classifies the subject site as Mature Suburban Areas, which are medium density areas with mostly single-family residential development. Located in the lower end of the county and along County Line Road south of Route 611, these communities were planned and developed during the period immediately following World War II. Mature suburban areas are mostly built-out and have had limited population growth in the last 30 years and, in some cases, a loss of population.

The long-term survival and success of the communities within the Mature Suburban Areas will be tied to both repairing and enhancing infrastructure, redevelopment and revitalization of underutilized lands, and effective neighborhood planning to avoid the potential problems of decline and disinvestment in residential areas.


Municipal Sewage Facilities Plan: The Final Environmental Impact Statement Horsham, Warminster, Warrington, Pennsylvania Wastewater Treatment Facilities Plan is the official Act 537 Plan for Warminster Township. The plan indicates that the subject area is served by municipal sewage facilities.
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

April 1, 2015

BCPC #50-15-2 (P)

MEMORANDUM

TO: Warrington Township Board of Supervisors
    Warrington Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Private Request for Zoning Map Change, and Amendments to Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan

Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: March 11, 2015
Hearing Date: Not indicated

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal has been sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on April 1, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requested Action: Amend the zoning map to change TMP #50-4-150 from RA Residential Agricultural to Residential Agricultural 2 District. Amend the RA-2 district to reduce the front and rear yard setbacks. Amend the comprehensive plan to accommodate the zoning change.

Location & Size of Tract: The 46.25-acre parcel is located on the northeast side of Street Road, approximately 1,000 feet northwest of its intersection with Folly Road.

Requested Provisions: RA-2 Residential Agricultural District 2 permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 8,500 square feet. The amendment to the RA-2 district reduces the front and rear yard setbacks from 35 to 25 feet. The comprehensive plan will be amended to change the future land use classification from Agricultural to Residential Single-Family and remove it from Rural Area and include it in the Staged Growth area.

Existing Zoning Provisions: RA Residential Agricultural permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 3-acres or more. Cluster development is permitted on sites of 10 acres or more with a minimum lot size of 7,500 square feet, open space ratio of 83 percent, and density of 0.65 units per acre. Agricultural uses, public school, kennel, riding academy, and nursery are also permitted.
COMMENTS:
We note the following issues that the township should address in its consideration of the applicant’s proposal:

A. **Zoning Map Amendment**

1. **Adjacent land uses**—Single-family detached residential uses adjoin the subject site to the southeast (Legacy Oaks) and southwest (Somerset Walk). Agricultural uses (including a nursery) are to the northwest and northeast. The proposed use may be consistent with the uses to the southeast and southwest but not the agricultural uses to the northeast and northwest.

2. **Adjacent zoning**—Nearly three-quarters of the parcels surrounding the subject site are zoned RA. The area to the southeast is zoned I-U-A Institutional — Age Qualified Residential Community District, and two small areas southwest across Street Road are zoned RA-3. The RA Residential Agricultural permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 3 acres or more. The I-U-A requires 6,000 square foot lots and maximum density of 3 units per acre and 83 percent open space ratio. The RA-3 district requires a minimum lot size of 12,000 square feet. The proposed RA-2 zoning allows lots of 8,500 square feet and would permit lot sizes and resulting density significantly different from the RA district, which would be inconsistent with adjacent zoning on three sides of the parcel.

3. **Comprehensive Plan**—The *Warrington Township Comprehensive Plan (2006)* (p. 33-34) recognizes the importance of agriculture and identifies areas that are preserved or should be dedicated to preservation or low-intensity development. The parcels to the northeast and northwest are classified as rural area. The parcels to the southeast and southwest are classified as single-family residential.

   In a discussion of Development Capacity under current zoning (p. 34) the plan states “Residential development in the western end of the township has traditionally been of the single-family detached type served by on-lot water and wastewater disposal systems on large lots. These uses define the character of the western portion of the township and should be retained by limiting extension of water and sewer lines and not permitting higher residential densities.” The proposed amendment for smaller lot single-family detached dwellings which would be served by public sewer would not be consistent with the comprehensive plan.

B. **Zoning Text Amendment**

1. **District purpose**—The RA-2 and RA-3 districts were created to accommodate curative amendments brought by property owners in the late 1990s. These districts have not been expanded to date and it doesn’t appear that the district was intended to apply to other parcels.

   The purpose of the RA-2 District is to provide for small-lot single-family residential development in order to provide housing for all persons who wish to reside in Warrington Township. Affordable housing is more appropriate in areas where there is access to public...
transportation and jobs. The site is located in a rural area of the township and would require dependence on automobiles and is not close to employment.

The purpose of the RA Residential Agricultural District is to provide areas within the Township where a low-density residential atmosphere is preserved; to provide area where continued agricultural use of the land is feasible, particularly where prime agricultural soils have been identified; to discourage higher intensity uses which would make agricultural preservation and a rural residential atmosphere impossible; to discourage higher densities of development in areas where public utilities, particularly sewer and water, are neither available nor anticipated to be provided within the time period shown in the Comprehensive Plan.

2. **RA-2 dwelling standards**—The proposed zoning seeks to change the yard setback for single-family detached dwelling in the RA-2 district. The following table shows the existing area and dimensional requirements for the RA-2 and RA districts, and the RA Cluster Use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District/Use</th>
<th>Yard Setback</th>
<th>Lot Width</th>
<th>Lot Area</th>
<th>Density du/ac</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Side*</td>
<td>Rear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA-2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5/25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20/50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA Cluster</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10/25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Proposed standards

The minimum front and rear yards setbacks for single-family detached dwellings in most zoning districts in Warrington are 35 feet and in some districts they are greater than 35 feet. The proposed amendment does not provide a rational for the reduction. The required lot width is 85 feet but there is no requirement for minimum lot depth.

The density for the RA-2 district is more than 5 times the density of the RA district. The proposed standards would permit a higher density and smaller lot size in an area where the surrounding lot sizes are larger.

C. **Comprehensive Plan Amendment**

1. **Comprehensive Plan**—The *Warrington Township Comprehensive Plan* (2006) (p. 33-34) recognizes the importance of agriculture and identifies areas that are preserved or should be dedicated to preservation or low-intensity development. The parcels to the northeast and northwest are classified as rural area. The parcels to the southeast and southwest are classified as single-family residential.

In a discussion of Development Capacity under current zoning (p. 34) the plan states “Residential development in the western end of the township has traditionally been of the single-family detached type served by on-lot water and wastewater disposal systems on large lots. These uses define the character of the western portion of the township and should be retained by limiting extension of water and sewer lines and not permitting higher residential densities.” This area is appropriate for preservation and continuation of agriculture. These areas may be preserved in whole or in part through farmland
preservation or through open space preservation by development. Present zoning will remain in place but added incentives for preservation such as TDR or conservation design may be offered.

Recommendations for land use are to support the preservation of farmland and through county and state programs or the use of TDR and maintain the overall residential densities and intensities of the current zoning ordinance. The TDR program has been suspended but development on the site may preserve significant open spaces for agriculture or recreation. The proposed zoning does not include any purpose or intent regarding agricultural or open space preservation. The proposed amendment for smaller lot single-family detached dwellings, which would likely be served by public sewer, does not encourage continuation of existing agricultural uses and would not be consistent with the comprehensive plan.

2. **Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan**—The Act 537 plan notes that the site is classified as Mill Creek area which is to rely on on-site sewage treatment systems. The areas to the southeast and southwestern in the Developed area which are to be served by the Warminster Township sewage treatment plant. The proposed rezoning is not consistent with the 537 Plan.

3. **Comprehensive Plan**—The proposed comprehensive plan amendment references the Warrington Township Growth Management Plan Update. The Warrington Township Comprehensive Plan Update 2006 is the most recently adopted plan for Warrington. We recommend that the amendment be revised to reference the appropriate sections of the most recent comprehensive plan.

**Summary**—The proposed amendment points to a larger issue, which is the need to reflect upon what the western half of the township has become and what the Township wants it to be in the future. The policy and regulations for agricultural preservation and rural residential use has worked, but agriculture is changing in Warrington and the TDR program has been suspended. The proposed amendment does not include a statement of intent describing why it is proposed and any benefits that it will provide to the Township.

The Township’s comprehensive plan, for example, is explicit in its policy of discouraging new higher density residential development in the RA district. The proposed rezoning current zoning is at odds with the stated purpose of the Rural Area which calls for agricultural preservation and low intensity residential uses. Any new development should be consistent with the existing character which is comprised of uses and densities.

Because past Township plans and studies do not reflect the changes since 2006, we recommend that the Township reevaluate development policy for the RA district and consider adjusting the comprehensive plan to reflect the current trends, conditions, and goals. In the last two years, the Route 202 Parkway has opened and new commercial development has taken place nearby at County Line and Limekiln and Lower State roads. A more comprehensive look at the western part of Warrington may be in order so that it can develop in accordance with Township goals, rather than in response to site specific applications.
We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

DCZ:dwb

cc: William Casey, Esquire, Township Solicitor
    Timothy J. Tieperman, Township Manager (via email)
PERTINENT INFORMATION

Site Characteristics, Natural Features: The site is generally level with a large pond in the rear and small areas of woodlands.

Existing Land Use: Agricultural commercial — plant nursery

Surrounding Land Use:
- Northwest: Agricultural
- Northeast: Agricultural
- Southwest: Residential
- Southeast: Residential

Surrounding Zoning:
- Northwest: RA Residential Agricultural
- Northeast: RA Residential Agricultural
- Southeast: RA Residential Agricultural, IU-A Residential Agricultural, Institutional Use-Age Qualified Community
- Southwest: RA, RA-3 Residential Agricultural

County Comprehensive Plan: *The Bucks County Comprehensive Plan* (2011) classifies the site as Emerging Suburban Areas which is the area with both planned and available public infrastructure and services intended for future development by municipalities. It is in these areas that the mixed use, Smart Growth development types should be implemented. For example, the location of new public facilities should be steered towards underutilized sites (e.g., brownfields and grayfields), new development should be compact and built where existing infrastructure is adequate, and all development should be designed with the pedestrian in mind. Future development may include residential, nonresidential, and a mixed uses as part of planned developments.

Municipal Comprehensive Plan: The *Warrington Township Comprehensive Plan* (2006) states in the land discussion of Agricultural Areas (p. 33-34), the plan recognizes the importance of agriculture and identifies areas that are preserved or should be dedicated to preservation or low-intensity development. The preserved farms between Bristol and Pickertown roads, the working farms and nurseries between Street and Pickertown roads, and the farmland along Lower State Road are shown as agricultural areas. This designation does not mean that development cannot occur, but it identifies the farming areas as lands appropriate for preservation and continuation of agriculture. These areas may be preserved in whole or in part through farmland preservation or through a development process that would allow a portion to remain open space. Present zoning will remain in place, but added incentives for preservation, such as transfer of development rights or conservation design may be offered.

Development Capacity under current zoning (p. 34) Residential development in the western end of the township has traditionally been of the single-family detached type served by on-lot water and wastewater disposal systems on large lots. These uses define the character of the western portion of the Township and should be retained by limiting extension of water and sewer lines and not permitting higher residential densities.

Municipal Sewage Facilities Plan: The *Warrington Township Act 537 Plan Amendment No. 5* (2005) calls for continued use of on-lot systems for the subject site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number(s)</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Submission Level</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bensalem Township</td>
<td>12059</td>
<td>2-36-9</td>
<td>MarMar Builders</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8 Semi-detached Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bensalem Township</td>
<td>12033-A</td>
<td>2-1-42, -42-3, &amp; -47-1</td>
<td>Provec Group</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Lot Line Change 2 Commercial Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Township</td>
<td>12061</td>
<td>5-7-42</td>
<td>400 Princess Avenue</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Township</td>
<td>12062</td>
<td>5-7-30</td>
<td>Sycamore Avenue Subdivision</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doylestown Borough</td>
<td>11928</td>
<td>8-6-2</td>
<td>Provident Bank</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 2,775 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doylestown Borough</td>
<td>12065</td>
<td>8-4-105</td>
<td>McCaffrey's Food Markets</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 822 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doylestown Township</td>
<td>7220-A</td>
<td>9-6-25 &amp; - 26</td>
<td>Buckingham Retail Properties</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 24,638 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Township</td>
<td>4427-C</td>
<td>13-51-1-13, -13-1 &amp; -31-2</td>
<td>Sika</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Industrial Land Development: 37,090 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haycock Township</td>
<td>12060</td>
<td>14-6-53-1 &amp; -53-2</td>
<td>Schur &amp; Rubic</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Lot Line Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Makefield Township</td>
<td>11942</td>
<td>20-3-36-1</td>
<td>Moon Nurseries Tract</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15 Single-family Lots 2 Open Space Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown Township</td>
<td>8928-A</td>
<td>22-47-11-2</td>
<td>1501 E. Lincoln Highway</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 3,350 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain Township</td>
<td>12068</td>
<td>26-1-95-1</td>
<td>Estates at Peace Valley</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkasie Borough</td>
<td>12063</td>
<td>33-16-34</td>
<td>Dunkin Donuts</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 3,255 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkasie Borough</td>
<td>6982-A</td>
<td>33-2-45-1</td>
<td>Country Ridge</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>18 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland Township</td>
<td>6734-B</td>
<td>36-17-25 &amp; -23-3</td>
<td>Cemetery Road, LLC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Lot Line Change Office Land Development: 8,592 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telford Borough</td>
<td>12064</td>
<td>43-1-112</td>
<td>Trinity Cemetery</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Lot Line Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster Township</td>
<td>10794-A</td>
<td>49-9-9 &amp; -12</td>
<td>273 W. County Line Road</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Industrial Land Development: 40,080 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington Township</td>
<td>12067</td>
<td>50-4-21</td>
<td>Eble</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>5 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington Township</td>
<td>10876-A</td>
<td>50-25-17, -18, -19, -20, -21, 50-10-114, 50-26-25, 50-26-25-2</td>
<td>High Grove Manor</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>107 Attached Units Commercial Land Development: 2,957 Square-feet Office Land Development: 2,800 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO:    Bensalem Township Mayor
       Bensalem Township Council
       Bensalem Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for MarMar Builders
         TMP #2-36-9
         Applicant: MarMar Builders
         Owner: Regency Estates, Inc.
         Plan Dated: December 5, 2014
         Date Received: February 9, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide 1.87 acres into 8 single-family twin dwelling lots, ranging from 4,403 to 4,791 square feet. An approximately 0.66-acre lot will consist of common open space and a constructed wetland basin. Public water and sewerage serve the site.

Location: Along the west side of Mechanicsville Road, 300 feet north of its intersection with Salem Drive.

Zoning: R-A-1 Residential District does not permit twin dwelling lots. Single-family detached dwellings are permitted on a minimum lot size of 20,000 square feet. The Bensalem Township Zoning Hearing Board granted the following variances from the zoning ordinance at a hearing held on August 7, 2014:

- Section 232-59(a)(2)a, to permit a greater disturbance of steep slopes than otherwise permitted.
  - 85 percent of 8-15 percent steep slopes in lieu of the required 40 percent.
  - 95 percent of 15-25 percent steep slopes in lieu of the required 30 percent.
  - 86 percent of 25 percent or greater steep slopes in lieu of the required 15 percent.

- Section 232-124, to permit the use of twin homes in the R-A-1 Residential District.
• Section 232-125(a), to permit a lot area of 4,000 square feet for each twin home in lieu of the 20,000 required in the R-A-1 District.

• Section 232-125(b), to permit a lot width of 40 feet in lieu of the required 80 feet.

• Section 232-125(c), to permit the individual lots to have a building coverage of 40 percent in lieu of the required 30 percent.

• Section 232-125(d), to permit the individual lots to have an impervious surface ratio of 58 percent and the overall lot to have an impervious surface ratio of 44 percent in lieu of the required 35 percent.

• Section 232-125(e)(1)(a), to permit a 20-foot front yard setback from the street line of the private drive and 12 feet from the curb line of the cul-de-sac in lieu of the required 30 feet.

• Section 232-125(e)(2)(a), to permit a side yard of 0 feet in lieu of the required 12 feet.

Present Use: Vacant

COMMENTS

1. Waivers—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance requirements:

   • Section 201-41(d)(9), to provide an aerial photo in lieu of providing existing features within 400 feet of the project.

   • Section 201-104(g)(5), to permit grading less than 2.5 percent across the cul-de-sac.

   • Section 201-106(a)(2)a.6, to permit grading within three feet of the site property lines.

   • Section 201-106(a)(2)a.14, to permit a slope of less than 2 percent on grassed areas.

   • Section 201-106(a)(2)a.15, to permit runoff from more than three upstream properties to pass through or along downstream properties.

In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based. The final plan should note all granted waivers.

2. Private driveway—Section 201-104(a)(5) of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires private streets to meet the design construction and improvement standards of the subdivision and land development ordinance, unless agreed upon by Township Council. A 25-foot wide cartway is proposed. Section 201-104(b)(1) requires local streets to have a 50-foot right-of-way and minimum 28-foot cartway.
3. **Recreational land**—Section 232-260(c) of the zoning ordinance requires the developer to provide adequate active recreational facilities and amenities in the open space area, which areas, when completed, shall be dedicated to the township for general public use. In lieu of developing the aforesaid active recreational amenities, if the township desires, the developer may donate to the township the sum of $2,000.00 per each residential building lot. The plan should indicate compliance with this requirement.

4. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the April 1, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MR:dwb

cc: MarMar Builders  
Regency Estates, Inc.  
Mark Havers, PE, Pickering, Corts & Summerson, Inc.  
Charlie Marte, Esq., Marte & Toadvine  
Loretta Alston, Bensalem Township Department of Building and Planning  
Ron Gans, P.E., O'Donnell & Naccarato, Township Engineer  
William Cmorey, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bensalem Township Mayor  
    Bensalem Township Council  
    Bensalem Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Lot Consolidation and Subdivision Plan for Provco Group  
TMPs #2-1-42, 2-1-42-3, 2-1-43, 2-1-47-1  
Applicant: Provco Partners  
Owner: Provco Partners; Shrinath Two  
Plan Dated: February 6, 2015  
Date Received: February 23, 2015

This proposal was reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Consolidate TMP #2-1-42-3 and TMP #2-1-42 to form Lot #2 (3.003 acres). Subdivide TMP #2-1-47-1 into two parcels; convey approximately 20,524 square feet from TMP #2-1-43 to Lot #1 to form lots of 2.232 acres (Lot #1), 2.900 acres (Lot #3), and 1.498 acres (Lot #4). The site is served by public water and sewerage.

Location: At the northwest corner of Street Road and Kingston Way.

Zoning: PCD-UD Planned Commerce Park Unified Development District permits 100 percent of the tract to be used for convenience stores, retail sales and commercial services, lodging, and recreation/leisure time on a minimum tract area of 8 acres, minimum lot area of 1 acre, minimum lot width of 100 feet, and maximum impervious surface coverage of 70 percent.

Present Use: Restaurant; hotel; tavern.
COMMENTS

1. **Zoning table**—The plan should include a zoning table, demonstrating that the subdivision is in conformance with the requirements of the zoning district, or citation to variances approved by the Bensalem Township Zoning Hearing Board (Section 201-41(d)(12) of the subdivision and land development ordinance).

2. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed subdivision. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the subdivision review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the April 1, 2015, public meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the Bucks County Planning Commission board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MAR:dwb

cc: Provo Partners
   John Korczak, Bohler Engineering
   Kimberly A. Freimuth, Esq.
   Loretta Alston, Bensalem Township Department of Building and Planning
   Ron Gans, P.E., O'Donnell & Naccarato, Municipal Engineer
   William Cmorey, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO:        Bristol Township Council
           Bristol Township Planning Commission

FROM:      Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT:   Final Plan of Subdivision for Princess Avenue
           TMP #5-7-42
           Applicant: Alex Shnayder, Esq.
           Owner: Sperduto Investments L.L.C.
           Plan Dated: June 3, 2014
           Date Received: February 13, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a 12,500-square-foot parcel into two single-family detached lots consisting of 6,250 square feet each. According to aerial photographs, it appears that an existing dwelling is located on one of the proposed lots (the eastern-most lot) and an existing shed structure is located on the other proposed lot (western-most lot adjacent to the paper street). Public water and sewer facilities serve the site.

Location: Along the southern side of Princess Avenue, approximately 425 feet west of the intersection of Princess Avenue and Fourth Street. A paper street, identified as Overlook Avenue, borders the site to the west.

Zoning: The R-3 Residence District permits single-family detached dwellings on lots having a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet with a minimum lot width of 50 feet. The maximum building area and impervious surface ratios are 30 and 40 percent, respectively.

Present Use: Residential.

COMMENTS

1. Required setback— For corner lots, Section 702.E.4 of the zoning ordinance requires a 25-foot front yard along each street. The plan shows a proposed setback of 8 feet from the edge.
of the right-of-way for Overlook Avenue (paper street) and indicates, “Proposed zoning front set back with variance.” It is unclear if a variance from the required setback has been requested and obtained. If the applicant intends to request a variance from this zoning ordinance requirement, an official request should be made to the Zoning Hearing Board. This issue should be resolved prior to the Township Council taking action on this proposed subdivision.

2. **Site capacity calculations**—Section 2101 of the zoning ordinance requires the submission of site capacity calculations with all applications for subdivision and land development. The plan should be revised to provide the required calculations.

3. **Location of driveways**—The plan should indicate the intended locations of the driveways for both lots so that compliance with the off-street parking and driveway requirements can be verified (Section 2114 of the zoning ordinance and Section 508 of the subdivision and land development ordinance.)

4. **Recreation land**—The plan should be revised to indicate how the subdivision would meet the recreation land requirements of Section 521.a of the subdivision and land development ordinance and/or the fee-in-lieu provisions in Section 521.c.

5. **Sidewalks and curbs**—Sections 503.a, 511.a, and 513.a of the subdivision and land development ordinance require sidewalks and curbs along streets unless determined unnecessary by Council. The plan should be revised to comply with these requirements unless it is determined that sidewalks and curbs are unnecessary in this area.

6. **Street trees**—Section 519.a.1.c of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that within any subdivision, street trees shall be planted along streets where suitable existing trees or natural wooded areas do not exist. Street trees are to be planted from 25 to 50 feet apart depending upon the size of the trees chosen. The plan should be revised to indicate the proposed location and species of the required street trees.

7. **Existing large trees**—Aerial photographs indicate the presence of large trees on the site. Section 501 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that where trees are located within a subdivision or land development, every possible means to the fullest extent shall be provided to preserve these features. We recommend that wherever possible, existing healthy trees be retained and included in the design of the site. At the time of future development, tree protection measures, as outlined in Section 520 of the subdivision and land development ordinance, should be employed for trees intended to remain to help ensure their survival during and after construction.

8. **Stormwater management**—While the proposal may be exempt from containing a stormwater management plan, the plan should indicate how additional runoff from future increases in impervious surface would be managed in accordance with Section 518 of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

9. **Required information**—The plan should be revised to provide the following required information for minor subdivisions in accordance with Section 805 of the subdivision and land development ordinance (we note that the plan contains symbols in the legend for some
of the required information noted below, but does not provide the required information on the plan):

805.b.1 name of the subdivision
805.b.5 a brief description of the proposal
805.b.6 total acreage of the tract
805.b.7 proof of any variances that may have been granted by the Zoning Hearing Board (see comment #1)
805.b.9 a location map at a scale of not less than 800 feet to the inch (location map shown is less than 800 feet to the inch)
805.c.2 the names of owners, tax parcel numbers, and zoning classification of land immediately adjacent to or across from the tract
805.c.3 the widths of streets; the location of sanitary sewers, storm drains, water mains, culverts, and all other utilities or significant man-made features on or within 200 feet of any part of the tract
805.c.5 the location, size and ownership of all underground utilities and any rights-of-way or easements on the property
805.c.6 appropriate contours at 2- to 5-foot intervals
805.c.7 location of existing buildings and/or structures, the use of each building/structure, existing wells, on-lot sewage disposal systems, driveways
805.c.9 existing soil type(s) and the species and size of large trees on the site
805.d.1 consecutive numbering of lots
805.d.7 the location of required plantings
805.d.9 certification of water and sewer from the serving authority
805.d.10 tree protection zone

10. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed subdivision.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the April 1, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC boards and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

LMW:dw

cc: Alex Shnayer, Esq.  
Larry Young, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Bristol Township Engineer  
Randy Flager, Esq., Flager & Yockey, Bristol Township Solicitor  
William McCauley, Bristol Township Managing Director (via email)  
Colleen Costello, Bristol Township Department of Licenses and Inspections (via email)  
Tom Scott, Bristol Township Zoning Officer (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bristol Township Council
    Bristol Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision—Sycamore Avenue Subdivision
    TMP #5-7-30
    Applicant: Alex Shnayder, Esq.
    Owner: David Della-Croce
    Plan Dated: June 3, 2014
    Date Received: February 13, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which
prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code
(Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide an 18,750-square-foot parcel into three single-family detached lots consisting of
6,250 square feet each. The plan indicates that a dwelling and a garage currently exist on the site
and are intended to be removed. Public water and sewer facilities serve the site.

Location: Along the northern side of Sycamore Avenue, approximately 375 feet west of the
intersection of Sycamore Avenue and Fourth Street. A paper street, identified as Overlook
Avenue, borders the site to the west.

Zoning: The R-3 Residence District permits single-family detached dwellings on lots having a
minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet with a minimum lot width of 50 feet. The maximum building
area and impervious surface ratios are 30 and 40 percent, respectively.

Present Use: Residential.
COMMENTS

1. **Required setback**—For corner lots, Section 702.E.4 of the zoning ordinance requires a 25-foot front yard along each street. The plan shows a proposed setback of 6 feet from the edge of the right-of-way for Overlook Avenue (paper street) and indicates, “Proposed zoning front set back with variance.” The plan notes that the current front yard setback for the existing dwelling is 6 feet.

   It is unclear if a variance from the required setback has been requested and obtained. If the applicant intends to request a variance from this zoning ordinance requirement, an official request should be made to the Zoning Hearing Board. This issue should be resolved prior to the Township Council taking action on this proposed subdivision.

2. **Site capacity calculations**—Section 2101 of the zoning ordinance requires the submission of site capacity calculations with all applications for subdivision and land development. The plan should be revised to provide the required calculations.

3. **Location of driveways**—The plan should indicate the intended locations of the driveways for each lot so that compliance with the off-street parking and driveway requirements can be verified (Section 2114 of the zoning ordinance and Section 508 of the subdivision and land development ordinance.)

4. **Recreation land**—The plan should be revised to indicate how the subdivision would meet the recreation land requirements of Section 521.a of the subdivision and land development ordinance and/or the fee-in-lieu provisions in Section 521.c.

5. **Sidewalks and curbs**—Sections 503.a, 511.a, and 513.a of the subdivision and land development ordinance require sidewalks and curbs along streets unless determined unnecessary by Council. The plan should be revised to comply with these requirements unless it is determined that sidewalks and curbs are unnecessary in this area.

6. **Street trees**—Section 519.a.1.c of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that within any subdivision, street trees shall be planted along streets where suitable existing trees or natural wooded areas do not exist. Street trees are to be planted from 25 to 50 feet apart depending upon the size of the trees chosen. The plan should be revised to indicate the proposed location and species of the required street trees.

7. **Existing large trees**—Aerial photographs indicate that large trees may exist on the site. Section 501 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that where trees are located within a subdivision or land development, every possible means to the fullest extent shall be provided to preserve these features. We recommend that wherever possible, existing healthy trees be retained and included in the design of the site. At the time of future development, tree protection measures, as outlined in Section 520 of the subdivision and land development ordinance, should be employed for trees intended to remain to help ensure their survival during and after construction.
8. **Required information**—The plan should be revised to provide the following required information in accordance with Section 803 of the subdivision and land development ordinance:

- **803.a.7** the plan shall be labeled “Preliminary Plan—Not to be Recorded.”
- **803.b.1** name of the subdivision
- **803.b.5** a brief description of the proposal
- **803.b.6** total acreage of the tract
- **803.b.7** proof of any variances that may have been granted by the Township Zoning Hearing Board (see comment #1)
- **803.b.9** a location map at a scale of not less than 800 feet to the inch (location map shown is less than 800 feet to the inch)
- **803.c.2** the names of owners, tax parcel numbers, and zoning classification of land immediately adjacent to or across from the tract
- **803.c.3** the widths of streets; the location of sanitary sewers, storm drains, water mains, culverts, and all other utilities or significant man-made features on or within 200 feet of any part of the tract
- **803.c.5** the location, size and ownership of all underground utilities and any rights-of-way or easements on the property
- **803.c.6** appropriate contours at 2- to 5-foot intervals
- **803.c.7** the location of existing wells and on-lot sewage disposal systems (if they exist on the site), driveways, parking and other paved areas
- **803.c.9** location of species and size of large trees standing alone, the location and area of all floodplains, floodplain soils, woodlands, wetlands, slopes over 15 percent, and boundaries of all soil types with a description of each type
- **803.d.1** consecutive numbering of lots
- **803.d.2** the proposed width of streets
- **803.d.6** the total area of the tract and the proposed density
- **803.d.7** location and size of proposed storm drains, sanitary sewers, culverts, gas mains, water mains, fire hydrants, street lights, planting, special structures, and other underground conduits or structures
- **803.d.8** a plan for the surface drainage of the tract, which shall also indicate the impervious surface ratio. A plan to control erosion during and after the construction period shall be required as provided in Section 516 of the subdivision and land development ordinance
- **803.d.13** a landscape plan showing proposed contours and required street trees and plant schedule
- **803.d.17** tree protection zone
- **803.d.18** a stormwater plan

9. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed subdivision.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the April 1, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC boards and staff.
In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

LMW:dwb

cc: Alex Shnayder, Esq.
    Larry Young, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Bristol Township Engineer
    Randy Flager, Esq., Flager & Yockey, Bristol Township Solicitor
    William McCauley, Bristol Township Managing Director (via email)
    Colleen Costello, Bristol Township Department of Licenses and Inspections (via email)
    Tom Scott, Bristol Township Zoning Officer (via email)
March 13, 2015  
BCPC #11928

MEMORANDUM

TO: Doylestown Borough Council
    Doylestown Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Provident Bank
    TMP #8-6-2
    Applicant: Provident Bank
    Owner: Same
    Plan Dated: February 11, 2015
    Date Received: February 13, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: To remove an existing commercial building and construct a one-story 2,775-square-foot bank on a 24,785-square-foot parcel. The site is served by public water and sewerage.

Location: On the southeast corner of the intersection of North Main Street and Font Hill Drive.

Zoning: FC Free Standing Commercial District provides reasonable standards for the orderly development of highway-oriented businesses and commercial uses. A bank (Use 24 Business service, non-governmental) is a permitted use in the FC Free Standing Commercial (FC) zoning district. The minimum lot size for all permitted uses in the FC District is 20,000 square feet.

Present Use: Commercial.

COMMENTS

1. **Waivers**—The applicant is seeking waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance requirements:
   
   - Section 116.5 – Minimum pipe size
   - Section 516(F) – Edge of slopes (allow edge of slope to be closer than 5 feet from property).

Visit us at: www.buckscounty.org
- Section 803(C)(2) – Show existing features within 400 feet of site.
- Section 805(A)(1) – Plan drawn at a scale of 1”=50’ or 1”=100’
- Section 8-125.3.C(10) – Minimum 3 feet of cover of storm drain pipes
- Section 8-125.3.C(13) – 12 feet of stone over storm pipe
- Section 520(D)1.D(iii) & Table 1 Buffer Requirements – Planting and berm requirements

Under the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved and the minimum modification necessary.

2. **Parking area in front yard setback**—The plan depicts a small portion of the proposed parking area along North Main Street to be within the 35-foot front yard setback. Section 510 of the zoning ordinance does not permit parking areas to be located in the front yard.

3. **Traffic impact study**—The proposed land development may meet the criteria within Section 524(c)(7) of the subdivision and land development ordinance for warranting a traffic impact study. According to the Institute of Traffic Engineers, Trip Generation (7th Edition), a drive-in bank could generate approximately 1,400 trips per weekday.

4. **Tree protection**—Sheet 9 of the plan provides typical discussion of tree protection measures, but the plan shows that several off-site trees not marked for removal would be impacted by disturbances, related to the construction of parking areas and stormwater management facilities, within their drip lines. The plan should demonstrate compliance with Section 502(e)1.B(2) of the subdivision and land development ordinance which provides that if the root area within the drip line of any existing tree is encroached upon by more than ¼ of the total root area, the tree will not be considered preserved and must be replaced. The damage that may occur during construction could cause these trees to become a hazard and maintenance concern in coming years.

5. **Signs**—Except for traffic signage, the plan does not show any signs for the proposed office use. If signage is intended for the use, we recommend that the location and dimensions of all proposed signs be reviewed by the borough to ensure consistency with the regulations in Part 7 of the zoning ordinance.

6. **Stormwater management**—Sheet 2 of the plan lists a stormwater management report/erosion and sedimentation control narrative dated February 11, 2015 as a reference document. Borough officials should determine if this document demonstrates compliance with the stormwater management requirements found in Chapter 8, Part 1 of the Doylestown Borough Code of Ordinances. The borough engineer’s review should also determine whether the proposed land development meets these provisions.

7. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the
preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the April 1, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MMW:dwb

cc: Nicholas Cocozza, Provident Bank
    Frank A. Costanzo, P.E., Van Cleef Engineering Associates
    John F. Hartzel, Esq., Hartzel & Bush
    Karyn Hyland, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Borough Engineer
    John Davis, Borough Manager (via email)
Memorandum

To: Doylestown Borough Council
   Doylestown Borough Planning Commission

From: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

Subject: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for McCaffrey’s Food Markets
   TMP #8-4-105

Applicant: McCaffrey’s Food Markets
Owner: Kola, LLC
Plan Dated: February 4, 2015
Date Received: February 13, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

General Information

Proposal: Construct an 822-square-foot addition to an existing building to be used for retail uses (food market) on a 40,442-square-foot site. Public water and sewerage serve the site.

Location: Southern side of West State Street, between West and Franklin streets. Beek Street abuts the rear of the site.

Zoning: CC-Central Commercial District permits a variety of retail and office oriented uses, including Use 29 Retail Shop, on lots of 6,000 square feet or more.

Present Use: Vacant (former hobby shop).

Comments

1. Parking area in front yard setback—The plan depicts three parking spaces, one in the western parking area and two in the eastern parking area, within the 10-foot front yard setback. Section 510 of the zoning ordinance does not permit parking areas to be located in the front yard.
2. **Street trees**—The plan does not depict any street trees for the proposed land development. Section 520(d)1.A(1) requires street trees for any land development where suitable street trees do not exist.

3. **Screen wall**—The proposed screen wall is located in close proximity to adjacent structures on TMPs #8-8-17 and 8-8-25. We recommend that these existing structures be shown on the plans to ensure that the proposed screen wall does not interfere with their access. The borough’s application for land development waiver plan checklist requires that the location of existing buildings on and adjacent to the tract be shown on the plan.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the April 1, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MMW:dwb

cc: James J. McCaffrey, McCaffrey’s Food Markets  
Van Cleef Engineering Associates  
Karyn Hyland, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Borough Engineer  
John Davis, Borough Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO:    Doylestown Township Board of Supervisors  
       Doylestown Township Planning Commission

FROM:  Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Buckingham Retail Properties-  
         Doylestown  
         TMP #9-6-25, -26  
         Applicant: Thomas Verrichia  
         Owner: Same  
         Plan Dated: December 12, 2014  
         Date Received: February 9, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Consolidate two parcels into one 9.006-acre tract for the construction of a convenience store (4,685 square feet) with a 12-pump fueling station under canopy, and a retail pharmacy (14,673 square feet) with two drive-through service lanes. Shared access and a total of 130 parking spaces would be provided on the site (67 spaces for the Wawa and 63 for the Rite Aid Pharmacy). Public water and sewer facilities are intended to serve the development. The existing structures would be demolished.

Location: Southwestern corner of the intersection of PA Route 313 (Swamp Road) and Ferry Road, adjacent to New Britain and Plumstead townships in the village of Fountainville.

Zoning: C-4 Office and Medical Professional District allows such uses as office, medical office, veterinary office and clinic, nursing home, financial establishment, banquet facility, and emergency services. A minimum lot area of 30,000 square feet is required for most of the permitted uses with a maximum building coverage of 20 percent and maximum impervious surface coverage of 60 percent.

Present Use: Industrial/residential; former Eagle Spring Water Company and single-family dwelling.
COMMENTS

1. **Zoning amendment submission**—The subject site is zoned C-4 Office and Medical Professional which does not permit the proposed uses (Use E-1 Retail Shop, Use E-2 Large Retail Store or proposed Use E-20 Motor Vehicle Fueling Center). With the exception of a bank use, drive-in facilities also do not appear to be allowed with a business in the C-4 district. Therefore, the plan should not be approved as submitted.

We note that a zoning amendment to permit the proposed uses has been submitted to our office and the township for review and comment. The Bucks County Planning Commission has prepared a review letter (BCPC #9-15-1(P)), dated March 4, 2015, regarding the proposed amendment, and a copy of the review has been sent to the applicant and township under separate cover. Although the plan does not comply with the existing C-4 zoning provisions, and therefore should not be approved as submitted, the following is a review of the development plan as if it were in compliance with the proposed zoning ordinance amendment. It should be emphasized that this review does not offer an opinion on the merits of the proposed zoning amendment.

2. **W40FB-Tower**—The building footprint on the plan sheets for Wawa note a W40FB-Tower with Large Trash. The C-4 district allows non-tower wireless communication facilities provided that the provisions of Section 175-16F(4)e of the zoning ordinance are met. However, no detail or explanation regarding the tower use is provided on the plan. We recommend that the plan be revised to clearly indicate what is intended by the tower with large trash use to ensure it complies with all pertinent ordinance requirements.

3. **Waivers**—Sheet 1 of the plan notes that three waivers are requested from the subdivision and land development ordinance regarding grading, tree removal and tree replacement provisions. In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved, and the minimum modification necessary.

4. **Transportation and circulation issues**

   a. **Ferry Road access drive**—A traffic impact study (TIS) was provided with the plan submission as required by Section 153-20.E(1)(a) of the subdivision and land development ordinance. The TIS indicates that the access drive proposed on Ferry Road, which is aligned with the access drive for the shopping center located across the street in New Britain Township, will not have an exclusive left-turn lane into the subject site, due to its proximity to PA Route 313 (Swamp Road). The location of the proposed access drive on Ferry Road so close to the signalized intersection at PA Route 313 would interfere with, and possibly block, the left-turn lane for northbound traffic on Ferry Road.

   While the TIS indicates that limited traffic will be making a left into the site during the morning and evening peak hours (10 and 19 vehicles, respectively), we believe that it is probable that even these few numbers of vehicular trips could be blocked from entering the site due to excessive queuing from vehicles making a left turn and through
movements at the northbound approach of Ferry Road at PA Route 313. Sheet 23 (Aerial) shows an example of how the vehicular queue on Ferry Road currently blocks access at the proposed location.

This existing condition will be worsened if the eastbound approach of PA Route 313 experiences greater levels of congestion than those indicated in the TIS. If severe delays occur, traffic attempting to enter the site may find it quicker to make the right turn onto southbound Ferry Road, followed by an immediate left into the site, rather than to use the main access drive to the site from PA Route 313. Due to the high opposing volumes, it is unsafe to have unprotected left turning vehicles at this location on Ferry Road. It also may lead to southbound congestion if the Ferry Road shoulders are insufficiently wide for through movements attempting to get around vehicles waiting to turn left into the site.

We recommend that the applicant and township officials re-examine the use of a full movement intersection at the Ferry Road location due to the lack of left-turn lanes, and also investigate the feasibility of eliminating the left turns altogether or possibly during peak hours.

b. Internal access—Except for the two access driveways, the development on the site is proposed as two separate entities, each with its own parking lot and no pedestrian connection or interrelationship between the businesses or nearby area. We recommend that pedestrian linkages (e.g., paths, crosswalks, walkways, etc.) be provided on-site among the two buildings, and that connections to the larger area also be considered to conveniently and safely direct people and bicyclists that may wish to patronize the businesses. Site amenities such as a bike rack and bench could be coordinated with any potential site and community linkages.

5. Sewage facilities—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the April 1, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

CHG:dwb

cc: Thomas Verrichia
John Hornick, P.E., Bohler Engineer PA LLC
John A. VanLuvanee, Eastburn & Gray, P.C.
Marlo Canales, P.E., Pickering, Corts & Summerson, Township Engineer
Stephanie J. Mason, Township Manager (via email)
New Britain and Plumstead townships (adjacent municipalities) (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Falls Township Board of Supervisors
   Falls Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Sika Building Addition
         TMPs: #13-51-1-13; -13-1; and -13-2
         Applicant: HFH PA, LP
         Owner: Same
         Plan Dated: February 20, 2015
         Date Received: February 23, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a 37,090-square-foot addition to an existing industrial building on a 6.963-acre site. The application states the site is served by public water and sewer.

Location: Northwest corner of the intersection of Gamesa and Ben Fairless drives, in U.S. Steel's Keystone Industrial Port Complex.

Zoning: The MPM Materials Processing and Manufacturing District permits a variety of light and heavy industrial uses on a minimum tract of 50 acres with a lot of at least 5 acres for each principal building. A maximum impervious surface ratio of 80 percent is permitted in this district for parcels of more than 8 acres.

Present Use: Industrial.

COMMENTS

1. Plan information—Bucks County Board of Assessment tax maps show two smaller tax map parcels (TMPs #13-5-1-13-1 and -2) situated within the boundaries of TMP #13-51-1-13. The smaller parcels, according to the project engineer, surround buildings held in condominium ownership, and one of them, TMP #13-51-1-13-1, would be extended to accommodate the proposed building addition. The plan should be revised to show the boundaries, the area
(existing and proposed), and tax map numbers of all parcels involved, and the applicable
development standards given the configuration of parcels and the nature and location of the
proposed development. The building coverage and impervious surface areas should account
for the two future tank farms, silos, and other proposed facilities.

2. **Front yard**—A tank farm, silos, bunkers, hoppers, storage, a dryer and a filter are depicted
within the minimum 100-foot front yard required along Gamesa Drive according to Table 5
of the zoning ordinance. The plan should comply with the front yard setback requirement.

3. **Natural resources**—The plan should be revised to include full designation of any areas of
natural resources on the site, for each tax map parcel, in compliance with Section 191-52.1 of
the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO), so that adherence to natural
resource preservation standards can be confirmed.

4. **Landscaping**
   a. **General landscaping**—Section 209-42.B.1 of the zoning ordinance requires
      clustered dense plantings at least 4 feet high between off-street parking areas and any
      lot line or street line, except where a building intervenes or where the distance to the
      lot line or street line exceeds 100 feet. Street trees are required along the sides of all
      streets where suitable street trees to not exist, under SALDO Section 191-48. Township
      officials should determine whether adequate landscaping has been provided
      along the frontage of Ben Fairless Drive.
   
   b. **Proposed ash trees**—Due to the discovery of the emerald ash borer (EAB) in Bucks
      County in 2012 (Warrington Township), the proposed *Fraxinus pennsylvanica* ‘Patmore’
      (seedless green ash) trees should be replaced with another type of street tree. The EAB
      is very destructive and once ash trees are infested, they will die without ongoing
      insecticide treatment. Additionally, township officials should consider developing a
      management strategy for ash trees located in municipal parks and other public
      property.

5. **Stormwater management**—Township officials should determine whether the proposal
   would comply with the provisions of the municipal stormwater management ordinance.

6. **Sewage facilities**
   a. **Sewer system**—The application states the site is served by public water and sewer.
      The Keystone Industrial Port Complex is designated for sewer and water service by
      U.S. Steel in the township’s Act 537 sewage facilities plan. The township should
      confirm the nature of sewer and water service.
   
   b. **Planning module**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module
      Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection to
determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted
      for this proposed land development.
7. **Editorial**—Maintenance Drive, labeled on the inset map on Sheet 1 of the plan, is now known as Gamesa Drive, and is so labeled on the rest of the site plan. The maps on the site plan depict TMP #13-51-1-18 abutting the southwest edge of TMP #13-51-1-13, rather than TMP #13-51-1-14, as is indicated by county Board of Assessment records. The discrepancy should be resolved. The signature block on the plan lists the tax map parcel number as #13-51-13-1. The block should be revised to include all three subject parcels.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the April 1, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

GF:dwb

cc: HFH PA, LP
    Erik Garton, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Inc.
    Tom Profy IV, Esq., Begley, Carlin & Mandio
    Tom Beach, Remington, Vernick & Beach
    Jim Sullivan, P.E., T&M Associates, Township Engineer
    Peter Gray, Township Manager (via e-mail)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Haycock Township Board of Supervisors
Haycock Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Lot Line Change for Schur & Rubic
TMPS: #14-6-53-1 and 14-6-53-2
Applicant: Israel and Sharon Schur
Owners: Israel & Sharon Schur and Wayne J. & Antionette P. Rubic
Plan Dated: January 15, 2015
Date Received: February 11, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Convey 3.6501 acres (gross), noted as Parcel A on the plan, from TMP #14-6-53-2 to TMP #14-6-53-1. As a result of the lot line change, TMP #14-6-53-2 would be 6.9808 acres (gross) and TMP #14-6-53-1 would be 16.7275 acres (gross). Both lots contain an existing dwelling unit and additional outbuilding(s). Individual on-lot water and sewage facilities service both lots.

Location: On the north side of Thatcher Road, approximately 800 feet west of its intersection with Covered Bridge Drive.


Present Use: Residential

COMMENTS

1. Natural Resource Protection—Section 402.3.F.(3) of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that the natural resource protection standards contained in the zoning ordinance be shown on the proposed plan.
2. **Contour lines**—Section 402.3.P of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that USGS contours be shown on a plan for lot-line adjustment. Prior to final plan approval this information should be shown on the proposed plan.

3. **Sewage facilities planning module**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed subdivision. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the subdivision review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the April 1, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

AAF:dwb

cc:  Israel and Sharon Schur  
Wayne and Antionette Rubic  
Eastern/Chadrow Associates, Inc.  
C. Robert Wynn Associates, Inc., Municipal Engineer  
Nancy Yodis, Township Secretary/Treasurer
MEMORANDUM

TO: Lower Makefield Township Board of Supervisors
    Lower Makefield Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Final Plan of Subdivision—Moon Nurseries Tract
    TMP #20-3-36-1
    Applicant: Orleans Homes, Inc.
    Owner: Moon Nurseries Maryland, Inc.
    Plan Dated: November 26, 2013
    Last Revised: December 31, 2014
    Date Received: February 24, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: To subdivide a 29.76-acre (gross) site into 15 single-family detached lots which range in size from 34,058 to 42,336 net square feet (34,058 to 42,336 gross square feet). The site will also contain two common area lots. Common Area #1 will consist of 12,254 square feet (gross) east of proposed Silver Stream Drive as well as an area west of proposed Silver Stream Drive (size not indicated) that will contain preserved steep slopes; Common Area #2, which consists of 567,755 square feet (gross), contains significant natural resources and will contain three proposed stormwater management basins. Public water and sewer facilities are intended to serve the development.

Location: Along the southern side of Quarry Road, approximately 110 feet east of Lindenhurst Road.

Zoning: R-1 Residential Low Density District permits single-family detached dwellings on a minimum net lot area of 34,000 square feet for sites in which the base site area contains between 32 and 46 percent of natural resources. (According to the site capacity calculations, 35.8 percent of the parcel’s base site area is classified as resource protected land.) A maximum permitted density on the net buildable site area is 1.07 dwelling units per acre. The required minimum lot width is 140 feet at the front building setback line.

Present Use: Nursery.
COMMENTS

Prior to final plan approval, the township should ensure that the plan meets all conditions of preliminary plan approval. The plan should not be approved until all issues are resolved.

The conditions of preliminary plan approval, as outlined in a letter from the township solicitor dated November 7, 2014, indicate that waivers have been granted from 17 subdivision and land development ordinance requirements. However, according to information on Plan Sheet 2 of 18, and as indicated in correspondence from the applicant’s engineer (in letters dated January 21, 2015 and January 28, 2015), an additional waiver has been requested. The applicant is requesting a waiver from Section 178-38.F of the subdivision and land development ordinance to allow a reduced turn-around area for Red Maple Drive. In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based and the minimum modification necessary. This issue should be resolved prior to final plan approval.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the April 1, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

LMW:dwb

cc: Orleans Homes, Inc.
Boucher & James, Township Engineer
Terry Fedorchak, Lower Makefield Township Manager (via email)
Steve Ware, Planning and Zoning Administrator, Keystone Consulting Services (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Middletown Township Board of Supervisors
Middletown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision and Land Development for Proposed Commercial Development
TMP# 22-047-011-002
Applicant: Waterstone Retail Development
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: January 29, 2015
Date Received: February 2, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a building consisting of 3,350 square feet on a 0.93-acre portion of a 12.1-acre parcel. The lot contains an existing 104,456-square-foot building (The Dump) and associated parking. The existing parking area and internal accessways are proposed to be reconfigured for the construction of a cellular phone retailer (1,500 square feet) and a coffee shop (1,850 square feet) with a drive-through facility. Public water and sewerage facilities are proposed to serve the development.

Location: Southeastern side of Lincoln Highway with access also on Highland Park Way.

Zoning: C Commercial District permits a variety of professional office and retail sales related uses on a minimum lot size of 20,000 square feet and a lot width of at least 100 feet. A maximum impervious surface ratio of 60 percent is permissible. Restaurants having drive-in or take out service are only permitted by special exception.

Present Use: Commercial.
COMMENTS

1. **Proposed drive-in**—A drive-in facility is proposed to serve the coffee shop. Section 1502.D of the zoning ordinance requires that drive-in service for restaurant uses is permitted by special exception approval by the zoning hearing board. The plan does not indicate whether such approval was received. Therefore, we recommend that the planning commission not make a recommendation to the board of supervisors regarding this proposal until there is resolution of the request for special exception of the drive-in facility.

We note that proposed placement of the drive-in will make it less convenient for pedestrian patrons to access the building from the parking lot due to the drive-in configuration and various crossings, and its retaining wall. If a drive-in is subsequently allowed, we recommend that a more coordinated arrangement between the parking spaces, driveway aisles and crossings, drive-in lane, and building entry be examined to ensure safe, defined, and convenient pedestrian access and enhanced vehicular circulation is provided (also see comment 4, below).

2. **Parking and landscaping**—Section 421.5.D of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that the edge of any parking area not be closer than 15 feet to the outside wall of any building. The area is to be used for sidewalks to entryways and foundation plantings. The three angled parking spaces on the west side of the building appear to be within 15 feet of the building. The plan should be revised to indicate compliance with this ordinance provision.

In addition, Section 1503.J of the zoning ordinance requires a special 12-foot-wide planting strip along Lincoln Highway with the rearmost five feet of the planting strip landscaped in a manner satisfactory to the Township planning commission. We suggest that a review of the existing planting strip be undertaken to determine if it is adequately landscaped or if supplemental plantings are needed.

3. **Impervious surface coverage**—Sheet 3 of the plan indicates that the existing impervious surface ratio on the site is nonconforming given that a maximum of 60 percent is permitted and 90.05 percent impervious surface currently exists. The plan proposes a very small decrease in the overall amount of impervious surface on the site (89.85 percent coverage). We note that according to the calculations provided on Sheet 3 of the plan, 486 spaces are required, whereas 566 are provided. Therefore, to help reduce the impact of stormwater runoff on the site and within the local watershed due to the extensive amount of impervious surface, we suggest that consideration be given to the use of “green concepts,” such as pervious paving in new parking stalls, establishment of rain gardens, planted swales, and the addition of trees and green spaces within the parking areas.

4. **Internal circulation**—The main accessway in and around the site and the interior parking aisles are currently a short distance from where the proposed building is to be located. The first parking aisle into the parking lot is proposed to be changed from an egress lane to an ingress lane. Due to the parking arrangement, this leaves limited area for vehicular stacking at the main ingress/egress points. The proposed location of the drive-in further complicates this issue. To avoid conflicts between the main and secondary accessways, parking aisle, and parking space movements, we recommend that longer stems or necks be provided to lessen the potential for blocked accessways. Since this area of the site will be used as higher intensity
with increased traffic volumes, improved channelization to define and enhance safe and convenient ingress/egress would be beneficial near the site’s main access point.

5. **Refuse disposal**—The location of the dumpster will require workers to go down a stairway to dispose of trash and recyclables. We suggest that the applicant and township officials discuss alternatives to this proposal given possible hazards and safety concerns associated with this arrangement.

6. **Plan reference**—Reference to South Heidelberg Township on Sheet 3 should be changed to the correct municipality.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the April 1, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

CHG:dwb

cc: Anton Melchionda  
John Hornick, P.E., Bohler Engineering  
Wayne Kiefer, P.E., TriState Engineers, Township Engineer  
Patrick Duffy, Township Zoning Officer (via email)  
Stephanie Teoli Kuhls, Township Manager (via email)
Memorandum

To: New Britain Township Board of Supervisors
    New Britain Township Planning Commission

From: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

Subject: Preliminary Plan of Land Development—Estates at Peace Valley
        TMP #26-1-95-1
        Applicant: Benjamin Goldthorp
        Owner: Same
        Plan Dated: March 25, 2014
        Last Revised: February 25, 2015
        Date Received: March 3, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission Professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

General Information

Proposal: Subdivide a 10.23-acre parcel into three lots for single-family detached homes: Lot 1 (2.001 acres); Lot 2 (1.706 acres); and Lot 3 (5.396 acres), all net acres. The lots are to be served by public water and sewer.

Location: North side of Sellersville Road, about 170 feet east of Brook Lane.

Zoning: Suburban Residential-2 (SR-2) District, permits single-family detached dwellings with minimum lot areas of 2 acres. The proposal is subject to the terms of a stipulation and settlement agreement executed February 23, 2015. The agreement grants seven variances.

Use: Vacant.
COMMENTS

1. **Site capacity calculations**—The site capacity calculations on the record site and subdivision plan on Sheet CS-101 list the required natural resource protection ratios, but do not specify the ratios provided. The table should be revised to clarify the resource protection ratios actually afforded.

2. **Variances and waivers**—Plan Sheet CS-101 includes a list of six variances and a list of eight waivers. The six variances listed in a table on our copy of the plan do not conform precisely to the list of variances listed as approved through the stipulated agreement. A variance from Section 27-2104.d of the zoning ordinance regarding substitution of a driveway easement for lane access is listed on the plan, but not in the agreement, and a variance from Section 27-201 of the ordinance, regarding the minimum lot area of Lots 2 and 3, is listed in our copy of the agreement, but not in the plan, and its wording duplicates that of the variance from Section 27-802.b, also listed in the text of the agreement.

In the list of waivers on the plan, the waiver of Section 22-706.1.B of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) is listed twice. It appears that waiver number 7, regarding sidewalk installation along the street frontage, should instead refer to SALDO Section 706.2.B.

The tables on the plan do not clarify whether the listed variances and waivers have been granted, or simply requested. The final plan should list all granted variances and waivers, with accurate section numbers.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the April 1, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

GF: dwb

cc: Benjamin Goldthorp
Langan Engineering & Environmental Services
Craig Kennard, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer
Eileen Bradley, Manager, New Britain Township (via e-mail)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Perkasie Borough Council
Perkasie Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Dunkin Donuts
TMP #33-16-34
Applicant: Dunkin Donuts
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: February 3, 2015
Date Received: February 13, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a 3,225-square-foot building for an eating place with drive-through on a 26,676-square-foot (0.612-acre) parcel. Public water and sewerage facilities serve the site.

Location: Southeastern corner of Fifth Street and Blooming Glen Road.

Zoning: C-1 Business Professional District permits use E(3) Eating place on a minimum lot area of 15,000 square feet.

Present Use: Office.

COMMENTS

1. **Conditional use**—According to zoning ordinance Section 186-18.E(3) Eating place (without drive-through service except in C-1 District by conditional use), eating places where a drive-
through window is proposed may be permitted only by conditional use under the provisions of Section 186-128 Conditional Use. Eating places and facilities with drive-through service shall satisfy the criteria of Section 186-18.H(3). Conditional use approval must be obtained from Borough Council prior to plan approval.

2. **Buffering**—The plan should be revised to meet the buffering requirements of Section 186-54.D of the zoning ordinance and Section 164-35.D of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO).

   A Class A buffer is required when a proposed retail and consumer service use is proposed along a collector road, but no trees are provided along the Fifth Street and Blooming Glen Road frontages, and the 10-foot wide buffer yard is not designated in the front yard setbacks.

   A Class B buffer is required where a proposed retail and consumer service use abuts an institutional use. The plan proposes parking 7.5 feet from the boundary line abutting school district property (adjacent TMP #12-14-23-2) and no buffer material is provided. The required Class B buffer consists of a 15-foot-wide buffer yard with three planting or planting/fencing options.

   A Class C buffer is required for a retail and consumer services use proposed along any residential use. The plan proposes parking 7 feet from the property line that borders a residential use (adjacent TMP #12-14-23-4), instead of the required 20-foot-wide buffer yard, but the proposed 6-foot-high fence and Arborvitae planting exceeds the required 4-foot-high fence and planting option.

3. **Pedestrian access**

   a. **Sidewalks**—According to subdivision and land development ordinance Section 164-24.D sidewalks shall be provided along both sides of all streets, except in the opinion of Borough Council with the advice of the Planning Commission that they are unnecessary for the public safety and convenience. The required sidewalk should be provided along Blooming Glen Road and it should connect into the site. The plan also should be revised to extend the existing sidewalk along Fifth Street into the site along both sides of the access driveway and provide a crosswalk connecting the sidewalk to the building.

   b. **Crosswalk**—Safety issues should be addressed for pedestrians, particularly students who will be crossing Fifth Street from the school complex before and after school when traffic volumes will be heavy and school buses will be on the road. At a minimum, a crosswalk should be provided across Fifth Street.
c. **Disabled-accessible parking**—According to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Standards for Accessible Design, accessible parking spaces shall be located at the shortest distance between adjacent parking and an accessible building entrance. The location of the proposed disabled-accessible parking space requires customers to cross two potentially moving lanes of traffic, to enter the restaurant. Additionally, it is unclear why the proposed disabled-accessible parking space and crosswalk are placed at a diagonal, instead of directly across from the restaurant entrance. The parking layout should minimize potential conflicts with through traffic to make it as safe and convenient as possible for customers, especially those with disabilities, to access the building.

4. **Stormwater management**—It should be determined if the plan complies with the Borough’s stormwater management ordinance Chapter 158.

5. **Editorial comment**—In the Zoning Information on Sheet 1, the required minimum lot area of 87,120 square feet (for a planned commercial development) should be revised to 15,000 square feet (for any other principal structure or use), and the notes regarding lot area nonconformity should be removed.

6. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the April 1, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MW:dwb

cc: Manoj Patel, Dunkin Donuts  
    Nate Fox, Esq., Begley, Carlin & Mandio, Borough Solicitor  
    Pete Andersen, P.E., Andersen Engineering Associates, Borough Engineer  
    Andrea Coaxum, Borough Manager (via email)  
    Brandy McKeever, Code Enforcement Administrator (via email)  
    East Rockhill Township (Adjacent Municipality)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Perkasie Borough Council
Perkasie Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for Country Ridge
TMP #33-2-45-1
Applicant: Hallmark Homes Group, Inc.
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: February 9, 2015
Date Received: February 17, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a 7.55-acre (net) tract into 18 single-family detached lots with 3.74 acres of open space as an Open Space Preservation Performance Standard Subdivision I. Public water and sewerage facilities are intended.

Location: Northern side of West Park Avenue, between South Ninth Street and the intersection of Jefferson Drive and West Park Avenue.

Zoning: R-1B Residential District permits an Open Space Preservation Performance Standard Subdivision I use on a site area of 5.01 acres to 10.0 acres, minimum lot area of 6,500 square feet, minimum open space ratio of 45 percent, maximum impervious surface ratio of 35 percent, and a maximum density of 5.5 dwelling units per acre.

Present Use: Agricultural.
COMMENTS

1. **Proposed use**—Under Site Data on Sheet 3, it appears that the stated single-family residential use should be revised as Open Space Preservation Performance Standard Subdivision I use, to be consistent with the listed requirements.

2. **Environmental performance standards**—The site capacity calculations (Sheet 3) indicate the amount of each existing resource on the site that is required to be undisturbed and protected as permanent open space, according to the environmental performance standards of zoning ordinance Section 186-57. The plan also should specify the amount of each existing resource that is proposed to be protected, so that compliance with Section 186-57 can be confirmed.

3. **Stormwater facilities in open space**—Zoning ordinance Section 186-58 states that, in an Open Space Preservation Performance Subdivision I or II development, “naturalized stormwater management facilities” shall be permitted in the required open space, and additional stormwater management facilities, including retention basins, shall be limited to 20 percent of the required open space area on a site, at the discretion of the Borough Engineer. The plan should indicate if proposed Basin 1 meets the 20 percent maximum permitted by Section 186-58.

4. **Maintenance of easement areas**—The plan proposes a drainage easement between Lots 6 and 7 and a sanitary sewer easement between Lots 10 and 11. The easement areas do not appear to be part of the adjacent lots. Note 31 on Sheet 3 states a homeowners association will be created to maintain the stormwater management facilities, entrance features, and open space. The plan should clarify who will be responsible for maintenance of the sanitary sewer and drainage easement areas.

5. **Trees near utilities**—The location of several proposed trees may have to be adjusted to maintain an appropriate distance from proposed water, sanitary sewer, and storm sewer lines. For example, it appears that proposed trees on Lots 8, 9, 17, 18, around the western side of Basin 1, and in the buffer behind Lots 10 and 11 are within 10 feet of proposed utility lines.

6. **Recreation land**—The plan should indicate compliance with subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) Section 164-36.D(3), which requires that recreation land be provided for any residential subdivision or land development.

7. **Water volumes**—According to (SALDO) Section 164-68.D.23, the preliminary plan must state the estimated average and peak volumes of water needed to serve the proposed land development. An indication of the available water for fire flow and the water volume required to satisfy the Insurance Services Office (ISO) standards for fire protection also should be provided.

8. **Waiver requested**—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting a waiver from subdivision and land development ordinance Section 164-701.A.5 regarding plan sheet size. In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or
hardship on which the request for the waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved, and the minimum modification necessary.

9. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed subdivision. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the subdivision review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the April 1, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MW:dwb

cc: Hallmark Homes Group, Inc.
    Jon S. Tresslar, P.E., P.L.S., Boucher & James, Inc.
    Nate Fox, Begley, Carlin & Mandio, Borough Solicitor
    Erik Garton, Gilmore & Associates, Borough Engineer
    Andrea Coaxum, Borough Manager (via email)
    Brandy McKeever, Code Enforcement Administrator (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Richland Township Board of Supervisors
Richland Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Lot Line Change and Land Development for Cemetery Road
TMPs #36-17-25 and -25-3
Applicant: Cemetery Road LLC
Owners: Cemetery Road LLC and California Road LLC
Plan Dated: February 11, 2015
Date Received: February 18, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Section 502 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal has been sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The professional staff prepared the following review.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Convey an 8,261-square-foot parcel from TMP #36-17-25 (3.742 acres) to TMP #36-17-25-3 (0.548 acres). As a result of the conveyance, TMP #36-17-25 would consist of 3.552 gross acres and TMP #36-17-25-3 would consist of 0.738 gross acres. An 8,592-square-foot professional office would be built on TMP #36-17-25. A two-unit residential conversion occupies TMP #36-17-25-3. The site is served by public water and sewer.

Location: On the north side of Cemetery Road at its intersection with California Road.

Zoning: SRH, Suburban Residential High Intensity District. A D1 Office Use is permitted by conditional use in the district on a lot of at least 30,000 square feet with a maximum impervious surface ratio of 30 percent. A B2 Residential Conversion Use is permitted on a lot of at least 30,000 square feet at a maximum density of 2.9 dwelling units per acre. The current B2 Use is a nonconformity.

Present Use: Residential and vacant
COMMENTS

1. **Conditional use**—Because of the nature of the use, the proposal requires conditional use approval from the Board of Supervisors under Section 27-403 of the zoning ordinance.

2. **Nonconformity**—The two-unit apartment building on TMP #36-17-25-3 is a nonconformity, because the lot area is substandard for the existing density of residential development. Section 27-405.B.2a(2) of the zoning ordinance permits residential conversions at a maximum density of 2.9 dwelling units/acre. The nonconformity would be somewhat lessened by the proposed conveyance of 0.19 acre from TMP #36-17-25 to TMP #36-17-25-3, although the proposed density of 3.86 dwelling units/acre would still exceed the ordinance standard.

3. **Floor area**—Under Section 27-405.D.1a of the zoning ordinance, the maximum allowable floor area is 5,000 square feet for an office located in a zoning district other than Planned Commercial or Planned Industrial. The area of the proposed office building is 8,592 square feet.

4. **Natural resource protection**—The plan should be revised to delineate any natural resources on site, and provide site capacity calculations that meet the requirements of Section 27-511 of the zoning ordinance, so that adherence to resource protection standards can be determined.

5. **Buffers**—The plan should be revised to depict landscaped buffer yards required under Section 27-516 of the zoning ordinance. According to Table 1, 50-foot “Class B” landscaped buffers are required along the adjoining boundaries of the two subject parcels. A 25-foot landscaped “Class A” buffer is required between TMP #36-17-25 and the office use on adjoining TMP #36-17-25-4. The nature of the use on the small adjoining parcel of TMP #36-17-25-2 is not given, although a 50-foot landscaped buffer is outlined. The adequacy of the width and landscaping of the buffer yards cannot be determined based on the information given.

6. **Access easement**—The plan proposes a driveway that provides access between TMP #36-17-25 and TMP #36-17-25-3. We recommend that an access easement be provided over the shared portion of the driveway.

7. **Street trees**—Section 22-519 of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) requires street trees to be planted at minimum 45-foot intervals along all streets where suitable trees do not exist.

8. **Sidewalks**—Township officials should determine whether sidewalks are required along the Cemetery Road frontage, according to the provisions of SALDO Section 22-518.

9. **Dead-end parking**—The proposed parking lot on the north side of the office building should provide a back-up space at the end of the access aisle.

10. **Stormwater management**—As a result of the proposed office development on TMP #36-17-25, the impervious surface coverage would increase by 3,658 square feet. Township officials should confirm that the proposal complies with the provisions of the municipal stormwater management ordinance, including water quality standards.
11. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

GF:dwb

cc: Cemetery Road, LLC
    California Road, LLC
    Meese Engineering, P.C.
    Judith Stern Goldstein, Boucher & James, Inc.
    Mike Schwartz, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer (via email)
    Steven Sechriest, Township Manager (via email)
    Quakertown Borough (adjacent municipality) (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Telford Borough Council
   Telford Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision and Conveyance—Trinity Cemetery
        TMP #43-1-112
        Applicant: Lutheran Community at Telford
        Owner: Trinity Reformed Church of Telford
        Plan Dated: February 3, 2015
        Date Received: February 13, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a 5.18-acre area, identified as Parcel “A”, from TMP #43-1-112 containing 9.16 acres and convey it to adjacent TMP #43-1-104 which contains an existing institutional use (Lutheran Community at Telford). The plans do not indicate the resulting acreage of adjacent TMP #43-1-104 with the proposed conveyance of land. The remaining lands of the subject property, 3.98 acres, contain an existing cemetery. Information on the Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) application that was submitted with the subdivision plan indicates that public water and sewer facilities serve the area.

Location: Along the northern side of East Broad Street, approximately 500 feet northeast of the intersection of Washington and East Broad streets.

Zoning: I Institutional District permits a variety of institutional uses such as libraries, religious institutions, municipal uses, and cemeteries on varying lot sizes depending on the use. Cemeteries are permitted on a minimum tract size of 2 acres.

The district also permits retirement communities, residential life-care facilities or similar licensed institutions for the care of the handicapped, senior population, and/or other persons who require nursing or convalescent care for extended periods of time. Such uses require a minimum tract size of 10 acres and are permitted a maximum density of 12 dwelling units per gross acre.
Present Use: Cemetery; Parcel A (to be conveyed to TMP 43-1-104) contains woodlands with some existing unidentified structures.

COMMENTS

1. **Existing wooded area**—According to aerial photographs, proposed Parcel “A” is almost entirely wooded. The plan should be revised to indicate the wooded area on the subject parcel (see comment #6 below.)

2. **Proposed use of Parcel “A”**—The plan should be revised to indicate the intended use of Parcel “A” so that compliance with the zoning district requirements can be verified.

3. **Adjacent TMP #43-1-104**—In order to determine how the proposed subdivision and conveyance of Parcel “A” will effect adjacent TMP #43-1-104, it is recommended that the plan be revised to provide a boundary survey showing all contiguous ground contained in TMP #43-1-104. In addition, site information such as the proposed lot area of TMP #43-1-104 should be provided on the plan.

4. **Wellhead Protection**—According to the Wellhead Protection Overlay District on Exhibit A in the zoning ordinance, the site appears to be located within zones 2 and 3 of the Wellhead Protection Overlay District. Part 19 of the zoning ordinance contains regulations for development depending on the land use, as well as specific criteria regarding stormwater management controls, and additional preliminary plan requirements. The borough should ensure that any proposal on this site meets the regulations of this district.

5. **Recording of deeds**—If the proposed subdivision and conveyance is approved, Borough officials should ensure the deeds for both lots are rewritten and recorded, particularly since Parcel “A”, on its own, would be considered a landlocked parcel.

6. **Preliminary plan requirements**—The plan should be revised to provide the following required information in accordance with Section 402 of the subdivision and land development ordinance:

   - 402.2.D the location, species, and size of trees standing alone (over 6 inches in caliper measured at breast height); the location of tree masses
   - 402.3.A the north point
   - 402.3.H building setback lines, with distances from the ultimate right-of-way
   - 402.3.I indication of any lots in which a use other than residential is intended

7. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed subdivision.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the April 1, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.
In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

LMW:dwb

cc: Lutheran Community at Telford
    Ronald D. Jackson, P.E., Boucher & James, Inc.
    Patrick DiGangi, P.E., CKS Engineers, Inc., Borough Engineer
    Mark D. Fournier, Borough Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warminster Township Board of Supervisors
   Warminster Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for 273 West County Line Road
         TMP #49-9-9; 49-9-12
         Applicant: Sauers Investment Properties, LLC
         Owner: Same
         Plan Dated: January 1, 2015
         Date Received: January 29, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which
has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning
Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Redevelop a 5.96-acre site to serve as a contractor’s office and shop. The site contains a
single-family dwelling and welding shop and is served by public water and sewer. The new use will
comprise the following buildings:

   Two 14,400-square-foot buildings;
   3,500-square-foot storage building;
   3,780-square-foot enclosed materials shed;
   3,000-square-foot second story office addition to an existing garage; and
   1,000-square-foot lean-to addition to an existing garage.

Location: Northern side of the intersection of Park Avenue and County Line Road.

Zoning: IO Industrial/Office District permits medical or dental office/clinic, business or professional
office, retail shop, service business, repair shop, indoor commercial entertainment, outdoor private
recreation, wholesale business and storage, binding, contractor offices or shops, plumbing shop,
carpentry shop, and standard self-storage facility, on lots of one acre or more.

Present Use: Commercial–welding shop, residential, vacant.
COMMENTS

1. **Waivers**—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) requirements:

   - Section 301.2—Submission procedure-separate preliminary and final plans required
   - Section 510.4(B)—Driveway width of 25 feet for two way use
   - Section 518.6—Slope edges shall be setback at least 5 feet from property or right-of-way lines
   - Section 521.2(D)—15-inch storm sewer pipe diameter minimum
   - Section 523.4—Street trees required along all streets
   - Section 523.6(C)—Parking lot planting trees: 1 tree per 5 spaces
   - Section 523.7(C)—Stormwater facility landscaping standards (Phase 1 only)
   - Section 602.2(A)—Steep slope Class 1, 8 percent to 15 percent—no more than 40 percent of such areas shall be disturbed
   - Section 602.2(B)—Steep slope Class 2, 15 percent to 25 percent—no more than 30 percent of such areas shall be disturbed
   - Section 602.3(B)—Other Woodland Areas-no more than 30 percent of woodlands which are not located in environmentally sensitive areas shall be altered, regraded, cleared or built upon
   - Section 602.3(C)—Any tree over 24 inches caliper shall be 100 percent protected
   - Section 602.8(C (4))—Roads or driveways, are prohibited in the riparian buffer zone 2
   - Section 602.8(C (5))—Parking prohibited in riparian buffer zone 2
   - Section 425.3.(D)(6)(a)—Minimum depth of 36 inches between stormwater facility bottom and limiting zones for infiltration

   In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved, and the minimum modification necessary.

2. **Environmental standards**—The applicant is seeking waivers to the natural resource protection standards in Section 602 of the subdivision and land development ordinance to disturb greater amounts of resources such as woodlands, large trees, and steep slopes. Subdivision and land development ordinance Section 601, Natural Resources Application Standards, requires that any subdivision or land development may be undertaken only if it conforms to the environmental protection standards of this Part and the zoning ordinance.

   According to zoning ordinance Section 2103, Environmental Standards, the developer shall determine what environmental or natural features are present on the lot and shall meet standards of environmental protection. The plan shows wetlands, steep slopes, floodplains, vegetated areas and riparian buffers but does not show the existing amount of the resources or the amount that is permitted to be disturbed. Each of these resources is protected at specific rates. As noted above, the SALDO requires that the zoning ordinance natural resource protection standards be met (even if the SALDO requirements are waived). The plan should be revised to show compliance with the natural resource protection requirements.
3. **Trees over 24 caliper inches**—The applicant is seeking a waiver to subdivision and land development ordinance Section 602.3.B which requires that any tree over 24 caliper inches shall be 100 percent protected, whether located within the woodland areas or standing alone. The plan shows removal of numerous trees over 30 caliper inches and at least two over 40 caliper inches. These are large trees that provide numerous benefits to the site and the community. As the township considers the requested waiver of this requirement we recommend that the condition of the trees be evaluated and the layout of the plan be revised to protect as many large trees as possible.

4. **Parking spaces**—Section 2200A of the zoning ordinance specifies a required parking rate for all industrial uses of one space per 3,000 square feet of gross floor area. The plan notes that 14 spaces are required, but proposes 68 auto parking spaces (9 feet x 8 feet) and 10 truck parking spaces (10 feet x 40 feet). The proposed number of spaces is almost five times more than required. The extra parking spaces increase the impervious surface as well as construction and maintenance costs. We recommend that the applicant indicate the proposed number of employees and provide a rationale for all the proposed spaces.

5. **Traffic Impact Study**—The proposed contractor’s office land use will generate automobile and truck traffic that will impact traffic along both Park Avenue and County Line Road. As noted above in Comment 4, the plan proposes 68 parking spaces for automobiles and 10 spaces for trucks. The proposed number of employees is unclear but the 41 spaces labeled as employee parking would generate approximately 80 average daily trips and trucks would generate trips as well. Subdivision and land development ordinance Section 526, Transportation Impact Study (TIS), requires that a study be submitted for any proposed subdivision, land development or revision of existing land use anticipated to generate 100 or more trips per day, based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual*, most current edition. The applicant should provide information about the number of trips generated by the proposed land use to determine if a TIS is necessary.

6. **Use Regulations**—We note that Part 16 of the zoning ordinance use regulations specifies the following standards for contractor’s offices and shops:

   - The building size shall not exceed 15,000 square feet.
   - The building may contain offices for the contractor use as well as storage of material and equipment.
   - No outside storage of material or equipment is permitted.
   - Vehicles are permitted to be parked outside, provided that there shall be no more than 10 vehicles stored on the premises.

   We suggest that the plan be revised to note these use regulations to help ensure compliance with the use regulations.

7. **Tree protection fence**—The plan shows woodlands on the site and a significant amount of grading in much of the wooded area. A tree protection fence is shown on the Erosion and
Sediment Control Plan. SALDO Section 530.2 states that tree protection areas shall be shown on the landscape plan and grading plan. SALDO Section 530.3.A.2 requires that the tree protection area shall be 15 feet from the trunk of the tree to be retained, or the distance from the trunk to the dripline (the line marking the outer edge of the branches of the tree), whichever is greater. The plan shows the tree protection fence within the dripline of a number of trees.

We recommend that the plan be revised to show a tree protection fence on the landscape plan and grading plan and that the fence location be revised to fall outside the dripline of trees to be saved.

8. **Riparian corridor structures**—The plan proposes a portion of a subsurface infiltration basin within riparian corridor Zone 2. Subdivision and land development ordinance Section 602.8(B) permits naturalized stormwater management facilities within riparian corridor Zone 2, provided the entire facility is located a minimum of 50 feet from the defined edge of the identified water course and situated outside the 100-year floodplain. It should be determined if the subsurface infiltration basin is a naturalized stormwater management facility that is permitted within Zone 2.

The proposed trash enclosure at the edge of the parking area near the southeast corner of proposed Building 1 lies within the riparian corridor Zone 2. This is not a permitted use in the riparian corridor, according to Section 602.8(B). Additionally, Section 608(C)3.c of the SALDO specifically prohibits storage of hazardous or noxious material in the riparian buffer. The trash storage structure should be relocated.

9. **Parking area issues**

   a. **Curbing**—Section 512.3 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that all parking lots and bays permitting parking other than parallel shall be confined by curbing. The plan shows wheel stops at the end of all automobile parking spaces but no curbing. The plan should be revised to show curbing.

   b. **Paving**—Section 512.11. of the subdivision and land development ordinance permits use of pervious pavement in parking areas, but requires that the construction of all automobile parking areas not intended to be pervious shall be in accordance with the Warminster Township Specifications and Design Standards for Streets and Roads. A significant portion of the parking lot is to be paved with gravel which is not pervious and not consistent with the Street and Road standards. The plan should be revised to show paving in accordance with the applicable standards.

10. **PECO Right of way**—The plan indicates TMP #49-9-12 is a PECO right-of-way and that a water line easement exists on TMP #49-9-9. A driveway is proposed to cross both easements. The plan should be revised to indicate that the proposed driveway conforms with any right-of-way and easement regulations.

11. **Historic overlay**—The plan incorrectly identifies TMPs #49-9-10 and -9 as within the historic properties overlay. The township zoning map indicates that the two subject parcels
contain historic resources but are not part of the Hartsville or Johnsville historic overlay districts. The plan should be revised.

12. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the April 1, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

DCZ:dwb

cc: Sauer Investment Properties, LLC
    Eustace Engineering
    Craig D. Kennard, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer
    Steven Weisner, Township Manager (via email)
    Alfred Zollers, Hatboro Borough Manager (adjacent municipality)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warrington Township Board of Supervisors
   Warrington Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Sketch Plan of Subdivision for Eble
   TMP #50-4-21
   Applicant: Melody L. Eble
   Owner: Same
   Plan Dated: February 5, 2015
   Date Received: February 18, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: To subdivide a 9.184-acre site into 5 single-family detached lots served by public water and sewer.

Location: Northern side of the intersection of Stump and Pickertown roads.

Zoning: The RA Residential Agricultural District permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 3 acres or more. A cluster option allows for a minimum lot size of 7,500 square feet with a minimum open space ratio of 83 percent and maximum density of 0.65 units per acre. The required minimum site area is 10 acres.

Present Use: Residential and vacant

COMMENTS

We acknowledge that the applicant will seek zoning relief as noted in an email from the applicant’s planner, but the plan does not meet critical zoning requirements and should be revised to address the following issues:

1. **Lot size**—Section 403 of the zoning ordinance requires a minimum lot area of 3 acres for single-family detached dwellings in the RA district. A cluster option allows for a minimum lot size of 7,500 square feet with a minimum open space ratio of 83 percent. The proposal does
not meet the single-family detached standards or the cluster subdivision standards. The lots are too small for the standard subdivision. The lots are larger than required for the cluster subdivision, but the subject parcel does not meet the minimum site area requirement and no open space is provided. The preliminary plan should comply with the appropriate RA zoning lot area requirements.

2. **Lot width to depth ratio**—Subdivision and land development ordinance Section 316.7 states lots excessively deep in relation to width, or lots excessively irregular in shape are to be avoided. A proportion of 2 ½ in depth to one in width is generally accepted as a proper maximum. Lots 1 (500 feet by 100 feet) and 2 (625 feet by 160 feet) exceed the recommended maximum ratio.

3. **Side yards** —The plan shows an existing single-family dwelling and barn which are to be separated by a subdivision line. The proposed side yards do not comply with RA zoning district are requirements which require a minimum side yard width of 20 feet on either side and minimum total composite 50 feet.

4. **Nonconformity**—An existing structure behind the existing barn on proposed Lot 2 is within 10 feet of the proposed lot line. It appears that this structure would have to be removed if the proposed subdivision is approved.

5. **Natural resources**—The site contains a pond, stream, and woodlands. Sections 503.4.K and L of the subdivision and land development ordinance require that sketch plans show limits of resource protection areas and limits of environmentally sensitive area. This information should be provided to the Township to assist with consideration of the planned subdivision.

6. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed subdivision. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the subdivision review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the April 1, 2015, public meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the Bucks County Planning Commission board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

DCZ:dwb

cc: E. Van Ricker, AICP
    Melody L. Eble
    Tom Gockowski, P.E., Carroll Engineering Corporation, Township Engineer
    Timothy J. Tieperman, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warrington Township Board of Supervisors
Warrington Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Final Plan of Subdivision and Land Development for High Grove Manor
TMP #50-25-17,-18,-19,-20,-21, 50-10-114; 50-26-25; 50-26-25-2
Applicant: KTMT HGM, L.P. & KTMT Newbury, LP
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: February 25, 2014
Last revised: January 28, 2015
Date Received: February 13, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: To subdivide a 26.246-acre parcel into 4 lots. Lot 1 (2.405 acres) contains an existing office building and a second 2,800-square-foot office building is proposed. Lot 2 (1.413 acres) will contain a 2,957-square-foot motor vehicle service station and convenience store. Lot 3 (9.243 acres) will contain 107 townhouse dwelling units. Lot 4 (11.3 acres) is township open space. A 2,300-foot long loop road will be constructed to connect Easton Road to Bristol Road. Public water and sewer serve the lots.

Location: Eastern side of Easton Road (PA 611) opposite Park Road and approximately 1,200 feet south of its intersection with Bristol Road.

Zoning:
CR/O Corridor Residential Office District permits office buildings on lots of 2 acres or more.

R-2 Medium Density Residential District permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 30,000 square feet or more by right and municipal uses by conditional use.

C-1 Commercial District permits retail shops, offices, and financial establishments on lots of 5 acres or more.
Loop Road Overlay District permits townhouse dwellings, retail businesses, banks, and motor vehicle service stations, on a 10-acre minimum gross acre tract. Residential uses are permitted on a minimum gross site area of 5 acres and minimum lot size per residential structure of 3,000 square feet. The maximum density is 12 units per acre. Nonresidential uses shall have a minimum lot size of 1 acre. Tax map parcels #50-25-17; -18; -19; and #50-10-114 fall within the overlay district.

Present Use: Vacant and commercial (office)

COMMENTS

Prior to final plan approval, the Township should ensure that the plan meets all conditions of preliminary plan approval. The plan should not be approved until all issues are resolved. In addition, we have the following comment on the final plan that should be considered.

- **Padilla subdivision**—We recently reviewed a subdivision of the adjacent Padilla parcel (TMP #50-25-27), which accommodates the Anderson Way right-of-way. We recommend that the plan be revised to show the revised lot line if the Board of Supervisors approves the Padilla subdivision plan.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the April 1, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

DCZ:dwb

cc: KTMT HGM, L.P. & KTMT Newbury, LP
Christopher W. Jensen, P.E., T & M Associates
Tom Gockowski, P.E., Carroll Engineering Corporation, Township Engineer
Timothy J. Tieperman, Township Manager (via email)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number(s)</th>
<th>PaDEP Code Number</th>
<th>Plan Review Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Rockhill Township</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>10163</td>
<td>52-1-19</td>
<td>1-09952-247-2</td>
<td>20080-0206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Southampton Township</td>
<td>Lapat</td>
<td>9224-A</td>
<td>21-19-10</td>
<td>1-09006-114-3J</td>
<td>20080-0207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bensalem Township</td>
<td>Matthews</td>
<td>12003</td>
<td>2-4-294</td>
<td>1-09004-343-3J</td>
<td>20080-0210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
March 13, 2015

Francis J. Ernst
JF Hamill Land Surveying & Consulting, LLC
3636 Hulmeville Road
Bensalem, PA 19020

RE: Byberry Woods Subdivision Planning Module
PaDEP Code # 1-09004-341-3J
BCPC #11348-C
Bensalem Township, Bucks County

Dear Mr. Ernst:

We have received a copy of the planning module¹ concerning the proposal to subdivide 10.549 acres into 39 attached dwelling lots and one single-family dwelling lot. Wastewater flows (9,750 GPD) will be collected and conveyed to the Northeast Philadelphia Water Pollution Control Plant via the Neshaminy Interceptor.

The proposed revision is consistent with the Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Sewerage Facilities Plan, 1970, as the proposal is within a public sewerage area. PaDEP requires a planning module due to the projected hydraulic overload at the Neshaminy Interceptor. The Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority (BCSWA) has certified that there is collection and conveyance capacity and the additional waste load will not create a hydraulic or 5-year projected overload in the Bensalem Township sanitary sewer system or the Neshaminy Interceptor. The Philadelphia Water Department certifies adequate capacity within the City of Philadelphia’s conveyance and treatment facilities. The project is included in the BCSWA Neshaminy Interceptor Corrective Action Plan and Connection Management Plan accepted by Pa DEP on March 10, 2014.

We note that, although the planning module submission indicates that documentation is attached regarding the Pennsylvania Historic and Museum Commission review letter and the Pennsylvania Natural Diversity Inventory review, this information was not included in the copy of the planning module review packet submitted to our office for review.

¹ Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection’s (PaDEP) Title 25, Rules and Regulations, the planning module is a revision to the Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Sewerage Facilities Plan, 1970. Therefore, the Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) and the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH) are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.

Visit us at: www.buckscounty.org
If the municipality approves the planning module and thereby revises the official sewage facilities plan, the completed (signed) resolution and required supporting data (Components 3 and 4; transmittal letter; plans; narrative; copies of the BCPC and BCDH review letters) should be sent to Elizabeth Mahoney, Sewage Planning Supervisor, Wastewater Management Planning, Pa DEP, Southeast Regional Office, 2 East Main Street, Norristown, PA 19401.

Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Roedig
Planner

cc: Eric Ponert, Philadelphia Water Department
    Genevieve Kostick, BCDH
    Ron Gans, P.E., O'Donnell & Naccarato, Township Engineer
    Loretta Alston, Bensalem Township Department of Building and Planning
    William Cmorey, Township Manager (via email)
    Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
    Act 537 file
Note to Project Sponsor: To expedite the review of your proposal, one copy of your completed planning package and one copy of this Planning Agency Review Component should be sent to the existing county planning agency or planning agency with areawide jurisdiction for their comments.

**SECTION A. PROJECT NAME** (See Section A of instructions)

Project Name
Byberry Woods Subdivision

**SECTION B. REVIEW SCHEDULE** (See Section B of instructions)

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. February 20, 2015
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   Agency name
3. Date review completed by agency March 13, 2015

**SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW** (See Section C of instructions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Is there a county or areawide comprehensive plan adopted under the Municipalities Planning Code (53 P.S. 10101 et seq.)?
2. Is this proposal consistent with the comprehensive plan for land use?
3. Does this proposal meet the goals and objectives of the plan?
   If no, describe goals and objectives that are not met
4. Is this proposal consistent with the use, development, and protection of water resources?
   If no, describe inconsistency
5. Is this proposal consistent with the county or areawide comprehensive land use planning relative to Prime Agricultural Land Preservation?
   If no, describe inconsistencies:
6. Does this project propose encroachments, obstructions, or dams that will affect wetlands?
   If yes, describe impact
7. Will any known historical or archeological resources be impacted by this project?
   If yes, describe impacts See attached letter
8. Will any known endangered or threatened species of plant or animal be impacted by the development project? See attached letter
9. Is there a county or areawide zoning ordinance?
10. Does this proposal meet the zoning requirements of the ordinance?
    If no, describe inconsistencies N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Have all applicable zoning approvals been obtained? N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Is there a county or areawide subdivision and land development ordinance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Does this proposal meet the requirements of the ordinance? N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe which requirements are not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>14. Is this proposal consistent with the municipal Act 537 Official Sewage Facilities Plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15. Are there any wastewater disposal needs in the area adjacent to this proposal that should be considered by the municipality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, describe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16. Has a waiver of the sewage facilities planning requirements been requested for the residual tract of this subdivision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, is the proposed waiver consistent with applicable ordinances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe the inconsistencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>17. Does the county have a stormwater management plan as required by the Stormwater Management Act?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, will this project plan require the implementation of storm water management measures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18. Name, Title and signature of person completing this section:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name: Michael Roedig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Title: Community Planner Signature: [Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date: March 13, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name of County or Areawide Planning Agency: Bucks County Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Address: The Almshouse, 1260 Almshouse Road, Doylestown, PA 18901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone Number: 215 345-3400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION D. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (See Section D of instructions)

This Component does not limit county planning agencies from making additional comments concerning the relevancy of the proposed plan to other plans or ordinances. If additional comments are needed, attach additional sheets.

The county planning agency must complete this Component within 60 days.
This Component and any additional comments are to be returned to the applicant.
March 12, 2015

Francis J. Ernst
JF Hamill Land Surveying & Consulting, LLC
3636 Hulmeville Road
Bensalem, PA 19020

RE: Matthews Subdivision Planning Module
PaDEP Code # 1-09004-343-3J
BCPC #12003
Bensalem Township, Bucks County

Dear Mr. Ernst:

We have received a copy of the planning module\(^1\) concerning the proposal to subdivide 41,416.51 square feet into two single-family detached lots of 24,614.91 and 16,801.60 square feet. Wastewater flows (250 GPD) will be collected and conveyed to the Northeast Philadelphia Water Pollution Control Plant via the Neshaminy Interceptor.

The proposed revision is consistent with the *Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Sewerage Facilities Plan, 1970*, as the proposal is within a public sewerage area. PaDEP requires a planning module due to the projected hydraulic overload at the Neshaminy Interceptor. The Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority (BCSWA) has certified that there is collection and conveyance capacity and the additional waste load will not create a hydraulic or 5-year projected overload in the Bensalem Township sanitary sewer system or the Neshaminy Interceptor. The Philadelphia Water Department certifies adequate capacity within the City of Philadelphia's conveyance and treatment facilities. The project is included in the BCSWA Neshaminy Interceptor Corrective Action Plan and Connection Management Plan updated by Pa DEP on May 6, 2014.

---

\(^1\) Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection's (PaDEP) Title 25, Rules and Regulations, the planning module is a revision to the *Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Sewerage Facilities Plan, 1970*. Therefore, the Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) and the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH) are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.
Although the submission indicates that documentation is attached indicating compliance with the state historic preservation act, a return receipt for the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC) submission and the PHMC review letter are not included in the planning module review packet submitted to our office for review.

If the municipality approves the planning module and thereby revises the official sewage facilities plan, the completed (signed) resolution and required supporting data (Components 3 and 4; transmittal letter; plans; narrative; copies of the BCPC and BCDH review letters) should be sent to Elizabeth Mahoney, Sewage Planning Supervisor, Wastewater Management Planning, Pa DEP, Southeast Regional Office, 2 East Main Street, Norristown, PA 19401.

Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Michael A. Roedig
Planner

MAR:dwb

Attachment

cc:   Eric Ponert, Philadelphia Water Department
      Genevie Kostick, Bucks County Health Department
      Ron Gans, P.E., O'Donnell & Naccarato, Township Engineer
      Loretta Alston, Bensalem Township Department of Building and Planning
      William Cmorey, Township Manager (via email)
      Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
      Act 537 File
**SEWAGE FACILITIES PLANNING MODULE**  
**COMPONENT 4B - COUNTY PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW**  
(or Planning Agency with Areawide Jurisdiction)

**Note to Project Sponsor:** To expedite the review of your proposal, one copy of your completed planning package and one copy of this *Planning Agency Review Component* should be sent to the existing county planning agency or planning agency with areawide jurisdiction for their comments.

### SECTION A. PROJECT NAME (See Section A of instructions)

**Project Name**  
Matthews Subdivision

### SECTION B. REVIEW SCHEDULE (See Section B of instructions)

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. **March 4, 2015**
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction  
   **Agency Name**
3. Date review completed by agency **March 12, 2015**

### SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (See Section C of instructions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Is there a county or areawide comprehensive plan adopted under the Municipalities Planning Code (53 P.S. 10101 et seq.)?  
   **If no, describe goals and objectives that are not met**

2. Is this proposal consistent with the comprehensive plan for land use?  
   **If no, describe inconsistency**

3. Does this proposal meet the goals and objectives of the plan?  
   **If no, describe inconsistency**

4. Is this proposal consistent with the use, development, and protection of water resources?  
   **If no, describe inconsistency**

5. Is this proposal consistent with the county or areawide comprehensive land use planning relative to Prime Agricultural Land Preservation?  
   **If no, describe inconsistencies:**

6. Does this project propose encroachments, obstructions, or dams that will affect wetlands?  
   **If yes, describe impact**

7. Will any known historical or archeological resources be impacted by this project?  
   **If yes, describe impacts**  
   **See attached letter**

8. Will any known endangered or threatened species of plant or animal be impacted by the development project?  

9. Is there a county or areawide zoning ordinance?  
   **If no, describe inconsistencies**  
   **N/A**

10. Does this proposal meet the zoning requirements of the ordinance?  
    **If no, describe inconsistencies**  
    **N/A**

- 1 -
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th><strong>SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW</strong> (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>11. Have all applicable zoning approvals been obtained? N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>12. Is there a county or areawide subdivision and land development ordinance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>13. Does this proposal meet the requirements of the ordinance? N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>If no, describe which requirements are not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>14. Is this proposal consistent with the municipal Act 537 Official Sewage Facilities Plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>15. Are there any wastewater disposal needs in the area adjacent to this proposal that should be considered by the municipality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>If yes, describe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>16. Has a waiver of the sewage facilities planning requirements been requested for the residual tract of this subdivision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>If yes, is the proposed waiver consistent with applicable ordinances?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>If no, describe the inconsistencies N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>17. Does the county have a stormwater management plan as required by the Stormwater Management Act?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>If yes, will this project plan require the implementation of storm water management measures?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Name, Title and signature of person completing this section:

Name: Michael Roedig  
Title: Community Planner  
Signature: [Signature]

Date: March 12, 2015

Name of County or Areawide Planning Agency: Bucks County Planning Commission

Address: The Almshouse, 1260 Almshouse Road, Doylestown, PA 18901

Telephone Number: 215 345-3400

**SECTION D. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS** (See Section D of instructions)

This Component does not limit county planning agencies from making additional comments concerning the relevancy of the proposed plan to other plans or ordinances. If additional comments are needed, attach additional sheets.

The county planning agency must complete this Component within 60 days.

This Component and any additional comments are to be returned to the applicant.
February 25, 2015

Brian Horner
ProTract Engineering, Inc.
P.O. Box 58
Hatboro, PA 19040

RE: Lapat Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-09006-144-3J
BCPC #9224-A
TMP #21-19-10
Lower Southampton Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. Horner:

We have received a copy of the subject planning module regarding the connection of one single-family detached dwelling to the public sewer system with sewerage conveyance through the Poquessing Interceptor. The sewage will be treated by the Philadelphia Water Department’s Northeast Water Pollution Control Plant.

The 1970 Bucks County Sewerage Facilities Plan is the official Act 537 Plan for this portion of Lower Southampton Township. The proposal to connect to the existing public sewer facility is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan. The submission includes a letter from the Philadelphia Water Department (PWD) that provides Poquessing Interceptor capacity certification for this project under the City of Philadelphia’s PADEP-approved Corrective Action Plan.

If the municipality approves the planning module and thereby revises the official sewage facilities plan, the completed (signed) resolution and required supporting data (Components 3 and 4; transmittal letter; plans; narrative; and copies of the BCPC and BCDH review letters) should be sent to Elizabeth Mahoney, Supervisor, Wastewater Management, PaDEP Southeast Regional Office, 2 East Main Street, Norristown, PA 19401.

---

1 Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection’s (PaDEP) Title 25, Rules and Regulations, the subject planning module is a revision to the Lower Southampton Township Sewage Facilities Plan. Therefore, the Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) and the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH) are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.
If you have any questions regarding this review, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Matthew M. Walters
Planner

MMW:dwb

Attachment

cc: Genevieve Kostick, Bucks County Health Department
    Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
    Leo and Diane Lapat
    John McMenamin, Township Manager (via email)
    Act 537 file
**SEWAGE FACILITIES PLANNING MODULE**  
**COMPONENT 4B - COUNTY PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW**  
(or Planning Agency with Areawide Jurisdiction)

**Note to Project Sponsor:** To expedite the review of your proposal, one copy of your completed planning package and one copy of this *Planning Agency Review Component* should be sent to the existing county planning agency or planning agency with areawide jurisdiction for their comments.

**SECTION A. PROJECT NAME**  
(See Section A of instructions)

Project Name  
Leo Lapat Subdivision - Lower Southampton Township, Bucks County

**SECTION B. REVIEW SCHEDULE**  
(See Section B of instructions)

1. Date plan received by county planning agency.  
   February 10, 2015

2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   
   Agency name: Bucks County Planning Commission

3. Date review completed by agency  
   February 25, 2015

**SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW**  
(See Section C of instructions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Is there a county or areawide comprehensive plan adopted under the Municipalities Planning Code (53 P.S. 10101 et seq.)?

2. Is this proposal consistent with the comprehensive plan for land use?

3. Does this proposal meet the goals and objectives of the plan?
   If no, describe goals and objectives that are not met

4. Is this proposal consistent with the use, development, and protection of water resources?
   If no, describe inconsistency

5. Is this proposal consistent with the county or areawide comprehensive land use planning relative to Prime Agricultural Land Preservation?
   If no, describe inconsistencies:

6. Does this project propose encroachments, obstructions, or dams that will affect wetlands?
   If yes, describe impact

7. Will any known historical or archeological resources be impacted by this project?
   If yes, describe impacts

8. Will any known endangered or threatened species of plant or animal be impacted by the development project?

9. Is there a county or areawide zoning ordinance?

10. Does this proposal meet the zoning requirements of the ordinance?  
    N/A
    If no, describe inconsistencies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Have all applicable zoning approvals been obtained? N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Is there a county or areawide subdivision and land development ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Does this proposal meet the requirements of the ordinance? N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe which requirements are not met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>14. Is this proposal consistent with the municipal Act 537 Official Sewage Facilities Plan?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15. Are there any wastewater disposal needs in the area adjacent to this proposal that should be considered by the municipality?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, describe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>16. Has a waiver of the sewage facilities planning requirements been requested for the residual tract of this subdivision?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, is the proposed waiver consistent with applicable ordinances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe the inconsistencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>17. Does the county have a stormwater management plan as required by the Stormwater Management Act?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, will this project plan require the implementation of storm water management measures?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Name, Title and signature of person completing this section:

Name: Matthew M. Walters
Title: Community Planner
Signature: [Signature]

Date: February 25, 2015

Name of County or Areawide Planning Agency: Bucks County Planning Commission
Address: The Almshouse, 1260 Almshouse Road, Doylestown, PA 18901
Telephone Number: 215.345.3400

SECTION D. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (See Section D of instructions)

This Component does not limit county planning agencies from making additional comments concerning the relevancy of the proposed plan to other plans or ordinances. If additional comments are needed, attach additional sheets.

The county planning agency must complete this Component within 60 days.
This Component and any additional comments are to be returned to the applicant.
February 25, 2015

Mr. Scott Mease, P.E.
Mease Engineering, P.C.
516 W. Broad Street
Quakertown, PA 18951

RE: Matthew Weaver – Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-09952-247-2
TMP #52-1-19
West Rockhill Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. Mease:

We have received a copy of the subject planning module\(^1\) for the construction of an on-lot treatment facility to service a new single-family home under construction. The applicant plans to convert a portion of the new house into an in-law suite. The projected sewage flow for the project is 900 gallons per day (gpd), based upon a sewage flow of 500 gpd for the new single-family four bedroom house, and 400 gpd for the in-law suite. Both properties will be served by a private well on site.

The *West Rockhill Township Sewage Facilities Plan* is the official Act 537 sewage facilities plan for West Rockhill Township. The proposal is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan since this plan indicates that the subject site is located within an area not intended for public sewer service. Given that the soils on the project site were determined to be suitable to support individual on-lot sewage disposal and that the proposal is consistent with municipal and state planning for the area, other sewage disposal options were not explored.

We note that the return receipt for submission to the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission was not included in the planning module application submitted to our office for review. This should be included with the planning module application. In addition, the Pennsylvania Natural Diversity Inventory project environmental review search indicates that PaDCNR requests a "conservation measure" to avoid the introduction of invasive species. The planning module application should indicate how this issue will be addressed.

---

\(^1\) Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection’s (PaDEP) Title 25, Rules and Regulations, the subject planning module is a revision to the West Rockhill Wastewater Facilities Plan. Therefore, the Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) and the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH) are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.
If the municipality approves the planning module and thereby revises the official sewage facilities plan, the completed (signed) resolution and required supporting data (Components 2 and 4; transmittal letter; plans; narrative; copies of the BCPC and BCDH review letters) should be sent to Elizabeth Mahoney, Sewage Planning Supervisor, Wastewater Management Planning, PaDEP, 2 East Main Street Norristown, PA 19401.

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Paul W. Gordon
Planner

PWG:dwb

Attachment

cc: Genevie Kostick, Bucks County Health Department
    Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
    Greg Lippincott, West Rockhill Township Manager (via email)
    Act 537 File
**SEWAGE FACILITIES PLANNING MODULE**
**COMPONENT 4B - COUNTY PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW**
(or Planning Agency with Areawide Jurisdiction)

**Note to Project Sponsor:** To expedite the review of your proposal, one copy of your completed planning package and one copy of this *Planning Agency Review Component* should be sent to the existing county planning agency or planning agency with areawide jurisdiction for their comments.

### SECTION A. PROJECT NAME (See Section A of instructions)

**Project Name**
Matthew Weaver Property - 1700 Twin Lows Road - West Rockhill Township

### SECTION B. REVIEW SCHEDULE (See Section B of instructions)

1. Date plan received by county planning agency: February 6, 2015
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   - Agency name: Bucks County Planning Commission
3. Date review completed by agency: February 25, 2015

### SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (See Section C of instructions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Name, Title and signature of person completing this section:

   Name: Paul Gordon
   Title: Environmental Planner
   Signature: [Signature]
   Date: February 23, 2015

Name of County or Areawide Planning Agency: Bucks County Planning Commission
Address: The Almshouse, 1260 Almshouse Road, Doylestown, PA 18901
Telephone Number: 215-345-3400

SECTION D. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (See Section D of instructions)

This Component does not limit county planning agencies from making additional comments concerning the relevancy of the proposed plan to other plans or ordinances. If additional comments are needed, attach additional sheets.

The county planning agency must complete this Component within 60 days.
This Component and any additional comments are to be returned to the applicant.
BUCKS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING

Wednesday, May 6, 2015
2:00 P.M.

Robert H. Grunmeier Room
1260 Almshouse Road
Doylestown, PA 18901

AGENDA

1. Call to Order

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approval of Minutes of April 1, 2015

4. Executive Director’s Report

5. Presentation by David Zipf, Planner
   Warminster Township – Transit-Oriented Development
   - BCPC #11785-A The Station at Bucks County West
   - BCPC #4641-E The Station at Bucks County East
   - BCPC #12073 Jacksonville Plaza
   - BCPC #12074 SEPTA Train Station

6. Act 247 Reviews

7. Old Business

8. New Business

9. Public Comment

10. Adjournment

Please remember to contact us at
215-345-3400 if you cannot attend. Thank you.

AGENDA SUBJECT TO CHANGE PRIOR TO MEETING
BUCKS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
April 1, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: Raymond (Skip) W. Goodnoe; Edward Kisselback, Jr.; David R. Nyman; Robert M. Pellegrino; Carol A. Pierce; Evan J. Stone; Walter S. Wydro

STAFF PRESENT: Charles T. McIlhinney; Lynn T. Bush; Timothy A. Koehler; David Johnson; Donna W. Byers; Richard G. Brahler; Paul W. Gordon; David A. Sebastian; Maureen Wheatley

GUESTS: Jeff Darwak, Deputy Director, The Redevelopment Authority of the County of Bucks; Pete Krauss, Executive Director, Bucks County Industrial Development Authority

1. CALL TO ORDER
   Mr. Wydro called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
   All rose for the pledge of allegiance.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF MARCH 4, 2015
   Upon motion of Mr. Nyman, seconded by Mr. Pellegrino, with the vote being 7-0 the motion carried to approve the minutes of the March 4, 2015 meeting as presented. There were no abstentions.

4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT
   Ms. Bush reported that the Housing Advisory Board (HAB) is moving toward getting all housing organizations to meet and work together and be more efficient on targeting money that goes into housing. She stated that roughly $30 - $40 million goes through the county annually. Much like the Economic Development Board in the early meeting days, the HAB is in the fact finding stages, and will spend the next 6 months developing a system on how to be more efficient.

   On March 27th, Ms. Bush attended the State of the County meeting held by the Upper Bucks County Chamber of Commerce. Some of the highlights of the meeting focused on preservation, housing, social services, and trails.

   Ms. Bush reported that in early March she and Mr. Stone attended a special conference held by the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC). A speaker at the conference, Robert Gibbs, provided interesting facts on retail trends that will be valuable information to staff. Ms. Pierce asked if there was discussion at the conference on the plans to build retail/office space in the parking triangle in the town center of Quakertown, and the impact it would have on parking. Ms. Bush responded that it was not discussed at the conference but BCPC staff attended a fact finding meeting with Quakertown Borough on the parking situation. Mr. Koehler said that a short-term parking study should be completed in 3-4 months. Mr. Stone added that the importance of parallel parking in front of stores was raised at the DVRPC meeting. Discussion followed on
parking situations in other municipalities and the resurgence on malls that had been declining over
the past several years.

Staff Report Highlights:
Mr. Koehler reported that the BCPC staff began an analysis of Dublin Borough’s zoning
ordinances to see what changes can be made that line up with the borough’s revitalization plan.
He also reported the Northampton Township Comprehensive Plan is in the long-term stages of
plan production and work is just starting on the Hilltown Township Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Wydro polled the board for questions.

5. **Presentation: Sellersville Redevelopment Area – Park 10; Jeff Darwak, Deputy
Director Redevelopment Authority (RDA) of Bucks County**

Pete Krauss, Executive Director of the Bucks County Industrial Redevelopment Authority (IDA),
opened with a summary of the Sellersville Redevelopment Area, which is part of a 2-year effort to
acquire the former Ametek Site. The IDA acquired the property and is working with the RDA to
clean-up and make improvements to the site for future use. Mr. Krauss stated that the Park 10
Certified Redevelopment Area prepared by the RDA ties into the Ametek property. It was to be
presented to Sellersville Borough in March, but the meeting had been cancelled due to lack of
quorum.

Mr. Darwak provided an overview of the area located at the intersection of 12th and Main Street
in Sellersville Borough. The buildings were demolished in 1980 and currently consists of wooded
and grassy areas. Surrounding properties are a mix of residential and commercial uses. The site
consists of 4 parcels comprising approximately 10.257 acres and is a vacant brownfield. Mr.
Darwak presented on the site conditions, economic and socially undesirable brownfield land use
as well as remedial action at the site. Mr. Darwak requested the board pass a resolution certifying
the area to be a blighted area.

Mr. Wydro suggested it would be helpful if an appendix was added to the document that lists
studies made for reference purposes.

Mr. Wydro asked who owns the property, what it is zoned, and if Sellersville Borough Planning
Commission has authorized the redevelopment area. Mr. Darwak responded that the group, Park
10, are the owners of the property that the RDA will acquire. The property is zoned neighborhood
commercial. Mr. Darwak stated that the RDA will go back to Sellersville Borough for approval.

Mr. Wydro polled the board for questions.

Mr. Goodnoe asked if Sellersville Borough is fully aware of the project and if there are any
buildings on the property. Mr. Darwak answered that Sellersville Borough is aware of the project
and that no buildings exist on the property.

Mr. Nyman asked if the property is served by public water, if any well water is being used, and if
there was a stripping operation at one time. Mr. Darwak responded that there was a stripping
operation, and that the property will be served by public water. No well water is being used.
Following board discussion, Mr. McIlhinney proposed a motion be made to approve the resolution certifying certain areas of the Borough of Sellersville containing lands of the Park 10 Revitalization Area to be a blighted area with the following revisions:

1. Remove b thru e;

Mr. Nyman made a motion as presented by Mr. McIlhinney, seconded by Mr. Kisselback. With the vote being 7-0 the motion carried to approve the resolution with the above-noted revisions.

6. **PowerPoint Presentation: Trail Options – Richard Brahler, Senior Planner and Paul Gordon, Planner**

Brochures for the Upper Neshaminy Greenway Central Park to Bridge Point Park, Quakertown/Saucon Rail Trail Extension, and Newtown/Pennypack Rail Trail Extension were provided to the board.

Mr. Brahler presented an overview of trails, highlighting the recreational, environmental, quality of life, and economic benefits of trails. He stated the current trails in Bucks County have limited long-distance segments. The trails network is fragmented, particularly within municipal, county and state parks. Mr. Brahler highlighted the regional 750-mile trail called the “Circuit.” Trails in Bucks County that are part of the Circuit include Neshaminy Creek, Doylestown to New Hope Bike Route, Liberty Bell Trail, East Coast Greenway, and the recently added Newtown Rail Trail.

Mr. Gordon presented on current Bucks County trail projects. The Upper Bucks Rail Trail will be a 3.1-mile multi-use trail from County line south to the Veterans Park in Richland Township. Future plans call for extending it into Quakertown. The trail connects into the existing Saucon Rail Trail. Mr. Gordon said both Richland and Springfield townships have passed supporting resolutions. The estimated cost to design and build the trail is $516,000 ($421,000 with rail recovery fees). Discussion followed on where the trail will start and end and trail challenges.

The Upper Neshaminy Creek Trail is a proposed .5-mile multi-use asphalt trail that would extend from Central Park in Doylestown Township to Bridge Point Park, and connects into the existing Doylestown Community Bike & Hike system. The estimated cost to design and build the .5 mile trail is $1,414,000. Mr. Gordon highlighted the trail benefits and challenges.

The Newtown Rail Trail is a proposed 2.9-mile multi-use trail that extends from County Line Road to Bustleton Pike at the Churchville SEPTA station. The trail would connect into the Pennypack Trail and could eventually extend to Newtown Borough. The estimated cost to design and build the trail is $1,500,650 ($1,423,600 with rail recovery fees). Mr. Gordon highlighted the trail benefits and challenges.

Mr. Gordon stated the Bucks County Commissioners have agreed to move forward with the Upper Bucks Rail Trail and also support our trail efforts. A Request for Proposal has been issued for the design and engineering work for the Upper Bucks Rail Trail.

Mr. Gordon said steps are being taken to secure leases from SEPTA for the Upper Bucks and Newtown rail trails and to obtain agreements with municipalities on maintenance and operation of the trail once built.
Discussion followed on the leasing from SEPTA, width of right-of-ways, and timelines. Mr. Wydro thanked Mr. Brahler and Mr. Gordon for their good presentation.

7. **ACT 247 REVIEWS**
The reviews of April 1, 2015, were mailed to the board for their review prior to the meeting. Upon motion of Mr. Pellegrino, seconded by Mr. Goodnoe, the motion carried to approve the April 1, 2015 Act 247 reviews. There were no abstentions.

8. **OLD BUSINESS**
Mr. Nyman thanked Ms. Bush for including in the packet the Commissioners letter on the PennEast Pipeline.

9. **NEW BUSINESS**
Mr. Wydro commented on the E-Waste recycling events. Discussion followed on the change in laws and the inability to continue to hold electronics recycling events.

10. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**
There was no public comment.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**
Upon motion of Mr. Nyman, seconded by Ms. Pierce, the meeting adjourned at 3:05 PM.

Submitted by:
Donna W. Byers, Staff Secretary
Pennridge Airport – We met with the owner of the Pennridge Airport regarding the history and possible future use for the airport.

Jobs 1st Meeting – Margie McKevitt and I attended a regional meeting on a grant that is being run by the Chester County Economic Development Corporation for the region on coordinating workforce development with economic development.

Penndel Borough – I met with Penndel Borough on economic development and how we can help them.

Electronics Collection – The County has managed to piggyback on two electronics collection events, sponsored by other groups, where we took responsibility for labor and operations, in exchange for getting some credit as sponsors. All went well at the collection event at the Lower Makefield Corporate Center on April 25. County staff ran the event, and about 800 cars went through. There were no traffic problems. Because we only had one week to organize it, we had to scramble to get volunteers and some county staff to direct operations and help move cars through quickly.

Staff Training – We are having a training session for planning staff this week on the rules for condo associations, homeowners’ associations, and planned communities. Issues often come up with either plan reviews or with our providing guidance to municipalities on how land use planning and these other organizations interact.

Cross Keys study – We saw a sketch plan for a potential convenience store/gas station at Cross Keys that would implement our connector road idea. Township supervisors are supportive of the idea to accommodate this.

Trails – we are moving full-speed ahead to pursue our trails ideas.
  o Upper Bucks Rail Trail RFP for design services – We got a big turnout for our pre-proposal meeting on the trail design – 46 firms attended.
  o There is also much excitement about the possibility of extending the Pennypack Trail from Montgomery County into Bucks County. Montgomery County is planning to establish the County Line Road crossing, which will make it even easier for an extension into Bucks County. It looks like Upper Southampton may support the idea of extending the trail into their township.

Courier/Intelligencer Editorial Board – I met with the editorial boards for the newspapers in early April. They asked what the planning commission does, and I provided them with an overview on our many responsibilities.

Thanks to our First Floor Staff, Donna Byers and Kevin Sager – We had two staff members leave earlier this year, and Donna and Kevin have carried the full load of four people for several months. They have done so without a word of complaint and have accomplished much during that time. In addition to handling the many phone calls every day (mostly questions about how to get rid of old TVs), they have successfully implemented our new electronic plan recording system, kept up with our Board activities, and completed the annual Municipal Directory. We expect to have a new administrative assistant on board in mid-May.
COMMUNITY PLANNING

> Meeting Attendance—Attended the regular monthly planning commission meetings of Perkasie Borough and Buckingham Township.

> Northampton Township Village Commercial Design Guidelines—Continued development of landscape section; completed first draft of all other sections (without illustrations/graphics). Continued compiling example illustrations and photos.

> Richboro Village Master Plan—Continued to research and assess conditions of the village.

> Tinicum Township Comprehensive Plan—Incorporated edits and suggestions from supervisory staff. Coordinated final plan production with support staff.

> West Rockhill Township Almont Village Plan—Finalized village “concept plan.” Developed PowerPoint for presentation to West Rockhill Planning Commission regarding concept plan.

> Cross Keys Study—Continued narrative production for the Land Use and Zoning, and Economic Development Conditions sections.

> New Britain Borough Main Street Plan—Attended the April 9th steering committee meeting and presented the initial concept plan for the University Village Area and the preliminary streetscape recommendations for the corridor.

> Lower Makefield Township Master Plan Update—Began preparing a presentation of the Plan Update for a future Board of Supervisors’ public hearing on the document.

> Plumsteadville Village Plan—Continued analysis of plan production and layout.

> Brownsville Road Plan—Continued analysis of plan production using material already generated on the study area.

> Quakertown Borough Downtown Parking Inventory—Began gathering information for the parking inventory.

> Hilltown Township Comprehensive Plan—Attended an initial meeting with the township planning commission to discuss the process for the plan update, and the potential of conducting a town-hall style public meeting and/or a resident survey.

> Northampton Township Comprehensive Plan—Continued analysis of plan production. Met with the township zoning officer to discuss planning topics, policy changes, and issues that need to be addressed in the plan update. The planning process will begin with a meeting that ties in with the Richboro Village Master Plan.

> Dublin Borough Ordinance Overview—Continued analysis of the borough zoning ordinance and subdivision and land development ordinance to determine necessary revisions in line with the borough’s revitalization plan.

Planning Information and Agency Coordination

> Provided information to the public on topics including demographic and socioeconomic data, development proposals, review letters, local zoning, and municipal regulations.

> Continued researching public comment letters to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regarding the proposed PennEast Pipeline.
> Attended meeting of the Bicycle Task Force.
> Began assessment of Pennsylvania Historic and Museum Cultural Resource GIS database as part of the development of a Bucks County Historic Resource Inventory. Began development of a historic resource organizational matrix with contact information.
> Continued to work on the creation of a plan implementation progress model handbook to track and monitor recommendations outlined in planning documents.
> Reviewed Act 14, 67, 68 NPDES permit applications.

**Act 247 and 537 Review Activity**
> 25 Subdivision and Land Development Proposals
> 3 Sketch Plans
> 8 Municipals
> 3 Sewage Facility Planning Modules
> 1 Traffic Impact Studies

**ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING**

**Natural Resources**
> Continue to research comments submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regarding the proposed PennEast Pipeline.

**Integrated Water Resources Planning Work Program**
> Assisted watershed partners with programming for community events.
> Working with numerous firm and agencies regarding the Bensalem Greenway Ecological Prioritization Initiative.
> Answered a significant number of residential inquiries regarding flooding, wetlands, and preservation efforts.
> Coordinate efforts with Engineer firm responsible for the County’s MS4 program.
> Assist municipality with the development of a native plant ordinance.
> Continued to research funding opportunities for watershed-related projects.
> Researched regional efforts in the state regarding MS4/TMD planning.
> Assisted municipalities with Act 167 planning and compliance regarding new requirements for water quality (as of 2005).
> Assisted municipal engineers regarding new TMDL requirements and the county’s role moving forward.

**National Flood Insurance Program**
> Began initial review of new FIRMs for municipalities located within the Neshaminy Plan (re-study).

**William Penn Foundation: Poquessing Watershed Cluster**
> Work with project partners regarding the further development of the Streamwatch program and future training events.
Comprehensive Plans
> Began researching information about Hilltown Township, identified and reviewed existing plans and studies of the township.
> Prepared a list of questions to pose to the planning commission and township manager.
> Attended Kick-off meeting with Hilltown Planning Commission and Chairman of the Supervisors regarding the township’s comprehensive plan update.
> Began development of the natural resources section of the comprehensive plan update.
> Prepared a list of questions to pose to the zoning officer for our kick-off meeting.
> Attended Kick-off meeting with Northampton Township Zoning Officer regarding the township’s comprehensive plan update.
> Began researching information about the Northampton Township, identified existing plans and studies completed of the township.

Bucks County Open Space & Greenway Planning
> Spoke with representatives from Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission to discuss potential funding for Newtown Rail Line Trail.
> Attended Doylestown Community Bike & Hike meeting.
> Held Pre-Proposal meeting for Upper Bucks Rail Trail Design & Engineering Study.
> Presented an update on county trail projects to Bucks County Planning Commission Board.
> Conducted field assessment work on the Upper Bucks Rail Trail project.
> Continued developing narrative of the Lower Neshaminy Creek trail feasibility study.
> Requested preliminary cost estimate for Newtown Rail Trail from County Line Road to Bristol Road within Upper Southampton Township.
> Requested letter of support for Newtown Rail Trail from Upper Southampton Township.
> Met with Ken Boyle of Bikes Bucks County to discuss bicycle and trail planning in the county.

Recycling and Solid Waste
> Working with the Yardley EAC and a local e-waste recycler to co-sponsor a second electronic collection event.
> Coordinating the details for the 2015 Household Hazard Waste (HHW) five events.
> Continued preparing the Bucks County Municipal Waste Plan update.
> Submitting the recycling coordinator activities for the 2014 Section 903 50% salary reimbursement grant.
> Analyzing and preparing a summary report of the municipal 2014 recycling data.
> Answering an increasing number of residential recycling inquiries in the absence of a receptionist and convenient electronic waste recycling options.

Hazard Mitigation Planning
> Coordinating the second of three Hazard Mitigation Plan Update meetings with municipal managers and emergency management coordinators.
> Providing necessary data for the plan update.
TRANSPORTATION AND GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM (GIS)

General Transportation Planning
> Provided answers to questions on Request for Proposals for conversion of Quakertown Rail Line to Pedestrian Trail. Coordinated with SEPTA regarding leasing of unused rail lines. Coordinated with Springfield and Richland Township regarding project. Conducted mandatory pre-proposal consultant meeting.
> Coordinated with DVRPC, Upper Southampton Township and Northampton Township regarding conversion of Newtown Rail Line to Pedestrian Trail. Developed Statement of Interest to DVRPC regarding William Penn funding for design work.
> Attended Stand Up 4 Transportation Rally in Philadelphia.

Public Transportation
> Reviewed SEPTA Board Meeting Materials.
> Attended Doylestown DART Committee Meeting.
> Participated in discussions regarding TMA Bucks Outreach Seminar Program Agenda.
> Reviewed New Hope Public Transportation Study.
> Participated in Roosevelt Boulevard Public Transit Study Conference Call.

Transportation Assistance to Planning Staff
> Discussed transportation related issues with staff for subdivision and land development reviews.
> Attended Review Design Meeting.
> Continued to develop background information for Cross Keys Land Use and Transportation Study. Received contract from controller's office and processed it through DVRPC for final execution. Attended staff meetings to discuss project. Processed subconsultant first project invoice.
> Continued development of background data for New Britain Borough Transit Oriented Development TCDI Project. Attended staff meetings to discuss project. Received contract from controller's office and processed it through DVRPC for final execution. Coordinated with DVRPC regarding traffic count data request for Butler Pike.
> Continued developing computer-enhanced imagery for Almont Study. Attended meeting to discuss potential additional sketches for document. Attended meeting to discuss report graphics.

Transportation Improvement Program
> Provided Transportation Improvement Program information to various individuals and agencies.
> Provided draft TIP Tour Itinerary to DVRPC and PennDOT.
> Attended Request for Proposals Evaluation Committee Meeting to discuss county bridges 282 and 358 and 15 and 280. Provided short list justification to Commissioners.
> Participated in Congestion Management Program webinar.
> Attended Highway Safety Improvement Program Meeting at PennDOT.
> Attended Local Bridge Program Meeting. Coordinated with County Bridge Consultant to provide bridge data to PennDOT.
> Attended RTC TIP Subcommittee Meeting.
> Attended Regional Technical Committee Meeting.
**Geographic Information Systems (GIS)**

- Continued development of County-Wide Enterprise GIS program.
- Continued database development of site addresses and EMS, Fire, and Police response zones.
- Continued updating of Enterprise Geodatabase and ArcGIS Server.
- Continued coordination with GIS consultant on the Land Records and EMS projects.
- Continued development and support of County GIS Consortium efforts.
- Continued updating and editing of county Road Centerline database.
- Continued GIS technical software support to IT and GIS staff at Board of Assessment.
- Continued support of County hosted GIS web server connection and interface.
- Provided GIS technical support to Emergency Communication staff.
- Continued technical support for County GIS Web Viewer.
- Continued editing of county-wide data layers using GIS Data Reviewer tool.
- Continued editing procedures on land base parcel annotation features.
- Continued updating and testing of ArcGIS 10.3 desktop software.
- Continued edge matching work on SE PA 9-1-1 GIS Shared Services regional datasets.
- Continued production of county Park and Recreation maps and web applications.
- Continued development of new GIS Web Viewer from Flex to JavaScript application.
- Attended Shared GIS Services Meeting at Montgomery County Emergency Management.
- Continued software updating of Staging and Development components of the Enterprise GIS System.
- Continued development of web mapping application of suicide incidents in Bucks County.
- Created GIS Story Map of county diversity for Purchasing Director’s business presentation.
- Provided GIS data layers to Plumstead, Doylestown, Middletown, and Newtown township consortium members.

**GIS Map Production**

- Produced presentation maps for Community, Environmental and Preservation Planning units.
- Continued development of maps of county parks and facilities for print and web deployment.

**GIS Transportation**

- Continued development of Region-wide GIS Transportation initiative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number(s)</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chalfont Borough</td>
<td>7-15-1 (P)</td>
<td>Metropolitan Development Group</td>
<td>7-4-4-1 &amp; -4-3</td>
<td>Private Zoning Ordinance Amendment: B-13 &amp; B-14 Uses in VOC District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doylestown Borough</td>
<td>8-15-2</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Medical Office Uses in TND-1 District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown Township</td>
<td>22-15-SD1</td>
<td>Neshaminy School District</td>
<td>22-54-16</td>
<td>Lease of Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain Borough</td>
<td>25-15-CR1</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td>25-5-3-2</td>
<td>County Review: Land Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton Township</td>
<td>31-15-1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>31-23-5</td>
<td>Zoning Map Change: REC to P-O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster Township</td>
<td>49-15-1R</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>49-37-283</td>
<td>Zoning Map Change: GOV to R2 Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Single-family Detached Cluster in R-2 District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrightstown Township</td>
<td>53-15-WS1</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Act 537 Update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Chalfont Borough Council
   Chalfont Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Private Request for Zoning Ordinance Amendment—B13 & G14 Use in the VOC District
         Applicant: KTMT LIG L.P.
         Received: April 27, 2015
         Hearing Date: June 9, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal has been sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on May 6, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requested Action: Amend the zoning ordinance use regulations (Section 22-407) to permit uses B-13 Village House and B-14 Small-Lot Village House as part of a Use B12 Planned Village Development, which would be permitted by conditional use in the VOC Village Office Commercial District. These new uses will have specific area and dimensions requirements. The area and dimensional requirements of Use B12 Planned Village Development will also be revised.

Requested Zoning Provisions: Use B12 Planned Village Development minimum site area will be 10-acres and require sites over 20 acres to have 15 to 25 percent of site area devoted to nonresidential uses. The maximum residential density and maximum impervious surface ratio for Use B12 will be 3.6 units per acre and 55 percent, respectively. A portion of the base site area may be preserved as open space and Borough Council shall have discretion regarding the percent of open space as part of a conditional use hearing based on dwelling unit type. The recommended open space percentages are: 20 percent for Uses B3 Twin, B5 Multiplex, and B6 Townhome and 4 percent for Uses B13 Village House and B14 Small Lot Village House.
A Type B buffer yard (15 feet) will be required between residential and nonresidential uses and a Type A buffer (25 feet) between all residential uses including residential and open space and detention basins in a Planned Village Development. Buffers between residential uses can be reduced by 5 feet if a fence is provided along the property line.

The area and dimensional requirements for Uses B5 Multiplex and B6 Townhome in the Planned Village Development will be the same as currently listed for these uses. The area and dimensional requirements of Use B3 Twin will be as follows:

- **Minimum Lot Area**: 9,000 square feet
- **Building Area**: 40 percent maximum
- **Lot Width**: 35 feet minimum
- **Front Yard Setback**: 25 feet minimum
- **Side Yard Setback**: 10 feet minimum
- **Rear Yard Setback**: 25 feet minimum
- **Impervious Surface**: 50 percent maximum

The area and dimensional requirements of Use B13 Village House will be as follows:

- **Minimum Lot Area**: 10,000 square feet
- **Building Area**: 35 percent maximum
- **Lot Width**: 50 feet minimum
- **Front Yard Setback**: 15 feet minimum from right-of-way, 10 feet minimum from right-of-way for a corner lot with the side of the home facing the street
- **Side Yard Setback**: 5 feet minimum, aggregate of 15 feet minimum
- **Rear Yard Setback**: 30 feet minimum
- **Impervious Surface**: 40 percent maximum

The area and dimensional requirements of Use B14 Village House will be as follows:

- **Minimum Lot Area**: 7,000 square feet
- **Building Area**: 40 percent maximum
- **Lot Width**: 50 feet minimum
- **Front Yard Setback**: 15 feet minimum from right-of-way, 10 feet minimum from right-of-way for a corner lot with the side of the home facing the street
- **Side Yard Setback**: 5 feet minimum, aggregate of 15 feet minimum
- **Rear Yard Setback**: 20 feet minimum
- **Impervious Surface**: 55 percent maximum

Two off-street parking spaces will be required for Uses B13 and B14. Both uses are to have one or more of the following design elements: 6-foot wide porch along the front of the house, a fence or hedgerow along the front yard; front porch with a portico front porch with two white columns and a standing seam metal roof, or a raised front yard and 18 inch high retaining wall.

The Table of Use Regulations will be amended to permit Uses B13 Village House and B14 Small-Lot Village House as part of use B12 Planned Village Development.
Existing Zoning Provisions: Use B12 Planned Village Development is permitted as a conditional use in the VOC district and includes twin, townhouse, multiplex, and village house. Use B12 is permitted on a minimum site area of 20 acres and a maximum density of 3.5 units per acre. A mix of up to 20 percent nonresidential uses is required. A village house does not have specific use regulations. The minimum lot size for a village house is 10,000 square feet. Twenty percent of base site area must be preserved as open space. Setbacks are provided for the dwelling and detached garage.

The village house uses are to have two or more of the following design elements: a 7-foot-wide porch along the front of the dwelling, and a front yard raised along the sidewalk grade, and permanent fence or flowering shrub hedge.

Buffer yards are not required between single-family-detached, twin, and duplex residential uses.

COMMENTS

We note the following issues that the Borough should address in its consideration of the ordinance amendment:

1. **Open space requirement**—Section 407.2L.B12.1(d) of the proposed amendment states open space *may* be required. There are no standards for deciding when open space is required or not. The standards for granting conditional use approval are general and not specific to open space. We recommend that open space be required versus being discretionary since it provides an essential element to the character of the development and active and passive recreational opportunities to future residents. If borough officials determine that it should be discretionary, we recommend that standards be provided to determine when and if open space is required and a fee in lieu provision if open space is not required (in accordance with Section 22-714 of the subdivision and land development ordinance).

2. **Open space amount**—The proposed changes to the open space requirement for the Planned Village Development in Section 407.2L.B121(d) require open space based on unit type from 4 percent for village houses to 20 percent for twins, multiplex, and townhouses. However, the proposed amendment does not include open space requirements. So if two unit types are proposed with different open space requirements, it is unclear how much open space would be necessary. Open space and recreation should be commensurate to number of units because open space is necessary to meet household demand irrespective of unit type. Open space should be required at the same rate for all unit types. The existing standard for a Planned Village Development requires 20 percent open space for all residential uses. We recommend that the open space be required for all Planned Village Development consistently and that the requirement be raised to 20 percent for all uses.

3. **Buffer yard**—The proposed amendment requires buffer yards between residential and nonresidential uses and between residential uses. We recommend that the requirements specify that buffering and/or screening also be required to screen trail and recreation facilities from residential uses.

4. **Village house design standards**—The existing village house standards require that two or more design elements be provided which differentiate a village house from other single-family
detached dwellings. The proposed standards for Village House and Small-Lot Village House require that one or more design elements be provided at the discretion of the Borough Council. The design requirements have been reduced and lessen the character intended for the Village Office Commercial District and the Planned Village Development Use.

5. **Village house uses regulation placement**—The proposed amendment would place the use regulations for Use B13 and B14 in Section 27-407.M and N. There is no section 407 A through L for the proposed sections to follow. The correct placement would be Section 27-407.2 Residential uses, M and N.

6. **B-3 Twin use regulations**—Use regulations are proposed for twin dwellings. Existing zoning ordinance Section 407.2C.B-3 Twin Use regulations only defines the use and sets parking standards. We recommend that the borough consider using the proposed use regulations for the Planned Village Development Twin use in all districts in which Use B3 is permitted.

7. **Garage setbacks**—The existing standards for village houses contains setbacks for detached garages. Garages must have a front yard setback of 25-feet and rear yard setback of 5-feet. The proposed standards for Village House and Small-lot Village House have no setbacks for detached garages. We recommend that the amendment be revised to include garage setback standards.

8. **Comprehensive Plan Amendment**—Section 603(j) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code requires that the zoning ordinance be generally consistent with the comprehensive plan. Page 62 of the comprehensive plan indicates that the Hellberg Tract may only be developed for nonresidential uses. The site may be developed for an office/retail shop or service business on a lot of 5 acres or more by conditional use. If adjoining parcels are developed with others to create a site of 20 acres or more a Planned Village Development may be constructed. The minimum site area for a Planned Village Development will be reduced to 10 acres so the proposed amendment conflicts with the Borough’s comprehensive plan. The comprehensive plan should be amended if the proposed zoning change is adopted.

We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

DCZ:dwb

cc: Dean Ibrahim, Esq., Ibrahim & McKillop PC, Borough Solicitor
    Sandra B. Zadell, Borough Manager (via email)
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

May 6, 2015
BCPC #8-15-2

MEMORANDUM

TO: Doylestown Borough Council
    Doylestown Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Traditional Neighborhood Development
Applicant: Borough Council
Received: April 7, 2015
Hearing Date: Not indicated.

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on May 6, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend Section 406.4.1.D(3)(g) of the borough zoning ordinance to permit offices of physicians, dentists, and other medical related offices within the TND-1, Traditional Neighborhood Development 1 zoning district.

COMMENTS

The proposed amendment appears to be consistent with the ordinance amendment procedures as prescribed in Section 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code. Therefore, we recommend that the borough adopt the proposed revisions.

We would appreciate being notified of the Borough Council’s decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

MMW:dwb

cc: Jordan Yeager, Curtin & Heefner, Borough Solicitor
    Kelli J. Scarlett, Director of Building and Zoning
    John Davis, Borough Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Middletown Township Board of Supervisors
   Middletown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal for the Lease of the Samuel Everitt Elementary School Building
       TMP #22-55-201
       Applicant: Neshaminy School District
       Received: April 10, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Section 304 and 305 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on May 6, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: The Neshaminy School District proposes to close the Samuel Everitt Elementary School and lease the building to Bucks County Intermediate Unit #22 for a term of 5 years.

Location & Size of Tract: The school building is located in Middletown Township on a 17 acre site on Forsythia Drive S, across from the Fallenrock Road terminus.

COMMENTS

Neshaminy School District serves the municipalities of Middletown and Lower Southampton townships, and the boroughs of Hulmeville, Langhorne, Langhorne Manor, and Penndel. The Bucks County Comprehensive Plan (2011) addresses school facilities in the Community Facilities and Services component of the plan. Principle 6 of the plan is to “Provide Adequate Community Facilities and Services” by continuing to promote proactive, cost-effective and efficient community facilities and services that will keep pace with and fulfill the changing needs of our citizenry. The plan notes that the population of school age children in all communities is cyclical, and recommends the following Strategies and Actions regarding educational services:

- Promote the location of new facilities within existing neighborhoods and development areas.
• Encourage reuse of existing facilities before building new ones.
• Encourage leasing of used facilities rather than selling to retain potential reuse.
• Promote sidewalks and bicycle paths that connect schools with neighborhoods.

According to the information submitted, the lease of the Samuel Everitt Elementary School building to Bucks County Intermediate Unit #22 for a term of 5 years appears to be consistent with county policy. The submission indicates that the proximity of the school to other elementary schools will minimize the impact of the closure and the reassignment and transportation of students. Since the declining enrollment is expected to continue, and the students can be accommodated at other school facilities within the district (existing and proposed), the lease of the school building for 5 years appears to be reasonable, especially since the facility could still be used for public school purposes in the future if increases in enrollment occurs.

We would appreciate being notified of the School District’s decision regarding this matter.

CIG:dwb

cc: Robert Copeland, NSD Superintendent
    Thomas J Profy, IV, Neshaminy School District Solicitor
    Lower Southampton Township (via email)
    Hulmeville Borough (via email)
    Langhorne Borough (via email)
    Langhorne Manor Borough (via email)
    Penndel Borough (via email)
    Joseph Pizzo, Esq., Township Supervisor
    Stephanie Teoli Kuhls, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: New Britain Borough Council
    New Britain Borough Planning Commission
    New Britain Township Board of Supervisors
    New Britain Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal for Private Donation of Land for Open Space

Applicant: Borough Council
Received: April 15, 2015
Hearing Date: Not indicated

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 502 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal has been sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on May 6, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Subdivide a 3.65 acre parcel (TMP #25-5-3-2) into two lots for the conveyance of open space to the Borough. Lot 2A would be 1.14 acres and Lot 2B would be 2.51 acres. Lot 2B would be conveyed to the Borough for use as a public recreational facility. The site is served by public water and sewerage facilities.

Location: Approximately 200 feet southeast of the intersection of Industrial Drive and Sand Hill Drive.

Zoning:
- Light Industrial (LI) District permits a variety of light industrial, trade, and office uses. The minimum lot size for all permitted uses is one acre.
- R-1 Residential District permits public recreation facilities on lots with a minimum of 20,000 square feet.

Present Use: Vacant.
COMMENTS

1. **Access to public street**—Section 603 of the zoning ordinance requires that lots shall have frontage onto public streets. Note 2 of the zoning information on the plan indicates that street frontage is not required since alternate access via an easement is provided. We recommend that the ordinance provision that permits this be included on the plan.

2. **Wooded area disturbance**—Note 3 of the zoning information on the plan indicates that 26 percent of the wooded area on Lot 2A is proposed to be disturbed and that approval of this plan indicates permission from New Britain Borough that up to 26 percent of the wooded area of Lot 2A may be removed. The proposed disturbance would require a variance from Section 608.D of the zoning ordinance.

We would appreciate being notified of the Borough Council’s decision regarding this matter.

MMW:dwb

cc: Michael Goodwin, Esq., Borough Solicitor
    Robin Trymbiski, Borough Manager (via email)
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

May 6, 2015
BCPC #31-15-1

MEMORANDUM

TO: Northampton Township Board of Supervisors
Northampton Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Map
TMP #31-23-5
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: March 30, 2015
Hearing Date: Not indicated

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on May 6, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the Northampton Township zoning map by rezoning TMP #31-23-5 from REC Recreation District to P-O Professional Office District.

Location and Size of Parcel: The 22,338-square-foot parcel is located northeast of the intersection of Newtown-Richboro Road and Tennis Road.

Proposed Zoning: PO Professional Office District permits business and professional offices on a minimum lot area of 30,000 square feet with a minimum lot width of 150 feet.

Existing Zoning Provisions: REC Recreation District permits municipal uses on a minimum lot area of 20,000 square feet with a minimum lot width of 100 feet.

COMMENTS

We understand that the Township seeks to sell the property with an office zoning district designation, as it is more marketable to a potential buyer than a recreation zoning district. However, we have several comments that the Township should consider before adoption.
1. **Comprehensive plan**—The Future Land Use map of the *Northampton Township Comprehensive Plan, 1999 Update* indicates that the site is intended for recreational uses. Section 603(j) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code requires that zoning ordinance be generally consistent with the comprehensive plan. The comprehensive plan should be amended if the proposed zoning change is adopted.

2. **Compatibility with surrounding zoning and land use**—The permitted land uses in the proposed district may pose greater intensity differences from the surrounding land use and zoning. However, the potential impacts can be addressed through appropriate landscape buffering.

3. **Dimensional requirements**—The parcel does not meet the following dimensional requirement of the PO Professional Office District:

   - Minimum lot area—The parcel is 22,338 square feet. Section 504.3B of the zoning ordinance requires a minimum lot area of 30,000 square feet.
   - Minimum lot width—The parcel is approximately 125 feet in width at the street line. Section 504.3C of the zoning ordinance requires a minimum lot width of 150 feet at the street line.
   - Rear yard—The existing single-family dwelling has a rear yard setback of 14 feet. Section 504.3G of the zoning ordinance requires a rear yard setback of 50 feet.

   In addition, the Township should consider that some requirements may be difficult to meet for an office use, given the size of the lot:

   - Maximum impervious coverage—Section 504.3E of the zoning ordinance requires a maximum 65 percent impervious coverage of the lot area.
   - Minimum parking requirement—Section 1110.2A of the zoning ordinance requires one parking space per 150 square feet of gross floor area. The existing single-family home is approximately 2,000 square feet; an office use would require about 14 parking spaces.

4. **Summary comment**—We recognize the need to provide a marketable zoning designation that would encourage the purchase of the property by a private interest. Although the proposal may pose intensity differences compared to surrounding zoning and land use, landscape buffering can address these potential impacts. However, the parcel does not meet the minimum lot area, minimum lot width, and rear yard requirements of the PO Professional Office District and future applicants may have difficulty in meeting the maximum impervious coverage and minimum parking requirements of the district. While the *Northampton Township Comprehensive Plan, 1999 Update* indicates that this parcel is intended for recreational uses, the adoption of the new zoning district may be of benefit to the Township and may have little

---

1 The surrounding land use and zoning is described on the last page of our review under Pertinent Information.
effect on future land use policy in other areas of the Township, due to the unique circumstances of the property.

We would appreciate being notified of Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

MAR: dwb

cc: Robert Pellegrino, Township Manager (via email)
    Mike Solomon, Director of Planning and Zoning (via email)
    Joseph Pizzo, Esq., Rudolph Clark, LLC, Township Solicitor
PERTINENT INFORMATION

Site Characteristics: The site contains a single-family dwelling.

Existing Land Use: Residential

Surrounding Land Use:

    South: Recreation
    North: Recreation
    East:  Recreation
    West:  Recreation

Surrounding Zoning:

    South: REC Recreation District
    North: REC Recreation District
    East:  REC Recreation District
    West:  REC Recreation District

Municipal Comprehensive Plan: The Northampton Township Comprehensive Plan, 1999 Update indicates that this parcel is intended for recreational uses.
CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE

May 6, 2015
BCPC #40-15-2

MEMORANDUM

TO: Silverdale Borough Council
   Silverdale Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Architectural Preservation Inventory
Applicant: Silverdale Borough Council
Received: April 21, 2015
Hearing Date: Not indicated.

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on May 6, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend Section 340-130 of the borough zoning ordinance to establish an Architectural Preservation Inventory.

Current Zoning Provisions: The current zoning ordinance does not provide an Architectural Preservation Inventory.

COMMENTS

We recognize that the proposal is consistent with the applicable municipal ordinances; however, the commission recommends that the Borough address the following issues:

- **Architectural Preservation Overlay District Map**—Section 340-130.F of the zoning ordinance requires that an Architectural Preservation Overlay District Map be prepared at the time that the Borough Council determines the Architectural Preservation Inventory.
We would appreciate being notified of the Borough Council’s decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

MMW:dwb

cc: Colby Grim, Esq., Grim, Biehn & Thatcher, Borough Solicitor
    Lisa Herrmann, Borough Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warminster Board of Supervisors
   Warminster Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend Zoning Map Change and Zoning Ordinance
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: April 20, 2015
Hearing Date: May 21, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal has been sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on May 6, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action:

A. Change the zoning of TMP #49-37-283 (the former WREC and Hart School site) from GOV Government Public to R-2 Residence. Other than the correction of a typographical error of the parcel number, the proposed rezoning amendment is identical to a previously submitted amendment reviewed on April 1, 2015 (BCPC #49-15-1).

B. Amend the Zoning Ordinance to permit a Single-Family Detached Cluster Development (Use 3(a)) as a conditional use in the R-2 district and modify area and dimensional requirements to the R-3 and R-4 Residence districts. The Use Regulations for Single-Family Detached Cluster Development use would be added to Section 1602.B, Residential Uses, and parking standards for Use 3(a) would be added to the Off-Street Parking Requirements.

Location & Size of Tract: TMP #49-37-283 (15.7 acres) is located southeast of Little Lane, approximately 360 feet south of its intersection with Barness Drive.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: A new Section will be added that permits Single-Family Detached Cluster Development use as a conditional use in the R-2 district.
The area and dimensional requirements and other use regulations for Single-Family Cluster Development to be added to Section 1602.B Residential Areas are as follows:

- Minimum gross tract size: 10 contiguous acres
- Minimum lot area: 9,000 square feet
- Minimum lot width: 75 feet at building line; 70 feet at front property line
- Front yard: 25 feet
- Side yard: 10 feet each
- Rear yard: 25 feet
- Building coverage: 35 percent
- Impervious coverage maximum: 45 percent (40 percent at plan approval, 5 percent reserved for homeowner in future)
- Net tract impervious coverage: 50 percent
- Building height maximum: 35 feet, 2.5 stories
- Density maximum: 2.6 units per acre
- Open space minimum: 20 percent of gross tract area
- Storm water management facilities are permitted in open space
  Buffers: 35-foot buffer yard, fencing, and landscaped berms.
- Public water and sewer are required and all utilities shall be underground.

Section 602 Area and Dimensional requirements for the R-3 Residence district would be amended to permit a density of three dwelling units per acre.

Section 702.A Area and Dimensional requirements for the R-4 district will be amended to include front, side, and rear yard setbacks for uses other than those specifically listed. The requirements are: 50-foot front yard, 25-foot side yards, 50-foot rear yard.

Part 16 Use regulations, Section 1602.B Residential Uses, will be amended to include a description of Use 3(a) Single-Family Detached Cluster Development and a requirement for buffer yards.

Part 16, Section 1602.B Residential Uses will be amended to reference 8, Mixed Use development standards in Section 503.

Part 22, Off-Street Parking and Loading, Section 2200, Subsection A.3 will be amended to require two parking spaces per dwelling unit for Use 3(a) Single-Family Detached Cluster.

Existing Zoning Provisions: The R-2 Residential district permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 12,500 square feet or more. Mixed use development is permitted on sites of 18 acres or more. Public schools are permitted as a conditional use. The maximum density permitted is 2.2 units per acre.

The R-3 Residence district permits agriculture, single-family detached dwellings, and residential accessory uses on lots of 9,000 square feet or more. Similar yard requirements are provided for all permitted conditional and special exception uses. There are no maximum density standards.

The R-4 Residence district permits single-family detached dwellings and residential accessory uses on lots of 9,000 square feet or more. Yard requirements are provided for permitted residential
uses. There are no yard requirements for other uses permitted by condition or special exception. The maximum density for multifamily dwellings and townhouses is 5 units per acre.

COMMENTS:

We understand the goal of the township is to establish uses that can be located on vacated school sites that are compatible with the surrounding community. We note the following items for township’s consideration.

A. Zoning map change

1. Adjoining land use and zoning—The proposed rezoning to R-2 Residential is consistent with adjacent zoning. The Single-Family Detached Cluster Development permitted in the R-2 district would be slightly denser than the adjoining development, but the required open space and buffer yards should address any potential impacts.

   The proposed use in the R-2 district would apply to all parcels in the R-2 district. Other existing or former schools are on sites zoned R-2 and are located amongst residential subdivisions. The proposed Single-Family Detached Cluster Development use may be appropriate for these sites.

   The site is adjoined to the north and east by single-family detached dwellings on lots of approximately 10,000 square feet or more. Single-family dwellings on lots of 20,000 square feet lie to the south. A 6.7-acre open space lot adjoins the site to the west.

   The areas on the north and east side of the parcel are zoned R-2 Residential which permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 12,500 square feet. The area to the south is zoned R-1 Residential which permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 20,000 square feet. The open space parcel to the west is zoned GOV which permits municipal, educational and other uses on lots of one acre.

2. Existing zoning—The site is zoned GOV Government/Public to permit the former township recreation center and public school. The recreation center and school have closed and the school district is selling the parcel.

3. Municipal Comprehensive Plan—The future land use map of the Warminster Township Comprehensive Plan Update 2004 designates the site as Government & Institutional. Section 603(j) of the MPC requires that the zoning ordinance be generally consistent with the comprehensive plan. The comprehensive plan should be amended if the proposed zoning change is adopted.

B. Zoning text amendment

1. Stormwater facilities in open space—The proposed Single-Family Detached Cluster Development use requires 20 percent of site to be preserved as open space but also allows stormwater management facilities to occupy part of the open space. In a section of the current township zoning ordinance (Section 2102.B.1.a), the township requires that open space meet one of the following purposes:

CONFIDENTIAL — NOT FOR RELEASE
a. To conserve natural or scenic resources
b. To augment recreation or public open space opportunities
c. To preserve sites of historic, geologic, or botanic interest;
d. To enhance the value of existing parks, forests, wildlife preserves, nature preserves, or other public open spaces by preserving land abutting such existing parks

The proposed amendment conflicts with the open space requirements and permits open space to be used for stormwater management. Stormwater management areas are not open space but are necessary utilities required as part of the development process. The placement of a basin in open space can often seriously diminish the value and usefulness of open space if it is poorly located. It appears that neither the Mixed Use Development nor the Transit Oriented Development use include this flexibility with basins in open space.

This section also allows more than 25 percent of the open space to be used for stormwater facilities if a fee is paid. If the township is inclined to allow stormwater in open space, they should consider an upper limit on how much open space can be dedicated to stormwater. As written the amendment would allow all the open space to be used for the required stormwater management.

2. **Open space boundaries**—Proposed zoning requires that 20 percent of the site be devoted to permanent open space. The township’s subdivision and land development ordinance (Section 603.1.D) requires that access ways to open space that are located between or adjacent to residential lots be delineated with landscaping or fencing. In order to demarcate the open space so that residents don’t use public open space for private activities, we recommend that the ordinance require plantings or fencing between all open space areas and private lots, not just along the access ways.

We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

DCZ:dwb

cc: Mary Eberle, Esquire, Grim, Biehn & Thatcher, Township Solicitor
    Steven Weisner, Township Manager (via email)
PERTINENT INFORMATION

Site Characteristics, Natural Features: The site slopes to the west and has lawn around the existing building and woods to the southwest.

Existing Land Use: Former recreation center and former elementary school

Surrounding Land Use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Single-family residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Single-family residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>Township open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Single-family residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surrounding Zoning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>R-2 Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>R-2 Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>GOV Government/Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>R-2 Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

County Comprehensive Plan: The Bucks County Comprehensive Plan 2011 classifies the subject site as Mature Suburban Areas, which are medium density areas with mostly single-family residential development. Located in the lower end of the county and along County Line Road south of Route 611, these communities were planned and developed during the period immediately following World War II. Mature suburban areas are mostly built-out and have had limited population growth in the last 30 years and, in some cases, a loss of population.

The long-term survival and success of the communities within the Mature Suburban Areas will be tied to both repairing and enhancing infrastructure, redevelopment and revitalization of underutilized lands, and effective neighborhood planning to avoid the potential problems of decline and disinvestment in residential areas.


Municipal Sewage Facilities Plan: The Final Environmental Impact Statement Horsham, Warminster, Warrington, Pennsylvania Wastewater Treatment Facilities Plan is the official Act 537 Plan for Warminster Township. The plan indicates that the subject area is served by municipal sewage facilities.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Wrightstown Township Board of Supervisors
Wrightstown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal for an Update to the Official Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: March 30, 2015
Hearing Date: Not indicated

In accordance with the provisions of the Pennsylvania Sewage Facilities Planning Act (Act 537) and Section 304 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on May 6, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: According to the cover letter accompanying the proposed plan, Wrightstown Township was asked by DEP to update its official sewage facilities plan to address areas in the Township with suspected wastewater needs. The current wastewater plan, the 201 Sewage Facilities Plan, was adopted in 1985 and proposed the creation of a community sewage system to serve parts of the Township. That plan has not been implemented for a number of reasons including the estimated current cost of $14,406,000. The current plan also called for the management of all other individual on-lot wastewater systems in the Township through education. The Township implemented that part of the plan. In addition, the Township enacted an "On-lot Sewage System Management Ordinance for Wrightstown Township."

The Township prepared the subject sewage facilities plan to satisfy the State and to remove the formerly proposed community wastewater system from the official plan. It provides a means to allow the Township to identify areas of existing development with wastewater concerns and prioritize those areas so they can be addressed as time and resources allow. "Areas of Concern" were identified where concentrations of failing wastewater systems may occur because of the existing soil conditions, limited area available for replacement of sewage systems, and the age of the systems.

The plan projects that 125 new dwellings will be constructed by 2040, and based on the past decade, it is expected most of that growth will involve homes constructed using community
wastewater systems located in the Township’s "Country Residential" zoning districts. The plan also indicates that the other trend has been for new and expanded commercial development to rely on small community systems; and that, while there is limited land zoned for this use that hasn't been developed, it is expected additional community wastewater systems will be needed to meet future needs.

The plan makes provisions for community systems in areas of the Township where land use or site conditions may not permit the use of individual systems. A hierarchy of preferred systems has been established which must be adhered to by applicants proposing the construction of community systems.

The plan indicates there are limited areas where wastewater disposal problems exist in the Township. The priority areas include the following:

- Wycombe
- Penns Park
- Neshaminy Cliffs
- Wrenwood Estates
- Anchor Estates

The recommendations developed as part of subject Act 537 plan are as follows:

1. Institute a quarterly inspection of all major community wastewater systems using the operating staff the Township already employs to operate the community systems it owns.

2. Create a focused approach for on-lot maintenance areas of concern that do not have access to community wastewater systems in the foreseeable future.

3. Assign any available capacity in the two existing wastewater systems owned by the Township to nearby existing development that may need sewer service. Look for opportunities to obtain funding, easements, or developer assistance to extend sewers to areas of existing need.

4. Continue the enforcement of the individual on-lot management program.

The following recommendations are aimed at making the Township's wastewater management program more implementable:

1. Continue to enter into agreements with property owners, institutions, and developers where major community systems are proposed or the proposed wastewater system requires special consideration because of extensive maintenance requirements or because of serious environmental considerations or holding tanks are required.

2. Continue the notification and follow-up program for individual systems and small community systems.

3. Adopt new technical specifications and standards for community wastewater systems to provide consistence and quality and assure operational reliability.
4. Perform an independent review of systems currently under the Township’s control and operated under contract annually to identify any areas where additional work is needed and any capital improvements that may need to be budgeted for.

5. Update the "On-lot Sewage System Management Ordinance for Wrightstown Township" to reflect current standards to require specific requirements for the maintenance of each type of system, to provide for periodic inspections, and provisions for enforcing compliance with the maintenance requirements. In addition, the ordinance should be revised concerning required escrow for the installation of systems.

6. Continue with the policy of municipal ownership and operation of the residential community systems. With limited staff and the prospect of having a limited number of customers in the future, having the municipal staff to operate and maintain the systems does not appear to be feasible. The continuation of contract operations will meet the needs of the Township for the foreseeable future.

7. Adopt an improved municipal management program to provide oversight of existing and future non-municipal major community wastewater systems.

The plan recommendations for areas of concern, in addition to the continued implementation of the current township-wide wastewater management program, are as follows:

1. Review the pumping records for these areas to determine if the pumping rate indicates possible failures.

2. Review the Department of Health records to identify any complaints, malfunctions, or repairs.

3. Conduct a windshield survey of each area to identify any obvious problems.

4. Require the residents in these areas to have their wells tested once every three years and supply the test results to the Township.

5. Compare the results of the surveys and test results to previous years to identify any trends or if the number of wells contaminated or the number of failing wastewater systems approaches a critical number.

The Township doesn't want to create community wastewater systems for these areas of concern and would rather work with property owners to help them manage their wastewater systems.

COMMENTS

We commend township officials for undertaking this update of the Township’s official sewage facilities plan. The plan is comprehensive, well-prepared, and contains informative maps. It explains past Act 537 planning and describes the Township’s sewage facility planning issues in a clear and concise presentation. The plan provides a useful planning tool that, if used properly, will address the Township’s short-term and long-range sewage disposal needs. Additionally, the plan will help continue
the Township’s protection and preservation of both groundwater resources, which the Township is completely dependent upon for water supply, and surface water resources. We note the following issues for the Township’s consideration:

1. **Water Conservation**—We recommend that the plan provide a discussion on the benefits of water conservation and the need for low-flow plumbing fixtures to minimize the amount of water entering on-lot sewage disposal systems, thereby helping to ensure proper operation of the system. The Township should require the use of water conservation devices on all new construction as required by the Delaware River Basin Commission and the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC).

2. **Wastewater system management**—We commend the Township for including a copy of the existing Chapter 18 Sewage and Sewage Disposal of the Township Code that addresses management of individual and community wastewater systems, and recommending a comprehensive updating of the ordinance. Properly designed and installed individual and community wastewater systems function better and last longer with regular maintenance. Sewage management programs, including public education and an implementing ordinance, ensure that these systems are properly operated and maintained. Various options are available to municipalities for ensuring performance of routine operation and maintenance for new and existing individual and community wastewater systems. The update among other things should include:

   - a requirement specifying that prior to the execution of an agreement of sale for any property or lot containing an on-lot sewage disposal facility, that the Seller provide the Buyer with a copy of the township maintenance requirements of the system and a copy of the maintenance and repair record. In the agreement of sale the Buyer’s acknowledgment of the receipt of the sewage system maintenance agreement should be provided.

   - a requirement specifying that the planning, design, siting, construction, maintenance, repair, and replacement of any On-lot Sewage Disposal System shall be done in accordance with the requirements of PA Code Title 25, Chapter 73, and Standards for On-lot Sewage Treatment Facilities.

   - the following requirement with this same wording required in the sewage system maintenance agreements:

     In accordance with the requirements of PA Code Title 25, Chapter 73, Standards for On-Lot Sewage Treatment Facilities, only normal domestic wastes including kitchen, bathroom, and laundry waste and water softener backwash water shall be discharged to any On-Lot Sewage Disposal System. Sewage which contains any of the following shall not be discharged into any individual or community sanitary sewage disposal system:

     i. Industrial waste (without appropriate pretreatment)
     ii. Automobile oil and other non-domestic oil
iii. Toxic or hazardous substances or chemicals, including but not limited to pesticides, disinfectants (excluding household cleaners), acids, paints, paint thinners, herbicides, gasoline and other solvents
iv. Clean surface or ground water, including water from roof or cellar drains, springs, basement sump pumps and French drains
v. Wastewater resulting from hair treatment at beauty shops
vi. Any non-biodegradable materials
vii. Following or during pumping, backflow from the absorption area
viii. Surface discharge, ponding or other signs of malfunction in the vicinity of the absorption area

The use of garbage disposals connected to On-Lot Sewage Disposal Systems is prohibited for new construction and is strongly discouraged for existing systems as they increase the solids in the treatment tank which may necessitate more frequent pumping or may cause improper functioning of the treatment unit.

- a section that outlines the priority of alternatives to be considered for both new and malfunctioning on-lot sewage disposal systems consistent similar to the community wastewater system selection strategy.

- a new addressing replacement sewage disposal areas. This proposed section would outline the requirements relative to replacement areas for on-lot sewage disposal facilities including easement requirements, proposed activities within identified replacement areas, and the need to identify a replacement area for new development.

3. **Consistency with Comprehensive Plan**—The proposed Act 537 Plan appears to be consistent with the *2009 Newtown Area Joint Comprehensive Plan*. The Comprehensive Plan’s strategies for wastewater are:

- update the wastewater facility plans for the jointure municipalities and make sure that wastewater policies are consistent with land use policies.

- require detailed wastewater facilities alternatives for proposed extensions of sewer service outside the delineated Development Area. Such analyses should include the evaluation of community systems and the impact of providing sewer service on the available capacity intended for the Development Area.

- consider the long-term impacts of community wastewater systems and their management.

- adopt ordinances which address operation and maintenance requirements and design requirements of individual alternative systems (e.g., spray irrigation or stream discharge systems) supplemental to PADEP and BCDH regulations.

The plan goes on to indicate that “wastewater and water decisions should support and help implement the region's land use planning policies and that wastewater and water planning activities are the responsibilities and prerogatives of the individual municipalities. The basic
principles of protecting water resources by considering water supply in land use planning and by disposing of wastewater in ways that replenish groundwater are shared goals of the three municipalities and fundamental to the area’s comprehensive plan.”

Once the Plan Revision is approved by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, we request that the Borough send a final copy of the Act 537 Plan Revision to the Bucks County Planning Commission for our files.

TAK:dwb

cc: Thomas G. Kelso, Castle Valley Consultants
Terry Clemons, Esq., Clemons, Richter & Reiss PC, Municipal Solicitor
Mario Canales, P.E., Pickering, Corts & Summerson, Inc., Municipal Engineer
Genevie Kostick, Bucks County Department of Health
Elizabeth Mahoney, PA DEP
Joseph F. Pantano, Township Manager (via email)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number(s)</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Submission Level</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedminster Township</td>
<td>12070</td>
<td>1-2-90</td>
<td>1885 Fairview Road</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bensalem Township</td>
<td>11141-A</td>
<td>2-45-1-8 &amp; -1-9</td>
<td>Costa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lot Line Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Borough</td>
<td>12072</td>
<td>4-16-30, -31 &amp; -32</td>
<td>Goodwill Fire Company</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Institutional Land Development: 10,400 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Township</td>
<td>12061</td>
<td>5-7-42</td>
<td>400 Princess Avenue</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>2 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Township</td>
<td>12062</td>
<td>5-7-30</td>
<td>Sycamore Avenue Subdivision</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>3 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Township</td>
<td>12077</td>
<td>13-28-61</td>
<td>Silvi Concrete Private CNG Facility</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Industrial Land Development: Compressed Natural Gas Fueling Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Township</td>
<td>6253-FF2</td>
<td>13-15-1-9</td>
<td>Abington Reldan Metals, LLC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Industrial Land Development: 12,745 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Township</td>
<td>9702-C</td>
<td>13-47-150, -152</td>
<td>Gelest, Inc.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Industrial Land Development: 12,865 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown Township</td>
<td>10415-B</td>
<td>22-57-46</td>
<td>Chipotle Mexican Grill</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 2,150 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown Township</td>
<td>4478-I</td>
<td>22-57-8-10</td>
<td>Empire Abrasive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Industrial Land Development: 9,100 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain Township</td>
<td>11112-D</td>
<td>26-5-2</td>
<td>Colebrooke</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2 Commercial Lots 24 Semi-detached Units 35 Attached Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hope Borough</td>
<td>11925-A</td>
<td>27-10-75, -80 &amp; -81</td>
<td>18-20 W. Mechanic Street</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Lot Line Change Commercial Land Development: 1,901 Square-feet 3 Attached Units 2 Semi-detached Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown Borough</td>
<td>11917</td>
<td>28-1-7, -8, -9, -10, -10-1</td>
<td>Steepleview Phase 1</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>10 Multifamily Units Commercial Land Development: 12,039 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nockamixon Township</td>
<td>10963-B</td>
<td>30-4-102 &amp; -104</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Lot Line Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nockamixon Township</td>
<td>9077-C</td>
<td>30-15-2</td>
<td>Brubaker</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 7,030 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkasie Borough</td>
<td>12042</td>
<td>33-6-17</td>
<td>Moyer Living Trust</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland Township</td>
<td>12040</td>
<td>36-38-31-1</td>
<td>Dunkin Donuts</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 4,000 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster Township</td>
<td>11785-A</td>
<td>49-9-18 &amp; -19-3</td>
<td>The Station at Bucks County West</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>24 Multifamily Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster Township</td>
<td>12066</td>
<td>49-9-28-4 &amp; -28-15</td>
<td>Havis, Inc.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Industrial Land Development: 37,500 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster Township</td>
<td>12073</td>
<td>49-9-19</td>
<td>Jacksonville Plaza</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Driveway Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster Township</td>
<td>12074</td>
<td>49-9-19-2</td>
<td>SEPTA Train Station</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Parking Lot Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster Township</td>
<td>4641-E</td>
<td>49-9-28</td>
<td>The Station at Bucks County East</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>151 Multifamily Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington Township</td>
<td>7994-A</td>
<td>30-4-150</td>
<td>Warrington Run</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>103 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick Township</td>
<td>12071</td>
<td>51-3-89 &amp; -89-2</td>
<td>B3 Sketch Plan</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>33 Attached Units 116 Multifamily Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rockhill Township</td>
<td>11055-A</td>
<td>52-17-26</td>
<td>Penn Valley Gas</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 25,690 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rockhill Township</td>
<td>12069</td>
<td>52-17-64, -65 &amp; -68</td>
<td>Carillon Hill II</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>22 Semi-detached Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yardley Borough</td>
<td>12076</td>
<td>54-3-147 &amp; -148-1</td>
<td>Grist Mill Properties</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Lot Line Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bedminster Township Board of Supervisors
   Bedminster Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Final Plan of Subdivision for 1885 Fairview Road
        TMP #1-2-90
        Applicant: Brian J. and Mari-Jayne E. Kaczinski
        Owner: Same
        Plan Dated: February 20, 2015
        Date Received: March 16, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a 17.269-acre tract into two residential lots. Lot 1, containing an existing dwelling unit and several accessory structures, would be 1.968 net acres. Lot 2 would be 13.858 net acres, and in addition to a dwelling, is proposed to contain accessory structures and a home occupation (landscaping business). Individual on-lot sewage disposal system and water supply are present on Lot 1 and intended on Lot 2.

Location: Southeastern side of the Ridge and Fairview Road intersection.

Zoning: AP Agriculture Preservation District permits a variety of agricultural uses and various options for single-family residential uses. A farm subdivision is permitted when 80 percent of the farmland soils are preserved and the lot area is not less than 25 acres for all subdivided lots. Single-family detached dwellings are also permitted subject to the mandates of Act 319 on lots with a minimum size of one acre and a maximum size of two acres.

Present Use: Agricultural/Residential.
COMMENTS

1. **Waivers**—A letter dated February 17, 2015, submitted with the plan indicates that various waivers are requested from the subdivision and land development ordinance, including plan requirements (scale, location map, existing features within 200 feet of tract boundary), environmental impact assessment, drainage and cartway improvements, sidewalks, recreational trails (bikeways/greenways) and stormwater management provisions. In accordance with the requirements of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, township officials should determine if each waiver should be granted in whole or in part.

2. **Home occupation**—The zoning officer should be consulted to determine whether the proposal for an accessory landscaping business complies with Section 405.C of the zoning ordinance pertaining to accessory home occupations.

3. **Use section reference**—Notes 2 and 3 under Zoning Information of plan Sheet 1 indicates use category C9 as Residential Accessory Building. Our office copy of the township zoning ordinance lists No-Impact Home-Based Business as C9 and Residential Accessory Building, Structure or Use as C10. Therefore, we recommend that this use reference be checked to ensure it is current, and if necessary, the plan should be revised accordingly.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

CIG:dwb

cc:  Brian J. and Mari-Jayne E. Kaczinski  
Gilmore and Associates, Inc.  
Thomas J. Fountain, P.E., Keystone Municipal Engineering  
Richard H. Schilling, Township Manager (via email)  
Patricia Vaugh, Administrative Assistant (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bensalem Township Mayor
    Bensalem Township Council
    Bensalem Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Final Plan of Lot Line Change for Byberry Road Subdivision
TMP #2-45-1-8; 2-45-1-9
Applicant: Alvaro Costa
Owner: Costa Homes, Inc.
Plan Dated: December 2, 2014
Date Received: March 11, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Convey 4,364 square feet from TMP #2-45-1-9 (Lot 9) to TMP #2-45-1-8 (Lot 8) to form lots of 30,074 and 27,050 square feet, respectively. Public water and sewerage serve the site.

Location: At the south court of proposed Street “A,” 500 feet west of its intersection with Byberry Road.

Zoning: R-1 Residential District permits single-family detached dwellings on a minimum lot size of 12,000 square feet with a minimum lot width of 80 feet.

Present Use: Vacant

COMMENTS

- Plan information—The proposed lot areas for Lots 8 and 9 under Site Data are shown as 27,050 and 30,074 square feet, respectively. Under the Zoning Table these lots are shown as 28,172 and 28,951 square feet, respectively. The applicant should revise the plan to show the correct proposed lot areas.
This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MAR:dwb

cc: Costa Homes, Inc.
    SiteWorks Consultants, Inc.
    Loretta Alston, Bensalem Township Department of Building and Planning
    Ron Gans, P.E., O'Donnell & Naccarato, Township Engineer
    William Cmorey, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bristol Borough Council  
Bristol Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Goodwill Fire Company #3  
TMP #4-16-30, 4-16-31, and 4-16-32  
Applicant: Goodwill Fire Company #3  
Owner: Same  
Plan Dated: March 20, 2015  
Date Received: April 6, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Consolidate TMP #s 4-16-30, 4-16-31, and 4-16-32 into one lot. The resultant lot would be 0.8109 acres and contain an existing fire station and a proposed 10,400-square-foot community room. The existing community room will be demolished. Public water and sewer serve the site.

Location: On the north side of Mifflin Street, between Linden and Swain streets.

Zoning: LI—Light Industrial District permits light industrial, heavy commercial, and office uses with a minimum lot area of 15,000 square feet. Use 5B Emergency Services is permitted as a conditional use.

The existing building is nonconforming with respect to the front yard setbacks, side yard setbacks, and maximum impervious surface ratio.

Present Use: Fire station with community room
COMMENTS

1. **Impervious surface**—As noted on the plan, the applicant proposes an increase in the impervious surface which would in turn increase an existing nonconformity. Borough officials should determine if a variance is need from Section 27-314.5 of the zoning ordinance. This issue should be resolved prior to taking action on the plan.

2. **Parking requirements**—Table 7.1 of the zoning ordinance requires that Use 5B Emergency Services provide one off-street parking space for each member on duty on the largest shift and one off-street parking space for each 100 square feet of gross floor area where a community room is provided. This provision requires that 104 parking spaces be provided for the 10,400 square foot community room. The plan indicates that 23 parking spaces are to be provided off-street. Borough officials should determine if the proposed number of parking spaces is adequate.

3. **Building coverage**—In accordance with Section 22-404.B.3.c and 22-404.B.3.e of the subdivision and land development ordinance, the building coverage data should be shown on the plan.

4. **Setback lines**—In accordance with Sections 22-404.B.3.d and 22-404.B.3.j of the subdivision and land development ordinance, the proposed building setback lines should be shown on the plan.

5. **Landscape plan**—In accordance with Section 22-404.B.3.p, the plan should list all species proposed, planted sizes, and root condition.

6. **Accessible parking area**—The plan proposes a 14-foot wide access way for the accessible parking area. This pavement width meets the requirement of Section 22-510.D.1 of the subdivision and land development ordinance for a 12-foot, one-way driveway but does not meet the requirement of Section 22-5812.B for an 18-foot, one-way drive aisle. Borough officials should determine which provision of the subdivision and land development ordinance is applicable, and the plan should be revised if necessary.

7. **Parking area setbacks**—Section 22-512.J of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that all parking areas shall be set back from the future right-of-way line at least 15 feet. The plan proposes several parking spaces within the required setback along Linden and Swain streets.

8. **Stormwater management**—The applicant proposes no additional stormwater management facilities for the site because of the diminimus increase in impervious surface coverage. Borough officials should determine if the requirements of Section 22-520 of the subdivision and land development ordinance are satisfied.

9. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the
preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MMW:dwb

cc: Goodwill Fire Company #3
    William R. Swanick, P.E., Herbert, Rowland & Grubic, Inc.
    Kurt M. Schroeder, P.E., Borough Engineer
    James Dillon, Borough Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bristol Township Council
    Bristol Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Revised Final Plan of Subdivision for Princess Avenue
        TMP #5-7-42
        Applicant: Sperduto Investments, LLC
        Owner: Same
        Plan Dated: October 6, 2014
        Last Revised: December 10, 2014
        Date Received: April 1, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a 12,500-square-foot parcel into two single-family detached lots consisting of 6,250 square feet each. A new single-family detached dwelling is proposed to be constructed on each lot. The Existing Features Plan (Sheet 2 of 4) shows an existing dwelling located in the northeastern portion of the site which is intended to be removed. Public water and sewer facilities serve the site.

Location: Along the southern side of Princess Avenue, approximately 425 feet west of the intersection of Princess Avenue and Fourth Street. A paper street, identified as Overlook Avenue, borders the site to the west.

Zoning: The R-3 Residence District permits single-family detached dwellings on lots having a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet with a minimum lot width of 50 feet. The maximum building area and impervious surface ratios are 30 and 40 percent, respectively.

According to information received from the township, the Zoning Hearing Board of Bristol Township granted a variance to allow construction of a single-family detached dwelling with a setback of 6 feet from a paper street (Overlook Avenue). The lot is a corner lot and the proposed construction conforms with the 25-foot setback requirement with respect to the other front yard along Princess Avenue.
Present Use: Residential.

**COMMENTS**

1. **Requested waivers**—According to information listed on Plan Sheet 1 of 4, the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) Sections:

   - **511** requires sidewalks to be provided on one side of all abutting streets (boundary streets), except when in the opinion of Council with the advice of the Township Engineer and Planning Commission they are unnecessary for the public safety and convenience.
   - **513** requires curbs to be provided on one side of all abutting streets (boundary streets), and along both sides of all proposed and existing streets.
   - **519.a.1.(a)** requires street trees to be planted along both sides of all streets where suitable existing trees or natural wooded areas do not exist.
   - **521.a.1** requires a minimum of 1,500 square feet of suitable recreation land to be provided per dwelling unit within all residential subdivisions or land developments, unless the developer agrees to a fee in lieu thereof.
   - **803.c.3** requires that locations, names and widths of streets, railroads and utilities or manmade features on or within 200 feet of the tract be shown on the plan.
   - **805.a.1** requires minor subdivision plans to be drawn at a scale of 1 inch equals 50 feet or 1 inch equals 100 feet.

In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved, and the minimum modification necessary. Township officials should determine if sufficient information has been provided regarding the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the requirement for the waiver is based.

Regarding the relief requested from the street tree requirement, we recommend that the township officials not waive Section 519.a.1(a) of the subdivision and land development ordinance regarding street tree planting. Street trees provide shade, help to buffer roadway noises, and help soften the appearance of roadway asphalt. Based on the requirement in Section 519.a.1(c) of the SALDO, between 2 and 4 street trees (depending on the tree sizes) would be required along the entire site frontage of Princess Avenue (both proposed lots).

Finally, we recommend that the reference to Section 803.c.3 be changed to Section 805.c.3 to reflect the same requirement for minor subdivision plan submissions (Section 803.c.3 pertains to preliminary plan submissions for major subdivisions and/or land developments.)

2. **Site capacity calculations**—Section 2101 of the zoning ordinance requires the submission of site capacity calculations with all applications for subdivision and land development. The plan should be revised to provide the required calculations.

3. **Existing large trees**—Aerial photographs indicate the presence of large trees on the site. Section 501 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that where trees are
located within a subdivision or land development, every possible means to the fullest extent
shall be provided to preserve these features. We recommend that wherever possible, existing
healthy trees be retained and included in the design of the site. At the time of future
development, tree protection measures, as outlined in Section 520 of the subdivision and land
development ordinance, should be employed for trees intended to remain to help ensure their
survival during and after construction.

4. **Cartway width of Princess Avenue**—As shown on Plan Sheet 2 of 4, the existing cartway
width of Princess Avenue measures between 18 and 20 feet along the subject property. Section
503.b of the SALDO requires a minimum cartway width of 26 feet for secondary residential
roadways. Section 503.b of the SALDO requires that where a subdivision abuts or contains
an existing street of inadequate cartway width, the developer shall be required to widen and/or
reconstruct the roadway to meet current Township standards. This issue should be addressed
before action is taken on the plan.

5. **Stormwater management**—The plan shows an infiltration bed in the rear yard of proposed
Lot 1. However, there is nothing shown to indicate how stormwater will be addressed for
proposed Lot 2. The plan should indicate how additional runoff from future development on
proposed Lot 2 will be managed.

Furthermore, we recommend that the applicant prepare and submit to the township a detailed
schedule of all anticipated long- and short-term operational and maintenance procedures for
the proposed infiltration beds. The maintenance manual should include any type of potential
maintenance that may be necessary to continue sound performance of the facility. Copies of
the manual should also be provided to those responsible for stormwater facility maintenance,
in this case, the future homeowners.

While the proposal may be exempt from containing a stormwater management plan, the plan
should indicate how additional runoff from future increases in impervious surface would be
managed in accordance with Section 518 of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

6. **Required information**—The plan should be revised to provide the following required
information for minor subdivisions in accordance with Section 805 of the subdivision and land
development ordinance (we note that the plan contains symbols in the legend for some of the
required information noted below, but does not provide the required information on
the plan):

805.b.1  name of the subdivision
805.c.5  the location, size and ownership of all underground utilities and any rights-of-
way or easements on the property
805.c.9  the species and size of large trees on the site
805.d.9  certification of water and sewer from the serving authority
805.d.10  tree protection zone

7. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module
Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to
determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this
proposed subdivision.
This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC boards and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

LMW:dwb

cc: Sperduto Investments, LLC
    Larry Young, P.E.
    John Genovesi, P.E., Tri-State Engineers & Land Surveyors, Inc.
    Kurt Schroeder, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer
    Randy Flager, Esq., Flager & Associates, Township Solicitor
    William McCauley, Township Manager (via email)
    Colleen Costello, Township Department of Licenses and Inspections (via email)
    Thomas Scott, Township Zoning Officer (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bristol Township Council
    Bristol Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Revised Preliminary Plan of Subdivision—Sycamore Avenue Subdivision
        TMP #5-7-30
        Applicant: David Della-Croce, LLC
        Owner: Same
        Plan Dated: October 7, 2014
        Last Revised: December 10, 2014
        Date Received: March 31, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide an 18,750-square-foot parcel into three single-family detached lots consisting of 6,250 square feet each. A new single-family detached dwelling is proposed to be constructed on each of the proposed lots. The plan indicates that a dwelling and a garage currently exist on the site and are intended to be removed. Public water and sewer facilities serve the site.

Location: Along the northern side of Sycamore Avenue, approximately 375 feet west of the intersection of Sycamore Avenue and Fourth Street. A paper street, identified as Overlook Avenue, borders the site to the west.

Zoning: The R-3 Residence District permits single-family detached dwellings on lots having a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet with a minimum lot width of 50 feet. The maximum building area and impervious surface ratios are 30 and 40 percent, respectively.

According to information received from the township, the Zoning Hearing Board of Bristol Township granted a variance to allow construction of a single-family detached dwelling with a setback of 6 feet from a paper street (Overlook Avenue). The lot is a corner lot and the proposed construction conforms with the 25-foot setback requirement with respect to the other front yard along Sycamore Avenue.
Present Use: Residential.

COMMENTS

1. **Requested waivers**—According to information listed on Plan Sheet 1 of 4, the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) Sections:

   - 511 requires sidewalks to be provided on one side of all abutting streets (boundary streets), except when in the opinion of Council with the advice of the Township Engineer and Planning Commission they are unnecessary for the public safety and convenience.
   - 513 requires curbs to be provided on one side of all abutting streets (boundary streets), and along both sides of all proposed and existing streets
   - 519.a.1.(a) requires street trees to be planted along both sides of all streets where suitable existing trees or natural wooded areas do not exist
   - 521.a.1 requires a minimum of 1,500 square feet of suitable recreation land to be provided per dwelling unit within all residential subdivisions or land developments, unless the developer agrees to a fee in lieu thereof
   - 803.c.3 requires that locations, names and widths of streets, railroads and utilities or manmade features on or within 200 feet of the tract be shown on the plan.
   - 805.a.1 requires minor subdivision plans to be drawn at a scale of 1 inch equals 50 feet or 1 inch equals 100 feet

   In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved, and the minimum modification necessary. Township officials should determine if sufficient information has been provided regarding the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the requirement for the waiver is based.

   Regarding the relief requested from the street tree requirement, we recommend that the township officials not waive Section 519.a.1(a) of the subdivision and land development ordinance regarding street tree planting. Street trees provide shade, help to buffer roadway noises, and help soften the appearance of roadway asphalt. Based on the requirement in Section 519.a.1(c) of the SALDO, between 3 and 6 street trees (depending on the tree sizes) would be required along the entire site frontage of Sycamore Avenue (all three proposed lots).

   Finally, we recommend that the reference to Section 805.a.1 be changed to Section 803.a.1 to reflect the same requirement for major subdivision plan submissions (Section 805.a.1 pertains to drafting standards for minor subdivision plan submissions.)

2. **Site capacity calculations**—Section 2101 of the zoning ordinance requires the submission of site capacity calculations with all applications for subdivision and land development. The plan should be revised to provide the required calculations.
3. **Proposed extension of Sycamore Avenue**

   a. **Cartway width**—Plan Sheet 3 of 4 shows a proposed extension of the existing macadam roadway (Sycamore Avenue). This roadway extension, as proposed, will be approximately 16 feet wide. Section 503.a of the SALDO requires a minimum cartway width of 26 feet for secondary residential roadways. Section 503.b of the SALDO requires that where a subdivision abuts or contains an existing street of inadequate cartway width, the developer shall be required to widen and/or reconstruct the roadway to meet current Township standards. This issue should be addressed before action is taken on the plan.

   b. **Turnaround area for stub street**—The proposed extension of Sycamore Avenue is 16 feet and does not include a turnaround area. Section 502.k of the SALDO requires that stub streets greater in length than one lot depth shall be provided with a temporary turnaround to the standards required for culs-de-sacs or shall be paved to the full width of the right-of-way for the last 75 feet of their length. Section 507.c of the SALDO requires that culs-de-sacs have a turnaround with a right-of-way having a minimum outside radius of not less than 60 feet and shall be paved to a radius of not less than 40 feet. This issue should be addressed before action is taken on the plan.

4. **Existing large trees**—Aerial photographs indicates that large trees may exist on the site. Section 501 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that where trees are located within a subdivision or land development, every possible means to the fullest extent shall be provided to preserve these features. We recommend that wherever possible, existing healthy trees be retained and included in the design of the site. At the time of future development, tree protection measures, as outlined in Section 520 of the subdivision and land development ordinance, should be employed for trees intended to remain to help ensure their survival during and after construction.

5. **Stormwater management**—The plan shows a proposed stone infiltration pit in the rear yard of each proposed lot. We recommend that the applicant prepare and submit to the township a detailed schedule of all anticipated long- and short-term operational and maintenance procedures for the proposed infiltration pits. The maintenance manual should include any type of potential maintenance that may be necessary to continue sound performance of the facilities. Copies of the manual should also be provided to those responsible for stormwater facility maintenance, in this case, the future homeowners.

6. **Required information**—The plan should be revised to provide the following required information in accordance with Section 803 of the subdivision and land development ordinance:

   - **803.a.7** the plan shall be labeled “Preliminary Plan—Not to be Recorded.”
   - **803.b.1** name of the subdivision
   - **803.c.5** the location, size and ownership of all underground utilities and any rights-of-way or easements on the property
   - **803.c.9** location of species and size of large trees standing alone, the location and area of all floodplains, floodplain soils, woodlands, wetlands, slopes over 15 percent
   - **803.d.17** tree protection zone
a stormwater plan as may be required through Section 518 of the SALDO.

7. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed subdivision.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC boards and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

LMW:dw

cc: David Della-Croce, LLC  
Larry Young, P.E.  
John V. Genovesi, P.E., Tri-State Engineers & Land Surveyors, Inc.  
Kurt Schroeder, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer  
Randy Flager, Esq., Flager & Associates, Township Solicitor  
William McCauley, Township Manager (via email)  
Colleen Costello, Township Department of Licenses and Inspections (via email)  
Thomas Scott, Township Zoning Officer (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Falls Township Board of Supervisors
   Falls Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development—Silvi Concrete Private CNG Facility
   TMP #13-28-61
   Applicant: Silvi Concrete Product
   Owner: Riverside Inc. Complex Inc.
   Plan Dated: April 9, 2015
   Date Received: April 14, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a compressed natural gas (CNG) fueling facility at the site of an existing concrete plant on a 7.48-acre parcel. The facility will consist of a CNG equipment compound with 16 duel hose CNG fueling posts. The site is served by public water and sewer.

Location: South side of Newbold Road, between Geoffrey Road and My Lane, in the Penn Warner Industrial Park.

Zoning: PIP—Planned Industrial Park District permits mining, processing and farming uses on a tract of at least 10 acres. The site is a pre-existing nonconforming lot. The maximum impervious surface ratio for parcels of 3 to 8 acres in size is 60 percent. According to the plan, the Falls Township Zoning Hearing Board issued a use variance on February 11, 2014, to permit the CNG fueling facility use.

Present Use: Industrial.

COMMENTS

1. **Waiver**—The plan indicates a waiver is being requested from Section 191-6(E) of the subdivision and land development ordinance that allows the zoning officer to deny application for exemption from the land development process. Under the requirements of Section
512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved and the minimum modification necessary. The final plan should list all granted waivers.

2. **Plan information**—The plan omits various information required of a preliminary plan under Section 191-78 of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO). Key information that has been omitted includes the existing features (e.g., driveway exits/entrances, buildings/canopies), compliance with development standards (the plan only indicates existing compliance, not proposed compliance), a plan for surface drainage and stormwater management, and a plan for erosion and water quality during construction. The plan should be revised to provide all required information.

3. **Front yard**—The plan information indicates that the required front yard is 50 feet and that the existing front yard is 159 feet. The proposed transformer pad, two “fast fill spaces”, a duel hose CNG fueling post, and a portion of the CNG equipment compound are shown located within the required front yard. Township officials should determine if the plan should be revised to show these structures outside the required front yard.

Also, a portion of what appears to be existing diagonal parking is located within approximately 15 feet of the right-of-way. Section 209-28G(2) of the zoning ordinance requires that at least the first 30 feet adjacent to any street line (edge of the ultimate right-of-way) and 10 feet adjacent to any lot line shall not be used for parking and shall be planted and maintained in lawn area, ground cover or landscaped with evergreen shrubbery. The plan should be revised accordingly.

4. **Lot coverage**—The plan information indicates that the existing lot coverage is 46 percent. Based on the plan and observation of aerial photographs, the site appears to have a significant amount of disturbance. The township engineer should closely examine the conditions to determine how much of the site would be considered impervious and compare that to the lot coverage listed on the plan.

5. **Site capacity calculations**—The plan should include site capacity calculations as required under SALDO Section 191-52.1C, to enable determination of compliance with resource protection provisions of Section 191-52.1B.

6. **Parking**

   a. **Number of spaces**—It is not clear what parking standard or standards are being applied, or where the parking spaces will be located. The plan shows 32 “time fill spaces” and two “fast fill spaces” that appear to be areas where vehicles will park to receive CNG from the fueling posts. There’s no indication where employees will park their personal vehicles. Township officials should ensure that appropriate standards are applied and that adequate parking is provided.

   b. **Landscaping**—The plan does not depict landscaping of any parking area. Section 209-42.B(1) of the zoning ordinance requires clustered planting at least 4 feet high between off-street parking and any lot line or street line except where a building...
intervenes or where the distance between the parking area and the lot or street line is more than 150 feet.

Section 209-42.B(3) of the zoning ordinance requires each off-street parking area to have landscaping in ground cover, trees, or shrubs at least the equivalent of 1 parking space for every 30 spaces. SALDO Section 191-37.G also details planting requirements for off-street parking areas that include curbed planting islands at each end of a parking row, and planting of at least one approved shade tree of 1 ½-inch caliper for every 6 parking spaces in single rows.

c. **Disabled-accessible parking**—Parking for the disabled shall be provided in accordance with the standards of the Americans with Disabilities Act, according to Section 191-37.C of the SALDO.

7. **Loading**—Township officials should determine if off-street loading facilities should be provided for the existing building to remain on the site in accordance with the standards of Section 209-42.I of the zoning ordinance.

8. **Lighting**—The plan should depict lighting arrangements in compliance with Section 209-40 of the zoning ordinance.

9. **Trash collection**—The plan should depict screened trash collection stations meeting the requirements of Section 191-51.H of the SALDO, if indoor collection is not provided.

10. **Street trees**—Under Section 191-48-A of the SALDO, street trees are required to be planted along the sides of all streets where suitable street trees do not exist.

11. **Stormwater management**—Township officials should ensure that provisions for stormwater management conform to best management practices and other provisions of the stormwater management ordinance.

12. **Access and parking easement**—The plan shows an existing concrete driveway and what appears to be a diagonal parking area extending into adjacent TMP #13-28-60. The driveway provided egress and ingress to the subject parcels. Reciprocal access easements should be provided to allow access to the driveway and parking area.

13. **Detail and mechanical sheets**—The plan contains several references to detail sheets and mechanical sheets that were not included in the submission to the Bucks County Planning Commission. Township officials should be provided with this information to allow for a complete assessment of the proposal.

14. **Sewage facilities**—According to the plan, an exemption to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) sewage facilities planning module was submitted to the PaDEP on October 16, 2014. The applicant should provide proof that an exemption has been granted by PaDEP.
This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

TAK: dwb

cc: Silvi Concrete Products
    Zachary David Freshner, CESO Inc.
    Jim Sullivan, P.E., T&M Associates, Township Engineer
    Tom Beach, P.E., Remington, Vernick & Beach, Township Traffic Engineer
    Peter Gray, Township Manager (via e-mail)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Falls Township Board of Supervisors
    Falls Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Abington Reldan Metals, LLC

TMP: #13-51-1-9
Applicant: Abington Reldan Realty
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: March 30, 2015
Date Received: April 17, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construction of three additions (Phases 2, 3, and 4) to an existing industrial building (titled Phase 1). Phase 2 would consist of 12,745 square feet; Phase 3 would consist of approximately 22,700 square feet; and Phase 4 would consist of 30,000 square feet. Sewer and water service are be provided by U.S. Steel.

Location: On the northwest side of Old Bordentown Road, about 350 feet northwest of its intersection with Ben Fairless Drive, in U.S. Steel’s Keystone Industrial Port Complex.

Zoning: The MPM Materials Processing and Manufacturing District permits a variety of light and heavy industrial uses on a minimum tract of 50 acres with a lot of at least 5 acres for each principal building. A maximum impervious surface ratio of 75 percent is permitted in this district.

Present Use: Industrial

COMMENTS

1. Waivers—The plan lists waivers granted from 11 sections of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO). It additionally lists two requested waivers from a section of the SALDO and two sections of the stormwater management ordinance. The final plan should list all granted waivers.
2. **Zoning information**—The plan indicates that required maximum building coverage and maximum impervious surface is 60 and 75 percent, respectively. According to Table 5 referred to in Section 209-30.D of the zoning ordinance, there is no required maximum building coverage for the MPM Materials Processing and Manufacturing District and the maximum impervious is 80 percent for parcels greater than 8 acres in the same district. The plan should be revised accordingly.

3. **Replacement trees**—While a waiver has been granted to the protection ratio for other wooded areas, township officials should determine if the plan should be revised to provide tree replacement in accordance with the mitigation requirement of SALDO Section 191-52.1B.(4)(d).

4. **Pedestrian walkways**—The plan shows concrete walkways along the parking spaces closest to the existing building and along a portion of the proposed parking spaces closest to the side of the proposed Phase 4 building. We recommend that the same type of walkway be provided along the proposed parking spaces closest to the rear of the proposed Phase 3 and 4 buildings.

5. **Landscaping**—It is unclear from the information provided on the landscaping and lighting plan whether the proposal complies with all landscaping provisions of the zoning ordinance and the SALDO. Section 209.42.B(1) of the zoning ordinance requires clustered plantings at least 4 feet high between parking areas and lot or street lines except where a building intervenes or where the distance from the parking area to the lot or street lines is more than 150 feet. This type of cluster planting should be provided along the parking area proposed in the Phase 4 area adjacent to the northwest property boundary. SALDO Section 191-37.G(1) requires curbed raised planting beds in parking areas.

The landscaping plan sheet should be revised to depict any additional landscaping that would be provided and Township officials should ensure that landscaping (including shade trees) is provided according to ordinance standards, particularly for the existing parking areas.

6. **Parking**

   a. **Parking calculations**—The plan indicates that there will be a total of 160 employees (35 office employees and 125 manufacturing employees) working on split shifts, and that there will be a total of 139 parking spaces. The plan should be revised to clarify what portion of the work force will be on the different shifts to ensure that proposed number of parking spaces will be sufficient.

   b. **Accessible parking spaces**—The plan should be revised to provide a total of 4 accessible parking spaces and 1 van accessible parking space out of the 139 total spaces proposed for all phases of the proposed development in accordance with SALDO Section 191-37.C. There is only 1 new accessible parking space shown on the plan. There appear to be only 2 van accessible spaces provided in the existing parking lot along the side of the existing building.

   c. **Striping**—The plan should be revised to show the parking space striping in the proposed parking areas so that Township officials can assess compliance with parking dimensions required by SALDO Section 191-37.C.
7. **Stormwater management**—Township officials should determine if the current stormwater management facility is sufficiently sized to receive the stormwater that will be generated by Phases 1 through 4.

8. **Planning module**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

TAK:dwb

cc: Abington Reldan Realty  
Gilmore & Associates, Inc.  
Jim Sullivan, P.E., Township Engineer  
Peter Gray, Township Manager (via e-mail)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Falls Township Board of Supervisors
Falls Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Final Plan of Land Development for Gelest, Inc. Phase II
TMPs #13-47-150; -152
Applicant: Gelest Realty, Inc.
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: April 30, 2013
Last Revised: April 13, 2015
Date Received: April 16, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following review in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct Phase II of a three phase development comprising of a total of 50,515 square feet of industrial space on a 13.204-acre parcel. As proposed, Phase II would consist of an 8,840-square-foot hazardous drum storage shed and an approximately 3,025-square-foot tank farm. Phase I is under construction and consists of a 21,375-square-foot laboratory building and Phase III will consist of a future 16,800-square-foot manufacturing building and a 3,500-square-foot “band 4 building”. Water and sewer service are provided by U.S. Steel.

Location: Along the north side of Steel Road East at the intersection of Steel Road South, in the U.S. Steel Keystone Industrial Port complex.

Zoning: HI Heavy Industrial District permits a variety of uses including office, warehousing, manufacturing and other industrial uses on lots of at least 0.5 acre having a minimum lot width of 100 feet.

Present Use: Industrial
COMMENTS

Before final plan approval, the township should be assured that the applicant has complied with the conditions of preliminary plan approval as well as the requirements of other applicable reviewing agencies.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

TAK:dw

cc: Gelest Realty, Inc.
William R. Rearden, P.E., Bohler Engineering
John Koopman, Esq., Begley, Carlin & Mandio, L.P.
Jim Sullivan, P.E., Township Engineer
Peter Gray, Township Manager (via e-mail)
April 24, 2015
BCPC #10415-B

MEMORANDUM

TO: Middletown Township Board of Supervisors
Middletown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Chipotle Mexican Grill, Inc. (Store #2325)
TMP: #22-57-46
Applicant: Chipotle Mexican Grill
Owner: Simon Property Group
Plan Dated: March 27, 2015
Date Received: March 31, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Section 502 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the professional staff.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Demolish a 3,677-square-foot vacant building within a shopping center and in its place construct a 2,150-square-foot restaurant with area for outdoor eating. The site is served by public sewerage and water supply.

Location: On the north side of Lincoln Highway (Business Route 1), just east of the main accessway into the Lincoln Plaza Shopping Center.

Zoning: The site is located in the GB General Business District. A minimum site area of 50 acres is required, with a minimum lot size of 5 acres for each principal use, with the exception that up to nine lots on the site may have a lot area of 1 acre. Restaurants are a permitted use in the district. A maximum impervious surface ratio of 65 percent is permitted.

Present Use: Commercial; shopping center
COMMENTS

1. **Plan information**—The zoning information table on plan Sheet SP-1.0 includes an asterisk footnote regarding nonconforming use. However, no asterisk is provided within this table regarding nonconformities. The existing impervious surface ratio is indicated at 87 percent and therefore is nonconforming since the GB district permits a maximum of 65 percent. According to the calculations provided on the plan, the impervious surface ratio will be decreased by 0.2 percent or 86.8 percent. Township officials should determine whether this is acceptable, or if additional information/calculations are needed to verify the overall site’s impervious surface.

In addition, the parking space calculation table (SP-1.0) indicates that the plan provides the required number of parking spaces for the proposed building square footage. Township officials should determine whether additional parking is needed for the outdoor eating area.

2. **Subdivision and land development ordinance**—No requests for waivers from subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) provisions are indicated on the plan nor received with the submission pursuant to Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code. Therefore, compliance with all SALDO regulations should be provided including the following:

   a. **Parking setback from building**—Section 421.5D of the SALDO requires that the edge of any parking area be no closer than 15 feet to the outside wall of any building. The 15-foot area is to be used for sidewalks to entryways and foundation plantings. Although the proposed improvements incorporate plants and sidewalks along the building, they do not extend the full 15 feet in width all the way around the building. We note that continuing a walkway along the parking stalls on the outer portion of the planting bed wall could provide a safer and more convenient pedestrian accessway to the building’s entries. Reducing the width of the planting bed by just a few feet could provide a narrow walkway (e.g. 3- to 4-foot wide) along the outer wall and the parking spaces.

   b. **Width of moving aisle**—The short vehicular moving aisle around the building would be reduced to 18.9 feet in width at its narrowest. Section 421.5.E of the SALDO requires a minimum aisle width of 24 feet for two-way traffic. In addition, no plan for delivery truck unloading is indicated on the plan as required by SALDO Sections 426.3 and 426.10. Given the proposed improvements to the property, we suggest that truck delivery details be provided on the plan and also recommend that the township fire marshal review the building and circulation plan to ensure adequate emergency access/egress is provided.

   c. **Lighting plan**—Neither the utility plan nor the plan detail sheets indicate a lighting plan although the legend does refer to existing and proposed light pole. Section 303.D(3)(a) of the SALDO requires that the location of lights be shown. The plan does not include information regarding the intensity. We suggest that if energy efficient lighting (e.g. Light Emitting Diode (LED)) is not already used, that it be considered to provide lower energy consumption and reduced maintenance costs.
3. **Landscaping**—Plan Sheet LP-2.0 proposes 54 *Spiraea japonica* (Japanese spirea) shrubs within the various planting beds. The species is considered an invasive plant in the southwestern portion of Pennsylvania according to the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. We recommend that the landscaping plan be revised to include hardy native plants that provide for seasonal interest based on placement conditions.

   In addition, Section 1503.J of the zoning ordinance requires a special 12-foot-wide planting strip along Lincoln Highway with the rear most five feet of the planting strip landscaped in a manner satisfactory to the township planning commission. We suggest that a review of the existing planting strip be undertaken to determine if supplemental plantings would be beneficial on the grass lawn between the existing street trees.

4. **Planning module**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposal.

   This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for its May 6, 2015 public meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the Bucks County Planning Commission board and staff.

   In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

   CIG:dwb

   cc: Chipotle Mexican Grill  
   Wallace & Pancher, Inc.  
   Larry Young, P.E., TriState Engineers, Township Engineer  
   Stephanie Teoli Kuhls, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Middletown Township Board of Supervisors
    Middletown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Empire Abrasive Expansion

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a 9,100-square-foot addition on the rear portion of an existing one-story manufacturing building (86,814 square feet). Modifications to the stormwater management basins, 23 additional parking spaces (128 total) and a second driveway access onto West Cabot Boulevard are also proposed on the 7-acre parcel. Public sewerage and water facilities serve the existing use.

Location: South side of West Cabot Boulevard, approximately 500 feet from the cul-de-sac bulb.

Zoning: M-1 Light Manufacturing District permits a variety of manufacturing and industrial uses on a minimum lot area of 80,000 square feet and a maximum impervious surface of 60 percent.

Present Use: Industrial; manufacturing facility.

COMMENTS

1. Plan information—Plan Sheet C-1 indicates that variances were granted from zoning ordinance Sections 1904.A(1)(E) regarding building height and 1904.A(C) regarding paving for parking in the side yard. We recommend that the zoning hearing board case number, date of approval, and any conditions attached to the variance approval be indicated on the plan.
In addition, a north point should be provided on the plan for site orientation as required by subdivision and land development ordinance Section 303.4(7). Also, note 3 on plan Sheets C-1 and C-2 indicates the “IP” zoning for Lower Providence Township rather than “M-1” for Middletown Township. This reference should be corrected.

2. **Waiver**—A waiver is requested from subdivision and land development ordinance Section 420(E)(4) pertaining to the 15-foot setback required between the building and parking area. The applicant is required to state the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based and the minimum modifications necessary in accordance with the requirements of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Code.

   In addition, we note that a small planted island or rain garden by the southeast corner of the proposed building expansion (where the striped paving is proposed between the parking rows) should be considered to add a bit of green space to an otherwise large expanse of blacktop and also to better define the accessway. A rain garden in this area could help capture and filter a portion of the roof or parking lot runoff.

3. **Street trees**—Section 417 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that street trees shall be planted along all streets where suitable street trees do not exist and where existing conditions warrant the planting of street trees. Township officials should determine whether additional street trees should be provided, given the proposal for a second driveway and parking area on what is currently lawn space.

4. **Stormwater management**—The stormwater management basins are proposed to be modified to accommodate the additional runoff. Aside from grass seed, the plan does not include a basin planting plan. Best management practices for vegetation and/or other approaches should be considered for incorporation into the plan pursuant to the township Stormwater Management and Earth Disturbance Ordinance in Chapter 430.

5. **Planning module**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module ApplicationMailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

CIG:dwb

cc: Ed Wade, Empire Abrasive Equipment Company
    REL Design, Inc.
    Larry Young, P.E., TriState Engineers, Township Engineer
    Patrick Duffy, Township Zoning Officer (via email)
    Stephanie Teoli Kuhls, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: New Britain Township Board of Supervisors
   New Britain Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision and Land Development for Colebrook
         TMP #26-5-2
         Applicant: Colebrook Acquisitions
         Owner: Quad/Graphics Marketing
         Plan Dated: February 25, 2015
         Date Received: March 3, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a 20.949-gross-acre parcel (Lot 2) from a tract of 100.182 acres and construct 59 single-family attached dwelling units (35 townhouses and 24 twin dwellings) in a planned residential development (PRD) on Lot 2. A total of 9.89 acres would be preserved as open space. An existing industrial building sits on the remainder of the tract (Lot 1; 79.232 gross acres). Public water and sewer would serve the PRD.

Location: West side of Schoolhouse Road, at Boulder Drive.

Zoning: RR Rural Residential District permits the B5 Use, single-family attached housing, within a PRD on a site of at least 20 acres, with a maximum density of five dwelling units per acre. A minimum of two dwelling unit types is required for proposals of 50 to 199 total dwelling units.

Present Use: Industrial
COMMENTS

1. **Waivers**—The plan lists requested waiver of four provisions of the municipal subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO), as follows:

   - Section 22-502.A, regarding a change in the plan’s scale;
   - Section 22-5-2.D, regarding the requirement to show existing features within 100 feet of the property boundary;
   - Section 22-706.1.B, requiring the installation of curbing; and
   - Partial waiver of Section 22-706.2.B, requiring installation of sidewalks along the property frontage of every street adjoining a proposed subdivision.

   Under the requirements of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved and the minimum modification necessary. The final plan should list all granted waivers.

2. **Conservation easement**—The site plan on Sheet 3 of the plan depicts the “approximate” location of a conservation easement. The easement should incorporate all of the delineated riparian buffer required under Section 27-2400.i of the zoning ordinance.

3. **Overflow parking**—Information on Sheet 3 indicates that the required two parking spaces per dwelling unit are provided in the driveways. The plan should indicate how overflow parking will be accommodated for visitors and delivery or repair vehicles.

4. **Park and recreation land**—The plan should indicate compliance with SALDO Section 22-715, which requires all residential subdivision and land development plans to provide suitable recreation land and/or a fee-in-lieu.

5. **Proposed trees**

   a. *Fraxinus americana*—On Sheet 10, the nine proposed *Fraxinus americana* ‘Greenspire’ (white ash) trees should be replaced with another shade tree from the township’s required plant material list in the SALDO (Appendix D). All *Fraxinus* species are susceptible to the emerald ash borer (EAB), which was found in Bucks County several years ago. The EAB is very destructive and once ash trees are infested, they will die without ongoing insecticide treatment.

   Additionally, township officials should remove *Fraxinus americana* from required plant material list, and consider developing a strategy for ash trees located in municipal parks and other public property. A great deal of information about the insect and its control is available on the EAB national website [http://www.emeraldashborer.info/index.cfm](http://www.emeraldashborer.info/index.cfm) and the Penn State University site [http://ento.psu.edu/extension/trees-shrubs/emerald-ash-borer](http://ento.psu.edu/extension/trees-shrubs/emerald-ash-borer).
b. **Zelkova serrata** ‘Green Vase’—We recommend replacing *Zelkova serrata* ‘Green Vase’ with another *Zelkova* cultivar, such as ‘Village Green’ or ‘Halka’, which are superior for form and long term branch strength. ‘Green Vase’ has the weakest branch angle/attachments and is the most susceptible to wind damage. These problems will develop as the trees mature, leaving homeowners, through the homeowners association, with the responsibility and cost of tree removal and replacement.

7. **Editorial**—The site design requirements table on Sheet 3 states that the proposed zoning on the parcel is RR Rural Residential. The township has already rezoned the parcel to the RR District, and plan data should be revised accordingly, for consistency.

The site design table also states the B5 Use is permitted by special exception. Only ancillary uses permitted within a PRD, (i.e., emergency service center and community center), require a special exception, according to Section 27-904.b of the zoning ordinance. Attached housing is a permitted use in the RR District.

Section 27-305.B.5.b(1) of the zoning ordinance states that B5 single-family attached homes “are only permitted in a Planned Residential Development (PRD) and in the Village Residential District (VR),” although the B5 Use is permitted in the RR District according to the zoning districts table in Attachment 2 of the ordinance. We recommend that the ordinance be revised to clearly reflect the township’s intent.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

GF:dwb

cc: Quad/Graphics Marketing
    Ronald E. Klos, Jr., P.E., Bohler Engineering
    Craig Kennard, P.E., Gilmore & Associates
    Eileen Bradley, Township Manager (via e-mail)
    Montgomery Township (adjoining municipality)
MEMORANDUM

TO: New Hope Borough Council
New Hope Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Revised Preliminary Plan of Subdivision and Land Development for 18-20 W. Mechanic Street
TMP #27-10-75, -80 & -81
Applicant: Towpath Development, LLC c/o Benner & Wild
Owner: Paul Licitra
Plan Dated: May 30, 2014
Date Last Revised: February 20, 2015
Date Received: March 18, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Prior to redeveloping the site, a land conveyance will occur which will result in three parcels becoming two parcels. The applicant proposes to subdivide TMP #27-10-75 into two parcels and convey 22,532 square feet to TMP #27-10-81 and 5,441 square feet to TMP #27-10-80. The proposed lot sizes will be 9,511 square feet for TMP #27-10-80, 36,687 square feet for TMP #27-10-81, and TMP #27-10-75 will be eliminated. TMP #27-10-81 currently contains 1 restaurant use, 1 retail use and 2 apartments. Those uses will remain with an additional square footage of 1,901 proposed for the commercial use. In addition, 3 townhouse units and 2 two-family dwellings will be developed on TMP #27-10-81. No further development is proposed for TMP #27-10-80. The site is served by public water and sewer.

Location: The northeastern side of the intersection of West Mechanic Street and the Delaware Canal.

Zoning: CC—Central Commercial District requires a minimum lot area of 5,000 square feet for Use 22K Dwelling in Combination with Business. A minimum lot width of 40 feet, minimum front yard of 10 feet, minimum rear yard of 15 feet, and minimum side yards of 6 feet are also required. It should be noted that Use 14C Two-family Dwellings and Use 14E Townhouses are not permitted in the CC District, therefore, no dimensional requirements are provided for these uses. A variance has been granted which will allow for two-family dwellings and townhouses.
R2—Rural Residential District requires a minimum lot area of 2 acres for all permitted uses. A minimum lot width of 200 feet, minimum front yard of 50 feet, minimum rear yard of 50 feet, and minimum side yards of 35 feet are also required. It should be noted that Use 14E Townhouses is not permitted in the R2 District, therefore, no dimensional requirements are provided for this use. A variance has been granted which will allow for townhouses.

The plan indicates that the applicant received 12 variances from the New Hope Borough Zoning Hearing Board on May 22, 2012. These variances from the zoning ordinance include:

2. Section 275-31.B.1 to permit the townhouse use in the CC District;
3. Section 275-31.C to eliminate the 15-foot rear yard setback requirement along tax map parcel #27-10-82;
4. Section 275-42.F.20 to encroach 4.2 feet into the 20-foot riparian buffer;
5. Section 275-62 to permit the extension of a nonconforming front yard setback distance for the building on West Mechanic Street so as to enable its extension for a distance of 19 feet, instead of the maximum permitted 10 feet;
6. Section 275-40.B to eliminate the required 15-foot buffer area between the CC and R2 zoning districts along the boundary line separating the tax parcels that compose the subject property;
7. Section 275-28.C.1.a to allow the development of 5 townhouses in a condominium form of ownership, without compliance with the 2-acre minimum lot area requirement for each dwelling;
8. Section 275-28.C.1.f.2 to permit a side yard setback of 9.9 feet instead the required 35 feet;
9. Section 275-31.C.1.b to permit the dwelling units in the CC District to be owned in a condominium form of ownership without separate lots by exempting the minimum lot area requirement;
10. Section 275-31.C.1 to permit a Dwelling in Combination in the CC District to be owned in a condominium form of ownership without separate lots by exempting the minimum lot area requirement;
11. Section 275-17.D.2.d.2 to permit outdoor seating on the terrace by the canal with it to be located at a 6-foot side yard setback distance, instead of the required 25 feet and a 3.6-foot front yard setback distance from West Mechanic Street, instead of the required 10 feet; and
12. Sections 275-38.A, 275-38.B and 275-47.A to accommodate the previously mentioned variances from the yard, dimensional, lot coverage and setback requirements.

Present Use: Commercial

COMMENTS

1. **Plan submission level**—According to information provided by New Hope Borough, the subject plan has not received preliminary plan approval. Therefore, we are reviewing this plan as a revised preliminary plan, rather than a revised final plan, as indicated on the Bucks County Planning Commission application.

2. **Waivers requested**—The applicant has requested a total of five waivers from the subdivision and land development ordinance. In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of
the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (MPC), the applicant has provided reasons for the requested waivers. The borough should determine if the reasons provided meet the facts of unreasonableness or hardship requirements of the MPC before granting the requested waivers.

3. **Floodplain requirements**—Ordinance 2015-01, which was adopted by the borough on January 20, 2015, requires compliance with new FEMA mapping standards for all properties within the Special Flood Hazards as documented in Flood Insurance Maps dated March 16, 2015. The subject proposal originally was submitted prior to the new ordinance and used the 1999 data, but the borough must use the new data to be in compliance with FEMA regulations. The plan should provide the current 2015 data and be revised as necessary to ensure compliance with the current requirements.

4. **Stormwater management systems**—The applicant has proposed an underground stormwater management structure. Stormwater management systems require proper maintenance. Due to the proposed structures being located underground, observation and maintenance of the systems will be difficult. A detailed manual should be provided by the designer of the system for distribution to the condominium association and the borough to ensure that proper operation and maintenance is performed on the system.

5. **Condominium requirements**—The applicant has proposed that the townhouses would be held in condominium ownership. The limits of ownership and area of maintenance responsibility must be clearly defined within the condominium documents in accordance with the Pennsylvania Uniform Condominium Act. We recommend that a copy of all condominium documents be provided to the borough solicitor to ensure compliance with the Pennsylvania Uniform Condominium Act.

6. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed subdivision and land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

RGB:dwb

cc: Towpath Development, LLC c/o Benner & Wild
    Paul Licitra
    Hibbeln Engineering Company, LLC
    Robert Larason, Borough Zoning Officer
    Craig Kennard, P.E., Carroll Engineering Corporation
    John Burke, Borough Manager (via email)
    Rick Daulton, Park Manager, Delaware Canal State Park
MEMORANDUM

TO: Newtown Borough Council
   Newtown Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Revised Final Plan of Land Development for Steepleview Phase 1—Mixed Use Building
   TMP #28-1-7, -8, -9, -10, -10-1
   Applicant: Steeple View LP
   Owner: Steeple View LP (28-1-7, -8, -9, and -10-1); Allan and Craig Smith (28-1-10)
   Plan Dated: October 5, 2012
   Last Revised: March 9, 2015
   Date Received: March 11, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a building with 12,039 square feet of retail space on the first floor and 10 multifamily dwelling units on the second and third stories. The 6.786-acre site comprises five parcels that will be consolidated and resubdivided into three lots: Lot 1 is 1.370 acres, Lot 2 is 4.903 acres, and Lot 3 is 0.513 acres. Lot 1 will contain the proposed building and the existing historic Sedia residence, which will remain at the corner of Penn Street and South State Street. Lot 2 is vacant and Lot 3 contains an existing parking lot that will be restriped to meet current dimensional standards. Public water and sewerage facilities are intended.

Location: Southwestern corner of the intersection of South State Street and Penn Street.

Zoning: V-2 Village Gateway District permits single-family detached dwelling and two-family dwelling and nonresidential uses such as business or professional office and medical office by right on a minimum lot area of 5,000 square feet and maximum impervious surface coverage of 60 percent. Traditional neighborhood development is permitted by conditional approval on a minimum lot area of two acres.

The plan indicates that variances were granted by the Zoning Hearing Board on August 31, 2012 and January 15, 2013 to permit more than one principal use per lot, permit specialty retail use and
multifamily units in a mixed use building in the V-2 district, allow 11,817 square feet of retail space where a maximum 5,000 square feet is permitted, allow 75 percent impervious surface area where 60 percent is permitted, allow building length of 213 feet where 120 feet is permitted, allow building height of 47 feet where 35 feet is permitted, and provide relief from a number of other requirements such as building setback, location of parking adjacent to rear of a building, lighting, and planted buffers.

Present Use: Single-family detached residential and the vacant former Stockburger Chevrolet dealership.

COMMENTS

Prior to approving the plan, the borough should be satisfied that the revised final plan meets all conditions of preliminary/final plan approval granted by Borough Council on February 12, 2013.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MW:dwb

cc: Steeple View LP
    Gilmore & Associates, Inc.
    Mario Canales, P.E., Pickering, Corts & Summerson, Borough Engineer
    Marcia Scull, Borough Secretary (via email)
    Jo-Anne Brown, Zoning Officer (via email)
    Newtown Township (Adjacent Municipality)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Nockamixon Township Board of Supervisors
    Nockamixon Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Lot Line Adjustment for Thomas
    TMP #30-4-102 and -104
    Applicant: Julie and Jeff Thomas
    Owner: Same
    Plan Dated: March 13, 2015
    Date Received: March 20, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Convey 23.1741 acres from TMP #30-4-104 (currently 26.1741 acres) to TMP #30-4-102 (currently 17.3013 acres). TMP #30-4-104 will be 3.0000 acres and contain an existing dwelling and garage. TMP #30-4-102 will be 40.4754 acres gross (39.3154 acres net, excluding road right-of-way), with 35.9754 acres (including road right-of-way) in a conservation easement and 4.5000 acres not included in the conservation easement. On-lot water and sewerage facilities exist on TMP #30-4-104 and are intended for TMP #30-4-102.

Location: Southeastern corner of Church Hill Road and Frogtown Road.

Zoning: R Residential District permits use B1 Single-family detached dwelling on a minimum lot area of 2.0 acres.

Present Use: Residential and vacant.

COMMENTS

The staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission recognizes that this submission is consistent with major ordinance requirements. It is recommended that the plan be approved if it meets all ordinance requirements, as determined through the municipal engineer’s review, and if the plan complies with the requirements of other applicable reviewing agencies. We note the following issue:
• **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed subdivision.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MW:dwb

cc: Julie & Jeff Thomas
Scott Mease, P.E., Mease Engineering (via email)
Jordan B. Yeager, Curtin & Heefner, LLP, Township Solicitor
C. Robert Wynn Associates, Inc., Township Engineer (via email)
Arlene E. Eichlin, Township Secretary (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Nockamixon Township Board of Supervisors
    Nockamixon Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Final Plan of Land Development for Brubaker
    TMP #30-15-2
    Applicant: Thomas Brubaker
    Owner: Same
    Plan Dated: December 10, 2014
    Last Revised: April 7, 2015
    Date Received: April 13, 2014

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a 7,030-square-foot building on a 1.29-acre (net) parcel for use E-1 Retail Trade and Service. On-lot water and sewerage facilities are intended.

Location: Southeastern corner of Easton Road (S.R. 611) and Tabor Road, between Quarry Road to the north and Foellner Lane to the south.

Zoning: C-Commercial District permits use E-1 Retail Trade and Service on a minimum lot area of 20,000 square feet, maximum impervious surface ratio of 70 percent, and maximum building coverage of 30 percent.

Present Use: Vacant.

COMMENT

Prior to final plan approval, the township should ensure that the plan meets all conditions of preliminary plan approval. The plan should not be approved until all issues are resolved.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.
In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MW:dwb

cc: Thomas Brubaker
    Urwiler & Walter, Inc.
    C. Robert Wynn Associates, Inc., Township Engineer (via email)
    Arlene E. Eichlin, Township Secretary (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Perkasie Borough Council
Perkasie Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Plan of Minor Subdivision for Moyer Living Trust
TMP #33-6-17
Applicant: Willis Moyer
Owner: Willis and Sherry Moyer Living Trust
Plan Dated: September 9, 2014
Last Revised: February 6, 2015
Date Received: February 23, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a 30,192.59-square-foot parcel into two single-family detached lots. Lot 1 is 14,648.86 square feet and contains a single-family detached dwelling and Lot 2 is 15,543.73 square feet. Public water and sewerage are intended.

Location: Western side of Callowhill Road, approximately 120 feet south of Ridge Road.

Zoning: The R-1B Residential District permits a single-family detached dwelling on a minimum lot area of 13,500 square feet.

Present Use: Residential
COMMENTS

1. **Steep slopes**—The environmental performance standards information on Sheet SP-2 indicates that steep slope requirements are not met for 8-15 percent slopes (for total site and Lot 2), and for 15-25 percent slopes (for Lot 2). The plan does not indicate if variances will be sought, although that was discussed at the Planning Commission meeting regarding the sketch plan. The Planning Commission should not take action on the plan until this zoning issue is resolved.

2. **Maintenance of alley**—The proposed driveway for Lot 2 takes access from the alley that abuts the northern boundary of the lot, as recommended by the Planning Commission during review of the sketch plan. We recommend that a maintenance agreement be established specifying responsibilities for repair, snow removal, and other potential maintenance issues for the alley.

3. **Sidewalks**—Subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) Section 162-20.B states that sidewalks shall be provided along both sides of all streets, except in the opinion of Borough Council with the advice of the Planning Commission that they are unnecessary for the public safety and convenience. As discussed during the sketch plan review, sidewalks do not exist on either side of this portion of Callowhill Road.

4. **Buffer**—The plan should include a calculation verifying that the proposed trees along Callowhill Road comply with the Class B buffer requirements of zoning ordinance Section 186-54 and SALDO Section 164-35.

5. **Tree protection**—The plan shows tree protection fencing, but for several of the trees to remain, grading is proposed within the tree protection zone (TPZ) and fencing. In addition, it is unclear whether the 24-inch-caliper maple tree near the existing shed on Lot 1 is intended to remain, but a 6-inch perforated PVC pipe is shown through the dripline. Zoning ordinance Section 186-5 and SALDO Section 164-41.1 require that no construction activity shall occur within the TPZ, including grade changes and excavations.

6. **Stormwater management**—The borough engineer should be satisfied that the proposed stormwater management for the site complies with the East Branch Perkiomen Creek Watershed Act 167 Stormwater Management Plan.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.
In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MW:dwb

cc: Willis Moyer
   J. Cheryleen Strothers, Cowen Associates, Inc.
   Edward Wild, Esq., Benner and Wild
   Erik Garton, P.E. Gilmore & Associates, Borough Engineer
   Andrea Coaxum, Borough Manager (via email)
   Brandy McKeever, Code Enforcement Administrator (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Richland Township Board of Supervisors
Richland Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Revised Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Dunkin Donuts
TMP #36-38-31-1
Applicant: Quaker Alliance
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: September 16, 2014
Last Revised: April 21, 2015
Date Received: April 21, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a 4,000-square-foot building with drive-through window, housing two commercial establishments, on a lot of 1.023 acres. Public water and sewerage systems would serve the development.

Location: West side of Route 309 (South West End Boulevard), at the intersection of Tollgate Road.

Zoning: PC Planned Commercial District, also within the Arterial Corridor Overlay District. Multiple commercial use is permitted by conditional use within the PC District on a minimum lot area of 1.0 acre. All land development within the Arterial Corridor Overlay District requires conditional use approval.

According to the plan, the following variances were granted by the Richland Township Zoning Hearing Board on February 27, 2015:

Sections 27-513 & 604 Permit structures within the 100-foot front yard setback along an arterial highway
Sections 27-513 Permit structures within the 65-foot setback along a collector highway
Sections 27-516 & 516.2.C Permit vehicular access and an underground detention basin in the 25-foot wide Class A buffer yard
Sections 27-603 Permit limited vehicular access onto State Route 309
Sections 27-911 Permit a menu board in addition to the proposed signage, including another freestanding sign

Present Use: Vacant.

COMMENTS

1. Conditional use—The proposal requires conditional use approval under Section 27-601 of the zoning ordinance because it is located within the Arterial Corridor Overlay District along Route 309. Conditional use approval would also be required under Section 27-404 of the ordinance for an E22 Multiple Commercial Use within the PC Planned Commercial District. According to a letter from the project engineer accompanying the plan, dated April 21, 2015, testimony for the conditional use application will be furnished at the May 11, 2015 Board of Supervisors meeting.

2. Waivers—Sheet 1 lists the following requested waivers from the provisions of the subdivision and land development ordinance:

   Section 22-506.2 defer issue of improvements to Tollgate Road and Route 309 to PennDOT
   Section 22-512.3.L allow proposed grading to daylight less than 5 feet from the property line
   Section 22-516.5.Q permit parking and display areas along arterial (Route 309) road to be set back from the ultimate right-of-way by a distance less than the 30 feet required
   Section 22-519 allow the buffer trees to be counted as credit toward the street tree requirements
   Section 22-702C(2) partial waiver from showing existing features within 400 feet of the site

Under the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waivers is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved and the minimum modification necessary. The letter from the project engineer accompanying the plan, dated April 21, 2015, attempts to address the grounds for these waivers. The final plan should list all granted waivers.

3. Lot coverage—Section 27-405.E.E22.b of the zoning ordinance requires no more than 35 percent of the total lot area shall be occupied by buildings. Township official should determine if this requirement should be included in the zoning data on Sheet 1. Rough calculations indicate that the proposed development is in compliance with this requirement. We also note that the floor area ratio in the zoning data on Sheet 1 is listed as a “minimum” versus “maximum”.

4. Drive-through lane—The drive-through lane circulates vehicles around three sides of the building. It is not clear whether the drive-in window is intended to serve both of the businesses that would share the building. It is unclear where customer orders will be taken for the drive-
through. The drive-through arrangements do not appear to incorporate an adequate bypass lane; it appears that the striped loading area is to function in that role. Also, the depicted circulation pattern appears to route exiting drive-through traffic almost directly into vehicles entering the site from the Route 309 entrance.

5. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.
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cc: Quaker Alliance  
    Judith Stern Goldstein, Boucher & James  
    Quakertown Area Planning Committee  
    Mike Schwartz, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer (via e-mail)  
    Steven Sechriest, Township Manager (via e-mail)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warminster Township Board of Supervisors
Warminster Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Revised Final Plan Land Development—The Station at Bucks County West
TMP #49-9-18; 49-9-19-3
Applicant: 330 Jacksonville/JERC Partners VIII, L.P.
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: July 30, 2010
Last Revised: March 27, 2015
Date Received: March 31, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION
Proposal: To construct 24 multifamily dwellings as an addition to an existing Transit Oriented Development (TOD), consisting of 233 townhouse and/or multifamily dwellings within 19 buildings, 2,650-square-foot maintenance building, 3,600-square-foot clubhouse and pool on a 15.961-acre (net) parcel. Open space of 4.81 acres is proposed. The proposed residential density is 15.33 units per acre. The site is served by public water and sewer. A portion of a new access drive serving the SEPTA Warminster train station will be constructed on a corner of the subject site.

Location: Northern side of Jacksonville Road, approximately 100 feet from its intersection with Van Horn Drive.

Zoning: I/O Industrial Office District permits public or private school, medical or dental office/clinic, business or professional office, retail shop, service business, bank, restaurant, repair shop, hotel, large retail store, light manufacturing, research and development facility, and wholesale business and storage on lots of 1 acre or more. Transit Oriented Development is permitted as a conditional use on a lot size of 15 acres or more. At least 30 percent of the net tract area shall be preserved as open space. The permitted residential density is 14 units per acre.

The applicant received the following variances from the zoning ordinance:
Section 1602.B.9.c.(2).—Substitute multifamily residential use for retail use and exceed permitted density
Section 1602.B.9.c.(2).B.—Area devoted to nonresidential use
Section 1602.B.9.c.(2).E(3)—Required building setback
Section 1602.B.9.c.(3).A—Maximum number of units
Section 1602.B.9.c.(3).C.(1)—Building separation
Section 1602.B.9.c.(6).D—Fewer parking spaces
Section 2015—Parking in side yard setbacks

Present Use: Multifamily residential

COMMENTS

1. **Waivers**—The plan indicates that the waivers will be requested from the following requirements of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO):
   
   Section 602.3.A—Woodland protection
   Section 602.8A & B—Riparian buffer 1 and 2 requirements

   In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1.(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved and the minimum modification necessary.

   The board of supervisors previously granted the following SALDO waivers for the original plan:

   Sections 404.3.B, 406.B, and 423.B.3.b and c—Existing features
   Section 504.9—Private streets
   Sections 506 and 508—Street geometry
   Section 518.6—Grading setback
   Section 523.8.A—Tree replacement
   Section 602.3B. and C—Riparian buffer
   Section 602.8.C and D—Revegetation of riparian area

2. **Riparian buffer**—Zoning ordinance Section 2103.E.1 prohibits stormwater management facilities within Riparian Zone 1 and Section 2103.E.2 prohibits buildings in Riparian Zone 2. A proposed rain garden lies within Zone 1 and a portion of proposed multifamily building 20 lies within Zone 2. A waiver has been requested from the SALDO to permit these features in the riparian zone but zoning relief has not been granted. The plan should be revised to comply with the zoning requirements.

3. **Recreational facilities**—The plan proposes adding dwelling units and number of residents while reducing the amount of open space on the site from 43.7 to 30.1 percent. The recreational needs will likely increase with the increased number of residents. We recommend that the township and applicant determine if the existing facilities are sufficient to meet the recreation needs of the additional residents.
4. **Landscaping**—The landscaping plan on plan Sheet 15 shows all the plantings proposed for the original project and the new plantings. It is difficult to determine what is existing and what is proposed as part of the revised plan for Building 20. We recommend that the plan be revised to show the new plantings alone to determine if they comply with the plantings requirements.

5. **Sidewalks**—Section 1602.B.9.c.(5)A of the zoning ordinance requires that sidewalks be provided along all internal streets and external streets. The plan shows no sidewalks along the rear of proposed building 20 along the alley. The plan should be revised to show a sidewalk along the alley to allow pedestrians to access to building 19 and the maintenance building from proposed building 20.

6. **Lighting**—The plan does not show any new lighting proposed along the new driveway. We recommend that the applicant and SEPTA ensure that adequate lighting is provided along the proposed driveway.

7. **Access easement**—The plan shows a proposed driveway serving the SEPTA train station crossing the subject parcel. An access easement is shown along the driveway on the adjacent Jacksonville Plaza but not the subject site. We recommend that an access easement be provided to ensure free access to the train station across the subject site.

8. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015, public meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the Bucks County Planning Commission board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

DCZ:dwb

cc: JERC Partners VIII, L.P.
    William McNaney, P.E., Van Cleef Engineering Associates
    Edward F. Murphy, Esq., Wisler Pearlstine, L.L.P.
    Craig Kennard, Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer
    Steven Weisner, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warminster Township Board of Supervisors
Warminster Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Havis
TMP #49-2-28-4 and 49-2-28-15
Applicant: Havis, Inc.
Owner: Blue Marlin Associates
Plan Dated: January 12, 2015
Date Received: March 2, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a 34,800-square-foot warehouse/manufacturing building on a 2.98-acre parcel (TMP #49-2-28-4), and 2,700-square-foot addition to an existing 88,787.98-square-foot manufacturing building on an 8.25-acre parcel (TMP #49-9-28-15). The site is served by public water and sewer.

Location: Southwestern side of Jacksonville Road and Potter Street approximately 200 feet northeast of the Jacksonville Road intersection with County Line Road.

Zoning: IO Industrial Office District permits light manufacturing, business or professional office, and wholesale business and storage on lots of one acre or more.

Present Use: Light industrial, vacant.

COMMENTS

1. Slope disturbance—Zoning Ordinance Section 2103.B, Steep Slopes, permits no more than 30 percent disturbance of 15 to 25 percent slopes. The plan indicates that 32.05 percent of this slope is to be disturbed. The plan should be revised to show 30 percent or less of slope disturbance and indicate the acreage of sloped land and the acreage amount of disturbance.
2. **Grading**—Section 518.6 of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) requires that the top or bottom edge of slopes shall be a minimum of 5 feet from property or right-of-way lines of streets or alleys. Grading is shown 5 feet from the parcel line of TMP #49-9-32 in two locations. The plan should be revised to terminate grading 5 feet from the property line.

3. **Trees over 24 caliper inches**—Section 602.3.B of the SALDO requires that any tree over 24 caliper inches be 100 percent protected, whether located within the woodland areas or standing alone. The plan shows removal of numerous trees over 30 caliper inches and one over 50 caliper inches. These are large trees that provide environmental and aesthetic benefits to the site and the community. We recommend that the condition of the trees be evaluated and the plan be revised to protect trees over 24 caliper inches as required by the SALDO.

4. **Tree protection fence**—SALDO Section 530.2 states that tree protection areas shall be shown on the landscape plan and grading plan. Section 530.3.A.2 requires that the tree protection area shall be 15 feet from the trunk of the tree to be retained, or the distance from the trunk to the dripline (the line marking the outer edge of the branches of the tree), whichever is greater. A tree protection fence is shown on the Overall ESPC plan but not on the landscape or grading plans. The ESPC plan shows grading within the dripline of 30- and 50-inch caliper trees in the rear of TMP #49-2-28-4. We recommend that the plan be revised to show the tree protection fence on the grading plan and revise the fence location to fall outside the dripline of trees to be saved. Damage and soil compaction may be caused by storage of materials or equipment being operated over the tree roots within the dripline.

5. **Parking spaces**—The plan notes that 12 parking spaces are required for the proposed building, but provides 55 parking spaces. The proposed number of spaces is four times more than required. Although the impervious surface ratio complies with zoning ordinance requirements, the extra parking spaces increase the impervious surface as well as construction and maintenance costs. We understand the applicant stores vehicles for installation of aftermarket equipment, therefore, we recommend that the applicant consider minimizing impervious surface by using pervious pavement or other means.

6. **Sidewalks**—The plan does not show any pedestrian facilities between the proposed and existing building. We recommend that sidewalk extensions be provided and a crosswalk be provided between the fronts of the two buildings. A crosswalk should also be provided to connect both sides of the sidewalk along Jacksonville Road.

7. **Common driveway access issues**—The two adjoining parcels share a common access and are currently under common ownership. Two issues arise regarding access and maintenance if one of the parcels is sold:
   a. **Access easement**—An access easement should be established over the common access to the site from Jacksonville Road, the main driveway through the site, and other common areas with maintenance responsibilities specified. Although the two parcels have the same owners, in the future one may be sold to a different owner.
b. **Water line easement**—Sheet 11 shows a proposed water lateral (fire and domestic), on TMP #49-2-28-4 approximately 3 feet from the property line abutting TMP #49-2-28-15 and beneath the common driveway. We recommend that an easement be placed on TMP #49-2-28-15 to permit access for maintenance of the line.

8. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.
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cc: Havis, Inc.
    Boucher & James
    Craig D. Kennard, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer
    Steven Weisner, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warminster Township Board of Supervisors
Warminster Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary/Final Plan of Land Development for Jacksonville Plaza
TMP #49-9-19
Applicant: JERC Partners XIX L.P.
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: March 27, 2015
Date Received: March 31, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: To construct a driveway across a portion of the 1.367-acre commercial site to connect the Warminster SEPTA station parking lots with Jacksonville Road. In addition, a proposed access drive to The Station at Bucks County West would connect into the proposed driveway, and an existing bus shelter will be relocated along the site’s Jacksonville Road frontage. No improvements are proposed to the commercial buildings on the site. Public water and sewerage facilities serve the site.

Location: Northern side of Jacksonville Road, approximately 100 feet from its intersection with Van Horn Drive.

Zoning: I/O Industrial Office District permits a public or private school, medical or dental office/clinic, business or professional office, retail shop, service business, bank, restaurant use, repair shop, hotel, large retail store, light manufacturing, research and development facility, wholesale business and storage on lots of 1 acre or more.

The applicant has received variances from the following zoning ordinance requirements:

Section 1401.D—Impervious surface ratio
Section 2015 and 2016 —Access drive in side and rear yard setbacks
Present Use: Retail commercial

COMMENTS

1. **Waivers**—The plan indicates that the following waivers will be requested from the requirements of the subdivision and land development ordinance:

   - Section 304 — Preliminary/final plan
   - Section 504.9 — Private streets prohibited
   - Section 506 and 508 — Horizontal road geometry
   - Section 506.2A2 — Clear site triangle
   - Section 518.6 — Grading setback
   - Section 523.2.D — Tree inventory
   - Section 523.4.C — Number of street trees
   - Section 523.4.E — Street trees in the right-of-way
   - Section 523.5.C.2 — Buffer containing existing and new vegetation
   - Section 523.6.A — Parking area landscaping
   - Section 523.8 — Replacement trees
   - Section 602.3.A — Woodland protection
   - Section 602.8.C — Riparian buffer
   - Section 602.8.D — Revegetation of riparian area

   In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1.(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved and the minimum modification necessary.

2. **Requested stormwater management waiver**—Notations on Sheet 3 of the plans indicate that the following waiver is requested from the Stormwater Management Ordinance:

   - Section 426.6 Runoff and peak flow rates

   Relief from this provision may not be granted under the subdivision and land development ordinance. This request should be discussed and resolved prior to approval of the plan.

3. **Driveway plantings**—The plan does not show any landscaping or trees along the proposed SEPTA driveway. The Station at Bucks County West plan shows a line of streets trees along the proposed driveway that could be continued to create an avenue-type appearance similar to the existing SEPTA driveway just off Jacksonville Road northeast of the site. We recommend that applicant consider providing trees and plantings.

4. **Crosswalk**—The plan does not show pedestrian routes across the driveway or between the existing retail building and the proposed sidewalk along the proposed driveway. We recommend that a crosswalk be provided across the driveway and between the sidewalk and the retail building for pedestrians from The Station at Bucks County West and transit users.
5. **Access easements**—Reciprocal access easements should be provided to allow access to the proposed SEPTA access driveway, proposed access to The Station at Bucks County West, and the existing commercial development parking area and access.

6. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015, public meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the Bucks County Planning Commission board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.
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cc: JERC Partners XIX L.P.
Craig Kennard, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer
William McNaney, P.E., Van Cleef Engineering Associates
Steven Weisner, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warminster Township Board of Supervisors
   Warminster Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for SEPTA Train Station
         TMP 49-9-19-2
         Applicant: J.G.Petrucci Co. Inc.
         Owner: SEPTA
         Plan Dated: March 27, 2015
         Date Received: March 31, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a new parking lot and a portion of an access drive serving the SEPTA Warminster train station on a 10.264-acre parcel. The site contains a station building served by public water and sewer, and a large parking lot.

Location: Northern side of Jacksonville Road, approximately 100 feet from its intersection with Van Horn Drive.

Zoning: The I/O Industrial Office District permits public or private school, medical or dental office/clinic, business or professional office, retail shop, service business, bank, restaurant use, repair shop, hotel, large retail store, light manufacturing, research and development facility, wholesale business and storage on lots of 1 acre or more. Transit Oriented Development (TOD) is permitted as a conditional use on a lot size of 15 acres or more. At least 30 percent of the net tract area shall be preserved as open space. The permitted residential density is 14 units per acre.

The submission indicates that the following zoning variances were granted by the Zoning Hearing board (decision mailed December 23, 2014):

   Section 1401.D—To permit greater impervious surface ratio than permitted.
   Section 2015—To permit proposed access drive within side yard setback.
Present Use: Parking lot

COMMENTS

1. **Waivers**—The plan indicates that waivers will be requested from the following requirements of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO):

   - Section 304 — Preliminary/final plan
   - Section 404.3.B — Existing features within 400 feet of site
   - Section 504.9 — Private streets prohibited
   - Section 506.2.A.2 — Clear site triangle
   - Section 513.1 — Three-foot planting strip required
   - Section 518.6 — Grading setback
   - Section 523.4.C — Street trees
   - Section 523.4.E — Street trees in right-of-way
   - Section 523.5.C.2 — Buffer containing existing and proposed vegetation
   - Section 523.5 — Buffer containing existing and new vegetation
   - Section 523.6.A — Parking area landscaping
   - Section 523.8 — Replacement trees
   - Section 602.3.A — Woodland protection in environmentally sensitive areas
   - Section 602.3.B — Woodland protection requirements
   - Section 602.8.C — Riparian buffer of 100 feet
   - Section 602. 8.D — Revegetation of riparian area

   In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1.(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved and the minimum modification necessary.

2. **Riparian buffer**—The proposed driveway and sidewalk are located within Riparian Zones 1 and 2. Zoning ordinance Section 2103.E prohibits sidewalks and parking lots in the Riparian Zones. A waiver from the SALDO has been requested to permit these features in the riparian zone but zoning relief has not been granted. The plan should be revised to comply with the zoning requirements.

3. **Woodland protection**—The plan shows greater encroachment in woodlands than permitted in Section 2103.C of the zoning ordinance. A waiver from the SALDO has been requested to permit greater woodland disturbance than permitted, but zoning relief has not been granted. The plan should be revised to comply with the zoning requirements.

4. **Requested stormwater management waiver** — Notations on Sheet 3 of the plans indicate that the following waiver is requested from the Stormwater Management Ordinance:

   - Section 426.6 Runoff and peak flow rates

   Relief from this provision may not be granted under the subdivision and land development ordinance. This request should be discussed and resolved prior to approval of the plan.
5. **Tree protection fence**—The plan shows woodlands on the site and a significant amount of grading in much of the wooded area. A tree protection fence is shown on the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan. Section 530.2 of the SALDO states that tree protection areas shall be shown on the landscape plan and grading plan. We recommend that the plan be revised to show the required tree protection fence on the landscape plan and grading plan.

6. **Lighting**—The plan shows new lights for the proposed parking lot, but it does not appear that any new lighting is proposed along the new driveway or along the proposed sidewalk to the large parking lot. We recommend that the township ensure that adequate lighting is provided along the existing and proposed sidewalks and driveways.

7. **Parking aisle width**—The proposed parking lot aisle driveway is 22 feet wide. Section 512.2 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that a parking lot with a two-way driveway and 90-degree parking spaces have a 24-foot-wide driveway aisle. The plan should be revised to show the required aisle width.

8. **Parking lot islands**—The proposed parking lot shows a double-stacked parking aisle with more than 20 parking spaces per row. Section 512.6 of the SALDO requires that a ten-foot-wide, curbed refuge island be provided after a maximum of twelve parking spaces. The plan should be revised to show the curbed islands.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015 public meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the Bucks County Planning Commission board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.
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cc: J.G. Petrucci Co. Inc.
William McNaney, Van Cleef Engineering
Craig D. Kennard, P.E. Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer
Edward F. Murphy, Esq., Wisler Pearlstine, L.L.P.
Steven Weisner, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warminster Township Board of Supervisors
   Warminster Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for The Station at Bucks County East
           TMP #49-9-28
           Applicant: JERC Partners XIX, L.P.
           Owner: Same
           Plan Dated: March 27, 2015
           Date Received: March 31, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a Transit Oriented Development (TOD) consisting of 151 multifamily dwellings within 8 buildings, a 3,600-square-foot clubhouse and pool, and a 400-square-foot maintenance building, on a 10.81-acre (net) parcel. Open space of 3.97 acres is provided. The proposed residential density is 14 units per acre. The site is served by public water and sewer.

Location: Eastern side of Jacksonville Road 800 feet north of its intersection with Van Horn Drive.

Zoning: The I/O Industrial Office District permits public or private school, medical or dental office/clinic, business or professional office, retail shop, service business, bank, restaurant, repair shop, hotel, large retail store, light manufacturing, research and development facility, wholesale business and storage on lots of 1 acre or more. Transit Oriented Development is permitted as a conditional use on a lot size of 15 acres or more. At least 30 percent of the net tract area shall be preserved as open space. The permitted residential density is 14 units per acre.

The applicant has received variances from the Zoning Hearing Board (decision dated December 23, 2014) from the following zoning ordinance requirements:

Section 1602.b.9.c.(1).B—Transportation Oriented Development on a tract area less than required
Section 1602.b.9.c.(1).C — Tract width and frontage on arterial
Section 1602.b.9.c.(2).b — To permit a TOD with no nonresidential use.
Section 1602.b.9.c.(2).e.4 — To permit parking in setback
Section 1602.B.9.c.(3) — Maximum number of units in buildings
Section 1602.b.9.c.(3).c.(1) — To permit less than the required building separations between buildings #4 and 6, and 5 and 7
Section 2006 E — Parking in buffer setback
Section 2015 — To permit parking within the side yard setbacks

Present Use: Office/Warehouse.

COMMENTS

1. **Conditional use** — Section 1602.9.B.2.d. of the zoning ordinance permits TOD as a conditional use, in accordance with Part 25 of the ordinance. The plan shall be accompanied by conceptual architectural renderings and a traffic study. The plan cannot be approved until the required material is submitted and conditional use approval is granted.

   We also note the submission to this office did not contain renderings or a traffic impact study.

2. **Waivers requested** — The plan indicates that waivers will be requested from the following requirements of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO):

   - Section 304 — Preliminary/final plan
   - Section 401.4 — Plan scale
   - Sections 404.3.B, 406.3.B, and 423.B.3.b and c — Existing features
   - Section 504.9 — Private streets
   - Sections 506 and 508 — Street geometry
   - Section 506.2A2 — Clear site triangle
   - Section 518.6 — Grading setback
   - Section 523.2.D — Tree inventory
   - Section 523.5.C — Buffer from existing vegetation
   - Section 523.6.A — Parking area landscaping
   - Section 602.3.A — Woodland protection
   - Section 602.8.C — Riparian Buffer requirements - 100-foot setback
   - Section 602.8.D — Revegetation of riparian area

   In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1.(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved and the minimum modification necessary.

3. **Requested stormwater management waiver** — Notations on Sheet 3 of the plan indicate that the following waivers are requested from the Stormwater Management Ordinance:

   - Section 426.6 — Runoff and peak flow rates
   - Section 422.6 — Dewatering time for one year storm
Section 425.6.C—Freeboard between 100-year water surface elevation and spillway elevation

Relief from these provisions may not be granted under the subdivision and land development ordinance. This request should be discussed and resolved prior to approval of the plan.

4. **Riparian buffer**—Proposed buildings 1 and 3 and a parking lot lie within Riparian Zone 2. Zoning ordinance Section 2103.E.2 prohibits buildings and parking lots in Riparian Zone 2. A waiver from the SALDO has been requested to permit these features with the riparian buffer, but zoning relief has not been granted.

A dog park is proposed in Riparian Zone 2. This use appears to be similar to active recreation which is permitted only in Zone 2. We recommend that the township determine the impacts of such an activity and if it is appropriate in the riparian buffer.

5. **Nonresidential use**—Zoning ordinance Section 1602.B2B(1) permits a retail use on a contiguous parcel to meet requirements for nonresidential use in a TOD. The Station at Bucks County West is contiguous to Jacksonville Plaza and shares a common border and, therefore, can reasonably share retail requirements. However, Jacksonville Plaza does not share a common boundary or abut the subject parcel because it is separated by the Jacksonville Road right-of-way. We recommend that the township determine if use of Jacksonville Plaza is appropriate to meet nonresidential requirements for The Station at Bucks County East.

6. **Open space**—Section 1602.B.9.c(9)A of the zoning ordinance stipulates that stormwater management facilities, parking lots, and driveways shall not be counted as common open space. Additionally, Section 603 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that areas of open space shall measure at least 75 feet in any direction, and not include areas occupied by buildings, easements, roads or road rights-of-way, lot area or yards associated with any dwelling unit, and parking areas. The site plan proposes a community center, pool, and dog park, but does not delineate or identify open space areas or show any areas of the required dimensions. The plan should provide this information so that compliance with the open space requirements can be determined, and ensure that unusable, remnant areas are not counted as required open space.

7. **Design issues**

   a. **Site amenities**—Section 1602.B.9.c(5)E of the zoning ordinance requires that site amenities such as bike racks, benches, and trash receptacles be provided. The plan should be revised to show the required amenities.

   b. **Walkability plan**—Section 1602.B.9c.(5)F of the zoning ordinance requires a walkability plan. The submission did not include such a plan, so the plan should be revised to provide a walkability plan.

   c. **Parking design**—Section 1602.B.9.c(6)E of the zoning ordinance requires that off-street parking should be designed such that vehicular access does not dominate the existing external streetscape. The proposed driveways and parking spaces dominate the streetscape, which will not be attractive for drivers, pedestrians or those viewing
the site from the street. We recommend that more trees be planted along the driveway and the parking areas.

d. **Signage detail**—Section 1602.B.B.9c(11) of the zoning ordinance requires that signs meet specified standards. We recommend that the plan be revised to show the proposed locations of signs as well as details of proposed signs in accordance with the ordinance requirements.

e. **Adjacent site**—The adjacent parcel (TMP #49-9-24-6) is owned by the applicant and, if developed for a similar TOD use, presents an opportunity for larger scale planning. We recommend that the applicant and township discuss potential development of the adjacent parcel so that all of the TOD development may be coordinated.

f. **Secondary access**—The proposed development has a single access to Jacksonville Road. For emergency purposes a second access would be necessary. We recommend that a second access be provided, such as across adjacent TMP #49-9-24-6 to Steamboat Drive.

g. **Building arrangement**—As noted in the parking design comment (7.c), the proposed layout of the community is dominated by vehicular access and parking, with little green space. After entering the site on Drive A, the vehicular circulation system consists of a series of parking lot aisles. Buildings 4-7 are lined up with the rear of buildings 4 and 5 only 25 feet from the opposing walls of buildings 6 and 7. Residents of the interior units of these buildings will have a stark view of the adjacent buildings because there are no shrubs or trees proposed. We realize that proposed utilities between the buildings limit planting options. However, we recommend that foundation or other plantings be provided in the space between the buildings and/or on the walls (vertical gardens) to soften the view, and that open space and parking courts be integrated into the arrangement of buildings on the site.

8. **Crosswalks**—The plan shows sidewalks throughout the site but few crosswalks to provide safe passage across driveway and parking areas. In particular we recommend that a crosswalk be provided across the entrance driveway (Drive A) west of Parking Lot A.

9. **Mail delivery**—The plan does not indicate the mail delivery arrangement. If centralized mailboxes are proposed, their locations should be shown on the plan.

10. **Street tree**—Sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*) is proposed as a street tree on Sheet 12 (Landscaping Plan). We recommend specifying the fruitless cultivar, 'Rotundiloba', or replacing the sweetgum trees with another type of tree that will not produce fruit that will be a nuisance on streets and sidewalks.

11. **Stormwater management**—Section 404.4.O of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that a stormwater management study be submitted with the preliminary plan. Also, a condition of the variances requires that the stormwater management study include Warminster Heights. A study should be submitted to complete the submission.
12. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015, public meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the Bucks County Planning Commission board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.
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cc: JERC Partners XIX, L.P.
    William McNaney, P.E., Van Cleef Engineering
    Edward F. Murphy, Esquire, Wisler Pearlstine, LLP.
    Craig Kennard, Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer
    Steven Weisner, Municipal Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warrington Township Board of Supervisors
   Warrington Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Sketch Plan of Subdivision for Warrington Run
         TMP #50-4-150
         Applicant: KTMT Warrington Run LP
         Owner: Geerling Florist, Inc.
         Plan Dated: February 24, 2015
         Date Received: March 11, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: To subdivide a 46.25-acre parcel into 103 single-family detached lots ranging in size from 9,520 to 16,810 square feet. An existing dwelling will remain on a 1.5-acre lot. Open space of 12.3 acres will be provided. Public water and sewer is intended to serve the proposed and existing dwellings.

Location: Northeast side of Street Road approximately 1,000 feet northwest of its intersection with Folly Road.

Zoning: The RA Residential Agricultural District permits single-family detached dwellings on lots of 3 acres or more. Cluster development is permitted on sites of 10 acres or more with a minimum lot size of 7,500 square feet, minimum open space ratio of 83 percent and maximum density of 0.65 units per acre. Agricultural uses, public school, kennel, riding academy and nursery are also permitted.

Present Use: Residential; Agricultural
COMMENTS

The applicant has requested rezoning of the site from RA Residential Agricultural District to RA-2 Residential Agricultural-2 District. The rezoning request was submitted to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review, and copies of our review (BCPC # 50-15-2(P)) have been sent to the township and the applicant. The proposed sketch plan does not comply with the existing RA Residential Agricultural District zoning provisions. The following review was prepared as if the plan were in compliance with the requested RA-2 rezoning, but it is not a recommendation to rezone.

1. Natural resource protections—The plan shows a manmade stormwater management facility and manmade slopes. A sizable portion of the stormwater facility is to be filled in and slopes are to be eliminated. The stormwater facility appears to meet the zoning ordinance definition (Section 202) of Waterbody Type I which is a natural or artificial body of water, such as a lake or pond, which retains water year round, is greater than one acre, and has a normal water depth in excess of 6 inches. Section 305.2 of the zoning ordinance requires that Waterbody Type I be 100 percent restricted.

The plan also shows natural and manmade steep slopes, but does not show protection of the manmade slopes. Section 305.4 of the zoning ordinance does not distinguish between manmade and natural slopes and requires that 60 to 85 percent of steep slopes must be left undisturbed, based on the severity of the slope. Therefore, it appears that all slopes on the site must be protected as prescribed in this section, and shall not be disturbed by regrading or stripping of vegetation.

2. Street Road access—The plan shows three access points to Street Road along a frontage of approximately 1,200 feet. Subdivision and land development ordinance Section 305.4 4. states that streets of the primary or secondary class shall not intersect with collector streets at intervals of less than 800 feet from the same side of the collector street. The plan shows three secondary streets accessing Street Road which are 250 feet from each other on the same side of Street Road. The frontage width of the site would permit at most two access points. The plan should be revised to show only two access points along Street Road.

3. Sidewalks—Section 408 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that sidewalks be constructed along all existing abutting streets and on both sides of all other streets within the subdivision or land development for all districts. The plan shows sidewalks along Street Road but they do not extend to the site boundary. The plan should be revised to show sidewalks along the entire length of Street Road.

The plan also shows sidewalks along all streets but no connection to the path network at the adjacent Legacy Oaks development. We recommend that the applicant coordinate with the Legacy Oaks homeowners association to provide a pedestrian connection between the two sites.

4. Site design—Two elements of the proposed design, open space and street design, may be optimized to better serve residents. All proposed open space is located along the entire northern and eastern periphery of the site and the open space may only be accessed from one point along a residential street. A centrally located area that is large enough to be functional as open space could serve as a focal point and meeting place for residents, and help to generate
a sense of community. This space also could be effective for recreation that may be easily watched over by neighbors.

The plan also shows a large grid pattern with curved streets along the exterior of the grid. Several of the blocks are long, which may discourage walking, encourage speeding, and may present a monotonous streetscape. A finer grained grid pattern with shorter blocks would encourage pedestrian movement, slow traffic, and enhance the streetscape.

We recommend that the plan be revised to provide centrally located open space(s) that is easily accessible to all residents of the subdivision, and that the street system be redesigned to create a smaller scaled grid pattern.

5. **Existing dwelling driveway**—The existing dwelling on proposed Lot 104 takes access to Street Road. We recommend that the plan be revised to provide driveway access to Road B to minimize access points along Street Road.

6. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed subdivision. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the subdivision review with the planning module review.

   We note the *Warrington Township Act 537 Plan Amendment No. 5* (2005) calls for continued use of on-lot systems for the subject site.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015, public meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the Bucks County Planning Commission board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.
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cc: KTMT Warrington Run LP
    Van Cleef Engineering Associates
    Tom Gockowski, P.E., Township Engineer
    Timothy Tieperman, Township Manager (via email)
April 15, 2015
BCPC #12071

MEMORANDUM

TO: Warwick Township Board of Supervisors
Warwick Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Sketch Plan of Land Development for B3 Sketch Plan Warwick
TMP #51-3-89 and -89-2
Applicant: Blank Ashkenasy Properties, LLC
Owner: York Road Bladco, L.P.
Plan Dated: February 9, 2015
Date Received: March 20, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: To construct 149 dwelling units on three lots on a base site totaling 27.266 acres. Lot 1, comprising of 6.75 acres, will contain 33 townhouses, Lot 2, comprising 8.23 acres, will contain 36 multiplex units (4 per building), and Lot 3, comprising 12.29 acres, will contain 80 garden apartments in 5 buildings (16 units per building). The development will be serviced by public water and sewer.

Location: Located between Meetinghouse Road and Pennsylvania Route 263 (Old York Road).

Zoning: C3 Commercial Multifamily Residential District permits Use B3 Performance Standard Development by right.

Present Use: Nursery and agriculture.

COMMENTS

1. **Proposed lots**—It is unclear whether the applicant is proposing to consolidate two parcels and then subdivide into three distinct lots, requiring setbacks, buffers, etc., or if the lots are for illustrative purposes to show compliance with zoning requirements for the dwelling types.
2. **Corridor Overlay District**—We note the property is located within the Corridor Overlay District. According to Section 163-51.3 of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO), the Corridor Overlay District shall apply to all properties in Warwick Township, regardless of zoning district, depicted on the overlay district plan. These are supplemental regulations which shall apply in addition to all other applicable regulations of the zoning and subdivision and land development ordinances. The intent is to enhance the appearance, design, and function of the corridor which serves as a gateway to Bucks County and to Warwick Township, and ensure that new development reflects and enhances the visual, historic, and cultural character of the township. Standards are established for elements such as prototypical design, landscaping, parking, pedestrian circulation, lighting, and streetscape and green areas. Future plans should show compliance with the Corridor Overlay District standards.

3. **Impervious surfaces**—Future plan submissions should include maximum impervious surface requirements per lot prior to occupancy and after occupancy for the townhouses and garden apartment units, as required by Section 195-16.B(3)(k)[2][f] and [g] of the zoning ordinance. The plan shows the requirements only prior to occupancy.

4. **Traffic Impact Study**—Future plan submissions should include a traffic impact study as required by Section 195-16.B(3)(0) of the zoning ordinance to determine the impact of the proposed development on the Township's circulation system.

5. **Street standards**—The proposed streets do not meet the minimum cartway width and other street standards of the SALDO Section 163-33. It appears the streets will be private because rights-of-way are not proposed. SALDO Section 163-38.B states that driveways shall be located not less than 40 feet from any intersection. The three townhouses closest to the entrance drive do not meet this requirement. The proposed street system should be discussed and future plans should comply with the township's standards. We also recommend that future plan submissions designate snow storage areas.

6. **Street connections**—We recommend a permanent connection to Meetinghouse Road instead of an emergency access easement. This would disperse the expected trips from the 149 proposed dwellings and provide a second access for emergency vehicles. We note that if the second access is added, the layout of the parking area for the garden apartments near Meetinghouse Road would need to be revised to accommodate the through driveway. This would be necessary to improve traffic flow and safety throughout the development.

7. **Multiplex parking**—According to the off-street parking requirements of zoning ordinance Section 195-16.B(3)(m), 3 off-street parking spaces are required for 3 bedrooms or more. For the multiplex units, the plan provides 2 on-lot parking spaces and one additional space in the spillover area. In addition, we recommend revising the parking configuration to avoid the stacking of parking spaces on-lot. Zoning ordinance Section 195-79.B states that wherever possible, parking areas for residential uses shall be designed to permit each motor vehicle to proceed to and from the parking space without requiring the moving of any other motor vehicle.

8. **Spillover parking location**—We recommend that courted spillover parking areas be incorporated into the design instead of the perpendicular spaces along the accessways. For example, it appears a parking court could be provided on Lot 1 in the open space near the stormwater management area (or on other open areas throughout the site), instead of along
the accessway. This would minimize potential conflicts between vehicles backing out of the spillover spaces and vehicles traveling on the accessway, and improve pedestrian safety and convenience by allowing for a sidewalk along the accessway.

9. **Pedestrian connections**—We note that pedestrian circulation could be enhanced by extending sidewalks throughout the development instead of stopping at the townhouse and multiplex areas, and by providing a pedestrian connection to the adjacent, proposed Wawa shopping center.

10. **Open space**—Future plans should clearly show the extent of open space areas. For instance, it is unclear whether all of the area labeled as open space along the boundary of Lots 2 and 3 can be counted as open space, or if the portion on Lot 3 is common lot area for the garden apartments.

11. **DEP Stormwater management permit screening procedure**—Future plan submissions should comply with Stormwater NPDES Construction Permitting Requirements by submitting a Post-Construction Stormwater Management Plan (PCSMP) along with the NPDES application for stormwater discharges associated with construction activities. An effective PCSWP is necessary to avoid adverse impacts on receiving waters. This is most important for projects such as this one with 149 dwelling unit would significantly increase the volume of stormwater runoff.

In order to review the proposal for consistency with any water quality requirements, our office should receive a stormwater management plan for the subject site.

12. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.
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cc: Adam Benosky, P.E., Bohler Engineering  
    Dennis Glackin, Glackin Thomas Panzak  
    Daniel S. Blesnak, York Road Bladco, LP  
    John Van Luvanee, Eastburn and Gray  
    Gail Weniger, Township Manager (via email)  
    Judith A. Algeo, Esq., Chair Board of Supervisors  
    Kyle Seckinger, Township Director of Planning and Zoning (via email)  
    Mary Eberle, Esq., Grim, Biehn & Thatcher, Township Solicitor (via email)  
    Bryan McAdam, P.E., CKS Engineers, Inc., Township Engineer (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warwick Township Board of Supervisors  
Warwick Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Sketch Plan of Land Development for Guardian Academy & Indoor Range, Inc.  
TMP #51-13-10-27
Applicant: Guardian Academy & Indoor Range
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: March 9, 2015
Date Received: March 27, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a 10,420-square-foot addition to an existing building for use as a recreational facility. The plan indicates future building additions of 3,480 square feet and 1,950 square feet, for a total proposed building area of 21,281 square feet. The facility will include an indoor shooting range and training facility. The future classroom training area and future simulator training area will include a gun vault, pro shop, 21 indoor firing lanes (15 proposed, 6 future lanes), sound and bulletproof to exterior, air filtration, and ballistic construction. No exterior discharge of firearms will be permitted. The facility will be serviced by public water and sewer.

Location: This site is located within the Warwick Business Campus. The lots are situated on the southern side of Campus Drive, approximately 300 feet west of its intersection with Technical Drive.

Zoning: LI Limited Industrial District permits use H-13 Industrial Park and use D-1 Recreational Facility by right. The original subdivision of this tract was prepared under the zoning criteria for H-13 Industrial Park, which requires a minimum lot size of 1 acre, minimum lot width of 145 feet at the building line, maximum building height of 35 feet, and maximum impervious coverage ratio of 80 percent. For the proposed use D-1 Recreational Facility, the dimensional, setback, and coverage requirements of use H-13 apply, while D-1 parking requirements apply.

Present Use: Industrial.
COMMENTS

1. **Variance**—The plan states that a variance is required from the parking requirement of Section 195-16D(1)(f) of the zoning ordinance. According to the plan, 270 parking spaces are required, but 85 spaces are provided. The township planning commission should not take action on future plan submissions until this zoning issue is resolved.

2. **DEP Stormwater management permit screening procedure**—Future plan submissions should comply with Stormwater NPDES Construction Permitting Requirements by submitting a Post-Construction Stormwater Management Plan (PCSMP) along with the NPDES application for stormwater discharges associated with construction activities. An effective PCSWP is necessary to avoid adverse impacts on receiving waters.

   In order to review the proposal for consistency with any water quality requirements, our office should receive a stormwater management plan for the subject site.

3. **Traffic Impact Study**—Future plan submissions should include a traffic impact study. Section 163-17.A of the subdivision and land development ordinance states that a transportation impact study shall be required for all nonresidential subdivisions and land developments.

4. **Parking**—Section 163-39.D of the subdivision and land development ordinance states that rows of parking shall not exceed 12 spaces. Future plans should revise the parking layout to comply with this requirement, because the plan proposes rows of 13, 14, and 15 parking spaces.

5. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

   This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

   In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

REM:dwb

cc: Gregory R. Glitzer, P.E., Gilmore & Associates
    Edward F. Murphy, Esq., Wisler Pearlstine, LLP
    Judith A. Algeo, Esq., Chair Board of Supervisors
    Gail Weniger, Township Manager (via email)
    Kyle Seckinger, Township Director of Planning and Zoning (via email)
    Mary Eberle, Esq., Grim, Biehn & Thatcher, Township Solicitor (via email)
    Brian McAdam, P.E., CKS Engineers, Inc., Township Engineer (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: West Rockhill Township Board of Supervisors
   West Rockhill Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Penn Valley Gas
   TMPs: #52-17-26
   Applicant: Penn Valley Gas
   Owner: Balmer Farms LTD Partnership
   Plan Dated: March 13, 2015
   Date Received: March 17, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: To construct two new storage buildings, expand an existing garage/office building, and expand existing stone parking areas on a 35.739-acre site. The new buildings and additions to existing buildings would have a combined square footage of 25,690 square feet, and the new stone parking areas a total of 52,100 square feet. The site is served by on-lot wells and sewage disposal systems.

Location: The site is located at the northwestern corner of the intersection of Township Line Road and Meetinghouse Road.

Zoning: PI – Planned Industrial District permits Farming/Agriculture and Fuel Storage and Distribution on a minimum site area of 5 acres.

Present Use: Farming/Agriculture and Fuel Storage

COMMENTS

1. **Waivers requested**—The plan indicates that the following waivers will be requested from the requirements of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO):
Section 403.2.A Requiring that the preliminary plan be at a scale of not more than 50 feet to the inch
Section 403.9.R Requiring that a lighting plan showing parking area lighting, driveway lampposts and street light fixtures be provided
Section 403.12.B Requiring that a Traffic Impact Study be provided
Section 403.12.F Requiring a wetland delineation report
Section 505.13 Requiring that drainage improvements be made to existing streets
Section 506.2 Requiring that a 52-foot right-of-way be provided along the frontage of the development parcel for local access roads
Section 506.4 Requiring that local access roads have a minimum paved cartway width of 28 feet
Section 513 Requiring the installation of curbs along existing streets
Section 514 Requiring the installation of sidewalks or bicycle/pedestrian paths along both sides of existing streets
Section 515.1 Requiring that street trees be planted along existing streets
Section 515.2 Requiring landscaping of off-street parking facilities
Section 517.2 Requiring a maximum slope of no greater than four horizontal feet to one vertical foot for areas where the vertical drop of an excavation is greater than five feet
Section 523.3H Requiring that all non-residential parking facilities be paved
Section 523.5 Requiring planting strips for non-residential parking lots
Section 526.2 Requiring that a lighting plan be prepared

The plan also indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the requirements of Ordinance No. 209, West Rockhill Township Stormwater Management Ordinance.

Section 308.N.4 Requiring a maximum basin depth of 24 inches for a 2-year or 10-year storm event, and 36 inches for a 100-year storm event
Section 308.N.7.C Requiring perimeter plantings around detention/retention basins
Section 309.C Requiring the consideration that the entire set, consisting of existing impervious surfaces and undeveloped land, be considered as meadow in good condition

In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based and the minimum modification necessary.

2. Plan information

a. Editorial—The word valley is spelled incorrectly in the plan name on all pages and in the title on the cover page.
b. **Incorrect citation**—The plan indicates that the applicant is requesting a waiver from section 403.9.R of the subdivision and land development ordinance requiring a lighting plan. The correct citation is 403.9.E.

3. **Septic tank location**—The plan as proposed shows the existing septic tank and septic drain field located to the southwest corner of the existing one-story metal garage and office building. Although the septic tank location and drain line are shown to be approximately 25 feet from the construction of the new stone parking lot on the west side of this building, the township may want to consider requiring temporary construction fencing in this area to protect the existing septic system.

4. **Landscaping**—The plan indicates that 16 existing evergreen trees located on the northeast side of the fuel storage area will be relocated. Section 515.6.C of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that if any plant material is to be moved, it must be done in accordance with specifications set forth by the American Association of Nurserymen. A note to this effect should be added to Sheet 6. Additionally, the plan should identify how these trees to be transplanted will be stored and protected until their replanting.

5. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailing to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

PWG:dbw

cc: Penn Valley Gas, Inc.
Cynthia Smith, Horizon Engineering, Applicant’s Engineer
Greg Lippincott, Township Manager (via email)
Richard C. Schnaedter, Hilltown Township Manager (Adjacent Township)
MEMORANDUM

TO: West Rockhill Township Board of Supervisors  
   West Rockhill Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Carillon Hill II  
   TMPs: #52-17-64, 52-17-65 and 52-17-68  
   Applicant: Cooper Acquisitions, L.P.  
   Owners: Estate of Walter Senkow  
   Plan Dated: February 26, 2015  
   Date Received: March 11, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: To subdivide a 10.032-acre (gross) parcel into 22 lots. The 22 lots will range in size from 5,850 square feet to 8,655 square feet. Twin dwelling units are proposed to be built on each lot. The existing buildings on the site will be removed. Public water and sewerage systems are proposed.

Location: The site is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of South Main Street (Route 152/Bethlehem Pike and Branch Road/Township Road.

Zoning: SR – Suburban Residential District, which permits twin dwellings on 5,000-square-foot lots when developed as a performance standard subdivision.

Present Use: Residential

COMMENTS

1. **Waivers**—The plan indicates that the following waivers will be requested from the requirements of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO):

   Section 403.4    Requiring existing features within 100 feet of the tract boundary be shown
Section 512.2.F  Requiring shared driveways serve no more than two single-family dwellings

Section 517.2  Requiring a maximum slope of no more than four horizontal to one vertical feet, where the vertical drop of an excavation or fill slope is greater than five feet

The plan also indicates that the applicant is requesting a waiver from the requirements of Ordinance No. 138, West Rockhill Township Stormwater Management Ordinance:

Section 304.J.3  Requiring a detention basin bottom slope of at least two percent

Relative to the waivers being requested, the following should be noted:

- As the proposed shared driveway serving Lots 1 and 2 only serves two dwelling units, thereby being in compliance with the ordinance requirements, the township should determine if this waiver is needed.
- Specific to the waiver requirement from the Ordinance No. 138, West Rockhill Township Stormwater Management Ordinance, it should be noted that this is an outdated ordinance and was replaced by Ordinance No. 209 which is now the official West Rockhill Township Stormwater Management Ordinance. The applicant should review this ordinance to determine if a waiver request is still needed.

In addition to the waiver requests, the Landscape Compliance Chart located on Sheet 7, Landscape Plan, indicates that a waiver would be needed relative to the spacing requirements for the street trees due to utility conflicts. This waiver request is not noted on Sheet 1 along with the other waiver requests. The township should determine if this waiver request is needed.

In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based and the minimum modification necessary.

2. **Excavation and grading**—Section 517.3 of the subdivision and land development ordinance specifies that the top or bottom edges of slopes shall be a minimum of five (5) feet from property lines. The plan as presented shows the slopes cutting across the lot.

The applicant has requested a waiver from Section 517.2 relative to the maximum slope allowed. As proposed, the applicant is proposing a maximum slope of three horizontal feet to one vertical foot, representing a 33 percent slope versus the ordinance requirement of four horizontal feet to one horizontal foot, representing a 25 percent slope. If the township approves this waiver request, we encourage a thorough review of the stormwater management plans and erosion and sedimentation control plans to ensure that stormwater runoff and the potential for erosion are addressed.

3. **Shared driveway**—We commend the applicant’s proposal to use a shared driveway for access to Lots 1 and 2 as it reduces the number of access points along the road, and reduces the extent of impervious surface. It is recommended that the plan include a maintenance
agreement so all property owners taking access from the shared driveway are aware of the financial responsibilities in the event that the driveway needs to be repaired or replaced.

4. **Road closure**—The plan shows that Carillon Hill Road will be closed and a portion of the road area will be incorporated in the site area for the proposed development. The applicant should provide proof that the township has approved the street vacation.

5. **Sidewalks**—We commend the applicant for providing sidewalks along the street frontage of Branch Road/Tower Road as required by Section 514.1 of the subdivision and land development ordinance. Additionally, we recognize that Carillon Hill Road is to be abandoned and physical constraints such as steep slopes along the right-of-way for South Main Street limit the ability to provide a sidewalk in this area. However, as the applicant is also the developer of the adjacent parcel located to the north in Sellersville Borough (TMP 39-7-82), we would encourage the applicant to provide some pedestrian connection between the two developments to provide access to the sidewalk network in place beginning on the north side of the entrance drive for the Sellersville development. Providing pedestrian connections to this area will allow residents of the new development to walk into the Sellersville commercial district and also enable children in the proposed development to walk to Sellersville Elementary School.

6. **Landscaping**

   a. **Plant materials**—The applicant has provided the required landscaping around the basin as required by Section 308.N.7.c of Ordinance No. 209, West Rockhill Township stormwater management ordinance and in the buffer areas as required by Section 1704.D.1 of the subdivision and land development ordinance. Although these ordinance sections specify the types and sizes of plant material to be provided, they are not specific relative to the plant materials to be used. However, Section 515.1 of the subdivision and land development ordinance does provide a list of plant materials that may be utilized for landscaping required by the subdivision and land development ordinance. Similarly, zoning ordinance Section 1704.A.10 specifies that plan materials suitable for buffer areas are listed in Article V of the subdivision and land development ordinance. The following plant materials are proposed on the plan but are not listed on the list of approved plant materials. We believe all of these plants are suitable and have no known issues.

   *Quercus bicolor* (Swamp White Oak)
   *Abies concolor* (White Fir)
   *Chamaecyparis thyoides* (Atlantic White Cedar)
   *Ilex glabra* ‘Shamrock’ (Shamrock Inkberry Holly)
   *Rhododendron maximum* ‘Rosebay’ (Rosebay Rhododendron)
   *Aronia arbutifolia* ‘Brilliantissima’ (Red Chokeberry)
   *Clethra alnifolia* (Summersweet Clethra)
   *Cornus sericea* (Red Osier Dogwood)
   *Itea virginica* ‘Herny’s Garnet’ (Garnet Sweetspire)
   *Lindera benzoin* (Spicebush)
   *Vaccinium corymbosum* (Highbush Blueberry)
We encourage the township to review the proposed plant materials and determine if they wish to have the applicant change them to be in compliance with the list of approved plant materials in the subdivision and land development ordinance.

b. **Buffer areas**—Section 1704.D.1 of the subdivision and land development ordinance specifies minimum sizes in terms of height and caliper that buffer planting materials should have. The landscape schedule on Sheet 7 of the plan indicates that many of the sizes shown for ornamental trees and shrubs are not in compliance with ordinance requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Type</th>
<th>Ordinance Requirement</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evergreens</td>
<td>6 - 7’ in height</td>
<td>6 - 7’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade Trees</td>
<td>3 – 3 ½” caliper</td>
<td>2 ½ - 3” caliper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornamental Flowering Trees</td>
<td>8 – 10’ in height</td>
<td>8 – 10’ in height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ½” caliper</td>
<td>2 - 2 ½” caliper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrubs</td>
<td>48” height</td>
<td>36 – 48” height</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We encourage the township to review the sizes of the proposed plant materials and determine if they wish to have the applicant change it to be compliance with the size requirements specified in Section 1704.D.1 of the stormwater management ordinance.

c. **Proposed tree cultivar**—We recommend replacing *Zelkova serrata* ‘Green Vase’ with another *Zelkova* cultivar, such as ‘Village Green’ or ‘Halka’, which are superior for form and long term branch strength. ‘Green Vase’ has the weakest branch angle/attachments and is the most susceptible to wind damage. These problems will develop as the trees mature, leaving homeowners with the responsibility and cost of tree removal and replacement.

7. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

PWG:dwb
cc:  Cooper Acquisitions, L.P.
     R.E. Klos, Jr., P.E., Bohler Engineering, Applicant’s Engineer
     Steven Baluh, C. Robert Wynn Associates, Inc., Municipal Engineer
     Greg Lippencott, Township Manager (via email)
     David Rivet, Sellersville Borough Manager (Adjacent municipality)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Yardley Borough Council
    Yardley Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Lot Line Change for Grist Mill Properties and Ravi and Jennifer Rajan
    TMP #54-3-148-1

Applicant: Grist Mill Properties and Ravi and Jennifer Rajan
Owner: Ravi and Jennifer Rajan
Plan Dated: January 26, 2015
Date Received: April 14, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which
prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code
(Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Convey 13,177 square feet (Parcel A) from TMP #54-3-148-1 (Lot 2) consisting of 94,087
square feet, and convey it to adjacent TMP #54-3-147 (Lot 1) consisting of 57,589 square feet. As
a result of this conveyance, Lot 1 and Lot 2 will be 70,766 and 80,910 square feet, respectively. Parcel A is situated primarily along the existing fence line and contains an existing ingress-egress and parking easement and facilities associated with the commercial/office use located on TMP #54-3-147. No improvements to either property are proposed at this time.

Location: North side of N. Main Street, approximately 300 feet west of Afton Avenue. Brock Creek flows to the rear of the property.

Zoning: Parcel A is situated in the R-1 Low-Density Residential District which permits a minimum lot area of 17,500 square feet per unit and a lot width of 100 feet at the building setback line. A maximum impervious surface ratio of 20 percent and a density of 2 dwelling units per acre are allowed.

Present Use: Residential; a single-family detached dwelling, carriage house and road access and parking associated with the commercial/office use located on TMP #54-3-147 are located on the property.
COMMENTS

1. **Zoning boundary**—The proposed lot line change will create a split zoning situation for TMP #54-3-147. Parcel A (the area to be conveyed to TMP #54-3-147) is currently zoned R-1 Residential and TMP #54-3-147 is zoned C-1 Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial. In general, it is not recommended to create split zoned properties or create nonconforming land uses. Since the underlying parking use on Parcel A is currently nonconforming in the R-1 district, there may be some benefit for Borough officials to consider a zoning change from R-1 to C-1 for Parcel A. Rezoning the new lot entirely to C-1 may also help avoid potential split zoning issues that may arise in the future.

2. **Plan information**—The front yard setback and impervious surface ratio on Lot 2 is an existing nonconformity and should be noted on the zoning table as such. In addition, although it appears Lot 2 complies with the density and open space requirements, the data should be calculated and shown on the zoning table rather than shown as N/A.

3. **Side lot line**—The proposed side lot line primarily follows the existing fence and creates a somewhat irregular side yard. Subdivision ordinance Section 513(e) states that side lot lines shall be substantially at right angles or radial to street lines. Since no waiver has been requested from this subdivision ordinance requirements, the plan should be revised accordingly.

4. **Deed of consolidation**—Borough officials should request a copy of the new deed incorporating Parcel A into adjoining TMP #54-3-147 as a condition of plan approval to ensure that a separate, substandard lot is not created.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the May 6, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

CIG:dwb

cc:  Tom Cramer, Grist Mill Properties  
     Ravi and Jennifer Rajan  
     Donald Rife, PLS  
     Don Marshall, Esq., Stuckert and Yates  
     James Majewski, P.E., Remington Vernick & Beach Engineers, Borough Engineer  
     Michael Mueller, Borough Zoning Officer (via email)  
     John Boyle, Borough Manager (via email)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number(s)</th>
<th>PaDEP Code Number</th>
<th>Plan Review Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northampton Township</td>
<td>Jake's Eatery</td>
<td></td>
<td>31-15-145</td>
<td>1-09937-403-3J</td>
<td>20080-0208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeton Township</td>
<td>Gerhardt</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-10-5</td>
<td>1-09916-059-3S</td>
<td>20080-0211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bensalem Township</td>
<td>Home Depot Plaza</td>
<td>11428-A</td>
<td>2-30-9</td>
<td>1-09004-351-3J</td>
<td>20080-0213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 22, 2015

Theresa Holmes, Project Engineer
Langan Engineering and Environmental Services
30 South 17th Street
Suite 1300
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4005

RE: Home Depot Plaza Expansion Planning Module
PaDEP Code # 1-09004-351-3J
BCPC #11428-A
Bensalem Township, Bucks County

Dear Ms. Holmes:

We have received a copy of the planning module\(^1\) concerning the proposal to construct a retail and restaurant building, totaling 25,050 square feet, on a 29.27-acre site. Wastewater flows will increase by 2,300 gallons per day (GPD) from the current 11,776 GPD and will be collected and conveyed to the Northeast Philadelphia Water Pollution Control Plant via the Poquessing Interceptor.

The proposed revision is consistent with the Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Sewerage Facilities Plan, 1970, as the proposal is within a public sewerage area. The project has been approved by Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (Pa DEP) as an addition to the Connection Management Plan in accordance with the Consent Order and Agreement with Pa DEP for the Poquessing Interceptor. The Philadelphia Water Department has certified that waste loads from this proposed development will not create a hydraulic or organic overload or a five-year projected overload that is inconsistent with the City’s approved Corrective Action Plan, Connection Management Plan, and Combined Sewer Overflow Plan. The Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority (BCSWA) has also certified that there is collection and conveyance capacity and the additional waste load will not create a hydraulic or five-year projected overload in the Bensalem Township sanitary sewer system.

If the municipality approves the planning module and thereby revises the official sewage facilities plan, the completed (signed) resolution and required supporting data (Components 3 and 4; transmittal letter; plans; narrative; copies of the BCPC and BCDH review letters) should be sent to Elizabeth

---
\(^1\) Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection’s (PaDEP) Title 25, Rules and Regulations, the planning module is a revision to the Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Sewerage Facilities Plan, 1970. Therefore, the Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) and the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH) are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.
Theresa Holmes, Project Engineer  
April 21, 2015  
Page 2

Mahoney, Sewage Planning Supervisor, Wastewater Management Planning, Pa DEP, Southeast Regional Office, 2 East Main Street, Norristown, PA 19401.

Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Roddig  
Planner

MAR:dwb

cc:   Eric Ponert, Philadelphia Water Department  
      Genevie Kostick, BCDH  
      Ron Gans, P.E., O'Donnell & Naccarato  
      Loretta Alston, Bensalem Township Department of Building and Planning  
      Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP  
      Act 537 file
**SEWAGE FACILITIES PLANNING MODULE**
**COMPONENT 4B - COUNTY PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW**
(or Planning Agency with Areawide Jurisdiction)

**Note to Project Sponsor:** To expedite the review of your proposal, one copy of your completed planning package and one copy of this Planning Agency Review Component should be sent to the existing county planning agency or planning agency with areawide jurisdiction for their comments.

### SECTION A. PROJECT NAME (See Section A of instructions)

Project Name  
Home Depot Plaza Expansion

### SECTION B. REVIEW SCHEDULE (See Section B of instructions)

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. **April 6, 2015**
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   - Agency name
3. Date review completed by agency **April 21, 2015**

### SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (See Section C of instructions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Is there a county or areawide comprehensive plan adopted under the Municipalities Planning Code (53 P.S. 10101 et seq.)?
   - If no, describe goals and objectives that are not met

2. Is this proposal consistent with the comprehensive plan for land use?

3. Does this proposal meet the goals and objectives of the plan?
   - If no, describe inconsistency

4. Is this proposal consistent with the use, development, and protection of water resources?
   - If no, describe inconsistency

5. Is this proposal consistent with the county or areawide comprehensive land use planning relative to Prime Agricultural Land Preservation?
   - If no, describe inconsistencies:

6. Does this project propose encroachments, obstructions, or dams that will affect wetlands?
   - If yes, describe impact

7. Will any known historical or archeological resources be impacted by this project?
   - If yes, describe impacts

8. Will any known endangered or threatened species of plant or animal be impacted by the development project?

9. Is there a county or areawide zoning ordinance?

10. Does this proposal meet the zoning requirements of the ordinance? **N/A**
    - If no, describe inconsistencies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Have all applicable zoning approvals been obtained? <strong>N/A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Is there a county or areawide subdivision and land development ordinance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Does this proposal meet the requirements of the ordinance? <strong>N/A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe which requirements are not met ________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14. Is this proposal consistent with the municipal Act 537 Official Sewage Facilities Plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistency ________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15. Are there any wastewater disposal needs in the area adjacent to this proposal that should be considered by the municipality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, describe ________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16. Has a waiver of the sewage facilities planning requirements been requested for the residual tract of this subdivision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, is the proposed waiver consistent with applicable ordinances. <strong>N/A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe the inconsistencies ____________________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17. Does the county have a stormwater management plan as required by the Stormwater Management Act?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, will this project plan require the implementation of storm water management measures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18. Name, Title and signature of person completing this section:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name: Michael Roedig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Title: Community Planner Signature: ___________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date: April 21, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name of County or Areawide Planning Agency: Bucks County Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Address: 1260 Aimshouse Road, Doylestown, PA 19001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone Number: 215-345-3400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION D. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (See Section D of instructions)

This Component does not limit county planning agencies from making additional comments concerning the relevancy of the proposed plan to other plans or ordinances. If additional comments are needed, attach additional sheets.

The county planning agency must complete this Component within 60 days.
This Component and any additional comments are to be returned to the applicant.
April 7, 2015

Jessi Kile, Technical Administrator  
Urwiler & Walter, Inc.  
3162 Main Street  
P.O. Box 269  
Sumneytown, PA 18084-0269

RE: Gregory Gerhardt Small Flow Treatment Facility - Planning Module  
PaDEP Code #1-09916-059-3S  
TMP #3-10-5  
Bridgeton Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Ms. Kile:

We have received a copy of the subject planning module¹ for the construction of a small flow treatment facility to serve a new single-family detached dwelling and existing single-family dwelling in Bridgeton Township. According to the Project Narrative, the existing dwelling has an on-lot septic system which is currently working but was built prior to permit requirements and is therefore undocumented. The Bucks County Health Department has requested and required that this dwelling be connected to the proposed treatment plant when the new dwelling is constructed. The proposed effluent discharge point for this system will be to an unnamed tributary of Swamp Creek.

The Palisades Wastewater Facilities Plan (1980) is the official Act 537 sewage facilities plan for Bridgeton Township. The proposal is inconsistent with the official Act 537 Plan since the policies and priorities of the plan emphasize continued reliance on individual and community subsurface and spray irrigation. However, according to the Alternatives Analysis, Robert Diegel, Bucks County Health Department SEO, visited the site and found no soils suitable for subsurface disposal system. The use of a spray irrigation system and micro drip or A/B system were also found unsuitable due to the absence of suitable soils. Connection to a municipal sewage facility was eliminated as a viable alternative since there is no municipal sewer service in proximity to the site.

Although the proliferation of stream discharge systems is not desirable from a stream water quality and groundwater recharge perspective, it would appear from the information submitted that, due to the soil conditions, limitation regarding subsurface disposal and spray irrigation, and the unavailability

¹ Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection’s (PaDEP) Title 25, Rules and Regulations, the subject planning module is a revision to the Bridgeton Township Wastewater Facilities Plan. Therefore, the Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) and the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH) are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.

Visit us at: www.buckscounty.org
of public sewers, the proposed stream discharge would be the most reasonable wastewater alternative. Township officials may wish to solicit comments from its municipal engineer as to the adequacy of the submitted alternative analysis to ensure the proposed small flow treatment facility is consistent with the intent of PaDEP’s Rules and Regulations.

The proper long-range operation and maintenance (O & M) of any stream discharge facility is always of utmost concern. Plans for system operation and maintenance should be outlined and submitted to the township. Township officials should consider requiring the property owner to obtain a service contract with either an equipment manufacture supplier or a wastewater contract O & M company to ensure proper continuous operation and maintenance of the treatment facility. The property owner should also be provided with educational material explaining the system O & M requirements.

We note that the plan submitted for our review does not show the connection of the existing house to the proposed treatment plant for the new house. We recommend that this information be shown on the plan.

If the municipality approves the planning module and thereby revises the official sewage facilities plan, the completed (signed) resolution and required supporting data (Components 2 and 4; transmittal letter; plans; narrative; copies of the BCPC and BCDH review letters) should be sent to Elizabeth Mahoney, Sewage Planning Supervisor, Wastewater Management Planning, PaDEP, 2 East Main Street Norristown, PA 19401.

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Timothy A. Koehler
Director of Planning Services

TAK:dwb

Attachment

cc: Genevie Kostick, Bucks County Health Department
Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
C. Robert Wynn Associates, Inc., Township Engineer
Gard Holby, Chairman, Bridgeton Township Board of Supervisors
Act 537 File
SEWAGE FACILITIES PLANNING MODULE
COMPONENT 4B - COUNTY PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW
(or Planning Agency with Areawide Jurisdiction)

Note to Project Sponsor: To expedite the review of your proposal, one copy of your completed planning package and one copy of this Planning Agency Review Component should be sent to the existing county planning agency or planning agency with areawide jurisdiction for their comments.

SECTION A. PROJECT NAME (See Section A of instructions)

Project Name
Gregory Gerhardt - TMP #3-10-5 - Bridgeton Township

SECTION B. REVIEW SCHEDULE (See Section B of instructions)

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. March 12, 2015 with revisions March 23, 2015
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   Agency name: Bucks County Planning Commission
3. Date review completed by agency April 7, 2015

SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (See Section C of instructions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Is there a county or areawide comprehensive plan adopted under the Municipalities Planning Code (53 P.S. 10101 et seq.)?

2. Is this proposal consistent with the comprehensive plan for land use?

3. Does this proposal meet the goals and objectives of the plan?
   If no, describe goals and objectives that are not met

4. Is this proposal consistent with the use, development, and protection of water resources?
   If no, describe inconsistency

5. Is this proposal consistent with the county or areawide comprehensive land use planning relative to Prime Agricultural Land Preservation?
   If no, describe inconsistencies:

6. Does this project propose encroachments, obstructions, or dams that will affect wetlands?
   If yes, describe impact

7. Will any known historical or archeological resources be impacted by this project?
   If yes, describe impacts

8. Will any known endangered or threatened species of plant or animal be impacted by the development project?

9. Is there a county or areawide zoning ordinance?

10. Does this proposal meet the zoning requirements of the ordinance?
    If no, describe inconsistencies N/A
SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (continued)

☐ ☐ 11. Have all applicable zoning approvals been obtained? N/A

☐ ☒ 12. Is there a county or areawide subdivision and land development ordinance?

☐ ☐ 13. Does this proposal meet the requirements of the ordinance? N/A

If no, describe which requirements are not met

☐ ☒ 14. Is this proposal consistent with the municipal Act 537 Official Sewage Facilities Plan?

If no, describe inconsistency see cover letter

☐ ☒ 15. Are there any wastewater disposal needs in the area adjacent to this proposal that should be considered by the municipality?

If yes, describe

☐ ☒ 16. Has a waiver of the sewage facilities planning requirements been requested for the residual tract of this subdivision?

☐ ☐ 17. Does the county have a stormwater management plan as required by the Stormwater Management Act?

☐ ☒ If yes, will this project plan require the implementation of storm water management measures?

☐ ☒ 18. Name, Title and signature of person completing this section:

Name: Timothy A. Koehler

Title: Director of Planning Services

Signature: [Signature]

Date: April 7, 2015

Name of County or Areawide Planning Agency: Bucks County Planning Commission

Address: The Almshouse, 1260 Almshouse Road, Doylestown, PA 18901

Telephone Number: 215 345-3400

SECTION D. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (See Section D of instructions)

This Component does not limit county planning agencies from making additional comments concerning the relevancy of the proposed plan to other plans or ordinances. If additional comments are needed, attach additional sheets.

The county planning agency must complete this Component within 60 days.

This Component and any additional comments are to be returned to the applicant.
April 23, 2015

Stephen McGill  
Munz Construction  
201 Buck Road  
Holland, PA 18966

RE:   Jake’s Eatery  
PaDEP Code # 1-09937-403-3J  
TMP #31-15-145  
Northampton Township, Bucks County

Dear Mr. McGill:

We have received a copy of the planning module concerning the proposal to repurpose the use of a vacant strip mall unit from commercial retail store into a bar. Wastewater flows (1,360 gallons per day) will flow by public sewerage through the Northampton, Bucks County, Municipal Authority’s collection system, through the Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority (BCWSA) system, and to the Philadelphia Water Department’s (PWD) Northeast Philadelphia Water Pollution Control Plant via the Neshaminy Interceptor.

The proposed revision is consistent with the Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Sewerage Facilities Plan, 1970, as the proposal is within a public sewerage area and flows will be conveyed to the Northeast Philadelphia Water Pollution Control Plant.

The PWD certifies there is adequate capacity within the City of Philadelphia’s conveyance and treatment facilities to receive and treat the sewage flows from this change of use. The waste load will not create a hydraulic or organic overload or a five-year protected overload that is inconsistent with the City’s approved Combined Sewer Overflow Plan. The project is included in the BCWSA Neshaminy Interceptor Corrective Action Plan and Connection Management Plan with flow increase in 2015.

If the municipality approves the planning module and thereby revises the official sewage facilities plan, the completed (signed) resolution and required supporting data (Components 3 and 4; transmittal letter; plans; narrative; copies of the BCPC and BCDH review letters) should be sent to Elizabeth

---

1 Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection’s (PaDEP) Title 25, Rules and Regulations, the planning module is a revision to the Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Sewerage Facilities Plan, 1970. Therefore, the Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) and the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH) are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.
Mahoney, Sewage Planning Supervisor, Wastewater Management Planning, Pa DEP, Southeast Regional Office, 2 East Main Street, Norristown, PA 19401.

Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Roedig
Planner

cc: Eric Ponert, Philadelphia Water Department
Genevie Kostick, Bucks County Health Department
CKS Engineers, Inc.
Mike Solomon, Northampton Township, Director of Planning and Zoning
Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
Act 537 file
SEWAGE FACILITIES PLANNING MODULE
COMPONENT 4B - COUNTY PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW
(or Planning Agency with Areawide Jurisdiction)

Note to Project Sponsor: To expedite the review of your proposal, one copy of your completed planning package and one copy of this Planning Agency Review Component should be sent to the existing county planning agency or planning agency with areawide jurisdiction for their comments.

SECTION A. PROJECT NAME (See Section A of instructions)

Project Name
Jake’s Eatery

SECTION B. REVIEW SCHEDULE (See Section B of instructions)

1. Date plan received by county planning agency.  April 22, 2015
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   Agency name ____________________________
3. Date review completed by agency  April 23, 2015

SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (See Section C of instructions)

Yes  No
☐  ☐  1. Is there a county or areawide comprehensive plan adopted under the Municipalities Planning Code (53 P.S. 10101 et seq.)?
☐  ☐  2. Is this proposal consistent with the comprehensive plan for land use?
☒  ☐  3. Does this proposal meet the goals and objectives of the plan?
   If no, describe goals and objectives that are not met ____________________________
☒  ☐  4. Is this proposal consistent with the use, development, and protection of water resources?
   If no, describe inconsistency ____________________________
☐  ☐  5. Is this proposal consistent with the county or areawide comprehensive land use planning relative to Prime Agricultural Land Preservation?
   If no, describe inconsistencies: ____________________________
☐  ☐  6. Does this project propose encroachments, obstructions, or dams that will affect wetlands?
   If yes, describe impact ____________________________
☐  ☐  7. Will any known historical or archeological resources be impacted by this project?
   If yes, describe impacts ____________________________
☐  ☐  8. Will any known endangered or threatened species of plant or animal be impacted by the development project?
☐  ☐  9. Is there a county or areawide zoning ordinance?
☐  ☐  10. Does this proposal meet the zoning requirements of the ordinance?  N/A
   If no, describe inconsistencies ____________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th><strong>SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW</strong> (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>11. Have all applicable zoning approvals been obtained? <strong>N/A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>12. Is there a county or areawide subdivision and land development ordinance?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ☐   | ☐  | 13. Does this proposal meet the requirements of the ordinance? **N/A**  
If no, describe which requirements are not met |
| ☒   | ☐  | 14. Is this proposal consistent with the municipal Act 537 Official Sewage Facilities Plan?  
If no, describe inconsistency |
| ☐   | ☒  | 15. Are there any wastewater disposal needs in the area adjacent to this proposal that should be considered by the municipality?  
If yes, describe |
| ☐   | ☒  | 16. Has a waiver of the sewage facilities planning requirements been requested for the residual tract of this subdivision?  
If yes, is the proposed waiver consistent with applicable ordinances. **N/A**  
If no, describe the inconsistencies |
| ☐   | ☒  | 17. Does the county have a stormwater management plan as required by the Stormwater Management Act?  
If yes, will this project plan require the implementation of storm water management measures? |

18. **Name, Title and signature of person completing this section:**  
**Name:** Michael Roedig  
**Title:** Planner  
**Signature:** [Signature]  
**Date:** April 23, 2015  
**Name of County or Areawide Planning Agency:** Bucks County Planning Commission  
**Address:** 1260 Almshouse Road  
**Telephone Number:** 215-345-3400

**SECTION D. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS** (See Section D of instructions)  
This Component does not limit county planning agencies from making additional comments concerning the relevancy of the proposed plan to other plans or ordinances. If additional comments are needed, attach additional sheets.  
The county planning agency must complete this Component within 60 days.  
This Component and any additional comments are to be returned to the applicant.
BUCKS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING

Wednesday, June 3, 2015
2:00 P.M.

Robert H. Grunmeier Room
1260 Almshouse Road
Doylestown, PA 18901

AGENDA

• Call to Order

• Pledge of Allegiance

• Approval of Minutes of May 6, 2015

• Executive Director’s Report

• Presentation: Overview of County Economic Development Programs and Progress
  – Margie McKevitt, Coordinator of Economic Development and Planning Services

• Act 247 Reviews

• Old Business
  ▪ BCPC Board Meeting – Justice Center

• New Business

• Public Comment

• Adjournment

Please remember to contact us at 215-345-3400 if you cannot attend. Thank you.

AGENDA SUBJECT TO CHANGE PRIOR TO MEETING
BUCKS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
May 6, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: Joseph A. Cullen; James J. Dowling; Raymond (Skip) W. Goodnoe; Edward Kisselback, Jr.; David R. Nyman; Robert M. Pellegrino; Carol A. Pierce; Evan J. Stone; Walter S. Wydro

STAFF PRESENT: Charles T. McIlhinney; Lynn T. Bush; Timothy A. Koehler; Richard G. Braehler; Donna W. Byers; Paul W. Gordon; David A. Sebastian; Maureen Wheatley; David C. Zipf

GUESTS: Larry Menkes, Warminster Resident

1. CALL TO ORDER
   Mr. Wydro called the meeting to order at 2:05 PM.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
   All rose for the pledge of allegiance.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF APRIL 1, 2015
   Upon motion of Mr. Nyman, seconded by Mr. Stone, with the vote being 8-1 the motion carried to approve the minutes of the April 1, 2015 meeting as presented. Mr. Dowling abstained as he was not present.

4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT
   Ms. Bush reported that she met with the owner of the Pennridge Airport located in East Rockhill Township, to explore its future use as an airport and possible funding options through the economic development program.

   Ms. Bush met with Penndel Borough and will be talking with them in June to discuss future guidance under the Municipal Economic Development Initiative.

   The County assisted with two e-waste collection events this year that were sponsored by other groups. The most recent event was held at the Lower Makefield Corporate Center. Ms. Bush reported that Bucks County provided labor with volunteers from Adult Probation and other sources. She said this may be the last electronics event in 2015.

   Ms. Bush reported that planning staff attended a training session on relationships between condominium/homeowners’ associations and planned communities.

   Ms. Bush said a traffic consultant for the Cross Keys area study has been engaged. She added that the Biotechnology Center recently received federal funds to expand their facility. There is also the potential for a convenience store that would utilize vacant properties in the study area. Mr. Nyman said a TMA meeting was held at the Biotechnology Center and the TMA seemed very interested
in supporting the study. Ms. Bush said when the traffic information is received, she will include TMA at the next meeting.

The Intelligencer/Courier Editorial Board contacted Ms. Bush to meet with their board in early April. Ms. Bush provided the Editorial Board with an overview of Planning Commission responsibilities.

The Commissioners approved the BCPC to hire an administrative Assistant who will come on board on May 18th. Ms. Bush acknowledged Ms. Byers and Mr. Sager for doing a super job carrying a heavy workload over the past several months.

Mr. Brahler reported that things are moving forward with the Upper Bucks Rail Trail. He stated the Request for Proposal (RFP) for design services was downloaded by more than 100 vendors. Mr. Brahler said he expects the RFP to close at the end of the month at which time a recommendation will be made to the commissioners. He also said the Upper Southampton Township Board of Supervisors passed a resolution in support of the Newtown Rail Trail. Efforts are being explored to secure a lease from SEPTA and funding from the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission.

Mr. Wydro asked Ms. Bush if there was anything interesting to report on from the Commissioners’ meeting. Ms. Bush said there were no matters associated with the BCPC, however, Commissioners approved asking legislators to support using Act 13 Marcellus Shale funds for lower to moderate income housing projects.

Ms. Bush followed up with off-site board meeting locations. She is awaiting confirmation from the President Judge as to when the board can hold their meeting at the Justice Center. At Mr. Wydro’s suggestion, Ms. Bush will look into holding meetings in municipalities for which BCPC has prepared comprehensive plans.

_Staff Report Highlights:_
Mr. Koehler reported that the BCPC will be meeting with the West Rockhill Township Planning Commission on the plan for the Almont Village Master Plan which will be a subject presentation at a future BCPC board meeting.

Mr. Wydro polled the board for questions.

5. **PowerPoint Presentation: Warminster Township Transit Oriented Development – David Zipf, Planner**
Mr. Zipf gave a PowerPoint presentation on The Station at Bucks County Transit-Oriented Development (TOD). Highlights of Mr. Zipf’s presentation included the following proposed plans:

- The preliminary plan of land development for SEPTA Train Station that proposes a new parking lot and a portion of an access drive serving the SEPTA Warminster train station on a 10.264-acre parcel.
- The preliminary/final plan of land development for Jacksonville Plaza that proposes to construct a driveway across a portion of the 1.367-acre commercial site to connect the
Warminster SEPTA station parking lots with Jacksonville Road. In addition, a proposed access drive to The Station at Bucks County West would connect into the proposed driveway, and an existing bus shelter will be relocated along the site’s Jacksonville Road frontage.

- The preliminary plan of land development for The Station at Bucks County East that proposes to construct a TOD consisting of 151 multifamily dwellings within 8 buildings, a 3,600-square-foot clubhouse and pool, and a 400-square-foot maintenance building, on a 10.81-acre (net) parcel.

- The revised final plan for land development for The Station at Bucks County West that proposes to construct 24 multifamily dwellings as an addition to an existing TOD, consisting of 233 townhouse and multifamily dwellings within 19 buildings, 2,650-square-foot maintenance building, 3,600-square-foot clubhouse and pool on a 15.961-acre (net) parcel.

Mr. Zipf provided an overview of TOD which is a mixture of housing, office, retail and other amenities that are integrated into a walkable neighborhood and located within a one-half mile of public transportation. Mr. Zipf said this allows for location efficiency, encourages a healthy lifestyle by promoting walking and biking for daily commutes, saves on personal transportation costs, provides a sense of community, and strengthens existing investment in transit.

Discussion followed on parking, distances, hours of operation, ridership, and facilities. Ms. Bush will make arrangements for SEPTA to present at a future BCPC Board meeting per Mr. Wydro’s suggestion. Larry Menkes, Warminster resident, commented that he did not believe the proposal for the Station at Bucks County East fits the TOD description.

Mr. Wydro polled the board for questions.

6. **ACT 247 REVIEWS**

The reviews of May 6, 2015, were mailed to the board for their review prior to the meeting. Upon motion of Mr. Pellegrino, seconded by Mr. Stone, the motion carried to approve the May 6, 2015 Act 247 reviews. Mr. Goodnoe abstained from Revised Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Dunkin Donuts in Richland Township, BCPC Review #12040.

7. **OLD BUSINESS**

At the April 2015 BCPC Board meeting, a motion carried to approve a resolution certifying certain areas of the Borough of Sellersville containing lands of the Park 10 Revitalization Area to be blighted. Ms. Pierce raised for discussion the area site that appears to be mostly wooded with two streams and a parcel that borders preserved open space. She asked Ms. Bush what further plans the Bucks County Redevelopment Authority (RDA) has for the site. Ms. Bush responded that there is currently no plan. Board discussion followed on administrative procedures for resolution requests.

8. **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.
9. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**  
There was no public comment.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**  
Upon motion of Mr. Dowling, seconded by Ms. Pierce, the meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Submitted by:  
Donna W. Byers, Staff Secretary
Welcome/Introductions: Debra Canale, Administrative Assistant

Dublin Borough - I met with Dublin Borough and presented them with two project reports. One is the economic data that we derive from a national company that provides information on market areas and market gaps. The other is an assessment of their ordinances and the extent to which they support or work against their revitalization plan.

Rickett Road Bridge - Consulting parties meeting was held last week. There is nothing new on the timeline and we heard no new comments, except for more direct input from those who favor restoring the old bridge because of its historic character.

Fair Housing Conference - I am speaking at a fair housing conference in Montgomery County, on some work we did on our analysis of impediments to fair housing.

Coordination with Housing and Community Development on CDBG Applications – We received applications for Community Development Block Grant funding from a number of nonprofit groups and from two municipalities for CDBG funding. Staff is doing some initial vetting of the projects to see if they are eligible. We are also adding another consideration, which is how much County money from other sources goes into specific programs or agencies. For example, several agencies apply for CDBG funding but also receive funding from MH/DP or other human services funds.

Morrisville Borough – I met with Morrisville’s economic development committee. They seemed well informed about what the tools are for redevelopment but do not have priorities or a plan to take action.

New Britain Borough and Delaware Valley University – I met with President Joe Brosnan and their director of strategic planning to determine if our planning efforts, to make more of a “Main Street” on Butler Avenue to create a college town feel, is consistent with their planning. We found no areas of conflict with their planning.

Quakertown Rail Line Study – The saga of restoring passenger service on the Quakertown Rail line continues. We have the full support of SEPTA and the Montgomery County commissioners to pursue this. New ridership projections show slightly lower numbers. SEPTA and DVRPC will look at the projections. This is due mainly to the slower population growth and projections, post-recession, on which ridership numbers are based.

Biotechnology Center – Margie McKevitt and I are meeting with the Biotechnology Center to gain some understanding of their expansion plans. They appeared before the Buckingham Township supervisors two weeks ago and explained their plans for expanding the buildings. The Supervisors gave them their full support and said they would support their application to the Zoning Hearing Board for variances needed.
Hazard Mitigation Plan – We held our second meeting on the Bucks County Hazard Mitigation Plan on May 5. This process is being overseen by Emergency Services and the Planning Commission and is a required update of our Hazard Plan. We try to get all 54 municipalities to participate.
COMMUNITY PLANNING

> **Meeting Attendance**—Attended the regular monthly planning commission meetings of Sellersville Borough, and Milford townships, and the Quakertown Area Planning Committee.

> **Northampton Township Village Commercial Design Guidelines**—Completed development of the landscape section. Continued compiling example illustrations and photos.

> **Richboro Village Master Plan**—Continued to research and assess conditions of the village.

> **Tinicum Township Comprehensive Plan**—Sent final draft to surrounding municipalities and school district for review and comment in accordance with MPC requirements. Presented plan to township planning commission.

> **West Rockhill Township Almont Village Plan**—Presented village “concept plan” PowerPoint presentation to West Rockhill Planning Commission.

> **Cross Keys Study**—Continued narrative production for the Land Use and Zoning, and Economic Development Conditions sections.

> **New Britain Borough Main Street Plan**—Continued to prepare streetscape and redevelopment plans for the western end of Butler Avenue. Met with Delaware University officials to discuss the University’s future land use plans.

> **Lower Makefield Township Master Plan Update**—Continued preparing a presentation of the Plan Update for a future Board of Supervisors’ public hearing on the document.

> **Plumsteadville Village Plan**—Continued analysis of plan production and layout.

> **Brownsville Road Plan**—Continued analysis of plan production using material already generated on the study area.

> **Quakertown Borough Downtown Parking Inventory**—Continued gathering information for the parking inventory.

> **Hilltown Township Comprehensive Plan**—Met with the planning commission to review draft questions for a residential survey.

> **Northampton Township Comprehensive Plan**—Began review and update of existing land use, preserved land, and demographic information.

> **Dublin Borough Ordinance Overview**—Completed draft analysis of the borough zoning ordinance and subdivision and land development ordinance to determine necessary revisions in line with the borough’s revitalization plan. Prepared economic market analysis.

Planning Information and Agency Coordination

> Provided information to the public on topics including demographic and socioeconomic data, development proposals, review letters, local zoning, and municipal regulations.

> Continued researching public comment letters to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regarding the proposed PennEast Pipeline.

> Continued assessment of Pennsylvania Historic and Museum Cultural Resource GIS database as part of the development of a Bucks County Historic Resource Inventory. Continued development of a historic resource organizational matrix with contact information.
> Continued to work on the creation of a plan implementation progress model handbook to track and monitor recommendations outlined in planning documents.
> Reviewed Act 14, 67, 68 NPDES permit applications.
> Attended the regional summit meeting of the East Coast Greenway.

**Act 247 and 537 Review Activity**
> 9 Subdivision and Land Development Proposals
> 4 Sketch Plans
> 4 Municipals
> 4 Sewage Facility Planning Modules
> 3 Traffic Impact Studies

**ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING**

**Energy Efficiency**
> Assisted DVRPC with the Regional Streetlight Procurement Program.

**Stormwater Management**
> Coordinated a staff seminar to learn about the Community Associations Institute Government & Professional Affairs Committee and Common Interest Ownership Communities.
> Reviewed new MS4/TMDL requirements.
> Coordinated training efforts with PADEP regarding new MS4/TMDL requirements.
> Continued communique with regional planning commissions regarding MS4/TMD planning.
> Assisted municipalities with Act 167 planning and compliance regarding new requirements for water quality (as of 2005).
> Assisted municipal engineers regarding new TMDL requirements and the county’s role moving forward.
> Researched Growing Greener funding requirements

**Integrated Water Resources Planning Work Program**
> Assisted Upstream Philadelphia watershed partners with programming for community events.
> Working with numerous firms and agencies regarding the Bensalem Greenway Ecological Prioritization Initiative.
> Attended conference call for Bensalem Greenway Ecological Prioritization Initiative.
> Assisted several municipalities with adoption of new floodplain ordinance and implementation.
> Attended What’s the Value of Water? The Pennsylvania Story panel discussion regarding integrated water resources.
> Attended a PADEP 2015 Growing Greener Watershed Protection grant application workshop.

**National Flood Insurance Program**
> Assisted residents with new floodplain data/FIRMs and insurance coverage.
> Assisted municipalities with implementation of new floodplain ordinances.
William Penn Foundation: Poquessing Watershed Cluster

> Work with project partners regarding the further development of the Streamwatch program and future training events.

Comprehensive Plans

> Began draft narrative for the natural resources, open space, farmland, recreation, historic and scenic resources sections of the Hilltown Township comprehensive plan.
> Reviewed survey contained in Hilltown Township’s comprehensive plan and provided comment and revisions for presentation to the Hilltown Township planning commission.

Bucks County Open Space & Greenway Planning

> Attended Upper Southampton Township Board of Supervisors meeting and secured resolution of support for the Newtown Rail Trail project.
> Submitted funding application to Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission for Newtown Rail Line Trail Design & Engineering Study.
> Met with representatives from Upper Southampton Township relative to trail maintenance, securing the lease for the rail corridor from SEPTA, and trail liability.
> Responded to questions related to the request-for-proposal for Upper Bucks Rail Trail Design & Engineering Study.
> Finished initial draft narrative of the Lower Neshaminy Creek trail feasibility study.
> Met with representative from Bike Bucks County to discuss ways to partner on planning for bicycle facilities in the county.
> Provided GIS data to Plumstead Township for use in development of the township’s trail planning study.
> Provided information for Commissioner Marseglia’s presentation at the East Coast Greenway Summit.

Recycling and Solid Waste

> Collecting data on the two electronic collections the County assisted with, and exploring available options for County residents.
> Coordinating the details for the 2015 Household Hazard Waste (HHW) upcoming events.
> Attended two meetings to review the Regional HHW program and compare notes on the impact of not having electronic collections.
> Continued preparing the Bucks County Municipal Waste Plan update.
> Answered DEP’s questions regarding the 2014 Section 903 50% salary reimbursement grant submission.
> Answering an increasing number of residential recycling inquiries in the absence of convenient electronic waste recycling options.

Hazard Mitigation Planning

> Attended the second of three Hazard Mitigation Plan Update meetings with municipal managers and emergency management coordinators.
> Providing necessary data for the plan update.
TRANSPORTATION AND GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM (GIS)

General Transportation Planning
> Provided answers to questions on Request for Proposals for conversion of Quakertown Rail Line to Pedestrian Trail. Coordinated with SEPTA regarding leasing of unused rail lines. Coordinated with Springfield and Richland Township regarding project.
> Coordinated with DVRPC and Upper Southampton Township regarding conversion of Newtown Rail Line to Pedestrian Trail. Provided project presentation at Upper Southampton Township Board of Supervisors Meeting. Met with Township Manager and Park and Recreation board members. Developed Statement of Interest and submitted same to DVRPC regarding William Penn funding for design work.
> Provided Multimodal Transportation Fund Announcement to all municipalities.
> Attended Regional Bike Committee Meeting.
> Participated in TMA Seminar Development Conference Call.

Public Transportation
> Reviewed SEPTA Board Meeting Materials.
> Reviewed Bethlehem Branch Ridership Forecasts. Attended Forecast Meeting.
> Participated in discussions regarding TMA Bucks Outreach Seminar Program Agenda.

Transportation Assistance to Planning Staff
> Discussed transportation related issues with staff for subdivision and land development reviews.
> Attended Review Design Meeting.
> Continued to develop background information for Cross Keys Land Use and Transportation Study. Received fully executed contract from DVRPC and forwarded to solicitor's and controller's offices. Attended staff meeting to discuss project. Coordinated with sub-consultant regarding project kickoff meeting.
> Continued development of background data for New Britain Borough Transit Oriented Development TCDI Project. Received fully executed contract from DVRPC and forwarded to solicitor's and controller's offices. Processed Purchase of Services Agreement with New Britain Borough. Coordinated with DVRPC regarding traffic count data request for Butler Pike.
> Presented roundabout option for Almont Village Study at West Rockhill Township Planning Commission Meeting. Attended internal meeting to discuss results of Planning Commission Meeting.

Transportation Improvement Program
> Provided Transportation Improvement Program information to various individuals and agencies.
> Attended Regional Technical Committee Transportation Improvement Program Subcommittee Meeting.
> Attended Regional Technical Committee Meeting.
> Attended Rickert Road Bridge Consulting Parties Meeting.

Geographic Information Systems (GIS)
> Continued development of County-Wide Enterprise GIS program.
Continued database development of site addresses and EMS, Fire, and Police response zones.

Continued updating of Enterprise Geodatabase and ArcGIS Server.

Continued coordination with GIS consultant on the Land Records and EMS projects.

Continued development and support of County GIS Consortium efforts.

Continued updating and editing of county Road Centerline database.

Continued GIS technical software support to IT and GIS staff at Board of Assessment.

Continued support of County hosted GIS web server connection and interface.

Continued technical support for County GIS Web Viewer.

Continued editing of county-wide data layers using GIS Data Reviewer tool.

Continued editing procedures on land base parcel annotation features.

Continued updating and testing of ArcGIS 10.3 desktop software.

Continued edge matching work on SE PA 9-1-1 GIS Shared Services regional datasets.

Continued production of county Park and Recreation maps and web applications.

Continued development of new GIS Web Viewer from Flex to JavaScript application.

Attended Shared GIS Services Meeting at Bucks County Emergency Management.

Continued software updating of Staging and Development components of the Enterprise GIS System.

Continued development of web mapping application of suicide incidents in Bucks County.

Created GIS Story Map of county diversity for Purchasing Director's business presentation.

Provided GIS data layers and assistance to Upper Makefield Township.

Updated GIS Web Viewer with newest FEMA floodplain data layers.

Provided GIS Soils data and assistance to Doylestown Township.

Attended ESRI Web Seminar on Portal for ArcGIS and Story Maps.

Provided GIS data layers to Plumstead Township for trail planning development.

GIS Map Production

Produced presentation maps for Community, Environmental and Preservation Planning units.

Produced maps and database of properties for Housing and Community Development.

Continued development of maps of county parks and facilities for print and web deployment.

GIS Transportation

Continued development of Region-wide GIS Transportation initiative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number(s)</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hilltown Township</td>
<td>15-15-WS1</td>
<td>Hilltown Township Water &amp; Sewer Authority</td>
<td>15-17-70-1</td>
<td>New Well - Well #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster Township</td>
<td>49-15-2</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>SALDO Amendment: Floodplain Ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster Township</td>
<td>49-15-3</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Floodplain Ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yardley Borough</td>
<td>54-15-3</td>
<td>Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: Bed and Breakfast/Guesthouse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONFIDENTIAL—NOT FOR RELEASE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Hilltown Township Board of Supervisors
   Hilltown Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Sketch Plan of Land Development for Hilltown Township Water and Sewer Authority
Well #3
TMP #15-17-70-1
Applicant: Hilltown Township Water and Sewer Authority
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: April 15, 2015
Date Received: May 4, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Develop an existing well by constructing a 920-square-foot building to contain a water treatment facility, an underground pump station, and an access drive onto Minsi Trail on a 1.43-acre site.

Location: On the west side of Minsi Trail, approximately 1,600 feet from its intersection with Schwenkmill Road.

Zoning: Rural Residential (RR) district which permits Use F4 Municipal Use.

Present Use: Public utility (well location).

COMMENTS

1. Water resources impact study—Section 140-22 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that all projects withdrawing 10,000 gpd or greater of groundwater or surface water, or a combination of these two sources, are required to obtain a permit from the Delaware River Basin Commission. Township officials should determine if this requirement is applicable to this project.
2. **Wetland mapping source**—The sketch plan identifies wetlands on the site. Future plan submissions should identify the source of wetlands mapping.

3. **Environmental performance standards**—Section 160-28 of the zoning ordinance establishes the environmental performance standards to be met by all subdivision and land development proposals. The sketch plan depicts the features that are required to be protected but does not indicate the amount of encroachment. Subsequent plan submissions should demonstrate compliance with the environmental performance standards.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the June 3, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MMW:dc

cc: Hilltown Township Water and Sewer Authority  
    Crystal B. Hessler, PE, Castle Valley Consultants, Inc.  
    C. Robert Wynn, Township Engineer  
    Richard C. Schnaedter, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warminster Township Board of Supervisors
Warminster Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance—Floodplain Ordinance
Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: May 18, 2015
Hearing Date: June 18, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 505 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on June 3, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the subdivision and land development ordinance to delete the definitions of the terms Floodplain, Floodplain (100 year) and Floodplain Soils on Floodplain and add definitions of Base Flood, Base Flood elevation and Floodplain to be consistent with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Revise Sections 600, Natural Resource Protection to include the new terms.

COMMENTS

We recommend that the township adopt the proposal as submitted since it appears to be consistent with the ordinance requirements as presented by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and FEMA.

We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 505(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

DCZ:dc

Matthew McHugh, Esq., Grim, Biehn, Thatcher
Craig Kennard, Gilmore & Associates. (via email)
Steven Weisner, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warminster Township Board of Supervisors
   Warminster Township Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Floodplain Ordinance

Applicant: Board of Supervisors
Received: May 18, 2015
Hearing Date: June 18, 2015

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on June 3, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend the zoning ordinance to comply with the updated floodplain regulations required by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

Proposed Zoning Provisions: Remove a reference to Floodplain Conservation Overlay in Section 301, Classes of Districts. Repeal existing floodplain regulations in Section 27-1700 through 1712 (Floodplain Conservation District) since they are addressed by a newly adopted stand-alone floodplain ordinance. The definition of floodplains will be replaced in Section 2101, Open Space and Environmental Protection Standards with a new term consistent with new FEMA regulations.

Existing Zoning Provisions: Section 27-1700- through 1712 (Floodplain Conservation District Overlay) contains standards and provisions for all lands within the Township shown as being located within the boundaries of designated Floodplain Districts.

COMMENTS

We recommend that the township adopt the proposal as submitted since it appears to be consistent with the ordinance requirements as presented by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and FEMA.
We would appreciate being notified of the Board of Supervisors’ decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609(g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

cc: Matthew McHugh, Esq., Grim, Biehn, Thatcher
Craig Kennard, Gilmore & Associates (via email)
Steven Weisner, Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Yardley Borough Council
Yardley Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend the Zoning Ordinance—Bed-and-Breakfast/Guesthouse
Applicant: Borough Council
Received: May 14, 2015
Hearing Date: Not set

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 304 and 609 of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, this proposal was sent to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review. The following review was prepared by the staff and endorsed by the Bucks County Planning Commission at a meeting held on June 3, 2015.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposed Action: Amend Chapter 17 of the Yardley Borough Code to provide for the establishment of, and regulation for, a Bed-and-Breakfast/Guesthouse.

Proposed Zoning Provisions: Define Bed-and-Breakfast/Guesthouse and allow by conditional use within: Historic District if property fronts along Main Street or Afton Avenue; R-1 District if property fronts along North Main Street, West Afton Avenue or South Delaware Avenue; and R-2 District if property fronts along the southern side of South Main Street or Reading Avenue.

Regulations are included for plan submission requirements, permits, building codes, rooms and common areas, length of stay, parking, signage and guest registry.

Existing Zoning Provisions: No regulations are provided for Bed-and-Breakfast/Guesthouse.

COMMENTS

We believe that allowing a Bed-and-Breakfast/Guesthouse use in selective areas of the Borough can be an effective approach to preserve and improve historic buildings and complement the important tourism industry in the County. We recommend that the proposal be adopted since it appears to be consistent
with the ordinance requirements as prescribed by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and applicable comprehensive plans.

We would appreciate being notified of the Borough Council’s decision regarding this matter. If the amendment is adopted, please send a copy within 30 days as required by Section 609 (g) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

CIG:dwb

cc: Jordan B. Yeager, Esq., Municipal Solicitor
    John Boyle, Borough Manager/Zoning Officer (via email)
## Bucks County Planning Commission
### Subdivision and Land Development Reviews
#### April 27, 2015 to May 22, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number(s)</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Submission Level</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chalfont Borough</td>
<td>4918-D</td>
<td>7-4-4-1 &amp; -4-3</td>
<td>Chalfont View</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>54 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalfont Borough</td>
<td>12081</td>
<td>7-6-110</td>
<td>Tulio</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4 Multifamily Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Township</td>
<td>8554-A</td>
<td>13-3-8-8</td>
<td>78 Cabot Boulevard East</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Industrial Land Development: 1,800 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Township</td>
<td>12039</td>
<td>13-28-28</td>
<td>Buckingham Retail Properties</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial land Development: 22,428 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilltown Township</td>
<td>10199-B</td>
<td>15-34-112</td>
<td>Kirk Tract</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>13 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Makefield</td>
<td>12079</td>
<td>20-3-26-1</td>
<td>Kaplan Tract</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Makefield</td>
<td>11292-A</td>
<td>20-12-28</td>
<td>ERIN Development</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>80 Attached Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>12082</td>
<td>26-1-133</td>
<td>Teece</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4 Semi-detached Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain Township</td>
<td>12080</td>
<td>27-10-148 &amp; -148-1</td>
<td>8 East Mechanic Street</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 526 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland Township</td>
<td>12078</td>
<td>36-38-32</td>
<td>CVS Pharmacy</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2 Commercial Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 13,225 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sellersville Borough</td>
<td>9958-B</td>
<td>39-8-228, etc.</td>
<td>Elmhurst Gardens</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>115 Multifamily Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 12,000 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Makefield</td>
<td>12083</td>
<td>47-5-2, etc.</td>
<td>Wood Hill Manor</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4 Single-family Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington Township</td>
<td>12075</td>
<td>50-25-15 &amp; -16</td>
<td>MM Storage</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Commercial Land Development: 90,000 Square-feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Chalfont Borough Council
    Chalfont Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Sketch Plan of Subdivision for Chalfont View
    TMP #7-4-4-1; 7-4-4-3
    Applicant: KTMT LIG 1, L.P.
    Owner: Herman Hellberg, Lenape Swim Club
    Plan Dated: November 24, 2014
    Date Received: April 9, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: To subdivide a 16.0141-acre parcel into 54 single-family detached dwelling lots. Open space of 4.48 acres is proposed. An existing recreation complex and plant nursery will be removed. The site is served by public water and sewer.

Location: South of Westview Avenue between North Main Street and Sunset Avenue.

Zoning: The VOC Village Office Commercial District permits village houses on lots of a minimum 10,000 square feet as part of a Planned Village Development on tracts of 20 acres or more as a conditional use. A minimum of 20 percent of the Planned Village Development base site area shall be open space.

The applicant is requesting that the borough amend the standards for Use B12 Planned Village Development to permit Use B14 small lot village houses on lots of 7,000 of square feet or more with the maximum density of 3.6 units per acre on a site area of 10 to 20 acres. Open space of 4 percent of base site area may be required.

Present Use: Commercial and recreational
COMMENTS

1. **Zoning amendment submission**—The applicant has requested an amendment of the zoning ordinance to permit the proposed small lot village house uses in the VOC Village Office Commercial district as part of a Planned Village Development on tracts of 10 to 20 acres. The amendment was submitted to the Bucks County Planning Commission for review, and copies of our review (BCPC # 7-15-1(P)) have been sent to the borough and the applicant. The proposed sketch plan does not comply with the existing VOC zoning provisions. The following review was prepared as if the plan were in compliance with the requested amendment, but it is not a recommendation for adoption of the requested amendment.

2. **Conditional use approval**—Section 27-1304 of the zoning ordinance permits Use B12 Planned Village Development as a conditional use in accordance with Section 27-1809. Conditional use approval must be obtained prior to preliminary plan approval.

3. **Open Space**
   
   a. **Stormwater management in open space**—The plan shows development of adjacent Chalfont Greene open space (TMP #7-4-438) for stormwater management, recreation and buffering. Section 27-551 of the zoning ordinance prohibits land occupied by nonrecreational buildings or structures, stormwater detention and retention basins in open space. Section 27-552 of the zoning ordinance requires that subdivision and land development plans contain a statement that the open space land shall not be separately sold or further subdivided, except for transfer to the borough or a conservation organization and a statement that the open space land shall not be further developed, except for recreational facilities.

   b. **Subdivision of open space land**—Calculations on the plan indicate that sufficient open space for Chalfont Greene remains if land is used for stormwater management. Because the open space may not be used for stormwater detention as noted above in comment 3.a, the land must be subdivided off from Chalfont Greene, which is in conflict with the zoning ordinance section cited above. The adjacent parcel is owned by the Chalfont Green homeowners association and any improvement would require an agreement with the homeowners association and a subdivision of the open space. We recommend that these issues be addressed by the borough and applicant.

   c. **Open space amount**—The plan shows 4.48 percent of the site reserved for open space. The proposed village house lots are small and may provide little space for recreation. The adjacent Chalfont Greene provides almost 30 percent of the site area for open space. The proposed development is minimally denser than Chalfont Greene. We recommend that the applicant consider providing additional open space that is more useable to the residents.

4. **Double frontage lots**—Section 22-703 of the subdivision and land development ordinance states through lots are to be avoided and generally not to be permitted unless the lots are a minimum of 200 feet deep. The plan shows Lots 1-4 and 50-54 will front on Westview Avenue, but present rear yards along Road A with depths of approximately 100 feet. We recommend that the borough determine if the double frontage lots are appropriate.
All other existing lots front along Westview Avenue, so the proposed lots fronting on Westview Avenue will maintain the front yard character. The rear of lots 1-4 and 50-54 will front on Road A which may not be as pleasing a streetscape. We recommend that a street redesign be considered to eliminate the double frontage lots.

5. **Driveway access**—Section 22-705 A. (1) of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that residential driveways shall connect to the street of lowest potential traffic if located on a corner lot. Lots 1 and 54 at the main entrance to the site at Road B and Westview Avenue will have to access Road A.

6. **Stub Street**—Section 22-704.4 of the subdivision and land development ordinance prohibits dead-end streets except as stubs to permit future street extension into adjoining tracts or when designed as culs-de-sac. Road A terminates as a stub street approximate 120 feet southwest of North Main Street. Stub streets shall be designed with a temporary turnaround built to the standard required for culs-de-sac. The plan should be revised to show a cul-de-sac terminus.

7. **Sidewalks**—Section 22-702.2 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that sidewalks shall be required on both sides of all existing streets. The plan shows sidewalks along almost the entire street frontage of all parcels except along North Main Street southeast of the emergency access. We recommend that a short sidewalk section be provided along North Main Street southeast of the emergency access.

8. **Traffic impact study**—Section 22-771.3A.(1) of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires a traffic impact study (TIS) for residential subdivisions of 10 or more dwellings units. We recommend that the TIS evaluate the necessity of extending the Road A stub street to intersect with North Main Street.

9. **Trail easement**—A trail is proposed across adjacent TMP #7-4-438 to the southwest of the site and TMPs #7-4-56 and 7-4-439 to the east. No easement is shown across TMP #7-4-438, so the plan should be revised to show an easement to permit public access. The plan shows an existing easement along TMPs #7-4-56 and 7-4-439. A final composite plan for Chalfont Greene (dated May 21, 200, Carroll Engineering) does not show this easement. The easement should be verified.

10. **Plan scale**—The plan indicates that the scale is 1”=50’ but it appears that the actual scale is 1”=60’. The preliminary plan should show the correct scale.

11. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed subdivision. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the subdivision review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the June 3, 2015, public meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the Bucks County Planning Commission board and staff.
In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

DCZ:dwb

cc: KTMT LIG 1, L.P.
    Robert W. Gundlach, Jr., Esquire, Fox Rothschild LLP
    Pat DiGangi, CKS Engineers, Inc. Borough Engineer
    Sandra Zadell, Borough Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Chalfont Borough Borough Council
    Chalfont Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Sketch Plan of Land Development for Vincent Tulio
        TMP #7-6-110
        Applicant: Vincent Tulio
        Owner: Same
        Plan Dated: November 12, 2014
        Date Received: April 24, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a 4-unit multiplex building on a 15,500-square-foot (0.35-acre) parcel which contains an existing single-family detached dwelling. The site is served by public water and sewer.

Location: Northern side of East Butler Avenue, approximately 900 feet east of its intersection with North Main Street (SR 152). The rear of the site abuts the SEPTA Doylestown rail line.

Zoning: BC Borough Commercial District permits use B5 Multiplex on lots of a minimum 8,000 square feet per building as a conditional use.

Present Use: Residential and vacant

COMMENTS

1. **Conditional use**—Section 27-1104.A of the zoning ordinance permits Use B5 Multiplex as a conditional use in the BC District. In accordance with Section 27-1809 of the ordinance, the Borough Council shall have the power to approve conditional uses at a public hearing. Future plans cannot be approved until conditional use is granted.
2. **Variance**—The plan indicates that variances are needed from zoning ordinance requirements for minimum lot area, minimum lot width, minimum building setback from a parking area, and maximum impervious surface ratio. The borough planning commission should not take action on future plan submissions until the zoning issues are resolved.

3. **Buffer yard**—Zoning ordinance Section 27-514 requires a 25-foot-wide Class B buffer yard between multiplex (residential) and transportation/utility uses. Zoning ordinance Section 27-514.2.C states that no structure, sign, manufacturing or processing activity, commercial activity, parking, or storage or display of materials shall be permitted in the buffer yard. Within the buffer yard, plant material shall be provided according to one of three Class B planting options indicated in Table 2 of the ordinance.

The plan proposes seven parking spaces and a shed in the required 25-foot buffer yard setback area. Future plans should show a buffer yard along the rear property line which abuts the SEPTA rail line, with no parking or structures, and provide the required Class B planting materials.

4. **Minimum setback of accessory building**—In addition to the buffer yard issue stated in Comment 3, we note that the proposed shed is located partially within the 20-foot rear yard setback required by zoning ordinance Section 27-407.2.E(1)(f), and set back five feet from the rear property line. Zoning ordinance Section 27-405.1.C states that an accessory building may be erected within one side yard or within the rear yard, provided that it is located not further forward than the front line of the principal building and provided that the side and rear yards are not less than seven feet each.

5. **Parking stall size**—The proposed parking stall dimensions are 9 feet by 18 feet. Future plans should provide parking stall dimensions of 10 feet by 20 feet, in compliance with zoning ordinance Section 27-533.6.

6. **Driveway width**—Section 22-705.4.B(2) of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires a minimum driveway width for commercial, industrial, and multifamily uses of 22 feet for two-way traffic movement and 12 feet for one-way traffic movement. The plan shows a driveway width of only 18 feet. Future plans should show the required driveway width.

7. **Spillover parking**—The applicant and borough should consider spillover parking needs for the proposed dwellings. At times when additional parking is needed, such as holidays or for parties, or service or delivery vehicles, spillover parking may be forced on-street. The plan provides one parking space more than the minimum required two spaces per unit. It is recommended that future plans provide additional off-street spillover parking for the five proposed units on the site.

8. **Recreational facilities**—Future plans should indicate compliance with subdivision and land development ordinance Section 22-714.1, which requires the construction of recreational facilities, payment of fees in lieu thereof, private reservation of land, or a combination thereof, for all residential subdivisions and land developments of two dwelling units or more.

9. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to
determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the land development review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the June 3, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

DCZ:dwb

cc: Vincent Tulio
    Pat DiGangi, CKS Engineers, Borough Engineer
    Sandra Zadell, Borough Manager (via email)
May 5, 2015
BCPC #8554-A

MEMORANDUM

TO: Falls Township Board of Supervisors
   Falls Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development—78 Cabot Boulevard East
         TMP #13-3-8-8
         Applicant: The Brickman Group
         Owner: Enterprise Leasing Corp. of Philadelphia
         Plan Dated: March 4, 2015
         Date Received: April 22, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a 1,800-square-foot clearspan storage structure on a 6.6-acre tract, which currently contains an existing one story building and storage and staging areas. The site is served by public water and sewer.

Location: South side of Cabot Boulevard East, between U.S. Route 1 and the rail tracks.

Zoning: The PIP—Planned Industrial Park District permits a variety of industrial and commercial uses on a lot of at least 0.5 acre.

Present Use: Industrial.

COMMENTS

1. **Screening**—Section 209-28.G.(3) of the zoning ordinance requires that all outdoor storage or operations shall be adequately concealed from abutting nonindustrial properties with evergreen-type planting or a solid screen fence. Township officials should determine if the existing trees and brush on the perimeter of the site would be sufficient to conceal the proposed clearspan storage structure.
2. **Site capacity and natural resources**—Section 191-52.1.C of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that site capacity calculations shall be submitted and shown on the record plan of all preliminary and final plans by the applicant for all subdivisions and land developments. This would include information to determine natural resources land to be protected and percent of base site area in resource-protected land. Township officials should determine if these calculations are necessary given that the proposed clearspan storage structure is shown to be constructed on an existing paved area with no intrusion on existing natural resources.

3. **Circulation**—Township officials should determine if there would be sufficient distance between the proposed clearspan storage structure and the edge of existing paving to allow proper circulation and turning patterns of work vehicles around the structure.

4. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the June 3, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

TAK:dwb

cc: The Brickman Group  
Enterprise Leasing Corp. of Philadelphia  
Aloysius T. Gryga, RLA, CMC Engineering  
James Sullivan, P.E., Township Engineer  
Peter Gray, Township Manager (via e-mail)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Falls Township Board of Supervisors
    Falls Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for Buckingham Retail Properties
        TMP #13-28-28
        Applicant: Buckingham Retail Properties, LL c/o Tom Verrichia
        Owner: American Stores Company, LLC
        Plan Dated: June 30, 2014
        Last Revised: May 1, 2015
        Date Received: May 6, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct commercial space totaling 22,428 square feet in three buildings on leased lots on a parcel of 8.76 acres. The buildings would consist of a 14,578-square-foot pharmacy with drive-through lane and two drive-in restaurants (one 6,000 square feet and the other 1,850 square feet). Public water and sewer serve the site.

Location: The east side of West Trenton Avenue at Pine Grove Road (Route 13).

Zoning: HC, Highway Commercial District permits a variety of commercial space uses on a lot of at least 40,000 square feet, with a maximum impervious surface ratio of 70 percent. Convenience stores, including drugstores are permitted by right. Restaurants with drive-in service are permitted as conditional uses.

Present Use: Commercial.
COMMENTS

1. **Conditional use**—Restaurants with drive-ins are permitted in the HC District by conditional use, according to Section 209-23.D of the zoning ordinance. The applicant must obtain conditional use approval from the Board of Supervisors prior to plan approval.

   We also note that while the proposed Rite Aid pharmacy is permitted by right, Section 209-23.B the zoning ordinance does not specifically include a drive-in as part of this use nor does Section 209-23.E list drive-ins as a permitted accessory use. Township officials should determine if the proposed pharmacy with a drive-in is a permitted use.

2. **Waivers**—The applicant is seeking waiver of numerous provisions of the subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO). The SALDO waivers encompass requested relief from two sections regulating driveway configuration and grade; from three sections regarding parking lot setback, curbing, stall, and landscaping standards; from one section regarding sidewalk installation; from one section regarding grading in the road right-of-way; from one section regarding installation of curbing; and a partial waiver from the plan information requirements.

   We recommend against waiving the sidewalk installation requirements of Section 191-61 of the subdivision and land development ordinance, so that there will be sidewalk connectivity along the Pine Grove Road (Route 13) frontage to link the apartment complex and other housing, adjacent to the site and across Route 13, with the proposed nearby commercial development. This would also be consistent with the Trenton Avenue Corridor Study (discussed below in comment #8).

   Under the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved and the minimum modification necessary. The final plan should list all granted waivers.

3. **Driveway width**—Continuous open driveways exceeding 30 feet in width at the street line are prohibited under Section 209-42.E of the zoning ordinance. The driveway serving the proposed development off of West Trenton Avenue exceeds this 30-foot requirement.

4. **Off-street loading**—The plan should show off-street loading provisions for the restaurant use #2 in accord with Section 209-23.J of the zoning ordinance and Section 191-51.F of the subdivision and land development ordinance. In addition, all the loading areas should comply with the landscape and screening requirements of Section 209-42.B(2) of the zoning ordinance.

5. **Landscaping**—All improved portions of the property not occupied by buildings or paving shall be landscaped, under Section 209-23.H.4 of the zoning ordinance. In addition, Section 209-38.1 allows buffer screen planting along street lines may be waived at the discretion of the Board of Supervisors. Township officials should confirm that landscaping is sufficient to meet ordinance standards (see comment #8 below regarding landscaping as part of an overall streetscape recommended in the Trenton Avenue Corridor Study).
6. **Street trees**—The township should determine if the existing trees along the West Trenton Avenue frontage are suitable as provided by Section 191-48.A of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

7. **Planting and utilities**—Several proposed trees and shrubs are shown being located over or in close proximity of utilities such as water, sewer, and stormwater lines. The plant materials and utilities should be an appropriate distance away from each other to eliminate potential problems from root growth or from maintenance and repair of utility lines. According to Sections 191-45.A and 191-45.A of the subdivision and land development ordinance, a minimum 20-foot wide easement shall be provided as necessary for utilities and drainage and no permanent structure shall be permitted to be placed, planted, set and put within the area of an easement; the area shall be kept as lawn or ground. The plan should be revised accordingly.

8. **Street improvements**—The plan should be revised to incorporate improvements recommended by the Trenton Avenue Corridor Study. While the subject site falls just outside the study area, the portions of West Trenton Avenue and Pine Grove Road along the site would benefit from the implementation of the overall recommendations for the corridor and the specific recommendations for the “Big Box Character Area” delineated in the study. In addition to street and signal improvement recommendations, we feel strongly that the provision of sidewalks along Pine Grove Road and a coordinated streetscaping package (e.g. street trees, ornamental landscaping, aesthetic lighting) may give the corridor a more coherent identity (as stated in the plan) and increase pedestrian circulation and safety.

9. **Delivery access**—The truck turning plan indicates that there is insufficient turning radius for the full movement driveway on West Trenton Road and, as such, eastbound trucks attempting to enter the site must cross into the second eastbound lane in order to gain access. This is an unsafe situation and the plan should be revised to allow for a more accommodating turning radius which does not force tractor trailer combinations into the second lane. The plan also indicates that trucks cross over internal lanes after delivery to restaurant use #1 to exit from the full movement driveway on West Trenton Road. This also is not a desirable situation and in our opinion the plan should be revised to allow for a more accommodating turning radius, unless deliveries are only to take place after hours of operation and are strictly enforced.

The truck turn plan should also be revised to show the truck turning movements east bound onto West Trenton Avenue from the full movement driveway, south bound onto Pine Grove Road from the full movement driveway, into the full movement driveway from south bound Pine Grove Road, the internal movement after the single driveway from south bound Pine Grove Road to the loading area of restaurant use #1, and the internal movement for deliveries to the restaurant use #2.

10. **Sewage facilities**—The Grading and Utilities Note #23 on sheet 3 of the plan indicates that a Sewage Facilities Planning Module has been submitted to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP). We continue note that the PADEP has notified the applicant that the existing receiving, collection and conveyance system has a projected hydraulic overload, and that conveyance capacity must be provided consistent with the Bucks
County Water and Sewer Authority’s Connection Management Plan for the Neshaminy Interceptor.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the June 3, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

TK:dc

cc: Buckingham Retail Properties, LLC
    American Stores Company, LLC
    Eric Britz, Bohler Engineering
    Tom Hecker, Esq., Begley, Carlin & Mandio
    Jim Sullivan, T&M Associates, Township Engineer
    Thomas Beach, Remington, Vernick & Beach, Township Transportation Engineer
    Peter Gray, Township Manager (via e-mail)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Hilltown Township Board of Supervisors
Hilltown Township Planning Commission

New Britain Township Board of Supervisors
New Britain Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Revised Final Plan of Subdivision for Kirk Tract
TMP #15-34-112
Applicant: Deluca Lot Investors, LP
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: March 22, 2013
Plan Last Revised: March 27, 2015
Date Received: April 6, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: To subdivide a 50.91-acre parcel into 13 single-family detached residential lots. Lots range in size from 3.0 to 4.09 acres. A 0.28-acre portion of the tract located at the rear of proposed Lot 3 would be conveyed to the adjoining TMP #15-34-107. The site would be served by individual on-lot wells and on-lot sewage disposal systems.

The eastern corner of Lot 1 is located within New Britain Township. No structures or driveways are proposed in the portion of the site located within New Britain Township.

Location: Northwestern corner of Upper Stump Road and Callowhill Road intersection.

Zoning: The Rural Residential (RR) District is intended to serve low density residential development and permits Use B1 Single-Family Detached Dwellings on lots of a minimum 50,000 square feet when served by public water. When not served by public water, the minimum lot area is 3 acres.

Present Use: Agricultural and vacant.
COMMENTS

1. **Conservation easement**—Note 35 on Sheet 2 of the plan states that all woodland areas must be permanently preserved. Woodlands to be preserved exist on lots 8, 9, and 10. We recommend the conservation easement be placed on woodlands intended to be preserved.

2. **Pedestrian trail easement**—Note 10 on Sheet 2 of the plan states that a 25-foot-wide pedestrian trail easement was accepted for dedication by the Township. However, the easement is labeled as being terminated on the plan. We recommend that this discrepancy be resolved.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the June 3, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

MMW:dwb

cc: Matthew DeLuca, DeLuca Lot Investors, L.P.
    Frank A. Costanzo, P.E., Van Cleef Engineering Associates
    Edward F. Murphy, Esq., Wisler Pearlstine, LLP
    C. Robert Wynn, Township Engineer
    Richard C. Schnaedter, Hilltown Township Manager (via email)
    Eileen Bradley, New Britain Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Lower Makefield Township Board of Supervisors
   Lower Makefield Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Sketch Plan of Subdivision—Kaplan Tract
         TMP #20-3-26-1
         Applicant: Larry Kaplan
         Owner: Ann Ryan Trust
         Plan Dated: April 8, 2015
         Dated Received: April 20, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a 0.92-net acre lot (1.29 gross acres) from a 4.8-acre parcel. The proposed subdivision will result in the following lot sizes: proposed Lot 1 will contain 3.16 acres and proposed Lot 2 will contain 0.92 net acres. Lot 1 contains an individual on-lot well and septic system. An individual on-lot well and septic system are proposed on Lot 2.

Location: Along the western side of Dolington Road, opposite Susan Circle.

Zoning: R-1 Residential Low Density District permits single-family detached dwellings on a minimum net lot area of 34,000 square feet for sites in which the base site area contains between 32 and 46 percent of natural resources. According to the site capacity calculations on the plan, approximately 39 percent of the site is classified as resource-protected land.

Present Use: Residential.

COMMENTS

1. Requested waivers—Notes on the plan indicate the applicant is requesting waivers from the following requirements of the Lower Makefield Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (ordinance section numbers are not indicated): from providing
roadway widening improvements to Dolington Road; from providing curbing along Dolington Road; and from providing a sidewalk along Dolington Road.

In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for each waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved and the minimum modification necessary.

2. **Reverse frontage lots**—Section 178-44.E of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that, in single-family residential zoning districts, all new lots abutting collector or arterial roads shall be reverse frontage lots. Reverse frontage lots are defined as lots extending between and having frontage on a collector or arterial street and a local or minor street with vehicular access solely from such local or minor street (Section 178-11 of the subdivision and land development ordinance.) We note the site does not have access to a local or minor street, therefore, the applicant should discuss this issue with the township.

3. **Lane lots**—Sections 200-65.B and 200-65.C of the zoning ordinance require a minimum lot size of 40,000 for a lane lot, exclusive of the area of the lane. Future plan submissions should indicate compliance with these requirements for proposed Lot 2.

4. **Setbacks from resource-protected lands**—Section 200-61.C of the zoning ordinance requires that, on lots which include lands with resource restrictions, the minimum building setbacks shall be measured from the limit of the resource protected lands rather than from the lot lines. Future plan submissions should identify the resource protected lands on each lot and indicate compliance with the setback requirement from such resources.

5. **Bike lane**—Section 178-48.A of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires bike lanes in accordance with the Township Official Map. According to the Walkway System Map dated April 7, 1997, last updated December 19, 2002 (which is part of the township’s Official Map), a proposed walkway and bicycle lane is shown along Dolington Road. The sketch plan for the proposed subdivision does not show a bike lane along the site’s frontage on Dolington Road.

6. **Clear sight triangle**—Section 200-60.B of the zoning ordinance requires that at each point where a private driveway intersects a public street or road, a clear sight triangle of 15 feet, measured from the point of intersection of the street and the driveway, shall be maintained, within which the vegetation and other visual obstructions shall be limited to a height of not more than 1.5 feet above street level. Future plan submissions should indicate the required sight triangle for the proposed driveway.

7. **Tree protection**—While not required for sketch plan submissions, we note that future plan submissions shall indicate compliance with the required tree protection measures identified in Section 178-85 of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

8. **On-lot water and sewer facilities**
   
a. **Proposed on-lot water facilities**—Section 178-36.E of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that where no public water supply is available to the
subdivision, the township shall require the developer to obtain from a licensed testing laboratory certificates of approval for each lot as to the quality and adequacy of the water supply proposed to be utilized by the applicant. The applicant will be required to submit the required certificates of approval at future plan stages.

b. **Proposed sewage facilities**—Section 178.36.F of the subdivision and land development ordinance states that no preliminary plan shall be approved without a feasibility report from the Bucks County Health Department where on-lot sewerage is to be provided. The noted feasibility report will be required at future plan stages.

c. **Planning Module**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed subdivision. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the subdivision review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the June 3, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

LMW:dwb

cc: Larry Kaplan  
Mark G. Hintenlang, P.E.  
Boucher & James, Township Engineer  
Terry Fedorchak, Lower Makefield Township Manager (via email)  
Steve Ware, Planning and Zoning Administrator, Keystone Consulting Services (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Lower Makefield Township Board of Supervisors
    Lower Makefield Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision—TMP #20-12-28 Dobry Road
TMP #20-12-28
Applicant: ERIN Development
Owner: Dobry Road, LLC
Plan Dated: January 27, 2015
Date Received: April 23, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a 16.56-acre site into an age-qualified community of 80 residential units for a proposed density of 4.8 dwelling units per acre of base site area. The proposed development consists of 20 separate buildings, with each building containing 4 attached residential units. The dwelling structures are intended to be privately owned by each homeowner; land around the units will be considered common open space. Public water and sewer facilities are intended to serve the development.

Location: Along the northern side of Dobry Road, west of Oxford Valley Road. The western portion of the site abuts railroad tracks (land owned by the North Pennsylvania Railroad Company).

Zoning: C-3 Central Business/Industrial District permits Age-Qualified Community as a permitted use. A minimum of two different types of residential units is required. Attached dwellings are permitted on a minimum lot area of 2,000 square feet. Overall, a maximum density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre of base site area is permitted.

In addition to residential dwellings, a variety of commercial, service, office and recreational uses are permitted in an Age-Qualified Community. A maximum of 600 square feet of office/retail uses per acre of base site area may be developed. The maximum tract impervious surface ratio permitted is 60 percent of the gross site area.
Present Use: Residential and agricultural.

COMMENTS

1. **Requested waivers**—Plan Sheet 7 of 34 of the plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance sections:

   178-20.C(9) to not show existing buildings, driveways, sewer lines, storm drains, etc., within 200 feet of and within the site
   178-40.C to not reconstruct Dobry Road to meet current Township standards
   178-47.A to not provide sidewalk along proposed roadway
   178-93.D(11)(e) to not provide a deep water zone of at least 8 feet in the wet ponds

   In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for each waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved and the minimum modification necessary.

   Regarding relief requested from the street improvement and sidewalk requirements, we recommend that the township not waive Sections 178-40.C and 178-47.A of the subdivision and land development ordinance for the following reasons:

   a. **Dobry Road**—Dobry Road is currently a narrow 2-lane roadway that provides access to less than a dozen properties and dead ends at a residential driveway just west of the railroad tracks. It is the only road on which the subject site has frontage. The subdivision proposal would add 80 new residential units, twelve of which are shown to have direct driveway access onto the roadway (the remaining 68 units are proposed to access an interior roadway within the development.) With the proposed addition of vehicular trips from 80 new residential units, we strongly recommend that the applicant be required to reconstruct Dobry Road to meet current township street standards.

   b. **Sidewalks**—Sidewalks provide pedestrians with a safe route separate from roadways with moving vehicles. To safely accommodate pedestrians, we strongly recommend that sidewalks be provided along the site’s frontage on Dobry Road and along the proposed interior roadway of the development.

2. **Mixture of residential types**—Section 200-47A.3(a) of the zoning ordinance requires a minimum of two different types of residential units for an Age Qualified Community. This ordinance section permits single-family attached dwelling units to comprise a maximum of 60 percent of the total dwelling units in an Age Qualified Community. The plan shows only attached residential units for the proposed development. The plan should be revised to comply with this ordinance requirement.

3. **Maximum allowable density**—Section 200-47A.3(f)(i) of the zoning ordinance permits a maximum density of 4.6 dwelling units per acre of base site area for the Age Qualified Community use. The plan indicates a proposed density of 4.8 dwelling units per acre of base
site area, which exceeds the allowable maximum. The plan should be revised to comply with this ordinance requirement.

4. **Natural resource protection requirements**

   a. **Wetlands and Watercourse Buffers**—According to information on the plan, the proposal would disturb more than the allowable amount of disturbance of wetlands/watercourse buffers. The plan shows proposed grading and plantings within the proposed wetlands/watercourse buffer in the western portion of the site. Section 200-51.B.(4)(b) of the zoning ordinance requires 100 percent protection of wetlands/watercourse buffers. The Site Capacity Calculations on Sheet 10 of 34 indicate that 0.413 acres of wetlands/watercourse buffers exist on the site and 0.311 acres are proposed to be protected. The plan should be revised to comply with this zoning ordinance requirement.

   b. **Site capacity calculations for Woodlands**—According to the Site Capacity Calculations on Sheet 10 of 34, the proposal would exceed the allowable disturbance of woodlands on the site (a 70 percent required protection ratio is indicated). However, use regulations for Age Qualified Community in Section 200-47A.3(b)(ii) of the zoning ordinance require that 40 percent of the total quantity of woodlands on the site shall be protected. It is recommended that the site capacity calculations be revised to include this information.

5. **Environmental assessment**—Section 178-20.G of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires the submission of an environmental impact assessment report for all subdivisions involving three or more dwellings or lots. The required assessment was not provided with the plan submission to our office.

6. **Traffic impact study**—Section 178-020.E.23 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires a traffic impact study when required by the township’s Act 209 Traffic Improvement Plan. We did not receive a transportation impact study for this project nor does the plan indicate that the township has waived the need for such a study. The township officials should determine if a traffic impact study is required for this proposed development.

7. **Common open space area**—Based on the definition of common open space in Section 200-7 of the zoning ordinance, streets, parking areas, and areas set aside for facilities, including detention and retention basins or resource-protected land, shall not be included as common open space. Within the proposed age-restricted development, the plan shows private access drives, which provide access to parking for each dwelling, to be located in area delineated as common open space area. Township officials should determine if the proposed arrangement is acceptable.

8. **Private access drives**—Section 200-47A.19(d) of the zoning ordinance requires private access drives to have a minimum cartway width of 12 feet for one-way circulation and 18 feet for two-way circulation. Private access driveways having 12-foot widths, each to be shared among several units, are proposed for the development. The proposed driveways would not meet the required width for two-way circulation. Township officials should determine if the proposed 12-foot wide driveways are acceptable given the short length of the driveways and
the low number of units that will be served. We do, however, recommend that the driveway and emergency accessway shown between buildings 5 and 6 remain as proposed (20 feet wide).

9. **Parking**

   a. **Number of off-street spaces per unit**—The plan indicates that the off-street parking requirements of two spaces per dwelling unit will be met with one garage space and one driveway space. While it is acknowledged that the ordinance allows garage spaces to be counted towards the parking requirement in an Age-Qualified Community (zoning ordinance Section 200-47A.4.(c)(i)), we note that the use of garage space to meet parking requirements is sometimes not the best arrangement. Often, garage space is used for other purposes, such as for storage or even converted to another room. Therefore, it is recommended that the plan be revised to include a comment stating that garage space intended for parking will be deed-restricted from being used for anything other than vehicle parking.

   Also, we note that Section 200-47A.4(b)(iii)[c] of the zoning ordinance allows up to 25 percent of the parking requirement to be accommodated on new local streets or on shared access easements where a designated lane or area is provided for on-street parking. Consideration should be given to providing a designated parking lane.

   b. **Spillover parking**—Provisions for spillover parking needs for the development should be considered. At times when additional parking may be needed, such as holidays or for parties, or for service or delivery vehicles, spillover parking will be forced on-street. It is recommended the plan be revised to provide off-street spillover parking convenient to all dwelling units. In addition, consideration should be given to how parking for over-sized recreation vehicles would be accommodated.

10. **Recreation land**—The plan should be revised to indicate how the applicant intends to meet the recreation land requirements of Section 200-47A.5.(e) of the zoning ordinance which requires a minimum of 350 square feet of recreation land per dwelling unit.

Future residents should be provided with opportunities within their community to exercise while enjoying the outdoors. In addition, consideration should be given to providing a walking trail around the perimeter of the development for residents. Such a trail would be a nice amenity for a neighborhood where many of the future residents will be active adults. In addition, or possibly as another option, construction of a community center to serve the development might be a worthwhile consideration.

11. **Pedestrian connection**—We note that an office complex containing some physician and medical offices is located directly north of the site (Makefield Executive Quarters). Consideration should be given to providing some type of safe pedestrian connection to the adjacent office complex, whereby future residents may be able to walk rather than drive to appointments.

12. **Tree protection**—Sheet 21 contains a tree protection detail and notes, however, the plan does not show the proposed location of tree protection fencing on the site during
construction. A plan for tree protection during construction in accordance with Section 178-20.E(14) of the subdivision and land development ordinance should be provided.

13. **Buffering from adjacent rail lines**—The Landscaping Plan on Sheets 22 and 23 shows existing tree lines and proposed planting along the western property line which abuts an adjacent rail line. Township officials may want to consider if some additional plantings along this boundary would be beneficial to add buffering between the proposed residences and adjacent rail line.

14. **Stormwater management**—Township officials should be assured that the plan complies with applicable low-impact development design standards and stormwater management practices adopted in Ordinance No. 363 (adopted December 20, 2006).

15. **Editorial**—Plan notation #10 under General Notes (on Sheet 15 of 34) refers to “adjacent parcel, TMP 2-1-32”. Based on the referenced number, the parcel would not be located within Lower Makefield Township. If the notation is intended to reference activity on an adjacent parcel, the plan should be revised to provide a correct parcel number. Otherwise, the notation should be removed.

16. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed subdivision. We recommend that the planning module be submitted at the preliminary plan stage to coordinate the subdivision review with the planning module review.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the June 3, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

LMW:dwb

cc: ERIN Development  
Mark Havers, P.E., Pickering, Corts & Summerson  
Edward F. Murphy  
Boucher & James, Township Engineer  
Terry Fedorchak, Township Manager (via email)  
Steve Ware, Planning and Zoning Administrator, Keystone Consulting Services (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: New Britain Township Board of Supervisors
   New Britain Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision and Land Development—Tecce
   TMP #26-1-133
   Applicant: Alberto and Rosemarie Tecce
   Owner: Same
   Plan Dated: November 18, 2014
   Date Received: April 29, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission Professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide a 1.962-acre parcel into two lots for 2, two-family detached dwellings. Lot 1 would be 31,828 square feet (0.731 acre) and Lot 2 would be 30,410 square feet (0.698 acre). Lot 2 currently contains an existing dwelling that will be removed. The lots will be served by public water and sewer.

Location: North side of Sellersville Road, about 80 feet east of North Main Street (Route 152).

Zoning: RR Rural Residential District permits the B4 Use, two-family dwelling, as a special exception on a minimum lot size of 15,000 square feet per unit.

Use: Residential.

COMMENTS

1. Special exception—Future plan submissions should not be approved until the applicant has received approval of a special exception to permit the proposed two-family detached dwellings by the New Britain Township Zoning Hearing Board.
2. **Clear-sight triangle**—Future plan submissions should show how the plan will comply with the clear-sight triangle requirements of Section 27-2111 of the zoning ordinance.

3. **Site-capacity calculations**—The plan provides site capacity calculations; however, the calculations do not provide all the information required by Section 27-2402 of the zoning ordinance. Future plan submissions should comply with these requirements.

4. **Off-street parking**—The plan shows that two off-street parking spaces will be provided for each dwelling unit. Section 27-2901 of the zoning ordinance requires two off-street parking spaces for use B4 with three or less bedrooms and three off-street parking spaces for use B4 with four or more bedrooms. Future plan submissions should indicate the number of bedrooms planned for the proposed dwelling units and revise the proposed off-street parking arrangements according to Section 27-2901 if necessary.

The dominant feature in the front of the two proposed lots will be the driveway and parking areas. We recommend that Township officials and the applicant discuss whether there would be alternative layouts for the proposed dwelling and parking areas (e.g., parking to the side or rear of the dwellings) that would diminish the impact of the parking areas and allow the front façade of the dwelling to be the dominant feature on each lot.

5. **Cartway width**—Section 22-705.3.C of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires the applicant to improve an existing street to the standards for ultimate right-of-way and cartway widths. The township’s street classification map shows Sellersville Road as a major collector. The required right-of-way and cartway width for a major collector street are 80 feet and 48 feet, respectively. The plan shows an ultimate right-of-way of 30 feet and no improvement to the existing cartway. Future plan submissions should ensure that appropriate right-of-way and cartway widths are provided.

6. **Curbs and sidewalk**—The plan shows no curbs or sidewalks along Sellersville Road on the subject site. Sections 22-706.1.B and 22-706.2.B of the subdivision and land development ordinance require curbs and sidewalks to be installed along the frontage of an existing street. Future plan submissions should provide the required curbs and sidewalks. We note that a sidewalk exists along Sellersville Road across from the subject site in Chalfont Borough and that a sidewalk would allow for potential pedestrian connection to adjacent Swartley-Winkleman Park in Chalfont Borough.

7. **Bike lane**—Section 22-707.2.A of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires bicycle lanes on public streets when required by the Board of Supervisors in locations where off-street bicycle facilities are not feasible because of physical constraints or ownership patterns of land. The Tri-Municipal Master Trail and Greenway Plan recommends an on-road bike lane along Sellersville Road. Township officials should determine if there are any road improvements that should be considered for the subject development that would assist in facilitating the recommended bike lane.

8. **Landscaping**—Section 22-713.4 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires street trees to be planted at minimum 30-foot intervals along all streets and proposed streets abutting or within a subdivision. Township officials should determine if the existing trees along the frontage of the site are sufficient to meet this requirement.
9. **Recreation land**—Future plan submissions should indicate how the proposed development will meet the recreation land requirements of Section 22-715 of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

10. **Historic structure**—Bucks County Board of Assessment records indicate that the existing dwelling dates back at least to the year 1840. We recommend that township officials consider requiring the applicant provide a historical record of the structure before it is demolished. Officials may wish to consider the potential for reuse of the building if it is structurally sound and of historical significance.

11. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant should submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the June 3, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

TAK: dwb

cc: Alberto and Rosemarie Tecce  
Craig Kennard, P.E., Gilmore & Associates  
Eileen Bradley, Manager, New Britain Township (via e-mail)
MEMORANDUM

TO: New Hope Borough Council
    New Hope Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Final Plan of Lot Consolidation and Land Development for 8 E. Mechanic Street
    TMP #27-10-148 & -148-1
    Applicant: Playhouse Inn Property, LLC
    Owner: Same
    Plan Dated: April 15, 2015
    Date Received: April 23, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Prior to constructing an addition to the existing building and converting it from residential to an inn, TMP #27-10-148 and TMP #27-10-148-1 will be consolidated into one lot. The proposed lot size will be 6,135.53 square feet. TMP #27-10-148 currently contains a residential use and TMP #27-10-148-1 contains a garage. The garage will remain, but the existing residential use will be converted to an inn. In addition, 455 square feet of the existing building will be removed and an addition of 981 square feet is proposed. Therefore, there will be a net expansion of the building of 526 square feet. The site is served by public water and sewer.

Location: The north side of East Mechanic Street, approximately 40 feet east of its intersection with South Main Street.

Zoning: The CC—Central Commercial District permits Use 17I—Inn by special exception. A minimum lot area of 4,000 square feet, minimum lot width of 40 feet, minimum front yard of 10 feet, minimum rear yard of 15 feet, and minimum side yards of 6 feet are required. It should be noted that the existing site does not meet the maximum impervious surface coverage ratio, minimum front yard or minimum side yard requirements. However, none of these nonconformities will be expanded through the proposed land development.

Present Use: Residential
COMMENTS

1. **Special exception**—According to the plans, a special exception is being requested. Future plan submissions should not be approved until the applicant has received approval of a special exception to permit the proposed inn use by the New Hope Borough Zoning Hearing Board.

2. **Floodplain requirements**—Ordinance 2015-01, which was adopted by the borough on January 20, 2015, requires compliance with new FEMA mapping standards for all properties within the Special Flood Hazards as documented in Flood Insurance Maps dated March 16, 2015. The plan should provide the current 2015 data and be revised as necessary to ensure compliance with the current requirements.

3. **Historic district**—The site lies within the Historic District according to Ordinance No. 183-A-1. According to Section 5 of this ordinance, the zoning officer shall not issue any permits for the erection, reconstruction, alteration, restoration, demolition or razing of any building, in whole or in part, within a Historic District until the Borough Council has issued a Certificate of Appropriateness as provided within the ordinance. Section 4 of this ordinance indicates that the New Hope Borough Historical Architectural Review Board (HARB) shall give counsel to the borough council regarding any proposed development activity in the Historic District. Therefore, the borough should not act upon this plan until it has received comments from the HARB.

4. **Stormwater management systems**—According to the plans, there are no stormwater management facilities proposed. However, since the site is currently 100 percent impervious surfaces and will remain as such, the borough should determine if additional stormwater management facilities or changes to the existing stormwater management are necessary.

5. **Parking**—According to Section 275-56.E(9) of the zoning ordinance, the required parking for an inn is one off-street parking space for each rental room or suite, plus one space for each two employees. According to the plans, a total of 3 parking spaces is being provided. We note the following issues with the proposal:
   a. **Employee parking**—The plans indicate that 3 rooms will require 3 parking spaces, but do not provide any spaces for employees. Rather, the plans state that there will be no employees. Since the proposed use is an inn, it is reasonable to assume that at some point, a caretaker and/or housekeeper will need to access the facility, and service and delivery vehicles will need access periodically. Therefore, while there may not be an employee on-site at all times, there will be a need for inn staff to park at the site to service the facility. Therefore, we recommend that employee parking be provided.
   b. **Stacked parking**—The plans state that one of the parking spaces will be located within the garage and the other two will be located in front of the garage. According to Section 5.17.B of the subdivision and land development ordinance, parking areas shall be designed to permit each motor vehicle to proceed to and from the parking space provided for it without requiring the moving of any other motor vehicles(s). The proposed arrangement does not meet the requirements of the subdivision and land
development ordinance. In addition, the proposed parking spaces should be delineated on the plans.

6. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the June 3, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

RGB:dwb

cc:    Kevin Daugherty, Playhouse Inn Property, LLC
       Boucher and James, Inc.
       Robert Larason, Borough Zoning Officer
       Craig Kennard, Gilmore & Associates, Inc., Borough Engineer
       John Burke, Borough Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Richland Township Board of Supervisors
Richland Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision and Land Development for CVS Pharmacy
TMP #36-38-32
Applicant: Rich Rycharski, SW Quakertown CVS, LP
Owner: Lapp Warehouse
Plan Dated: April 15, 2015
Date Received: April 22, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Subdivide an 11.85-acre site into two lots. Lot 1 would be 2.75 acres and contain a 13,225-square-foot proposed large retail store (CVS Pharmacy). Lot 2 would be 9.1 acres and contain a relocated retail use (Country Structures – sale of small garages, sheds, and other small out buildings/structures). Public water and sewerage systems would serve the development.

Location: East side of Route 309 (South West End Boulevard), at the intersection of Tollgate Road.

Zoning: PC Planned Commercial District, also within the Arterial Corridor Overlay District. Uses E1 Retail Shop and E2 Large Retail Store (gross floor area greater than 10,000 square feet) are permitted within the PC District on a minimum lot area of 1.0 acre. All land development within the Arterial Corridor Overlay District requires conditional use approval.

According to information provided by the project engineer, the Richland Township Zoning Hearing Board granted the following variances from the zoning ordinance for the subject proposal:

Section 27-513 permit a front yard setback of less than 100 feet along Route 309 (including building and stormwater management structure for Lots 1 and 2)
Section 27-405.E.E2(c) permit a stacking land that serves less than 8 vehicles; 4 are proposed
Section 27-516.2.C permit parking, trash enclosure, signage, and stormwater facilities within the buffer yards

Section 27-557 permit a trash enclosure within the side yard of Lot 1 and the stormwater facility within the side yard of Lot 2

Section 27-557 permit the stacking lane for the drive-through to be adjacent to the loading area

Present Use: Commercial

COMMENTS

1. **Conditional use**—The proposal requires conditional use approval under Section 27-602 of the zoning ordinance because it is located within the Arterial Corridor Overlay District along Route 309. The plan should not be approved until the proposal has been given conditional use approval.

2. **Site capacity calculations and environmental performance standards**—The plan should be revised to provide the site capacity calculations required by Section 27-511 of the zoning ordinance. These are particularly important to show the calculations related to all the natural resource restrictions and protection so that an adequate determination can be made toward compliance with the environmental performance standards in Section 27-514 of the zoning ordinance. The plan does provide lot area calculations that only provide information on wetlands. In addition, these calculations are not formatted, nor are they as comprehensive as those required by Section 27-511.

3. **Drive-through lane**—Section 27-405.E.E2.c of the zoning ordinance requires a stacking lane that would serve a minimum of 8 cars where a drive-in window is proposed. In addition, the stacking lane shall not be used for parking lot circulation aisles, nor shall it in anyway conflict with circulation and parking. The plan has been granted a variance to the length of the stacking lane; however, the drive-through arrangements do not appear to incorporate an adequate bypass lane. It appears that the circulation aisle is to function in that role.

4. **Planting and utilities**—Several proposed trees and shrubs are shown being located over or in close proximity of utilities such as water, sewer (including force main), and stormwater lines. The plant materials and utilities should be an appropriate distance away from each other to eliminate potential problems from root growth or from maintenance and repair of utility lines. According to Section 22-514 of the subdivision and land development ordinance, a minimum 20-foot wide easement shall be provided as necessary for utilities and nothing shall be placed, planted, set or put within the area of an easement. Easements should also be provided for stormwater drainage areas and management facilities. The plan should be revised accordingly.

5. **Parking**—The plan provides parking calculations for the proposed large retail store, but provides no parking calculations for the retail shop use proposed for Lot 2. While the plan shows no improvements to Lot 2 other than stormwater management facilities and a gravel area, we understand that the lot will be used for the existing business on the site – the sale of small garages, sheds, and other small out buildings/structures. As such, there will be a need for customer and employee parking. The plan should be revised to indicate how it will comply with the parking requirements of Section 27-405.E.E1.B of the zoning ordinance.
6. **Parking setback**—Section 22-516.5.B of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires the edge of any parking area not to be closer than 20 feet from the outside wall of the nearest building. The plan shows parking along two sides of the proposed building on Lot 1 only separated by the outside wall by a concrete sidewalk having a maximum width of 9.8 feet. The plan should be revised to comply with Section 22-516.5.B.

In addition, Section 22-516.5.Q of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires parking areas along arterial and collector roads to be set back at least 30 feet from the future right-of-way in order to accommodate acceleration and deceleration lanes and marginal access roads. The plan depicts the 30-foot setback line, but shows the proposed parking areas on Lot 1 20.7 feet from the ultimate (future) right-of-way line of Route 309 and as close as 9.2 feet from the right-of-way line of Tollgate Road. Township officials should determine if the 30-foot setback is needed to accommodate potential acceleration and deceleration lanes or a marginal access road.

7. **Gravel area**—The plan should be revised to clearly indicate how the proposed gravel area on Lot 2 will be used for the relocation of the retail business currently on the site. The plan should show the proposed position of buildings/structures for sale, positions of buildings/structures used for/by employees (e.g., sales office, storage), and proposed circulation and parking of customer vehicles and any business vehicles. Township officials should determine if any of the gravel area should be paved and curbed for driveway access or parking (meeting zoning ordinance and subdivision and land development ordinance requirements). Section 27-541.H of the zoning ordinance indicates that parking for areas of more than three vehicles, the area not landscaped and so maintained, including driveways, shall be graded, surfaced with asphalt or other suitable material, and drained to the satisfaction of the municipal engineer to the extent necessary to prevent dust erosion or excessive water flow across streets or adjoining property. This section also requires off-street parking spaces to be marked so as to indicate their location.

8. **Access management**—Section 27-603 of the zoning ordinance states that no tract within the Arterial Corridor (Overlay) District shall be provided with direct access to the arterial if adequate alternative access can be provided by way of a secondary, primary, collector or marginal access street or through joint access with a neighboring property already provided with access to the arterial. In addition, Section 22-510.2 of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires common ingress and egress be provided when two adjacent nonresidential lots front on a collector or arterial road. The plan proposes a new access on Route 309 for the development proposed for Lot 2. Township officials should determine if there is no adequate alternative access for this lot in accordance with Sections 27-603 and 22-510.2. The extent of the existing wetlands shown on the plan on Lot 2 may have an impact on the consideration of a marginal access street or the joint access with an adjacent parcel.

9. **Off-street loading area and truck circulation**—Section 27-544.F of the zoning ordinance requires that off-street loading facilities have adequate maneuvering space and be arranged so that they may be used without blocking or otherwise interfering with use of automobile accessways, parking facilities, fire lanes or pedestrian ways or backing out onto a street. Given the proposed location of the loading area on Lot 1 and the truck circulation pattern shown on Sheet 25, it is unclear how trucks will use the proposed loading space without interfering with
the one-way vehicle accessway and possibly the proposed sidewalk closest to the building or the drive-through lane. Sheet 25 indicates that trucks will be entering the one-way accessway in the opposite direction of the intended traffic flow. The length of any tractor trailer truck servicing the business may require the truck to be positioned in the drive-through lane or on top of the sidewalk area. The plan has been granted a variance to permit the stacking lane to be adjacent to the loading area. Township officials should determine if the loading space and/or truck circulation pattern should be changed to meet the intent of Section 27-544.F.

10. **Traffic Impact Study**—We recommend that the traffic impact study submitted with the plan be revised to include the level-of-service (LOS) calculations for the intersection of Tollgate Road and Pa Route 309 including the future LOS with the impacts from site generated traffic. Currently the Tollgate Road approaches function poorly during peak hours due to excessive turning movements particularly in the am peak hour. Current lane configurations are inadequate and as such the level of service calculations should be included to determine if the proposed improvements will correct the peak hour delays. Poor geometry particularly for the westbound left turn lane for Tollgate Road also exacerbates the capacity problem. We would recommend that the traffic impact study also address this issue since the excessive left turning volumes create a safety conflict with eastbound right turning movements onto Pa Route 309.

11. **Delivery access**—The truck circulation plan indicates that there is insufficient turning radius for the full movement driveway on Tollgate Road and as such eastbound trucks attempting to enter the site must cross into the opposing westbound lanes in order to gain access. This is an unsafe situation and the plan should be revised to allow for a more accommodating turning radius which does not force tractor trailer combinations into the opposing lanes. The plan also indicates that the internal movement for deliveries is against the one way circulation pattern of the internal driveways. This also is not a desirable situation and in our opinion the plan should be revised to eliminate this circulation pattern unless deliveries are only to take place after hours of operation and are strictly enforced.

12. **Refuse collection**—The plan should be revised to show refuse collection stations and accompanying screening on Lot 2 in accordance with Section 22-522.9 of the subdivision and land development ordinance.

13. **Signage**—The plan shows no information regarding any signage related to advertising the two uses. The plan should be revised to indicate compliance with the requirements of Part 9 Signs of the zoning ordinance if any freestanding or building signs are proposed for the uses intended for Lots 1 and 2.

14. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development.

15. **Editorial**—The term “max. building ratio” in the zoning plan notes should be changed to “max. floor area ratio” to be consistent with the terminology used in Section 27-513 of the zoning ordinance.
This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the June 3, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

TAK:dwb

cc: Rich Rycharski, SW Quakertown CVS, LP
    Joel Dellicarpino, Bohler Engineering
    Quakertown Area Planning Committee
    Mike Schwartz, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer (via e-mail)
    Steven Sechriest, Township Manager (via e-mail)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Sellersville Borough Council
Sellersville Borough Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Tentative Plan of Land Development for Elmhurst Gardens
TMPs #39-8-228 to -8-236; -8-248- to -8-263; 8-283 to -8-288; -8-290 to -8-292; -8-307 to -8-310
Applicant: Curtis Building Group, Inc.
Owner: Same
Plan Dated: July 5, 2001
Last Revised: March 26, 2015
Date Received: April 23, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502). The plan has been submitted in accordance with Article VII of the PaMPC as a Planned Residential Development.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a 120,000-square-foot, six-story building comprising 115 multifamily dwelling units and 12,000 square feet of commercial space on a 7.39-acre parcel. Recreation space of 84,528 square feet is proposed. Public water and sewer will serve the lot.

Location: Approximately 180 feet southeast of the intersection of Willow Street and Park Avenue. The site is at the intersection of Elmhurst Avenue and Willow Street (paper streets), north of Hughes Avenue.

Zoning: PR Planned Residential District permits multifamily dwellings on a minimum site area of 2 acres and maximum density of one dwelling unit per 1,000 square feet of site area. A maximum of 90 percent of proposed floor area may be allocated to residential uses and a maximum of 50 percent for commercial and institutional uses. The required open space must be at least the equivalent to 20 percent of the proposed floor area. The maximum permitted building height is six stories or 65 feet.

Present Use: Vacant woodland

COMMENTS

1. Plan submission—The plan submission does not contain a number of elements which provide the basis for a complete plan review. Sections 707 and 707(4) of the Pa MPC indicate it is in the public interest that all procedures with respect to the approval or disapproval of the development plan shall be consistent with several provisions, including a requirement that an application provide only such information as is reasonably necessary to disclose to the governing body or planning agency the elements listed in subsections (i) through (ix) of Section 707(4) of the MPC. The plan submitted is a single sheet similar to a sketch plan submission. The plan does not include the following information which appears to be reasonably necessary in order to review the plan and, thus, serve the public interest:

   a. Natural resources plan
   b. Stormwater management plan
   c. Traffic impact study
   d. Grading plan
   e. Erosion and sedimentation control plan
   f. Landscaping and buffering plan
   g. Utility plan
   h. Truck turning plan

We recommend that the plan be resubmitted with all information required by the provisions of the Borough's PRD ordinance in order to permit the Borough to establish a reasonable basis to determine whether the Development Plan would or would not be in the public interest as required by Section 709(b) of the Pa MPC.

2. Waivers requested—The site plan indicates that the applicant is requesting waivers from the following subdivision and land development ordinance (SALDO) requirements:

   Section 135-46—Existing features
   Section 135-46.B(10)—Existing features
   Section 135-18.C(1)—Widening Elmhurst Avenue
   Section 135-22.B—Buffer yard
   Section 13521.E—Grading setback
   Section 135-20.C(4)—Open space between wall and parking area

In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved, and the minimum modification necessary.

3. Spillover parking spaces—Section 160-103.A of the zoning ordinance requires two parking spaces for multifamily dwelling units, which are shown on the plan. In addition, SALDO
Section 135-20.C(17) requires that the applicant or owner shall provide for spillover parking of no less than one off-street parking space per unit in A- and B-class developments (as set forth in SALDO Section 135-20.B(6)). The plan should be revised to show the required spillover parking spaces.

4. **Distance from parking area**—As noted in Comment 2, the applicant is requesting a waiver from SALDO Section 135-20.C(4), which requires no less than 20 feet of open space between the outside of walls of dwellings and the curblines of any parking area. The plan shows a loading space directly in front of three dwelling units on the first floor of the building. If the entrances to the units have either outside access or window views of trucks loading and unloading, the view will be very unattractive. We recommend that the loading space be relocated to a space farther northeast along the building.

5. **Site access**—The plan approved under stipulation and agreement showed access to Park Avenue. The subject plan shows two access points along Hughes Avenue which would introduce more than 650 trips per day (6 trips/unit x 115 units) into a neighborhood street. We recommend that the plan be revised to provide access to Park Avenue.

6. **Plan changes**—A letter submitted with the plan indicates the applicant is requesting a change to replace the commercial space required in the PR district with 24 additional residential units. The plan does not show the extra units or required parking spaces and, therefore, should be revised to show the proposed additional units and parking.

7. **Transportation Impact Study**—Section 135-11.I of the SALDO requires that a transportation impact study (TIS) be submitted for all major subdivisions and land developments. The plan submission does not contain a TIS and said study should be submitted to complete the plan application.

8. **Perpendicular parking spaces**—Section 135-20.(2) of the SALDO prohibits angle or perpendicular parking along curbs of local public or private access roads or streets. Parking lots and bays shall be physically separated from the roadway and confined by curbing or other suitable separating device.

   The plan shows 18 perpendicular parking spaces along the main road which is an extension of a paper street, Elmhurst Avenue. Through traffic and vehicles maneuvering in and out of parking spaces may conflict in the proposed design. The plan should be revised to comply with the ordinance by relocating the perpendicular parking spaces in parking courts.

   The plan also shows a row of 27 parking spaces along an accessway connecting Elmhurst Avenue and Pine Street. This accessway will serve as a major circulation route and should not serve both circulation and parking maneuvers. The perpendicular parking should be removed from this accessway.

9. **Sidewalks**—Section 135-11 of the SALDO requires that sidewalks be provided along both sides of all streets. The plan does not show sidewalks along Elmhurst Avenue or Pine Street. The plan should show the required sidewalks.
10. **Truck movement**—Section 135-18.A.(1) of the SALDO requires that proposed streets be planned with regard to public convenience in terms of fire protection, etc. The proposed building and surrounding driveways should be designed in a manner to facilitate truck movement for routine deliveries and fire protection. The plan should contain a truck turn analysis. We also recommend that the borough fire marshal review the plan.

11. **Trail to Park Avenue**—The plan shows a trail system on open space land for recreation. To maximize the benefits of the trail and the sites in proximity to Lenape Park, we recommend that a trail be placed along Willow Street to Park Avenue, which is adjacent to Lenape Park.

12. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the June 3, 2015, public meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the Bucks County Planning Commission board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

DCZ:dwb

cc: Curtis Building Group, Inc.
    Protract Engineering, Inc.
    John A. VanLuvanee, Esq., Eastburn and Gray, PC (via email)
    Cheryleen Strothers, Cowan Associates, Inc., Borough Engineer
    David Rivet, Borough Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Upper Makefield Township Board of Supervisors
    Upper Makefield Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Final Plan of Lot Line Change for Wood Hill Manor

TMPs: #47-5-2, 47-5-3, 47-5-4, 47-5-5, 47-6-6, 47-6-7, 47-6-9 and 47-6-10
Applicant: William A. King
Owners: Howard Schwartz Trust
Plan Dated: March 26, 2015
Date Received: May 11, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: To change the existing boundaries for eight lots with a combined acreage of 24.769 acres (gross), into four lots with a combined acreage of 23.973 acres (net). The difference in the acreage is attributable to the acreage for the eight existing lots being measured to the existing right-of-way and the four proposed lots being measured to the ultimate right-of-way. Lot 1 would contain 9.041 acres, Lot 2 would contain 4.764 acres, Lot 3 would contain 4.051 acres and Lot 4 would contain 6.117 acres. Lot 1 contains an existing single-family detached dwelling and three barns. A plan note indicates that once subdivided, Lot 4 is to be conveyed in its entirety to Howard Schwartz, owner of adjacent TMP #47-4-94. Individual on-lot water and sewerage systems are proposed.

Location: The site is located on the eastern side of Eagle Road, approximately 2,050 feet south of the intersection of Eagle Road and Woodhill Road.

Zoning: CM Conservation Management District permits single-family detached dwellings on a minimum gross site area of 3 acres, with a minimum lot area of 1 acre and a maximum gross density of 0.33 dwelling units per acre.

Present Use: Residential and agricultural
COMMENTS

1. **Zoning data**—The plan notes for zoning data for the Conservation Management District indicate the required maximum impervious surface ratio as follows: for lots up to 1.5 acres: 0.25 of lot area; for lots between 1.5 and 3.0 acres: 0.375 acres plus 0.18 of the lot area in excess of 1.5 acres; and for lots greater than 3.0 acres: 0.645 acres plus 0.15 of the lot area in excess of 3.0 acres. We note that those maximum impervious surface requirements are **per lot**, according to Article IV, Section 401.C of the zoning ordinance. Section 401.B indicates a maximum impervious surface ratio of 0.15 **per site** for single-family detached dwellings in the Conservation Management District. This information should be clarified on the plan prior to final plan approval and the plan adjusted accordingly if required.

2. **Driveway**—An existing driveway/lane on proposed Lot 1 is partially located on proposed Lot 2 where the driveway accesses Eagle Road. The plan should be revised to address this issue. If the driveway is intended to remain as an access for Lot 1, an access easement should be established.

3. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposal.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the June 3, 2015 meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

PWG:db

cc: William A. King  
TLC Surveying, Inc.  
Douglas Rossino, P.E., Gilmore & Associates, Township Engineer  
David Nyman, Interim Township Manager (via email)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Warrington Township Board of Supervisors
   Warrington Township Planning Commission

FROM: Staff of the Bucks County Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Land Development for MM Storage
         TMP #50-25-15; 50-25-16
         Applicant: Storage Partners of Warrington, LP & SMCCI Group, LLC.
         Owner: Same
         Plan Dated: March 31, 2015
         Date Received: April 6, 2015

This proposal has been reviewed by the Bucks County Planning Commission professional staff, which has prepared the following comments in accordance with the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (Section 502).

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal: Construct a 90,000-square-foot storage building on a 1.59-acre site served by public water and sewer. A vacant service station and auto repair garage will be removed.

Location: Western side of Easton Road approximately 500 feet south of its intersection with Freedoms Way.

Zoning: The O-I Office Light Industrial District permits manufacturing, laboratories, professional and business offices on lots of a minimum 5 acres. Limited access self storage facility is permitted as a conditional use on lots of 1.5 acres, or more.

Present Use: Vacant service station/auto repair garage and vacant auto sales office.

COMMENTS

1. Conditional use—Section 1403.A. of the zoning ordinance permits limited access self storage facility as a conditional use, in accordance Section 2302 of the ordinance. The plan cannot be approved until conditional use approval is granted.

2. Waivers requested—The plan indicates that the following waivers will be requested from the requirements of the subdivision and land development ordinance:
Section 319.2.B(4)—Storm pipe diameter  
Section 319.2.B(9)—Storm drain pipe cover  
Section 319.2.C(8)—One foot freeboard  
Section 319.2.C(10)—Detention basin berm width  
Section 406—Monuments

In accordance with the requirement of Section 512.1.(b) of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, the applicant must state in full the grounds and facts of unreasonableness or hardship on which the request for the waiver is based, the provision or provisions of the ordinance involved and the minimum modification necessary.

3. **Corridor Overlay District**—The site falls within the Corridor Overlay District which establishes design standards for buildings. Section 330.3 of the subdivision and land development ordinance establishes standards for building design and requires that applicants for subdivision or land development submit a description of the use proposed, architectural drawings of proposed building(s) and photographs of the original site in which the proposed development will occur and how the new development will relate to the existing surroundings. The required information should be submitted to the township.

4. **Grading**—Section 318.2.E of the subdivision and land development ordinance requires that grading be set back 5 feet from property lines. The plan shows grading within 5 feet of the property line, but it should be revised to show the grading terminating at least 5 feet from the property line.

5. **Parking**—The plan shows ten parking spaces, which complies with the zoning ordinance requirements for office and retail use parking as part of a limited access self storage use. However, it is not clear where storage facility users will park. The applicant should ensure that sufficient parking exists for the site.

6. **Site circulation**—The keypad entry panel for the fenced storage area is on the left side of the driveway for drivers entering the site. A patron accessing the storage area must drive on the left side of the driveway against traffic to enter the storage area. We recommend that the plan show a circulation pattern to describe how cars will maneuver and minimize conflict.

7. **Plan information**—The zoning data table on Sheet 1 indicates the maximum height permitted is 55 feet. The plan states the proposed height of the building is less than 55 feet. This building will be one of the tallest along the Easton Road corridor and may present a challenge for firefighters. We recommend that the plan be revised to indicate the precise height of the proposed building, and that the plan be reviewed by the township fire marshal.

8. **Signage**—The plan does not show signage for the proposed use. Part 22 of the zoning ordinance specifies standards for signs. The plan should be revised to show sign details so the township may determine compliance with the ordinance.
9. **Existing structure**—The plan shows a sign and brick wall planter along the right-of-way of Easton Road in the northeastern corner of the site. We recommend that this structure be removed.

The plan also shows an existing chain link fence along the Eason Road frontage and on PECO property along the northern portion of the site. The fence along Easton Road will be removed but nothing is stated about the fence on the PECO property. We recommend that the applicant and PECO coordinate removal of the fence.

10. **Sewage facilities**—The applicant must submit a Sewage Facilities Planning Module Application Mailer to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) to determine if an Act 537 Planning Module for Land Development must be submitted for this proposed land development.

This review will be included in the Bucks County Planning Commission board materials for the June 3, 2015, meeting. It is not necessary for you to attend this meeting, but you are welcome to do so and to offer comments on the proposal to the BCPC board and staff.

In order that we may be more aware of your concerns, please send us a copy of all municipal decisions sent to this applicant.

DCZ:dwb

cc: Storage Partners of Warrington, LP & SMCCI Group, LLC.
    Eric Clase, P.E., Gilmore & Associates
    Tom Gockowski, P.E., Carroll Engineering Corporation, Township Engineer
    Timothy Tieperman, Township Manager (via email)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>BCPC Number</th>
<th>Tax Parcel Number(s)</th>
<th>PaDEP Code Number</th>
<th>Plan Review Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Makefield Township</td>
<td>Moon Nursery Tract</td>
<td>11942</td>
<td>20-3-36-1</td>
<td>1-09929-293-3J</td>
<td>20080-0212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton Township</td>
<td>Spaeth</td>
<td>11206</td>
<td>31-26-56-2</td>
<td>1-09937-401-3J</td>
<td>20080-0214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Southampton Township</td>
<td>McCabe</td>
<td>12014</td>
<td>48-23-7</td>
<td>1-09949-126-3J</td>
<td>20080-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington Township</td>
<td>Bhakta</td>
<td>10243-A</td>
<td>50-27-34</td>
<td>1-09950-273-3J</td>
<td>20080-0217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 4, 2015

Mr. Douglas A. Waite, P.E.
Gilmore & Associates, Inc.
65 E. Butler Avenue
Suite 100
New Britain, PA 18901

RE: Moon Nurseries Tract Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-09929-293-3J
BCPC #11942
TMP #20-3-36-1
Lower Makefield Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. Waite,

We have received a copy of the subject planning module\(^1\) regarding the proposed connection of 15 new single-family detached dwellings to public sewer facilities. Proposed is an extension to connect the development into the Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority’s Core Creek collection system. Sewage from the residences will be conveyed through the Neshaminy Interceptor to the Northeast Philadelphia Treatment Plant for final treatment by the Philadelphia Water Department.

The *Township of Lower Makefield, Bucks County, Pennsylvania Act 537 Sewage Facilities Plan Update*, (adopted February 1, 1999) is the official sewage facilities plan for Lower Makefield Township. This plan indicates that the subject site is within the Core Creek Service Area, within which the sewage generated is conveyed by the Core Creek Interceptor to the Neshaminy Interceptor and ultimately to the Northeast Philadelphia Treatment Plant. Therefore, the proposed method of sewage conveyance and treatment is consistent with the township’s official Act 537 Plan.

According to correspondence from the Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority (BCWSA), dated April 17, 2014, the Moon Nursery Tract project is included in the BCWSA Neshaminy Interceptor Corrective Action Plan (CAP) and Connection Management Program (CMP) that was accepted by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PaDEP) on March 10, 2014, with flow release scheduled for 2015.

\(^1\) Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection’s (PaDEP) Title 25, Rules and Regulations, the subject planning module is a revision to the Lower Makefield Township Sewage Facilities Plan. Therefore, the Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) and the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH) are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.
In further review of the planning module submission, we note that documentation confirming compliance with the state historic preservation act, while indicated to be attached in the packet, is not included in the copy of the planning module packet submitted to our office for review. Furthermore, the required sections have not been completed: J.2 regarding total sewage flows to facilities; and O.4 and O.5 related to required agent signatures from the collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities.

If the township approves the planning module and thereby revises the official wastewater facilities plan, the completed (signed) resolution and required supporting data (Components 3 and 4; transmittal letter; plans; narrative; copies of the BCPC and BCDH review letters) should be sent to Elizabeth Mahoney, Supervisor, PaDEP, Southeast Regional Office, 2 East Main Street, Norristown, Pennsylvania 19401.

If you have any questions regarding this review, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Lisa M. Wolff
Community Planner

LMW:dwb

Attachment

cc: Terry S. Fedorchak, Lower Makefield Township Manager
Steve Ware, Lower Makefield Township Planning and Zoning Administrator
Genevieve Kostick, BCDH
Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
Act 527 file
Note to Project Sponsor: To expedite the review of your proposal, one copy of your completed planning package and one copy of this Planning Agency Review Component should be sent to the existing county planning agency or planning agency with areawide jurisdiction for their comments.

**SECTION A: PROJECT NAME** (See Section A of instructions)

Project Name
Moon Nurseries Tract

**SECTION B: REVIEW SCHEDULE** (See Section B of instructions)

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. **March 27, 2015**

2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   
   Agency name

3. Date review completed by agency **May 4, 2015**

**SECTION C: AGENCY REVIEW** (See Section C of instructions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Is there a county or areawide comprehensive plan adopted under the Municipalities Planning Code (53 P.S. 10101 et seq.)?

   ☒ ☐ Is this proposal consistent with the comprehensive plan for land use?

   ☒ ☐ Does this proposal meet the goals and objectives of the plan?
      
      If no, describe goals and objectives that are not met

   ☒ ☐ Is this proposal consistent with the use, development, and protection of water resources?
      
      If no, describe inconsistency

   ☒ ☐ Is this proposal consistent with the county or areawide comprehensive land use planning relative to Prime Agricultural Land Preservation?
      
      If no, describe inconsistencies:

   ☒ ☐ Does this project propose encroachments, obstructions, or dams that will affect wetlands?
      
      If yes, describe impact

   ☒ ☐ Will any known historical or archeological resources be impacted by this project? **Not known**
      
      If yes, describe impacts

   ☒ ☐ Will any known endangered or threatened species of plant or animal be impacted by the development project?

   ☒ ☐ Is there a county or areawide zoning ordinance?

   ☒ ☐ Does this proposal meet the zoning requirements of the ordinance?
      
      If no, describe inconsistencies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th><strong>SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW</strong> (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Have all applicable zoning approvals been obtained?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>12. Is there a county or areawide subdivision and land development ordinance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>13. Does this proposal meet the requirements of the ordinance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe which requirements are not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>14. Is this proposal consistent with the municipal Act 537 Official Sewage Facilities Plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>15. Are there any wastewater disposal needs in the area adjacent to this proposal that should be considered by the municipality? <strong>Not known</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, describe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>16. Has a waiver of the sewage facilities planning requirements been requested for the residual tract of this subdivision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, is the proposed waiver consistent with applicable ordinances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe the inconsistencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>17. Does the county have a stormwater management plan as required by the Stormwater Management Act?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, will this project plan require the implementation of storm water management measures?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Name, Title and signature of person completing this section:

Name: **Lisa M. Wolff**

Title: **Planner**

Signature: **Lisa M. Wolff**

Date: **May 4, 2015**

Name of County or Areawide Planning Agency: **Bucks County Planning Commission**

Address: **The Armagh, Neshaminy Manor Rd., 1360 Armagh Road, Doylestown, Pa 18901**

Telephone Number: **215.345.3400**

---

**SECTION D. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS** (See Section D of instructions)

This Component does not limit county planning agencies from making additional comments concerning the relevancy of the proposed plan to other plans or ordinances. If additional comments are needed, attach additional sheets.

The county planning agency must complete this Component within 60 days.

This Component and any additional comments are to be returned to the applicant.
May 11, 2015

Matthew Chrobocinski
1456 Ferry Road, Bldg. 500
Doylestown, PA 18901

RE: Spaeth Subdivision
PaDEP Code # 1-09937-401-3J
BCPC #11206
Northampton Township, Bucks County

Dear Mr. Chrobocinski:

We have received a copy of the planning module¹ concerning the proposal to subdivide 2.242 acres into two single-family lots of 40,106 square feet (Lot 1) and 41,145 square feet (Lot 2). Wastewater flows (542 gallons per day) will flow by public sewerage through the Northampton, Bucks County, Municipal Authority’s collection system, through the Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority (BCWSA) system, and to the Philadelphia Water Department’s (PWD) Northeast Philadelphia Water Pollution Control Plant via the Neshaminy Interceptor.

The proposed revision is consistent with the Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Sewerage Facilities Plan, 1970, as the proposal is within a public sewerage area and flows will be conveyed to the Northeast Philadelphia Water Pollution Control Plant.

The PWD certifies there is adequate capacity within the City of Philadelphia’s conveyance and treatment facilities to receive and treat the sewage flows from this subdivision. The waste load will not create a hydraulic or organic overload or a five-year protected overload that is inconsistent with the City’s approved Combined Sewer Overflow Plan. The project is included in the BCWSA Neshaminy Interceptor Corrective Action Plan and Connection Management Plan accepted by PaDEP on March 10, 2014, with flow increase in 2014.

¹ Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection’s (PaDEP) Title 25, Rules and Regulations, the planning module is a revision to the Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Sewerage Facilities Plan, 1970. Therefore, the Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) and the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH) are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.

Visit us at: www.buckcounty.org
If the municipality approves the planning module and thereby revises the official sewage facilities plan, the completed (signed) resolution and required supporting data (Components 3 and 4; transmittal letter; plans; narrative; copies of the BCPC and BCDH review letters) should be sent to Elizabeth Mahoney, Sewage Planning Supervisor, Wastewater Management Planning, PADEP, Southeast Regional Office, 2 East Main Street, Norristown, PA 19401.

Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Michael A. Roedig
Planner

cc: Eric Ponert, Philadelphia Water Department
    Genevie Kostick, BCDH
    CKS Engineers, Inc.
    Mike Solomon, Director of Planning and Zoning, Northampton Township
    Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
    Act 537 file
**Note to Project Sponsor:** To expedite the review of your proposal, one copy of your completed planning package and one copy of this *Planning Agency Review Component* should be sent to the existing county planning agency or planning agency with areawide jurisdiction for their comments.

**SECTION A. PROJECT NAME** (See Section A of instructions)

- **Project Name**
  - Spaeth Subdivision

**SECTION B. REVIEW SCHEDULE** (See Section B of instructions)

1. **Date plan received by county planning agency.** April 20, 2015
2. **Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction**
   - **Agency name**
3. **Date review completed by agency** May 8, 2015

**SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW** (See Section C of instructions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1. Is there a county or areawide comprehensive plan adopted under the Municipalities Planning Code (53 P.S. 10101 et seq.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>2. Is this proposal consistent with the comprehensive plan for land use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>3. Does this proposal meet the goals and objectives of the plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe goals and objectives that are not met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>4. Is this proposal consistent with the use, development, and protection of water resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>5. Is this proposal consistent with the county or areawide comprehensive land use planning relative to Prime Agricultural Land Preservation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistencies:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>6. Does this project propose encroachments, obstructions, or dams that will affect wetlands?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, describe impact:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>7. Will any known historical or archeological resources be impacted by this project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, describe impact:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>8. Will any known endangered or threatened species of plant or animal be impacted by the development project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>9. Is there a county or areawide zoning ordinance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>10. Does this proposal meet the zoning requirements of the ordinance? <strong>N/A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistencies:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>11. Have all applicable zoning approvals been obtained?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>12. Is there a county or areawide subdivision and land development ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>13. Does this proposal meet the requirements of the ordinance?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If no, describe which requirements are not met: ________________________________

| ☒   | ☐  | 14. Is this proposal consistent with the municipal Act 537 Official Sewage Facilities Plan? |
|     |    | If no, describe inconsistency: ________________________________ |

| ☒   | ☐  | 15. Are there any wastewater disposal needs in the area adjacent to this proposal that should be considered by the municipality? |
|     |    | If yes, describe: ________________________________ |

| ☒   | ☐  | 16. Has a waiver of the sewage facilities planning requirements been requested for the residual tract of this subdivision? |
|     |    | If yes, is the proposed waiver consistent with applicable ordinances? | N/A |

If no, describe the inconsistencies: ________________________________

| ☒   | ☐  | 17. Does the county have a stormwater management plan as required by the Stormwater Management Act? |
|     |    | If yes, will this project plan require the implementation of storm water management measures? |  |

| ☒   | ☐  | 18. Name, Title and signature of person completing this section: |
|     |    | Name: Michael Roedig |
|     |    | Title: Planner |
|     |    | Signature: [Signature] |
|     |    | Date: May 8, 2015 |
|     |    | Name of County or Areawide Planning Agency: Bucks County Planning Commission |
|     |    | Address: 1260 Almshouse Road |
|     |    | Telephone Number: 215-345-3400 |

### SECTION D. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (See Section D of instructions)

This Component does not limit county planning agencies from making additional comments concerning the relevancy of the proposed plan to other plans or ordinances. If additional comments are needed, attach additional sheets.

The county planning agency must complete this Component within 60 days.

This Component and any additional comments are to be returned to the applicant.
May 21, 2015

Cynthia D. Smith, P.E.
Horizon Engineering
428 Main Street
Pennsburg, PA 18073

RE: McCabe Minor Subdivision Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-09949-126-3J
BCPC #12014
TMP #48-23-7
Upper Southampton Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Ms. Smith:

We have received a copy of the subject planning module regarding the connection of one single-family dwelling to the existing sanitary facilities of the Upper Southampton Township Sewer Authority. The sewage will be treated by the Philadelphia Water Department’s Northeast Philadelphia Treatment Plant.

The 1970 Bucks County Sewerage Facilities Plan is the official Act 537 Plan for this portion of Upper Southampton Township. The proposal to connect to the existing public sewer facility is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan, since this plan indicates that the subject site is within an area to be served by the public sewer facilities of the Upper Southampton Township Sewer Authority.

As stated within the planning module submission, the sewage generated from the site will flow through the Poquessing Interceptor which is under a Corrective Action Plan to address overflows within the system. Subsequently, connections to the Poquessing Interceptor must be on the Connection Management Plan. The submission includes correspondence from the Upper Southampton Municipal Authority and from Lower Southampton Township to the Philadelphia Water Department requesting that the project be added to the Connection Management Plan. We recommend that the township not approve the planning module until confirmation from the Philadelphia Water Department that this project is included in the Connection Management Plan.

If the municipality approves the planning module and thereby revises the official sewage facilities plan, the completed (signed) resolution and required supporting data (Components 3 and 4; transmittal

---

1Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection’s Title 25, Rules and Regulations, the subject planning module is a revision to the Upper Southampton Sewage Facilities Plan. Therefore, the Bucks County Department of Health and Bucks County Planning Commission are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.
letter; plans; narrative; copies of the Bucks County Department of Health and Planning Commission
review letters) should be sent to Elizabeth Mahoney, Sewage Planning Supervisor, Wastewater
Management, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection Southeast Regional Office, 2
East Main Street, Norristown, PA 19401.

If you have any questions regarding this review, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Matthew M. Walters
Planner

MMW:dc

Attachment

cc: Genevie Kostick, BCDH
    Elizabeth Mahoney, PaDEP
    Joseph Golden, Township Manager
    Act 537 file
**SEWAGE FACILITIES PLANNING MODULE**
**COMPONENT 4B - COUNTY PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW**
(or Planning Agency with Areawide Jurisdiction)

**Note to Project Sponsor:** To expedite the review of your proposal, one copy of your completed planning package and one copy of this Planning Agency Review Component should be sent to the existing county planning agency or planning agency with areawide jurisdiction for their comments.

### SECTION A. PROJECT NAME
(See Section A of instructions)

**Project Name**
McCabe Minor Subdivision

### SECTION B. REVIEW SCHEDULE
(See Section B of instructions)

1. Date plan received by county planning agency: April 22, 2015
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction: 
   Agency name: Bucks County Planning Commission
3. Date review completed by agency: May 21, 2015

### SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW
(See Section C of instructions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>1. Is there a county or areawide comprehensive plan adopted under the Municipalities Planning Code (53 P.S. 10101 et seq.)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>2. Is this proposal consistent with the comprehensive plan for land use?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ☒   | ☐  | 3. Does this proposal meet the goals and objectives of the plan?  
   If no, describe goals and objectives that are not met |
| ☐   | ☒  | 4. Is this proposal consistent with the use, development, and protection of water resources?  
   If no, describe inconsistency |
| ☒   | ☐  | 5. Is this proposal consistent with the county or areawide comprehensive land use planning relative to Prime Agricultural Land Preservation?  
   If no, describe inconsistencies: |
| ☐   | ☒  | 6. Does this project propose encroachments, obstructions, or dams that will affect wetlands?  
   If yes, describe impact |
| ☐   | ☒  | 7. Will any known historical or archeological resources be impacted by this project?  
   If yes, describe impacts |
| ☐   | ☒  | 8. Will any known endangered or threatened species of plant or animal be impacted by the development project? |
| ☐   | ☒  | 9. Is there a county or areawide zoning ordinance? |
| ☐   | ☒  | 10. Does this proposal meet the zoning requirements of the ordinance?  N/A  
   If no, describe inconsistencies |

- 1 -
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Have all applicable zoning approvals been obtained? N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Is there a county or areawide subdivision and land development ordinance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Does this proposal meet the requirements of the ordinance? N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe which requirements are not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14. Is this proposal consistent with the municipal Act 537 Official Sewage Facilities Plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe inconsistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15. Are there any wastewater disposal needs in the area adjacent to this proposal that should be considered by the municipality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, describe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16. Has a waiver of the sewage facilities planning requirements been requested for the residual tract of this subdivision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, is the proposed waiver consistent with applicable ordinances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If no, describe the inconsistencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17. Does the county have a stormwater management plan as required by the Stormwater Management Act?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, will this project plan require the implementation of storm water management measures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18. Name, Title and signature of person completing this section:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name: Matthew M. Walters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Title: Community Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date: May 21, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name of County or Areawide Planning Agency: Bucks County Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Address: The Almshouse, 1260 Almshouse Road, Doylestown, PA 18901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone Number: 215 345-3400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION D. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (See Section D of instructions)

This Component does not limit county planning agencies from making additional comments concerning the relevancy of the proposed plan to other plans or ordinances. If additional comments are needed, attach additional sheets.

The county planning agency must complete this Component within 60 days.
This Component and any additional comments are to be returned to the applicant.
May 14, 2015

Brian Horner, P.E.
Protract Engineering Inc.
P.O. Box 58
Hatboro, PA 19040

RE: Bhakta Assisted Living Facility Planning Module
PaDEP Code #1-09950-273-3J
BCPC #10243-A
TMP #50-27-34
Warrington Township, Bucks County, PA

Dear Mr. Hanna:

We have received a copy of the subject planning module\(^1\) regarding the construction of sewage conveyance and collection facilities to serve a four-story assisted living facility.

The Warrington Township Act 537 Plan Amendment No. 5 is the official Act 537 Plan for this portion of Warrington Township. The proposal to construct a collection and conveyance system is consistent with the official Act 537 Plan, since this plan indicates that the subject site is within an area to be served by the Warminster Municipal Authority Log College Wastewater Treatment plant.

If the municipality approves the planning module and thereby revises the official sewage facilities plan, the completed (signed) resolution and required supporting data (Component 4b; transmittal letter; plans; narrative; copies of the BCPC and BCDH review letters) should be sent to Elizabeth Mahoney, Wastewater Management Planning, PaDEP Southeast Regional Office, 2 East Main Street, Norristown, PA 19401.

---

\(^1\) Under the revised Chapter 71 of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection's (PaDEP) Title 25, Rules and Regulations, the subject planning module is a revision to the Warrington Township Sewage Facilities Plan. Therefore, the Bucks County Planning Commission (BCPC) and the Bucks County Department of Health (BCDH) are required to review and comment on the proposed plan revision.
If you have any questions regarding this review, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David C. Zipf, AICP
Community Planner

DCZ:dwb

Attachment

cc: Genevieve Kostick, BCDH
    Elizabeth Mahoney, Sewage Planning Supervisor, Wastewater Management, PaDEP
    Tim Tieperman, Township Manager
    Act 537 file
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
BUREAU OF WATER STANDARDS AND FACILITY REGULATION

SEWAGE FACILITIES PLANNING MODULE
COMPONENT 4B - COUNTY PLANNING AGENCY REVIEW
(or Planning Agency with Areawide Jurisdiction)

Note to Project Sponsor: To expedite the review of your proposal, one copy of your completed planning package and one copy of this Planning Agency Review Component should be sent to the existing county planning agency or planning agency with areawide jurisdiction for their comments.

SECTION A. PROJECT NAME (See Section A of instructions)

Project Name
Bhakta Assisted Living Facility

SECTION B. REVIEW SCHEDULE (See Section B of instructions)

1. Date plan received by county planning agency. May 12, 2015
2. Date plan received by planning agency with areawide jurisdiction
   Agency name: Bucks County Planning Commission
   Date review completed by agency: May 14, 2015

SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (See Section C of instructions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>If No, Describe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Is there a county or areawide comprehensive plan adopted under the Municipalities Planning Code (53 P.S. 10101 et seq.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>2. Is this proposal consistent with the comprehensive plan for land use?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Does this proposal meet the goals and objectives of the plan?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>4. Is this proposal consistent with the use, development, and protection of water resources?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>5. Is this proposal consistent with the county or areawide comprehensive land use planning relative to Prime Agricultural Land Preservation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Does this project propose encroachments, obstructions, or dams that will affect wetlands?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>7. Will any known historical or archeological resources be impacted by this project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>8. Will any known endangered or threatened species of plant or animal be impacted by the development project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>9. Is there a county or areawide zoning ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Does this proposal meet the zoning requirements of the ordinance? N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If no, describe inconsistencies:
### SECTION C. AGENCY REVIEW (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Have all applicable zoning approvals been obtained? ____________________________

12. Is there a county or areawide subdivision and land development ordinance?

13. Does this proposal meet the requirements of the ordinance? N/A

   If no, describe which requirements are not met ____________________________

14. Is this proposal consistent with the municipal Act 537 Official Sewage Facilities Plan?

   If no, describe inconsistency ____________________________

15. Are there any wastewater disposal needs in the area adjacent to this proposal that should be considered by the municipality?

   If yes, describe ____________________________

16. Has a waiver of the sewage facilities planning requirements been requested for the residual tract of this subdivision?

   If yes, is the proposed waiver consistent with applicable ordinances. ____________________________

   If no, describe the inconsistencies ____________________________

17. Does the county have a stormwater management plan as required by the Stormwater Management Act?

   If yes, will this project plan require the implementation of storm water management measures?

18. Name, Title and signature of person completing this section:

   Name: David C. Zipf, AICP

   Title: Community Planner

   Signature: [Signature]

   Date: May 14, 2015

---

### SECTION D. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (See Section D of instructions)

This Component does not limit county planning agencies from making additional comments concerning the relevancy of the proposed plan to other plans or ordinances. If additional comments are needed, attach additional sheets.

The county planning agency must complete this Component within 60 days.

This Component and any additional comments are to be returned to the applicant.